

University of Southampton Research Repository

Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis and, where applicable, any accompanying data are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This thesis and the accompanying data cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder/s. The content of the thesis and accompanying research data (where applicable) must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder/s.

When referring to this thesis and any accompanying data, full bibliographic details must be given, e.g.

Thesis: Attapon Sriprasert (2020) 'Thai University Teachers' Beliefs of English as a Lingua Franca and their Multilingual Awareness', University of Southampton, Faculty of Humanities, PhD Thesis, 241

Data: Attapon Sriprasert (2020) 'Thai University Teachers' Beliefs of English as a Lingua Franca and their Multilingual Awareness', URI [dataset]

University of Southampton

FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics

**Thai University Teachers' Beliefs of English as a Lingua Franca and
their Multilingual Awareness**

by

Attapon Sriprasert

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

September 2020

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

ABSTRACT

FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics

Doctor of Philosophy

**THAI UNIVERSITY TEACHERS' BELIEFS OF ENGLISH AS A
LINGUA FRANCA AND THEIR MULTILINGUAL AWARENESS**

By Attapon Sriprasert

Teachers' belief is the field of the study that is widely studied among scholars in various fields of studies, particularly in the field of educational system. This is because it plays an important role in both learning and teaching. Importantly, it controls the way teachers plan the lessons, the decisions they make in their teaching, and their behaviors in the classroom. Therefore, this present study aims to investigate Thai teachers' beliefs of English language in English as a lingua franca (ELF) context. This is because ELF is the new trend of the study in a Thai context, particularly among Thai English language teachers. It is essential to investigate how they perceive the notion of ELF before the integration of ELF into Thai ELT context. Furthermore, their awareness of ELF in relation to multilingualism and factors affecting their language awareness are to be discovered. The study seeks to provide references for English education practice in Thailand and further benefit the vast number of Thai practitioners of English who will be engaging in international communication in various ways.

To do so, 20 Thai university English teachers in one Thai public university participated in this study. Qualitative research with four research instruments including; semi-structured

interviews, focus groups, documents analysis, and classroom observations, was employed to conduct the study. Then, content analysis with the use of Nvivo12 was utilized to analyze the data to reveal Thai teachers' beliefs and their awareness towards ELF in relation to multilingualism. The findings reveal that the majority of the participants believed that English language can be differently used from standard English as long as they can reach the goal of communication. Even though they did not show that they have an explicit awareness of ELF, it is found from the study that they showed their implicit ELF awareness through their pragmatic strategies used in their real-life communication. Nevertheless, these beliefs tended to be limited in the educational context when they held their identities as English teachers instead of English users. It was found that standard English models have still been embedded in Thai ELT context due to several factors. Raising ELF awareness among Thai English language practitioners is suggested to prompt them with the shift of English language status from monolingual to multilingual use of English.

Table of contents

Table of Contents	vii
List of Tables	xiii
Academic Thesis: Declaration of Authorship	xv
Acknowledgements	xvii
Definitions and Abbreviations	xix
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background and rationale of the study.....	1
1.2 Research aims and research questions.....	4
1.3 Contributions of the study.....	5
1.4 Thesis structure.....	5
Chapter 2 Teachers' Beliefs	7
2.1 Introduction.....	7
2.2 Defining teachers' beliefs.....	7
2.3 The nature of teachers' beliefs.....	9
2.4 Types of teachers' beliefs.....	11
2.4.1 Teachers' beliefs about learners.....	11
2.4.2 Teachers' beliefs about learning.....	12
2.4.3 Teachers' beliefs about themselves.....	13
2.4.4 Teachers' beliefs about language.....	15
2.5 Function of teachers' beliefs.....	16
2.6 Factors affecting teachers' beliefs.....	17
2.6.1 Internal factors.....	17
2.6.2 External factors.....	19

2.7 Summary of the chapter.....	22
Chapter 3 English as a Lingua Franca.....	23
3.1 Defining ELF.....	23
3.2 ELF characteristics.....	25
3.2.1 The pragmatics of ELF.....	25
3.2.2 Grammar in ELF.....	28
3.3 Multilingualism in ELF.....	29
3.4 English language teaching and ELF.....	32
3.5 ELF awareness in ELT classroom.....	34
3.6 ELF and multilingualism in Thai context.....	38
3.7 Summary of the chapter.....	39
Chapter 4 Research Methodology.....	41
4.1 Research methods.....	41
4.1.1 Qualitative research design.....	41
4.1.2 Trustworthiness (reliability and validity) in qualitative research.....	42
4.1.3 Triangulation.....	43
4.1.4 Advantages and disadvantages of triangulation.....	45
4.2 Data collection tools.....	46
4.2.1 Semi-structured interviews.....	46
4.2.2 Focus groups.....	53
4.2.3 Document analysis	57
4.2.4 Classroom observations	59
4.3 Data analysis.....	61
4.3.1 Deductive category application.....	62
4.3.2 Inductive category development.....	62
4.4 Summary of the chapter.....	63

Chapter 5 Teachers' beliefs of English as a subject matter	65
5.1 Introduction.....	65
5.2 Participants.....	65
5.3 Analysis methods.....	67
5.3.1 Analytical framework.....	67
5.3.2 Transcription and coding process.....	68
5.4 Results and analysis.....	72
5.4.1 Teachers' beliefs about English language.....	72
5.4.1.1 Target language: ENL or ELF.....	72
5.4.1.2 Ownership of English: NES ownership vs global ownership.....	76
5.4.1.3 NES conformity vs NNES creativity.....	79
5.4.1.4 English vs Englishes.....	82
5.4.1.5 Fixity vs fluidity.....	86
5.4.1.6 Culture and language.....	89
5.4.1.7 Classroom vs authentic.....	91
5.4.2 Teachers' ELF in relation to multilingual awareness.....	93
5.4.2.1 The pragmatics of ELF.....	93
5.4.2.2 Grammar in ELF.....	101
5.4.3 Factors affecting teachers' ELF in relation to multilingual awareness.....	105
5.4.3.1 Factors affecting the lack of participants' ELF awareness.....	105
5.4.3.2 Factors affecting the formation of participants' ELF awareness.....	113
5.5 Summary of the chapter.....	116

Chapter 6 Teachers' beliefs and reflections on English in ELT practices.....	119
6.1 Introduction.....	119
6.2 Participants in focus group.....	119
6.3 Analytical method and procedure.....	121
6.4 Results and analysis.....	123
6.4.1 Teachers' beliefs on English language education in a Thai context.....	123
6.4.1.1 Beliefs on standard English.....	124
6.4.1.2 Beliefs on variety of Englishes.....	132
6.4.2 Teachers' awareness of ELF.....	135
6.4.3 Factors affecting ELF awareness in Thai ELT context.....	138
6.4.3.1 Factors affecting the lack of ELF awareness.....	139
6.4.3.2 Factors affecting the formation of ELF awareness.....	144
6.5 Summary of the chapter.....	145
Chapter 7 (Mismatch between teachers' beliefs and teachers' practices of English.....)	147
7.1 Findings from document analysis.....	147
7.1.1 Course descriptions of the productive skill modules.....	147
7.1.2 Course descriptions of the receptive skill modules.....	150
7.1.3 Course descriptions of the literature modules.....	153
7.1.4 The summary of the findings from document analysis.....	154
7.2 Findings from the classroom observations.....	154
7.2.1 Teachers' practices in English major student classroom.....	157
7.2.1.1 Contents vs forms (English major classes).....	157
7.2.1.2 ELF pragmatic use (English major classes).....	160
7.2.2 Teachers' practices in non-English major student classroom.....	164
7.2.2.1 Contents vs forms (Non-English major student classes).....	164

7.2.2.2 ELF pragmatic use (Non-English major student classes).....	167
7.2.3 Summary of the chapter.....	171
Chapter 8 Conclusion.....	173
8.1 Responses to research questions.....	173
8.1.1 Thai university English teachers' beliefs of English language (RQ1).....	174
8.1.1.1 Thai English teachers' beliefs of English language used in general.....	174
8.1.1.2 Thai English teachers' beliefs of English language used in ELT context.....	179
8.1.2 Thai English teachers' ELF awareness (RQ2).....	186
8.1.3 Factors affecting Thai English teachers' ELF awareness (RQ3).....	191
8.1.3.1 Factors affecting Thai English teachers' the lack of ELF awareness.....	192
8.1.3.2 Factors affecting Thai English teachers' the formation of ELF awareness.....	197
8.2 Thai teachers' beliefs of the integration of ELF in Thai ELT context.....	199
8.2.1 Teachers' beliefs of the current status of English used.....	199
8.2.2 The integration of ELF in ELT context.....	201
8.3 Implications and contributions of the study.....	203
8.4 Limitations and suggestions for further research.....	206
8.5 Concluding remark.....	207
Appendices.....	209
Appendix A: Participant Information Sheet.....	211
Appendix B: Consent Form.....	213

Appendix C: Risk Assessment Form.....	214
Appendix D: Student Research Project Ethics Checklist	216
Appendix E: Data Collection Schedule.....	218
Appendix F: Interview Questions.....	219
Appendix G: Focus Groups Guideline.....	220
References.....	221

List of tables

Table 1: Description of the teacher participants.....	66
Table 2: Interview transcription conventions.....	69
Table 3: Coding frame for the interviews.....	71
Table 4: Description of the teacher participants in focus groups.....	120
Table 5: Focus groups transcription conventions.....	121
Table 6: Focus group coding framework.....	123
Table 7: Descriptions of the teacher participants in classroom observations.....	155
Table 8: Classroom observations transcription conventions.....	155
Table 9: Coding frame for classroom observations.....	156

Academic Thesis: Declaration of Authorship

I, Attapon Sriprasert declare that this thesis entitled *Thai University Teachers' Beliefs of English as a Lingua Franca and their Multilingual Awareness* and the work presented in it are my own and has been generated by me as the result of my own original research.

I confirm that:

1. This work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;
2. Where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;
3. Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;
4. Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;
5. I have acknowledged all main sources of help;
6. Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;
7. None of this work has been published before submission.

Signed:

Date: September 2020

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible to complete without the great help and support from my supervisor, Dr. Ying Wang. Her expertise and suggestions led me to the end of my PhD journey. Therefore, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to her for everything she had done supporting me to finish this project. In addition, I would also like to thank Professor Laura Dominguez (my second supervisor) who offered me useful advice and suggestions.

I am also truly indebted and thankful to my friends and colleagues in the Center for Global Englishes (CGE) at the University of Southampton for their friendships and support. Spending 4 years with them, thought-provoking and lively discussion from them encouraged me to become one part of the community.

Furthermore, I am also grateful to my research participants for their contribution to the data collected for my research. Without them, I could not have made this done.

Finally, without my beloved family, I could not come this far. I would like to express my special thanks to my parents and brother for their love, understanding, and support during my pursuit of PhD dream. This PhD thesis is dedicated to my family.

Definitions and Abbreviations

AEC	ASEAN Economic Community
ASEAN	Association of South-East Asian Nations
DWLL	Department of Western Languages and Linguistics
EFL	English as a foreign language
ELF	English as a lingua franca
ELFA	English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings
ELT	English language teaching
ENL	English as a native language
ESL	English as a second language
L1	First language
L2	Second language
NESs	Native English speakers
NNESs	Non-native English speakers
NSE	Native Standard English
TQF	Thailand Qualification Framework

Chapter 1

Introduction

The main objective of this present study is to investigate Thai university teachers' language beliefs in response to the rise of English as a global lingua franca and their awareness of English as a lingua franca (ELF) in relation to multilingualism in their teaching practice in Thailand, which is a multilingual nation. This chapter begins with the research background and rationale of the study. Then, research aims, research questions, research contributions are presented in the next section. The final part of the chapter introduces the the thesis structure.

1.1 Background and rationale of the study

In a Thai context, English plays a leading role as lingua franca (Baker, 2009) because it is mostly used by Thai people to interact with people whose first language is not Thai, particularly in Thai tourism industry (Todd, 2006). This is most obviously seen along with the establishment of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) Community in 2015, when English became an official working language for communication among the ASEAN member countries as well as between those countries and its counterparts. Hence, English is important for Thai people with people from various countries and multicultural backgrounds. In order to prepare Thais for this situation, developing effective English users for intercultural communication has to be taken into consideration. Kongkerd (2013) claimed that Thai English teachers who are providing students with knowledge and skills for communication in English may have the most important role.

In a Thai academic context, despite the fact of adopting the notion of ELF in ELT appears unacceptable to many scholars, the notion of ELF has raised vital issues regarding communication features and culture in ELF communication. Consequently, the notion of ELF will be useful for English teachers to consider equipping students the appropriate knowledge and skills for intercultural communication (Baker, 2009; Kongkerd, 2013). Thai users of English need to use English as an important medium to interact mainly with non-native speakers of English (NNSEs). As a consequence, other skills (for example; accommodation, co-construction, code mixing, etc) apart from English may be necessary for successful intercultural communication (Kongkerd, 2013). Similarly, Baker (2011) emphasized that only linguistic knowledge such as lexis, grammar, or the cultural norms of English native speakers seems not to be sufficient for communication with people from multilingual and multicultural backgrounds. It is necessary to understand a variety of contexts and cultures for success in intercultural communication in ELF. Thai users of English need to be able to employ the variety of Englishes through developing the skills, knowledge, and attitudes of successful multilingual intercultural communicators (Canagarajah, 2007). Therefore, English teachers who are responsible for developing knowledge and skills in their students may have to adjust their teaching roles and their teaching foci to provide the students with appropriate skills and knowledge for effective intercultural communication in the lingua franca context (Kongkerd, 2013).

As mentioned before that although English plays mainly roles as a lingua franca in Thailand, it tends to be difficult to apply the notion ELF in the ELT classroom because non-native teachers and learners may generally desire to achieve the aim of sounding like a native speaker (Jenkins, 2000). Many researchers have suggested the way out for this issue. These are for examples, Baker (2012) revealed that Thai English teachers may have to raise Thai learners' awareness of issues of intercultural communication, and Thai learners may have to interact with people from multilingual and cultural backgrounds. Rajeevnath (2015) mentioned that local teachers are likely to have a better understanding of socio-cultural

context of their learners and institutions apart from the experience of learning English as a foreign/second language. It is relevant to Rattanaphuma (2013) and Kanoksilapatham (2013) which noted that teacher of English should have broad perspectives about the role of functions of English in different contexts. They should understand the goals of language learning in current situations and reality. Furthermore, they should choose appropriate choices of teaching methodologies and assessment to match the needs and problems of students and a context as a whole.

However, before the adoption of ELF approach in ELT in a Thai context, teachers' beliefs towards ELF and ELF awareness among Thai teachers need to be explored. According to Dewey (2015), it is essential for research to become much more thoroughly engaged with teachers' existing beliefs, and for researchers to pay closer attention to teachers' levels of awareness of ELF and their understanding of what ELF means for learners and teachers in particular pedagogic contexts. Similarly, Sifakis and Bayyurt (2015) claim that non-native teachers operating in an Expanding Circle context will more readily approve the integration of ELF and WE in their classroom when they have understood and appreciated the validity and function of ELF.

Consequently, the study aims to investigate the beliefs of ELF in relation to multilingual awareness among Thai university teachers. This is because language beliefs and language awareness play an important role in learning and teaching and directly affect both their perceptions and judgments of teaching and learning interaction in classroom. While many studies on language awareness are confined to grammar, recent language awareness has expanded beyond linguistic forms to cover area such as pragmatics, culture, and pedagogy (Murray, 2012). Despite several language interests, the traditional language awareness study is mainly focused on knowledge about the English used by NESs and connected with the conventions generated in the monolingual context of NESs. This seems to be limited through the ELF perspective, a research field emerging in response to the globalization of

English in multilingual context (Wang, 2015). Particularly in a Thai context, Thailand is categorized as a multilingual context because there are; for example, Chinese, Malays, Cambodians, Vietnamese, alongside with Thai people (baker & Jarunthawatchai, 2017). As a consequence, the focus of this study is to reveal Thai teachers' beliefs of ELF and their awareness of ELF in relation to multilingualism.

1.2 Research aims and research questions

The present study consists of three research aims. Firstly, it seeks to investigate Thai university English language teachers' beliefs of English language. This includes their perspectives on using English and English learning and teaching. Secondly, this study aims to explore the awareness of ELF in relation to multilingualism among Thai English language teachers. This is to gain an insight into how they are aware of the phenomenon of ELF and how it reflects in their practices. Thirdly, factors affecting the formation or the lack of an awareness of ELF in relation to multilingualism are to be discovered. Overall, ELF in relation to multilingualism is the new trend of study in a Thai context, particularly for Thai teachers. Therefore, before adopting ELF to some extent in ELT in a Thai context, it is crucial to explore their beliefs and ELF awareness among them. This is because teachers' beliefs and language awareness play an important role in language teaching and learning. The study of Thai teachers' beliefs of English used and their ELF awareness would clarify their perceptions, attitudes, knowledge, and skillset regarding ELF. Additionally, it would reveal how these teachers understand what ELF is and what ELF means to them and their learners in pedagogic contexts. Consequently, three research questions are proposed to help frame the study which include:

1. What are Thai university English teachers' beliefs of English?
2. To what extent do Thai university English teachers have an ELF awareness?
3. What factors are contributing to the formation or the lack of their ELF awareness under a multilingualism framework?

1.3 Contributions of the study

There are a number of contributions from this present study. Firstly, although there are lots of studies of teachers' beliefs in a Thai context, not many of them have placed the focus on teachers' beliefs of ELF. It is hoped that the findings of this study will, to some extent, lead to a better understanding of the beliefs of ELF among Thai university English teachers. Additionally, this will reveal how they think English is used in the present day. Secondly, the awareness of ELF in relation to multilingualism which is investigated in the study have never been explored in a Thai context. It is essential to pay attention to teachers' level of awareness of ELF and their understanding of what ELF means to them and their learners (Dewey, 2015). This would lead to teacher development and teacher training in a Thai context. Finally, factors affecting teachers' awareness of ELF in relation to multilingualism in this study would be a guideline for English education practice in Thailand and further benefit Thai learners of English who will be engaging in international communication. Furthermore, this will definitely encourage English teachers, academic staffs, researchers, and scholars in Thailand to recognize the issues regarding ELF that can vitally contribute to the development of the appropriate English language teaching and curriculum as Wang (2015) claimed that language education needs to change to address the sociolinguistic reality.

1.4 Thesis structure

This thesis consists of eight chapters: an introduction with an overview of the rationale for the research; two chapters of literature review; one chapter of research methodology; three chapters of the findings and discussion; and one chapter of the conclusion.

In chapter 2, the concept of teachers' beliefs from the previous literatures are reviewed. This is to clarify the definition and the nature of teachers' beliefs. Different types of teachers' beliefs on different contexts and their functions of beliefs are delineated in this section. Furthermore, both internal and external factors affecting their beliefs are discussed in this section. This is to describe the significant of beliefs which affect on teachers' practices.

In chapter 3, the definition of ELF is illustrated to clarify this paradigm which is different from standard English. The characteristics of ELF consisting of: the pragmatics of ELF and grammar in ELF, are discussed to help frame the study. Then, the ELT and ELF notion in relation to ELF awareness are reviewed to use as a framework how this notion reflects the teacher participants' beliefs of English language in relation to ELF awareness.

Chapter 4 provides the rationale how this thesis conducted. It begins with the explanation of qualitative research design with the triangulation of data collection to strengthen the study. Four research instruments including: semi-structured interviews, focus groups, documents analysis, and classroom observations, are discussed in detail how each instrument is conducted. Finally, the analytical framework using content analysis with deductive and inductive categories is showed in this section.

Chapter 5, 6, and 7 present the findings from each research instrument. The findings from semi-structured interviews with the main themes emerged from the interviews are discussed in chapter 5, and chapter 6 discusses the findings from focus groups. Then, the findings and discussions from the documents analysis and classroom observations are clarified in chapter 7.

Chapter 8 is the final chapter of this thesis providing the conclusion of the study. The first section of this chapter presents the detailed discussion of the relevant findings of the study to answer the research questions. Then, the possibility, difficulties, and solutions of how to integrate the notion of ELF in Thai ELT context, are revealed in the next section. Finally, the implications, contributions, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further studies, are presented in the final section of this chapter.

Chapter 2

Teachers' beliefs

2.1 Introduction

Teachers' beliefs play an important role in learning and teaching. For many years, several research literatures have suggested that teachers' beliefs directly affect both their perceptions and judgments of teaching and learning interaction in classroom (Clark & Peterson, 1986; Clark & Yinger, 1987). The study of Shavelson and Stern (1981) hypothesized that beliefs played a role in teachers' decisions, judgments, and behaviors. More importantly, Pajares (1992) restated that teachers' beliefs heavily influence the way they plan the lessons, the decisions they make in their teaching, and their behaviors in the classroom. The importance of teachers' beliefs has been also documented in second language acquisition research. Williams and Burden (1997) pointed out that teachers' beliefs about language learning affect everything that they do in the classroom, guiding and prompting classroom actions much more strongly than the use of particular methodology or course book. Similarly, Xu (2012) emphasized that teachers' beliefs guide language teachers to adopt their teaching strategies for coping with their daily language teaching challenges, influence their general well-being, and in turn, shape language learner; learning environment, their motivation and their language achievement and ability. Specially, Ng and Farrell (2003) found some evidence that what teachers say and do in the classrooms are controlled by their beliefs. In the following sections, definition of teachers' beliefs, the nature of teachers' beliefs, types of teachers' beliefs, function of teachers' beliefs, and factors that affect teachers' beliefs are clarified.

2.2 Defining teachers' beliefs

Teachers' beliefs are one of the most difficult concepts to define (Mansour, 2009). Savasci-Acikalın (2009) mentioned that although educational study has paid great attention to

teachers' beliefs, the clear definition of teachers' beliefs has still not been defined. This is because as Pajares (1992) argued that 'the difficulty in studying teachers' beliefs has been caused by definitional problems, poor conceptualizations, and differing understandings of beliefs and belief structures' (p.307). Consequently, the definitions of beliefs have been varied in the literature. However, to understand what beliefs are, this present study has gathered a number of statements and definitions of beliefs which are clarified by previous studies.

Because teachers' beliefs have no single definition; thus, different researchers gave different definitions for teachers' beliefs. According to Pajares (1992), belief is defined as an 'individual's judgment of the truth or falsity of proposition, a judgment that can only be inferred from a collective understanding of what human beings say, intends, and do' (p.316). Similar to Pajares, Cabaroglu and Roberts (2000) stated that beliefs are conceptual portrayals that signal a reality, truth, or trustworthiness to its holder to ensure reliance upon it as a guide to personal thought and action. Borg (2001) indicated that 'a belief is a proposition which maybe consciously or unconsciously held, is evaluative in that it is accepted as true by the individual, and is therefore imbued with emotive commitment; further, it serves as a guide to thought and behavior'. He also pointed out that teacher belief is a term that usually used to refer to teachers' pedagogic beliefs, or those beliefs of relevance to an individual's teaching. Likewise, Khader (2012) defined teachers' beliefs as the teachers' arguments and their views on teaching and learning.

According to the different definitions of beliefs from previous studies, this study defines beliefs as ideas, assumptions, and convictions individuals hold to be true based on their past experiences. Even though the terms 'beliefs' and 'attitudes' are interwoven, they are different. While beliefs are ideas based on individual's previous experiences that individuals hold as being true, attitudes are the mental dispositions individuals have towards others and current circumstances. Attitudes can be changed easily and frequently

depending on the influences. On the other hand, even though beliefs can be changed, it usually takes time or strong evidences to convince individuals to change their beliefs. The nature of beliefs is clarified in the next section

2.3 The nature of teachers' beliefs

According to Fives and Buehl (2012), teachers' beliefs can be both implicit and explicit. The implicit beliefs guide teachers' behaviors and filter interpretation of teaching experiences without the teachers' awareness. Additionally, implicit beliefs are also beyond the teachers' control and cannot be influenced through personal reflective practice (Nespor, 1987). On the other hand, some beliefs may be explicit to the teachers (Rimm-Kaufman et al., 2006). Dewey (1986) pointed out that require both intellectual and practical commitment as he mentioned that 'beliefs...involve precisely this commitment and consequently sooner or later they demand our investigation to find out upon what ground they rest' (p.117). Because teachers' beliefs can be both implicit and explicit, Fives and Buehl (2012) suggested that the study on teachers' beliefs should consider on the process of data analysis. If beliefs are explicit, the researcher can ask teachers what their beliefs are and use those responses as the unit of analysis (Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004). The process of data collection could be done through interview protocols or questionnaire. However, if beliefs are implicit, the researcher can infer their beliefs through the analysis of teacher actions, planned action, or talk (Gill & Hoffman, 2009). These beliefs can be investigated through observations.

Teachers' beliefs exist along with a continuum of stability, and they are activated by context demands (Fives & Buehl, 2012). It is an argument among researchers to examine whether beliefs are viewd as stable or dynamics (Kagan,1992; Thompson, 1992). Many researchers have emphasized that beliefs are relatively stable and resistant to change (Mosely, Reinke, & Bookout, 2002; Haney & McArthur, 2002). On the other hand, other researchers have

found that teachers' beliefs can change over time; such as, beliefs about classroom management, classroom practice, and children (La Paro, Siepak, & Scott-Little, 2009) or beliefs about the involvement of parents (Burton, 1992). According to Fives and Buehl (2012), they suggested that for teachers' beliefs to be viable construct for research, intervention, or practice, beliefs can be changed with experience and interactions in professional communities, but some degree of consistency is also essential. However, whether beliefs can change or not is not the main consideration but rather on the degree to which teachers' beliefs vary or remain consistent across different contexts or settings. Regarding this issue, researchers have pointed out that different situations or contexts may activate specific beliefs that influence the teachers' understanding and actions, and beliefs are individually held conceptions that are in constant relation to the context and teachers' experiences (Bandura, 1997; Fives & Buehl, 2009, 2012).

Teachers' beliefs show a large number of knowledge and teachers understand their world by shaping a complicated system of personal and professional knowledge (Clark & Peterson, 1986). Although several researchers have differentiated the constructs of teachers' beliefs and teachers' knowledge, the distinctions between them are not still clear (Murphy & Alexander, 2004; Southerland, Sinatra, & Matthews, 2001). However, Fives & Buehl (2012) claim that both teachers' beliefs and teachers' knowledge are interwoven and perceived as part of the integrated system. This is supported by Phipps & Borg (2009) and Abdi & Asadi (2015) that teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning are affected by their own experiences as learners and are established when they go to university, act as a filter through which teachers explain new information, have a great impact on their teaching decisions, and greatly affect what and how they learn during language teaching education. In this present study, to avoid the confusion between the terms teachers' beliefs and teachers' knowledge, the researcher uses the definitions provided by previous studies to separate these two terms. For instance, according to Pajares (1992), beliefs have been

described as subjective claims that the individual accepts or wants to be true. In contrast, Knowledge has been described as having a truth component that can be externally verified or confirmed by using procedures which are accepted by large community as appropriate for evaluating and judging the validity of a claim (Richardson, 1996).

2.4 Types of teachers' beliefs

2.4.1 Teachers' beliefs about learners

Generally, teachers may hold any one of combination of beliefs with learners whom they teach (Xu, 2012). According to Meighan (1990), teachers' views of learners may be construed metaphorically as resisters, receptacles, raw materials, clients, partners, individual explorers, or democratic explorers. These views of teachers on learners also have an influence on their classroom practice. Meighan (1990) described that if teachers consider their learners as resisters, receptacles, or raw materials, this construct are heavily teacher-dominated. This means they will force learners to master a language, fill learners with knowledge, and shape learners according to the teachers' wishes. On the other hand, if teachers view their learners as clients, partners, individual explorers, or democratic explorers, they will adjust the nature of relationship between teachers and learners. In this point of view, teachers will have language learning activities from learners' needs, and practice themselves as co-learners, co-operators, and facilitators.

Effective teachers' beliefs about learners are necessary for effective teaching (Xu, 2012). Melodie & Sherman (2008) revealed from their study that effective teachers act on the beliefs that all learners can learn, meet the need of different learners, and believe that teachers can be people who make the difference. In other words, effective teachers have interventionist beliefs about students which are a set of beliefs that in inclusive classrooms lead to effective teacher practice, and improve learners' performance and self-esteem. On the other hand, teachers with less effective beliefs which is called pathognomonic beliefs

attribute learners' learning difficulties to permanent in the learners which distracts from learners' success.

Yang (1995) analyzed teachers' beliefs about learners that they appear to be the teachers' expectations for the learners. The teachers' expectations about the learners and their impact arise during the teaching and learning process of interaction between teachers and learners. She explains that during this process, teachers steady insist on influencing the learners according to their own expectations, and the learners will gradually develop themselves as the teachers expect. It is related to what Brophy (1986) suggested that teachers should 'routinely project attitudes, beliefs, expectations, and attributions that imply that your students share your own enthusiasm for learning. To the extent that you treat your students as if they already are eager learners, they will be more likely to become eager learners'.

2.4.2 Teachers' beliefs about learning

Teachers' beliefs about what learning is affect everything that they do in the classroom, whether these beliefs are implicit or explicit (Williams & Burden, 1997). Gow and Kember (1993), British psychologists, suggested that the approaches to learning can be placed under the following headings which include; 1) a quantitative increase in knowledge, 2) memorization, 3) the acquisition of facts, 4) the abstraction of the meaning, 5) an interpretative process aimed that the understanding of reality, and 6) some form of personal change. According to Xu (2012), the first three conceptions which are a quantitative increase in knowledge, memorization, and the acquisition of facts, can be categorized under the heading of reproductive approaches. These three approaches can be induced as the direct transmission instruction, which indicates that teachers' role is to communicate knowledge in a clear and structured way, to give learners clear and resolvable problems, to explain correct solutions, and to ensure calm and concentration in the classroom. The other three approaches which include the abstraction of the meaning, an interpretative process aimed

that the understanding of reality, and some form of personal change, can be seen as meaning-based. These three approaches can be induced as constructivist instruction, which mainly emphasizes on learners as active participants in the process of acquiring knowledge, focuses on facilitating learners' inquiry, gives learners the opportunities to develop solutions to problems by themselves, and allows learners to play active role in instructional activities.

Whatever teaching approaches teachers use in the language classrooms reflect their beliefs about learning. Holt-Reynolds (1995) revealed from her long-term observation that learning occurs from learners' heads as a result of their active efforts to making meaning rather than getting meaning through direct transmission. She suggested that learners' failure to participate and learn mostly due to instructional problems rather than personality or motivational problems, so the focus of learning should be considered on instructional moves by teachers rather than judgments about learners' willingness to cooperate. Julianne (2009) stated that teachers' beliefs about learning appear to rely on a great deal of visible, behavioral evidence rather than on assessment of meaning-making. Nevertheless, Nuthall (2004) argued that for teachers to understand the relation between teaching and learning, they ought to understand; 1) how instruction, management, and assessment influence learners' experiences and behaviors, 2) How the sociocultural context influence teaching and learning, and 3) how individual learners make sense of their classroom experiences.

2.4.3 Teachers' beliefs about themselves

Two main teachers' beliefs about themselves which include teacher self-efficacy and teacher emotions are the key factors for language teachers to enhance overall quality (Xu, 2012). According to Bandura (1994), self-efficacy is defined as people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that influence over events that affect their lives. Therefore, self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave. That is to say these beliefs produce diverse effects through four

major processes which are cognitive, motivational, affective, and selection processes. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) further define teacher efficacy as teachers' judgments of their capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of learners' engagement and learning. This can be said that it is a teachers' subjective judgments that they could actively influence the learners' learning process. Xu (2012) describes that teachers with high self-efficacy place high expectations on learners, think that they are responsible for the learners' development, and believe that they can teach learners well. This kind of teachers can promote progress among learners because high self-efficacy can adopt efficacious teaching behaviors in the class. In contrast, teachers with low self-efficacy will find it is hard to build up self-efficacy among others, and have less confidence in classroom control. Also, teachers with low self-efficacy tend to conduct limited classroom teaching skills. Hoy and Woolfolk (1990), stated that 'Researchers have found few consistent relationships between characteristics of teachers and the behavior or learning of students. Teachers sense of efficacy ...is an exception to this general rule' (p. 295). This means teachers' self efficacy determines the teaching behavior (Xu, 2012).

Sutton and Wheatley (2003) found from their study that when consideration is put on empirical and theoretical reasons, it is believed that teachers' emotions play an essential role in teachers, teaching, and student. Teachers' emotions influence not only teachers' cognitions; such as, attention, categorizing, memory, thinking, and problem-solving, but also teachers' motivation, attributions, efficacy beliefs, and goals (Xu, 2012). Teachers' expression of negative emotions mostly make learners feel sad, ashamed, guilty, hurt, and embarrassed. In contrast, teachers' expression of positive emotions are more motivated, more likely to be helpful, cooperative, and to follow classroom rules. This is to say learners are often influenced by teachers' expressions. Additionally, this is similar to Pine and Boy (1997) suggested in their study that effective teachers should create learning atmospheres

which are cognitively and affectively expanding, learning atmosphere which enable the learners to become a more adequate and knowledgeable person.

2.4.4 Teachers' beliefs about language

It is found from the research that teachers' beliefs on language do generate their individual teaching methodologies (Borg,2003; Thompson, 1992). Traditionally, two major beliefs of language consist of structural and functional beliefs of language (Miramontes et al., 2012). In the structural beliefs of language, language is treated as an abstract code or a system of structurally related elements for the meaning transmission. The target of language learning is the mastery of these elements which mainly include grammatical rules and lexical items. On the other hand, in the functional beliefs of language, language is seen as a vehicle for the expression of functional meaning, focusing on the semantic and communicative aspects of language (Richards & Rogers, 2001). The goals of communicative approach is to develop communicative competence and to express communication functions. Learning activities attempt to engage learners in meaningful and authentic language use.

Apart from structural and functional beliefs of language, Richards and Rogers (2001) proposed an essential beliefs related to language learning and teaching which is the interactional belief. In the interactional belief of language aspect, language is seen as a communicative tool, as the mean of interpersonal relationships and social transactions between individuals. The goal of the language learning is to enable learners to initiate maintain communication with other people. Hence, rather than knowing the grammar rules and vocabulary, it is essential to know how to use them in the communicative context. Normally, the interactional beliefs and functional beliefs of language quite resemble to each other because both of them have focus on the communication. However, the interactional beliefs of language also apply the notion of socially-oriented on learning and teaching. According to Morton (2012), language is increasingly seen as a set of meaning making resources when people engage in the communication. This belief of language reveal

that multiform and multilingual resources are utilized in different ways in different situations.

2.5 Function of teachers' beliefs

Indicating the function or purpose of teachers' beliefs is essential to explain how beliefs function for teachers engaged in practice, planning, learning, or reflection. Fives and Buehl (2012) identified three functions that beliefs serve related to action which include; 1) filters for interpretation, 2) frames for defining problems, and 3) guides for standards for action.

When beliefs function as a filter, beliefs are related to practice as they influence human perception and the interpretation of information and experience (Nisbett & Ross, 1980; Fives & Buehl, 2012). Gates (2006) claimed that this function of beliefs is habitus which means beliefs take on the shape of habits that serve as implicit filters for information. He emphasized that an individual's understanding of reality is always seen through the lens of existing beliefs; therefore, the role of beliefs as a filter is particularly relevant in the context of teacher education. From the study of Lee, Baik, & Charlesworth (2006), it is suggested that if teachers' existing beliefs are relevant to the new teaching practice, teachers will be more accepting of it. On the other hand, if teachers seem unlikely to believe the new set of knowledge, they will rarely apply this knowledge in their practices (Yerrick, Parke, & Nugent, 1997). This can be said that the filtering role of beliefs pertains to what information teachers recognize as worth discussing with their learners (Fives & Buehl, 2012).

Fives and Buehl (2012) described that teachers' beliefs can act as a framing function in which beliefs are used to define or frame a problem or task. Similarly, Gates (2006) also claimed the role of beliefs as systems that shape 'how we elaborate meaning, interpret behavior, and shape our social relations with others' (p.353). This means when beliefs extract information from the situation through belief filters, they continue to play a role in how to

frame or conceptualize the problem. The study of Yadav and Koehler (2007) revealed that individuals' beliefs help them to define the nature of the problem based on their own beliefs. This means that each individual has different way to conceptualize the problem. For teachers' beliefs, the beliefs about content and beliefs about teaching and learning affect how they interpret pedagogical reforms and what they perceive as the task (Enyedy, Goldberg, & Welsh, 2006).

One of most important functions of teachers' beliefs is that beliefs guide teachers' intention and action (Fives & Buehl, 2012). After beliefs play role as filters and frame the problem, in this stage, beliefs are used to guide teachers' practice. Especially, teachers' efficacy beliefs influence and guide the goals that teachers set, their attempt when face challenges, and how they feel when they are doing the task (Bandura, 1997). For the same task, different teachers with different beliefs could differently believe that they could successfully implement different techniques to complete the task; therefore, beliefs can be serve as a guide for teachers' practices (Abrami et al., 2004).

2.6 Factors affecting teachers' beliefs

Factors that affect teachers' beliefs according to Buehl and Beck (2015) can be mainly divided into two types which include internal factors and external factors. These factors were identified as supports and hindrance to teachers in implementing their beliefs. To have a clear picture about the distinction between both internal factors and external factors, more detail about these factors is clarified in the next section.

2.6.1 Internal factors

There are several internal factors that can support or obstruct teachers in using their beliefs which intern affect to their practices. Such factors include other beliefs, knowledge and

experiences, as well as teachers' level of self-reflection and awareness (Buehl & Beck, 2015).

According to Fives and Buehl (2012), interaction among different kind of teachers' beliefs can lead to an influence on each other. Teachers hold different types of beliefs, and these beliefs exist in a multidimensional system which may facilitate or impede the use of beliefs into practice. Tang, Lee, & Chun (2012) illustrated some of the inconsistencies between teachers' beliefs and practices through teachers' capability and self-efficacy beliefs. They described that teachers are more likely to do on their beliefs about content and several aspects of instruction when they believe in their capabilities that they can do so. In many cases, teachers' capability and self-efficacy beliefs are moderating the relation between teachers' beliefs about content and their classroom practices. Nishino (2012) also highlighted that teachers' capability and self-efficacy beliefs act as mediators, showing how other beliefs are related to specific practices. It is explained that teachers' beliefs about communicative language predicted their sense of self-efficacy for language teaching which in turn predicted their practices in the classrooms. Some of other teachers' own beliefs that influence their implementing beliefs that affect their practices is illustrated through teachers' sense of responsibility for learners' learning. Roehring et al. (2009) revealed that teachers' sense of responsibility beliefs may moderate the relationship between beliefs about teaching practices and learners and teachers' practices in the classroom. Similarly, Turner et al. (2011) also emphasized that teachers' sense of responsibility is an important factor in their willingness to use new teaching practices to support learners' motivation.

Buehl and Beck (2015) claimed that to enact their beliefs, teachers need to have necessary knowledge. This is because it is found from the study of Rushton et al. (2011) that preservice and practicing teachers did not practice align with their beliefs because of a lack of knowledge of the content. Additionally, several studies have found that teachers lack the

pedagogical knowledge of how to implement the instructional practices that come along with their beliefs (Jorgensen et al., 2010; Teague et al., 2012). Personal experiences and educational experience especially language learning from observing previous teachers' teaching practices have also influence negative or positive teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning (Zheng, 2009). This can be seen from the study of Golombeck (1998), a teacher with negative experience which being corrected by her previous teacher as a learner resulted in her being cautious of correcting students.

Self-awareness and self-reflection are other factors affecting teachers' beliefs and practices. Roehrig et al. (2011) revealed that teachers with a lack of self-awareness may enact their practices different from their beliefs. In this case, Phipps and Borg (2009) suggested that if teachers discuss the inconsistencies between their beliefs and practices, these beliefs and practices can be modified. Many researchers also claim that self-reflection is essential to align with teachers' beliefs and practices (Kang, 2008; Potari & Georgiadou-Kabouridis, 2009). To sum up, teachers need to be made aware of and reflect on the congruence and incongruence of their beliefs and practices (Buehl & Beck, 2015).

2.6.2 External factors

Apart from the internal factors mentioned above, a specific context is an important external factor that can influence teachers in both teaching and learning (Smith, 1996; Borg, 2006). Samuelowicz and Bain (1996) described that teachers' beliefs are context-defined and context-dependent which means that they are related to educational circumstances in which the teachers work and live. Borg (2003) stated that 'social, psychological, and environmental realities related to the classroom, school, and greater society shape teachers' beliefs and practices and influence to some extent beliefs are consistent to beliefs' (p.94). Moreover, contextual factors which include school leaders' requirements, prescribed curriculum, academic tests, and the availability of teaching resources may prevent teachers from

practicing in accordance with their beliefs (Phipps & Borg, 2009). These factors can be identified as external factors that can influence teachers' beliefs and practices. According to Buehl and Beck (2015), These contextual external factors can be divided into three types depending on its levels which consist; classroom-context factors, school-context factors, and national-context factors.

Classroom-level factors; such as, student ability, student attitudes, classroom management, and class size are external factors that may affect teachers' beliefs which related to their practices (Savasci & Berlin, 2012; Phipps & Borg, 2009; Dooley & Assaf, 2009). These factors can be both challenges and barriers for teachers to enact their practices. In aspect of student attitudes and preferences for instruction, it is found that these factors affect the implement of teachers' practices. It can be seen from the study of Kang (2008) that students were reluctant to engage in higher level thinking which affect to teachers' practices to implement inquiry learning in the class. This is because students preferred worksheets than inquiry-based instruction in order to avoid deep thinking. This factors act as barriers for teachers to enact their beliefs and practices to their implementing instructions. Apart from students' attitudes and preferences for instruction, classroom management and large class sizes have been noted to limit the implementation of teachers practices (Teague et al., 2012; Savasci & Berlin, 2012; Uzuntiryaki et al., 2010.). Teague et al. (2012) claimed that teachers were reluctant to implement an appropriate instruction in the class due to student misbehavior, and this become the barrier for teachers to act on their beliefs.

Looking up in the higher level than classroom-level factors, school-context factors can influence both challenges and barriers to teachers in enacting upon their beliefs. These factors are; for instance, administration, parental support, colleagues, and the available resources in a school (Rentzou & Sakellariou, 2011; Southerland et al., 2011). The study of Bullock (2010) found that when teachers did not have adequate resources they needed to

become successful, their practices did not reflect their beliefs accurately. Similarly, school culture and community are another school-context factors which may support or hinder teachers in enacting upon their beliefs (Buehl & Beck, 2015). It is found from Ciani et al. (2008) that teachers at high-performance schools had lower self-efficacy for instruction, classroom management, teacher community, and perceived mastery school goal structure than teachers in low-performance goal oriented schools. Buehl and Beck (2015) also emphasized that teacher community and teachers' teaching efficacy beliefs are related to the implementation of their practices in their classroom.

Education policies and curricular standards are the main national-context external factors that may affect teachers in enacting practices related to their beliefs (Cincotta-Segi, 2011; Tan, 2011). However, Buehl and Beck (2015) indicated that the influence of these external factors depends on the type of policy, teachers' individual perceptions, and the teachers' role in the political context. Some examples language policy which affect teachers' beliefs and practices on their language instructions were illustrated in de Jong's (2008) and Cincotta-Segi's (2011) studies. In 2008, de Jong researched on the influence of 'English-only policy' on bilingual elementary teachers' beliefs and practices. It was found that both positive and negative reactions to the policy were expressed by the teacher participants. Several bilingual teacher participants revealed that they had an emotional conflict when they were forced to teach students in the ways that were not culturally responsive and was not congruent with their beliefs. This case is similar to Loa PDR country policy when the government declared Lao language as the official language in the country. Cincotta-Segi (2011) studied teachers' beliefs and practices related to this policy where Kmhmu language is used as L1 in rural area of the country. It was found that the teacher participants in the study chose to use students' L1 for significant teaching by using L1 texts to connect students' background knowledge to L2 texts. Another main national-context factor apart from education policies is curriculum standards. It is claimed that curriculum standards

create pressure to cover the content for both administrators and teachers (Dooley & Assaf, 2009). Some teacher participants the study of Potari and Georgiadou-Kabouridis (2009) reported that the national curriculum was the constraint for her exploratory teaching practices.

2.7 Summary of the chapter

The purposes of this chapter are mainly to examined and review previous literatures on teachers' beliefs. The researcher begins this chapter with how to define teachers' beliefs and what their natures are. Then, types of teachers' beliefs which consist of 1) teachers' beliefs about learners, 2) teachers' beliefs about learning, 3) teachers' beliefs about themselves, and 4) teachers' beliefs about language, are illustrated. Three main functions of teachers' beliefs including 1) filters for interpretation, 2) frames for defining problems, and 3) guides for standards for action, are described in the next section. Finally, internal and external factors which could affect teachers' beliefs and their practices are presented in the last section.

Chapter 3

English as a lingua franca

3.1 Defining ELF

English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) is defined by many scholars in various ways, and these are some of its definition. Jenkins (2009) defines ELF as English as it is used as a contact language among speakers from different first languages. Seidlhofer (2011) defines 'ELF as any use of English among speakers of different first languages and linguacultural backgrounds across all three Kachruvian circles' (p.7). Both definition includes native speakers of English, who may use ELF as an additional resource for intercultural communication. This position is claimed by most scholars in this field (Jenkin2007; 2014; Mauranen 2012; Cogo and Dewey 2012). Most scholars also agree that ELF is not variety, and not a uniform and fixed mode of communication (Jenkins, 2015; Mauranen, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2011). ELF is a flexible, co-constructed, and therefore variable, means of communication. The variability is locally constructed in different geographical areas and domains, but not necessarily geographically constrained, since remote, virtual communities may also develop ELF communicative practices (Jenkins 2014; Mauranen 2012; 2014).

In more detail, ELF as defined by Cogo & Dewey (2012) concerns three necessary principal levels which include its setting, its function, and its enquiry. Defining ELF in terms of its settings, the site of investigation in ELF research can be any language contact setting in which English is spoken as the primary medium of communication. It is not just English which is used as a medium to communicate among people in expanding circle who share different first language. For the ELF setting today, most scholars actively engaged in ELF research would probably agree that this can involve speakers from all of Kachru's three circles including speaker of inner circle Englishes (Seildhofer, 2004 and Jenkins, 2007). Jenkins (2007) clarifies that 'ELF is not limited to members of the expanding circle, and

those who also speak English internationally, whether they come from an inner or outer circle country, are included from ELF communication’.

In terms of ELF function, Cogo & Dewey (2012) regard as ELF any interaction where English is the preferred option for intercultural communication, not only among expanding circle speakers who do not share another language, but also all of three circles. To define an ELF interaction is not so much about the geographic location of communicative event, but rather the linguacultural makeup of participants as well as their orientation towards each other and the language itself. Cogo & Dewey further clarify that ‘an interaction that takes place in an inner circle city, such as London say, may be described as an ELF events as long as there are speakers from at least two L1 backgrounds’ (p.12). This is similar to Jenkins (2009) who defines ELF as English as it used as a contact language among speakers from different first languages. This is also in relation to what Seidlhofer (2011) mentioned that ELF is any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option.

As a field of enquiry, ELF can be described as the empirical study of innovative uses of English as attested in corpora of naturally occurring talk. Under the framework of phonology of ELF, lexical grammatical properties, and pragmatic processes, research conducted within this framework aims to uncover, describe, and make sense of the processes in operation in lingua franca talk. Additionally, they provide incidences of innovative language forms. This is not to attempt to fix the language nor to identify the properties of ELF as a single variety, but rather to illustrate its hybrid and mutable nature. This is not to investigate on the surface level which occurs in World Englishes (WE) which has often prioritized surface level linguistics features to highlight the differences between each of the nativized Englishes (Cogo & Dewey, (2012). Similarly, Seidlhofer (2012) emphasizes that ELF enquiry focus on not of varieties but of variation, not of how forms of language confirm to codified norms, but how they function as the exploitation of linguistic resources for making meaning.

As mentioned three principal levels above concerning defining ELF, these can be distinguished ELF from WE. In WE paradigm, language analysis takes places in relation to distinct speech communities which are largely defined geographically and/or politically for the purpose of identifying core linguistic and pragmatic features that are deemed to be characteristic of a particular variety, usually at the national level. Therefore, WE tends to deal with nativized Englishes, such as, Indian English, Singaporean English, Nigerian English, etc. In contrast, ELF is used in contexts which are not necessarily geographically located but can transient in nature, and it can involve speakers from all Kachruvian circles who have varying linguacultural backgrounds and different first language.

3.2 ELF characteristics

According to Cogo & House's (2017) and Ranta's (2017) notion of ELF characteristics, ELF can be characterized by using the pragmatics of ELF and grammar in ELF. The study of Cogo and House (2017) focuses on the pragmatic strategies used and the accommodation processes which are used among ELF users. On the other hand, Ranta (2017) tried to characterized ELF by focusing in grammar which are different from native norms and often used among ELF users. These two aspects are applied in this present study to identify the characteristics of ELF. Deeper detail in each aspect is clarified in the next section.

3.2.1 The pragmatics of ELF

Four aspects underlie the accommodation process in pragmatics among interactants which has been theorized as major characteristics of ELF communication include: negotiation of meaning, use of interactional elements, including discourse markers, idiomatic expressions and multilingual resources (Jenkins, 2000; Cogo & House, 2017).

Several strategies are used to negotiate meaning, construct meaning, and solve non-understanding which occur in the conversation among ELF users. Repetition strategies

(both self-repetition and other-repetition) have been mentioned as common strategies which are used generally in intercultural communication (Cogo, 2009; House, 2010; Mauranen, 2012). Repetition strategies, according to Cogo and House (2017), can be used both to draw attention to the possible non-understanding and to solve a communication problem afterwards. House (2010) also indicated that repetition strategies have different functions which are: 1) as a strategy with speakers' working memory in comprehension and production is supported, 2) a coherence-creating strategy in which lexical clusters for speaker and addressee are systematically built up, 3) a signal for receipt and confirmation of comprehension of the interactant, and 4) a meta-communicative procedure that strengthens interactants' awareness of their own and others' talk. Apart from repetition strategies, self-initiated repair and co-construction of utterances are also found in the interaction among ELF users to negotiate meaning. When realizing that speakers themselves produce an error in which could be reflect to the interlocutors' misunderstanding, they often resort to the practice of repairing their own talk. As well as co-construction of utterance which is defined as the joint construction of utterances among participants is one of meaning negotiation powerful strategy. In this strategy, the process that participants attempt to negotiate what it is that one of them wants to convey may lead to a feeling of community and group identity (Cogo & House, 2017).

Discourse markers and back-channeling are concerned as another aspect of ELF pragmatic research which are used to manage the interaction among interlocutors (House, 2009). Baumgarten and House (2010) suggested that ELF users not only use different discourse markers but also add different function to them. For instance, House (2009) found from her study that the discourse marker 'you know' can become a more self-referenced way of highlighting both formulation difficulties and coherence relations in speakers' own turns. Additionally, when speakers used 'you know' with the conjunctions: but, and, because, it acts as a re-enforcing strategy that makes these conjunctions more salient. Apart from this,

other discourse markers; such as, 'I think, I don't know, and I mean' are also marked as the discourse markers that are frequently used by ELF users. Baumgarten and House (2010) described the interpretation of these discourse markers as: 'I think' among ELF users is used to express the speakers' subjective opinion. 'I don't know' is used when speakers have insufficient knowledge about the topic, and 'I mean' is frequently used with a strong evaluative element over its main function of clarification. Another interactional element which is frequently used by ELF speakers is the minimal response or backchannel item (Wolffartsberger, 2011). These include short verbal signals like; yeah, ok, mhm, given to the interlocutors to indicate that they can continue speaking. For several times, these signals are not used as the agreement marker, but they are used to display attentiveness and gain time to think about what the speakers want to say (Baumgarten & House, 2010).

ELF users also use multilingual resources, most often from ELF users' mother tongues, rather than only English language based on their talks to ensure that possible misunderstandings are either avoided or carefully negotiated (Cogo & House, 2017). ELF speakers can switch their language from L2 to L1 when their interlocutor share an L1. This process is called 'code-switching' which is often used as an organizational move, and functions as 'management talk'. Edmondson (1981) claimed that code-switching is frequently used in instructional settings such as language classroom. In the code-switching process, it is not necessary for speakers to always switch their language into L1. From the study of Cogo (2009), it is found that interactants sometimes switch not to their L1 but to a third shared language. Several studies revealed that multilingual strategies are used for many purposes including 1) the sharing of a sense of non-nativeness (Cogo, 2012), 2) the collaborative construction of meaning (Cogo, 2010; Vettorell, 2014), and 3) the creation of a sense of intercultural community-membership or identity (Polzl & Seidlhofer, 2006). Cogo and House (2017) describe that using multilingual resources involves the development of

accommodation practices which ensure sensitivity to speakers' cultural background and linguistic repertoires, while adapting their resources for communicative effectiveness.

3.2.2 Grammar in ELF

ELF is not a fixed code which is used in a situation where two or more speakers need to communicate through a lingua franca (Jenkins, 2000). Therefore, there cannot be a fixed form of ELF grammar either (Ranta, 2017). ELF can be described as a series of more or less demanding communicative situations where speakers come with whatever their language skills to deal with the communicative tasks at hand. Ranta (2017) noted that although ELF cannot be identified a uniform code, some ELF features were frequently found from the previous studies. Seidlhofer (2004) gave some examples of grammatical features of ELF which are mostly found from her VOICE project. These are for instance: dropping the third-person -s, confusing the use of relative pronoun 'who' and 'which', invariable tag questions, and non-standard use of articles and prepositions. Other studies also point out other grammatical features of ELF; for instance, Erling and Barlett (2006) found the non-standard use of tense and aspect markers, fluctuation in time, and the extended use of 'would' in if-clause sentences. Dewey (2007) reported that it was found ELF grammatical features: such as, the omitting of the object in using transitive verbs, variable use of prepositions and articles, and non-standard adverbial positions. Bjorkman (2010) found the use of non-standard form in her study which include not marking the plural on the noun, double comparatives and superlatives, non-standard formulations of the passive voice and tense, etc. Even though it does not claim that these examples are the specific grammatical features of ELF, Ranta (2017) pointed out that non-standard grammatical forms in ELF could, in various ways, serve the purpose of making what the speaker has to say more explicit; such as, by adding prominence or by making the construction heavier than necessary.

Mauranen (2012) indicated that ELF is a second-language use (SLU); therefore, research in to ELF is research on language use in real-life situations among different speakers. In ELT context, learners in the class normally share an L1 and cultural background, and this makes the comprehensibility of L2 does not the priority for learners in the class because they can switch into L1 when communication breakdowns. On the other hand, in ELF/SLU situations where communication take place in the real-life situations outside the class, speakers do not share an L1 and may not know about each other's' cultures. As a consequence, in ELF/SLU situations mutual understanding in L2 is the desire goal for participants. Mauranen (2012) described that because ELF speakers mainly focus on contents rather than forms, so it is acceptable to rely on whatever seems to work in the interaction, whether this might be different from standard language or, for example, mixing languages. Additionally, because of the increase of speakers who use English for lingua franca communication around the world, Mauranen also pointed out that speakers have to be able to manipulate simultaneously many more cultural practices, accents, and proficiency level than they normally do ELT class. Jenkins (2006) indicated that from ELF perspective, the focus is on L2 output from the same perspective as any other natural language. Therefore, the shift in the research perspective from that of learner to user can lead to the new views on the linguistic output observed (Ranta, 2017).

3.3 Multilingualism in ELF

After the relatively few years since empirical research in to ELF began being conducted more widely, Jenkins (2015) proposes an alternative theoretical framework for ELF which is called 'English as a Multilingua Franca'. This framework is defined as multilingual communication in which English is available as a contact language of choice among other languages. In other words, English as a Multilingua Franca refers to multilingual communicative setting in which English is used potentially 'in the mix', regardless of whether or not, and how much, it is actually used.

This framework has been proposed under five main reasons. The first reason is dealing with orientations to the demographic trend. This is because the world today has become multilingual not monolingual; therefore, the focus of ELF discussion should be on developing the relationship between English and other languages in respect of the multilingualism of most ELF users and the multi-competence of the community (Jenkins, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2017). The second reason is about the criticisms against the monolingual of SLA-based orientations to the learning of additional language in which each variety must conform to certain prescriptive norms. This has led to the multilingual turn in applied linguistics that starting to argue against notion such as native speaker competence and in favor of multicompetent users, to focus on language as social practice, and to view multilingualism as a resource rather than a problem (Jenkins, 2015; Llorca, 2017; Kirkpatrick, 2017). The third reason of a retheorization relates to ELF's approach is about the ELF community. In the past, ELF community was framed by the 'community of practice' notion or CoPs (Wenger, 1998). However, Seidlhofer (2011) points out 'in contrast with local speech communities, such global communities tend to be referred to as discourse communities with a common communicative purpose' (p.87). She proposed three basic criteria for ELF community which are mutual engagement in shared practices, taking part in some jointly negotiated enterprise, and making use of members' shared repertoire. This means that grouping of ELF users are not necessarily communities in Wenger's sense, but the notion of shared repertoire is in need of further theorization in ELF communication (Jenkins, 2015). The fourth reason in reconceptualizing ELF is concerned with the number of ELF users. Brumfit (2011) points out that native English speakers are in a minority for English language use, and thus in practice for language change, language maintenance, and for the ideologies and beliefs associated with the language. Therefore, multilingualism has become by very far the norm in ELF communication, and this has greater implications than have yet been considered. The last reason in retheorizing ELF is Jenkins' personal reason about 'ELF bubble'. She explained that ELF research is becoming too self-contained, too repetitive, and is lacking the cutting edge it had previously had. Thus, it is the time to find

out what seems to be missing in the ELF bubble: other languages, or, to put it another way, multilingualism (Jenkins, 2015).

Jenkins (2015) delineates the key aspects regarding English as a *Multilingua Franca* as follows. Firstly, the focus of English as a *Multilingua Franca* is multilingualism rather than English. In other words, this framework is to reduce the size of English in ELF and focus more of the multilingualism of most ELF users. It is also noted for English as a *Multilingua Franca* that English is not seen as optional but is always potentially 'in the mix'. Secondly, the other language of everyone present (their L1 and all other languages they know) are also present in the interaction. This includes although any or all the languages other than English are not used, as there will be at least some influence from speakers' first, and possibility their other languages into their English (Jenkins, 2015; Cogo & House, 2017). This is similar to the notion of *similects* proposed by Mauraanen (2012) which refers to a variety of English that arise from contact between English and another language. Thirdly, English as a *Multilingua Franca* comprises a rethink about the terms of 'multilingual repertoire', 'shared repertoire', and 'multilingual resources'. Jenkins suggests that these terms should be replaced with the term 'repertoires in flux'. The repertoires in flux may not initially include specific items from other languages, but may be influenced during the interaction by the language of their multilingual interlocutors. More importantly, the term repertoires in flux emphasizes more clearly that what ELF users already have in their linguistic repertoires, and these may be added to or changed either temporarily or permanently during the course of interaction. Lastly, Jenkins describes that the notion of English as a *Multilingua Franca* also needs to find an alternative to CoPs notion, so the notion of 'contact zone' (Pratt, 1991) is proposed to be used. Jenkins explains that contact zone which focuses on 'contact' rather than 'practice' seems better suited to communication that is co-constructed online among speakers from diverse multilingual backgrounds, who are engaging in one-off or infrequent encounters rather than in more enduring group meeting with pre-existing shared repertoires.

3.4 English Language Teaching and ELF

Even though the use of ELF increases around the world, the prevailing orientation in English language teaching and testing, and ELT materials remains undoubtedly towards ENL, with correctness still widely controlled by NES use (Jenkins, 2012). This is to serve the assessment of international ELT examinations like IELTS and TOEFL test which conform British and American norms. This “ownership of English” (Widdowson, 1994) and standard native English language have been seriously questioned both generally and in ELT for many reasons. The most obvious reason for opposing to native speaker authority is the fact that nonnative speakers clearly outnumber native speakers of English worldwide (House, 2002). Furthermore, the irrelevance of standard native models has been recognized in ELF communication; native-like production is often not only unrealistic but also unnecessary, or even counter-productive, for nonnative speakers in intercultural communication (Jenkins, 2006). More importantly, superior native speaker ideals in ELT have been questioned by those who have recognized the legitimacy of ELF and varieties of English because the native-speaker English is thus not less varied than that of nonnative speakers’ (Widdowson, 1994).

The purpose of ELF studies does not aim to point out what teachers should do or not to do, but that is for ELT practitioners to decide whether/to what extent ELF is relevant to their learners in their contexts (Jenkins, 2012). Nevertheless, this discussion for introducing ELF into ELT as an alternative choice of English forms is uneasy. Although some tentative suggestions, for example, Jenkins (2007); Seidlhofer (2011); Dewey (2012), for incorporating some general ELF-oriented principles into ELT when required, there has been little discussion of what this means in practice for ELT. This is the point that should be emphasized the introducing ELF into ELT as Ranta (2010) reveals that younger NNEs are developing an awareness that the English they are taught in their ELT classrooms, both the idealization and the real native English, often does not reflect the kind of English they need to communicate in their intercultural lives outside. Similarly, Wang (2015), reveals

that English language teaching and learning should reflect English language realities and are relevant to learners' real life language experiences. Additionally, Baker (2015) claims that the absence of culture and intercultural communication, particularly as related to ELF, is a significant blind spot in ELT and is an issue pedagogic researchers, teachers, and teacher trainers need to give greater attention to. In so doing, ELT will be more responsive to learners' needs and uses of English (Wang, 2015). To sum up, ELT teachers need to adapt to the highly internationalized uses of the language and could more incorporate the idea of ELF and introduce changes in their way of teaching English.

As a consequence, Llorca (2017) suggested that the shift of perspective from that of English learner to English user can lead to the new views on the linguistic output. He divided people in ELT into three main groups including; 1) people who are in the beginning of their English learning process, 2) former learners who have some experiences in using the language, and 3) English teachers. The first group are learners who are in the initial stage of English learning and have not had more opportunity to use the language. Therefore, they tend to conform to NSE as much as they can, and the goal of learning is to use the language like NESs. The another group of learners are the former learners who have experiences in using English language in a diversity of communicative situations. They have used English language to communicate with people who share different L1, and they have developed their pragmatics strategy skills to communicate with diverse people. This group of learners is considered as English users because their language production does not conform to NSE, but they can adjust their language in their own ways to reach the communicative purpose by using communicative strategies. The last group of people including in ELT process are English teachers (this study mainly focuses on non-native English teachers). Most of the non-native English teachers tend to perceive themselves as incomplete English learners who have not mastered yet because their ultimate goal is to use the language like NESs (Jenkins, 2015). More importantly, they perceive themselves as English custodians due to the learners' expectations that English teachers should use English language like NESs. This

is the reason why this group of teachers tries as much as they can to conform to the NSE regulations. Llurda (2017) proposed that the paradigm shift from English learners to English users could reflect the reality English that learners have to confront in the reality communicative situations. Teachers should prepare their learners with communicative strategy skills set to reach the goal of communication with diverse people from different origins. Consequently, Llurda (2017) suggested that non-native English teachers should change their perspectives from considering themselves as English custodians into perceiving themselves as English facilitators. Their responsibility is to develop their learners' strategies that will allow them to become autonomous English users in a diversity context.

3.5 ELF Awareness in ELT Classroom

ELF awareness as defined by Sifakis (2017) is a set of principles that refer to the knowledge, attitudes, and skillset of ELT stakeholders and ELT products with regard to issues and concerns raised in the ELF research literature, and the extent to which they have relevance for local ELT contexts. According to Wang (2015), ELF awareness in ELT classroom is examined in three aspects which include the sociolinguistics of language education, the subject of language education, and learner in language education. However, I would like to add one more aspect which is important for the four commonplaces in education, teacher in language education.

The sociolinguistic context of language education, it includes both the educational environment within the classroom and the larger social world outside the classroom. That is, the awareness of what is happening of the use of English language in reality would help to prepare learners in the classroom for their use of English outside the classroom. However, the English language in ELT classroom as described before does not reflect how English is used in real-life situation. In the ELT context, the goals and aims of ELT is communicative competence which tends to conform English as a native language (ENL)

norms. It can be seen from the teaching materials which rely on NESs (British or American English). When discussing literature and providing examples of literature written in English, the text still focuses on the Anglophone country, missing an important opportunity for more complex socio-cultural contextualizations of English (Baker, 2015). This is to say native English which is focused in ELT reflects the use of English in monolingual settings. Nonetheless, the wide spread of English has led to the change of English users in the larger social world. The number of NNEs increases dramatically and goes beyond that of NESs. This reflects to the rising of ELF which is used among people who share different L1 in contrast with the traditional role of EFL and ENL. The research into ELF reveals that different roles imply different ways of using English and that different approaches to English are required to understand how English plays those different roles (Jenkins 2007, Cogo and Dewey 2012). Therefore, in ELT educational context, the gap between what is taught in the classroom and what is happening outside the world should be taken into consideration (Wang, 2015).

The awareness of ELF raises significant questions regarding language choices in English education which are: what kind(s) of English represent the nature of English today? and what kind of English should be learned and taught today? (Wang, 2015). These questions were raised because of the change of the present goal in English education regarding the diversity of English and its fluidity. Because of the spread of English in global scale, English today now becomes Englishes in plural, and the global ownership of English has led NNEs use Englishes on their own which are different from ENL. Additionally, Seidlhofer (2011) claims that ELF users exploit the potential of language and are fully involved in the interactions, with their focus on the interactional and transactional purposes of the talk on their interlocutors as people rather than on the linguistics code itself. In other words, ELF users play with what ever communicative resources and linguistics features, which are either standard or non-standard forms, are open to people who are involved in the social action (Wang, 2013). This leads to the non-conformity to ENL and ELF in ELT

which English should conform to native English. Consequently, the representation of English in current language education should be reconsidered because of the view of English as practice-based, evolving, fluid, and multilingual.

Learner in language education is one aspect that is put in the consideration of language teaching and learning. The empirical studies of ELF awareness among L2 learners do not aim to replace ELF to EFL, but argue for the space of ELF as alternative form of language in ELT context. In learning practice, it is necessary for L2 learners to be aware of the suitability of language choices for different contexts of language use. Hence, Wang (2015) proposes that learner in language education aspect should be focused on the understanding of how learners enact their identities in the learning process in response to the context they are situated in. The example is shown in her study that is in the case of Chinese students who are situated in the language classroom that is situated in the ELF-relevant environment. A few questions were asked here to raise for the reconsideration in language learning practices which include: whose voice, culture, language and community are represented in the learning process? and do the representation suit purposive learning for the future use of English in real-life situations? This issue relates to the institutional policy of language teaching as shown in Wang's (2012, 2013) study which investigate Chinese speakers' language attitudes. From the study, it is found that some Chinese speakers prefer the conformity to native English norms and view it as their ultimate goal, because of their concern for the institutional policy which wants to maintain the predominant position of EFL in China. This finding reflects that institutional policy regarding language practice has an influence in the choices of language form learners can choose.

The teacher in language education plays an important role in in the process of language learning and teaching in ELT classroom. In aspect of ELF-awareness, Dewey (2015) claims it is essential for research to become much more thoroughly engaged with teachers' existing beliefs, and for researchers to pay closer attention to teachers' levels of awareness of ELF

and their understanding of what ELF means for learners and teachers in particular pedagogic contexts. The study of Dewey (2015) investigated teacher trainers' beliefs and awareness of ELF in ELT training course. The purposes of this study are to determine current levels of awareness of ELF among teacher educators and to establish whether this awareness is beginning to shape syllabus content. Additionally, it is to explore ways in which ELF might be further incorporated in the curriculum for language teacher education. The questionnaire findings revealed that the majority of teacher participants have limited awareness of ELF, and professional qualifications in ELT are still somewhat lacking with respect to incorporating an ELF perspective practice. Dewey mentioned that this is because there are some fairly strong indications that uptake of ELF in the curriculum is still relatively limited. This leads to the argument that being ELF-aware is not enough but action needs to be taken to implement the recognition of the phenomenon of ELF in ELT practice. According to the lack of ELF awareness and ELF training of teacher participant in previous studies, Sifakis and Bayyurt (2015) conducted a study under the framework which is called 'ELF-aware teacher education (ELF-TEd)'. In this study, the framework involves interested teachers in a crucial reorientation of their beliefs towards English language teaching, learning, and communication. Turkish teacher participants in the ELF-Ted project were informed about variety of ELF and WE-related concerns in the theoretical phase. In the application phase, they were asked to link the knowledge and skills from the first phase with their own teaching context. Finally, they were prompted to raise, discuss, and reflect on issues that arose from their application of the theoretical concerns in the evaluation phase. The reflection from the teacher participants revealed that they found ELF a straight forward enough notion. They appreciated the different elements involved and were able to establish key distinctions between ELF and standard English and between ELF and EFL. They emphasized that their engagement with the ELF literature and their familiarity with the aspect of the local context prompted them to want to integrate both ELF and EFL to the extent that this was possible. More importantly, teacher participants saw their ELF-aware training as a window to becoming aware of new development in ELT. Additionally,

they also reflected on their learners' positive, even enthusiastic reaction to ELF-aware lesson they designed. Sifakis and Bayyurt (2015) have mentioned that this implies that ELF-aware language learning materials work best when they are locally designed by the teachers who know the specification of their own classroom context better than anyone else. From this study, it could be argued that non-native teachers operating in an Expanding Circle context will more readily approve the integration of ELF and WE in their classroom when they have understood and appreciated the validity and function of their own ELF varieties.

3.6 ELF and multilingualism in Thai context

English language has been used as a lingua franca in a Thai context because it is mostly used by Thai people to communicate with people who share different L1 (Baker, 2009). Particularly, English plays a leading role as a lingua franca among ASEAN people since the establishment of the ASEAN community in 1967. ASEAN community consists of 10 countries including Thailand, Lao PDR, Brunei, Singapore, Malaysia, Myanmar, Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam, and Cambodia. All of these countries have their own different L1; for example, Thailand has Thai as a L1, Vietnam has Vietnamese, and Myanmar has Burmese. As multilingual context refers to the use of three and more languages and is distinguished from bilingualism (Aronin, 2019). Therefore, ASEAN community is considered as a multilingual context where English language has been used as an official language among ASEAN people. Not only people in the ASEAN community, the globalized world has accelerated the use of English in Thailand among Thai people and foreigners from different language backgrounds. In Thai context, English is used for international communication in Business, trades, tourism, media entertainment, higher education, and so on (Foley, 2005; Trakulkasemsuk, 2018).

In Thai ELT context, even though ELF represents a paradigm shift in understanding language use which moves away from the traditional foreign language paradigm (Jenkins, Cogo, and Dewey, 2011), NSE are still deeply embedded in the basic education curriculum

in a Thai context (Baker & Jarunthawatchai, 2017). Responding to this problem, Baker (2012) claimed that if English use in Thailand is viewed as part of ELF paradigm, ELT in Thailand needs to move away from NSE model by which English proficiency is measured. This is because ELF users in Thailand are seen as proficient multilingual communicators with their own repertoire of linguistic and communicative resources. Therefore, ELT in Thailand should be evaluated in relation with local pedagogic practices and the needs of Thai students with the communicative situations that are relevant to them. More importantly, students in Thai ELT context at present day do not consist of only Thai student. Due to the globalization and the establishment of ASEAN community, there are some both foreign students and teachers from ASEAN community get involve in Thai ELT context as well. As a consequence, Thai ELT context has been shifted from bilingual context into multilingual context. While there are some shared features of ELF in the ASEAN community (Kirkpatrick, 2010), ELF is characterized by its fluidity with variety distinguishing features (Seidlhofer, 2009). Hence, Thai users of English need to be able to negotiate this variety by developing the skills, knowledge, and attitudes of successful multilingual communicators (Canagarajah, 2007; Kramsch, 2009; Baker, 2012).

3.7 Summary of the chapter

In summary, this chapter aims to clarify the notion of English as a lingua franca from the previous literatures. The first section describes the how several scholars define ELF, and the pragmatics of ELF and grammar in ELF, which are considered as ELF characteristics are presented. Then, ELF in relation to multilingualism which is called 'English as a Multilingua Franca' proposed by Jenkins (2015), is delineated in the next section. Later on, the situation of ELF and English language teaching are discussed to reveal the match and mismatch of English used between ELT and reality. In addition, four aspects of ELF awareness in ELT classroom including 1) sociolinguistics of language education, 2) the subject of language education, 3) learner in language education, and 4) teacher in language

education, are discussed. At the end of this chapter, ELF and multilingualism in Thai context are clarified.

Chapter 4

Research Methodology

This chapter is divided into three main sections. The first section discusses about the research methodology used in the study. Qualitative research design, trustworthiness, triangulation, and its advantages and disadvantages are illustrated in this section. Then, data collection tools including semi-structured interviews, focus groups, document analysis and classroom observations, are presented in the second section. Finally, data analysis is described in the last section.

4.1 Research Methods

The aim of this study is to investigate Thai English teachers' beliefs of English as a lingua franca and their awareness of ELF in relation to multilingualism. To conduct the study, the concept of triangulation with multiple qualitative data collection methods is employed. In this section, the rationale of using qualitative research is discussed and follow by trustworthiness of the study. After that, the discussion moves to the use of triangulation which includes advantages and disadvantages of triangulation, and how to overcome the limitations of this concept.

4.1.1 Qualitative research design

This present study is conducted under the qualitative research paradigm which aims to reveal Thai university teachers' beliefs of English as a lingua franca and their multilingual awareness. This study fits to qualitative research paradigm because qualitative research uses a naturalistic approach which seeks to understand phenomena in context-specific settings, such as 'real world setting where the researcher does not attempt to manipulate the phenomenon of interest' (Patton, 2002, p.39). Therefore, this kind of research produces findings arrived from real-world settings where the phenomenon of interest unfolds

naturally. In addition, this study aims to investigate deeper understanding of teachers' beliefs; hence, it is concerned with subjective opinions, experiences and feelings of individuals. Dornyei (2007) explains that 'it is only the actual participants themselves who can reveal the meanings and interpretations of their experiences and actions' (p.38). The qualitative research also aims to broaden the repertoire of possible interpretations of human experience instead of seeking a generalizable correct interpretation like in quantitative research (Duff, 2006). This leads to the flexibility of conducting a research when things go wrong as Dornyei (2007) claims that some of unexpected events can make the study meaningless if a researcher uses purely quantitative research design. The qualitative research methods not only allow the researcher to accommodate the changes but also enable the researcher to capitalize on them and produce exciting findings.

4.1.2 Trustworthiness (reliability and validity) in qualitative research

Patton (2002) claims that reliability and validity are two factors which qualitative researcher should be concerned about while designing a study, analyzing results, and judging the quality of the study. Nevertheless, the terms reliability and validity in quantitative research paradigm are defined differently from that of qualitative research paradigm. Joppe (2000) defines reliability as 'the extent to which results are consistent over time and accurate representation of the total population of the study is referred to as reliability and if the results of a study can be reproduced under the similar methodology, then the research instrument is considered to be reliable' (p.1). At the same time, Joppe (2000) also provides the explanation of what validity is as 'Validity determines whether the researcher truly measures that which it was intended to measure or how truthful the research results are. In other words, does the research instrument allow you to hit "the bull's eye" of your research object? Researchers generally determine validity by asking a series of questions, and will often look for the answers in the research of others' (p.1). Nevertheless, these definitions cannot be applied in qualitative research paradigm. This is because reliability is a concept used for testing or evaluating quantitative research. If we see the idea of testing as a way of

information elicitation then the most important test of qualitative study is its quality (Golafshani, 2003). To ensure reliability in qualitative research, Lincoln and Guba (1985) claims that 'since there can be no validity without reliability, a demonstration of the former (validity) is sufficient to establish the latter (reliability)' (p.316). This is supported by Patton (2001) that reliability is a consequence of the validity in qualitative research. Many researchers have adopted their own concepts of validity in qualitative research and adopted what they consider to be more appropriate terms, such as, credibility, rigor, and trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Seale, 1999; Mishler, 2000; Davies & Dodd, 2002). In this study, the term trustworthiness is used to establish confidence in the findings. Duff (2006) presents a set of criteria that is used to evaluate the trustworthiness of an interpretive researcher's knowledge claims. This includes, for example, strong evidence, the use of triangulation, disconfirming case analysis, thick description, long-term observation, and researcher's self-reflection. In this study, the concept of triangulation is used to examine various interpretation and reflect the multiple ways of establish truth. The concept of triangulation is then described in the next section.

4.1.3 Triangulation

According to Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007), triangulation is defined as the use of two or more data collection methods in the study of some aspect of human behavior. Generally, triangulation in social science research is a process by which a researcher wants to verify a finding by showing that independent measures of it agree with or do not contradict it (Miles & Huberman, 1994). According to Miles and Huberman (1994), triangulation in qualitative research is divided into five kinds:

- Triangulation by data source (data collected from different people, individuals, groups, or communities)
- Triangulation by method (the use of multiple methods of data collection)

- Triangulation by investigator (the participation of two or more researchers in the same study to provide multiple conclusion)
- Triangulation by theory (the use of different theories to analyze and interpret data)
- Triangulation by data type (the use of different data type, for example, combining quantitative and qualitative data in one study)

The type of triangulation chosen depends on the purpose of the study, and more than one type of triangulation can be applied in the same study. In this present study, the researcher chooses to use triangulation by data source and triangulation by method to conduct the study. Triangulation by method as defined by Kopinak (1999) is 'gathering information pertaining to the same phenomenon through more than one method, primarily in order to determine if there is a convergence and hence, increased validity in research finding' (p.71). It is also indicated that the use of more data collection tools would provide for more detailed and multi-layered information about the phenomenon under the study. In this study, multiple data collection tools include document analysis, semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and focus group interviews. Moreover, triangulation by data source is also applied in this study to ensure the confirmation and completeness of the findings. According to Banister, Burman, Parker, Taylor & Tindall (1994), 'triangulation by data source implies the collection of accounts from different participants in a prescribed setting, from different stages in the activities of the setting and, if appropriate, from different sites of the setting' (p.146). It also entails the cross-checking of the consistency of specific and factual data items from several sources through multiple methods at different time (Patton, 1990). In this study, the semi-structured interviews are conducted with teacher participants from different majors to compare the findings in different perspectives. Furthermore, focus group interviews are conducted with the group of teacher participants to compare the findings between data collected through semi-structured interviews and focus group interviews. By doing this, it would improve comprehension of the various reasons for the existence of inconsistencies between the two sets of data (Patton, 1990).

4.1.4 Advantages and disadvantages of triangulation

Many researchers have argued for the strengths and benefits of triangulation. Denzin (1978) states that using a combination of methods allows the researcher to achieve the best of each method while simultaneously overcome the deficiencies of each method. Jick (1979) claims that triangulation offers researchers various important opportunities which include increasing confidence in results, the potential to create new methods and the opportunity to provide an enriched explanation of the research problem. Foss and Bradley (2002) argues that it can produce richer and more authentic data, while Andrews (2005) mentions that it has the potential to produce more comprehensive and insightful data. More importantly, many researchers have claimed that triangulation could help to overcome the bias inherent in single-method research and counterbalance the short-coming evident in using a single research strategy (Denzin, 1989; Erzerber & Prein, 1997; Thurmond, 2001). These would ensure the confirmation and the completeness of the findings in this study.

Nevertheless, some limitations of triangulation are proposed by other scholars, such as, the potential incompatibility of research paradigms (Duffy, 1985; Blaikie, 1991), many researchers fail to make clear how triangulation has been achieved (Oberst, 1993), and the fact is that it does not reduce bias in the methods chosen (Fielding and Fielding, 1986). To overcome these limitations of triangulation, a number of strategies are proposed. The use of well-focused, clear, and appropriate research questions should be applied in the study (Dootson, 1995). A clear rationale and account of the way triangulation is conducted need to be provided (Shin, 1998). More importantly, Johnson (2001) emphasizes that each data collection method must have rigor and be complete in itself to present the confirmation of the findings and the completeness of the findings. The description and rigor of each data collection tool is explained in the next section.

4.2 Data collection tools

The present study closely follows the concept of triangulation to gather and analyze data. Following the concept of triangulation, this study employs four different data collection tools which include: document analysis, semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and focus group interviews. This is to answer these three research questions;

1. What are Thai university English teachers' beliefs of English?
2. To what extent do Thai university English teachers have an ELF awareness?
3. What factors are contributing to the formation or the lack of their ELF awareness under a multilingualism framework?

In this section, each data collection tool is elaborated to explain how and why it is necessary for this study to answer the research questions.

4.2.1 Semi-structured interviews

Since people's inner state, such as ideas, feelings, beliefs, views, reasoning behind actions, and opinions are not observable, researchers need instruments which enable them to access these (Seale 1998; Davies 2007). Among different research instruments in qualitative research, the interview is the most often used method in qualitative inquiries (Dornyei, 2007). Basically, the interview is defined as an interaction between two or more individuals with a specific purpose in mind. Additionally, the interview is one of the qualitative data collection methods that helps researcher learn about their participants' thoughts and feelings (Merriam, 1988). Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) describe that the use of qualitative interview 'attempts to understand the world from the subjects' points of view, to unfold the meaning of their experiences, to uncover their live world prior to scientific explanations' (p.3). Therefore, the interview is generally utilized to collect data in applied linguistic contexts (Block, 2000; Richard, 2003).

According to Dunn (2005) the interview could basically be divided into three categories; (1) the unstructured interview, (2) the structured interview, and (3) the semi-structured interview. The unstructured interview is relaxed in nature and the generation of questions is spontaneously arising from natural conversational flow. The interviewer has the advantage of maximum flexibility and can modify questions depending on the context of the investigation. The advantage of the use of unstructured interview approach is the depth of information gathered. However, this interview approach is quite difficult for researchers to gather information systematically. The structured interview is the most structured of the three interview approaches. Each interviewee is led through a defined sequence of questions using essentially the same wording. Data analysis is more straightforward. Consequently, this leads to little space for variation or spontaneity in the responses of participants (Dornyei, 2007). The semi-structured interview is more structured than the unstructured interview and involves outlining a set of issues that are to be explored before interviewing begins (Patton, 1990). There is not necessarily a set order to the questions, and wording used could be varied from participants to participants. However, an interview guide is necessarily needed for this approach to ensure that all relevant topics are covered. The use of the interview guide helps make the data gathering more systematic.

In the present study, the semi-structured interview is employed to gather data, this is because this interview approach offers efficient flexibility and systematic. Dornyei (2007) mentions that in this interview approach the interviewer provides guideline and direction, and is keen to follow up interesting developments and to let the interviewee elaborate on certain issues. Similarly, Galletta (2012) claims that this approach has found to be successful in enabling reciprocity between the interviewer and participants. In other word, this approach enables the interviewer to improvise follow-up questions based on participants' responses (Hordon et al, 2004; Rubin & Rubin, 2005); Polit & Beck, 2010) and allow space for participants' individual verbal expressions (RWJF, 2008). However, Dornyei (2007) further suggests that the semi-structured interview is suitable for the study that the

researcher has a good enough overview of the phenomenon and is able to develop board questions about the topic in advance but does not want to use ready-made response categories that would limit the depth and breadth of data. This is similar to what Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) emphasize that it is the task for the researcher to have ability to develop questions that encourage the participants to describe as precisely as possible what they experience and feel and how they act. The interview questions have to be determined before the interview and formulated using the interview guide (Manson, 2004) because the interview questions are based on previous knowledge (Wengraf, 2001; Kelly, 2010). Therefore, before conducting the interviews, the researcher has studied and reviewed various previous studies on ELF, language belief and attitude, and language awareness to develop an interview guideline which aims to elicit participants' attitudes, beliefs, ideas, and awareness of ELF. Nevertheless, regarding formulating interview questions, Dunn (2005) explains that 'It is not possible to formulate a strict guide to good practice for every interview context' (p.5). To begin this, researchers need to brief themselves fully on the topic, and it is important to work out a list of themes or questions to ask participants (Longhurst, 2016). Additionally, the researcher should consider related issues when preparing an interview guide and a central question is the depth of information that the researcher wants to collect (Kallio et al, 2016). Although the goal of qualitative research is to gain a deep understanding of the specific phenomenon (Polit & Beck, 2010), it is ethically questionable to collect data that is not completely necessary for the study (Gibbs et al, 2007). This leads to the rationale why the researcher needs to systematically design the interview guide that could keep the interviews on track and focus on the particular theme (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015).

The present study employs five phases of the semi-structured interview guide development which proposed by Kallio et al (2016) to design the semi-structured interview guide. According to Kallio et al (2016), the semi-structured interview guide development includes five phases: (1) identifying the prerequisites for using semi-structured interviews; (2)

retrieving and using previous knowledge; (3) formulating the preliminary semi-structured interview guide; (4) pilot testing the interview guide; (5) presenting the complete semi-structured interview guide. To show how this guide development can be practically employed in this study, the detail of all five phases are elaborated.

The purpose of the first phase is to evaluate the appropriateness of the semi-structured interview as a rigorous data collection method in relation to research questions (Kallio et al, 2016). As mentioned in the research questions in this study, the researcher wants to investigate teachers' beliefs, awareness, and factors that affect their beliefs and awareness of ELF. Therefore, the semi-structure interview is appropriate for collecting data in this study because it is suitable for studying people's perceptions and opinions or complex (Barriball & While, 1994) or emotionally sensitive issues (Astedt-Kurki & Heikkinen, 1994). Moreover, the semi-structured interview method is appropriately used when there are issues that participants are not familiar with and have low level of awareness of the subject (Astedt-Kurki & Heikkinen, 1994). It is anticipated from this study that the participants are not familiar with ELF concept, so the semi-structured interview method is chosen to be used to elicit their beliefs and awareness of ELF.

After the first phase, the researcher goes further to the next phase which is retrieving and using previous knowledge. The aim of this phase is to gain a comprehensive and sufficient understanding of the subject. In this phase, it requires critical appraisal of previous knowledge and the possible need for complementary empirical knowledge (Kallio et al, 2016). This is because previous knowledge could generate a conceptual basis for the interview (Astedt-Kurki & Heikkinen, 1994), and the critical appraisal of previous knowledge could be conducted by carrying out an extensive literature review (Barriball & While, 1994; Krauss et al, 2009). In this phase, the researcher has studied and reviewed the previous studies in relation to ELF, language awareness, and language belief to help create

and frame the interviews. Thus, this study focuses on teachers' beliefs and their ELF awareness in ELT class from sociolinguistic context, subject matter, learner, and teacher themselves in language education aspect.

The third phase is formulating the preliminary semi-structured interview guide. This phase, the researcher aims to formulate an interview guide as a tool for interview data collection by using previous knowledge on structural, logical, and coherent form. An interview guide has been defined as a list of interview questions which directs the conversation towards the research topic during the interview (Whiting, 2008; Krauss et al, 2009, Cridland et al, 2015). The form of a semi-structured interview guide is loose and flexible (Dearnley, 2005; Turner, 2010). This is to allow dialogue during the interview, the chance to change the order of the questions, and easy movement from question to question (Dearnley, 2005; Cridland et al, 2015). The aim of the interview guide is to elicit answers from participants that are spontaneous, in-depth, unique, and vivid (Dearnley, 2005; Krauss et al, 2009, Baumbusch, 2010). The questions in semi-structured interview guide are divided into two levels: main themes and follow-up questions (Kallio et al, 2016). The main themes cover the main content of the research while follow-up questions maintain the flow of the interview and gain accurate and optimal data (Turner, 2010; Rabionet, 2011). Following these rationales, the semi-structure interview guide is designed and developed rigorously in this study for the richest quality of data collected (see Appendix F).

The fourth phase is pilot testing of the interview guide which aims to confirm the coverage and relevance of the content and to seek the possible need to reformulate interview questions and to test implementation of it (Kallio et al, 2016). In addition, testing the interview guide helps the researcher to know the possible of adjustment to the interview questions, and it can improve the quality of data collection (Chenail, 2011). In this study, field-testing which is a technique where the preliminary interview guide is used with the potential participants is employed. Therefore, this interview guide is used with the potential

participants which are different group of the target participants, but they have the same requirements as a target group participant in different university. Three potential participants are involved in the pilot study to test the interview guide. This is to ensure intelligibility and determine whether the questions really elicit the participants' varied perceptions and experiences (Barriball & While, 1994; Chenail, 2011). Finally, by following all four mentioned phases above, the researcher has presented the semi-structure interview guide at the fifth phase which can be viewed on Appendix F. This is to produce a clear, finished, and logical semi-structured interview guide for data collection (Kallio et al, 2016).

According to Brinkmann and Kvale (2015), the role of the interviewer is the key factor for knowledge elicitation in interviewing. They propose two metaphors, the interviewer as a miner or as a traveler, to illustrate different epistemological approaches to the interview. The interviewer as a miner is described as knowledge collection, the interviewer is a miner digging for information. In other word, Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) explain that 'The knowledge is waiting in the subject's interior to be uncovered, uncontaminated by the miner' (p.57). Regarding this approach, it is seen as positivist pursuit for existing truth having the goal to obtain valid report from the interviewees. On the other hand, the interviewer as a traveler metaphor is associated with knowledge construction which the interviewer is seen as a traveler on the journey of experience with the interviewees, travelling through the landscape and providing an environment conducive to the production of a range of narrative responses. Therefore, 'the potentialities of meanings in the original stories are differentiated and unfolded through the traveler's interpretations of the narratives he or she brings back to home audiences' (p.58). Regarding these two approaches of the interview, this present study employs both the concept of the interviewer as a miner and traveler. This is because some point during the interviews the researcher could be act as a miner who seek to know the fact from the participants whereas the researcher has more of the traveler's characteristics when exploring participants' feelings,

opinions, attitudes, beliefs, and ideas (Seal, 1998).

In this study, the semi-structured interviews are conducted with teacher from different majors (the same department) to explore teachers' beliefs of ELF and their language awareness from different perspectives. In this study, 20 teachers from the Department of Western Languages and Linguistics (DWLL) are planned to be interviewed. The interview questions and probes are adapted from that of Wang (2012). The interview is designed to be divided into three parts which are opening topics, issues to be explored, and closing question. In the opening topics part, the researcher will ask general questions to the interviewees and not so much from the content point. This is because as Dornyei (2007) mentioned that 'if the interviewees feel that they can do themselves justice when answering these initial questions, this will make them feel competent, help them to relax and consequently encourage them to open up' (p.137). In the second part of the interview includes the questions with probes and issued to be explored regarding beliefs of ELF and ELF awareness among the interviewees. Furthermore, factors that affect the formation or lack of language awareness of them will be investigated in this part as well. Finally, the closing part will allow the interviewees to add the information which the researcher does not ask them during the interviews. During the interviews, new and unexpected issues regarding the research theme could happen all the time. In this study, the researcher tries to investigate ELF belief and awareness from the participants in EFL context. It is very interesting for the researcher to have new insights of these perspectives from the participants. Moreover, this could lead to the answer that why and how these beliefs and awareness are generated. Therefore, regarding what the participants say, new additional questions will be brought up through the interviews to explore their ideas. This corresponds to what Brinkmann and Kvale note that 'The interviewer exhibits openness to the new and unexpected phenomena, rather than having ready made categories and schemes of interpretation' (p.33). The sites of the interviews will be agreed by both the interviewees and the researcher which are convenient and relaxing for them and quiet for recording purpose.

In this stage, the researcher plans to conduct the interviews in the personal office at the department.

4.2.2 Focus groups

After the semi-structured interviews, focus groups are planned to be conducted in the next stage of this study. My focus in this stage is to investigate what factors or beliefs that influence the development or obstacles of teacher participants' ELF awareness under multilingual framework from the focus groups. Traditionally, a focus group is a special form of group interview in which the conversation and discussion are centered on a specific theme and facilitated by a moderator (Chestnutt & Robson, 2001). It is not just gathering a group of people together to talk because a focus group is a special type of group in term of purpose, size, composition, and procedures (Krueger & Casey, 2015). The focus group format as explained by Dornyei (2007) is 'based on the collective experience of group brainstorming, that is, participants thinking together, inspiring and challenging each other, and reacting to the emerging issues and points' (p.144). The main purpose of a focus group is to obtain data regarding the understanding, ideas, perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs from the target participants when they discuss about the particular topic (Plummer, 2008). Participants in focus groups are selected on the criteria that they would have something to say on the topic, and they are within the age-range, have similar socio-characteristics, and would be comfortable talking to each other (Richardson & Rabiee, 2001). The merit of focus groups is that participants express multiple understanding and meaning and provide the researcher with a number of perspectives in their own view, challenging each other's contradictions and responding to other points of view (Ivanoff & Hultberg, 2006). In this section, a focus group design in relation to the present study purposes is described.

As mentioned above, the participants in focus groups have to discuss and share experiences, ideas, understanding, attitudes, and beliefs regarding the particular topic; therefore, selecting participants in the study needs to be concerned. As several researchers

claim that the participants who is selected to participate in focus groups are determined by the purpose of the study (Robinson, 1999; Kruger & Casey, 2000; Rabiee, 2004; Kruger& Casey, 2015); thus, focus groups mostly employ purposive sampling which the participants are selected in relation to the nature of the research questions (Roberts, 1997; Lane et al, 2001). Therefore, the target participants in this study are Thai university English language teachers who can disclose their attitudes and beliefs regarding ELF in a Thai context. In focus groups, homogeneity of participants is recommended to be employed to expand the extent to which the participants feel comfortable to express their perceptions and to avoid effects from different ideas from other participants (Kitzinger, 1995; Asbury, 1995; Kruger& Casey, 2015). ‘Segmentation’ proposed by Morgan (1995) which is the sorting different categories of participants into separate groups is employed in this study to help ensure that the groups are homogeneous. In this study, the participants in each group are designed by the researcher concerning with age-range, experience, working experience, acquaintanceship, and degree of education. By utilizing ‘segmentation’ (Morgan, 1995), the participants in each group of focus groups in this study can freely express what they actually think and feel without the pressure and anxiety from different group member levels. However, acquaintanceship of group member is raised as an issue in focus groups. It is argued that participants in focus groups should not know each other because it would potentially disrupt the dynamics of the group and inhibit responses (Smith, 1972; Hurworth, 1996). This point should be concerned when the topic of focus groups is a sensitive issue to be discussed (some issues that affect participants’ feeling and responses to other group members). However, the purpose of the focus groups in this study is to share participants’ attitudes, ideas, beliefs, and thoughts towards ELF which is not a sensitive issue (comparing with some sensitive issue like, religious issues and personal issues). The theme and topic of this present study which is about participants’ beliefs and attitudes towards ELF can be shared in the group members how they feel and understand about the topic.

Group size and number of groups are another aspect that consideration should be taken on when conducting focus groups. In general, it is recommended that the number of participants in each group should be six to eight people (Chestnutt & Robson, 2001; Johnson & Christensen, 2004; Dornyei, 2007, Kruger & Casey, 2015). Nevertheless, the number of participants may vary, and it can range from three to twelve participants in each group (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990; Lane et al, 2001). It is important to justify the group size in the study because too few participants may limit the quantity and diversity of the information (Kruger & Casey, 2015). Additionally, it may also run the risk of insufficient interaction or the failure to challenge the dominant perspectives (Sim & Snail, 1996). On the other hand, if the group size is too big, it may prevent sufficient participation from all participants, and it may prevent quieter or introverted participants from sharing their views (Roberts, 1997; Dornyei, 2007; Kruger & Casey, 2015). More importantly, it can create an environment where participants do not feel comfortable to share their understanding, ideas, attitudes, beliefs, and experiences (Onwuegbuzie et al, 2009; Denzin & Lincoln, 2013). Regarding the number of groups, there is no certain rule for specifying the number of the groups, and this decision is based on the objectives of the study (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990). However, it is recommended that focus groups should be conducted in a series because the researcher could identify trends across groups (Hurworth, 1996). Krueger & Casey (2015) and Morgan (1997) have suggested that three to six groups are adequate for the researcher to reach data saturation (when information collected through focus groups occurs repeatedly that the researcher could anticipate it and when more data appears to have additional interpretive worth; Sandelowski, 2008; Saumure & Given, 2008). Regarding the important of group size and the number of groups, the researcher in this present study will conduct three different focus groups with six to eight participants in each group. This number fits to the number of participants in the context where the researcher collects data.

The role of the researcher in focus groups is different from the interviewer in group interview or one-to-one interview. In focus groups, the researcher acts as the moderator who function more as a facilitator of the discussion than as the interviewer in the traditional sense (Dornyei, 2007; Kruger & Casey, 2015). According to Sim & Snell (1996) and Chestnutt & Robson (2001), the moderator is a non-participant whose role is to facilitate the group processes and ensure the discussion covers the topic of the study. Many researchers have pointed out a number of critical skills needed by the moderator to ensure the success of focus groups. These include be fully grounded in the purpose of the study and understand about the topic enough, establish the environment which encourage the participants to share their opinions, maintain the discussion without directing or constraining it, be open, clarify and paraphrase what participants said, and be able to reach the key questions in time (Hurworth, 1996; Holloway & Wheeler, 1996; Greenwood & Parsons, 2000; Hollis et al, 2002; Dornyei, 2007; Kruger & Casey, 2015). Additionally, the moderator needs to prevent any dominating and inhibiting group opinion from emerging by actively encouraging participants to think critically (Dornyei and Murphey, 2003). Regarding these skills mentioned, the researcher in this study decides to be a moderator in every focus groups. This is because the researcher has reviewed the literatures which are related to the purposes of the study, and it would be easy to determine what ideas from the participants are insightful in relation to the research topic. Importantly, familiarity of the topic and interpersonal relationship among participants in these focus groups could help the researcher to reveal the participants' ideas, opinions, attitudes, and beliefs regarding the topic of the study.

A route of questions in focus groups is one aspect that the researcher should concern before conducting focus group. This is because focus groups have a central topic with a key question that must be answered (Chestnutt & Robson, 2001). Furthermore, stimulus materials are recommended to be used in focus groups in order to provoke discussion (Torronen, 2002; Litosseliti, 2003; Stewart & Shamdasani, 2014). When stimulus materials

are used to provoke the discussion, the researcher chooses cultural products that challenge, with the aid of provocative questions, the interviewees to deal with the established meanings, conventions, and practices of the phenomenon under examination (Torronen, 2002). In this present study, two articles about the spread of English and ELF concept are used as provokers to encourage the discussion among participants in the groups by following the route of questions from topic guide (See appendix G). According to Krueger and Casey (2015), the route of questions in focus groups consists of three phases: introductory questions, transition questions, and key questions. On the first phase, introductory questions are used to introduce the topic and get participants to think about their connection with the topic. Board opening questions regarding participants' using of English will be discussed. On the second phase, transition questions are used to move the discussions into the key questions that drive the study. The questions on this phase will reveal the participants' awareness of different Englishes in the world context. On the final phase, the key questions about ELF are used to elicit their beliefs and awareness of ELF. Additionally, this will lead to the investigation of factors that affect their beliefs and ELF awareness as well (See appendix G).

4.2.3 Document analysis

Document analysis is one of the important research instruments which is used to gather and elicit data in this study. According to Bowen (2009), document analysis is one of qualitative research in which documents are interpreted by the researcher in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge (Rapley, 2007; Strauss & Corbin, 2008). Merriam (1998) stated that 'Documents of all types can help the researcher uncover meaning, develop understanding, and discover insights relevant to the research problem' (p.118). Three primary types of documents which would be analyzed, according to O'Leary (2014), include; 1) Public records: the official, ongoing records of an organization's activities (mission statements, annual reports, policy manuals, student handbooks, strategic plans, and syllabi), 2) Personal Documents: first-person accounts of an individual's actions,

experiences, and beliefs (calendars, e-mails, scrapbooks, blogs, Facebook posts, duty logs, incident reports, reflections/journals, and newspapers), 3) Physical Evidence: physical objects found within the study setting (flyers, posters, agendas, handbooks, and training materials). Document analysis is often used in combination with other research instruments as a means of triangulation to reduce the impact of potential bias by examining data collected through different research instruments (Bowen, 2009).

Similarly, to other qualitative research instruments, document analysis has both advantages and limitations. According to Bowen (2009), document analysis is less time-consuming and therefore more efficient than other research methods because it requires data selection instead of data collection. More importantly, documents are stable non-reactive data sources which means that they can be read and reviewed several times and unchanged by the researcher's influence or research process. Documents can also contain data that no longer can be observed, provide information that the participants may have forgotten, and can track the change and development. In addition, document analysis can raise the questions that need to be asked or situations that need to be observed. However, there are some limitations of document analysis that should be concerned before conducting it. Bowen (2009) points out that some documents may only provide small data that contain necessary information to answer the research questions; also, some documents may not be available or easily accessible. More importantly, 'biased selectivity' (Yin, 1994, p. 80) which are the documents that may reflect just only the organizational unit that handle-keeping should be concerned. To avoid these problems regarding document analysis, it is necessary to thoroughly to evaluate and investigate the subjectivity of documents and the researcher's understanding of the information in order to preserve the reliability and validity of the study (Bowen, 2009; O'Leary, 2014).

In this present study, various types of documents in relation to English learning and teaching in a Thai context are analyzed. These include Thailand Qualification Framework

(TQF), student handbook, course syllabuses, textbooks, handouts, and exam papers. These documents would consist the information that can reveal teachers' beliefs of ELF and their multilingual awareness. For instance, the content in textbooks or handouts that the teacher participants use in their class would have some part that consist the knowledge which is related to the use of ELF or variety of Englishes. In the course syllabuses which are designed by teachers themselves, may show the focus of English learning and teaching that could reflect their beliefs. Furthermore, some documents provide the information that could reflect factors that affect their language awareness. For example, some information in TQF and student handbooks show language policy which control the language use in a Thai context. This information from document analysis would help support the findings from other research instruments to strengthen the reliability of the study.

4.2.4 Classroom observations

Classroom observation is one of the research instrument which is used to gather information what really happen in the real-life teaching situations in this study. Zohrabi (2013) mentioned that classroom observation is a research tool that is preplanned to serve the research questions and objectives purposefully. When using classroom observation, the researcher observes the events and classroom interactions as they actually and naturally occur (Burns, 1999; Flick, 2006). In the classroom observation, several aspects of the class can be investigated; such as, routines, time using, schedule, participation, interaction, teaching strategies, learning interest, and so on. This would help the researcher to be able to reflect the reality of teachers' teaching practices which could show their beliefs and awareness regarding ELF and multilingualism. Moreover, the data collected through the classroom observation could support and combine with the data collected through another research instruments which are semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and document analysis to collect 'relatively objective first hand information' (Johnson & Turner, 2003, p. 314).

In qualitative research, classroom observation models are divided into three types which include: 1) the completely unstructured type, 2) the semi-structured type, and 3) the highly structured type (O'Leary, 2014). The completely unstructured type has no clear point on what it is looking for, and the observer just observe what is taking place before deciding on its significance for the research. In the semi-structured type, the observer will have an agenda of issues and gather data to explain these issues in systematic manner. In the highly structured type, the observer will know what it is looking for and will have its observation categories before conducting the observation. In this study, the semi-structured observation type is used for gathering data in the classrooms. This is because the focus of the observations in this study is to look in to the reality of learning and teaching English in relation to ELF and multilingualism. The researcher has no hypothesis to be proved before the observation but will review the observational data before suggesting an explanation for the phenomenon being observed. Therefore, the semi-structured observation type is fit for this present study.

In terms of observer role, the observer can, according to Merriam (1998), be divided into four types. These include: 1) the complete participant – researchers are already part of member of the group under investigation and fully involved in all group activities, 2) the participant-as-observer – researchers may become part of the group, but is not fully involved in all the group activities, 3) the observer-as-participant – researchers have clear data gathering aims and they primarily observe their subjects for a brief period of time as they attempt to conduct structured or semi-structured interview, and 4) the complete observer – researchers are fundamentally removed from the setting and try to be as unobtrusive as possible. The observer-as-participant type in which the researcher only watches and records the classroom activities without any involvement is employed in this study. This is to avoid loosing sight of the classroom activities as Merriam (1998) mentions that if the observer becomes too much involved in the classroom processes, it will consequently cannot concentrate on selected behaviors and activities.

In terms of the criterion what to be observed, Fraenkel & Wallen (2003) propose two types of observation which include 'narrow focus observation' and 'board focus observation'. Narrow focus observation normally focuses on a single element while board focus observation focuses on the whole picture of what is happening in the classroom. This study employs the concept of board focus observation to conduct the study. The field note is used to capture classroom activities those are made by both teacher and student participants in relation to ELF and multilingualism; such as, their lesson structure, type of teaching activities, the use of language, the use of materials, and teaching strategies (Richards & Farrell, 2011). Schoenfel (2012) argues that what to be observed is not rely on the questions 'what does a teacher know?' or 'what does a teacher say s/he believes?' but should focus on 'how do teacher's knowledge and beliefs play out in the classroom? He also emphasizes that for the greater confidence in the results of the classroom observation, triangulation should be conducted in the same study. This is because different data resources can be used to support other research instruments. Therefore, the data collected trough classroom observations in this study could help support the data collected through semi-structure interviews, focus groups and document analysis to reflect teachers' beliefs and their awareness regarding ELF and multilingualism in a Thai context.

4.3 Data analysis

After gathering data from four research instruments, the data in this present study is analyzed by using the analytical framework called content analysis. According to Krippendorff (2013), 'content analysis is a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the context of their use' (p.24). Flick (2009) mentioned that content analysis is generally used to analyze large quantities of text message by using categorization to reduce large quantities of data. To put data in proper categories, the coding technique is used in this study. This would help the researcher to

explain and gain a better understanding of the data by putting words into categories which are related to the content (Elo & Kyngas, 2008). Following the research questions, the aspects of text interpretation are putted into categories which are carefully founded and revised within the process of analysis. In the coding process in this study, the researcher employs two approaches to set up the categories and produce codes which are 'deductive category application' and 'inductive category development'. The detail of these two approaches is described in the next section.

4.3.1 Deductive category application

The deductive category application approach is applied to set up categories based on previous knowledge and theory (Mayring, 2000). This approach is often used when the researcher wants to retest existing data in a new context which may involve testing categories, concepts, model or hypotheses (Catanzaro, 1988). Categories and codes in this approach are generated based on earlier work; such as, theories, models, mind maps, and literature reviews (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Therefore, in this stage the concept of ELF and multilingual awareness from the literature reviews are used to generate and develop categorization matrix. Then, all data are reviewed for content and coded for correspondence with or exemplification of the identified categories (Polit & Beck, 2004).

4.3.2 Inductive category development

The inductive category development approach is used to produce the categories' definitions of concepts, themes or patterns of coding based on research objectives and research questions (Mayring, 2000). This approach is used when the researcher wants to analyze the data emerging from the field that do not fit with the previous theory. In this stage, the researcher reads through the text initially and tries to see the big picture of the data. When reading through the text data, the researcher tries to find the key phrases and text segments that correspond to the research questions to set up the headings. This process is called 'open coding' (Elo & Kyngas, 2008). After the open coding, the lists categories are formulated and

grouped under higher order headings. The purpose of formulating categories is to provide a means of explaining the phenomenon, to increase understanding, and to generate knowledge (Cavanagh, 1997). Then, each category is named given a description using content-characteristic words. This process is called ‘abstraction’ according to Elo and Kyngas (2008).

4.4 Summary of the chapter

This chapter mainly focuses on all the information related to the research methodology for the present study. It is mainly divided into three sections including: research methods, data collection tools, and data analysis. In the first section, qualitative research design, trustworthiness, and triangulation which are used in this study are described. Then, data collection tools consisting of semi-structured interviews, focus groups, document analysis, and classroom observations are clarified in the following section. Additionally, research aims and research questions are presented in this section. The final section describes how the data collected through all the four data collection tools are analyzed. Two main approaches of content analysis which are ‘deductive category application’ and ‘inductive category development’ are explained.

Chapter 5

Teachers' beliefs of English as a subject matter

5.1 Introduction

The first chapter of data analysis focuses on teachers' beliefs of using English, their awareness of ELF in relation to multilingualism, and factors affecting their ELF awareness which were revealed through the semi-structured interviews. The chapter begins with the information of the participants which include 20 Thai university English teachers. Then, the procedure of the semi-structured interviews including the analytical framework that is used to manage the data sets collected by using data collection tool, transcription and translation, and coding framework are presented. The final section describes the findings from the interviews in terms of coding categories and the patterns established among different codes. The purpose of this chapter is to interpret the findings retrieved from the interviews and to answer all three research questions.

- RQ1: What are Thai university English teachers' beliefs of English language?
- RQ2: To what extent do Thai university English teachers have an ELF awareness?
- RQ3: What factors are contributing to the formation or the lack of their ELF awareness under a multilingualism framework?

5.2 Participants

The participants in this study include 20 Thai university English language teachers. All of them are the member of the Department of Western Languages and Linguistics (DWLL) in one Thai university. Before the main interview, the researcher contacted the head of the department asking permission to collect the data from the member of the department. After permission was granted, the researcher contacted the participants individually asking for their participation in the present study. Then, 20 teachers agreed to participate in the semi-

structured interviews which include 7 males and 13 females. These teacher participants are Thai, non-native English speakers, and have at least 3 years of English language teaching experience in undergraduate level in Thailand. All of them are responsible to teach both English and non-English major students. Most of them have an experience to study abroad mainly in the English speaking countries, for instance, in USA, UK, Australia, and New Zealand. Table 4.1 illustrates the information of the teacher participants.

Table 5.1 Description of the teacher participants

Participant	Gender	Year of teaching English in university	The highest education level	Country of studying abroad
T1	Female	12	M.Phil.	UK
T2	Female	12	Ph.D.	UK
T3	Male	3	M.Ed.	USA
T4	Male	13	M.Phil.	UK
T5	Male	8	M.A	-
T6	Male	7	M.A	Australia
T7	Female	7	M.A	Australia
T8	Male	6	Ph.D.	Australia
T9	Female	3	M.Ed.	-
T10	Female	6	Ph.D.	UK
T11	Female	4	M.A	-
T12	Female	14	M.Phil.	New Zealand
T13	Male	13	Ph.D.	UK
T14	Male	14	M.Ed.	USA
T15	Female	13	M.Phil.	USA
T16	Female	15	M.A	New Zealand

T17	Female	13	M.A	-
T18	Female	7	Ph.D.	UK
T19	Female	6	M.A	New Zealand
T20	Female	3	M.A	UK

5.3 Analytical Methods

5.3.1 Analytical framework

After gathering data from semi-structured interviews, the data in this present study is analyzed by using the analytical framework called qualitative content analysis. According to Krippendorff (2013), 'content analysis is a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the context of their use' (p.24). Flick (2009) mentioned that qualitative content analysis is generally used to analyze large quantities of text message by using categorization to reduce large quantities of data. To put data in proper categories, the coding technique is used in this study. This would help the researcher to explain and gain a better understanding of the data by putting words into categories which are related to the content (Elo & Kyngas, 2008). Following the research questions, the aspects of text interpretation are putted into categories which are carefully founded and revised within the process of analysis. In the coding process in this study, the researcher employs two approaches to set up the categories and produce codes which are 'deductive category application' and 'inductive category development'.

The deductive category application approach is applied to set up categories based on previous knowledge and theory (Mayring, 2000). This approach is often used when the researcher wants to retest existing data in a new context which may involve testing categories, concepts, model or hypotheses (Catanzaro, 1988). Categories and codes in this approach are generated based on earlier work; such as, theories, models, mind maps, and

literature reviews (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Therefore, in this stage the concept of ELF and multilingual awareness from the literature reviews are used to generate and develop categorization matrix. Then, all data are review for content and coded for correspondence with or exemplification of the identified categories (Polit & Beck, 2004).

The inductive category development approach is used to produce the categories' definitions of concepts, themes or patterns of coding based on research objectives and research questions (Mayring, 2000). This approach is used when the researcher wants to analyze the data emerging from the field that do not fit with the previous theory. In this stage, the researcher reads through the text initially and tries to see the big picture of the data. When reading through the text data, the researcher tries to find the key phrases and text segments that correspond to the research questions to set up the headings. This process is called 'open coding' (Elo & Kyngas, 2008). After the open coding, the lists categories are formulated and grouped under higher order headings. The purpose of formulating categories is to provide a means of explaining the phenomenon, to increase understanding, and to generate knowledge (Cavanagh, 1997). Then, each category is named given a description using content-characteristic words. This process is called 'abstraction' according to Elo and Kyngas (2008).

5.3.2 Transcription and coding process

The qualitative data in this study were video recorded from 20 teacher participants semi-structure interviews. After finishing all the interviews, to become familiar with data before setting the themes, the researcher decided to transcribe the data by himself. Because of the time constraints, 15 teachers' interviews were fully transcribed, while the rest of the participants' interviews were partially transcribed. During the transcription, the researcher tried to set the theme for the coding which is relevant to the previous literatures in relation to ELF notion. When the transcription finished, the researcher read through all the data

again and tried to make notes about some important features from the data. Then, some emerging themes from the field were added to the coding frame.

As all the interviews in this study were conducted by using Thai, the transcriptions were all done in the original language. The reason that the researcher used Thai language to conduct the interviews because the researcher wanted all participants to feel more relax and more comfortable when they reveal their ideas during the interviews. The researcher did not translate all the transcriptions into English but only the transcriptions which are presented in the analysis and discussion were translated. To confirm the correctness of the translation, the researcher applied the framework called ‘back translation’ proposed by Bracken and Barona (2001) in this process. When the researcher translated the transcripts from Thai to English, these transcripts were sent to two Thai translators to convert them into Thai again. Then, the researcher compared the Thai version transcripts from these two translators with his version to check the similarities and differences. It should be noted that both of the translators are Thai English language teachers who are well-knowledgeable in both Thai and English language. Since this current study focuses on what the participants revealed and the content meanings rather than the linguistic features, the researcher did not use many transcription conventions. The transcription conventions are listed below:

Table 5.2 Interview transcription conventions (adapted from Mauranen, 2006; Jenkins, 2007, 2014)

Symbol	Explanation
R	Researcher
T1, T2, T3, etc	Teacher participant number according to interview order
Bold type	Speaker emphasis
<i>Italics</i>	Italics used by the researcher to identify key points in the extracts
(.)	Pause about 1 second or less

(2)	Pause about 2 second, etc
[...]	Omission of text which is irrelevant
< >	The researcher's additional information to make meaning clear
@ @	Laughter
[[Overlapping or interrupted speech
CAPITAL	In a louder voice

After finishing the transcription process, the researcher transferred all the transcriptions to NVivo 12. This software allowed the researcher to manage the interview data and facilitated the coding process. Regarding the coding process, the first stage was to identify the main themes to explain the data and to setup sub-themes for each theme. This stage applied the concept of deductive codes where the codes were preconceived by the researcher from the research questions, previous literatures and theories. Therefore, the researcher selected a set of main theme from R1, R2, and R3 including 1) Teachers' beliefs of English language, 2) their ELF and multilingual awareness, and 3) factors affecting their language awareness. Then, the researcher started the second stage by coding the data based on these deductive codes. During this stage, the researcher also opened for codes or themes emerged from the data based on the inductive coding approach. After retrieving both deductive and inductive themes and sub-themes from the transcripts, the final stage was to revise or expand the coding frame. In this stage, the researcher went through the main themes and sub-themes to consider the similarities or differences among these themes. Then, the similar sub-themes were merged into one sub-theme, while new sub-themes were added to fit with the data from the interviews. Then, the coding frame for the interviews is as follow:

Table 5.3 Coding frame for the interviews

<p>5.4.1 Teachers' beliefs about English language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">5.4.1.1 Target language: ENL or ELF5.4.1.2 NES ownership vs global ownership5.4.1.3 NES conformity vs NNES creativity5.4.1.4 English vs Englishes5.4.1.5 Fixity vs fluidity5.4.1.6 Culture and language5.4.1.7 Classroom vs authentic
<p>5.4.2 Teachers' ELF in relation to multilingual awareness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">5.4.2.1 The pragmatics of ELF<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Negotiate meaning- Error correction- Let it pass- Code switching- Multilingual resources and code mixing5.4.2.2 Grammar in ELF<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Content rather than form- English user vs English learner
<p>5.4.3 Factors affecting teachers' ELF in relation to multilingual awareness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">5.4.3.1 Factors affecting the lack of their ELF awareness<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Internal factors (professional status, educational experiences, individuals' attitudes)- External factors (students and stakeholders' expectations, traditional exam oriented, language policy)5.4.3.2 Factors affecting the formation of their ELF awareness

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Internal factors (individuals' beliefs towards English language and experiences of using English with people who share different L1) |
|--|

5.4 Results and analysis

In this section, the data from the interviews were analyzed and discussed with the analytical methods which were discussed in the previous section.

5.4.1 Teachers' beliefs about English language (RQ1)

Regarding teachers' beliefs about language theme, the focus is on the beliefs which are related to both ENL and ELF perspectives. This is to reveal how the teacher participants perceive or differentiate ENL and ELF. Therefore, to describe the beliefs regarding these two perspectives, seven codes were framed including; target language, ownership of English, NES conformity vs NNEs creativity, English vs Englishes, fixity vs fluidity, culture and English language, and classroom vs authentic.

5.4.1.1 Target language: ENL or ELF

Although most of the teacher participants in this study revealed that English can be adapted from ENL to reach the communicative purposes, the majority of them accepted that the target language that they prefer was relied on standard English used by NESs. This finding is similar to what Jenkins (2007) described that non-native English teachers tends to accept the notion of ELF in theory, but native English is still their desired goal. Particularly, American English were mostly chosen by the teachers from the interviews. They described that this might because of the influence of the materials they exposed with mostly produced by American NESs; for instance, teaching materials, American music, American movies, and other American media. Here are a few examples to illustrate their beliefs.

Extract 1

- 1 R: Do you have the role model of English language in your mind?
- 2 T15: *Actually, I prefer American accent (.) This may be because of some of American series*
- 3 *or movies I have seen (..) Another reason might be because I studied with an American*
- 4 *teacher when I was in*
- 5 *master degree level. He also had the responsibility on TOEFL tutorial courses in the university*
- 6 *as well. I also had an experience to take some courses with him to prepare myself for the test.*

Extract 2

- 1 R: As you mentioned earlier that you want to use English language like them. In this case,
- 2 *who are they? And do you have the role model of English language in your mind?*
- 3 T9: *Yes, I have. They I referred to means like (..) the movie stars from the American movies*
- 4 *that we watch.*

Extract 3

- 1 R: Do you have the role model of English language in your mind?
- 2 T16: *Actually, I don't have the role model of English language in my mind. However, by the*
- 3 *influence of the media that we exposed (.) because I am a kind of people who like to listen*
- 4 *to foreign music as well as watching foreign movies. Because most of the media are produced*
- 5 *by American people, so they affect and influence my English to be like American English.*

Some of the teacher participants stated that if it is possible, they want to use English language like NESs. However, the main reason underpin this kind of beliefs is due to their social status. As they work as an English teacher, particularly in the university, they revealed that they are expected to be the role model for their students, as illustrated in extract 4 and 5.

Extract 4

- 1 R: Do you have the role model of English language in your mind?
- 2 T11: *Deep in my mind, honestly, I want to use English like NESs (..) Actually, I know that at*
- 3 *the present day, the concept of world Englishes is widely accepted which means that the*
- 4 *focus is not on (.) different accent, but the on the intelligibility. However, as an English*
- 5 *teacher, I want to produce the most perfect English language which is nearly used by NESs*
- 6 *as much as I can.*

Extract 5

- 1 R: Do you have the role model of English language in your mind?
- 2 T12: *For me now <she is an English lecturer who has non-potential to develop her English*

3 language due to the responsibilities to her kids>, *although I want to have my English as native-*
4 *liked, I can not improve it due to many things I have to do*, especially, to take care my family
5 because my kids are so young. *However, I try to use English language with the correct*
6 *pronunciation and intonation in the communication. This is because to be a good model for*
7 *the students.*

Interestingly, one of my teacher participant has a strongly belief on the target language that she preferred which is British English. This belief was motivated by both her experience and social status. As she realized that she graduated from UK university both master and doctoral degree, it would be great if people or her students perceive her English language as British people. From the interview, it is evidenced that her beliefs about English language are strongly influenced by her educational experience and social status. The following is some part of her interview regarding the target language.

Extract 6

1 R: Do you have the role model of English language in your mind?
2 T18: *British English, definitely.* Cause I studied there for my both degree <master and doctoral
3 degree> [...].
4 What do you think about English language in Thai style?
5 **Not OK for me.** I mean English language is an international language. If you think that (.) I
6 am Thai people, I can use English like Thai style which can be intelligible by Thai people.
7 However, this kind of language can not be understandable by NESs, so I can not accept it.
8 Therefore, *the communication by using English language should be relied on NESs.*(.) I mean
9 (.) it is not necessary to produce the perfect grammar, but *all the vocabularies and expressions*
10 *should not be different from the NESs.*

More interestingly, in this teacher participant's interview, she strongly revealed that standard English should be presented and used by both Thai and non-Thai English lecturers. This is because she believes that standard English which is used by NESs should be the role model for anybody who wants to communicate by using English, as it is seen in extract 7 and Extract 8.

Extract 7

1 T18: [...]*Although the concept of world Englishes; for example, Chinese English (.)*
2 *Singaporean English, is different from standard English (2) let me use this word 'Standard*
3 *English', although it is different from standard English, it is still based on standard English.*
4 One more thing, although other people use broken English, we should not do like them. If we
5 use the correct standard English and our interlocutors use the wrong one (2) the context is

6 just a communication outside the class() it is just a communication. If we can understand
7 each other by I use the correct English and the others use broken English() It is OK. However,
8 the problem would be occurred when we can not totally communicate with each other. If this
9 situation occurs, it will not be my fault() who studies and uses standard English. It would be
10 his/her fault <the interlocutor> who can not totally communicate with me.

Extract 8

1 T18: [...]I don't know how to say (2) *cause personally I like NESs and they are the role*
2 *model for me <in using English>, so I want my students do the same as me. I won't teach any*
3 *kind of English <which is different from NSE> like Chinese, Vietnamese, or Singaporean*
4 *accent to them() I don't know() maybe it is because of my attitude.*
5 R: What do you think if our department employs foreign teachers who are NNEs to teach
6 English for our students?
7 T18: DISAGREE. I totally **disagree** with this *cause our students are English major student,*
8 *they should learn standard English. [...]* I think if we better employ NESs rather than NNEs
9 to teach conversation to our students. The difference between English which is used by NESs
10 and NNEs is not just only an accent. There are some vocabulary or expression
11 which are also different as well. *Our students should be better learnt from NESs cause I*
12 *think if we produce students who use standard English, they can communicate with any*
13 *people from any countries (2) although they are Chinese, Singaporean, Vietnamese, cause*
14 *we have what it is called 'Standard' so we can accommodate them.*

However, some of the teacher participants shown some aspects of their target language beliefs relating to ELF perspective. They revealed that as long as they can communicate with other people by using English, they do not mind what kind of English they use. The focus is on intelligibility rather than form. Some of the interview data are demonstrate as follow.

Extract 9

1 R: Do you have the role model of English language in your mind?
2 T10: *NO. I don't have () such a kind of preferable English. Just use it. However, I try to*
3 *focus on the consistency. (2) I mean...for example I try to use British English as much as I*
4 *can every time I use English.*
5 R: If I talk about English norms, somebody said that this norms act as a gate keeper. Do you
6 think that the grammatical rules or norms conformity could be the obstacles which decrease
7 the students' confidence in using English language?
8 T10: *Yes: I think so. If our students have to be blocked or stuck with this kind of grammatical*
9 *rules all the time, it would affect their confidence in expressing the language and their fluency.*
10 *Like I told you before, In the real life, there is not just British or American English (2) or*
11 *maybe Australian English. In the real life or authentic situations, if we can understand each*
12 *other, () it's OK.*

Extract 10

- 1 R: *Personally, do you have the role model of English language?*
2 T19: *If you mean British or American English, I don't have. This is because when I produce*
3 *the English language, it doesn't like both of them. (2) It's my English. It just like what I said.*
4 *Actually, I want my English like NESs, but when I speak it out, I have to force myself to be*
5 *that kind of English. So, it would be easy to use it with my style because I think that it could*
6 *be used to communicate with others and understandable.*
7 R: *Do you think that we can have Thai English style?*
8 T19: **Absolutely**, if you mean Thai accent. This is because *I always told my students that it's*
9 *not necessary to conform the (.)NESs. Just have confidence to speak it out (2) don't care*
10 *what accent you have as long as you can communicate with others. I like to encourage my*
11 *students in this way to make them relax when they use English. Not necessary to use correct*
12 *grammar, if I understand it, this is OK.*

It can be shortly summarized the findings from this section that the participants in this study hold both structural and functional beliefs of language. However, the structural beliefs of the language which relies on code or a system of structurally related elements for the meaning transmission (Miramontes et al, 2012), seems to be preferred by the participants rather than the functional beliefs which relies on the communicative purposes. These beliefs were generated from their own traditional education experiences which mainly focused on standard English and their social status as the English teachers which are expected to be the role model of English users for their students. This is relevant to what Turner et al. (2011) mentioned that teachers' sense of responsibility beliefs could affect their practices.

5.4.1.2 Ownership of English: NES ownership vs global ownership

In this theme, the researcher intended to investigate teacher participants' beliefs about the ownership of English language. The main purpose is to seek who the participants think that they have the role of gatekeeping the creativity in using English language. It was found from the interviews that most of the participants believe that English language was just originated in England, but it did not belong to any specific country. This means they believed that English language can be used differently from NES norms as long as they

can communicate successfully. This reflects what Widdowson (1994) claimed that the ownership of English has shifted from the NESs to the English users where they have the right to use English in their own way to meet their needs and specific purposes. This kind of belief can be viewed from the extract below.

Extract 11

- 1 R: Personally, who is the owner of English language?
- 2 T16: **No one!** But if you mean where did English language originate (.) I can say England.

Extract 12

- 1 R: In your opinion, who is who is the owner of English language?
- 2 T13: Personally, (2) it can be viewed in two perspectives. The first one, *we have to accept*
- 3 *that English language was originated in England. However, at the present day with my*
- 4 *opinion, I view English language as a tool. When it becomes a tool, everybody is the owner*
- 5 *of it.*

One of the participants mentioned the interesting point that he accepted that English language was originated in England; however, at the present day it can be said that no one is the owner of English language and it could be changed or adjusted by NNEs. He also compared the English language in the past with the present to show that language is dynamic. This is shown in extract 13.

Extract 13

- 1 R: Who do you think is the English language owner?
- 2 T5: *It can't be denied that the owner of English language is NESs if we focus on the origin.*
- 3 *On the other hand, it won't be wrong if I say that English language doesn't belong to anyone.*
- 4 *This is because it <English language> becomes an international language already.*
- 5 R: According to the number of NNEs is more than NES at the present day, supposing that
- 6 Chinese people and Indian people <two billion people> use the the wrong grammar; for
- 7 example, 'He don't know' instead of 'He doesn't know', do you think that, one day, 'He don't
- 8 know' can be changed into 'He doesn't know'.
- 9 T5: **Absolutely.** *This is because one of the language characteristic is that it is dynamic. (.)*
- 10 We can't force any language to have the same grammatical rules all the time. If it is so,
- 11 people in the Shakespeare's age could resurrect and and tell the NESs that they use the
- 12 wrong language which is different from their age. This is because English language in the
- 13 current day is different from the past.

Some of the teacher participants illustrated that she believed English language belongs to NESs; however, she to some extent shown that NNESs can have English language in their own versions. She also believed that English language could be adapted by NNESs in the authentic situations for intelligibility; however, she still believed it could be relied on NES norms. Extract 14 is the data from her interview.

Extract 14

- 1 R: Is there any difference for you when using English to communicate with NESs and NNESs?
- 2 T19: I don't feel the difference because *I view English language as a medium in*
- 3 *communication. I don't care whether the interlocutors are NESs or NNESs (.) I mean just*
- 4 *understand each other, that's OK.*
- 5 R: Who do think is the owner of English language?
- 6 T19: Uhm (2) *If you mean which country (2) maybe England or America (.) I guess.*
- 7 R: Do you think we <NNESs> can be the owner of English language?
- 8 T19: *If we can be English language owner, I think we can own it in our version (.) I mean the*
- 9 *accent. Personally, we have to rely on the standard norms first; then, we can adapt the*
- 10 *language depending on the authentic situations. Sometimes right, sometimes wrong (2) I*
- 11 *mean as long as we can communicate, that's fine.*

A few of the participant in this study also presented their beliefs about the ownership of English language that they believed English language belongs to everybody who use the language. Interestingly, in extract 17, the participant mentioned that if NESs want to be included in the situations where NNESs use different English with them, they have to accept those differences.

Extract 15

- 1 R: Finally, who do you think is the English language owner?
- 2 T3: ***Whoever. Who uses English language can be the owner. As long as we can reach the***
- 3 ***purpose of communication, everyone can be the English language owner.***

Extract 16

- 1 R: What do you think (.) whether you are English user or learner?
- 2 T7: I think (.) English learner because we don't know everything. Sometimes, I just learn
- 3 from the situation that (2) Oh! They use this word or this expression in this situation.
- 4 R: Who are they?
- 5 T7: *The interlocutors (.) whoever.*

Extract 17

1 T2: [...] We have to understand that language has creativity because it's impossible that any
2 language can stay still. It can be seen that English language in the past is also different from
3 the present day (.) I mean language has its dynamic (.) not stay still. *More importantly, English*
4 *language is an international language which is used by international people.* Therefore, it's
5 impossible that when it <English language> is used in different areas, it can have the same
6 form of what NESs use. *Although, the English language which is used in UK in which the*
7 *language is used in the group of people from the different L1, my NESs friends have to accept*
8 *the difference if they want to stay in that situation (.) I mean in terms of language learning. If*
9 *they have much experiences in staying aboard, they can accept this point (.) I believe.*

In conclusion, most of the teacher participants believe that English language belongs to NESs, but it can be differentiated by both NESs and NNESs for successful communications depending on the situations. This shows that Thai English language teachers hold the interactional beliefs of language which proposed by Richards and Rogers (2001) that it applies the notion of socially-oriented. On the other hand, it can be said that language is seen as a set of meaning making resources when people involve in the communication (Morton, 2012) rather than following NESs norms. These findings are similar to what the researcher has found in the next theme about the conformity to NES and the creativity of NNES.

5.4.1.3 NES conformity vs NNES creativity

This theme was created to investigate teacher participants' beliefs whether they thought English should be used the same way as NESs use or NNESs have their own right to adjust the language in their own way. Most of the participants revealed that it is not necessary to conform NESs norms all the time because conformity sometimes could not be understood by everyone. It depends on the interlocutors and the contexts that English is used. For example, T2 shown her experience that standard English would cause unintelligibility in the Thai context, and she explained that sometimes non-conformity should be used to accommodate the interlocutor to reach the intelligibility. This is presented in extract 18.

Extract 18

1 T2: It was from my experience when I studied PhD. in UK. At that time, I had many friends
2 who were from different countries. I always keep telling my students that we should actually
3 know how to use standard English, but *I also tell them that when we use English in the real-*
4 *life communication with different people, it <English> is different.* (2) For example, *I have a*
5 *Thai friend who was born and live in USA, so his English is like NES.* (2) *One day, we went to*
6 *ice cream shop and everyone ordered their own flavor. Everyone got their own flavor except*
7 *this man. Therefore, I asked him which flavor he ordered.* (2) *He said CHOCOLATE <NES*
8 *pronunciation> @@ I told him that this couldn't be understood by Thai people in the Thai*
9 *context which chocolate should be pronounced 'Choc go lat' @ I mean.* (2) *finally we have to*
10 *accommodate our interlocutors.*

This belief is similar to what T13 and T5 showed in their interviews in which their focus is on intelligibility rather than NES conformity. Extract 19 and 20 illustrate their opinions on this issue.

Extract 19

1 R: In your opinion, if someone use the sentence 'He don't...' is it right or wrong?
2 T13: (2) For me now, I think it is a variety of English (2) *I mean you can use it <English> in*
3 *anyway as long as your communicative purpose successes. **That's enough.***
4 R: What do you think about broken English?
5 T13: It depends on what point we focus on (2) *If we focus on **traditional way of teaching***
6 ***grammar**, it <he don't...> is broken **for sure.** However, if we focus on communicative*
7 *purpose, **FOR ME** (2) broken means **incomprehensible sentence.** Although you use 100%*
8 *perfectly grammar, if I cannot understand it (2) this is called 'BROKEN'*

Extract 20

1 R: For example, if someone said 'He don't know', do you think it's wrong?
2 T5: *Uhm* (2) *I think it depends on the acceptability. If it <he don't know> can be accepted by*
3 *people in that context, for example, color American people use 'he don't know' in their casual*
4 *context, as long as the communicative purpose is reached, I think it's OK.*

One of the participant (T4 in extract 21) showed the interesting perspective that non-conformity of NES is not necessary, but in a Thai context, English language has been motivated by NES materials. Therefore, different English from NSE sounds strange for people who are familiar with NSE, but it is acceptable.

Extract 21

1 [...] Actually, I'm an optimistic one, but the difficulty to understand English depends on
2 different accents and expressions. Absolutely, English language is own by everyone because
3 of the concept of world Englishes. However, *we have basically studied English by using most*
4 *of NES materials, so British and American English always affect the way we use English* (.)
5 *Then, we feel that we are framed by NES norms* (2) *Therefore, it seems like NESs have a*
6 *privilege to define what English is* (2) *especially, people from inner circle. If people outside*
7 *from that circle <inner circle> like Singapore or Malaysia say something which is different*
8 *from NESs, for example 'How are you la' (2) it sounds different to me. Actually, it's not*
9 *strange for them <NNES>, but we have studied the traditional language <the materials>*
10 *which is written by NES, and most of our lecturers <Thai lecturers> graduated from UK*
11 *and USA, this means that what are different from NES norms, it sounds strange to me.* (2)
12 ***It's not wrong. Just feel a little bit strange.***

However, there are some evidences from the interviews that the participants' beliefs are affected by their social status as they work as an English language teacher, so they perceived English language still be relied on NES norms. Extract 22 and 23 describe this point.

Extract 22

1 R: If someone says (2) I mean whether Chinese, Taiwanese, or even though, Thai people (.)
2 *'he don't know', do you think it's wrong or not?*
3 T2: @@@ ***You ask this question to English language lecturer. I mean*** (2) (2) *honestly* (2)
4 *it's hard to accept. However,* (2) (2) *I don't think it <he don't know> is wrong. If they*
5 *<NNESs> consistently use 'don't', and it can be understood, I'm OK for it. I mean* (2) *the*
6 *focus should be relied on the consistency.* (2) *Focus on the intelligibility in the current day*
7 *rather than norms.*

Extract 23

1 R: Just want to know that whether one day we can see the errors as a creativity, as long as it
2 <English language> can be understood by the interlocutor?
3 T10: *<It cannot be accepted> As long as this idea <world Englishes> can be accepted* (.) *by*
4 *everyone. Exactly, the number of NNESs are more than than the NESs in the present day* (2)
5 *I think it <he don't know> is intelligible, but in the academic context* (.) *it's not acceptable*
6 *(2) specifically, when we work as an English lecturer.*

This theme can be concluded that the majority of the participants showed their beliefs that it is not essential to conform to NES norms all the time; furthermore, they tended to accept the non-conformity to NES norms as a creativity or variety of Englishes when it is used to reach the goal of communication. This is similar to the earlier theme which reflects the

participants' beliefs related to ELF notion that the non-conformity to NES norms is accepted by them for the communicative purposes. However, a few of them revealed their concern on the non-conformity to NES norms when they consider themselves as an English lecturer.

5.4.1.4 English vs Englishes

This theme clarified participants' beliefs about a monolithic variety of English and/or pluralistic forms of English. Almost 100% of the teacher participants had positive attitudes towards the notion of pluralistic Englishes; only one teacher participant had strong negative attitude toward this notion. However, the participants who had positive attitudes towards the notion of Englishes were divided into three groups including 1) they accepted the notion of Englishes but still relied their preferences on standard English particularly in the English classroom, 2) they preferred to include the notion of Englishes in their class, but there were an external factors which limited their practices, and 3) they were willing to include the notion of Englishes in their class whenever they had an opportunity.

Some examples describing the acceptance on the notion of Englishes but the preference still relied on standard English were illustrated in extract 24-27. This reflects what Baker and Jarunthawatchai (2017) claimed that standard English is still deeply embedded in Thai educational context.

Extract 24

1 T1: [...] In summary, *I think we should still rely on standard English (.) particularly in the*
2 *classroom. Nevertheless, students should be aware the differences on world Englishes as*
3 *well; so that, they <students> could better use English in their real-life communication. If*
4 *they can't understand their interlocutors, they can still refer to standard English.*

Extract 25

1 R: What do you think if our department employs NNEs to teach our students?
2 T11: As I mentioned before (2) *in the real-life communication, there isn't just only British or*
3 *American English. Students might have opportunities to communicate with several people;*
4 *they might contact with people who use Chinese English, Indian English, or Singaporean*
5 *English. We can tell them <student> to learn this by themselves. However, in the classroom*
6 *context, we should rely on standard English.*

In extract 26 and 27, T3 and T4 shown their positive attitudes and their acceptance of the notion of Englishes, and they tried to introduce this notion to their students. Nevertheless, standard English still be chosen to use in their class.

Extract 26

1 R: Do you think that English which is taught in your class reflects English which is used in
2 reality?
3 T3: Actually, *I've tried to provide my students **standard English**. But, I always tell them <his*
4 *students> that although we study English which is standard English, if we can't understand*
5 *Indian people (1) or Burmese people using English, it's useless. Personally, I think it's not*
6 *necessary for our department to employ just only NES teachers. To some extent, if we employ*
7 *Indian or Philippine teachers who use English as a second language, it would be useful for*
8 *our students. Students can exposure to variety of Englishes like the real-life communication.*
9 *I don't want them to think that there is only British or American English in the world. As long*
10 *as we can successfully communicate, it's OK.*

Extract 27

1 R: Do you think that English which is taught in your class reflects English which is used in
2 reality?
3 T4: *It's one of our limitation that we can't teach our students about variety of English accents*
4 *(1) I mean all of them <different accents>. We <Thai English language teachers> have to tell*
5 *our students that we have one standard that we can refer to which is (2) **unfortunately** from*
6 *inner circle people. However, when some of my friend introduce the notion of world*
7 *Englishes to me, this makes me to be aware of this notion, so I try to choose my teaching*
8 *materials that reflect variety of accents to promote to my students that, in the real life, there*
9 *are so many kinds of English accent. But we <Thai English language teachers> can't teach*
10 *them <students> all. So, **That's why we still rely on standard English.***

The second group of teacher participants shown their acceptance and willingness to include the notion of Englishes in their class. However, there were some limitation from the external factors which limited their practices. These factors include; for instance, time constraint, teaching materials, students and stakeholders' perceptions, and etc (These factors are further discussed on 5.4.3.1). These are described in extract 28-31.

Extract 28

1 R: What do you think *if our department employs NNEs to teach our students?*
2 T7: *For Business English major (1) I think it's OK. Because it would reflect variety of*
3 *Englishes, and we can also learn their different culture from them <NNE teachers> But for*
4 *English major (1) they want to have NES teachers.*

5 R: Who are *they*?

6 T7: **The students**. They want to study with the owner of the language.

Extract 29

1 R: What do you think if our department employs NNEs to teach our students?

2 T10: For me () I'm OK. *I don't mind the different accents. I think it would be challenging*
3 *for our students because in the real-life communication, there is just not only British or*
4 *American English. It is because we <Thai people> are taught since we were young that*
5 *English means () **standard English**, and all materials we use are based on British and*
6 *American or () Australian English. As a consequence, there are just only three standards for*
7 *us. If one day we have Chinese () Singaporean English teachers, It's OK for me. Maybe*
8 *because I have the concept of world Englishes or new varieties, so I don't mind this point.*

Extract 30

1 R: What do you think if our department employs NNEs to teach our students?

2 T20: *In terms of practicing students with different accents () I think it's fine. No problem.*
3 *However, the problem is about our **students' perceptions**. (2) I mean they have an expectation*
4 *to study with the owner of the language which means () British, American, or Australian.*

Extract 31

1 R: If we talk about world Englishes, what do you think if our department employs NNEs to
2 teach our students?

3 T14: *I think it's a **good idea** because it would reflect the reality of English language in the*
4 *present day to our students that there are varieties of English. However, it's still believed*
5 *among Thai people that in which institution that English is taught by NESs is more credible*
6 *in which it's taught by () Singaporean or Filipino. Different accents from NNEs are good*
7 *for students, but we have to explain the reasons why we provide them <students> NNEs*
8 *teachers (2) as well as their parents. They would think that they send their children to study*
9 *in English major, but the department provides NNEs teacher for them. On the other hand, if*
10 *we provide them NES teachers, they <NES teachers> will be more credible.*

The last group of the participants shown their strong acceptance and willingness to include the notion of Englishes in their class. They emphasized that it is essential for their students to expose with variety of Englishes because they realized that there are pluralistic forms of English in the real-life communication. Therefore, different Englishes were promoted through different kind of authentic materials. Some of the interview data regarding this issue are illustrated in extract 32 and 33.

Extract 32

- 1 R:[...]Do you think British and American English could reflect the English language at the
2 present day and do you think it's enough for the students?
3 T12: @@@ **They** <the students> **request** <British and American English> **by themselves**.
4 When I provide NNES teachers for them, () they feel like disagree with this idea. *I think*
5 *maybe because they <the students> have less experience in the real-life communication that*
6 *there isn't just only British or American English.*
7 R: So, what did you do?
8 T12: *We could provide them some courses like 'Global Cultural Communication' or what*
9 *else that could promote the concept of world Englishes.*
10 R: What do you think if our department employs NNESs to teach our students?
11 T12: *I totally agree with this idea. It would be a good opportunity for our students to expose*
12 *with different kind of English from NNESs.*

Extract 33

- 1 R: As you mentioned that English language in real-life communication is different from the
2 classroom, how can you prepare your students for the situation outside the class?
3 T13: We can support them like () *we can provide NNES teachers for them () or add some*
4 *exercises that promote variety of Englishes. Maybe we can use some authentic clips from*
5 *YouTube. Or maybe we can have a survey to find out **which English** that our students <the*
6 *alumni> find the most when they work in their workplace. Then, we can add this point to our*
7 *teaching materials. I mean () we should help them to have the awareness of variety of*
8 *Englishes to prepare them for the real-life situation when they graduate.*

From these three groups, the majority of the participants show their acceptance of the notion of Englishes. Nevertheless, both internal and external beliefs seem to limit their practices to apply different kind of English from standard English in their use of English. In this theme, they revealed their world Englishes awareness rather than ELF awareness.

Interestingly, T18 is the only participant who has a strong belief on standard English. Although from extract 7 she has revealed her knowledge about the concept of world Englishes, she can't tolerate with any English which is different from the NSE. She clearly mentioned that she disagreed to let the NNES teachers to teach English language. She has a strong belief that standard English could accommodate the interlocutors to reach the successful communication as she mentioned in Extract 34.11-14.

Extract 34

1 T18: [...]I don't know how to say (2) *cause personally I like NESs and they are the role*
2 *model for me <in using English>, so I want my students do the same as me. I won't teach any*
3 *kind of English <which is different from NSE> like Chinese, Vietnamese, or Singaporean*
4 *accent to them()I don't know() maybe it is because of my attitude.*
5 R: What do you think if our department employs foreign teachers who are NNESs to teach
6 English for our students?
7 T18: DISAGREE. I totally **disagree** with this *cause our students are English major student,*
8 *they should learn standard English. [...]* I think if we better employ NESs rather than NNESs
9 to teach conversation to our students. The difference between English which is used by NESs
10 and NNESs is not just only an accent. There are some vocabulary or expression
11 which are also different as well. *Our students should be better learnt from NESs cause I*
12 *think if we produce students who use standard English, they can communicate with any*
13 *people from any countries (2) although they are Chinese, Singaporean, Vietnamese, cause*
14 *we have what it is called 'Standard' so we can accommodate them.*

5.4.1.5 Fixity vs Fluidity

This theme was set to clarify the participants' beliefs about the use of English whether it should be fixed to NSE or it can be adapted by the users concerning on successful communication. This is because it is argued that ELF is conceptualized as the fluidity of English. It was found from the interviews that the participants' beliefs regarding this issue were divided into three groups including 1) English should be fixed with NSE, 2) English can be adapted in any way for successful communication, and 3) English can be adapted in any situation except in the academic context.

In Extract 35 and 36, T18 and T20 revealed their strong beliefs that English should be fixed with NSE. Particularly, they mentioned that English has its own norms and structure, so if it is used differently from this norms, it could affect the intelligibility. This can be described that these participants view English language as a decontextualize structural system which focus on grammatical and lexical features rather than its contextual use.

Extract 35

1 R: Is it impossible if the number of NNESs () like *Chinese and Indian people can change the*
2 *sentence 'He doesn't like pop music' into 'He don't like pop music'?*
3 T18: (2) *'He don't like pop music' sounds strange to me. I think it's impossible. Although*

4 *there are billions of Chinese or Indian people, NESs also still have their own norms. It could*
5 *be possible if NESs became extinct.*

Extract 36

1 R: As you mentioned that 'accuracy' put more pressure on students in using English, *what do*
2 *you think if we put the focus more on intelligibility rather than accuracy?*
3 T20: *Not really agreed. Because I still feel that 'accuracy' still be essential in terms of*
4 *language delivery. Especially in using correct grammar (.) I mean sometimes we just change*
5 *verb structure, the meaning is different. So, 'accuracy' is still important.*

In extract 37, T7 also shown her belief on the fixity of NSE; more interestingly, she emphasized that this belief was influenced by her social status as she works as an English lecturer.

Extract 37

1 R: What do you think about *broken English*?
2 T7: *I'm not quite OK with broken English. Particularly, as an **English lecturer**, when I found*
3 *my students use English fluently but inaccurately, I felt annoying. It's fluent, but it's wrong.*
4 R: *Wrong from [what?*
5 T7: *[standard grammar*

In contrast to the fixity on NSE, teacher participants held the beliefs of the fluidity of English use. These participants center their focus on communicative purposes rather than forms. Therefore, they mentioned that as long as the successful communication can be reached, it is not essential to rely the language on NSE. These evidences reveal that these participants believed that the legitimacy of English has shifted from NESs to the English users. This is shown in extract 38-40.

Extract 38

1 R: In your opinion, *the expression 'He don't ...' is an error or variety?*
2 T13: *Now, for me, I view it <He don't...> as a variety (2) I mean (.) you can use <the*
3 *language> whatever you want as long as you can reach the communicative purpose. **That's***
4 *it.* Cause I think I have heard that even NESs still use 'He don't ...'

Extract 39

1 R: Is it impossible to use *English in Thai style*?
2 T19: *Absolutely. I always tell my students that it's not necessary to use English like NESs (.)*
3 *just speak it out even in Thai accent as long as we can communicate. I like to motivate my*

4 *students like this way because I want them to relax. Keep telling them that wrong grammar*
5 *is OK, I understand.*

Extract 40

1 T2: [...] Actually, according to language learning theory, we <Thai English teacher> have
2 used the wrong methods since the past. I mean (.) we teach grammar before communication
3 skills. *Particularly, English teaching in Thailand is an exam-corrected, so students can do*
4 *the exam, but they don't know how to use the language. In my class, I always tell my students*
5 *that (.) look over the grammatical rules cause I know how students have learnt the English*
6 *language <base on grammar-oriented>. They <students> think that English is difficult because*
7 *of its grammatical rules. They have to spend the time to think about the grammar before they*
8 *speak it out. They have less confidence to use it. So, when I have a chance, I always tell my*
9 *students to simply use English language in order to have them know that it's just actually the*
10 *communication. Don't focus too much on grammar. Just use anyway they can do to*
11 *communicate.*

The last group of the participants have also held the beliefs that English has a fluidity. Although they accepted that in the real-life communication, English can be adapted focusing on the intelligibility, this belief can not be accepted in the educational context. From the interview, it is seen that this belief is influenced from their past experience and their professional status as an English lecturer. The researcher will discuss this issue later in 5.4.3.1 about factors affecting ELF awareness. Extract 41 and 42 illustrate this information.

Extract 41

1 R: You just mentioned about *accuracy and fluency*. What do you think about this issue?
2 T10: *It should be divided into two perspectives. In the academic perspective, accuracy and*
3 *consistency are essential; particularly, for us who work as an English lecturer. In contrast,*
4 *fluency is also important for daily-life communication (2) maybe it's more important. It's*
5 *hard to separate them <accuracy and fluency> out.*

Extract 42

1 R: *Before and after you studying grammar rules, are there any differences on the way you*
2 *use English?*
3 T17: ***Much really different.*** *When I started leaning English in the university where the focus*
4 *is on the grammar, we had to fix with NSE. It's different from when I use the language with*
5 *the priest who I talked with when I was young. At that time <before learning the grammatical*
6 *rules>, I feel relax to express the language. It's just to speak out for communication. I don't*
7 *know that other people feel like me. When I know much about grammar, I feel concerned. I*

8 *have to be careful anytime to express the language, especially when I work as an English*
9 *lecturer. [...]*

In summary, even though the teacher participants showed their beliefs that English language use in the real-life communication is not essential to fix with NES norms, the beliefs of the fixity to NES norms was widely found among the participants due to their educational experiences and professional status.

5.4.1.6 Culture and language

The notion of ELF also focuses on the relationship between language and culture. Baker (2017) suggested that successful users of English need to be equipped to negotiate such cultural diversity. Furthermore, the content of ELT materials needs to reflect this diversity of cultures. Therefore, this theme mainly focuses on teacher participants' beliefs how they perceived the necessity of different cultures in English language teaching.

The majority of the participants believed that culture have an influential effect on English language learning and teaching. Most of them reported that it is essential to introduce diversity of cultures in English class because when the contents are not familiar to their students, it affects their understanding. Some examples are illustrated in extract 43 and 44.

Extract 43

1 R: As you mentioned that you teach 'Reading Techniques' course, *do you think culture has*
2 *an influential affect on reading?*
3 T4: **Yes yes yes. Absolutely yes.** *I used to use the material that contain American content*
4 *which is about the mountain or the national park that students haven't known it. Haven't*
5 *heard about the name of that place or the name of the city. They <students> seemed confused*
6 *and didn't get the message. So, I changed from American material into Thai material which*
7 *I got from Tourism Authority of Thailand. Then, I've discovered that if I use the place where*
8 *students are familiar with, they can get more messages from the content.*
9 R: Now, we have ASEAN community (◦) do you think that (◦) *is it essential for us to study*
10 *different cultures from our neighboring countries?*
11 T4: **Absolutely.** *We should start from our context first. I've seen the project which Brunei*
12 *cooperate with Malaysia (◦) they will produce the materials in English version but contain*
13 *all their contents. I think this is the good start.*

Extract 44

1 T6: [...] When I was a student, *I used to study European literature like Shakespeare. I have*
2 *to accept that I quite didn't understand it because the content was far away from my*
3 *knowledge. However, when I had a chance to work in the 'International story telling project',*
4 *some of Thai literatures were illustrated by using English. I felt that it's easier to understand.*
5 *So, I think culture has an influential effect on intelligibility. If our students understand the*
6 *different cultures, it's easier for them to understand the language.*

T11 shown an interesting example about culture and language in her interview. This participant has a boyfriend who is a NES. She revealed that she and her boyfriend learnt the language through culture comparing. When she communicates with her boyfriend, she often tells her boyfriend how Thai people use the language in a Thai context. Extract 45 presents this information.

Extract 45

1 R: I've seen that this morning you made a joke on the idiom 'just a piece of cake'. *You used*
2 *just banana banana* <banana represents something that is easy in a Thai context> *instead*
3 *of 'just a piece of cake'. Have you ever used this in the reality?*
4 T11: @@ I use it with my boyfriend because he understands it <she used to tell her boyfriend>
5 or with my friends in an informal context.
6 R: Is there any English idiom that your boyfriend uses and you don't understand it?
7 T11: (.) Yes, there is. In the past, when I didn't understand the idiom, I just let it pass and
8 laughed. But when it often happens, I have to ask him what it means.
9 R: *Have you ever compare it with Thai language?*
10 T11: *I often did it. I told him that Thai people use the language like this. Sometimes, he*
11 *asked me that (.) didn't Thai people use the language like him? For example, this idiom (.)*
12 *'just a piece of cake'. **Banana** is something that is more related to a Thai context than **cake**.*
13 *Then, my boyfriend frequently uses banana instead of cake with me.*

It can be seen in this theme that the teacher participants accepted that culture and language are interwoven which is related to the concept of ELF. As Baker (2017) described that the negotiation of different cultures among the interlocutors could lead to the competent communication, these participants show their implicit ELF awareness regarding intercultural communication aspect in this theme.

5.4.1.7 Classroom vs Authentic

This emerged theme was set to investigate how teacher participants perceive English language which is used in different situations between inside and outside classroom. This is because it was noticeable during the interviews that the majority of the participants seemed to have different perceptions when they mentioned about English language used inside the class and in real-life communication. Most of them clarified that English has been taught by using traditional teaching methods, particularly using grammar translation, in a Thai educational context. The target language is the mainstream language including British and American English. More importantly, the main purpose of learning and teaching English in a Thai context is framed by the exam. Therefore, most participants claimed that English language in the class still rely on NSE. On the other hand, in the real-life communication perspective, the participants perceived English language differently from the classroom. They indicated that the main focus of using English in this situation is on communicative purposes rather than conforming to NSE. Particularly in the Thai educational context, many participants agreed that NNES teachers can provide different kinds of English which reflect the English used in the reality for students. Extract 46, 47, and 48 illustrate their beliefs regarding this issue.

Extract 46

1 T7: [...] Actually, before I went to Australia as an exchange student () at that time *when I*
2 *was in high school*, I studied <English> quite well (2) but *the way of the study relied on*
3 *grammatical rules or vocabulary memorizing rather than using the language. When I had to*
4 *use English in the real situation <in Australia>, I had many difficulties in using it () didn't*
5 *remember tenses. I was concerned whether I used it right or wrong. However, when I came*
6 *back from Australia*, I felt more confident. *I didn't worry too much whether it's right or wrong*
7 *() I didn't focus to much on the grammar. Because in real-life communication, it's just ()*
8 *communication. Just understand each other. That's enough.*

Extract 47

1 T3: [...] I think it's not necessary to study English just from the native teachers. If we have
2 non-native teacher like () Indian or Filipino teachers who use English as a second language,
3 it might more useful for our students that they can expose different kinds of English which
4 they will expose in the reality. *I don't want them <students> to believe that there are just*
5 *British and American English in the world. As long as we can communicate, that's OK. [...]*

6 *Additionally, the way we learn English <in Thailand> is to learn the grammar. Learn to*
7 *know which point is correct or incorrect. This let to the limitation for Thai people in speaking*
8 *English. It seems like we study English to do the exam. It makes us less confident in speaking*
9 *English.*

Extract 48

1 *R: Do you think that English which is taught in your class reflect the reality?*
2 *T5: English which we <Thai English language teachers> teach in the class is standard*
3 *English. If our students have to expose or work with NNEs (2) I think (.) it depends on*
4 *individual's experience accumulation. From my experience, I use Kachru's theory which*
5 *mentioned about inner, outer, and expanding circle. I mean the people who we have to contact*
6 *with mostly are NNEs rather than NESs. So, I often tell my students that if they want to*
7 *develop their English, they have to be able to understand both NESs and NNEs.*

Although most of the teacher participants agreed that English which is taught in their class is different from the reality, as an English teacher, particularly in academic context, they have to conform to NSE. This is viewed in Extract 49.

Extract 49

1 *R: Is it impossible if one day students use the sentence 'He don't like pop music' instead of*
2 *'He doesn't like pop music'?*
3 *T10: <This participant smiles and sigh deeply> From my perspective in the context that we*
4 *are **English teacher**, if my students write that sentence <He don't like pop music>, deduct*
5 *their points]*
6 *[Although that course doesn't focus on grammar (.) I mean (.) for example, English*
7 *for tourism?*
8 *If it's about writing, I think 'accuracy' is still important, especially, in the academic context,*
9 *we have to more focus on the structure <grammatical rules>. Whatever, (2) we are still in*
10 ***academic discipline**: English language has its own grammatical rules, so I have to deduct*
11 *their <students> points. This is from an English teacher's perspective (.) but if it <He don't*
12 *like pop music> happens in the real-life communication, I can accept it.*

From extract 46-49, the participants show their acceptance of ELF and their ELF awareness through the different contexts. Mainly, they clarified that different kinds of English instead of standard English can be used to reach the goal of communication in their real-life communication outside the classroom. Nevertheless, two main factors that limit their practices from their beliefs including the exam-oriented and their professional status. Therefore, these leads to the questions what were raised by Wang (2015) that 'what kinds

of English represent the nature of English today? and what kind of English should be learnt and taught today?'. The majority of the the participants seemed to have the confliction on their beliefs and practices of English used in the classroom and authentic used. This maybe because these participants have limited ELF awareness which leads to the limitation of the integration of ELF in their classroom (See Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2015).

5.4.2 Teachers' ELF in relation to multilingual awareness (RQ 2)

This theme was set to investigate to some extent teacher participants have an ELF in relation to multilingual awareness. Applying Cogo & House (2017) and Ranta's (2017) notion of ELF characteristics, ELF can be characterized by using the pragmatics of ELF and grammar in ELF. Therefore, this main theme is divided into two sub-themes including 1) the pragmatics of ELF and 2) Grammar in ELF to clarify the participants' awareness regarding ELF.

5.4.2.1 The pragmatics of ELF

As mentioned by Dewey (2015) that ELF is the use of pragmatic strategies among the language users to reach their successful communication; therefore, this theme focuses on how teachers' participants manage their pragmatic strategies use when they interact with their interlocutors. This is to reveal their ELF awareness regarding the use of pragmatic strategies of ELF. Four main aspects of pragmatic strategies use among interactants which have been theorized as major characteristics of ELF include: negotiation of meaning, use of interactional elements, idiomatic expressions, and multilingual resources (Jenkins, 2000; Cogo & House, 2017).

Negotiation meaning strategy focuses on the strategies use to construct meaning and/or solve non-understanding. These strategies are; for instance, repetition, accommodation, co-

construction, paraphrasing, simplifying, and so on. The participants shared their use of these strategies from their experiences through the interviews as follows.

Extract 50

- 1 R: Have you ever had some experience that you didn't understand what your interlocutor
- 2 wanted to communicate with you?
- 3 T6: Yes, sure.
- 4 R: How did you do?
- 5 T6: Uhm (.) *I asked him/her to repeat it again (2) slow it down and repeat it again.*

Extract 51

- 1 R: What did you do when you didn't understand your interlocutors?
- 2 T3: *Just asked them to repeat what they said again.*
- 3 R: If your students use the sentence like 'He don't like pop music', will you correct them?
- 4 T3: Not really. *Personally, I will repeat what students want to communicate by using the*
- 5 *correct sentence. This would help students to know which point they make it wrong.*
- 6 R: What about yourself? *Has anyone corrected your English?*
- 7 T3: Ahhh (2) *Not really. They sometimes expressed their confusion through their face (2) but*
- 8 *not much. At that time, I knew already that something's wrong with my language, so I*
- 9 *corrected myself. But I've never met the interlocutors who tell me directly that **Hey, you're***
- 10 ***wrong**. They just seemed like to correct me, but I think they asked and repeated to confirm*
- 11 *their understanding.*

In extract 50.6 and 51.2, T6 and T3 revealed that they used repetition strategy to negotiate meaning when they did not understand during the communication. Particularly, T3 showed his use of both self-repetition and other-repetition strategy in extract 51.4-11 to clarify the meaning. He mentioned that the main purpose of the use of repetition was not to correct the language but to confirm his understanding. The findings from extract 50 and 51 shows that the repetition strategies (both repetition and repaired-repetition), which are used in ELF communication to facilitate the comprehension among the interlocutors (Kaur, 2012), has been used by the participants to ensure the intelligibility among them.

Extract 52

- 1 R: Is there any situation that you think your students don't understand you English?
- 2 T9: **Absolutely**. I can guess from their faces. *Maybe because I speak too fast. So, I repeat it*
- 3 *again slowly.*
- 4 R: *What if they <students> still don't understand?*
- 5 T9: *Uhm (2) if it's about the difficult vocabulary, I try to simplify it. For example, the word*

6 like 'plagiarize' (?) I try to use the other word like 'Don't copy other people idea' something
7 like that

In extract 52, T9 illustrated her use of negotiation meaning strategy in her class with her students. She expressed that when her students did not understand her English, she tried to speak it again slowly. Furthermore, if repetition and speed adjustment strategy could not negotiate meaning, she used other strategy instead as it is shown in this extract that she used simplifying strategy or word replacement to gain her students' understanding. This was similar to what was found in Bjorkman's (2014) study that word replacement strategy is used to enhance the comprehension among the interlocutors rather than more focus on the linguistic forms. This is one of the evidences showing that the participants revealed their ELF awareness through their practices.

Error correction strategies which include both self-correction and other-correction were mentioned by the participants in the interviews. Similar to the repetition strategy, the majority of the participants illustrated that the main purpose of the use of this strategy is to confirm the understanding of the communication rather than to correct the language. This is similar to what Bjorkman (2014) clarified that self-initiated communicative strategies and other-initiated communicative strategies, which were reported as a characteristic of ELF communication (Cogo & Dewey, 2006; Mauranen, 2006; Bjorkman, 2011), were used among ELF users to enhance the comprehension of the utterance. This is shown in extract 53, 54 and 55.

Extract 53

1 R: From your experience, when you communicate with other people by using English, *has*
2 *anyone corrected your language?*
3 T15: (2) Uhhmm...so far, no one did that to me. *Mostly, I correct myself (2) like sometimes*
4 *when I had difficulties in thinking and using about vocabulary, my interlocutor tried to*
5 *understand that 'Oh you mean this'.*

Extract 54

1 R: When you communicate with your friends (2) whatever NESs or NNEs, did they correct
2 your English language?

3 T7: Yes. When I studied in Australia, for example, *when I said 'It is raining yesterday', at*
4 *that time, my native speaker friend asked me that 'Do you mean it was raining yesterday?'*
5 However, now, my native speaker colleagues have never corrected me. I'm not sure whether
6 they are afraid that I will feel shame from their correction.
7 R: *Do you think that the correction is to correct the language or to clarify the meaning?*
8 T: *I think that they tried to gain their understanding.*

Extract 55

1 R: Talking about error correction, *have you ever been corrected your English?*
2 T10: *Yes, I have. For example, when I talk with my friends <not Thai people>, they asked*
3 *me that 'Do you mean this?' cause they wanted to make sure that they understood me. I can*
4 *learn the language from this process as well. However, they didn't correct me directly that*
5 *'Hey! You are wrong!'*
6 R: What did you think from the correction?
7 T10: (2) Uhm, it's not easy to say. *From my point of view, I think they tried to understand*
8 *what I wanted to communicate. (.) However, personally I want them to correct my language.*

'Let it pass' is one of the pragmatic strategies which is frequently used among ELF users. This strategy was described as the situation where the interlocutors let the unclear words, pronunciation, or utterances to avoid the potentially problematic situations (Firth, 1996; Bjorkman, 2011; Matsumoto, 2011). This strategy was mentioned by the participants from the interviews that they chose to use this strategy when they did not understand their interlocutors. T8 explained in extract 56.4-8 that after he tried to clarify meaning with his interlocutor but he still did not understand, he used 'let it pass' strategy and changed the content of communication.

Extract 56

1 T8: [...] When I studied in the university, I really liked to talk to NESs. I think my English
2 has been developed from that point.
3 R: *Have you had any experience that you don't understand them?*
4 T6: *Yes yes yes. It's normal. Sometimes, I asked them <the interlocutors> for many times,*
5 *but I still didn't understand them.*
6 R: So, what did you do?
7 T6: *If it happens like this (.) I just let it pass. Pretend that everything's Ok, then change the*
8 *topic.*

However, 'let it pass' strategy was mentioned not only in the situation that the participants did not understand their interlocutors. It is used when they focus on the contents rather than forms. T20 described this situation in extract 57.

Extract 57

- 1 R: Is it different when you use English with your NNES friends and NES friends?
- 2 T20: (1) Uhm...It might be about language structure. For example, English which is used by
- 3 Chinese people is quite similar to Thai people. Like (1) they get eliminate some word from
- 4 the sentence. *Once, I had a group work with my Chinese friend. She shared her idea and*
- 5 *asked me 'Do you know by me?' It's not the correct grammar, but I understood. For NESs (1)*
- 6 *they have fluency. Sometimes, they use incorrect grammar, but I couldn't find it.*
- 7 R: *When you know that your friend <Chinese friend> used incorrect grammar, did you*
- 8 *correct her?*
- 9 T20: *No, just let it pass.*

Interestingly in extract 58, T13 revealed his experiences of the use of pragmatic strategies in his communication. He clarified that several pragmatic strategies were used during the communication, and the main purpose was to reach the intelligibility of the communication. These strategies, for instance, include accommodation, simplifying, let it pass, and repetition.

Extract 58

- 1 R: Is there any situation that you didn't understand your interlocutors <when using English>?
- 2 T13: For me? (2) Uhm (1) No, never. I mean (1) because *we tried to understand each other. It*
- 3 *was the communicative process (1) like (1) sometimes I wrote (1) sometimes I used body*
- 4 *language. Or, I tried to use (1) I mean (1) short words instead of long sentences.*
- 5 R: Do you have any friends <NNES friends> who have English proficiency lower than you?
- 6 T13: Yes yes.
- 7 R: When you communicate with them, do you have to adjust your English?
- 8 T13: Yes, absolutely. *I try to adjust my speed (1) speak slowly. Additionally, I repeat what*
- 9 *they said <to confirm his understanding>. It might because of different pronunciation. For*
- 10 *example, sometimes I didn't understand my Japanese friend, so I tried to focus on the context*
- 11 *and repeat what he/she said (1) to confirm that this was what he/she wanted to say. Sometimes*
- 12 *when I talked to my friends and I didn't understand (2), I chose to be silent and let it pass.*

Code-switching, which is the process that speakers can switch their language from L2 to L1, was also used by the teacher participants in this study for different purposes. Four main functions as a linguistic tool of code-switching among ELF users are: specifying an

addressee, introducing another idea, signaling culture, appealing for assistance (Klimpfinger, 2009; Jenkins, 2012). In this study, the majority of the participants claimed that they used code-switching in their class when they wanted to ensure their students' understanding. Another purposes include; for instance, getting familiarity with students, using as a wake-language, and using when they did not explain the content clearly by using L2.

Extract 59

- 1 R: What language do you usually use in your class?
- 2 T9: I take turn using both Thai and English. Mostly, *I try to use English, but in the part that*
- 3 *I want to ensure their <students> correct understanding, I switch it into Thai (.)* For example,
- 4 *in my writing class, I have to use code-switching (.) switch it into mother tongue language.*

Extract 60

- 1 R: What language do you usually use in your class?
- 2 T12: I use English with English major students, but if they are not, I use Thai.
- 3 R: *Have you ever switch from English to Thai with English major students?*
- 4 T12: *Yes, sure. When I looked to their faces and I knew that they didn't understand (.), when*
- 5 *to explained the difficult content, I switched into Thai to make sure that they understand it.*
- 6 *When they understood, I switched back into English.*

Extract 59 and 60 are the examples to show that the participants used code-switching to ensure their students' understanding. Another purpose of using code-switching is to getting familiarity with students. They used L1 to share their experience in their daily life because they thought their students would feel more relaxed when communicate with them. This is illustrated in extract 61 and 62.

Extract 61

- 1 R: What language do you usually use in your class?
- 2 T6: *If in the general English course, I use Thai (.) with easy English. But for English major*
- 3 *students, I use English.*
- 4 R: *Any Thai language in the class?*
- 5 T6: *Sometimes, I mostly use Thai to get familiarity with students (.) for example, asking about*
- 6 *general questions in their daily life, telling them about my experience (2) I think it makes*
- 7 *them feel more relaxed to talk to me.*

Extract 62

- 1 R: What language do you usually use in your class?
- 2 T18: English.
- 3 R: *Any Thai language in the class?*
- 4 T18: *Uhm (.) yes, when I want to talk to them. For example, yesterday I went to Zumba class.*
- 5 *If you're free next week, let's go with me. Another situation is to explain the content to*
- 6 *students individually, not in the class. Some difficult content (.) I mean **really really difficult***
- 7 *that I can't express it by using English to reach the point that I want, I speak Thai.*

In extract 62, T18 revealed that she usually used English language in her class; nevertheless, she sometimes switched into Thai when she wanted to talk with her students about the issue which was not related to the content in the class. Additionally, she mentioned that she also used Thai language to explain the content which was too difficult to express in English. This is similar to T10 in extract 63. She used code-switching when she wanted to explain difficult content and technical terms. Additionally, she reported that she used code-switching as a wake-language to activate her students in the class.

Extract 63

- 1 R: What language do you usually use in your class?
- 2 T10: I use English.
- 3 R: *Any code-switching?*
- 4 T10: *Yes, I use it as a wake language, for example 'ใช่มั๊ยคะ?' <Is that right?>, 'เหนาะ?' <OK?> or I use Thai language to explain difficult content or technical terms.*

Apart from code-switching, the use of multilingual resources and code-mixing, which are mostly used among ELF users, were mentioned by teacher participants. In extract 64 and 65, T20 and T19 illustrated the same point that they sometimes mixed Thai language with English when communicated with their students or other interlocutors. In extract 64, T20 mixed Thai word in English sentence; 'I was เหน' (64.7) instead of the using the 'I was abandoned'. The main purpose was to promote the sense of solidarity among her and her students as mentioned by Jenkins (2012).

Extract 64

- 1 R: What language do you usually use in your class?
2 T20: If they English major students, I use English.
3 R: *Any code-switching into Thai?*
4 T20: (1) *Sometimes* (2) *Mostly, I switch into Thai language when I want to use Thai slang word*
5 *to create positive atmosphere in the class. For example, the word ‘๒’ (2) like...last week, it*
6 *was the first week of the semester, so just few of students came to class. A week later, I talked*
7 *to my students that ‘I was ๒’ <I was abandoned>.*
8 R: *You mean you mix Thai with English?*
9 T20: *Right.*
10 R: Do you think that NESs can understand this expression <I was ๒>?
11 T20: I don't think so because they don't know the meaning of this word <๒>.
12 R: Do you think they can understand if you explain to them?
13 T20: *Maybe.*
14 R: Do you think one day this expression ‘I was ๒’ can be used widely in the international
15 context?
16 T20: *Actually, the word ‘๒’ is widely used among Thai people. But in the international*
17 *level (1) I think it's too far. I used to see (2) in this case (3) NES who has stayed in Thailand*
18 *for a long time and has a Thai wife, he told me about the way Thai people use the number*
19 *‘555’ instead of laughing <ha ha ha>. When he often saw it, he thought that this is an*
20 *international language that he has never understood. But actually, it's Thai style.*

In extract 65, T19 delineated her experience of the use of multilingual resources by herself and her interlocutor to promote the sense of solidarity between them. From line 9-13, she explained the way she used the signal ‘555’ instead of ‘ha ha ha’ because the signal ‘555’ is pronounced ‘ha ha ha’ in Thai. More interesting, when her interlocutor understood the meaning of ‘555’, s/he used the signal ‘555’ instead of ‘ha ha ha’. Even though the signal ‘555’ is not her or her interlocutor’s L1, they both used this signal to promote the sense of solidarity between them. Jenkins (2012) described that ELF users could switch their languages into the languages that are not the L1 of any present to signal a plurilingual identity and promote the sense of solidarity between them.

Extract 65

- 1 R: For example, the idiom ‘just a piece of cake’ If you’ve never heard it before, do you think
2 you can understand it?
3 T19: (2) No, I might think he/she is talking about a cake.
4 R: What if I switch from ‘a cake’ to ‘banana banana’ <banana represents something that is
5 easy in Thai idiom>?
6 T19: Uhm (1) Yes, I can understand it because it's a Thai style.

7 R: Do you think you can use English with Thai style to communicate with other people <except
8 Thai people>?
9 T19: Uhm (2) No no cause I think they don't understand. However, I believe that we can
10 learn and have an exchange from each other. For example, the number '555'. (.) When I
11 chatted with my NES friends, I typed '555' instead of 'ha ha ha'. At the beginning, they felt
12 a little bit confused. However, when I'd already explained the meaning of '555', which
13 means laughing in a Thai context, they sometimes typed '555' back to me. @@

5.4.2.2 Grammar in ELF

As Jenkins (2000) claimed that ELF is not a fixed code; therefore, there cannot be a fixed form of ELF grammar either (Ranta, 2017). Additionally, Mauranen (2012) described that ELF users mainly focus on contents rather than forms, so it is acceptable to rely on whatever seems to work in the interaction. Therefore, this theme mainly focuses on teacher participants' perceptions towards the use of English; whether they rely their use of English on contents or forms; whether they consider themselves as English users or English learners.

From the interviews, the majority of the participants reported that they mainly focused on contents rather than forms when they used English in their communication. They viewed English language as a mean of communication. As long as English users can deliver the meaning through the language, it is acceptable to rely on whatever seem to work in the interaction as Mauranen (2012) mentioned. This finding could be the evidence revealing that these participants held the beliefs of English language that reflect their ELF awareness. Extract 66 and 67 are the examples of the interviews.

Extract 66

1 R: Do you have any pressure when you communicate with NESs?
2 T5: No, because I always view that language learning is something that we have to try to do
3 the new things. It can be right or wrong. I always tell my students (.) don't expect to use the
4 correct English all the time (.) Just try to use it frequently because the main purpose is to
5 communicate. It's not a grammatical test when communicate in the real-life situation.
6 R: Have you ever correct the students?
7 T5: I've rarely done it because it decreases students' confidences and their self-esteem (2) I

8 *correct them just only the really important points. Personally, I focus more on pragmatics (1)*
9 *how to reach the goal of communication by unnecessarily using 100% correct grammatical*
10 *rules. [...]*

Extract 67

1 R: What do you think about broken English?
2 T20: Actually, I'm not a person who has an attitude against broken English. *Uhm (2) in the*
3 *communicative perspective, I think that if we can deliver our intention and the receiver can*
4 *understand it, that's enough for communication. In terms of accuracy, it can be developed*
5 *later.*

Although the majority of the participants revealed that they focused on the contents rather than forms, almost half of them reported that standard English was still necessary, particularly when they taught English major students. This is because they emphasized that English major students need to know how to use correct English. On the other hand, it was different when they taught general students who are not English major students; the teacher participant did not emphasize much about grammatical rules. This issue will be discussed later on 5.4.3.1. This can be viewed from extract 68 and 69.

Extract 68

1 R: What do you think about broken English?
2 T12: *If they are English major students, I correct it (1) because I think they should be*
3 *corrected. They should know which is wrong which is right. On the other hand, if they are*
4 *general students, I focus on the whole picture (2) for example, if I notice that most of them*
5 *use some incorrect grammar or vocabulary, I will summarize it at the end of the class.*

Extract 69

1 R: Some of former students told me that English which they've met in their workplaces is
2 different from what they've learnt in the class. What do you think about this?
3 T14: They need to adjust themselves. *I believe that when we use English in our Thai style,*
4 *Saudi Arabian or Indian people may have difficulty to understand us as well. (2) So, I think*
5 *standard English should be the core for English Language when we have difficulties in*
6 *communication. If the language would be changed, we couldn't control it. As long as we can*
7 *communicate, that's fine. However, standard English should still be taught to be the core for*
8 *students. Then we can add variety of Englishes to prepare them for different situations.*

Interestingly, from all of the participants, one participant held the strong belief on standard English. Whatever situations or whoever she contacts with, she always relies on the NES norms. This is shown in extract 70.

Extract 70

1 T18: *Let me ask you that if students say 'There has a chair in the room' is this OK from ELF*
2 *perspective?*
3 R: *Yes.*
4 T18: *<Her face is totally disagreed> I'm not OK with this theory. I'm sorryyyyyyyyyy. As I*
5 *mentioned, our students are English major students, not majoring in Communication.*
6 R: *What if they are not English major students?*

1

7 T18: ***Wrong (,) still be wrong. Because they study English language, they should receive the 8***
8 ***correct thing(,) But in their real life, it depends on their experience to face with something***
9 ***wrong or something right.***

As Ranta (2017) claimed that research into ELF is research on language use in real-life situations among different speakers, which is different from SLA which mainly investigate on learners' acquisition of certain code; therefore, the shift in the research perspective from that of learner to user can lead to the new views on the linguistic output. This theme also focuses on how teacher participants perceive themselves as English users or English learners.

From the interviews, the majority of the participants claimed themselves as English learners because they considered that English language is not their mother-tongue language; therefore, they have to learn new things as a long-life learning learners. Extract 71 and 72 are examples of their interviews.

Extract 71

1 R: *In your opinion, do you consider yourself as an English user or learner?*
2 T5: *I think (,) I'm an English learner (,) because when I use the language (,) like when I talk*
3 *to my foreign friend, they use some vocabulary that I've heard it, I've to learn from them. If*
4 *I could consider myself as an English user, this would mean I have to know everything like*
5 *NESs.*

Extract 72

- 1 R: In your opinion, do you consider yourself as an English user or learner?
- 2 T17: *I think (1) I'm (1) better an English learner (2) I'm not sure whether I correctly understood*
- 3 *(2) I mean we're not NESs who can use English fluently, so we have to learn it everyday. (2)*
- 4 *Still have to be careful all the time when using it <English>. So, I consider myself as an*
- 5 *English learner.*

In contrast, four of the participants strongly identified themselves as English users. Mainly, they revealed that they have passed the situations where they used English in the class as a learner. When they consider themselves in the real-life situations, they consider themselves as English users. This is illustrated in extract 73 and 74 as follows.

Extract 73

- 1 R: In your opinion, do you consider yourself as an *English user or learner?*
- 2 T6: *(2)(2) As an English user. This is because we work as an English lecturer (2) but if in the*
- 3 *context when I studied in Australia, I consider myself as a learner. (2)(2) Uhm... I think I've*
- 4 *passed the stage what we call 'learner'. Now, I think I'm an English user rather than*
- 5 *learner... simply say that... I can survive everywhere in the world.*

Extract 74

- 1 R: In your opinion, do you consider yourself as an English user or learner?
- 2 T18: *Nowadays, I consider myself as an English user because I haven't learnt English*
- 3 *language at all (1) I mean I can learn by myself, not in the class. In the communicative context,*
- 4 *I think I'm an English user.*

Nevertheless, a quarter of the participants did not sure whether they are English users or learners. They claimed themselves as both English users and learners depended on their roles. This is illustrated in extract 75 and 76.

Extract 75

- 1 R: In your opinion, do you consider yourself as an English user or learner?
- 2 T3: *It happens together. For example, when I speak, I'm an English user. On the other hand,*
- 3 *when I listen to it <English> or read it <English>, sometimes when I heard something new,*
- 4 *I can be both an English user and learner.*

Extract 76

- 1 R: In your opinion, do you consider yourself as an *English user or learner?*
- 2 T: *Uhm... (2)(2) It's quite difficult for this question... Uhm (2) I think I'm both of them*

3 *<English user and English learner> because when I consider myself as a user, I have to use*
4 *English in my daily-life communication and both in the class as an English lecturer.*
5 *Meanwhile, I feel that I've not known everything about English language (2) sometimes I*
6 *have to learn it <English> together with my students. For example (2) some of the*
7 *grammatical rules that I rarely use it, I have to review it again.*

In summary, although the majority of the participants revealed that the main purpose of their language used focus on the communicative purposes rather than forms, they seemed still held the beliefs that English language used should follow the standard English. This can be seen from what they considered themselves as English learners rather than English users. This point of view is similar to what Ranta (2017) described that L2 speakers try to master their lacking L2 skills relying on standard language (SLA perspective) rather than focusing on the authentic used. In short, although these participants reveal their English language used which is related to the notion of ELF through their practices, standard English with NES norms is still embedded as the role model in their beliefs.

5.4.3 Factors affecting teachers' ELF in relation to multilingual awareness (RQ3)

In this section, the researcher intends to investigate factors affecting teacher participants' the formation and the lack of their ELF awareness. Regarding the analysis, these factors are divided into two different factors including internal factors and external factors. Internal factors are the factors or things that reside in the participants' minds. On the other hand, external factors are the factors or things that reside outside participants' mind and externally influence participants.

5.4.3.1 Factors affecting the lack of participants' ELF awareness

From the interviews, it is found that there are both internal and external factors that influence participants to the lack of ELF awareness. The first part of this section mainly focuses on the internal factors. It is found from the interviews that these factors include; for

example, professional status, educational experience, and personal attitude towards English language.

From the analysis, professional status is the main factor that affected their lack of ELF awareness. They mentioned that as they work as an English lecturer, they should be a role model in using English. This is similar to what was found from Sifakis (2008) described from his study that it is expected for English lecturers to be responsible for their duties to teach English as a subject matter which relies on NESs norms. Therefore, they try to use standard English as much as they can all the time when they use English, and their target language is NSE. Extract 77 and 78 show this kind of belief which obstruct participants from the formation of ELF awareness.

Extract 77

- 1 R: Do you have a role model of English language?
- 2 T11: *Honestly, I want to use English like NESs. (.) Actually, I know that the concept of world*
- 3 *Englishes is widely accepted in the present day (.) I mean it doesn't focus much on the accent*
- 4 *(.) just deliver the message to the receiver. However, as I work as an English lecturer, I want*
- 5 *have perfect English or close to NSE as much as I can.*

Extract 78

- 1 R: Have you ever use English language with incorrect grammar?
- 2 T12: Yes yes yes.
- 3 R: Did you correct yourself?
- 4 T12: Yes, yes. If I'm aware, I always do it. This is because when I know that I use incorrect
- 5 *grammar (.) for example, when I talk to NES, I feel like I'm an English teacher all the time.*
- 6 *If I speak incorrectly, I feel (.) like I'm losing my face. I don't want anybody looks at me that*
- 7 *(.) You are an English teacher but use incorrect English.*
- 8 R: Has anybody correct you?
- 9 T12: (2) Rarely happens. I mean (.) never (.) with my interlocutors. Maybe they were afraid
- 10 that I would lose my face. Isn't it? As I'm an English teacher (.) I'm not sure. *It's just only*
- 11 *me who correct myself because I don't want to lose face <as an English teacher>*

Educational experience is one of the most significant factor that affect how participants use English. Because all of the participants were English major students when they were in university, they viewed English as a subject rather than a means of communication.

Additionally, English which is taught in a Thai context mainly focuses on mainstream English. Therefore, English which is used by the participants mainly rely on NSE. That is to say they mostly viewed English in SLA perspective rather than SLU perspective from their educational experience (See Ranta, 2017). T17 shared her different experience between the use of English outside the class and inside the class in extract 79. She clarified that she felt relaxed when she studied English outside the class with the evangelist in the church (Extract 79.2-5). On the hand, she felt stressed when she studied grammatical rules in the class, and it became her obstacle to express the language (Extract 79.12-21). This can be the evidence that shows the differences between SLA and ELF communication from the participants' experiences which similar to what Ranta (2017) mentioned.

Extract 79

1 R: Why did you choose to study in English major?

2 T17: *My neighbor was my inspiration in studying English (.) He was an American evangelist.*

3 *At that time, I studied English with him. [...] I felt fun (.) It started from this feeling first*

4 *because what I studied was not too difficult (.) It's just English for communication in daily*
5 *life.*

6 R: Can he <the evangelist> speak Thai?

7 T17: A little bit.

8 R: Did you speak Thai with him?

9 T17: Yes (2) mix with English that he taught me.

10 R: *When you studied English in the university, do you think it's different from what you*
11 *learnt from the evangelist?*

12 T17: (2) *Uhm, it's different (.) **much different.** When I studied in the university, there were*
13 *a lot of grammatical rules that I had to rely on when using the language. It's different from*
14 *when I studied with the evangelist when I was young (.) At that time, It's easy and relaxed (.)*
15 *I didn't have to worry too much on the language rules. But when studying English in the*
16 *university (.) there were a lot of grammatical rules for me to remember. When I wanted to*
17 *express the language (.) even though for general communication (.) I don't know whether*
18 *others feel like me (.) I felt worried. I have to be careful all the time that I might use incorrect*
19 *grammar (.) This is my personal case. Therefore, when grammatical rules come to my life,*
20 *I have to be always careful when using language for communication (.) even though in*
21 *writing.*

Interestingly, personal attitude is the key main factor for T18, who held a strong belief on standard English, when using English. She revealed that she personally has NES as a role model; therefore, different kinds of English from NSE could not be accepted by her. This

can be explained that this participant held the strong belief on the standard English as a behavioral construct which relies on NESs norms rather than social construct (See Kohn, 2011). Extract 80 reflected that strong belief on standard English could be assumed as one important factors that leads Thai English language teachers to the lack of ELF awareness among them.

Extract 80

1 T18: [...]I don't know how to say (2) *cause personally I like NESs and they are the role*
2 *model for me <in using English>, so I want my students do the same as me. I won't teach any*
3 *kind of English <which is different from NSE> like Chines, Vietnamese, or Singaporean*
4 *accent to them() I don't know() maybe it is because of my attitude.*
5 R: What do you think if our department employs foreign teachers who are NNESs to teach
6 English for our students?
7 T18: DISAGREE. I totally **disagree** with this *cause our students are English major student,*
8 *they should learn standard English. [...] I think if we better employ NESs rather than NNESs*
9 *to teach conversation to our students. The difference between English which is used by NESs*
10 *and NNESs is not just only an accent. There are some vocabulary or expression*
11 *which are also different as well. Our students should be better learnt from NESs cause I*
12 *think if we produce students who use standard English, they can communicate with any*
13 *people from any countries (2) although they are Chinese, Singaporean, Vietnamese, cause*
14 *we have what it is called 'Standard' so we can accommodate them.*

Apart from internal factors, there are external factors that influence participants' beliefs and practices. In this part, the researcher focuses on the external factors which lead the teacher participants to the lack of ELF awareness. From the interviews, these factors are divided into three types depending on its level which include; classroom-context factors, school-context factors, and national-context factors.

Students' attitude is one of the significant classroom-context factors that influence participants' practices in using English. As most of the participants stated that their students had positive attitude towards NSE, they expected their teachers to use standard English rather than other kinds of English. This can be the evidence showing that their students do not realize the importance of ELF. Even though the teacher participants wanted to prepare them for the real-world communication of variety of Englishes, students themselves still

conform to the standard English (British or American English). Ren et al (2016), suggested that English teachers and students have to reconsider the purpose of English teaching and the language acquisition and the pedagogical practices. This can be seen from the findings that even though the teacher participants realized that the status of English language has been changed from the conformity to NES to the international language (focusing on the communicative purposes), students themselves still showed their preferences on NES rather than other kinds of English. The preferences on standard English among students had the influence on the curriculum design conducting by the teachers. When the focus is still embedded on standard English norms rather than the communicative purposes, this would lead both Thai students and teachers to the lack of ELF awareness which focuses on the intelligibility rather than forms. This can be viewed from extract 81; T12 revealed that she wanted her students to expose with variety of Englishes by had her students studied with NNES teachers, but the students requested to study with just NES teachers. This is similar to what T20 reported in extract 82.

Extract 81

- 1 R:[...]Do you think British and American English could reflect the English language at the
- 2 present day and do you think it's enough for the students?
- 3 T12: @@@ **They** <the students> **request** <British and American English> **by themselves**.
- 4 When I provide NNES teachers for them, (,) they feel like disagree with this idea. *I think*
- 5 *maybe because they* <the students> *have less experience in the real-life communication that*
- 6 *there isn't just only British or American English.*
- 7 R: So, what did you do?
- 8 T12: *We could provide them some courses like 'Global Cultural Communication' or what*
- 9 *else that could promote the concept of world Englishes.*

Extract 82

- 1 R: What do you think if our department employs NNESs to teach our students?
- 2 T20: *In terms of practicing students with different accents (,) I think it's fine. No problem.*
- 3 *However, the problem is about our students' perceptions. (2) I mean they have an expectation*
- 4 *to study with the owner of the language which means (,) British, American, or Australian.*

Another classroom-context factor that frequently mentioned by the participants is time constraint. Most of the participants accepted that they knew the concept of world Englishes,

and they wanted to describe this concept to their students. However, because of the time constraint, they had to use only standard English in their class. This limited the integration of ELF in Thai educational context which could lead to the lack of ELF awareness in both teachers and students due to the main focus on standard English. This example was reported by T10 in extract 83.

Extract 83

- 1 R: [...] Do you think that English which is taught in your class reflects English in the reality?
- 2 T10: (.) Personally, I try to be neutral. I mean (.) *in my class, I always tell my students to*
- 3 *accept the concept of world Englishes (.) because we are not NESs. Aren't we? However, I*
- 4 *can't teach the concept of world Englishes to them because the limitation of time. So, I have*
- 5 *to teach standard English (.) I think the introduction of world Englishes concept is necessary*
- 6 *'cause the classroom context is different from reality (.) But, I can't get in the deeper detail.*

In the school-context level, the factor that affect the lack of ELF awareness in both teacher and student participants mainly relies on the stakeholders. As mentioned before that most of the teacher participants accept the variety of Englishes; however, the main obstacle that obstruct them from this concept is the stakeholders including specifically students' parents and administrators. In extract 84, T4 released that his students' parents put their trust in the institutions where NESs work as lecturers. Similarly, T7 disclosed in extract 85 that the administrators preferred to employ NES teachers rather than NNES teachers. In short, extract 84 and 85 illustrate that two main external school-context factors that affect their lack of ELF awareness are students' parents and administrators. This shows that the strong beliefs of the ownership of English language in the Thai context still relies on the NESs rather than NNESs. This limited the Thai educational context to shift from EFL to ELF paradigm, from native-speaker-like mastery to the ability to use English in the real communication.

Extract 84

- 1 R: What do you think if our department employs NNESs to teach our students?
- 2 T4: I think it's a good idea (.) This would let our students to understand the reality that (.) in
- 3 the present day, there are varieties in English. However, *it's believed in a Thai context that if*
- 4 *English in your institution is taught by NESs, it's more reliable than which is taught by NNES*
- 5 *teachers (.) like Singaporean or Filipino teachers. If you ask me whether it's good to have*

6 *our students to exposure to different kinds of English, (.) it's good (.) it's good. **But**, there're*
7 *many obstacles before reaching that point (2) We have to clarify with our students why we*
8 *do that <NNES rather than NES> (.) particularly, with their parents. They would perceive*
9 *that they send their children to study in this program <English major>, but their children*
10 *have to study with NNES teachers. This would decrease their trust. On the other hand, They*
11 *view that learning with NES teachers (.) with blond hair is more reliable.*

Extract 85

1 R: *What do you think if our department employs NNESs to teach our students?*
2 T7: *For Business English program <the interviewer is the head of a Business English*
3 *program>, I'm OK with that. (.) This is because it would reflect varieties of English.*
4 *Furthermore, we can learn different culture from them <NNES teachers>. In the past, there*
5 *were NNES teachers in our department, but now **they** want to have all NES teachers.*
6 R: *'They'? who do you mean by this word?*
7 T7: *Our colleagues <the administrators>. When we employ foreign teachers, it seems like that*
8 *we choose only NES teachers rather than NNES teachers. However, for Business English*
9 *program, there's no problem (.) because this context (.) it has already become world*
10 *Englishes.*

Education policy is the main national-context external factor mentioned by most participants that obstructed them from using proper English teaching methods. In extract 86, T2 revealed that English teaching and learning in a Thai context has been based on exam-oriented since the past. Even though the teachers themselves realized that the status of English in the present day has been shifted from a monolingual paradigm to multilingual paradigm (Canagarajah, 2005; Canagarajah & Wurr, 2011), the stakeholders' beliefs of English language used still relies on the conformity to the NESs norms. Therefore, English teaching and learning in a Thai context mainly focuses on grammar translation rather than for communication. This leads to the lack of ELF awareness among both teachers and students in a Thai context.

Extract 86

1 T2: [...] *Actually, according to language learning theory, we <Thai English teacher> have*
2 *used the wrong methods since the past. I mean (.) we teach grammar before communication*
3 *skills. Particularly, English teaching in Thailand is an exam-corrected, so students can do*
4 *the exam, but they don't know how to use the language. In my class, I always tell my students*
5 *that (.) look over the grammatical rules cause I know how students have learnt the English*

6 language <base on grammar-oriented>. They <students> think that English is difficult because
7 of its grammatical rules. They have to spend the time to think about the grammar before they
8 speak it out. They have less confidence to use it. *So, when I have a chance, I always tell my*
9 *students to simply use English language in order to have them know that it's just actually the*
10 *communication. Don't focus too much on grammar. Just use anyway they can do to*
11 *communicate.*

13 R: Which one do you think it is more useful for students (.) between learning inside the class
14 and outside the class?

15 T2: *If Thai education is still like this (.) I mean still base on exam-oriented (.) Everybody*
16 *<students> still wants to get a good score from the exam (.) Teachers still believe that*
17 *everything has to be 100% correct <forms rather than content>. We <teachers> can't do*
18 *anything, but the only thing that we can give them <students> is 'way of thinking'.*

Another national-context factor that lead the participants to the lack of ELF awareness is the locational context. Apart from Thai education policy, the majority of the participants pointed that they rarely used English outside the class because almost 100 percent of Thai people use standard Thai or dialects to communicate with other people. Additionally, most of the cities in Thailand are small cities which are different from the big cities or scenery cities that are multilingual contexts. Therefore, the majority of Thai people rarely have occasions to interact with people who have different L1 by using English. This leads them to the lack of ELF awareness. The data from the interviews are; for instance, shown in extract 87, 88, and 89.

Extract 87

1 R: Nowadays, except inside the classroom, when do you use English to communicate with
2 other people?

3 T12: (2) with the foreign teachers in our department (.) *I rarely use English outside the class.*
4 [...].

5 R: In your opinion, what is the main factor that influences the students to use English?

6 T12: @@@ I think (.) it's very little. *I mean the main factor is an environment. The*
7 *environment in a Thai context doesn't support us to use English in our daily life.*

Extract 88

1 R: Nowadays, except inside the classroom, when do you use English to communicate with
2 other people?

3 T19: @@@ @@@ please (2) *If it's outside the office, I rarely use it <English>. Just use it*
4 *with myself (.) for example, watching YouTube, listening to the songs, talking with myself (.)*
5 *something like this.*

Extract 89

- 1 R: In your opinion, except in learning and teaching, what are the factors that influence Thai
- 2 people to use English?
- 3 T14: (2) Firstly, I think it depends the individual. If he/she is interested in English, he/she
- 3 will find the way to use it (.) whatever. In contrast, if he/she isn't interested it, he/she won't
- 4 use it anymore. *Secondly, it might be because of the location (.) for example, if you live in a*
- 5 *big city or scenery city, you have more opportunities to use English.*

In summary, both internal and external factors influencing the participants to the lack of ELF awareness are; professional status, educational experiences, personal attitudes towards English language, stakeholders' expectations, exam-oriented policy, and lack of the exposure to Englishes. However, some factors leading these participants to the formation of ELF awareness were found and discussed in the next section.

5.4.3.2 Factors affecting the formation of participants' ELF awareness

The internal factors which influence teacher participants to the formation of ELF awareness discovered from the interviews mainly rely on their individuals' beliefs on English language and their experiences. For instance, T2 reported in the extract 90 that she understood that language has creativity and dynamic in itself. Additionally, English language is an international language which is used by international people. As a consequence, English can be adapted by the users to fit with the group of users. From the background of T2, it is found that she had an experience to study in UK where she mentioned that she met several international friends. Moreover, she used to work as a staff in the department of international relations. This allowed her to have various opportunities to interact and contact with people who use different L1. She stated in her interview that more experiences to expose with different people could lead her to the open-minded in the way she viewed the language.

Extract 90

- 1 R: If someday the number of NNEs is more than the number of NESs (.) and they don't
- 2 understand the idiom 'It's just a piece of cake', but they understand (2) for example 'It's just
- 3 banana banana' <'banana banana' refers to something's easy in Thai idiom>. Do you think
- 4 'It's just a piece of cake' would disappear and become 'It's just banana banana' instead?

5 T2: Uhm (2) it's impossible. *We have to understand that language has creativity because it's*
6 *impossible that any language can stay still. It can be seen that English language in the past*
7 *is also different from the present day (.) I mean language has its dynamic (.) not stay still.*
8 *More importantly, English language is an international language which is used by*
9 *international people. Therefore, it's impossible that when it <English language> is used in*
10 *different areas, it can have the same form of what NESs use. Although, the English language*
11 *which is used in UK in which the language is used in the group of people from the different*
12 *L1, my NESs friends have to accept the difference if they want to stay in that situation (.) I*
13 *mean in terms of language learning. If they have much experiences in staying aboard, they*
14 *can accept this point (.) I believe.*

Similarly, T5 revealed that he perceived English as a means of communication, and the main purpose of using English was to communicate. Furthermore, he mentioned that language has its dynamic, so it was impossible to force any language to fix with its grammar all the time. From his belief and perception of the nature of the language, this leads to the formation of his ELF awareness that he focuses more on contents rather than forms. This is reported in extract 91.

Extract 91

1 R: Do you have any pressure when you communicate with NESs?
2 T5: No, because *I always view that language learning is something that we have to try to do*
3 *the new things. It can be right or wrong. I always tell my students (.) don't expect to use the*
4 *correct English all the time (.) Just try to use it frequently because the main purpose is to*
5 *communicate. It's not a grammatical test when communicate in the real-life situation.*
6 R: *Have you ever correct the students?*
7 T5: *I've rarely done it because it decreases students' confidences and their self-esteem (2) I*
8 *correct them just only the really important points. Personally, I focus more on pragmatics (.)*
9 *how to reach the goal of communication by unnecessarily using 100% correct grammatical*
10 *rules. [...]*
11 R: [...]*Do you think we can have English in Thai style (2) for example, if we use the idiom*
12 *'It's just a piece of cake' but Thai students don't understand. Is it possible to use 'It's just*
13 *banana banana' instead?*
14 T5: Uhm (2) *It's impossible (.) impossible. For me, English language is a means of*
15 *communication that creates cultural literacy. I mean (.) different countries have different*
16 *idioms, so it's impossible for us to know everything. However, we can ask to understand that*
17 *cultural literacy.*
18 [...]
19 R: *If the number of NNESs uses the sentence 'He don't know' rather than 'He doesn't*
20 *know', do you think someday 'He doesn't know' will become 'He don't know'?*
21 T5: *Yes, sure. This is because one of the nature of the language is that it has dynamic. We*
22 *can't force any language to fix with its own grammar all the time. Otherwise, people in*

23 *Shakespeare period would have resurrected and blamed NESs in the present day that they*
24 *use the wrong English because English language today is different from the past as well.*

From extract 90 and 91, both T2 and T5 showed their awareness of the dynamic of English language which can be adapted to reach the communicative purposes rather than just fix to the NESs norms. This is similar to the ELF perspective which was claimed that ELF pragmatic, linguistic, and culture are flexible to use as a means of communication by individual interlocutor in the specific communicative situations (Seidlhofer, 2011; Mauranen, 2012; Jenkins, 2015; Sifakis, 2019). These beliefs from the participants' perspectives can be the evidences to show that, beliefs which were derived from multilingual interaction, can lead these participants to the formation of ELF awareness.

The external factors that influence the participants to the formation of ELF awareness are rarely found from the interviews. This is because it is illustrated in 5.4.3.1 (extract 87, 88, 89) that they rarely used English in their daily life except in the classroom because of the environmental context. Therefore, environmental context seems to be a significant factor that affect their both formation and lack of ELF awareness. If they have more opportunities to interact with people who share different L1, they seem to have more ELF awareness. Extract 92 and 93 are examples regarding this point showing that T2 and T17 English language can be adapted to fit the different situations with different people to achieve the goal of communication. This is to say the more opportunities they use English with the variety and plurality of English rather than the monolithic view of English language, the more ELF awareness is raised among them. This is similar to what several scholars (e.g. Matsuda, 2003, 2012b; Seidlhofer, 2004, 2011; Dewey & Leung, 2010) claimed that exposing to the monolithic view of English is not enough to prepare individuals to meet with the pluralistic of English in the global level.

Extract 92

- 1 *R: Have you have any experience that you have difficulties when communicate with your*
- 2 *friends <who share different L1>?*
- 3 *T2: Yes. I can remember that () once I talked to my Taiwanese flat mate () At that time, I*
- 4 *spoke the word **comfortable** () I spoke it for many times, but my friend didn't understand.*

5 R: *How did you do?*
6 T2: *So, I had to pronounce <pronounce in Thai style> COM-FORT-TA-BLE <syllable by*
7 *syllable>. I changed to stress at the second syllable instead because I remember that when I*
8 *was a child () I pronounce this word in this way () COM-FORT-TA-BLE and I've seen my*
9 *Thai students also pronounce like this. So, I pronounced like this with my flat mate friend and*
10 *() she understood. This means () people in her country <Taiwan> pronounce this word in*
11 *the same way with us <Thai people>.*

Extract 93

1 R: *I have seen some of our former students posted on their Facebook that English which they*
2 *faced in their workplace was different from what they learnt () They said that they often use*
3 *English with NNEs rather than NESs. Do you think English which is taught in the class*
4 *reflects the reality?*
5 T17: *() Actually, I think the grammatical rules of English are the same all over the world.*
6 *However, there are some factors that make different community use different English () For*
7 *example, once I went to Singapore, () I think it's because of different culture of Singaporean*
8 *people. They used some vocabulary that I've never met before () but it's an English word. I*
9 *can't remember that word () it's about the size of ice cream () () it's not the word 'large'*
10 *() it's not the word 'medium'. So, I had to look at the picture and used that word <in the*
11 *picture> to order this size.*

5.5 Summary of the chapter

The main purpose of this chapter is to present the findings retrieved from the semi-structured interviews. Twenty Thai university English teachers agreed to participate in these interviews with the grant from their department. After collecting the data, data were analyzed through NVivo 12 program by applying content analysis analytical framework. The coding frame was divided into three main themes including teachers' beliefs about English language, teachers' ELF in relation to multilingual awareness, and factors affecting teachers' ELF in relation to multilingual awareness.

The first theme focuses on teacher participants' beliefs towards English language which mainly compare their beliefs between ENL and ELF perspectives. The findings show that ENL is the main target language among the majority of the participants although they revealed the acceptance on variety of Englishes. Regarding the ownership of English, they

believed that English language belongs to no one even though it was originated in England. However, some of them held strong beliefs towards ENL, so they strongly relied their practices on NES norms. Regarding their use of English, the participants shown their different perspectives towards English which was used in educational context and real-life situations. Most of them concerned that the English language learning in a Thai context was too much framed by the exam which is rely on ENL; therefore, they mostly agreed that the notion of Englishes should be introduced to reflect the real-life situations.

The second theme mainly focuses on the participants' language practices, identities, and language resources. In this part, the participants reported their practices of English language use. They illustrated the pragmatic strategies which they used including, for example, repetition, accommodation, let it pass, code switching, etc. Regarding their language ideologies, most of them perceived themselves as English language learners rather than language users. However, the majority of them put their focus on the contents of the language rather than forms.

The last theme reveals factors affecting the lack and the formation of ELF in relation to multilingual awareness among the participants. It is found from the interviews that factors which affect the lack of participants' ELF awareness are; for example, professional status, educational experience, individual's attitude, stakeholders, and education policy. Regarding the factors affecting their formation of ELF awareness, two main factors mentioned by the participants rely on their individuals' beliefs towards language and their experiences exposing to the language.

Chapter 6

Teachers' beliefs and reflections on English in ELT practices

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the study collected through two focus group discussions. The first section clarifies the information of the teacher participants participating in both groups. Then, the overview of analytical method in analyzing data and procedure are given in the next section. The final section illustrates the findings from the focus groups, and some extracts are presented to reveal the participants' beliefs of English language use in relation to ELF. The purposes of this chapter are to interpret the findings from the focus groups and to answer three research questions.

- RQ1: What are Thai university English teachers' beliefs of English language?
- RQ2: To what extent do Thai university English teachers have an ELF awareness?
- RQ3: What factors are contributing to the formation or the lack of their ELF awareness under a multilingualism framework?

6.2 Participants in focus groups

Participants participating in focus groups in this present study includes 10 Thai university English language teachers. The majority of them were the same participants who participated in the semi-structured interviews. Just two from these ten participants did not participate in the interviews because of the time availability. These participants were divided into to two groups relying on their convenience. All of them have at least 3 years English language teaching experience in undergraduate level, and two of them have one-year experience in postgraduate level teaching in Thailand. All of them have an experience to study and spend their life aboard where English is the native language in these countries

including UK, USA, New Zealand, and Australia. Table 6.1 illustrated the information of the teacher participants.

Table 6.1 Description of the teacher participants in focus groups

Group 1

Participant	Gender	Year of teaching English in university	The highest education level	Country of studying aboard
T1	Female	12	M.Phil.	UK
T2	Female	4	M.A	USA
T3	Female	7	M.A	Australia
T4	Female	6	Ph.D.	UK
T5	Male	7	Ph.D.	UK

Group 2

Participant	Gender	Year of teaching English in university	The highest education level	Country of studying aboard
T6	Male	14	M.Ed.	USA
T7	Female	15	M.A	New Zealand
T8	Female	7	Ph.D.	UK
T9	Female	13	M.Phil.	USA
T10	Female	14	M.Phil.	New Zealand

6.3 Analytical method and procedure

The researcher applied the qualitative content analysis analytical method to analyze data collected through focus groups in this present study. The concept of qualitative content analysis was described in Chapter 5 (5.3.1). The purpose of using this method is to investigate and reveal the hidden underlying messages of the content. Furthermore, Barbour (2007) pointed that focus group analysis should focus both on how ideas or beliefs are expressed and the process of discussion. This means that the analysis should analyze the interactions among participants and take data as a whole. Therefore, Krippendorff (2013) suggested that a sign-vehicle which is anything that may carry meaning (a word or a set of words) in the context of focus groups should not be overlooked. Sign-vehicles may also include non-verbal signs which carry a great deal of information. These non-verbal signs may include; for instance, facial expressions, gestures, tone of voice, or any other means of communication.

Both focus groups in this study were conducted among Thai university English language teachers. Therefore, the researcher used Thai language in the transcriptions and translated them into English language in the extracts for analysis and discussion. To make it easy for understanding, transcription conventions used in the focus groups mostly follow those from the semi-structured interviews. However, as the role of the researcher in focus groups was different from the interviews; hence, ‘M’ which refers to moderator is used as a code for the researcher instead of ‘R’.

Table 6.2 Focus groups transcription conventions (adapted from Mauranen, 2006; Jenkins, 2007, 2014)

Symbol	Explanation
M	Moderator
T1, T2, T3, etc	Teacher participant number according to speaking order

Bold type	Speaker emphasis
<i>Italics</i>	Italics used by the researcher to identify key points in the extracts
(.)	Pause about 1 second or less
(2)	Pause about 2 second, etc
[...]	Omission of text which is irrelevant
< >	The researcher's additional information to make meaning clear
@ @	Laughter
[[Overlapping or interrupted speech
CAPITAL	In a louder voice
FG1, FG2	Focus group 1 and 2

In this present study, two focus groups were conducted with five participants in each group. The stimuli including two article about the spread of English (Crystal, 2000) and the concept of ELF (Jenkins, 2009) were submitted to all participants before conducting the focus groups. However, to avoid misunderstanding from both articles, the researcher summarized the main idea from these articles to the participants before starting the issues to be discussed. The data analysis for focus groups involves several stages. Firstly, right after the first focus group had been conducted, the researcher transcribed the data. In this stage, the researcher wanted to familiarize himself to the data and tried to generate the initial codes before conducting the second focus group. Then, after finished conducting the second focus group, the data were transcribed and compared to the first group to explore the emerging code. Finally, at the end of coding process, the data from both focus groups were imported and coded by using NVivo 12 program. The coding framework is shown in table 6.3.

Table 6.3 Focus group coding framework

6.4.1 Teachers' beliefs on English language education in a Thai context
6.4.1.1 Beliefs on standard English
6.4.1.2 Beliefs on variety of Englishes
6.4.2 Teachers' awareness of ELF
6.4.3 Factors affecting ELF awareness in Thai ELT context
6.4.3.1 Factors affecting the lack of ELF awareness
6.4.3.2 Factors affecting the formation of ELF awareness

6.4 Results and analysis

The results and analysis of focus groups focus on the group dynamics and interactions among participants in order to investigate how participants expressed and shared their ideas with each other. Three major themes emerged from the discussion in focus groups which include 1) teacher participants' beliefs on English language education in a Thai context, 2) their ELF awareness, and 3) factors affecting their ELF awareness.

6.4.1 Teachers' beliefs on English language education in a Thai context

Mainly, the moderator in both focus groups intended to encourage the participants to discuss about their ideas and experiences towards their use of English language. However, the discussion among the participants seemed to narrow into English language teaching and learning in a Thai context. Therefore, this theme emerged from the discussion and interactions among teacher participants. After going through the transcription, the researcher generated two subthemes from this main theme consisting 1) Teacher's beliefs on standard English and 2) their beliefs on variety of Englishes.

6.4.1.1 Beliefs on standard English

The discussion in FG1 revealed that although teacher participants in this group accepted the notion of variety of Englishes, they still believed that standard English should be the target language for students in Thai ELT context. The conversation began with the issue of native norms and then went to the preference kind of English. They had a consensus that standard English should be taught to their students. Interestingly, one of the participants in this group emphasized the importance of standard English that if her students can correctly use standard English, it would help them to use non-standard English as well. Therefore, standard English should be presented, particularly in the ELT context. This illustrates what Baker & Jarunthawatchai (2017) claimed that Anglophone models or standard English relying on NES norms is still the target language in Thai educational context. Extract 94 illustrated this discussion in FG1.

Extract 94 (FG1)

1 [...]

2 T4: Actually, it's not all the class teaching grammar. I mean ...(2)

3 T1, T2: It's hidden in every context.

4 T5: Grammar comes with communication.

5 T1: *Language has structures.*

6 T4: *Right. It has structures. But if the question is whether it must be correct all the time? (2)*

7 *They are 'use' and 'usage'. If you use English just for communication (2) If it can reach the*

8 *goal, I'm OK with that. However, if it's used in an official context, grammar is still necessary*

9 *(2) As an English lecturer.*

10 M: If we teach students who are not English major and the main purpose of their studying

11 English is just for communication, is it possible to have less focus on grammar?

12 T1: Personally, I can tell that it's impossible because *although they can communicate, the*

13 *efficiency of communication has to be measured by the 'accuracy'. (1) So, it comes back to*

14 *language structure again.*

15 T4: *It's touchable. It can be measured the differences among individuals.*

16 T2: It's like when we build the house (1) The house must have house poles. Additionally,

17 when our students graduate, they have to take competitive English exam with others.

18 T3: There are reading and writing skills.

19 T2: We have to teach them how to construct the language.

20 T3: For example, *my former students who graduated already (2) They can communicate*

21 *fluently, but it's unacceptable if they use wrong grammar. This is because they have to write*

22 *(2) for example, business letters or emails (1) sometimes if they use wrong tenses, the meaning*

23 *becomes different. So, for students who study language, grammar is inevitable for them.*

24 T4: I think it depends on the context. *If it is in academic context, I still expect standard*
 25 *English.*
 26 T2: *It's still questionable how much to teach and learn that can prepare our students with*
 25 *variety situations (2) not just British or American English (2) They might have to*
 26 *communicate with their Chinese boss (2) First of all, we have to give them <students>*
 27 *standard English.*
 28 T4, T5: Right right.
 29 T2: *If they know standard English, they can use non-standard English as well.*
 30 T5: I often see Thai people who were raised in UK since they were kids (2) They use the
 31 sentence **'You don't like this, isn't it?'** My Thai friend who has intermediate English
 32 proficiency also use this as well. (2) It's like black people that they use **'I ain't care'**. The
 33 question is which context English is used? If you use it with your friends, it's OK.
 34 M: OK
 35 T5: (2) *It's unpredictable which context our students have to face, so we have to give them*
 36 *standard English first.*

T4 opened the discussion regarding the teaching of grammar that not every English class focuses on teaching grammar; however, she spent a few second to continue her discussion. Then T1, T2, and T5 supported that grammar is necessary for every context, particularly, T5 emphasized that grammar comes with communication. The discussion seemed to narrow down to the ELT context when T4 shared that 'English use' and 'English usage' are different. She indicated personally that it depends on different context. If English is used for just communication, as long as the communication can reach the goal, no matter English is used is fine for her. However, if it is used in an official context, grammar is still essential for English use.

The moderator tried to expand participants' ideas whether NES norms are essential for students who want to study English for communicative purpose and have less focus on grammar. T1 responded that the proficiency of communication needed to be measured by language accuracy, so it cannot be denied to still focus on language structures which are NES norms. Regarding this issue, T2 and T4 supported that NES norms or grammatical rules are the evaluation principles that can be used to measure the English proficiency among people who have different English proficiency. Similar to T3, she illustrated that

although her former students can communicate (speaking and listening) fluently, they have difficulty in using corrected grammar in reading and writing skills. This leads her students to misunderstanding communication; therefore, she emphasized that grammar is still essential for students.

After the discussion of native norms, the discussion moved to the issue regarding standard and non-standard English (Extract 94, 24-35). T4 still expected standard English should be used in the academic context, while T2 described that it depends on the context. She revealed that there are variety of English at the present day. It can not predictable which kind of English her students were expected to be faced, so she strongly believed that standard English should be given to her students. She further believed that if her students can use standard English correctly, they can understand non-standard English. This point was supported by T4 and T5. Particularly, T5 shared his experience that errors which is different from NES can be happened, but the acceptability of these errors would depend on the context where the language is used. As a consequence, T5 summarized that it was unpredictable what context and who that the students have to use English language with. Then, he claimed that standard English is the priority choice to be given to his students. This point of view seems to focus the English language teaching on the NES norms relying on codes and structures. This is different from ELF perspectives which focus on the use of any resources or pragmatic strategies to reach the goal of communication (Cogo & House, 2017).

The discussion in FG2 regarding the standard English issue tended to be similar to what participants in FG1 had discussed. Although some of the participant in FG2 did not rely her teaching much on teaching grammatical rules and wanted ELT in a Thai context focuses more on communicative skill, she still held the belief that English language should be better taught by native speaker teachers. Regarding the interviews, the researcher found that one of the participants held the strong belief on standard English, and she seemed to be a

stimulator in this group regarding this issue. She had an implicit encouragement to other participants in this group to believe the same as hers. Extract 95 illustrates the discussion among participants in FG2 regarding standard English issue.

Extract 95 FG2

1 M: *If one day you become a policy maker, what do you want to do or change in ELT in a*

2 *Thai context?*

3 T9: *Teaching communication rather than just teach only grammatical rules. And I want to*

4 *have more NES teachers, so students can have more confidence in speaking English.*

5 M: *What about NNES teachers?*

6 T9: *Uhm (2) <seems not willing to answer> NNES is (2) Okay, **BUT** they must be the NNES*

7 *teachers who have very good English proficiency.*

8 T10, T8: *Right right.*

9 T7: *Native like.*

10 T6: *At least 80% native like. Not necessary 100% because we can't predict what kind of*

11 *English we're going to meet, and the accents are different (.) I mean if we employ NNESs*

12 *to work as English teachers here, there accents are different (2) this point is fine. **However,***

13 *regarding the language structure, they must have accuracy in it because if the language*

14 *structure they use is not standard, it would lead to confusion or misunderstanding would*

15 *happen.*

16 M: *So do you think English which is used in the class is different from what is used outside*

17 *the class?*

18 T8: **It's totally different.** *Like you told me about ELF which is happens all the time, BUT*

19 **it can't become a standard.** *I think it depends on the contexts. If you communicate with the*

20 *sellers in the market, whatever the crazy topics, just speak it out <do not rely on standard*

21 *English>, BUT if you use the language like this in the conference or academic setting, it's*

22 *not proper.*

23 T7: *Even though in the business context.*

24 T8: **RIGHT**

25 M: *Which context do you think that Thai people often use English?*

26 T8: **In the working context.** *Because English which is used in a Thai context is English as*

27 *a foreign language (.) not second language. Therefore, the context where Thai students often*

28 *use English is in their workplace.*

29 T6: *Right right. It's an English as a working language (.) like it's written in ASEAN MOU.*

30 T8: *Right.*

31 T6: *However, this kind of language (2) I still expect ...[*

32 T8: **STANDARD ENGLISH**

33 T6: *Right right right. Because I'm afraid that the language would be too much adapted and*

34 *become accepted by people.*

35 T8: **It's going to be collapsed.**

36 T10: *I agreed.*

In extract 95, the moderator started the discussion with the question how the participants wanted to do with Thai ELT context if they can. T9 shared her opinion that she wanted to focus the language teaching more on communicative skills rather than grammatical rules. She further expressed that NES teachers were needed to increase her students' confidence in English speaking. When the moderator tried to reveal her perception between NES teachers and NNES teachers, she felt like not willing to accept NNES teachers, but she finally claimed that NNES teachers are accepted with the condition that they are qualified with high English proficiency. This idea was supported by all participants, particularly, T7 emphasized that these NNES teachers should use English like NESs. Similarly, T6 mentioned that he did focus on different accent from NNES teachers or NES teachers, but the main point was standard English structure should be given to students.

The second turn of the discussion was made in line 16 when the moderator wanted the participants to share their thoughts regarding the differences between English use inside and outside the class. T8, who held strong belief on standard English, started the discussion by comparing the English used in different contexts. She sarcastically shared that if English is used among sellers in the market ('sellers in the market' in a Thai context refers to people in the lower status) ELF or whatever kind of English could be used; nevertheless, standard English should be presented in the academic context. T7 supported this opinion and further expressed that even though in business context, standard English should be used. The preference of standard English of T8 was confirmed by her respond of T7 in line 24.

The last turn of this extract (Extract95, 25-36), the moderator intended to reveal which contexts the participants thought that English was used by Thai people (particularly the students). T8 strongly emphasized that English would be often used by Thai people in their workplaces. Supporting by T6, he claimed that ASEAN policy also encourages ASEAN people to use English as a working language in their workplace. From line 31-35, T8 had a tendency to support her belief on the standard English by inserting her idea that standard

English should be used in this context. This action seemed to affect T6's thought. From the interviews, T6 claimed that English language can be adapted as long as the communication reaches the goal; however, it seemed like that T8's attitudes and actions had an influence on T6 to rely his belief on standard English. This can be viewed from extract 95 (line 31-35).

From extract 94 and 95, even though it seemed like these participants revealed that they wanted their students to focus more on the communicative purposes of using English rather than the conformity to NESs norms, they still believed that NESs norms are still be essential in Thai ELT context, particularly in the academic context. These points of view among the teacher participants reflect that these participants held the belief that NESs are still the center (norm-providing), which is quite different from the English language status in the present, which NESs are rejecting as the ideal for the students. This finding is similar to what Ur (2010) mentioned that English which is taught to students should reflect the status of English language at present relying on the pluralism use of English rather than fixing to the monolithic variety of English; however, the preferences among the practitioners still embed on the standard English.

In extract 96, the moderator started the discussion regarding the number of NNES users comparing with NES users issue. The main purpose was to view participants' attitudes towards the adaptation of standard English by NNESs. The interaction from the discussion led to the consensus that standard English should not be adapted. This is because they thought that standard norms could be used as an indicator to measure individuals' language proficiency, particularly for English language proficiency test. The discussion is as follow.

Extract 96 FG1

- 1 M: Regarding the number of English users in the present day, it's found that the number of
- 2 NNESs is more than NESs. As these NNESs accommodate their interlocutors when they have
- 3 communication, so *English is adapted from standard. What do you think about this kind of*
- 4 *English?*
- 5 T5: If it's used to just convey the meaning, we ourselves can be English users. *BUT, don't*
- 6 *forget that the English owner (2) they set up their standard to measure their language*

7 proficiency. For example, the university in the foreign country has a requirement for IELTS
8 score. This means they have already set the standard up to control the language.

9 T1: There are descriptions that explain the proficiency of each band. For example, if you get
10 band 7, it means you can read these printed text. (2) And these printed text must use standard
11 English for international sharing. This is to confirm the same understanding from different
12 people. Therefore, the correctness of the language is still necessary. Although Japanese
13 people communicate with Arab people, or Indian people communicate with Korean people
14 (2) although they accommodate each other to get the meaning across (2) I mean () is it
15 necessary to have something in printed form? (2) That's why the correctness of grammar is
16 still essential.

17 [...]

18 M: You guys mentioned about IELTS test and 'accommodation' () Is it possible to include
19 NNES rater in the IELTS test in order to accommodate NNES? () or to reflect the real
20 situation that it's not just British or American English in the reality.

21 T4: Personally, I think that it's a standardized test, so it still expects that the rater should be
22 the English own(er) <she stops and hesitate to use the word 'English owner' (2) uhmmmm
23 not exactly the English owner. I mean (2) ...

24 T5: The standard norms should be preserved.

25 T4: Right. Otherwise, we don't have a measurement tool. It can confirm that (2) for example,
26 if we want to study in the foreign university in somewhere, as much as we get higher band
27 from the IELTS test, it means we have the opportunity to (2) [

28 T1: [Accessible or the ability to
29 complete the program in time (2) something like that.

30 T5: If comparing with some of famous Thai major in Thailand () and if some people use the
31 sentence 'Monks eat rice' or 'Monks sleep', these examples can get the message across,
32 **BUT I can't accept it.** I have to set something up to be a standard to indicate which is right
33 or wrong. (2) It's about the power of language. If there are no IELTS and TOEFL test which
34 are created by British and American people, that means anybody can use English in their
35 own way.

36 T4: I think that language refers to something that untouchable. If we we want it to be
37 touchable, standard norms are essential.

38 T1: It's about the communicative efficiency as well. How long does it take to accommodate
39 your interlocutor? If you have a good English proficiency, just two turns can be understood
40 by each other.

The discussion began with the issue that whether English language can be adapted from the standard English by NNESs. T5 revealed that English can be adapted for the purpose of communicative purposes. Nevertheless, he raised the point that although English can be adapted, the NESs also have the authority regarding this issue as the owner of the language. He used the IELTS exam which is required by the foreign university as an example. T1 also

supported that although ‘accommodation strategy’ is used among NNEs to get the message across, standard English should be presented, particularly in the printed text, to confirm the mutual understanding.

Then, the discussion moved to the second turn when the moderator noticed that the participant intended to compare the use of English language among different settings (between the test and reality). The moderator raised up the question that ‘Is it possible to include NNEs rater in the IELTS test?’ This is to seek the participants’ beliefs towards the ownership of English language. T4 shared her idea that English proficiency test should be rated by the English language owner. However, she shown her hesitation to define the word ‘English language owner’ (line 22-23). Then, T5, who tended to hold strong belief on standard English, inserted his opinion that English native norms should be used as a standard of the IELTS test. It seemed like T5’s opinion had an influence on T4 belief, so she supported that standard English could be used as a tool to measure individuals’ English proficiency (line 25). From line 30-35, T5 displayed his belief regarding the ownership of the language by comparing English and Thai language. He described that if someone uses Thai language with wrong grammar, he could not accept it. Similar to NNEs, he thought that if English is used differently from the standard English, NNEs have the right to justify it. This belief was supported by T1 and T4 (line 36-40) that the English norms are still essential to be a standard as a measurement tool to measure individuals’ English proficiency.

From extract 96, these participants still held the beliefs that English language still be own by NNEs which should not be adapted from the NNEs norms. Particularly, they emphasized that NNEs norms is the standard that can be used to measure individuals’ English proficiency regarding the language assessment perspective. These points of views can reflect that although these participants showed their awareness of pragmatic use in the varieties of Englishes (which relate to ELF conception) from their experiences, they still

believed that standard English is still be essential for the assessment. These point of views from the participants seem to be contradict with ELF perspective describing that language assessment should correspond to the reality of Englishes which are in use worldwide. Jenkins & Leung (2019) described that English proficiency should not be evaluated by relying on standard NES versions because they are irrelevant with the majority of NNEs contexts due to the global spread and contingent diversity of English use.

6.4.1.2 Beliefs on variety of Englishes

When the researcher was going through the transcription, this subtheme emerged from the discussions on both FG1 and FG2. After the participants revealed their beliefs towards standard English, they also to some extent had a discussion on their beliefs towards variety of English. This can lead to the insight of how participants believe of English which is different from standard English.

In FG1, regarding the discussion about variety of Englishes, most of the participants shown their awareness of theses varieties. However, one of the participants viewed English which is different from standard English as errors rather than varieties. He strongly believed that these errors could not be defined as varieties. Extract 97 demonstrated this issue.

Extract 97 FG1

1 T1: Let me go back to what T5 mentioned (2) *I think standard English should be the kind of*
2 *English that everybody wants (.) have the same grammar (.) have the same vocabulary (.) But*
3 *what we do now is not just about British or American English because I believe that students*
4 *in Japan, Libya, or whatever (2) I believe that they don't use just American or English*
5 *teachers to teach English. For example, in India, Indian people also propose that they have*
6 *their own English (.) which is Indian English.*

7 T4: *It's variety.*

8 T1: Right.

9 T5: Personally, I think they mainly have the same structure (.) same vocabulary (.) almost
10 90%. Sometimes local vocabulary was added <to standard English>, but it's not the point.
11 *The point is if Japanese people say 'conversation' <He pronounced 'kong ver sa tion' > or*
12 *Filipino people say 'I want to tell the TRUTH' <he used Indian pronunciation>. Are they*
13 *understandable?*

14 T1, T2, T4: @@@

15 T4: That's Indian English.
 16 T5: Oh really? @@@ I mean their mother tongue has an influence on their English.
 17 T4: Pronunciation.
 18 T2: It's about pronunciation.
 19 T5: Right right. *Although they use the sentence 'He don't ...'*
 20 T3: *(but we understand.*
 21 T5: *(Whichever countries they are*
 22 *from, it's just an error in grammar. It's still be English.*

Although T1 accepted that standard English might be the desire goal for everybody; however, she also shown her awareness of variety Englishes in the present day (line1-6). T4 and T2 seemed to agree with T1's idea. Nevertheless, T5 shared his different perspective regarding this issue. He revealed that although different people from different countries use English differently, the majority of the language structure and vocabulary are still standard English. He also viewed these differences as errors rather than varieties.

In FG2, when the discussion focused on variety of Englishes, the interaction among the participants in the group seemed to be influenced by one teacher participant who held a strong belief on standard English. This led to the tendency of the English preference of this group was more relied on standard English although some of the participants seemed to want to share their open-minded perspectives on variety Englishes issue. The discussion is presented in extract 98.

Extract 98 FG2
 1 [...]
 2 T8: Personally, I think (1) *as an English teacher, I think we should teach whatever which rely*
 3 *on standard English (2) and we should be a standard for our students (2) Try to correctly use*
 4 *standard English as much as we can (1) Sometimes, we may make mistakes in using English*
 5 *(2) like this morning I said 'a compound sentences', **then**, I had to correct myself that it*
 6 *should be 'a **compound sentence**'. Because we are English teachers, students expect that*
 7 *whatever teachers said is correct. (1) Therefore, we should present ourselves with standard*
 8 *English as much as we can.*
 9 M: *What if your students ask 'Why Singaporean also use <English> like this'?*
 10 T8: *Uhm...(2) it depends, doesn't it? Like what Kachru defined. Singaporean have their own*
 11 *dictionary, but it hasn't existed in Thailand. Some people may say that 'Look at Singaporean*
 12 *people. They also use English differently from NESs: **BUT** don't forget that they*

13 <Singaporean people> have their language ownership because it's used as official
 14 language. On the other hand, if Thai students claim that 'You can speak like this <not
 15 standard English> because most of Thai people also speak like this'; **I can't accept it. We**
 16 *don't even have our own English dictionary.*
 17 T10: There is no standard to compare with.
 18 T7: One important thing that we have to be open-minded.
 19 T9: *I agreed with T8 about using standard English, **but** we have to be open-minded in the*
 20 *same time. (2) I mean (1) sometimes new vocabulary is generated (1) we have to be open-*
 21 *minded to learn the new thing. (2) Because language has dynamics, we should be well-*
 22 *prepared to learn and accept new things.*
 23 T6: *However, we have to teach the correct things.*
 24 T9: *That's the standard English as T8 mentioned.*
 25 T8: **RIGHT.**
 26 T6: We can accept the new thing, but we should be able to explain why this happens.

In extract 98, T8 shared that as an English teacher, she tried to use English relying on standard English as much as she can because she thought that an English teacher should be a role model in using corrected English for students. When the moderator tried to get in deep how she perceived variety of Englishes which is different from standard English, she tended to want to indicate that variety of Englishes should be happened in the contexts where the power of ownership was clearly presented. In this discussion, she claimed that Singapore has Singaporean English dictionary while it has not existed in a Thai context. Therefore, English language in a Thai context should still be relied on standard English (line 10-16). This opinion was supported by T10. However, T9 shared her opinion with respecting to T8's opinion, that she agreed with the idea that standard English should be presented by English teachers; nevertheless, English teachers should be open-minded to learn and accept the variety of Englishes because language has its dynamics. Then, T6 suddenly shared that standard English was essentially taught in a Thai ELT context. T6 and T8's responding with this issue seemed to have an influence to T9's idea. She then supported that standard English should be used by English teachers as can be viewed in line 24.

Similar to 6.4.1.1 (teachers' beliefs on standard English), when the researcher tried to elicit how these teacher participants perceive the variety of Englishes comparing with the standard English, these participants showed their awareness on the variety of Englishes (focused on the outer circle; for example, Indian or Singaporean English). Nevertheless, they still relied their preferences of English language on the standard English (relied on the inner circle). This could be the evidences revealing that the ownership of English language among Thai teachers' perspectives still relied on people who use English language in the inner and outer circle where 'good English is accepted' as a 'powerful symbolic resource' which is similar to what was found in Park's (2010) study.

6.4.2 Teachers' awareness of ELF

In this theme, the stimulus question regarding the concept of ELF was used to reflect teacher participants' perceptions towards the concept of ELF, and to investigate to some extent they have ELF awareness. The majority the participants in FG1 had the consensus in this issue that other kinds of English which is different from standard English could be existed but just in the informal context while standard English should be used in the formal context. One of the participant shown his idea which reflected the ELF concept; however, this did not mean he had an ELF awareness. Extract 99 describes the discussion.

Extract 99 FG1

1 M: The group of our students shared their experiences from the international English camp
2 in Indonesia. In this camp, they had to live and do activities with their foreign friends; such as,
3 Filipinos, Indonesian, Vietnamese, Malaysian, etc. *Our student told me that they didn't care*
4 *whether their English, which was used to communicate among these people, was correct or*
5 *not. They thought that if they can understand each other, that was fine for them. What do you*
6 *think about this issue if English in the present day is different from standard English?*
7 T1,T2,T4,T5: *Depends on the context.*
8 T5: *In the academic context where students play role as learners, it must be standard English*
9 *(.) but when the context is the community (2) like in business community (.) in that situation*
10 *we do not have to check their English whether it's correct or not. As long as the message*
11 *isn't misinterpreted, that's OK. (2) It's like people who work in the airport and who work*
12 *in the super market, their English proficiency are different (.) However, if people who work*
13 *in the airport use English outside their workplace, they may use English which is different*
14 *from what they use in the airport. It's about formal and informal context.*

15 T4: Right. It's about settings.
16 T5: It's like my friend. *He is a NES. When he was at the immigration, he used standard*
17 *English. BUT when he was at the beach, English he used is different (.) there were some*
18 *slang words or eroding the sound (.) something like that. It depends on the settings and*
19 *contexts.*

In extract 99, the moderator used a stimulus questions to have the participants discuss about how they think if English used in authentic situation would be different from standard English. The reflection regarding this issue seemed to rely on two key factors which were 'the role of user' and 'context'. In line 8-14, T5 described that if students (English user) are in academic context where they play role as English learner, standard English is the target language. On the other hand, if English is used outside the class in authentic situations where students play role as English users, as long as the intelligibility is reached, whatever kinds of English is accepted. His latter idea tended to be consistent with the ELF concept which focuses on intelligibility rather than forms. This idea seemed to be supported by the other participants in the group that different kinds of English can be used depending on different contexts.

The same question was also used in FG2 discussion to investigate the similarities or differences responses between FG1 and FG2. It was found that the responses of this question in FG2 had the tendency to be similar to what had been found in FG1. Interestingly, two responses in FG2 gave an insight into the reason why they expected standard English was depended on the 'user status'. This can be seen in extract 100.

Extract 100 FG2

1 M: Our EIC <the name of the program> student presented their experience when they attended
2 an international English camp in Indonesia(.) They shared that the only language that they
3 could used to communicate with their foreign friends in the camp was English. *They claimed*
4 *that they didn't care whether their English was correct or not as long as they can*
5 *communicate. (2) Do you think that English which was used by our students in that situation*
6 *is similar or different from what we teach?*
7 T9: *Totally different. Because when they were there <Indonesia>, they used the language in*
8 *the reality. But in Thailand (2) I think it's like simulation situations. Outside the class, they*
9 *RARELY RARELY have an occasion to use English. But when they were there where their*
10 *interlocutors didn't understand Thai language, they had to do anything in order to*

11 *communicate to survive their lives.*
 12 T8: <The disagreement shown from her face>
 13 T6: *We don't have the situation to force them <students> to use English. The only one*
 14 *situation that we can do is when they have an oral exam with us.*
 15 M: In your opinion, do you want your students to use English like in Indonesia or like in the
 16 oral exam?
 17 T6: *Bare in mind, if they are not English major students, I don't care what kind of English*
 18 *they use (2) just please use it. <at this moment, the moderator noticed that T8 shown more*
 19 *disagreement from her countenance> (2) BUT if they are English major students, standard*
 20 *English still be expected from me.*
 21 T8: **RIGHT** <she had a big smile and totally agreed with T6> **I agree with T6.**
 22 M: So do you think English which is used in the class is different from what is used outside
 23 the class?
 24 T8: **It's totally different.** Like you told me about ELF which is happens all the time, BUT
 25 **it can't become a standard.** *I think it depends on the contexts. If you communicate with the*
 26 *sellers in the market, whatever the crazy topics, just speak it out <do not rely on standard*
 27 *English>, BUT if you use the language like this in the conference or academic setting, it's*
 28 *not proper.*
 29 T7: Even though in the business context.
 30 T8: **RIGHT**

In FG2, the moderator tried to stimulate participants to shared their ideas about how they perceived other kinds of English which is different from standard English. From line 7-11, T9 shared that English which was used by her students in the authentic situation was different from what is used in class. She described that when her students used English language with people who shared different L1 with them, they tried to use any resources to reach the communication. This idea was noticeable by the moderator that it is in relation to ELF concept. At the same time, it is noticeable that T9's response seemed to disappoint T8 who has strong belief on standard English. T6 explained that these students were not forced to use English in a Thai context even though in the classroom. The only opportunity they were forced to express the language was in the oral exam. The moderator then further explored their preferences on the different kinds of English. In line 17, T6 revealed that he did not stick to any kinds of English as long as his students express the language. After this response, T8 shown more her disagreement through her countenance. However, T6 further mentioned in line 19-20 that standard English was still expected to be used among English

major students. The latter of T6's response seemed to be totally supported by T8's response and countenance in line 21. She further described that different kinds of English could be used (with the sarcastic sound in line 24-30 as describe by the researcher in extract 95), but it depended on the context.

From extract 99 and 100, this can be summarized that the findings from both FG1 and FG2 regarding the issue that how the participants perceived English, which is different from standard English, went to the same result. They have an implicit awareness of ELF that English can be differently used from standard English. However, it depends on the context and the status of the users. Standard English is still the target language for people who use it in the the formal context as learners, particular in the academic context. This seems to be similar to what Sifakis (2009) claimed that EFL teachers revealed the acceptance of the usefulness of ELF-based skills; however, when focusing on language teaching context, NESs-oriented perspective still be the the main significant of preferences of theses teachers.

6.4.3 Factors affecting ELF awareness in Thai ELT context

After conducting both focus group, this theme emerged from the discussion among teacher participants. The discussion among these participants had a tendency to be emphasized on ELT in a Thai context. The researcher found that the interaction among them revealed several factors influencing the language awareness among Thai students. Therefore, this theme is created to indicate factors affecting ELF awareness in Thai ELT context from teacher participants' perspectives. This theme is divided into two subthemes including 1) factors affecting the lack of ELF awareness and 2) Factors affecting the formation of ELF awareness.

6.4.3.1 Factors affecting the lack of ELF awareness

In FG1, educational language policy seemed to be the main influencing factor that limit the language awareness among learners in Thai ELT context. The participant reported that there were some conflicts between educational language policy and practices. The purpose of ELT in Thailand is for communication, but the educational language policy over focuses on testing. From ELF perspective, the ELF concept focuses on functions rather than forms. Therefore, the researcher claimed that this factor also leads to the lack of ELF awareness in Thai ELT context as well. In extract 101, teacher participants discussed about educational language policy in a Thai context.

Extract 101 FG1

- 1 M: Now, you guys are English lecturers, and you guys also used to be English students (.)
2 From both perspectives, what are the problems in Thai ELT context? Why do most of Thai
3 people can't use English efficiently even though they've learned English since they were
4 young?
5 T2: I think (2) the main problem is (.) **the educational policy is not clear** (.) It focuses too
6 much on the **test test test**. (2) like ONET and ANET test <both are the tests that every student
7 in Thai high schools requires to take before their graduation>. Then, students focus just only
8 want to pass the test, so they focus only on the exam (.) not for communication.
9 T3: As well as in the university level.
10 T2: Right (2) I mean it's not clear (.) not useful.
11 T1: It's like learning to prepare for testing.
12 T2: Right right. That's what I thought.
13 T3: When finish testing (.) it's nothing.
14 T2: **Right. The policy is not clear. When they are going to have a test, they just mug mug**
15 **mug up** (.) **It's too much. When finishing the test, there's nothing. Actually, they <students>**
16 **don't really know why they have to study English. Like T1 said, the policy is not clear (.)**
17 **whether the main purpose of learning English is for communication or for passing the test.**
18 M: What do you think about the present language policy? [
19 T1: [**FAIL** (suddenly respond)
20 T4: I personally view that there're some conflicts in the policy in (2) what we want students
21 to be and what we want. I'm not sure whether I understand it clearly or not (.) As English
22 lecturers, we expect that our students would communicate in English (2) fluently and
23 accurately (.) but our policy is set for testing (2) but there is still a conflict that there is not
24 enough area in our country for students to practice the language (2) I mean just only
25 receptive skills are used (.) they don't have the chance to produce (2) Many conflicts between
26 policy and practice.

In this extract, the moderator asked the participants to share from both English learners and teachers' perspectives why Thai people have low English proficiency. T2 noted that it is because the educational language policy in Thailand over focuses on testing rather than communication. This response was supported by T1 and T3 that learning English in a Thai context seems like learning for testing. T4 reflected that there were some conflicts between the policy and practices. While the aim of learning English is to enable learners to communicate in English, the testing over relies on forms (The ONET and ANET test mentioned in line 6 can measure only grammatical rules and reading skills).

From the responses regarding educational language policy in FG1, this issue was raised to be discussed in FG2. In extract 102, the moderator used the direct question which was influenced by FG1 that how participants in FG2 think about the issue 'English learners in a Thai context focus more on forms rather than functions because of the testing'. All participants spent a few seconds to consider the issue before responding to the question. Meanwhile, T8 as mentioned before that holding strong belief on standard English, seemed to be unhappy with the stimulus question. Then, all the teacher participants excepted T8 shown their agreement from line 8-10. Interestingly, T7's response in line 13 about the conflict between policy and practices is similar to what T4 reported in FG1. This idea was supported by T6 by illustrating some case which policy could not be applied to the practices. He described that 'Only English' policy was used in a Thai context in a few years ago (Only English language can be used in the school every Monday). He further explained that when this policy was applied, the school seemed to be quiet in Monday. He summarized that this was the conflict between policy and practices. Therefore, it can be implied from his response that the policy maker should be the people who are in specific field (line 20-21).

Extract 102 FG2

1 [...]

2 M: As discussed before, in our country () do you think it's about the testing () like *when*

3 *students learning English since they were young until finishing their high school, the only*

4 *opportunity that they use their knowledge about English language is in the testing (2) So, they*
5 *focus more on forms rather than communication?*
6 Every T: (2)(2) <they spent the time to consider the stimulus question>
7 T8: <shown her feeling against the stimulus question through her countenance>
8 T7, T10: *I agree.*
9 T6: *Right right. More focuses on Grammar rather than communication.*
10 T9: *Focuses on grammar (.) Focuses on testing.*
11 M: *Is it about language educational policy? How do you think about our policy?* [@@@
12 T9: [@@@
13 T7: *The policy is fine, but the problem is practices <shook her head like hopeless>*
14 T6: **Right, I agree (.) Do you remember that a few years ago there was a policy that every**
15 **Monday (.) everyone in the school have to use only English in their communication?**
16 T8: **REALLY?? @@@**
17 Every T: @@@
18 T6: **It's a rule (.) everyone must do. Finally, at that time everyone silenced all Monday.**
19 T7: *The problem is policy maker is not the practitioner.*
20 T6: *Actually, the policy maker, who has no specific knowledge in this field, writes the policy.*
21 <sigh>

Extract 101 and 102 are the focus group discussions revealing that there is the confliction between language policy and practices due to the language assessment in a Thai context. The teacher participants in both groups mentioned that English language policy, which aim Thai students to achieve the communicative purposes, contradicts to the English language assessment in a Thai context, which relies on the standard English. This finding is supported by Baker and Jarunthawatchai (2017) claiming that standard English which relies on Anglophone countries are still embedded in the basic education curriculum in Thailand. Even though in the higher education (in a Thai context) seems to focus on the communicative purposes, which relate to ELF concept, this seems to be limited by the assessments practices in Thai EFL context.

Grammar translation teaching method, which has been used in Thai ELT context since from the past, seemed to be considered as influencing factors that limit the use of English language in a Thai context. In extract 103, T3 shared her experience of learning English that she started from learning grammar, and all participants agreed with what she mentioned (line 6-10). Although CLT approach has been used later after 90's as T5

mentioned (line 9-10), grammar translation still be used as traditional teaching method in Thai ELT context. This can be implied from what T3 stated in line 13 that her niece has to study grammar since she was young. After her statement, T3 shown her disagreement of this teaching method by sighing. Extract 103 is as follow.

Extract 103 FG1

- 1 T3 [...]I think that *if I have my own kids, I'll let them learning English by starting from*
- 2 *speaking and listening skills first. When they grow up, they can pick up the grammar.*
- 3 T5: **RIGHT.** Grammar is inside there(.) For example, 'WHAT DID YOU EAT THIS
- 4 MORNING?' 'I ATE APPLE' (2) We don't teach that 'ate' is used with past tense (.) I mean
- 5 it can be acquired automatically.
- 6 T3: *But we didn't study this way <communication> when we were in school.*
- 7 T1, T2, T4: **GRAMMAR**
- 8 T3: *Yes, we started with grammar(.) It's a teaching method.*
- 9 T5: *Right right. In the age of 80-90's, we still used grammar translation. Communicative*
- 10 *approach came later.*
- 11 T2: But one thing that I notice is (.) teachers try to force young kids to study something that
- 12 too difficult for them.
- 13 T3: *My niece studied all present tense since she was at grade 3 <sigh>.*

Apart from educational language policy, learners' motivation which was mentioned by the participants in FG1 seemed to be a significant factor affecting their language practice in a Thai ELT context. As discussed in extract 104, T3 shared that Thai students, who are not English major students, pay less attention in English courses because they they think it is not essential with their fields of study (line 1-3). This seemed to be supported by T4's opinion that because Thailand is the country where English is not used as an official language, Thai people do not have more opportunities to use English. This led to less motivation among students in using English. T4 further explained that because Thailand has traditional ELT which is relied more on learning grammar, any kind of English which is different from native norms seems to be unacceptable (line 5-12). This can be implied as the factor that affects The lack of ELF awareness in Thai ELT context. This discussion is presented in extract 104 as follow.

Extract 104 FG1

- 1 T3: [...] *Thai students who are not majoring in English quite (.) do not pay attention in*
- 2 *English subject (2) because it isn't quite necessary in their field. In their curriculum, 2-3*

3 English courses are required. *They don't feel that it's important (.) just want to pass the test.*

4 T4: Everyone has already mentioned about the policy already. Right? For me, (2) if there is

5 another factor that affect student <English proficiency>, *I think (2) it's about students'*

6 *motivations and attitudes (.) First of all, our country is not the country where English is used*

7 *as official language, so people don't have any chance to use English (.) Because of this,*

8 *people who can use English in a Thai context are looked (2) weird or pretentious (.)*

9 *Something like that. So, this affects students' attitude that (.) they're shy to speak <English>*

10 *or afraid to speak with wrong grammar. Because this is our traditional learning (.) focuses*

11 *on grammar. It makes us believe that if someone speaks English with incorrect grammar,*

12 *others will look down on him/her.*

13 M: This is what you think or students think?

14 T4: I think (.) and I think that students also think like me. Because *every time incorrect*

15 *grammatical English is used, other students laugh to the speaker.*

16 [...]

17 T5: *We don't have motivation.*

18 T4: We don't see its necessity (2) actually we see (2) we might see (.) but we don't have (2)

19 what is it call? (2)

20 T5: It must be something to motivate them (.) For example, Burmese has their own language,

21 but they have soothing that motivate them to use English. (2) OK it's deniable to talk about

22 history (.) colonization, business, investment.

23 T4: *If our students are not in that context (2) for example, if they work at Serm-Thai <local*

24 *shopping department store>, they won't have opportunities to use English.*

25 M: What about when ASEAN community has begun? <English is used as an international

26 language among ASEAN members>

27 T1: ASEAN community has begun already. **So what??** Is there any effect with our students?

28 **NO**, nothing happens. [...]

From extract 103 and 104, traditional teaching method relying on NESs norms in a Thai context and stakeholders' perceptions on English language influencing by the exposure of English among Thai people, seemed to be the factors that limit their awareness of English use in the global scale. This is similar to what Baker and Jarunthawatchai (2017) described that Thai people mostly use English language to communicate with NNESs rather than NESs in their daily-life communication, so standard English which relies on Anglophone models does not reflect the reality use of English in a Thai context.

6.4.3.2 Factors affecting the formation of ELF awareness

From the interaction and discussion among teacher participants in focus groups, these participants revealed their beliefs and practices which were to some extent related to the notion of ELF. In extract 105, the participants in FG1 revealed their experiences, perceptions, and beliefs which could be implied that these factors could lead to the formation of ELF awareness in Thai ELT context. Extract 105 is illustrated as follow.

Extract 105 FG1

1 M: You guys mentioned about educational language policy, (1) locational factor, teaching
2 methods (2) something like that. *You guys have discussed that Thai students are afraid to use*
3 *English because they're afraid that they will use English with incorrect grammar. (2) Is it*
4 *possible (1) to have some English courses that (2) do not rely on grammar <native norms>?*
5 T3: *I did. One of my English course (2) I mean (1) I don't focus in grammar (2) like (2) if they*
6 *<students> can discuss and share their idea in the class, it's OK. The exams are all written*
7 *exams (2) You can't understand it <students' answer sheet>, if you don't open your mind.*
8 T5: *In my case, I teach architect student, engineering students (1) I asked them 'What did you*
9 *do last year?' (1) 'I go travelling with my friend' <his students' responses with incorrect*
10 *grammar>. (2) I understand what they want to answer, **and I believe that in the context,***
11 ***where they have to communicate with NESs, NESs can understand like what I understand.***
12 T2: *Although using word by word, it can be understandable. Like last night (2) I went to*
13 *have dinner with my Thai and NES friends. My Thai friend said <to her NES friend> that*
14 *'You handsome' (1) I mean she used the words she knew to convey the meaning <not rely on*
15 *grammar> (2) I think it depends on the context (1) She <her Thai friend> also used the*
16 *sentence 'You have friend handsome same you?'; then, my NES friend replied that 'Yes'.*
17 *Something like this. It depends on setting and aim of communication (1) which is getting the*
18 *message across. No need for grammar. But between I and Geoff <her NES boyfriend>, I*
19 *always tell him that if he spots my English errors, please tell me (1) because we're English*
20 *lecturers, and we don't want to use incorrect grammar. (2) Because students expect us as a*
21 *role model in using English. (2) However, when I studied my master degree, I learned one*
22 *theory which is called 'accommodation' (2) for example, students who study English with*
23 *us would produce language which we expect, but if they have to work with their NNES*
24 *friends, they might accommodate their friends by (1) decreasing the standard.*
25 T1: *It's like (1) if your interlocutors don't have perfect English, it's OK for you to do the*
26 *same.*
27 T2: *Right. What I've learned is about 'Socio'.*
28 T5: *Socio cultural differences.*

In extract 105, the moderator used the stimulus question that whether it is possible to have some English course which is not rely on NES norms in Thai ELT context. This were responded by T3 that some English course which she taught did not rely on NES norms or

grammar. She focused on the content that her students discussed and shared. Interestingly, she indicated that to understand her students, it is essential to open her mind (line 5-7). This perspective seems to relate with ELF concept that although English used by her students was different from native norms, she focused on the contents rather than forms. This were supported by T5 in line 8-10. He shared his teaching experience that even though his students made an error in the sentence they used, he still understood what his students wanted to communicate. Particularly, he emphasized that he also believes that NNEs could understand what his students wanted to say. This were also supported by T2 from her example that she used for describing that English which is different from standard English can be understandable (line 12-18). She summarized that as long as the message can be conveyed with intelligibility, it means the communication is successful. However, as discussed before in 6.4.3.1 (factors affecting the lack of participants' ELF awareness, extract 77), she personally prefers to used English with correct grammar because it is expected from her students that she should be the role model in using English language as an English teacher (line 18-21). Interestingly, from line 21-24, T2 shared her experience that she has learned what accommodation strategy is from her master degree course. As mentioned that accommodation strategy often used among ELF users, this can be assumed that ELF awareness can be raised by teacher training. This issue can be supported by the previous studies that teacher training about ELF-aware could lead teachers to the understanding what ELF is; furthermore, the more they have understood the validity and function of ELF, the more they readily approve the integration of ELF in their teaching practices (Sifakis, 2014; Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2015; Sifakis, 2019).

6.5 Summary of the chapter

This chapter reports the findings of the study collected via focus group discussion. Two focus groups with five participants in each group were conducted. After the data collection, the qualitative content analysis was applied to analyze the data. The findings are divided

into three main themes including 1) teachers' beliefs on English language education in a Thai context, 2) teachers' awareness of ELF, and 3) factors affecting ELF awareness in Thai ELT context.

The findings from the first theme shows that although teacher participants in both FG1 and FG2 had the awareness on the notion of variety of Englishes, they still held the belief that standard English should be the target language for students in Thai ELT context. They also indicated that standard English should not be adapted from NES norms because standard norms could be used as an indicator to measure individuals' language proficiency. Some of them noted that English which is different from standard should be considered as errors rather than varieties.

Regarding the ELF awareness in the second theme, it is found that the participants in both group seemed to have what the researcher calls 'implicit ELF awareness'. This is because they could tolerate with different English from standard English, but this depends on the contexts and users' status. Particularly, in an academic context where English is used by learners and teachers, standard English is still the proper target language.

The last theme focuses on factors affecting ELF awareness in Thai ELT context from teacher participants' perspectives. The discussion from both groups reveals that the influencing factors that lead to the lack of ELF awareness consists educational language policy, traditional teaching method, and learners' motivation. On the other hand, it is found the factors that seem to lead to the formation of ELF awareness include an open mind of the language users, language experience, knowledge, and training.

Chapter 7

(Mis)match between teachers' beliefs and teachers' practices of English

The purpose of this chapter is to get insight into how teachers' beliefs affect their practices emphasizing on ELF perspective. This chapter is divided into two main sections including: 1) findings from document analysis and 2) findings from the classroom observations. The first section illustrates some course descriptions written in student's handbook. Then, the second section describes the similarities and differences between teachers' practices and the educational policy mentioned in student's handbook.

7.1 Findings from document analysis

In this present study, the researcher focuses to investigate the information from student's handbook to reveal teacher participants' beliefs of English used in a Thai ELT context. Normally, this student's handbook mainly includes the design of the curriculum and description of each module. The curriculum and course descriptions of the modules have been designed and written by the teacher participants themselves. This could be implied that teachers' beliefs of English used in Thai ELT context can be also investigated from this document. After the analysis, the findings were divided into three parts which include 1) course descriptions of the productive skill modules, 2) course description of the receptive skill modules, and 3) course descriptions of the literature modules.

7.1.1 Course descriptions of the productive skill modules

In this section, the researcher intended to present the course description which were written by the participants from the productive skill modules. These modules include the the modules which mainly focus on speaking and writing skills; for instance, English structure and usage, Intermediate English grammar for communication, English listening and speaking for communication, English syntactic analysis, English phonetics, Advanced

English grammar for communication, English expository and argumentative writing, and etc. It was found that the majority of the course descriptions of these modules are explicitly relied on NSE grammatical structures. This is because most of the course descriptions from these modules were mentioned about using correct English grammatical structures. Some of the course descriptions are illustrated as follows:

Extract 106

1 **0105108: English Paragraph Writing**

- 2 **Course description:** Paragraph components and patterns of paragraph development e.g.
3 narration, description, and comparison and contrast; generating and shaping ideas or
4 information to be presented in paragraph *using correct grammatical structures*

Extract 107

1 **0105141: Intermediate English Grammar for Communication**

- 2 **Course description:** Types and functions of words, various phrase, clause, and *sentence*
3 *structures; subject-verb agreement*, principles of using punctuation marks; and use the basic
4 tenses for communication

Extract 108

1 **0105106: English Syntactic Analysis**

- 2 **Course description:** Analysis of English syntactic *structure and errors in using English*
3 *sentences*; causes and categories of structural errors in linguistic perspective

Extract 109

1 **0105343: English Expository and Argumentative Writing**

- 2 **Course description:** Principles and forms of expository and argumentative writing; practices
3 writing expository and argumentative compositions *using correct grammatical structures* and
4 present ideas effectively

These four extract (106-109) presents some of the course descriptions focusing on writing skills. The italic phrases from each extract reveal the teacher participants' beliefs on standard English in Thai ELT context via the course description written by themselves. This can be found from extract 106 (line 4), 108 (line 2-3), and 109 (line 3), that it was mentioned that correct grammatical structures should be presented in these modules. Furthermore, this emphasis was slightly found in extract 107 (line 2-3). Even though in this extract does not specifically mention directly about standard grammatical structure, some of grammatical point (subject-verb agreement in line 3) was raised as a prominent point in

this module. This point was also found in the modules which focus on speaking skills presented in the extracts as follows:

Extract 110

1 **0105105: English Listening and Speaking for Communication**

2 **Course description:** English listening and speaking skills for basic communication; practice
3 in listening to short messages and conversing in various situations *with correct and suitable*
4 *vocabulary, structure, pronunciation and intonation*

Extract 111

1 **0105145: English Phonetics**

2 **Course description:** *English sound system; practice of pronunciation of consonantal and*
3 *vowel sounds; use of phonetic symbols for transcription of English words; common*
4 *pronunciation problems fro Thai learners of English and ways to solve those problems*

Extract 112

1 **0105244: English Listening and Speaking for explanation**

2 **Course description:** Skills in English listening and speaking for communication *using*
3 *appropriate and correct grammatical sentences; giving critical opinions relevant to various*
4 *issues and events*

Extract 110-112 demonstrates some of the course descriptions from the modules which focus on speaking (and listening) skills. It is relevant to the findings from the early section that NSE still has an influence in the language focus in Thai ELT context. This can be evidenced from extract 110 (3-4) that the course description still focusses on using correct vocabulary, structure, pronunciation, and intonation. These issues were also found in extract 111 (line 2-3) and 112 (line 2-3) as well. Correct pronunciation and correct grammatical sentences which conform to NSE were mentioned in these extracts.

From extract 106-112, it can be shortly summarized that the teacher participants designed the ELT modules in a Thai context basing on the conformity to NES norms. From the course descriptions, the participants reveal their preference of the target language relying on the NES norms rather than the communicative purposes (in the productive skill modules). This finding supports what Baker and Jarunthawatchai (2017) claiming that the target language

in Thai ELT context still relies on Anglophone models of English. However, this finding seems different from ELF perspective which focuses on communicative purposes rather than relies on NES norms. According to the previous teachers' beliefs study, this finding in this section reveals that these teacher participants hold the beliefs of language as a process of knowledge transmission focusing on code or a transmission of meaning rather than the beliefs that language is the process of knowledge construction focusing on communicative competence, which is similar to what was found from the study of Richards and Rogers, (2001).

7.1.2 Course descriptions of the receptive skill modules

This section presents various course descriptions of the receptive skill modules which tend to focus on reading and listening skills. These modules include; for instance, English reading for comprehension, English listening and speaking for comprehension, English listening and speaking for explanation, English analytical reading and writing, English listening and speaking for academic report, etc. After the analysis, it was found that the majority of the course descriptions have not been explicitly mentioned what kind of English is the target language of the module. Extract 113-115 are some of the examples that present the course description of these kind of modules.

Extract 113

1 **0105104: English Reading Techniques**

- 2 **Course description:** Basic principles of reading; practice in reading English passages for
3 literal comprehension; paragraph and essay components; identifying main ideas and details
4 in paragraphs; analysis of meaning of English words based on their morphological structures
5 and context clues

Extract 114

1 **0105143: English Reading for Comprehension**

- 2 **Course description:** Principles and techniques of reading for comprehension; reading to
3 capture main ideas and details of various genres of writing; interpretation of meaning of words
4 in different contexts

Extract 115

1 **0105144: English Listening and Speaking for Communication**

- 2 **Course description:** Skills in English listening and speaking communication; essential

Although these course descriptions have not explicitly reveal the target language used in the modules, the researcher found from the materials used in the modules that they seem to rely on standard English. This is because most of the teacher participants chose to use commercial textbooks which were produced by British or American company in Thailand. It was found that although the content of these textbook focuses on receptive skills, each chapter still has the language focus part which focuses on grammatical rules and structures. This is an evidence showing that the preference target language chosen by Thai teacher still relies on standard English. Extract 116 is the content of one of the commercial textbook using in this kind of module. This is similar to the findings from the productive skill modules showing that the target language in Thai ELT context tends to rely on NES norms (See Baker & Jarunthawatchai, 2017). This is the content from the commercial text using in the reading module. It is found that although the main focus of this module focuses on the reading skills, grammatical points are inserted in one part of each chapter (as can be seen from the italic words). Importantly, these grammar focuses were also found in every commercial textbook using in the receptive skill modules.

Extract 116					
Unit chapter	Develop reading skills	Learning target vocabulary	<i>Building on the vocabulary</i>	Using critical thinking	Practicing writing
Chapter 2 Crazy about chocolate Page 2	- Guessing words and meaning from context - Identifying the topic and main idea of a reading Tips - Not stopping for new words - Scanning for proper nouns	afford, average, dusty, figure out, find, get to, hide, however, melt, offer, professional, researcher, share, turn into Tips - Understanding what phrase is - Practicing the challenging words	<i>-Word grammar: Nouns (singular, plural, common, and proper nouns)</i>	-Determining what the text says -Identifying key support details -Understanding and making comparison -Supporting your opinion -Introducing critical thinking	-Writing a paragraph about food Tips -Using your knowledge of parts of speech when you write -Reading your work aloud

Chapter2 Comfort food Page 13	-Understanding text features -Scanning for ideas -Using graphs and charts -Identifying the main idea of the paragraph and the whole passage Tips -Relying on context when you meet new words -Noticing definition in a text	Bored, choice, expect, in general, lonely, mention, natural, nearly, opposite, popular, prepare, rather, specific, take part, turn out	<i>-Word grammar verbs</i>	-Identifying key supporting details -applying information from the text to another context Tips -Figuring out what the main idea is -Seeing relationships between data points in graphs and charts	-Writing a paragraph about how you respond to a situation Tips Talking with a classmate as a prewriting strategy
Chapter3 The love apple Page 23	-Scanning -Understanding cause and effect -Summarizing Tips -Reading for main ideas	Available, accept, area, basic, case, change someone's mind, consider, highly, naturally, no doubt, once, root, seed, serve, tax Tips -Identifying the base form of a verb -Understanding etc.	<i>-Word grammar adjectives</i>	-Recognizing the purpose of the paragraph -Applying the writer's use of language -Supporting your opinion -Using your imagination Tips -Understanding the purpose of a sentence or paragraph	-Writing a paragraph about a food you feel strongly about Tips Rereading your work after taking a break

7.1.3 Course descriptions of the literature modules

Some course descriptions related to literature modules are presented in this section to disclose teacher participants' beliefs about the target language they prefer to present in Thai ELT context. The literature modules include; for instance, English literature for children and young adult, Introduction to literary reading, Contemporary literature in English,

British short stories and novels, American short stories and novels, American drama, etc. These kind of modules can reflect both culture and language the teachers want to present to their students in their classes. After the analysis, only British and American culture were found to be focused in this curriculum. This can be inferred that the target language and culture that the teacher participants want their students to learn through these modules seem to be relied on just on British and American English. Extract 117-120 are some of the course descriptions regarding this point.

Extract 117

1 **0105410: British Short Stories and Novels**

2 **Course description:** *Development of short stories and novels by British authors*; cultural
3 concepts and social circumstances in each period; criticism of literary works with proper
4 criteria

Extract 118

1 **0105411: American Short Stories and Novels**

2 **Course description:** *Development of short stories and novels by American authors*; cultural
3 concepts and social circumstances in each period; criticism of literary works with proper
4 criteria

Extract 119

1 **0105412: British Drama**

2 **Course description:** *Development of British plays*; highly-valued plays *written by British*
3 *playwrights*; analysis and criticism of plays with proper criteria

Extract 120

1 **American Drama**

2 **Course description:** *Development of American plays*; highly-valued plays *written by British*
3 *playwrights*; analysis and criticism of plays with proper criteria

These findings from the literature modules reflect that the preference target language based on language and culture in Thai ELT context still relies on Anglophone English models. This reveals the language beliefs among Thai English teachers still base on a monolithic of English rather than pluralistic forms of English. This point of views seems to be different from ELF perspective which focuses on the intercultural communication (pluralistic forms of English) which aims to achieve the successful communication (Baker, 2016).

7.1.4 The summary of the findings from document analysis

The main document that the researcher used to reveal teacher participants' beliefs about English use in Thai ELT context was student's handbook which include the design of the curriculum and course descriptions of the modules. The researcher divided the modules in the curriculum into three main types including: productive skill modules, receptive skill modules, and literature modules. It was found that NSE which focuses on standard grammatical rules and structures are explicitly mentioned in the productive skill modules. In the receptive skill modules, although the course descriptions do not explicitly reveal the target language focus of the modules, it was found from the teaching materials that conformity to NSE was implicitly existed. Similarly, it was also found from the course descriptions of the literature modules that just only British and American English are the target language that these teacher participants chose to introduce to their students in Thai ELT classes. Although NSE focus was found from three types of these modules, it is essential to observe that how these beliefs (reflect from the course descriptions) affect their practices in the reality. This leads to the findings from the classroom observations which will be presented in the next section.

7.2 Findings from the classroom observations

Classroom observations were conducted to get insight into how teacher participants enact their beliefs (which were explored from semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and document analysis) into practices. According to the findings from the interviews, focus groups, and document analysis, the researcher spotted that the majority of the teacher participants reported that their practices of teaching between English major student class and non-English major student class were different. Therefore, ten classroom observations were conducted with five teacher participants which include both English major student class and non-English major student class. This section is divided into two main sections which are: 1) teachers' practices in English major student classroom and 2) teachers'

practices in non-English major student classroom. Table 7.1 illustrates teacher participants' information.

Table 7.1 Description of the teacher participants in classroom observations

Participant	Gender	Year of teaching English in university	The highest education level	Country of studying aboard
T2	Female	12	Ph.D.	UK
T10	Female	6	Ph.D.	UK
T11	Female	4	M.A	-
T14	Male	14	M.Ed.	USA
T18	Female	7	Ph.D.	UK

* The number used to refer to teacher participants in this table is similar to what the researcher used in the interviews. This is to allow the researcher to compare their beliefs illustrated in chapter 5 with their practices in this chapter.

Qualitative content analysis and NVivo 12 program are also used to analyze the data collected through the classroom observations as same as which were collected through the semi-structured interviews and focus groups. The transcription conventions are used as follow in table 7.2.

Table 7.2 Classroom observations transcription conventions (adapted from Mauranen, 2006; Jenkins, 2007, 2014)

Symbol	Explanation
S	One student
SS	More than one student

T1, T2, T3, etc	Teacher participant number
Bold type	Speaker emphasis
<i>Italics</i>	Italics used by the researcher to identify key points in the extracts
(.)	Pause about 1 second or less
(2)	Pause about 2 second, etc
[...]	Omission of text which is irrelevant
< >	The researcher's additional information to make meaning clear
@@	Laughter
[[Overlapping or interrupted speech
CAPITAL	In a louder voice
' _____ '	Thai language
[1	Error

After going through the data collected from classroom observations, two main themes with each two sub-themes using in analyzing data are presented in table 7.3. The main focus is to describe the similarities and the differences of teachers' practices between English major student and non-English major student classes.

Table 7.3 Coding frame for classroom observations

7.2.1 Teachers' practices in English major student classroom 7.2.1.1 Contents vs Forms 7.2.1.2 ELF pragmatic use
7.2.2 Teachers' practices in non-English major student classroom 7.2.2.1 Contents vs Forms 7.2.1.2 ELF pragmatic use

7.2.1 Teachers' practices in English major student classroom

Five English major student classes with five teacher participants were observed in this study. The purpose of the observation was mainly focused on the use of language teachers used with their students in the class. From ELF perspective, the researcher tried to disclose how teacher participants rely their practices on (contents or forms), and to some extent these participants use ELF pragmatic in their classes.

7.2.1.1 Contents vs Forms (English major classes)

It was noticeable from the observations that teacher participants mostly used English language as a medium of instruction in their English major class. Interestingly, it can not be assured that the focus on English language they used mostly relies on whether contents or forms. Sometimes, these teacher participants made some errors in their use of English language, but they did not correct themselves every time they made as long as it seemed to be understood by their students. However, it was interesting that these participants seemed to focus on forms rather than contents when their students made some errors in the language use. Extract 121 is an example of this point.

Extract 121

- 1 T10: What is your sentence?
- 2 S: I play basketball and badminton with my friend.
- 3 T10: One more time.
- 4 S: I play basketball and badminton with my friend.
- 5 T10: Ok. <turns to ask another student> What is her sentence?
- 6 S: *She play[s] basketball and badminton with her friend.*
- 7 T10: Ok. *What is your sentence?*
- 8 S: (2) I play badminton and go bowling with my friend.
- 9 T10: Ok. <turns to ask another student> What is her sentence?
- 10 S: *She play[s] badminton and ()* [
- 11 [T10: *She plays*
- 12 S: *She play(s)* [
- 13 [T10: *She plays*
- 14 S: *She plays badminton and (1) bowl*
- 15 T10: *And?*
- 16 S: *Bowls*
- 17 T10: *And goes bowling (2)*

18 S: *And goes bowling with her friend.*
 19 T10: Ok. Thank you, and what's your sentence?
 20 S: *I play volleyball and [swimming my friend]*
 21 T10: Again please.
 22 S: *I play volleyball and [swimming with my friend]*
 23 T10: Ok. <turns to ask another student> What is her sentence?
 24 S: *She plays volleyball with her friend and [swimming]. [*
 25 *]* T10: *and she goes swimming. If*
 26 *you want to add 'ing', you have to say 'goes swimming'.*
 27 S: *And she goes swimming.*
 28: Ok. (2) <T goes back to the board> *If you use the sentence that the subject is a singular ()*
 29 *verb would [be] follow[S] by 's' [*
 30 *SS: [S*
 31 T10: *For example: 'It plays football' 'Maybe the dog plays football' or 'He plays football,*
 32 *or she plays football' (2) but if plural subject? 'if the subject is plural?' () I, you, we, they*
 33 *() 'except this one 'I', it's going to be () 'I play football' 'You play football' and 'They play*
 34 *football'.*

In extract 121, T10 illustrated how to say the sentence about playing favorite sports, and asked her students to use this pattern. After the first student use this pattern, T10 turned to another student and asked what sports the first student mentioned. Her main purpose of doing this was to enable her students to use an appropriate subject-verb agreement. In line 6, although one student used the sentence '*She play[s] basketball and badminton with her friend.*' without 's', T10 did not correct this error immediately. However, when the same error point was occurred again by other student in line 10, T10 immediately correct this error point, and asked this student to repeat this point for two times. Later on, subject-verb agreement point was emphasized and explained again from line 28-34.

Another point in extract 121 reveals that T10 seemed to want her students to use the correct form of the languages rather than rely on the communication. This can be seen from line 20 to line 26 that when the same error grammatical point was made by more than one student, T10 tried to explained how to use the correct form for this point. In line 20, when this student used the sentence '*I play volleyball and [swimming my friend]*', T10 tried to

encourage this student to correct herself by asking her to repeat the sentence again. Nevertheless, this student still used an incorrect form in line 22. T2 seemed to let this point pass by saying 'Ok' in line 23, but when another student made this error again in line 24, T10 decided to correct her student and explain how to use the correct form in line 25-26.

From these two illustrations from extract 121, T10's practice seemed to be correlate with her beliefs which was clarified from her interviews from chapter 5. She revealed in her interview (Extract 49) that her perspective of using English was divided into two aspects. In the real life communication, as long as that communication is success, whatever kind of English can be used. However, this perspective can not be applied in the academic context because she believed that English language has its own grammatical rules. Furthermore, as an English teacher, she should be a role model for her students in using standard English specifically in the academic context.

This is to some extents quite similar to T11 and T14 which they performed in their English major classes illustrated in the extract 122 and 123 as follows:

<p>Extract 122</p> <p>1 [...] <T11 asked her students to do the exercise in the book></p> <p>2 T11: <Read the sentence in the exercise> <i>A triathlon</i> (2) </p> <p>3 SS: HAS</p> <p>4 T11: <i>Why 'has'?</i> (2) <T11 went to the board and explained the grammar point> <i>If the</i></p> <p>5 <i>subjects are 'I, you, we, they' () the verb is 'have': If the subjects are 'he, she, it', verb will</i></p> <p>6 <i>be 'has': What about verb to do 'la kah'?</i> <pointed to the first group of subject> <i>This will</i></p> <p>7 <i>be 'do' () <went to another group> This will be 'does': (2) What about verb to be? (2) This</i></p> <p>8 <i>one is 'is' and this one is 'are' () except this one <pointed to subject 'I'> 'am': (2) Ok NEXT,</i></p> <p>9 <i>but it </i></p> <p>10 SS: <i>doesn't has</i></p> <p>11 T11: <i>hasn't 'or' doesn't ? (2) If you want to create a negative sentence, which verb do you</i></p> <p>12 <i>want? (2) 'doesn't': It doesn't have () Why 'have': I just explained that if the subjects are</i></p> <p>13 <i>'he, she, it', verb will be 'has' [...]</i></p>

<p>Extract 123</p> <p>1 T14: <i>Where does your best friend exercise?</i></p> <p>2 S: <i>She [play] badminton at gym</i></p>
--

3 T14: *Ahh...She plays badminton at **the** gym.* (.) Shall we move to the next question? *Do your*
4 *friends* (.) *Why we use 'do' kah?* (.) *because 'friends' means plural* (.) *we use 'do' not 'does':.*
5 (.) *Do your best friends bowl on the weekend?* <turned to another student to answer this
6 question> <no respond from this student, so T14 changed the question> *Do you bowl on*
7 *weekend?*
8 S: No, I don't.
9 T14: <turned to another student> *Do your friend bowl on the weekend?*
10 S: *No, I don't.* [
11 T14: [*No, she does* (.) [
12 S: [*No, she doesn't.*

These are some illustrations that teacher participants seemed to rely on standard English rather than contents which were occurred in all of these five classes. These findings are similar to the beliefs of language used among teacher participants from both semi-structured interviews and focus group showing that even though the participants accepted the different kind of English focusing on the communicative competences, standard English is the main target language they chose to express in Thai academic context, particularly for the English major students. Nevertheless, although these participants tended to encourage their students to use standard English, there were evidences that revealed their implicit ELF pragmatics in their practices in the class. These are presented in the next section.

7.2.1.2 ELF pragmatic use (English major classes)

This section illustrates some of examples that these teacher participants used their pragmatic strategies which are related to ELF pragmatic practices in their classes. In extract 124, T14 asked his student about the weather in the south of Thailand by using error English in line 1 and line 3; however, this student seemed not to understand the question. Therefore, T14 tried to change his question to be more understandable by this student in line 5. The negotiation of the meaning which is used in this extract can be considered as on of ELF pragmatic strategies. Furthermore, the repetition strategy was used line 6 to 8. When this student replied a short answer with an incorrect grammar (I think...rainy), T14 tended to clarify the meaning of this student's answer by repeating his sentence (You think 'It's

rainy?'). Then, this student confirmed his answer by using the same sentence with his teacher to ensure that his message would be understandable by his interlocutor. This interaction allows the researcher to have an insight into the ELF pragmatic used in this class.

Extract 124

- 1 T14: [...] The question is that (.) *what do you think the weather of the south of Thailand?*
- 2 S: *I think (2) @@*
- 3 T14: *Again (.) [What do you think the weather of the south of Thailand?]*
- 4 S: (2)
- 5 T14: *What is the weather in Ranong <one of Thailand city> like?*
- 6 S: *I think (.) rainy*
- 7 T14: *You think 'It's rainy'?*
- 8 S: *Yeah (.) it's rainy.*

Some of ELF pragmatic strategies which are clarifying meaning, repetition, and speed use, were found in extract 125. T14 asked the same question which was asked in extract 124 with other student about the weather in his/her hometown (line1-2). This student seemed to be confused with the question, so she asked T14 to repeat the question again. In line4, T14 tried to hint the meaning of the question by comparing with the former question; moreover, the researcher noticed that T14 lower his speed of his utterance when he wanted to accommodate his student. This can be viewed as follows.

Extract 125

- 1 T14: *Ok. Wanida (.) What do you think about the weather in Pare <one of Thailand city>*
- 2 *province?*
- 3 S: (2) @@ *Again. @@ Teacher, what is the question again?'*
- 4 T14: *The question that I ask you is the same question that I asked your friend. **What do you***
- 5 ***think about the weather in Pare province?***
- 6 S: (.) *I think the weather (2) hot.*
- 7 T14: *Ah (.) the weather is hot.*

The co-construction strategy was found extract 126. It began from line 3 when T14 asked the same question to another student. This student did not reply in the full sentence in line 4 (weather? hot). T14 understood this reply by showing in line 5 (Hot...Ok); however, he encouraged his student to use the complete sentence. The co-construction strategy used was

Extract 127

- 1 T2: *What would you like your foreigner friend to do in Thailand in April?*
- 2 S: (2)
- 3 T2: *Think about April.*
- 4 S: *Ah (◦) 'Songarn festival' [<water splash festival in April in Thailand>*
- 5 *[T2: Oh yes. Go on. [What people do]?*
- 6 S: *Play water [*
- 7 *[Ok. Play water.*

Some of multimodality used which is considered as one of ELF pragmatic strategy was evidenced in the observation. In extract 128, T18 introduced the title of lesson C which is 'I would like to play chess'. She wanted to ensure whether her students understand the word 'chess', so she asked the meaning of this word to her students (line 1). Some of her students replied that 'chess' is 'jigsaw'. However, T18 immediately confirmed the meaning of this word by using L1 because she noticed that that some of her students used their gestures like they were playing chess. This can be considered that ELF pragmatic strategies which are code switching and multimodality were used in this interaction.

Extract 128

- 1 T18: *Lesson C: I would like to play the chess. (2) What do you mean by 'Chess'?*
- 2 SS: *Jigsaw [*
- 3 *[T: 'Chess' because your friends act like they are playing chess'*

Accommodation strategy was also used by T18 in extract 129. It starts from line 1 when she asked what her student wanted to do after school. Although one of her student answer this question with error grammar sentence in line 2, she was willing to understand the meaning of the content as presented in line 3. Furthermore, accommodation strategy was used from line 4 to 9 as well. T18 gave time to her student to think about the answer when her student seemed confused with her question.

Extract 129

- 1 T18: *What would you like to do after school?*
- 2 S: *I would like [come back to home]*
- 3 T18: *Ok. You would like to go back to your home.*
- 4 T18 [...]*What would you like to do after midterm exam?*
- 5 S: *@@ <hesitate to answer>*

6 T18: @ *I'll come back later.*
7 [...] <Then, T18 came back to this student and asked the same question> *What would you*
8 *like to do after midterm exam?*
9 S: *Midterm? Ah (1) I would like to (,) travel.*
10 T14: *To what?*
11 S: *Travel*
12 T: *Ok.*

From extract 124-129, these are some examples showing that even though the participants indicated that standard English is the target language which is appropriately used in Thai ELT context, several pragmatic strategies use, which is related to the ELF notion, were found in their Thai ELT practices. This can be concluded that even though the teacher participants showed their preferences on the standard English, particularly in the ELT context, the implicit ELF awareness was found from their practices through the use of language pragmatic strategies among them.

7.2.2 Teachers' practices in non-English major student classroom

In this section, the researcher intended to present the information collected through the classroom observations from non-English major student classes. Similar to the former section, the same teacher participants were observed during their teaching in five non-English major classes. Two main aspects which are 1) contents vs forms and 2) ELF pragmatic use, are described to compare the similarities and differences of these participants' practices with their English major students.

7.2.2.1 Contents vs Forms (Non-English major classes)

The challenge in analyzing data in this section is the language teacher participants used as the medium of their instruction. It was relevant to what they have reported in their interviews that that they mostly use L1 with non-English major students. Furthermore, interactions among teachers and students seemed to be mostly one-way communication in which these teachers gave the lecture while students just listened to them. However, some

data can be described the participants' beliefs regarding the language contents and forms issue in their practices.

Firstly, the researcher spotted that these participants rarely corrected themselves when they made some errors in using English comparing with when this occurred with English major students. It seemed like these participants felt less stick to the standard English forms when they communicated with non-English major students as long as these students shown some reactions that they understood the meaning. This can be inferred that these teacher participants to some extent relies on contents rather than forms. Extract 130 describes this situation.

Extract 130

- 1 T11: *I don't think so*. Did you <students> [heard] this word before? (.) What do you mean
- 2 by (.) in Thai? What does it mean in Thai **I don't think so**?
- 3 SS: <Mumble>
- 4 T11: OK (.) last two minutes, *I just talked [about] with you that I [have] a problem with the*
- 5 *computer* (2) Do you believe me? (2) <answer this question by herself> **I don't think so** (.)
- 6 *I don't believe you that you can't handle with the problems with the computer*: [...] *If you*
- 7 *say that 'I don't think so' (.), [it's mean] that (2) you just a little bit agree.* <Then, T11
- 8 translated this sentence into Thai>
- 9 SS: <nodded their heads>

From extract 130, T11 tried to explain the meaning of the sentence 'I don't think so'. In line 1, this teacher participant introduced this sentence and then asked her students with the question 'Did you heard this word before?'. Although this sentence was used with English error grammatical rule, T11 did not correct herself and encouraged her students to show their understanding of this sentence (I don't think so) by using L1 in line 2. In line 3, students in the class tried to answer or show their understanding of the meaning of this sentence. However, T11 further explained more by illustration some situation that this sentence can be used in line 4. From line 4-7, she used two errors sentences (line 4 and 7), but she did not correct herself. This is because her students shown their intelligibilities by nodding their heads which is the sign that shows they understood the contents that T11 wanted to convey. This extract is one of the illustrations regarding this code.

Another point that was obviously observed in this section is that the majority of teacher participants mostly emphasized on the pronunciation rather than forms or contents. This was found that both teachers and students did not fix their use of English with only NSE forms. As long as their communication seemed to be intelligible by their interlocutors, both teachers and students tended to accept the language they use. However, although the teachers did not focus more on forms, most of the time it was observed that these teacher participants tried to encourage their students to pronounce the key words correctly. Extract 131 is some of several example regarding this point.

<p>Extract 131</p> <p>1 T2: Ok. I need two volunteers to read aloud. <pointed to one student> <u>I like your hair style</u></p> <p>2 Ok come on. <u>This is the first volunteer</u>:</p> <p>3 SS: @@</p> <p>4 T2: <u>You laugh at your friend () too much</u>. Ok. Come on. You're the second volunteer.</p> <p>5 SS: @@</p> <p>6 T2: <pointed to both student volunteer> Ok. The handsome man [need] to read 'the true of</p> <p>7 Thailand' () about the weather in Thailand, and you <pointed to another volunteer> you have</p> <p>8 to read here <pointed to the other side of the board <the false of Thailand> Ok. We should</p> <p>9 start with () with () lady first < the second chosen volunteer>. <u>Start with no. 1</u>.</p> <p>10 S: <student read the sentences on the board> <i>It's really cold in April.</i> [</p> <p>11 T2: <i>Cold or cool?</i></p> <p>12 S: <i>Oh! () It's really cool in April. [...] Three, [it] fairly cool in April. [...] Six, [it] really</i></p> <p>13 <i>cool in Bangkok.</i></p> <p>14 T: [...] <u>Remember that if there're two 'o', you have to pronounce 'COOL', but if there is</u></p> <p>15 <u>just only one 'o', you have to pronounce 'COLD'.</u></p> <p>16 S: <i>COOL () COLD.</i></p> <p>17 T: <emphasized on the pronunciation of other words></p>

In extract 131, T2 needed two students to read the sentences which were presented on the board. The first student started to read these sentences in line 10. This student pronounced the the word 'cold' instead of 'cool'. Immediately, T2 corrected this student's pronunciation by asking the question 'cool or cold?' in line 11. Then, this student corrected herself and emphasized the correct pronunciation of this word in another sentences. In line 14, T2 changed her language from English into Thai to clarify how to pronounce this word to all

students in the class. Then, all students repeated the correct pronunciation of this word. Nevertheless, in this situation, it was noticeable that although this student used the sentence which was not conform to NES (In line 12, she used the sentence ‘It fairy cool’ and ‘It really cool’ rather than ‘It’s’, T2 let this error pass but further emphasized on the pronunciation of the word ‘cool & cold’ (in line 14-15). This situation was not occurred to just only T2’s class, but there were found in other observations. This could be inferred that ‘word pronunciation’ are more emphasized by these teacher participants in non-English major class rather than English major class.

In short, it can be summarized from extract 130 and 131 that the teacher participants showed their implicit of ELF awareness through their practices (more focus on intelligibility than forms) among non-English major students. This is different from what have found from the English major students that the teachers seemed to emphasize their use of English relying on standard English. This finding is similar to what the researcher found from the semi-structured interviews and focus groups that the teacher participants believed that English language can be used differently from standard English for the communicative purposes; nevertheless, the conformity to NES norms should be emphasized depending on the contexts with different users. In Thai ELT context, when teachers interacted with English major students, they tried as much as possible to conform to standard English as the role model for their English major students. On the other hand, when they interacted with non-English major students, the conformity to standard English seemed to be less emphasized comparing with the communicative purposes.

7.2.2.2 ELF pragmatic use (Non-English major class)

As it was mentioned earlier that teacher participants mostly used Thai language as a medium of instruction in their non-English major classes, there were few evidences that show these participants’ ELF pragmatic use. However, some of their ELF pragmatic use found from the observations were mostly found from the beginning of the class when these

teacher participants wanted to greet and lead their students into the lesson by using English. Extract 132 presents some of ELF pragmatic use among T11 and non-English major students.

Extract 132

1 T11: *What did you do on the weekend?*

2 S: *I [go] to Dream World <the theme park in Thailand>.*

3 T11: *Dream World () Where is Dream World () situated in?*

4 S: *Prathumthanee <the name of the city in Thailand>*

5 [...]

6 T11: *And how about you Jubjib? What did you do?*

7 S: *Part time job () and [*

8 T11: *[I see, you [do] a part time job and?*

9 S: *And practice my script.*

10 T11: *Ok. What about you?*

11 S: *[Stay] at home [*

12 T11: *[What else? Did the house work? 'cleaning or laundry'*

13 S: *Yes, [wash] my clothe[s].*

14 T11: *Ah () You washed your clothes. And what about you Too?*

15 S: *[go] to Nakornsachasima and Buriram.*

16 T11: *Ah () You [have been] to Nakornsachasima and Buriram.*

17 [...]

18 T11: *And what about you Krit?*

19 S: *I (2) [play telephone]*

20 T11: ***Play telephone.*** *'What do you mean?'*

21 S: *<acted as he was using his cellphone>*

22 T11: *Ah () You play the telephone () 'throwing it around?' @@ (2) You mean () you [log*

23 *on] Facebook and Line?*

24 S: *Yes.*

25 T11: *Ok.*

Extract 132 starts from line 1 that T11 used the question 'What did you do on the weekend?' to start her class. The first chosen student replied to this question with short phase, 'Go to Dream World'. Although this student used the incomplete sentence with incorrect tense (used 'go' instead of 'went'), T11 seemed to understand what this student want to communicate and let this error pass by asking the next question to her. This ELF pragmatic strategy was applied to another communication in line 6-11. In line 6, T11 asked the same question to another student, and she replied by using short phase with incorrect tense. T11

tended to understand and accepted this answer. Not only incorrect grammatical sentences were used by students, but T11 also used incorrect tense in line 8 as well (used 'do' instead of 'did'). Furthermore, other ELF pragmatic strategies use in the interaction among this teacher and students was found from line 12-16. In line 12, T11 tried to ensure her student's intelligibility of the word 'house work' by using L1 to clarify the meaning. Then, this student seemed to understand the meaning of this word and replied what she did in line 13 with incorrect tense (used 'wash' instead of 'washed'). When T11 spotted this error, she repeated the answer with the correct grammatical rule in line 14. These errors were made by both teachers and students as presented from line 14-16. Clarifying meaning and L1 transferring strategy were used from line 18-25. In line 18 T11 asked the same question (What did you do on the weekend?) to another student, and this student replied in English that 'I play telephone' ('Play telephone' in a Thai context means someone uses his/her cell phone to search on the internet). T11 tried to clarify the meaning of 'play telephone' by using L1, and this student immediately acted as he was using his cell phone in line 21. T11, showed her intelligibility by using some activities which can be used with the cell phone (Line or Facebook) in line 22-23. In summary, several different ELF pragmatic strategies: such as; 'let it pass', 'fluidity rather than fixity', 'L1 transfer', and 'accommodation', were used by both teacher and student participants in this extract.

From the observations through non-English major classes, the researcher found the similarity of these five classes that teacher participants used L1 as a medium of instruction to ensure their students' intelligibility. It was found that all of them followed the commercial textbook part by part by reading the content in the textbook and then translated into L1. This was not only to ensure that their students understood the content of the lesson, but it also implied that one of the most important factor that affect the use of L1 in their class was influenced by testing. Extract 133 is one of the illustrations regarding this point.

Extract 133

1 T2: [...] Sukhothai was **annexed** (.) **annex** 'What does 'annex' mean? (2) It means 'connect
2 to' (.) by Ayudthaya. There were (.) 'remember (.) please remember this point because you
3 guys will see it in the examination: Sukhothai was annexed by Ayudthaya, and there were all
4 together nine kings ruling Sukhothai. [...] How long did Ayudthaya last? How long? (.) This
5 what you guys have to know 9(.) How long?'
6 S: <mumble>
7 T2: Four (.) hundred (.) seventeen (.) years. <Then, T2 translated this sentence into Thai>
8 **Remember this information:** (.) **This what you have to recognize:**' [...]' You have to
9 remember this vocabulary's meaning. (.) **annex** ' **decline** ' **found** ' **historical park** ' [...]
10 <T2 translated the meaning of these vocabulary word by word>

In extract 133, it can be illustrated that L1 was frequently used by T2 not only to ensure that their students to understand the content, but it seems to relate to the assessment process that were spotted in this extract. In line 1, T2 read the sentence in the textbook, and she emphasized the word 'annex' which seemed to be one of the keywords of this paragraph. Then, she switched her language into L1 to make sure that her students knew the meaning of this vocabulary. This point was found in line 8-9 that T2 used L1 to clarify the meaning of the other vocabulary. More interestingly, it can be inferred from this extract that teacher participants in the observations tended to use L1 to emphasize the important points which were related to the examination. These were found from line 2-4 and 7-8. T2 not only asked her students to memorize the meaning of the word important vocabulary, but she also highlighted on the information that these students needed to know to prepare for their exam. From the researcher's point of view, testing is one of the most important factors that influence these teacher participants' practices to use code-switching strategy.

Focusing on the ELF pragmatic strategies used of the teacher participants among non-English major students, it was found that these participants seemed to rely their practices of English used on the intelligibility rather than fixing to NSE norms showing their implicit of ELF awareness. Nevertheless, the conformity to NSE norms still be found in these non-English major class which mainly was influenced by the testing. In conclusion, even though the teacher participants did not more focus on the grammatical rules relying on the standard English when they interact with non-English major students, the language assessment in

Thai ELT context relying on standard English appears to be the main significant factor which leads both Thai teachers and students to fix with the NSE norms.

7.2.3 Summary of the findings from classroom observations

There were some similarities and differences between teachers' beliefs and their practices found from both English major and non-English major classes. The majority of these teacher participants show their consistency between their beliefs and practices in English major classes. The example could be seen from T10, 11, and 14, in which they reported that non-conformity of standard English can be accepted in real-life communication; however, standard English should be presented in an academic context, specifically when they play role as an English teacher. Although these teacher participants tended to encourage English major students to use NSE, it was found that these teachers seemed to have what the researcher call 'implicit ELF awareness' through their pragmatic use. Several ELF pragmatic strategies found; for instance, repetition, meaning negotiation, accommodation, code-switching, and so on, were used by both teachers and students in the English major classes.

On the other hand, it seemed that, in non-English major classes, the conformity of standard English seemed to be less than what the same teachers practiced in English major classes. As long as the communication by using English seemed comprehensible by both teachers and students, contents tended to be more focused than forms. Although, in non-English major class, the focus of the language used did not rely on forms when comparing with contents, pronunciation was found that frequently emphasized by the teacher participants. Furthermore, it was found that L1 use, which was frequently used to clarify the meaning of the contents and vocabulary, was influenced by the testing.

Chapter 8

Conclusion

The purpose of the present study is to investigate Thai English teachers' beliefs of English language in the ELF context. Qualitative research with four research instruments including; semi-structured interviews, focus groups, documents analysis, and classroom observations, was employed to conduct the study. Then, content analysis was used to analyze the data. In this chapter, the researcher aims to summarize the findings of the study which are divided into four main sections. The first section focuses on the responses to the research questions. Then, Thai teachers' beliefs of the integration of ELF notion in Thai ELT context is discussed in the second section. Implications and contributions of the study are delineated in the third section, and the final section describes the limitations and suggestions for further studies.

8.1 Responses to the research questions

The purpose of this section is to clarify and discuss about Thai teachers' language beliefs, ELF perceptions, and their multilingual awareness. This section is divided into three main sections. The first section discloses Thai university English teachers' beliefs of English language which is used in different contexts. Then, the second section delineates these teachers' awareness of ELF. The last section illustrates factors that affect their ELF awareness. All the findings from semi-structured interviews, focus groups, document analysis, and classroom observations, are described and discussed to answer three research questions in this present study including;

1. RQ1: What are Thai university English teachers' beliefs of English language?
2. RQ2: To what extent do Thai university English teachers have an ELF awareness?
3. RQ3: What factors are contributing to the formation or the lack of their ELF awareness under a multilingualism framework?

8.1.1 Thai university English teachers' beliefs of English language (RQ1)

This section mainly focuses on Thai university English teachers' beliefs of English language. This section is divided into two main sections which are; 1) Thai English teachers' beliefs of English language used in general, and 2) Thai English teachers' beliefs of English language used in Thai ELT context.

8.1.1.1 Thai English teachers' beliefs of English language used in general

From the data analysis, the researcher intended to clarify teacher participants' beliefs of English language used in their daily-life communication. The data from the findings were divided into two main perspectives which include the participants' beliefs of standard English and their beliefs of the kinds of English which are different from standard English.

It was found from this present study that the target English language preferred by these participants mostly relies on standard English. This finding relates to what Jenkins (2000, 2007,) and Jenkins, Cogo, and Dewey (2011) that non-native English teachers seem generally prefer to achieve the use of English like native speaker which is the standard English. Although these participants preferred to have their English like native speaker, they revealed the acceptance of the notion variety Englishes that are used in real-life communication. Several evidences were found from the interviews and focus groups that these participants accepted that the different kinds of English can be used in the real-life communication from their experiences; however, standard English is the still be the desire goal for them. This was influenced from their English learning experiences which mainly relied on standard English, and their professional status (as English teachers) which is expected to be the role model for students. These (learning experiences and professional status) lead them to the target language that they preferred to use and reach. This could be seen from both the semi-structure interviews and focus groups. Extract 4 and extract 19 are

the examples from the interview, while extract 100 is the example from focus groups.

Extract 4

- 1 R: Do you have the role model of English language in your mind?
- 2 T11: Deep in my mind, *honestly, I want to use English like NESs*(.) Actually, I know that at
- 3 the present day, the concept of world Englishes is widely accepted which means that the focus
- 4 is not on (.) different accent, but the on the intelligibility. However, *as an English teacher, I*
- 5 *want to produce the most perfect English language which is nearly used by NESs as much as*
- 6 *I can.*

Extract 19

- 1 R: In your opinion, if someone use the sentence 'He don't...' is it right or wrong?
- 2 T13: (.) For me now, I think it is a variety of English (.) *I mean you can use it <English> in*
- 3 *anyway as long as your communicative purpose successes. **That's enough.***
- 4 R: What do you think about broken English?
- 5 T13: It depends on what point we focus on (2) *If we focus on **traditional way of teaching***
- 6 ***grammar**, it <he don't...> is broken **for sure.** However, if we focus on communicative*
- 7 *purpose, **FOR ME** (.) broken means **incomprehensible sentence.** Although you use 100%*
- 8 *perfectly grammar, if I cannot understand it (2) this is called 'BROKEN'*

Extract 100 FG2

- 1 M: Our EIC <the name of the program> student presented their experience when they attended
- 2 an international English camp in Indonesia.(.) They shared that the only language that they
- 3 could used to communicate with their foreign friends in the camp was English. *They claimed*
- 4 *that they didn't care whether their English was correct or not as long as they can*
- 5 *communicate. (2) Do you think that English which was used by our students in that situation*
- 6 *is similar or different from what we teach?*
- 7 T9: *Totally different. Because when they were there <Indonesia>, they used the language in*
- 8 *the reality. But in Thailand (2) I think it's like simulation situations. Outside the class, they*
- 9 *RARELY RARELY have an occasion to use English. But when they were there where their*
- 10 *interlocutors didn't understand Thai language, they had to anything in order to communicate*
- 11 *to survive their lives.*
- 12 T8: <The disagreement shown from her face>
- 13 T6: *We don't have the situation to force them <students> to use English. The only one*
- 14 *situation that we can do is when they have an oral exam with us.*
- 15 M: In your opinion, do you want your students to use English like in Indonesia or like in the
- 16 oral exam?
- 17 T6: *Bare in mind, if they are not English major students, I don't care what kind of English*
- 18 *they use (2) just please use it. <at this moment, the moderator noticed that T8 shown more*
- 19 *disagreement from her countenance> (2) BUT if they are English major students, standard*
- 20 *English still be expected from me.*

21 T8: **RIGHT** <she had a big smile and totally agreed with T6> **I agree with T6.**
22 M: So do you think English which is used in the class is different from what is used outside
23 the class?
24 T8: **It's totally different.** Like you told me about ELF which is happens all the time, BUT
25 **it can't become a standard.** *I think it depends on the contexts. If you communicate with the*
26 *sellers in the market, whatever the crazy topics, just speak it out <do not rely on standard*
27 *English>, BUT if you use the language like this in the conference or academic setting, it's*
28 *not proper.*
29 T7: Even though in the business context.
30 T8: **RIGHT**

The evidences showing that the target language the participant prefer relying on ENL were also found in the document analysis. Most of the course descriptions written by teacher participants emphasize on the use of standard English which conform to NES norms. Extract 106 and extract 112 are the examples from document analysis.

Extract 106

1 **0105108: English Paragraph Writing**

2 **Course description:** Paragraph components and patterns of paragraph development e.g.
3 narration, description, and comparison and contrast; generating and shaping ideas or
4 information to be presented 4 in paragraph *using correct grammatical structures*

Extract 112

1 **0105244: English Listening and Speaking for explanation**

2 **Course description:** Skills in English listening and speaking for communication *using*
3 *appropriate and correct grammatical sentences*; giving critical opinions relevant to various
4 issues and events

However, few of the participants clarified that they did not have the role model of English language: as long as communication can be reached, different kinds of English can be used. Just only one participant that shown the strong belief on standard English was found. This participant shown her understanding of the notion of variety of Englishes; however, from her experience and attitude, she believed that English language should not be differentiated

or adapted from standard English. In conclusion, the target English language that Thai English teachers in this present study desire to use mostly relies on standard English which was influenced from their learning experiences, media and materials exposure, and their professional status.

In terms of the ownership of English language, the majority of the participants held the belief that English language belongs to anyone who uses it. The question about to whom English language belong to was raised in 1994 by Widdowson. Widdowson (1994) argued that NNEs are not the linguistic second-class citizens, which means they can use, shape, and own their English in their own right. The findings from the participants in this study illustrated that most of the participants accepted that English language was originated from UK or America (NESs); however, it does not belong to to any specific country. It belongs to anyone who uses this language because English language becomes an international language that is used worldwide. These beliefs lead to the participants' perceptions that they viewed English language as a tool of communication which can be adapted from NSE for the desire goal of successful communication. As long as the communication reaches the goal of the communication, the English language can be used or adapted to reach that point. These findings from Thai English language teachers are correlated with the previous studies (Widdowson, 1994; Cogo, 2008; Seidlholfer, 2009) which claimed that English language is owned by the users.

The same findings which showed that the majority of the participants believed that English language can be differently used from NSE as long as the purposes of the communication can be reached. From ELF perspective, Jenkins (2006) claimed that the same linguistic features might be considered as errors comparing with ENL, but these errors can be viewed as creativity in an ELF perspective. This concept of 'non-conformity to NSE were found among the participants in this study. As long as the communicative purpose reaches the goal, they believed that English language can be shaped, adjusted, and adapted from the conformity to NSE. These findings are correlated to what Wang (2013) discussed that non-

conformity to NSE can be considered as functionally motivated, social practice, and guarantee for the success of communication.

Focusing on teacher participants' attitudes towards the notion of pluralistic Englishes, all participants showed their positive attitudes and acceptances towards Englishes; only one participant held the strong belief on standard English. However, the acceptance on using different kind of standard English among these participants are divided into three categories. The first group of the participant reveal that they accepted the notion of Englishes, but their preference of English language still relied on standard English, particularly in the educational context. The second group of the participants not only accepted the notion of Englishes, they reported that they were willing to include the notion of Englishes in their class, but several external factors (for instance; time constraint, teaching materials, students and stakeholders' perceptions, and etc.) limited these attitudes into their practices. The last group of the participants shared that whenever they have any opportunity, they were willing to present the notion of Englishes in their class.

Regarding the concept from ELF perspective that ELF is conceptualized as the fluidity of English which can be adapted depending on different contexts, the participants held three main different beliefs regarding this issue. The first group of the participant held the strong belief on NSE that English should be fixed with NSE norms. They mentioned that if English is used differently from NSE norms, it could affect the intelligibility. On the other hand, several participants held the belief that English can be differently used and adapted from NSE as long as the successful communication can be reached. This group of participants focuses on communicative purpose rather than forms. Interestingly, the last group of the participants held the same belief of the second group that English language has a fluidity for the communicative purpose, but NSE still be relied on when English is used in the educational context.

This present study also found that the participants believed that culture have an influential effect on their use of English. They reported that different cultures which are not familiar

with them or their students would affect their intelligibility of using English. This notion is related to ELF concept which focuses on the relationship between language and culture as Baker (2017) claimed that successful users of English need to be equipped to negotiate with cultural diversity.

Regarding the first research question, ‘what are Thai university teachers’ beliefs of English?’, teacher participants in this study revealed their beliefs into two main perspectives. Firstly, although most of them preferred to use English language like NESs, they mostly believed that English language can be differently used and adapted from ENL norms as long as the successful communication can be reached. In other words, the non-conformity to ENL beliefs were found among these participants; particularly, from their real-life communication experiences. This finding can be explained that non-conformity to ENL can be used for social practice, functionally motivated, and guarantee for the successful communication (Wang, 2013), which is related to ELF notion. On the other hands, these participants have different belief towards English language when it is used in the academic context due to several factors (i.e. professional status, educational experiences, stake holders’ expectations, and so on), which will be discussed in the next section. This can be concluded that the participants accepted the different kinds of English use for the communicative purposes, but they seemed to rely their beliefs that NSE is the target language in the academic context.

8.1.1.2 Thai English teachers’ beliefs of English language used in ELT context

This section describes teacher participants’ beliefs of English language used in Thai ELT context. Four main focuses of these beliefs relies on teachers’ beliefs of environment, learners, teacher themselves, and subject matter. This is because these are the four commonplaces including in the educational context (Schwab, 1971).

The first part focuses on teachers' beliefs of English language used in Thai ELT context (the environment). It was clearly found from the both semi-structured interviews and focus groups that the majority of the participants believed that standard English should be presented in a Thai ELT context, particularly among English major students. They revealed that although the notion of variety Englishes was accepted by them, the target language in Thai ELT context still be relied on NSE. This is because they believed that the proficiency of communication need to be measured by language accuracy which relies on NSE norms. These participants emphasized that errors or different kinds of English from standard English can be used in the real-life communication context, but NSE should be the target language in Thai ELT context. They showed their beliefs that because it is unpredictable what kind of English from different people in different contexts they have to deal with, NSE is the priority choice to be given to their students. Some of the participants held the strong belief on NSE in the academic context by focusing on the ownership of the language. They described that English norms are still essential to be a standard as a measurement tools to measure individual's English proficiency. Particularly, entrance exams to high school or university still focuses to assess students' knowledge of grammar and lexis of NSE. Therefore, this influence the participants to rely their beliefs on NES especially when dealing with English major students in the class. This finding can be found; for instance, in extract 80 and extract 94.

Extract 80

1 T18: [...]I don't know how to say (2) *cause personally I like NESs and they are the role*
2 *model for me <in using English>, so I want my students do the same as me. I won't teach any*
3 *kind of English <which is different from NSE> like Chinese, Vietnamese, or Singaporean*
4 *accent to them(.) I don't know(.) maybe it is because of my attitude.*
5 R: What do you think if our department employs foreign teachers who are NNEs to teach
6 English for our students?
7 T18: DISAGREE. I totally **disagree** with this *cause our students are English major student,*
8 *they should learn standard English.* [...] I think if we better employ NESs rather than NNEs
9 to teach conversation to our students. The difference between English which is used by NESs
10 and NNEs is not just only an accent. There are some vocabulary or expression
11 which are also different as well. *Our students should be better learnt from NESs cause I*
12 *think if we produce students who use standard English, they can communicate with any*

13 *people from any countries (2) although they are Chinese, Singaporean, Vietnamese, cause*
14 *we have what it is called **Standard** so we can accommodate them.*

Extract 94 (FG1)

1 [...]

2 T4: Actually, it's not all the class teaching grammar. I mean ... (2)

3 T1, T2: It's hidden in every context.

4 T5: Grammar comes with communication.

5 T1: *Language has structures.*

6 T4: *Right. It has structures. But if the question is whether it must be correct all the time? (2)*

7 *They are 'use' and 'usage'. If you use English just for communication (2) If it can reach the*

8 *goal, I'm OK with that. However, if it's used in an official context, grammar is still necessary*

9 *(2) As an **English lecturer**.*

10 M: If we teach students who are not English major and the main purpose of their studying

11 English is just for communication, is it possible to have less focus on grammar?

12 T1: Personally, I can tell that it's impossible because *although they can communicate, the*

13 *efficiency of communication has to be measured by the **accuracy**. (1) So, it comes back to*

14 *language structure again.*

15 T4: *It's touchable. It can be measured the differences among individuals.*

16 T2: It's like when we build the house (1) The house must have house poles. Additionally,

17 when our students graduate, they have to take competitive English exam with others.

18 T3: There are reading and writing skills.

19 T2: We have to teach them how to construct the language.

20 T3: For example, *my former students who graduated already (2) They can communicate*

21 *fluently, but it's unacceptable if they use wrong grammar. This is because they have to write*

22 *(2) for example, business letters or emails (1) sometimes if they use wrong tenses, the meaning*

23 *becomes different. So, for students who study language, grammar is inevitable for them.*

24 T4: I think it depends on the context. *If it is in academic context, I still expect standard*

25 *English.*

26 T2: *It's still questionable how much to teach and learn that can prepare our students with*

25 *variety situations (2) not just British or American English (2) They might have to*

26 *communicate with their Chinese boss (2) First of all, we have to give them <students>*

27 ***standard English**.*

28 T4, T5: Right right.

29 T2: *If they know standard English, they can use non-standard English as well.*

30 T5: I often see Thai people who were raised in UK since they were kids (2) They use the

31 sentence **'You don't like this, isn't it?'** My Thai friend who has intermediate English

32 proficiency also use this as well. (2) It's like black people that they use **'I ain't care'**. The

33 question is which context English is used? If you use it with your friends, it's OK.

34 M: OK

35 T5: *(2) It's unpredictable which context our students have to face, so we have to give them*

36 *standard English first.*

Regarding teachers' beliefs of learners in Thai ELT context, the teacher participants showed their different beliefs of English language used between English and non-English major students. When dealing with English major students, it was found from all data collection tools that they seemed to conform to the NSE norms as much as they can. While dealing with non-English major students, although the conformity to NSE still be found, it seemed to be less than what was found in the English major students group. This is relevant to what Xu (2012) explained that teachers hold different beliefs with learners whom they teach. When they teach English major students, they hold the beliefs that this group of students should conform the NES norms as same as what teachers did when they were English major students. This kind of belief is different from what they believed about English language used when dealing with non-English major students. It was found from the observations that the teacher participants did not rely too much on NES when they taught this group of students. Although the teachers themselves or the students used English language with the non-conformity to NSE, it was acceptable in the class as long as the communication reach the goal. This can be explained according to Yang (1995) that teachers hold different beliefs depending on their expectations of the learners. Nevertheless, as mentioned before that teachers still to some extent conform to the NSE with both English and non-English major students due to the testing. This finding was evidenced form extract 94 mentioned earlier in focus groups and extract 122 (English major classroom observation) and 126 (non-English major classroom observation).

Extract 122 (English major classroom observation)

1 [...] <T11 asked her students to do the exercise in the book>
 2 T11: <Read the sentence in the exercise> *A triathlon* (2) []
 3 [SS: **HAS**
 4 T11: *Why 'has'?* (2) <T11 went to the board and explained the grammar point> *If the*
 5 *subjects are 'I, you, we, they' () the verb is 'have'. If the subjects are 'he, she, it', verb will*
 6 *be 'has'. What about verb to do 'la kah'?* <pointed to the first group of subject> *This will*
 7 *be 'do' () <went to another group> This will be 'does'. (2) What about verb to be? (2) This*
 8 *one is 'is' and this one is 'are' () except this one <pointed to subject 'I'> 'am'. (2) Ok NEXT,*
 9 *but it []*

10 /SS: *doesn't has*
 11 T11: *hasn't 'or' doesn't ? (2) 'If you want to create a negative sentence, which verb do you*
 12 *want? (2) 'doesn't: It doesn't have (.) Why 'have': I just explained that if the subjects are*
 13 *'he, she, it', verb will be 'has' [...]*

Extract 126 (non-English major classroom observation)

1 T14: Where are you from?
 2 S: Udorn <one of Thailand city>
 3 T14: [What do you think the weather in Udorn province?]
 4 S: Weather? (2) hot
 5 T14: Hot (.) Ok. Can you say in in the full sentence? <pointed to the sentence pattern on the
 6 board>
 7 S: Ah (.) I think (.) [weather
 8 /SS: in Udorn
 9 /S: in Udorn is hot
 10 T14: Ok (.) is hot. Are you hot?
 11 SS: @@
 12 T14: @@ Are you hot? this means You are hot <popular> or not (2) it's not about the
 13 weather
 14 SS: @@

Teachers' beliefs of learning affect everything they do in the classroom (Williams & Burden, 1997). The researcher found that the majority of the participant held different beliefs of learning English depending on the different group of learners. This finding is familiar with what the researcher found from the earlier section about teachers' beliefs towards learners. The majority of the teacher participants hold the beliefs that English learning should be more rely on; a quantitative increase in knowledge, memorization, and the acquisition of facts, which are categorized as reproductive approach, when they teach English major students. Therefore, direct transmission instruction which focuses on NSE norms were found from the English major students' classes. On the other hand, when dealing with non-English major students, teacher participants seemed to held their beliefs of English learning on constructivist instruction, which mainly focuses on; facilitating learners' inquiry, and giving learners the opportunities to develop solutions to problems by themselves. These findings resemble to what were found in the teachers' beliefs towards

learners' section. This can be explained that teachers' beliefs of English learning are different depending on the expectation of the group of learners and the sociocultural context.

In terms of teachers' beliefs of themselves, it was found that most of them agreed that they should use standard English as much as they can because of their professional status. They claimed that English teacher should be the role model for students in using correct English which relies on NSE. Although some of them accepted that English language has its own dynamics and can be adapted depending on different contexts, they still believed that English language should still be relied on standard English. It was also found that these beliefs about teachers' themselves affect their practices in their classes. This is related to what Xu (2012) discussed that teachers' self beliefs determine their teaching behaviors. It was found from the classroom observations that these teacher participants tried to correct themselves and their students when they produced some errors. These were found from both English major and non-English major classes. However, the participants seemed to less correct themselves in the non-English major class comparing with English major class, which is similar to what were found from their their beliefs about learners and learning. Extract 77, 98, and 129 are the evidences of this finding from semi-structure interviews, focus groups, and classroom observation respectively.

Extract 77

- 1 R: Do you have a role model of English language?
- 2 T11: *Honestly, I want to use English like NESs. (.) Actually, I know that the concept of world*
- 3 *Englishes is widely accepted in the present day (.) I mean it doesn't focus much on the accent*
- 4 *(.) just deliver the message to the receiver. However, as I work as an English lecturer, I want*
- 5 *have perfect English or close to NSE as much as I can.*

Extract 98 FG2

1 [...]
2 T8: Personally, I think (.) *as an English teacher, I think we should teach whatever which rely*
3 *on standard English (2) and we should be a standard for our students (2) Try to correctly use*
4 *standard English as much as we can (.) Sometimes, we may make mistakes in using English*
5 *(2) like this morning I said 'a compound sentences', **then**, I had to correct myself that it*
6 *should be 'a **compound sentence**'. Because we are English teachers, students expect that*
7 *whatever teachers said is correct. (.) Therefore, we should present ourselves with standard*
8 *English as much as we can.*
9 M: *What if your students ask 'Why Singaporean also use <English> like this?'*
10 T8: *Uhm... (2) it depends, doesn't it? Like what Kachru defined. Singaporean have their own*
11 *dictionary, but it hasn't existed in Thailand. Some people may say that 'Look at Singaporean*
12 *people. They also use English differently from NESs: **BUT** don't forget that they*
13 *<Singaporean people> have their language ownership because it's used as official*
14 *language. On the other hand, if Thai students claim that 'You can speak like this <not*
15 *standard English> because most of Thai people also speak like this', **I can't accept it. We***
16 *don't even have our own English dictionary.*
17 T10: *There is no standard to compare with.*
18 T7: *One important thing that we have to be open-minded.*
19 T9: *I agreed with T8 about using standard English, **but** we have to be open-minded in the*
20 *same time. (2) I mean (.) sometimes new vocabulary is generated (.) we have to be open-*
21 *minded to learn the new thing. (2) Because language has dynamics, we should be well-*
22 *prepared to learn and accept new things.*
23 T6: *However, we have to teach the correct things.*
24 T9: *That's the standard English as T8 mentioned.*
25 T8: **RIGHT.**
26 T6: *We can accept the new thing, but we should be able to explain why this happens.*

Extract 129

1 T18: *What would you like to do after school?*
2 S: *I would like [come back to home]*
3 T18: *Ok. You would like to go back to your home.*
4 T18 [...]: *What would you like to do after midterm exam?*
5 S: @@ *<hesitate to answer>*
6 T18: @ *I'll come back later.*
7 [...]: *<Then, T18 came back to this student and asked the same question> What would you*
8 *like to do after midterm exam?*
9 S: *Midterm? Ah (1) I would like to (.) travel.*
10 T14: *To what?*
11 S: *Travel*
12 T: *Ok.*

Regarding teachers' beliefs of language which is considered as subject matter aspect, teacher participants held both structural and functional beliefs of language depending on different contexts. It was found from findings that most of them held the functional beliefs of English language when they use English in their daily-life communication. This kind of belief mainly focuses on the semantic and communicative aspects (Miramontes et al., 2012; Ricards & Rogers, 2001). However, they seemed to hold the structural beliefs which mainly focuses on grammatical rules and lexical items rather than communication in ELT context. As Borg (2003) claimed that teachers' beliefs on language do generate their individual teaching methodologies; therefore, this structural beliefs of English language affect their practices in their classes which most emphasized on NSE. Apart from functional and structural beliefs of language, a few of the participants also appeared to hold the interactional belief as well. Regarding this kind of belief, Morton (2012) described that language is seen as a set of meaning making resources when people engage in the communication. Therefore, multiform and multilingual resources are used in different ways in different situations.

8.1.2 Thai English teachers' ELF awareness (RQ2)

The researcher applied the notion of ELF characteristic which proposed by Cogo & House (2017) and Ranta (2017), that ELF can be characterized by using the pragmatics of ELF and grammar in ELF. Dewey (2015) also claimed that ELF is the use of pragmatic strategies among the language users to reach their successful communication. Four main aspects of pragmatic strategies use by ELF users have been theorized as major characteristics of ELF including: negotiation of meaning, use of interactional elements, idiomatic expression, and multilingual resources (Jenkins, 2000; Cogo & House, 2017). These pragmatic strategies used were found among the teacher participants in this study from both their interviews and the observations. Negotiation of meaning strategy was the ELF pragmatic strategy that was mostly used from these participants. These strategies were; for example, repetition,

accommodation, co-construction, let it pass, etc. Extract 58 is one of the findings that revealed the use of ELF pragmatic strategies among these participants.

Extract 58

1 R: Is there any situation that you didn't understand your interlocutors <when using English>?
2 T13: For me? (2) Uhm (.) No, never. I mean (.) because *we tried to understand each other. It*
3 *was the communicative process (.) like (.) sometimes I wrote (.) sometimes I used body*
4 *language. Or, I tried to use (.) I mean (.) short words instead of long sentences.*
5 R: Do you have any friends <NNES friends> who have English proficiency lower than you?
6 T13: Yes yes.
7 R: When you communicate with them, do you have to adjust your English?
8 T13: Yes, absolutely. *I try to adjust my speed (.) speak slowly. Additionally, I repeat what*
9 *they said <to confirm his understanding>. It might because of different pronunciation. For* 10
11 *example, sometimes I didn't understand my Japanese friend, so I tried to focus on the context*
12 *and repeat what he/she said (.) to confirm that this was what he/she wanted to say. Sometimes*
13 *when I talked to my friends and I didn't understand (2), I chose to be silent and let it pass.*

These ELF pragmatic strategies were used by these participants in their practices in their class as well. Extract 124 illustrates T14 tried to accommodate his student by changing his question to ensure his student's intelligibility (line1-5). Although the student answered the question by using short answer, T14 repeated the answer by using the complete sentence to clarify his own understanding (line6-8).

Extract 124

1 T14: [...] The question is that (.) ***what do you think the weather of the south of Thailand?***
2 S: *I think (2) @@*
3 T14: *Again (.) [What do you think the weather of the south of Thailand?]*
4 S: (2)
5 T14: *What is the weather in Ranong <one of Thailand city> like?*
6 S: *I think (.) rainy*
7 T14: *You think 'It's rainy'?*
8 S: *Yeah (.) it's rainy.*

Apart from negotiation meaning strategies, multilingual resources and code mixing were used by the participants. Few of them reported that they mixed Thai language with English language to create the sodality atmosphere with their students. Similarly, they illustrated that sometimes even NESs need to adjust their language to create this sodality with

different interlocutors. According to the use of these pragmatic strategies among teacher participants, it can be inferred that these teachers to some extent have an ELF awareness.

Extract 64

- 1 R: What language do you usually use in your class?
- 2 T20: If they English major students, I use English.
- 3 R: *Any code-switching into Thai?*
- 4 T20: (◊) Sometimes (◊) *Mostly, I switch into Thai language when I want to use Thai slang word*
- 5 *to create positive atmosphere in the class. For example, the word ‘๓’: (2) like...last week, it*
- 6 *was the first week of the semester, so just few of students came to class. A week later, I talked*
- 7 *to my students that ‘I was ๓’ <I was abandoned>.*
- 8 R: *You mean you mix Thai with English?*
- 9 T20: *Right.*
- 10 R: Do you think that NESs can understand this expression <I was ๓>?
- 11 T20: I don't think so because they don't know the meaning of this word <๓>.
- 12 R: Do you think they can understand if you explain to them?
- 13 T20: *Maybe.*
- 14 R: Do you think one day this expression ‘I was ๓’ can be used widely in the international
- 15 context?
- 16 T20: *Actually, the word ‘๓’ is widely used among Thai people. But in the international*
- 17 *level (◊) I think it's too far. I used to see (◊) in this case (◊) NES who has stayed in Thailand*
- 18 *for a long time and has a Thai wife, he told me about the way Thai people use the number*
- 19 *‘555’ instead of laughing <ha ha ha>. When he often saw it, he thought that this is an*
- 20 *international language that he has never understood. But actually, it's Thai style.*

In terms of the the grammar in ELF, ELF cannot be characterized by focusing on the conformity of NSE norms because ELF is not a fixed code (Jenkins, 2000; Ranta, 2017). Hynninen and Solin (2017) further explained that norms in ELF are understood as socially based rather than as something stable. This means norms in ELF arise from the negotiation of norms among ELF users in the particular context. Therefore, this present study focuses on two main themes relating to ELF users' perceptions; whether they they rely their use of English on contents or forms, and whether they consider themselves as English users or learners. These perceptions can lead to the awareness of ELF among teacher participants.

From the findings, the participants clearly reported that they focus on the contents rather than forms when they use English in their communication. They revealed that they deeply

believed that English is just a tool of communication. This is similar to what Mauranen (2012) described about ELF that as long as the successful communication can be reached, whatever seems to work in the interaction can be acceptable. However, these findings were found on the spoken English rather than the written English as the participants mentioned earlier that non-standard English can be used depending on different contexts and interlocutors. The majority of the participants viewed English language as a tool of communication, and it can be adapted to reach the goal of communication in real-life communication. On the other hand, they seemed to view English language as a fixed code with the conformity to NSE when they use it with the role of English language teachers in the ELT context. This can be explained by the study of Hynninen and Solin (2017) that norms in ELF are not stable; they depend on what contexts they are arise in, and by whom they are promoted. Extract 66 and extract 68 are the illustrations that describe this issue.

Extract 66

- 1 R: Do you have any pressure when you communicate with NESs?
- 2 T5: No, because *I always view that language learning is something that we have to try to do*
- 3 *the new things. It can be right or wrong. I always tell my students (1) don't expect to use the*
- 4 *correct English all the time (1) Just try to use it frequently because the main purpose is to*
- 5 *communicate. It's not a grammatical test when communicate in the real-life situation.*
- 6 R: *Have you ever correct the students?*
- 7 T5: *I've rarely done it because it decreases students' confidences and their self-esteem (2) I*
- 8 *correct them just only the really important points. Personally, I focus more on pragmatics (1)*
- 9 *how to reach the goal of communication by unnecessarily using 100% correct grammatical*
- 10 *rules. [...]*

Extract 68

- 1 R: What do you think about broken English?
- 2 T12: *If they are English major students, I correct it (1) because I think they should be*
- 3 *corrected. They should know which is wrong which is right. On the other hand, if they are*
- 4 *general students, I focus on the whole picture (2) for example, if I notice that most of them*
- 5 *use some incorrect grammar or vocabulary, I will summarize it at the end of the class.*

Regarding their perceptions that whether they perceived themselves as English users or learner, this issue could clarify how they perceived the ownership of English language. Most of them reported that they perceived themselves as English learners, which is similar

to what has found from Llurda's (2017) study. Llurda (2017) described that NNES teachers perceived themselves as English learners because they think that their language proficiency is not good enough comparing with NESs. Therefore, the majority of NNES teachers perceived themselves as English learners instead of English users. However, it was found from the present study that the participants did not feel that English belongs to just NESs. They appeared to believe that English language is an international language which belongs to anyone who uses it. It can be explained from the findings that even though teacher participants perceived themselves as English learners, they tried to learn that English language can be differently used from NSE for successful communication with people who share different L1 via pragmatic strategies used with any resources rather than relying on NSE norms. They vary these norms depending on their interlocutors and contexts, which is similar to what Hynninen and Solin (2017) proposed in their study. In short, they believed that English language can be adapted as long as the goal of communication can be reached. However, these beliefs seemed to be limited in Thai ELT context, particularly with English major students. It can be inferred that the participants seemed to have an implicit awareness of ELF that English can be differently used from standard English if the communication reaches the goal, but these beliefs were limited depends on the context and the status of the users. Extract 100 is one of the discussion regarding this topic through focus group.

Extract 100 FG2

1 M: Our EIC <the name of the program> student presented their experience when they attended
2 an international English camp in Indonesia. They shared that the only language that they
3 could used to communicate with their foreign friends in the camp was English. *They claimed*
4 *that they didn't care whether their English was correct or not as long as they can*
5 *communicate. (2) Do you think that English which was used by our students in that situation*
6 *is similar or different from what we teach?*
7 T9: *Totally different. Because when they were there <Indonesia>, they used the language in*
8 *the reality. But in Thailand (2) I think it's like simulation situations. Outside the class, they*
9 *RARELY RARELY have an occasion to use English. But when they were there where their*
10 *interlocutors didn't understand Thai language, they had to anything in order to communicate*
11 *to survive their lives.*
12 T8: <The disagreement shown from her face>
13 T6: *We don't have the situation to force them <students> to use English. The only one*
14 *situation that we can do is when they have an oral exam with us.*

15 M: In your opinion, do you want your students to use English like in Indonesia or like in the
 16 oral exam?
 17 T6: *Bare in mind, if they are not English major students, I don't care what kind of English*
 18 *they use (2) just please use it. <at this moment, the moderator noticed that T8 shown more*
 19 *disagreement from her countenance> (2) BUT if they are English major students, standard*
 20 *English still be expected from me.*
 21 T8: **RIGHT** <she had a big smile and totally agreed with T6> **I agree with T6.**
 22 M: So do you think English which is used in the class is different from what is used outside
 23 the class?
 24 T8: **It's totally different.** Like you told me about ELF which is happens all the time, BUT
 25 **it can't become a standard.** *I think it depends on the contexts. If you communicate with the*
 26 *sellers in the market, whatever the crazy topics, just speak it out <do not rely on standard*
 27 *English>, BUT if you use the language like this in the conference or academic setting, it's*
 28 *not proper.*
 29 T7: Even though in the business context.
 30 T8: **RIGHT**

In summary, although these Thai English language teachers did not explicitly show that they have an ELF awareness, they to some extent have an implicit ELF awareness. This is because they showed their beliefs that English language can be adapted and differently used from standard English to reach the goal of the communication with the use of several pragmatic strategies. That is to say they focused on the contents rather than forms, and they mostly believed that English language belongs to anyone who uses it. However, these beliefs did not apply to all situations they use English. There are some factors that affect their beliefs and their language awareness which will be discussed in the next section.

8.1.3 Factors affecting Thai English teachers' ELF awareness (RQ3)

This section discusses about factors that affect an ELF awareness among Thai English language teachers. It is divided into two main parts which are: 1) factors affecting Thai English teachers' the lack of ELF awareness, and 2) factors affecting Thai English teachers' the formation of ELF awareness.

\

8.1.3.1 Factors affecting Thai English teachers' the lack of ELF awareness

Three main internal factors that affect the lack of ELF awareness among the teacher participants consist of 1) their professional status, 2) their educational experiences, and 3) their personal attitudes towards English language.

Regarding their professional status, most of them reported that as they work as an English teacher, they should be a role model in using English for their students, and the target language is standard English which relies on NSE norms. This point is very interesting because this is different from their reflections that English is an international language which can be adapted from standard English to reach the purpose of the communication. The former beliefs that English should conform to NSE norms were held by the participants when they perceived themselves as an English teacher, while the latter beliefs about the non-conformity to NSE norms were held by them when they perceived themselves as an English user in the daily-life communication. More interestingly, they reported that they rarely used English language outside the class in a Thai context. That is to say they mostly used English when they were in the role of an English teacher. This leads to the unacceptance of the non-conformity to NSE norms when they perceived themselves as an English teacher. This finding is supported by Turner et al (2011) explaining that teachers' sense of responsibility (as a teacher) is an important factor that affect their practices. Some of the evidence is found from extract 78.

Extract 78

- 1 R: Have you ever use English language with incorrect grammar?
- 2 T12: Yes yes yes.
- 3 R: Did you correct yourself?
- 4 T12: Yes, yes. If I'm aware, I always do it. This is because when I know that I use incorrect
- 5 grammar (.)*for example, when I talk to NES, I feel like I'm an English teacher all the time.*
- 6 *If I speak incorrectly, I feel (.) like I'm losing my face. I don't want anybody looks at me that*
- 7 *(.) You are an English teacher but use incorrect English:*
- 8 R: Has anybody correct you?
- 9 T12: (2) Rarely happens. I mean (.) never (.) with my interlocutors. Maybe they were afraid
- 10 that I would lose my face. Isn't it? As I'm an English teacher (.) I'm not sure. *It's just only*
- 11 *me who correct myself because I don't want to lose face <as an English teacher>*

Educational experience is the other factor that shows the conflict of the participants' beliefs of using English language, which leads to the lack of ELF awareness among them. From their educational experiences, all of them reported that they studied in English major when they were students. As an English major student, they perceived English language as a subject rather than a tool of communication. This means they tried to conform to NSE norms as much as they can. This is similar to what Zeng (2009) claimed that personal experiences and educational experiences influence teachers' beliefs. Extract 79 could be an example that reveals the conflict beliefs of English language between an English user and an English learner.

Extract 79

- 1 R: Why did you choose to study in English major?
- 2 T17: *My neighbor was my inspiration in studying English (.) He was an American evangelist.*
- 3 *At that time, I studied English with him. [...] I felt fun (.) It started from this feeling first*
- 4 *because what I studied was not too difficult (.) It's just English for communication in daily*
- 5 *life.*
- 6 R: Can he <the evangelist> speak Thai?
- 7 T17: A little bit.
- 8 R: Did you speak Thai with him?
- 9 T17: Yes (2) mix with English that he taught me.
- 10 R: *When you studied English in the university, do you think it's different from what you*
- 11 *learnt from the evangelist?*
- 12 T17: (2) *Uhm, it's different (.) **much different**. When I studied in the university, there were*
- 13 *a lot of grammatical rules that I had to rely on when using the language. It's different from*
- 14 *when I studied with the evangelist when I was young (.) At that time, It's easy and relaxed (.)*
- 15 *I didn't have to worry too much on the language rules. But when studying English in the*
- 16 *university (.) there were a lot of grammatical rules for me to remember. When I wanted to*
- 17 *express the language (.) even though for general communication (.) I don't know whether*
- 18 *others feel like me (.) I felt worried. I have to be careful all the time that I might use incorrect*
- 19 *grammar (.) This is my personal case. Therefore, when grammatical rules come to my life,*
- 20 *I have to be always careful when using language for communication (.) even though in*
- 21 *writing.*

Strong belief on standard English which was held by some participants is one of the factor that affects their ELF awareness. Some of the the participants mentioned that as they have personal preference on standard English which relies on NSE norms, different kinds of

English from NSE could not be accepted by them. This leads to the open-minded perspective of the acceptance of different kinds of English used. If English is used differently from their preferences, it is not acceptable by them. Therefore, personal attitude toward English language is one of the main factors that leads to the lack of ELF awareness among Thai English language teachers. Extract 80 is one of the illustration regarding this issue.

Extract 80

1 T18: [...] I don't know how to say (2) *cause personally I like NESs and they are the role*
2 *model for me <in using English>, so I want my students do the same as me. I won't teach any*
3 *kind of English <which is different from NSE> like Chinese, Vietnamese, or Singaporean*
4 *accent to them(.) I don't know(.) maybe it is because of my attitude.*
5 R: What do you think if our department employs foreign teachers who are NNESs to teach
6 English for our students?
7 T18: DISAGREE. I totally **disagree** with this *cause our students are English major student,*
8 *they should learn standard English. [...] I think if we better employ NESs rather than NNESs*
9 *to teach conversation to our students. The difference between English which is used by NESs*
10 *and NNESs is not just only an accent. There are some vocabulary or expression*
11 *which are also different as well. Our students should be better learnt from NESs cause I*
12 *think if we produce students who use standard English, they can communicate with any*
13 *people from any countries (2) although they are Chinese, Singaporean, Vietnamese, cause*
14 *we have what it is called 'Standard' so we can accommodate them.*

Apart from the internal factors, the external factors leading to the lack of ELF awareness among Thai English language teachers were found in different levels. Students' attitudes towards standard English seem to be the main factor in the classroom-context level which influence teachers' practices. As mentioned earlier that teacher participants have an inconsistency between their beliefs and practices, although these teachers hold the beliefs that English can be shaped or adapted from NSE for the successful communication, they still rely their practices on NSE particularly in the ELT context. They reported that this is because of the students' preferences on NSE. Although teachers want their students to expose to variety of Englishes, students still expected their teachers to use standard English which relies on NSE norms. Therefore, this expectation affects teachers' practices of using English in the class which appear to be the factor that limits the ELF awareness in Thai ELT context. Extract 81 is one of the examples regarding this issue

Extract 81

- 1 R: [...] Do you think British and American English could reflect the English language at the
2 present day and do you think it's enough for the students?
3 T12: @@@ **They** <the students> **request** <British and American English> **by themselves**.
4 When I provide NNEs teachers for them, (.) they feel like disagree with this idea. *I think*
5 *maybe because they* <the students> *have less experience in the real-life communication that*
6 *there isn't just only British or American English.*
7 R: So, what did you do?
8 T12: *We could provide them some courses like 'Global Cultural Communication' or what*
9 *else that could promote the concept of world Englishes.*

In the school-context level, stakeholders appear to be the important factor that affect the teacher participants' practices of using English language. This was reported by the teachers that although they realized the necessity of world Englishes awareness, their practices were limited to rely on NSE due to the expectation of the stakeholders in Thai ELT context. These stakeholders include; for instance, students, students' parents, the administrators, the language policy makers, and etc. This can be considered as one of the significant factor that affects the ELF awareness in Thai ELT context. More importantly, educational policy is the main national-context factor that leads to the conflict between teachers' beliefs and their practices. Due to the exam-oriented in Thai ELT context, the teacher participants disclosed that they have to teach English language which based on NSE. Although the teachers just need their students to express the English language which focus on the contents rather than forms to reach the purpose of the communication, these teachers have to rely their practices on NSE which focuses on forms because Thai ELT context exam mainly focuses on NSE grammatical rules. This factor affects Thai English language teachers and learners in using English which leads to the lack of ELF awareness among the practitioners in Thai ELT context. Extract 101 is one of the discussion through the focus group describing this issue.

Extract 101 FG1

- 1 M: *Now, you guys are English lecturers, and you guys also used to be English students (.)*
2 *From both perspectives, what are the problems in Thai ELT context? Why do most of Thai*
3 *people can't use English efficiently even though they've learned English since they were*

4 young?

5 T2: I think (2) *the main problem is (.) **the educational policy is not clear** (.) It focuses too*

6 *much on the test test test. (2) like ONET and ANET test <both are the tests that every student*

7 *in Thai high schools requires to take before their graduation>. Then, students focus just only*

8 *want to pass the test, so they focus only on the exam (.) not for communication.*

9 T3: As well as in the university level.

10 T2: Right (2) I mean it's not clear (.) not useful.

11 T1: *It's like learning to prepare for testing.*

12 T2: Right right. That's what I thought.

13 T3: When finish testing (.) it's nothing.

14 T2: **Right.** *The policy is not clear. When they are going to have a test, they just **mug mug***

15 ***mug up** (.) **It's too much.** When finishing the test, there's nothing. Actually, they <students>*

16 *don't really know why they have to study English. Like T1 said, the policy is not clear (.)*

17 *whether the main purpose of learning English is for communication or for passing the test.*

18 M: What do you think about the present language policy? [

19 T1: [**FAIL** (suddenly respond)

20 T4: *I personally view that there're some conflicts in the policy in (2) what we want students*

21 *to be and what we want. I'm not sure whether I understand it clearly or not (.) As English*

22 *lecturers, we expect that our students would communicate in English (2) fluently and*

23 *accurately (.) but our policy is set for testing (2) but there is still a conflict that there is not*

24 *enough area in our country for students to practice the language (2) I mean just only*

25 *receptive skills are used (.) they don't have the chance to produce (2) Many conflicts between*

26 *policy and practice.*

To summarize this section, the factors which affect the and limit the teachers' awareness and practices of ELF can be divided into two main factors; the internal factors and the external factors. The internal factors leading the participants to the lack of ELF awareness consist of; 1) their professional status, 2) their educational experiences, and 3) their personal preferences on NSE. Focusing on the external factors, three main factors were found in this study include; 1) students' attitudes towards standard English, 2) stakeholder's expectations, and 3) the educational language policy. Both of these internal and external factors are considered as the factors that lead to the lack of ELF awareness among Thai English language teachers and the practitioners in Thai ELT context.

8.1.3.2 Factors affecting Thai English teachers' the formation of ELF awareness

There are two main factors leading to the formation of ELF awareness found in this study including; individuals' beliefs of English language, and their experiences of using English. Although it is reported from the earlier section about their educational experiences leading to the lack of ELF awareness, teacher participants still hold different beliefs that English is a means of communication rather than the fixed-codes in the real-life situations. From the interviews and the focus groups, most of the participants held the beliefs that as long as the successful communication can be reached, English language can be shaped, adjusted, or adapted from NSE by the users. This means they focuses on the contents rather than forms which is relevant to notion of ELF. These beliefs are different from what they held when they were learners which more focus on the linguistic features rather than communicative purposes because they did not have more opportunities to use the language outside the class. When they grew up and had more opportunities to use the language in the diversity of communicative environments, they change their identity from English learners to English users. The participants reported that the more experiences to expose to the different kinds of English rather than NSE with different L1 users, different accents, different origins, lead them to the open-minded of the English used. As an English user, they have developed their communicative strategies rather than conform to NSE norms, to communicate with people in diversity of communicative situations. Lurda (2017) described that learners need an external authority to confirm that they are on the right path of using language, while users can successfully use the language to communicate without the fixed rules to confirm that what they use is right. Therefore, the more experiences the participants use the language, the more change of their beliefs shifted from English learners to English users. From the ELF perspective, the researcher views the individuals' beliefs of English language and their experiences to expose to the English language used in real-life communication as factors to some extent that lead to the formation of ELF awareness among Thai English language teachers. The findings from the semi-structured interviews

in extract 60 and from focus groups in extract105 are some of evidences showing that individual's beliefs and experiences of using English are the factors leading to the formation of ELF awareness among the participants.

Extract 90

1 R: If someday the number of NNESs is more than the number of NESs () and they don't
2 understand the idiom 'It's just a piece of cake', but they understand (2) for example 'It's just
3 banana banana' <'banana banana' refers to something's easy in Thai idiom>. Do you think
4 'It's just a piece of cake' would disappear and become 'It's just banana banana' instead?
5 T2: Uhm (2) it's impossible. *We have to understand that language has creativity because it's*
6 *impossible that any language can stay still. It can be seen that English language in the past*
7 *is also different from the present day () I mean language has its dynamic () not stay still.*
8 *More importantly, English language is an international language which is used by*
9 *international people. Therefore, it's impossible that when it <English language> is used in*
10 *different areas, it can have the same form of what NESs use. Although, the English language*
11 *which is used in UK in which the language is used in the group of people from the different*
12 *L1, my NESs friends have to accept the difference if they want to stay in that situation () I*
13 *mean in terms of language learning. If they have much experiences in staying aboard, they*
14 *can accept this point () **I believe.***

Extract 105 FG1

1 M: You guys mentioned about educational language policy, () locational factor, teaching
2 methods (2) something like that. *You guys have discussed that Thai students are afraid to use*
3 *English because they're afraid that they will use English with incorrect grammar. (2) Is it*
4 *possible () to have some English courses that (2) do not rely on grammar <native norms>?*
5 T3: *I did. One of my English course (2) I mean () I don't focus in grammar (2) like (2) if they*
6 *<students> can discuss and share their idea in the class, it's OK. The exams are all written*
7 *exams (2) You can't understand it <students' answer sheet>, if you don't open your mind.*
8 T5: *In my case, I teach architect student, engineering students () I asked them 'What did you*
9 *do last year?' () I go travelling with my friend' <his students' responses with incorrect*
10 *grammar>. (2) I understand what they want to answer, **and I believe that in the context,***
11 *where they have to communicate with NESs, NESs can understand like what I understand.*
12 T2: *Although using word by word, it can be understandable. Like last night (2) I went to*
13 *have dinner with my Thai and NES friends. My Thai friend said <to her NES friend> that*
14 *'You handsome' () I mean she used the words she knew to convey the meaning <not rely on*
15 *grammar> (2) I think it depends on the context () She <her Thai friend> also used the*
16 *sentence 'You have friend handsome same you?'; then, my NES friend replied that 'Yes:*
17 *Something like this. It depends on setting and aim of communication () which is getting the*
18 *message across. No need for grammar. But between I and Geoff <her NES boyfriend>, I*
19 *always tell him that if he spots my English errors, please tell me () because we're English*
20 *lecturers, and we don't want to use incorrect grammar. (2) Because students expect us as a*
21 *role model in using English. (2) However, when I studied my master degree, I learned one*
22 *theory which is called 'accommodation' (2) for example, students who study English with*

23 *us would produce language which we expect, but if they have to work with their NNES*
24 *friends, they might accommodate their friends by (.) decreasing the standard.*
25 T1: It's like (.) if your interlocutors don't have perfect English, it's OK for you to do the
26 same.
27 T2: Right. What I've learned is about 'Socio'.
28 T5: Socio cultural differences.

8.2 Thai teachers' beliefs of the integration of ELF in Thai ELT context

This section aims to discuss Thai EFL teachers' beliefs of English language used which could affect the integration of ELF in Thai ELT context. It is divided into two main sections including; 1) Teachers' beliefs of the current status of English used, and 2) The integration of ELF in Thai ELT context.

8.2.1 Teachers' beliefs of the current status of English used

As the status of English language in the present day has shifted from the the conformity to NSE to the varieties of English, this sections intends to clarify how the findings from the study reflect Thai English language teachers' beliefs of how English language should be used. The findings from the present study reveal that most of the teacher participants showed their beliefs towards English language used which is relevant to the notion of ELF (focusing on the intelligibility rather than the conformity to NSE). However, these beliefs among the participants seem to be limited depending on the different contexts. This is because the findings from this present study delineate that these teachers held the beliefs of English language as two main identities including; as English users and as English teachers.

As an English user, these teacher participants believed that English language is an international language which belongs to anyone who use it as a tool of communication. This means English can be used differently from NSE as long as it can reach the goal of communication. These beliefs towards English is related to the notion of ELF focusing on

the intelligibility rather than the conformity to NSE norms. However, these kind of beliefs were found from their experiences using English in the multilingual contexts (for example; when they studied abroad) with people who share different L1. Although they viewed English as a subject matter that needs to be mastered when they were students in Thai universities, this perspective had changed when they had more opportunities to use English to communicate with people in the multilingual contexts. They reported that in that situation the main purpose of using English was to have successful communication rather than focusing on the linguistic features or codes following NSE norms. They changed their identity from English learners focusing on the imitation of NSE into English users focusing on successful communicative purposes. This is similar to what was found from Sifakis (2009) reporting that the communicative use of NNES teachers outside the classroom would have several features of ELF variety. These beliefs reflect that these participants hold the functional belief of language rather than the structural beliefs of language (See Miramontes et al, 2012) when they used English in the authentic situations. Furthermore, the interactional beliefs of language (See Richards and Rogers, 2001) were also found from these participants in the same situation. The participants reported that when they focusing on the communicative purpose of using English, multiform and and multilingual resources were used in different ways in different situations. These beliefs are similar to Morton (2012) described the interactional beliefs of language that language is seen as a set of meaning making resources when people engage in the communication. In short, when these teacher participants use English in the authentic situations in real-life communication, they seem to hold the functional and interactional beliefs of language with language user identity, focusing on the goal of communicative approach rather than the mastery on grammatical rules and lexical items. This can be inferred that although the participants did not reveal the ELF awareness explicitly, they seem to have an implicit ELF awareness in using English when they consider themselves as an English user.

On the other hand, when they consider themselves as an English teacher, the beliefs of language they hold seem to be different from what they hold when considering themselves as an English user. As an English teacher, particularly in Thai ELT context, teacher participants tend to hold the strong beliefs on the structural beliefs of language, focusing on code or structurally related elements for the meaning transmission (See Miramontes et al, 2012). This is because English teachers in Thai ELT context are expected to be the role-model of using English for students. Therefore, if Anglophone models of English are still deeply embedded in the basic education curriculum in a Thai context (Baker & Jarunthawatchai, 2017), English language teachers still be expected to use English by conforming the NSE norms. That is to say their professional status is one of the most important factors influencing them to hold the strong beliefs on NSE. This is similar to what Sifakis (2009) found in Greek context that English teachers were expected to be specialists in their profession, and they were expected to teach English as similar to that of other subject matter and teaching in the NSE norms. Furthermore, they are perceived from their students, students' parents, and community, as custodians of English language. To sum up, even though these teacher participants reveal the acceptance of the current status of English language focusing on communicative purposes rather than forms, various factors (For instance; professional status, learners' expectations, testing, language policy, etc.) in Thai ELT context influence the participants to limit their beliefs of English used just only on NSE.

8.2.2 The integration of ELF in Thai ELT context

Due to the strong beliefs on NSE among Thai English teachers in Thai ELT context, it is a challenging issue to incorporate the notion of ELF in this context. Three main factors considering as the internal factors found among teacher participants affecting the integration of ELF in Thai ELT context are: their professional status, their educational experiences, their personal attitudes towards English language. As mentioned in the earlier section that the participants hold the different beliefs about English language. Although

they believed that English language is an international language which belongs to any one who uses it, and it can be adapted from NSE for the communicative purpose, this belief seemed to be limited in the educational context when they perceived themselves as English teachers. From their educational experiences, all of them were English major students. Therefore, they deeply hope to use English language like NESs as much as they can. This is to say that the purpose of their studying English tends to acquire the certain codes in SLA rather than in real-life situations. The last internal factor affecting the belief of English language found in some of the participant is the strong beliefs on NSE. Some of them held the strong belief that English language should be used relying on NSE norms. Other kinds of English which are differently used from NSE are considered as errors in English language used.

Apart from the internal factors, it was found that there are also several external factors in different levels affecting to the integration of ELF in Thai ELT context. In the classroom-context level, students' preferences on NSE seemed to be the main factor that influence the teacher participants' practices of using English. Although the teachers realized the necessity of the notion of variety of Englishes in the present situation, they had to rely their practices on NSE due to their students' expectations. This is similar to what have found from the school-context level. Stakeholders' expectations which expects the students to expose to NSE appear to be the main factor that limit the teachers' practices in this level. When focusing on the national-context level, it was found that educational policy which more rely an exam-oriented is the main factor that leads to the conformity to NSE norms in every context level. Although the teachers want to insert some different kinds of English from NSE which reflect the use of English in real-life situations, the exam-oriented in Thai ELT context relying on NSE norms limited the teachers' practices from their beliefs.

The integration of ELF notion in Thai ELT context is a challenging issue because of the strong beliefs on NSE among Thai ELT practitioners. From various factors described earlier, NSE is still the target language for teachers, learners, stakeholders, and language

policy makers, which is similar to what Baker and Jarunthawatchai (2017) described. To get over this situation, Thai ELT practitioners need to shift their perspectives on English language beyond the native-speaker paradigm; from English learners to be English users. This is supported by what Mauranen (2012) explained that, from the macrosocial ELF perspective, English users learn to live with a more different kinds of English lects rather than trying to imitate NSE. Similarly, Cook (2007) claimed that the goal of ELT is to help learners to become successful L2 users with communicative skills rather than conform to the standard norms as L2 learners. The paradigm-shifted from English learners to become English users can be enabled by the integration of ELF in the curriculum (Llurda, 2017). This is because ELF enables learners to perceive themselves as rightful English users rather than as English learners trying to use the language the same way as NESs do. To do so, teachers themselves need to change their perceptions and beliefs about themselves as language teachers to be as mediators and facilitators. This is because the responsibility of language teacher is to help learners to develop the strategies that allow them to become autonomous users in a diversity of contexts rather than conform to the NSE norms (Cook, 2005, 2007; Llurda, 2017). Focusing on students and stakeholders, their perspectives should be changed to prioritize on the successful communication over NSE norms. More importantly, the traditional exam-oriented relying on NSE norms needs to be adjusted to fit with the current status of English focusing on communicative purposes rather than fixed-code of NSE linguistic features. This challenge leads to the implications and contributions of the present study in the next section.

8.3 Implications and contributions of the study

The findings from the present study provide insights into Thai English language teachers' beliefs about English which have an influential impact on their practices. Based on ELF perspective, these teacher participants mostly perceived English as a means of communication which focuses on communicative function rather than linguistic forms.

They reported that the non-conformity to NSE norms was used in their practices as long as they can get the message across. Although the ELF awareness was not explicitly found among the participants, they implicitly show their ELF awareness from their practices. Several ELF pragmatic strategies; for instance, repetition, accommodation, co-construction, let it pass, code-switching, code mixing, and so on, were applied in their practices. However, these beliefs and practices seemed to be limited just only in their real-life communication with people who share different L1. There are various factors that limit their practices and beliefs of using English in Thai ELT context. Professional status, educational experiences, and preferences on NSE are considered as the main internal factors, while students' expectations, stakeholders' expectations, and educational policy are the external factors in different context levels. Due to these factors, it is not only leads to the limitation of teachers' practices in using English in Thai ELT context, it would affect both teachers and learners' beliefs of using English which could lead to the lack of ELF awareness among them. In short, teacher participants appeared to hold different beliefs towards English which could influence their practices. When they perceived themselves as an English user, their focus of the use of English is on the communicative function rather than the conformity to NSE, which to some extent relevant to the notion of ELF. On the other hand, when they perceived themselves as an English teacher, they tended to rely their beliefs and practices on NSE.

From the confliction of teachers' beliefs and practices between their real-life situations and Thai ELT context founded in this study, the researcher suggests that it is crucial to raise the explicit ELF awareness among Thai English teachers before the integration of ELF notion in Thai ELT context. This is relevant to what Dewey (2015) claimed that the level of ELF awareness and the understanding of what ELF means to learners and teachers should be investigated before the applying this notion in the pedagogic context. Teachers' training to raise ELF awareness among Thai teachers and learners is suggested to this context as Sifakis and Bayyurt (2015) described that both non-native teachers and learners

will more readily accept the inclusion of ELF and WE in their class when they have understood and appreciated the validity and function of ELF. This concern is not applied to only teachers and learners, the notion of ELF should be further introduced to the stakeholders and people who have the authority for language policy relevant to Thai ELT context as well.

This study contributes to the knowledge in the field of teachers' language beliefs, particularly which is relevant to the notion of ELF. Furthermore, the findings from the study could fill the research gap about teachers' beliefs and practices in Thai ELT context. Although the teacher participants revealed different beliefs and practices on English language depending on different contexts, these participants appeared to realize that English used in the real-life communication is different from what is taught and learned in Thai ELT context. Nevertheless, as mentioned earlier that Thai ELT context was framed by oriented-exam which particularly relies on NSE norms. As a consequence, the awareness of ELF is suggested to be raised among all Thai ELT stakeholders (teachers, learners, policy authorities) to shift the Thai ELT pedagogic change from the acceptance of the conformity to just only NSE norms to the pluralistic used of English which reflects the use of English language in the world-wide context where English is used as a lingua franca.

It is found from this present study that it is crucial to raise the level of ELF awareness among Thai English language teachers in order to shift their beliefs towards English from English learners into English users. However, changing teachers' beliefs is not an ease because beliefs are relatively stable and resistant to change (Mosely, Reinke, & Bookout, 2002; Haney & McArthur, 2002). Nevertheless, Fives and Buehl (2012) claimed that teachers' beliefs can be changed with experiences and professional communities by some degree of consistency is essential. The findings from this study reveals that even though the teacher participants accepted the notion of variety Englishes and ELF, they still value NES norms as a reference point because of several factors; for instance, professional status,

educational experiences, stakeholders' expectations, and language policy. Therefore, these findings contribute to the path to raise ELF awareness among Thai English language teachers. To change these teachers' beliefs towards English language, these teachers need to be educated and trained to become ELF-aware and understand how to integrate an ELF-aware perspective into their teaching (Bayyurt et al., 2018). Moreover, several aspects of Thai ELT need to be changed in accordance with ELF perspective; for example, teaching instruction, teaching materials, curriculum design, and testing. This is because Sifakis and Bayyurt (2018) stated that 'Being an ELF-aware teacher means finding ways to empower one's learners as competent non-native users of English, essentially prompting them to become ELF-aware users themselves' (p.464). Giving training and education regarding the notion of ELF among Thai English teachers is not only the path to raise the ELF awareness among teachers, but also the path to raise the ELF awareness among learners and stakeholders to prompt them in using English language in the wider contexts.

8.4 Limitations and suggestions for further research

A few limitations are considered by the researcher in this study. The first limitation is about the selection of the participants. In this present study, the participants consisted of 20 Thai English language teachers from just only one Thai University because of the time constraint. In addition, this university is located in the north-east of Thailand where English is rarely used in the daily-life communication. It was found from the findings that the participants reported that they and their students rarely use English as a means of communication in their daily life except in the classrooms. It is different from the universities which are located in the big cities or the scenery cities where English is used as a contact language among people who share L1. Therefore, different perspectives and beliefs towards English language among the different participants in different area context might be to some extent different or similar to the findings from this study. For the further study, the researcher suggests to select the participants from different Thai area contexts to reflect Thai teachers' beliefs and ELF awareness in the wider scale.

The second limitation relates to the articles which is used as the stimuli of the discussion in focus groups. Two articles used in this study included of the spread of English (Crystal, 2000) and the concept of ELF (Jenkins, 2009). These two articles were submitted to the participants to read before conducting the focus groups. Regarding this situation, the researcher could not ensure that all the participants read these article before the discussion. However, this issue is not concerned as a serious issue because the researcher summarized the main information and detail of these two articles to the participants before conducting the focus groups. It is suggested for the future study to thoroughly consider the understanding of the stimuli among the participants using in the focus groups before the discussions.

Finally, the concern of the limitation of the present study is the put on the subjectivity of the researcher. In this study, I myself was the only person who conducted the data collection and the analysis. As Brinkman and Kvale (2015) suggested that personality and subjectivity of the researcher could lead to the influence on the data collection and analysis. This is to say, other researchers might have different perspectives on the process of collecting data; for example, the sequence of question used in the interviews, the field notes taking on the data collection, and so on. This issue would be found on the data analysis process as well. As a consequence, the more research on this field in different contexts by different researchers are suggested to be conducted to compare and contrast the researchers' perceptions on the process of data collection and data analysis.

8.5 Concluding remark

The main purpose of this chapter is to conclude what have found in the present study. To respond to the research questions, the main findings of the study reveal that Thai English language teachers mostly believed that English language is an international language which belongs to the users. They focused the use of the language on the communicative purposes

over the linguistic forms which is similar to the ELF perspective. This can be inferred that these participants to some extent have an implicit ELF awareness. However, these beliefs and practices seemed to be limited in the educational context. They tended to conform to the NSE norms rather than the intelligibility. This is because of various factors; for instance, educational experiences, professional status, stakeholders' expectations, and educational policy.

From these findings, this reflects that the teacher participants held the different kind of beliefs of English language depending on different identities. They perceived themselves as English users when using English in the real-life situation. On the other hand, they tended to over conform to NSE norms when considering themselves as English language teachers. This leads to the suggestion that teachers should perceive themselves as mediators and facilitators rather than teacher in the ELT context. This is to encourage their learners to become English users instead of English learners. The integration of ELF and raising ELF awareness should be promoted among English practitioners in Thai ELT context to fit with the current status of English language in the wider context focusing on the communicative purposes rather than forms.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Participant Information Sheet

Study Title: Thai university English teachers' beliefs of English as a lingua franca and multilingual awareness

Researcher: Mr. Attapon Sriprasert

ERGO number: 30448

Please read this information carefully before deciding to take part in this research. It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you are happy to participate you will be asked to sign a consent form.

What is the research about?

This study aims to investigate beliefs of using English and language awareness among Thai university English language teachers. This is because language beliefs and language awareness play an important role in learning and teaching and directly affect both perceptions and judgments of teaching and learning interaction in the classroom. While many studies on language awareness are confined to grammar, recent language awareness has expanded beyond linguistic forms to cover area such as pragmatics, culture, and pedagogy. However, several language interests, the traditional language awareness approach is mainly focused on knowledge about the English used by native English speakers and connected with the conventions generated in the monolingual context of native English speakers. This seems to be limited through the English using in the world context today. As a consequence, the focus of this study is to reveal Thai English language teachers' beliefs of using English in the present day and their attitudes towards language use in different contexts with different English users.

Why have I been asked to participate?

You are chosen to participate in this research project because your qualifications fit with the criteria of the participants in this study. These include both male and female Thai English language teachers teaching in the university with age range from 25-65. Additionally, your English learning background and your English teaching experiences are needed in this study. Your participation would reveal how Thai university English language teachers think about how English is used in different contexts with different English users. More importantly, it would lead to how English language teaching in Thailand should be conducted.

What will happen to me if I take part?

If you are happy to participate in this study and are satisfied with the explanations from the researcher, a consent form will be sent to you to confirm that you agree to take part in the study. The data collection tools which are used to collect data from you include semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and focus groups. If you are invited to participate in the interview, you will be asked about your opinion on using English in various aspects. The interview will last approximately 30-60 minutes. If you are invited to join the focus group, it will spend 45-60 minutes discussing issues about English language learning, teaching, and English using in a Thai context. Classroom observations will be conducted 1-2 times during your teaching with your convenience. All of data collection will

be recorded for further analysis. Schedules of the data collection will be arranged depending on your convenience.

Are there any benefits in my taking part?

Your participation in this study would generate the opportunity for you to voice and share your points of view regarding English using in a Thai context. Furthermore, you will have a chance to discuss and reflect your views about English learning and teaching with your colleagues. This would lead to your professional development to some extent.

Are there any risks involved?

The study involves no physical risks at all.

Will my participation be confidential?

Your participation into the study will be totally confidential and your name will not be disclosed publicly. Each participant will have either a pseudo name or codified number. I will be in compliance with the Data Protection Act/University Policy and I will store the data on a password protected computer to ensure that they will remain confidential. The information you provide will not be shared with third parties except with supervisor of the project. You can also be assured of anonymity, and non-traceability.

What should I do if I want to take part?

If you want to take part in this study, please fill in the consent form and return it to me.

What happens if I change my mind?

During participating in this project, you are allowed to ask me any questions at any time. You have the rights to withdraw without any reasons at any stages during the period of this study.

What will happen to the results of the research?

The results of this research will be written up as a final product of a PhD programme requirement. The anonymised research data will be made available for future research projects due to the University of Southampton policy that the data will be a minimum of 10 years for staff and postgraduate research students. Publications and anonymised data relating to the research should be made available through the institutional repository.

Where can I get more information?

You can contact me for more details at this email address: as27g16@soton.ac.uk.

What happens if something goes wrong?

You can contact the Research Integrity and Governance Manager at 023 8059 5058 or rgoinfo@soton.ac.uk.

Thank you for taking the time to read the information sheet and considering taking part in the research. I really appreciate your kind participation.

Appendix B: CONSENT FORM

Study title: Thai university English teachers' beliefs of English as a lingua franca and multilingual awareness

Researcher name: Mr. Attapon Srprasert

ERGO number: 30448

Please initial the box(es) if you agree with the statement(s):

I have read and understood the information sheet (<i>insert date /version no. of participant information sheet</i>) and have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study.	
I agree to take part in this research project and agree for my data to be used for the purpose of this study.	
I understand my participation is voluntary and I may withdraw (<i>at any time</i>) for any reason without my rights being affected.	

Name of participant (print name).....

Signature of participant.....

Date.....

Name of researcher (print name).....

Signature of researcher

Date.....

ETHICS IN RESEARCH RISK ASSESSMENT FORM

Activity:

I am conducting a research study as a requirement of doing a PhD in the Faculty of Humanities in the field of Applied Linguistics: English Language Teaching, University of Southampton. The topic of the study is “Thai university English teachers’ beliefs of English as a lingua franca and multilingual awareness”

This study aims to investigate beliefs of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) and multilingual awareness among Thai university teachers. The study will explore Thai English teachers’ beliefs of ELF and their ELF awareness. Furthermore, the findings would reveal factors that affect their formation or the lack of their ELF awareness. The level of ELF awareness and factors which contribute to the lack or formation of ELF awareness among Thai teachers have never been investigated in a Thai context. The findings would be a guideline for English education practice in Thailand and further benefit the vast number of Thai learners of English who will be engaging in international communication in various ways.

In this study, 20 Thai English language teachers and 10 students are the main participants, and 5 Thai English language teachers for the piloting. All participants are the members of department of western languages and linguistics in one Thai university.

The research tools include document analysis, semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and focus group interviews. Firstly, the researcher will send a consent form to participants to get access to the documents which are relevant to the study; such as, student handbook, course syllabus, teaching materials, and course evaluation forms. Then, both teachers and students will be interviewed. The classrooms observations will be conducted to explore further regarding the issues to be explored. Finally, focus group interviews will be conducted with teacher participants to reveal their beliefs of ELF and multilingual awareness.

The data collected will be later analysed based on the theoretical frameworks presented in the literature review section. After the data are analysed, the conclusion of this study will be drawn and discussed objectively based on the evidence found and data collected.

Locations:

The data collection for this research will be conducted at the department of western languages and linguistics, faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Mahasarakham University, Thailand.

Potential risks:

There is no potential risk but there might be psychological risk as mental stress or emotional distress because they may feel uncomfortable with sharing their personal data with the third party.

Who might be exposed/affected?

The individual participant might be exposed to this risk.

How will these risks be minimised?

I will try to explain in every single detail to make the participants clear as much as possible. Additionally, I will provide them with contact information of The Chair of the Faculty Ethics Committee in case they prefer to talk to someone to make sure that their status will be confidential.

Risk evaluation: Low / Medium / High

Can the risk be further reduced? Yes / No

Further controls required:

Date by which further controls will be implemented:

Are the controls satisfactory: Yes / No

Date for reassessment:

Completed by:	Attapon Sripasert _____	Attapon Sripasert _____	21/09/17 _____
	Name	Signature	date

Supervisor/manager: If applicable	Ying Wang _____	Ying Wang _____	21/09/17 _____
	Name	Signature	date

Reviewed by:	_____ Name	_____ Signature	_____ date
---------------------	---------------	--------------------	---------------

Appendix D: Student Research Project Ethics Checklist 2016/17

This checklist should be completed by the student (with the advice of their thesis/dissertation supervisor) for all research projects.

Student name: Mr. Attapon Sriprasert

Student ID: 28872282

Supervisor name: Dr. Ying Wang
Humanities

Discipline: Faculty of

Programme of study: Applied Linguistics: English Language Teaching

Project title: Thai university English teachers' beliefs of English as a lingua franca and multilingual awareness

YES NO

1	Will your study involve living human participants?	X	
2	Does the study involve children under 18?		X
3	Does the study involve adults who are specially vulnerable and/or unable to give informed consent? (e.g. people with learning difficulties, adults with dementia)		X
4	Will the study require the cooperation of a third party/ an advocate for access to possible participants? (e.g. students at school, residents of nursing home)	X	
5	Does your research require collection and/or storage of sensitive and/or personal data on any individual? (e.g. date of birth, criminal offences)		X
6	Could your research induce psychological stress or anxiety, or have negative consequences for participants, beyond the risks of everyday life?		X
7	Will it be necessary for participants to take part in the study without their knowledge and consent at the time? (e.g. covert observation of people)		X
8	Will the study involve discussion of sensitive topics? (e.g. sexual activity, drug use)		X
9	Will financial inducements (other than reasonable expenses or compensation of time) be offered to participants?		X
10	Are there any problems with participants' rights to remain anonymous, and/or ensuring that the information they provide is non-identifiable?		X

11	Will you have any difficulty communicating and assuring the right of participants to freely withdraw from the project at any time?		X
12	If you are working in a cross cultural setting, will you need to gain additional knowledge about the setting to work effectively? (e.g. gender roles, language use)		X
13	Are there potential risks to your own health and safety in conducting the study? (e.g. lone interviewing in other than public spaces)		X
14	Will the study involve recruitment of patients or staff through the NHS?		X
15	Does the research project involve working with human tissue, organs, bones etc that are less than 100 years old?		X

Please refer to the Research Project Ethics Guidance Notes for help in completing this checklist.

If you have answered NO to all of the above questions, discussed the form with your supervisor and had it signed and dated by both parties (see over), you may proceed with your research. A copy of the Checklist should be included in your eventual report/ dissertation/ thesis.

If you have answered YES to any of the questions, i.e. if your research involves human participants in any way, you will need to provide further information for consideration by the Humanities Ethics Committee and/or the university Research Governance Office. This information needs to be provided via the Electronic Research Governance Online (ERGO) system, available at www.ergo.soton.ac.uk.

CHOOSE ONE STATEMENT:

- I have completed the Ethics Checklist and confirm that my research does not involve human participants (nor human tissues etc).
- I have completed the Ethics Checklist and confirm that my research will involve human participants. I understand that this research needs to be reported and approved through the ERGO system, before the research commences.

Signature of student: Attapon Sriprasert

Date: 21 September 2017

Signature of supervisor:

Date: 21 September 2017

Appendix E: Data Collection Schedule

1. Semi-Structured interviews Schedule

The researcher will interview the participants individually about their beliefs and attitudes towards English as a lingua franca. Moreover, they will also be asked to investigate their awareness of multilingual. There will be 20 teacher participants and 10 student participants in the semi-structured interviews. The schedule is expected as follows:

Interviewee	Kind of Interview	Expected Date
Teachers and students	Semi-structured interview	15 February 2018 - 28 February 2018

2. Classroom Observation Schedule

Classroom observations will be conducted with the observation protocols to reveal the extents that the participants use English as a lingua franca pragmatic strategies in the class. There will be 20 classroom observations, and the schedule is expected as follow:

Classroom Observation	Expected Date
Classroom observation #1-20	15 February 2018 - 5 March 2018

3. Focus Groups

Focus groups will be conducted at the final stage of data collection: It will be conducted in order to elicit their similar and different ideas among the group of participants on their beliefs of English as a lingua franca and multilingual awareness. Approximately 24 teacher participants will participate in 3 focus groups. The schedule is expected as follows:

Focus Group	Expected Date
Focus group# 1-3	1 July 2018 - 1 September 2018

Appendix F: Interview Questions

1. How long have you studied and taught English?
2. How often do you use English? What purposes? With whom?
3. What do you think about English today?
4. Do you have English model in your mind?
5. What do you think about different Englishes?
6. What are the differences and similarities of using English to communicate with both native and non-native English speakers?
7. What are the difficulties and eases of using English to communicate with both native and non-native English speakers?
8. What are the factors that influence using English in Thailand?
9. What function do you think English is used for Thai English language teachers and students?
10. What do you think about native English teachers and non-native English teachers?
11. Do you have any problem when communicate with interlocutors who share different first language with different accent, pronunciation, lexicogrammar, and lexis? In this case how do you deal with it?
12. Do you think different culture affect your communication when using English?
13. What do you think about broken English?
14. Have you ever been corrected your English language? What do you think about error correction?
15. Do you consider yourself as an English learner or English user?

Appendix G: Focus Group Guideline

Ideas to be explored through the discussion:

1. How do you think about learning and teaching English in a Thai context?
2. How do you think about standard English and different Englishes?
3. What are the differences between using English to communicate with native and non-native English speakers?
4. What do you think of the differences between native and non-native English speaker teachers?
5. What are the goal of English language teaching and learning in a Thai context which is a multilingual setting?
6. Do you think you have the right to use English on your own way?

References

- Abdi, H., & Asadi, B. 2015. A synopsis of researches on teachers' and students' beliefs about language learning. *International journal on studies in English language and literature*. 3(4). 104-114.
- Abrami, P.C., Poulsen, C., & Chambers, B. 2004. Teacher motivation to implement an educational innovation: Factors differentiating users and non-users of cooperative learning. *Educational psychology*, 24. 201-216.
- Aronin, L. 2019. What is multilingualism? In David Singleton and Larissa Aronin (eds.). *Twelve lectures in multilingualism*. 3-34.
- Asbury, J. 1995. Overview of focus group research. *Qual Health Res*. 5. 414-420.
- Astedt-Kurki, P., Heikkinen, R.L. (1994). Two approaches to the experiences of health and old age: the thematic interview and narrative method. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 20. 418-421.
- Baker, W. 2009. The cultures of English as a lingua franca. *TESOL quarterly*. 43(4). 567-592.
- Baker, W. 2011. From cultural awareness to intercultural awareness: culture in ELTR. *ELT Journal*. 66(1), 62-70.
- Baker, W. 2012. English as a lingua franca in Thailand: Characterisations and implications. *English in practice*. 1. 18-27.
- Baker, W. 2015. *Culture and Identity through English as a Lingua Franca*. Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Baker, W. 2016. Culture and language in intercultural communication, English as a lingua franca and English language teaching: points of convergence and conflict. In, Holmes, Prue and Dervin, Fred (eds.) *The Cultural and Intercultural Dimensions of English as a Lingua Franca*. (Languages for Intercultural Communication and Education) Bristol, GB. Multilingual Matters, pp. 70-92.

- Baker, W. & Jarunthawatchai, W. 2017. English language policy in Thailand. *European journal of language policy*. 9(1). 27-44.
- Bandura, A. 1994. Self-efficacy. *Encyclopedia of human behavior*. 4. 71-81.
- Bandura, A. 1997. *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: NY: Freeman.
- Barriball, K.L. & While, A. (1994). Collecting data using a semi-structured interview.: a discussion paper. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 19(2). 328-335.
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. 2004. Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on forms and their classroom practices. *Applied linguistics*. 25. 243-272.
- Baumbusch, J. 2010. Semi-structured interviewing in practice-close research. *Journal for Specialists in Pediatric Nursing*. 15(3). 255-258.
- Baumgarten, N., & House, J. 2010. *I think and I don't know* in English as a lingua franca and native English discourse. *Journal of pragmatics*. 45. 1184-1200.
- Bayyurt, Y., Kurt, Y., Oztekin, E., Guerra, L., Cavalheiro, L., & Pereira, R. 2018. English language teachers' awareness of English as a lingua franca in multilingual and multicultural contexts. *Euroasian journal of applied linguistics*, 5(2). 185-202.
- Bjorkman, B. 2010. Spoken lingua franca English at a Swedish Technical University: An investigation of form and communicative effectiveness. Stockholm University.
- Bjorkman, B. 2011. Pragmatic strategies in English as an academic lingua franca: Ways of achieving communicative effectiveness? *Journal of pragmatics*. 43. 950-964.
- Bjorkman, B. 2014. An analysis of polyadic English as a lingua franca (ELF) speech: A communicative strategies framework. *Journal of pragmatics*. 66. 122-138.
- Borg, S. 2001. Self-perception and practice in teaching grammar. *ELT journal*. 55(1). 21-29.
- Borg, S. 2003. Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teacher think, know, believe, and do. *Language teaching*. 36(2). 81-109.
- Borg, S. 2006. *Teacher cognition and language education*. Continuum. London.
- Bowen, G. 2009. Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research*

Journal. 9(2). 27-40.

- Brinkmann, S. & Klave, S. 2015. *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. 3rd Ed. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Brofhy, J. 1986. On motivating students. East learning, Michigan: Institute for research on teaching. Michigan State University. United States. 276-724.
- Buehl, M.M., & Beck, J.S. 2015. The relationship between teachers' beliefs and teachers' practices. *International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs*. 66-84. New York: Routledge.
- Bullock, D. 2010. Learner self-assessment: An investigation into teachers' beliefs. *ELT journal*. 65(2). 114-125.
- Burns, A. 1999. *Collaborative action research for English language teachers*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Burton, C. 1992. Defining family-centered early education. Beliefs of public school, child care, and Head Start teachers. *Early education and development*. 3. 45-59.
- Cabaroglu, N., & Roberts, J. 2000. Development in teachers' pre-existing beliefs during a 1-year PGCE program. *System*, 28. 387-402.
- Canagarajah, S. 2005. Introduction. In A. S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Reclaiming the local language policy and practice*. 13-30.
- Canagarajah, S. 2007. Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*. 91(5), 923-939.
- Canagarajah, S., Wurr, J. 2011. Multilingual communication and language acquisition: New research directions. *The reading matrix*. 11, 1-15.
- Catanzaro M. 1988. Using qualitative analytical techniques. In *Nursing Research; Theory and Practice* (Woods P. & Catanzaro M., eds), C.V. Mosby Company, New York, pp. 437-456.
- Cavanagh S. 1997. Content analysis: concepts, methods and applications. *Nurse Researcher* 4, 5-16.

- Chenail, R.J. 2011. Interviewing the investigator: strategies for addressing instrumentation and researcher bias concerns in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*. 16(1). 255-262.
- Chestnutt, I.G., Robson, K.F. 2001. Focus groups: what are they? *Dent Update*. 28. 189-192.
- Choi, T. 2013. Curriculum innovation through teacher certification: Evaluation of a government intervention and its effects on teacher development and English language pedagogy in South Korea. PhD Thesis, King's College London.
- Chowdhury, R., & Phan, L. H. 2008. Reflecting on western TESOL training and communicating language teaching: Bangladeshi teachers' voices. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 28(3). 305-316.
- Ciani, K.D., Summers, J., & Easter, M.A. 2008. A "top down" analysis of high school teacher motivation. *Contemporary educational psychology*. 709-725. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Cincotta-Segi, A.R. 2011. Signaling L2 centrality, maintaining L1 dominance: Teacher language choice in an ethnic minority primary classroom in the Lao PDR. *Language and education*. 25(1). 19-31.
- Clark, C.M., & Peterson, P.L. 1986. Teachers' thought processes. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Second handbook of research on teaching*. 255-296. New York: Macmillan.
- Clark, C. & Yinger, R. 1987. Explorer teacher thinking. In J. Calderhead (Ed.). *Teacher planning*. 57-71. London: Cassell.
- Cogo, A. 2008. English as a lingua franca: Forms follows function. *English today*. 24(3). 58-61.
- Cogo, A. 2009. Accommodating differences in ELF conversations: a study of pragmatic strategies. *English as a lingua franca: studies and findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 254-273.
- Cogo, A. 2010. Strategic use and perceptions of English as a lingua franca. *Pozna studies in contemporary linguistics*. 46(3). 295-312.

- Cogo, A. 2012. ELF and super-diversity: A case study of ELF multilingual practices from a business context. *Journal of English as a lingua franca*. 1(2). 287-313.
- Cogo A. 2015. English as a Lingua Franca: Descriptions, Domains and Applications. In: Bowles H., Cogo A. (eds) International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca. *International Perspectives on English Language Teaching*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. 2012. *Analysis English as a Lingua Franca: A corpus-driven investigation*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Cogo, A., & House, J. 2017. The pragmatics of ELF. *The routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca*. 210-223.
- Cook, V.J. 2005. Basing teaching on the L2 user. *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession*. New York: Springer. 47-62.
- Cook, V.J. 2007. The goal of ELT: Reproducing native-speakers or promoting multicompetence among second language users?. *International handbook of English language teaching*. New York: Springer. 237-248.
- Cridland, E.K., Jones, S.C., Caputi, P., Magee, C.A. 2015. Qualitative research with families living with autism spectrum disorder: recommendations for conducting semi-structured interviews. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability*. 40(1). 78-91.
- Davies, M. B. 2007. *Doing a successful research project: using qualitative or quantitative methods*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dearnley, C. 2005. A reflection on the use of semi-structured interviews. *Nurse Research*. 13(1). 19-28.
- de Jong, E.J. 2008. Contextualizing policy appropriation: Teachers' perspectives, local responses, and English-only ballot initiatives. *Urban review*. 40(4). 350-370.

- Denzin, N.K., Lincoln, Y.S. 2013. *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. 4th Ed. Sage. Newbury Park.
- Dewey, J. 1986. *The later works of John Dewey*. 8. 1925-1953.
- Dewey, M. 2007. English as a lingua franca: An empirical study of innovation in lexis and grammar. King's College London.
- Dewey, M., Leung, C. 2010. English in English language teaching: Shifting values and assumptions in changing circumstances. *Working papers in educational linguistics*. 25(1). 1-15.
- Dewey, M. 2012. Towards a post-normative approach: Learning the pedagogy of ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1(1). 141-170.
- Dewey, M. 2015. ELF, teacher knowledge and profession development. *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franc*. 176-193.
- Dooley, C.M., & Assaf, L.C. 2009. Contexts matter: Two teachers' language arts instruction in this high stakes era. *Journal of literacy Research*. 41(3). 354-391.
- Dornyei, Z. 2007. *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dunn, K. 2005 'Interviewing' in I. Hay (ed). *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press. 321-334.
- Edmondson, W. 1981. *Spoken discourse: A model for analysis*. London: Longman.
- Elo, S. Kyngas, H. 2008. The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of advanced nursing*. 62(1). 107-115.
- Enyedy, N., Goldberg, J., & Welsh, K. 2006. Complex dilemmas of identity of practice. *Science of education*. 90. 68-93.
- Erling, E.J., & Barlett, T. 2006. Making English their own: The use of ELF among students of English at the FUB. *Nordic journal of English studies*. 5(2). 9-40.
- Firth, A. 1996. The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of pragmatics*. 26. 237-259.

- Fives, H. & Buehl, M.M. 2012. Spring cleaning for the “messy” construct of teachers’ beliefs: What are they? Which have been examined What can they tell us? *Educational psychology handbook*. 471-499.
- Flick, U. 2006. *An introduction to qualitative research*. London: Sage.
- Foley, J. A. 2005. English in Thailand. *RELC journal*. 36(2). 223-234.
- Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. 2003. *How to design and evaluate research in education*. Fifth ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Galetta, A. 2012. *Mastering the Semi-structured Interview and Beyond: From Research Design to Analysis and Publication*. New York University Press. New York.
- Gates, P. 2006. Going beyond belief systems: Exploring a model for a social influence on mathematics teacher beliefs. *Educational studies in mathematics*. 63. 347-369.
- Gibs, L., Kealy, M., Willis, K., Green, J., Welch, N., Daly, J. 2007. What have sampling and data collection got to do with good qualitative research? *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*. 31(6). 540-544.
- Gill, M.G., & Hoffman, B. 2009. Shared planning time: A novel context for for studying teachers’ discourse and beliefs about learning and instruction. *Teachers college record*, 111. 1242-1273.
- Golombek, P.R. 1998. A study of language teachers’ personal practical knowledge. *TESOL quarterly*. 32(3). 447-464.
- Gow, L., & Kember, D. 1993. Conceptions of teaching and their relationship to student learning. *British journal of educational psychology*. 63. 20-33.
- Greenwood, J., Parson, M. 2000. A guide to the use of focus groups in health care research: Part 2. *Contemp Nurse*. 9(2). 181-191.
- Haney, J., & McArthur, J. 2002. Focus case studies of prospective science teachers’ beliefs concerning constructivist teaching practices. *Science education*. 86. 783-802.
- Hardon, A., Hodgkin, C. & Fresle, D. 2004. *How to Investigate the Use of Medicines by Customers*. World Health Organization and University of Amsterdam.

- Hollis, V. Openshaw, S., Goble, R. 2002. Conducting focus groups: Purpose and practicalities. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 65. 2-8.
- Holloway, I., Wheeler, S. 1996. *Qualitative for Nurses*. Blackwell Science. Oxford.
- House, J. 2002. Communicating English as a lingua franca. *EUROSLA Yearbook* 2. 243-261.
- House, J. 2009. Subjectivity in English as a lingua franca: the case of you know. *Intercultural pragmatics*. 6, 171-194.
- House, J. 2010. The pragmatics of English as a lingua franca. *Handbook of pragmatics*. 7. 363-387.
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A.E. 1990. Socialization o student teachers. *American educational research journal*. 27, 279-300.
- Hsieh H.-F. & Shannon S. 2005. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*. 15, 1277- 1288.
- Hurworth, R. 1996. Qualitative methodology. Common questions about running focus groups during evaluations. *Evaluation News and Comment*. 58(1). 489-452.
- Hynninen, N. & Solin, A. 2017. Language norms in ELF. *The routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca*. 267-278.
- Ivanoff, S.D., Hulberg, J. 2006. Understanding the multiple realities of everyday life: Basic assumptions in focus-group methodology. *Scandinavian Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 13(2). 125-132.
- Jenkins, J. 2000. *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. 2006. Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International journal of applied linguistics*. 16(2). 137-162.
- Jenkins, J. 2007. *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Jenkins, J. 2009. *World Englishes* 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J. 2012. English as a lingua franca from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 66(4). 486-494.
- Jenkins, J. 2014. *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University: The Politics of Academic English Language Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J. 2015. Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice*, 2, (3), 49-85.
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. 2011. Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language teaching*, 44(3). 281-315.
- Jenkins, J. & Leung, C. 2019. From mythical 'standard' to standard reality: The need for alternatives to standardized English language tests. *Lang. Teach.* 52(1). 86-110.
- Jorgensen, R., Grootenboer, P., Niesche, R., & Lerman, S. 2010. Challenges for teacher education: The mismatch between beliefs and practice in remote indigenous contexts. *Asia-pacific journal of teacher education*. 38(2). 161-175.
- Johnson, B. & Turner, L. A. 2003. Data collection strategies in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddie (Eds.). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 297-319). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. □
- Julianne, C. Turner, Andrea Christensen., & Debra K. Meyer. 2009. Teachers' beliefs about student learning motivation. *Springer international handbooks of education*. 21(5). 361-371.
- Kachru, B. 1985. "Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle" in R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson (eds.). *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kagan, D.M., 1992. Implementations of research on teacher belief. *Educational psychologist*, 27. 65-90.
- Kalio, H., Pietila, A.M., Johnson, M., Kangasniemi, M. 2016. Systematic methodological

- review: developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 72(12). 2954-2965.
- Kang, N. 2008. Learning to teach science: Personal epistemologies, teaching goals, and practices of teaching. *Teaching and teacher education*. 24(2). 478-498.
- Kanoksilapatham, B. 2013. The university students' voices heard: Aspired pronunciation model. *Journal of English studies*. 8, 124-153.
- Kaur, J. 2012. Saying it again: Enhancing clarity in English as a lingua franca (ELF) talk through self-repetition. *Text and Talk*. 5, 593-613.
- Kirkpatrick, A. 2010. *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN*. Hong Kong. Hong Kong university press.
- Kitzinger, J. 1995. Introducing focus groups. *BMJ*. 311. 299-302.
- Klimpfinger, T. 2009. "She's mixing the two languages together"—forms and functions of code-switching in English as a lingua franca' in A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds.). *English as lingua franca. Studies and findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne. Cambridge scholars publishing.
- Kohn, K. 2011. English as a lingua franca and the standard English misunderstanding. *English in Europe today: Sociocultural and educational perspectives*. 71-94.
- Kongkerd, W. 2013. Teaching English in the era of English used as a lingua franca in Thailand. *Executive journal*. 33(4). 3-12.
- Kramersch, C. 2009. *The multilingual subject*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krauss, S.E., Hamzah, A., Omar, Z., Suandi, T. Ismail, I.A., Zhari, M.Z. 2009. Preliminary investigation and interview guide development for studying how Malaysian farmers form their mental models of farming. *The Qualitative Report*. 14(2). 245-260.
- Krippendorff, K. 2013. *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology (3rd ed.)*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Krueger, R.A., Casey, M.A. 2015. *Focus Groups: A practical guide for applied research*. 5th Ed. Sage. Newbury Park.

- Lane, P., McKenna, H., Ryan, A.A., Fleming, P. 2001. Focus group methodology, *Nurse Res.* 8(3). 45-59.
- La Paro, K., Siepak, K., & Scott-Little, C. 2009. Assessing beliefs of preservice early childhood education teachers using Q-sort methodology. *Journal of early childhood teacher education.* 30. 22-36.
- Lee, Y.S., Baik, J., & Charlesworth, R. 2006. Differential effects of kindergarten teachers' beliefs about developmentally appropriate practice on their use of scaffolding following inservice training. *Teaching and teacher education.* 22. 935-945.
- Litosseliti, L. 2003. *Using Focus Groups in Research.* Continuum. New York.
- Llurda, E. English language teachers and ELF. *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca.* 518-528.
- Longhurst, R. Semi-structured interviews and focus group. *Key Methods in Geography.* Sage. 143-156.
- Mansour, N. 2009. Science teachers' beliefs and practices: Issues, implementations, and research agenda. *International journal of environmental and science education.* 4. 25-48.
- Matsuda, A. 2003. Incorporating world Englishes in teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Quarterly.* 37(4). 719-729.
- Matsuda, A. 2012b. Introduction. In a Matsuda (ed.), *Principles and practices in teaching English as an international language.* Bristol: Multilingual matters. 1-14.
- Matsumoto, Y. 2011. Successful ELF communications and implications for ELT: Sequential analysis of ELF pronunciation negotiation strategies. *The modern language journal.* 95. 97-114.
- Mauranen, A. 2012. *Exploring EL: academia English shaped by non-native speakers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mauranen, A. 2014. Lingua Franca discourse in academic contexts: Shaped by complexity. I Flowerdrew, J. ed. *Discourse in Context: Contemporary Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 3. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 225-245.
- Mayring, P. 2000. Qualitative content analysis. *Forum qualitative sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative social research*. 1(2).
- Meighan, R. & Meighan, J. 1990. Alternative roles for learners with particular reference to learners as democratic explorers in teacher education courses. *The school field*. 1(1). 61-77.
- Melodie, S., & Sherma, R. 2008. Developing effective teacher beliefs about learners: the role of sensitizing teachers to individual learning differences. *Educational psychology*. 28(30). 245-272.
- Merriam, S. B. 1988. *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Morgan, D.I. 1995. Why things (sometimes) go wrong in focus groups. *Qual Health Res*. 5. 516-523.
- Mosely, C., Reinke, K. & Bookout, V. 2002. The effect of teaching outdoor environmental education of preservice teachers' attitudes toward self-efficacy and outcome expectancy. *Journal of environmental education*. 34. 9-15.
- Murphy, P.K., & Alexander, P.A. 2004. Persuasion as a dynamic, multidimensional process: An investigation of individual and intraindividual differences. *American educational research journal*. 41. 337-363.
- Murray, N. 2012. English as a lingua franca and the development of pragmatic competence. *ELT Journal*. 66(3): 318-326.
- Nespor, J. 1987. The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of curriculum studies*. 19. 317-328.

- Ng, J., Farrell, T.S.C. 2003. Do teachers' beliefs of grammar teaching match their classroom practices? *TESL-EJ*. 9(2). 234-256.
- Nisbett, R., & Ross, L. 1980. *Human influence: strategies and shortcomings of social judgment*. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Nishino, T. 2012. Modeling teacher beliefs and practices in context: A multimethods approach. *Modern language journal*. 96(3). 380-399.
- Nuthall, G., 2004. Relating classroom teaching to student learning: A critical analysis of why research has failed to bridge the theory-practice gap. *Harvard educational review*. 74. 273-306.
- O'Leary, M. 2014. *Classroom Observation: A guide to the Effective Observation of Teaching and Learning*. Routledge.
- Onwuegbuzie, J.A., Dickinson, W.B., Leech, N.L., Zoran, A.G. 2009. A qualitative framework for collecting and analyzing data in focus group research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 1-21.
- Pajares, M.F. 1992. Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up the messy construct. *Review of educational research*, 62(3). 307-322.
- Park, J.S. 2010. Images of 'good English' in the Korean conservative press. *Pragmatics and society*. 1(2). 189-208.
- Patton, M. 1990. *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. 169-186.
- Pillot, D.S., Beck, D.C. 2010. *Essential of Nursing Research: Appraising Evidence for Nursing Practice*, 7th edn. Lippincott-Raven Publishers. Philadelphia.
- Plummer, P. 2008. Focus group methodology part1: considerations for design. *International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation*. 15(2). 69-73.
- Polit D.F. & Beck C.T. (2004) *Nursing Research. Principles and Methods*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Philadelphia, PA.

- Polzl, U., & Seidlhofer, B. 2006. In and on their own terms: the ‘habitat factor’ in English as a lingua franca interaction. *International journal of the sociology of language*. 177. 151-176.
- Potari, D., & Georgiadou-Kabouridis, B. 2009. A primary teachers’ mathematics teaching: The development of beliefs and practice in different “supportive” contexts. *Journal of mathematics teacher education*. 12(1). 7-25.
- Phipps, S., & Borg, S. 2009. Exploring tensions between teachers’ grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System: An international journal of educational technology and applied linguistics*. 37(3). 380-390.
- Pine, G.J. & Boy, A. V. 1977. Learner centered teaching: A humanistic view. Love Publishing Co.
- Rabiee, F. 2004. Focus group interview and data analysis. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*. 63. 655-660.
- Rabionet, S.E. (2011). How I learned to design and construct semi-structured interviews: an ongoing and continuous journey. *The Qualitative Report*. 16(2). 563-566.
- Rajeevnath, R. 2015. English language education in Thailand and AEC 2015. *RJES*. 2(1). 28-36.
- Ranta, E. 2010. English the real world. English at school: Finish English teachers’ and students’ views. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 20(2). 156-177.
- Ranta, E. 2017. Grammar in ELF. *The routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca*. 244-254.
- Rapley, T. 2007. *Doing Conversation, Discourse and Document Analysis*. London. Sage.
- Rattanaphumma, R. 2013. English as a lingua franca: ELF learners’ views on varieties of English and cultural identity. *The international academic forum*. 1-9.
- Ren, W., Chen, Y., Lin, C. 2016. University students’ perceptions of ELF in mainland China and Taiwan. *System*. 13(27). 13-27.

- Rentzou, K., & Sakellariou, M. 2011. Greek pre-service kindergarten teachers' beliefs about and practices of developmentally appropriate practices in early childhood education. *Early child development and care*. 181(8). 1047-1061.
- Richards, J. C. & T. S. Rodgers 2001. *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. Farrell, T. 2011. *Practice Teaching: A Reflective Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, L., and Morse, J.M. 2003. *Readme First for a User's Guide to Qualitative Methods* (2nd edn.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Richardson, C.A., Rabiie, F. 2001. A question of access: an exploration of the factors influencing the health of young males aged 15-19 living in Corby and their use of health care services. *Health Education Journal*. 60. 3-6.
- Richardson, V. 1996. The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. *Handbook of research in teacher education, second edition*. 102-119.
- Rimm-Kaufman, S., Storm, M., Sawyer, B., Pianta, R., & LaParo, K.M. 2006. The teacherbelief Q-Sort: A measure of teachers' priorities in relation to disciplinary practices, and beliefs about children. *Journal of school psychology*. 44(2). 141-165.
- Robert, P. 1997. Planning and running focus group. *Nurse Res*. 4(4). 78-82.
- Robinson, N. 1999. The use of focus group methodology with selected examples from the sexual health research. *J Adv Nurs*. 905-913.
- Roehring, A.D., Turner, G.E., Grove, C.M., Schneider, N., & Liu, Z. 2009. Degree of alignment between beginning teachers' practices and beliefs about effective classroom practices. *Teacher educator*. 44(3). 164-187.
- Rubin, H.J., Rubin, I.S. 2005. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing the Data*, 2nd edn. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

- Rushton, G.T., Lotter, C., & Singer, J. 2011. Chemistry teachers' emerging expertise in inquiry teaching: The effect of professional development model on beliefs and practice. *Journal of science teacher education*. 22(1). 23-52.
- RWFF (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation). 2008. Semi-structured Interviews.
- Sandelowski, M. 2008. Theoretical saturation. In L.M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of Qualitative Methods*. 1. 875-876.
- Saumure, K., Given, L.M. 2008. Data saturation. In L.M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of Qualitative Methods*. 1. 195-196.
- Savasci-Acikalin. 2009. Teacher beliefs and practice in science education. *Asia-pacific forum on learning and teaching*. 10(1). 1-14.
- Savasci, F., & Berlin, D.F. 2012. Science teacher beliefs and classroom practice related to constructivism in different school settings. *Journal of science teacher education*. 23(1). 65-86.
- Schoenfeld, A. 2012. Classroom observations and practice. *ZDM Mathematics Education*. DOI 10.1007/s11858-012-0483-1.
- Seale, C. (1998). Qualitative interviewing. In C. Seale (Ed.), *Researching society and culture* (pp. 203-216). London: Sage.
- Seidlhofer, B. 2004. Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual review of applied linguistics*. 24. 209-239.
- Seidlhofer, B. 2009. Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes*. 28(2). 236-245
- Seidlhofer, B. 2011. *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shavelson, R.J., Stern, P. 1981. Research on teachers' pedagogical judgments, decisions, and behavior. *Review of Educational research*, 51(4). 455-498.

- Sifakis, N. 2008. Challenges in teaching ELF in periphery: The Greek context. *ELT journal*. 63(3). 230-237. Oxford University Press.
- Sifakis, N. 2009. Challenges in teaching ELF in the periphery: The Greek context. *ELT journal*. 63(3). 230-237.
- Sifakis, N., 2014. ELF awareness as an opportunity for change: A transformative perspective for ESOL teacher education. *JELF*. 3(2). 317-335.
- Sifakis, N., & Bayyurt, Y. 2015. Insights from ELF and WE in teacher training in Greece and Turkey. *World Englishes*. 471-484.
- Sifakis, N. 2017. ELF awareness in English language teaching: Principles and processes. *Applied linguistics*. 1-20. Oxford University Press.
- Sifakis, N., & Bayyurt, Y. 2018. ELF-aware teaching, learning and teacher development. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds). *Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*. 456-467. London: Routledge.
- Sifakis, N. 2019. ELF awareness in English language teaching: Principles and processes. *Applied linguistics*. 40(2). 288-306. Oxford University Press.
- Sim, J., Snell, J. 1996. Focus groups in physiotherapy evaluation and research. *Physiotherapy*. 82. 189-198.
- Smith, D.B. 1996. Teacher decision making in the adult ESL classroom. *Teacher learning in language teaching*. 197-216. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, J.M. 1972. *Group discussions. In interviewing in market and social research*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London and Boston.
- Southerland, S.A., Sinatra, G.M., & Matthews, M. 2001. Belief, knowledge, and science education. *Educational psychology review*. 13. 325-351.
- Southerland, S.A., Gallard, A., & Callihan, L. 2011. Examining teachers' hurdles to "Science for all." *International journal of science education*. 33(16). 2183-2213.

- Stewart, D.W., Shamdasani, P.N. 2014. *Focus group: Theory and practice*. 3rd Ed. Sage. Newbury Park.
- Strauss, A., Corbin, J. 1998. *Basic of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (2nd ed.)*. London. Sage.
- Tan, M. 2011. Mathematics and science teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the teaching of language in content learning. *Language teaching research*. 15(3). 325-342.
- Tang, E.L.-Y., Lee, J.C.-k., & Chun, C.K.-W. 2012. Development of teaching beliefs and the focus of change in the process of pre-service ESL teacher education. *Australian journal of teacher education*. 37(5). 89-107.
- Teague, G.M., Anfara, V.R., Wilson, N.L., Gaines, C.B., & Beavers, J.L. 2012. Instructional practices in the middle grades: A mixed methods case study. *NASSP Bulletin*. 96(3). 203-227.
- Thompson, A. 1992. Teachers' beliefs and conceptions. *Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning*. 127-146.
- Todd, R. W. 2006. The myth of native speaker as a model of English proficiency. *rEFLECTIONS*. 8. 1-7.
- Torronen, J. 2002. Semiotic theory on qualitative interviewing using stimulus texts. *Qualitative Research*. 2(3). 343-362
- Turner, D.W. 2010. Qualitative interview design: a practical guide for novice researcher. *The Qualitative Report*. 15(3). 754-760.
- Trakulkasemsuk, W. 2018. English in Thailand: Looking back to the past, at the present and towards the future. *Asian Englishes*. 20(2). 96-105.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk Hoy, A. 2001. Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and teacher education*. 17. 783-815.

- Turner, J.C., Warzon, K., Christensen, A. 2011. Motivating mathematics learning: Changes in teachers' practices and beliefs during a nine-month collaboration. *American educational research journal*. 110(2). 228-245.
- Ur, P. 2010. English as a lingua franca: A teacher's perspective. *Cadernos de Letras*. 27(1). 85-92.
- Uzuntiryaki, E., Boz, Y., & Kirbulut, D. 2010. Do pre-service chemistry teachers reflect their beliefs about constructivism in their teaching practices? *Research in science education*. 40(3). 403-424.
- Vettorell, P. 2014. *English as a lingua franca in wider networking*. Berlin. De Gruyter.
- Wang, Y. 2012. *Chinese speakers' perceptions of their English in intercultural communication*. Southampton, UK: University of Southampton Doctoral thesis.
- Wang, Y. 2013. Non-conformity to ENL norms: a perspective from Chinese users. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 2(2). 255-282.
- Wang, Y. 2015. Chinese university students' ELF awareness: Impacts of language education in China. *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franc.* 86-106.
- Wengraft, T. 2001. *Qualitative Research Interviewing: Biographic Narrative and Semi-structured Methods*. Sage. London.
- Whiting, L.S. 2008. Semi-structured interviews: guidance for novice researchers. *Nursing Standard*. 22(23). 35-40.
- Widdowson, H. 1994. The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly* 28(2). 377-389.
- Williams, M., Burden, R.L. 1997. *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolffartsberger, A. 2011. ELF business/business ELF: Form and function in simultaneous speech. *Latest trends in ELF research*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 163-184.

- Xu, L. 2012. The role of teachers' beliefs in the language teaching-learning process. *Theory and practice in language study*. 2(7). 1397-1402.
- Yadav, A., Koehler, M. 2007. The role of epistemological beliefs in preservice teachers' interpretation of video cases of early-grade literacy instruction. *Journal of technology and teacher education*. 15. 335-361.
- Yang, L. 1995. English pedagogy. Shan Dong University Press.
- Yerrick, R., Parke, H., & Nugent, J. 1997. Struggling to promote deeply rooted change: the "filtering effect" of teachers' beliefs on understanding transformational views of teaching science. *Science education*. 81. 137-159.
- Yin, R. K. 1994. *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zohrabi, M. 2013. Mixed Method Research: Instruments, Validity, Reliability and Reporting Findings. *Theory and Practice in Language studies*. 3(2). 254-262.
- Zheng, H. 2009. A review of research on EFL pre-service teachers' beliefs and practices. *Journal of Cambridge studies*. 4(1). 73-81.

