คณะศิลปศาสตร์
มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลศรีวิชัย
เลขรับ ๗๓๙๔
วันที่ ๑๙ ต.ค.๖๙
เวลา ๑๐.๑๗ น.

งานวิจัย
คณะศิลปศาสตร์
เลขรับ ๙๘๖
วันที่ ๑๙ ต.ค.๖๙
เวลา ๑๐.๒๔ น.

บันทึกข้อความ

ส่วนราชการ หลักสูตรสาขาวิชาภาษาต่างประเทศเพื่อการสื่อสาร คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลศรีวิชัย

ที่ ๗๙๘/๒๕๖๙ **วันที่** ๑๙ ตุลาคม ๒๕๖๙

เรื่อง ขอส่งรายงานวิจัยฉบับสมบูรณ์ ประจำปี ๒๕๖๘

เรียน คณบดีคณะศิลปศาสตร์

ด้วยข้าพเจ้านางสาวกิตติยา พิศุทธางกูร ตำแหน่ง อาจารย์ สังกัดหลักสูตรสาขาวิชาภาษาต่างประเทศเพื่อการสื่อสาร ได้รับอนุญาตให้ดำเนินงานโครงการวิจัย เรื่อง เรื่อง ความตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ โดยไม่ขอใช้งบประมาณ

ในการนี้ ข้าพเจ้าจึงขอส่งรายงานวิจัยฉบับสมบูรณ์ เพื่อให้ผู้ทรงคุณวุฒิของคณะศิลปศาสตร์พิจารณาตรวจสอบ ตามเอกสารแนบ

จึงเรียนมาเพื่อโปรดพิจารณา

กิตติยา พิศุทธางกูร

(ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์กิตติยา พิศุทธางกูร)
ประธานหลักสูตรศิลปศาสตรบัณฑิต
สาขาวิชาภาษาต่างประเทศเพื่อการสื่อสาร

เรียน คณบดี

- เพื่อโปรดพิจารณา
- อ.กิตติยา ขอส่งรายงานวิจัยฉบับสมบูรณ์ ประจำปี ๒๕๖๘ เรื่อง ความตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ ดังแนบ

ธีระชัย
๑๙ ต.ค.๖๙

19/10/2569
13:27:02 +07'00'
DID-EB308CC38C

นางสาวศุภรดา พูนแก้ว
๑๙ ต.ค. ๖๙

๑๙ ต.ค. ๖๙



รายงานวิจัย

ความตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ

Thai EFL Learners' Awareness of Spoken Grammar and Their Perceptions of Its Instruction

กิตติยา พิศุทธางกูร

Kittiya Phisutthangkoon

คณะศิลปศาสตร์

Faculty of Liberal Arts

มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลศรีวิชัย

Rajamangala University of Technology Srivijaya

ประจำปี พ.ศ. 2568

(2025)

Abstract

This study aimed to explore the Thai EFL university students' self-reported awareness of spoken grammar and their perceptions of spoken grammar instruction. This issue has been understudied particularly in the Thai EFL contexts. The population and sample consisted of all 89 third-year Thai EFL students majoring in English, selected through purposive sampling. Using both the questionnaire and semi-structured interviews, the findings revealed that the majority of the student participants demonstrated limited knowledge of spoken grammar, as less than half of all participants were familiar with spoken grammar. Many of them lacked knowledge of spoken grammar features e.g., ellipsis, heads and tails. This may be due to the emphasis on written grammar in teaching speaking in the Thai EFL context. However, the majority of the participants viewed that learning spoken grammar could enhance their speaking skills, and perceived that spoken grammar instruction as important, as it could help them speak English more naturally, fluently and confidently. The majority of them also suggested their teachers introduce spoken grammar in the classroom by showing the differences between spoken and written grammar to avoid confusion. Additionally, they recommend using authentic materials and textbooks that include spoken grammar features along with its practical examples of how to use them. However, these findings focused on learners' perceived familiarity and teaching preferences rather than assessing their spoken grammatical knowledge. This study aimed to address the gap in the literatures and amplify Thai EFL university students' voices regarding spoken grammar instruction.

Keywords: self-reported awareness, spoken grammar, perceptions, spoken grammar instruction

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction 7
1.1 Introduction 7
1.2 The research questions 9
1.3 The research objectives 9
1.4 Significance of the study 10
Chapter 2 Literature Review 11
2.1 Spoken grammar 11
2.1.1 Features of spoken grammar 11
2.2 Teaching spoken grammar 14
2.3 Research on spoken grammar and its instruction 16
Chapter 3 Methodology 19
3.1 Research Objectives 19
3.2 Research Design 19
3.2.1 Research participants 19
3.2.2 Research instruments and procedure 19
3.2.3 Data Analysis 20
Chapter 4 Findings 21
4.1 Thai EFL university students' self-reported awareness of spoken grammar 21
4.1.1 Insufficient awareness of spoken grammar 23
4.2 Thai EFL university students' perceptions of spoken grammar instruction 26
4.2.1 Perceived benefits of spoken grammar instruction 29
4.2.2 Students' concerns regarding spoken grammar instruction 30
4.2.3 Preferred practices of spoken grammar instruction 31
Chapter 5 Discussion 34
5.1 Thai EFL university students' awareness of spoken grammar 34
5.1.1 Insufficient awareness of spoken grammar 34
5.2 Thai EFL university students' perceptions of spoken grammar instruction 35
5.2.1 Teaching spoken grammar: Gains and challenges 35
5.2.2 Spoken grammar instruction 36

5.3 Conclusion 38
5.4 Limitations of the study / Future Research 39
5.5 Ethics approval 39
References 40
Appendix A: Information Sheet for Research Participants 42
Appendix B: Informed Consent Form 45
Appendix C: The Questionnaire 46
Appendix D: Interview Questions 54

Lists of Table

Table 4.1 Students' self -reported awareness of spoken grammar ……21

Table 4.2 Joint display of quantitative and qualitative findings on students' self-reported Awareness of Spoken Grammar…….25

Table 4.3 Students' perceptions of spoken grammar …….26

Table 4.4 Joint display of quantitative and qualitative findings on students' perceptions of Spoken Grammar……32

Acknowledgement

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to all of the participants, the third-year students majoring in English who voluntarily agreed to participate in the research, provided useful data, and spent their time to accomplish the study.

I also would like to express my sincere appreciation to all of the experts for checking all of the instruments in this study to ensure the validity of the instruments.

Lastly, I truly appreciate to my family who have always supported me for everything I have done.

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

English has been recognized as a language that has been spoken widely and internationally around the world. It has been employed as a global language for communication in many areas including education, business, and professional careers. In Thailand, although English is used as a foreign language (Saengboon et al., 2022; Yuh & Kaewurai, 2021), it has become increasingly important for teaching at all educational levels, particularly in higher education, since 2015, when Thailand entered the era of ASEAN economic community , in which English serve as the primarily medium of communication. Thai students have been encouraged to improve their speaking skills to be the potential effective qualified manpower for enhancing economic growth of the country (Sha'ar & Boonsuk, 2021). Despite the Thai government putting an effort into improving Thai students' speaking skills, Thai students still are not able to speak English effectively and fluently (Yuh & Kaewurai, 2021). The evidence of their low level of English proficiency has been shown in the results of several international standardized tests including IELTS, TOEIC and TOEFL (Saengboon, 2017) .

In Thailand, many EFL teachers have still implemented a traditional approach, namely grammar translation, in English language teaching (Pianpadungporn, 2024; Saengboon et al., 2022) which focuses on teaching grammar rules explicitly (Pianpadungporn, 2024). This issue has also existed in several classrooms in other EFL contexts. This method focuses on teaching grammar separately from creating opportunities for students to practice speaking skills (Islam & Stapa, 2021) and it greatly depends on teacher-centered approach which the student's role remains that of a passive learner. Therefore, students rarely improve their confidence and speaking skills(Gömleksi˙z, 2007). It only allows students to practice grammar through using grammatical rules for translation and practicing pronunciation drills (Putra et al., 2021). Apart from this, a lot of emphasis has been placed on grammar and writing skills (Panthito, 2018). In addition, grammar that are taught in the EFL context is rather relevant to writing skills (Al-wossabi, 2014; Leech, 2000). However, written-based grammar does not include features that exist commonly in English native speakers' conversation (Carter & McCarthy, 1995; Timmis, 2002). Although, lecturers and administrators have been focused more on improving Thai EFL students' speaking skills, grammar structures are also the key issues that are greatly focused in English language and teaching in Thai EFL contexts (Pawabutra & Sutakote, 2024). Nonetheless, conversational grammar that is used in daily conversations seem not to be recognized in the classroom

settings (Al-wossabi, 2014). Teaching materials for teaching speaking skills are mainly based on written grammar which are not presented key spoken features (Carter & McCarthy, 1995). The question of what teachers teach should instead reflect how language is authentically used in real-life conversations (Timmis, 2002). In other to communicate in real life conversation, it is necessary for students to acknowledge the features of spoken grammar (Rashtchi & Afzali, 2011).

In reality, spoken language is likely to occur spontaneously depending on the contexts related to many aspects such as tone, intonation, and nonverbal language. On the other hand, written language can be edible, preparable, and more formal (Tripathi, 2022). As a consequence, grammar is divided into two main categories; prescriptive and descriptive grammar (Ellis, 2019). While prescriptive grammar, including written grammar, has been the focus of English language teaching, descriptive grammar including spoken grammar has been largely overlooked in EFL educational settings (Al-wossabi, 2014). The prescriptive grammar emphasizes using language following standard English, the rules of standard English, as stated in grammar books, which may not always reflect in how people actually speak. On the other hand, the descriptive grammar involves how language is used in real life context (Saengboon et al., 2022).

Therefore, proponents of descriptive grammar insist that spoken grammar should be taught as they are generally used in daily life situations and spoken form should not be taught by using the written norms of language (Al-wossabi, 2014). More studies showed the necessity of focusing on spoken grammar instruction. Pawabutra and Sutakote (2024) reported in their study that the Thai EFL students encountered difficulties in using grammar structures in the spoken language. In addition, EFL teachers themselves also face challenges in teaching spoken grammar (Larasati et al., 2021). However, it will not be effective for developing speaking skills if it ignores how real spoken language works. McCarthy and Carter (2006) stated that the spoken output will not be natural if the examples and practices are greatly based on written language.

As a consequence, in language teaching, students should be raised an awareness of the differences between spoken grammar and written grammar (Goh, 2009). Students need to know more grammar options so they can use language well in both speaking and writing (McCarthy & Carter, 2006). Although the teaching of spoken grammar is also still an arguable issue (Goh, 2009), many scholars (e.g., Al-wossabi,2014; Carter & McCarthy,1995)

strongly support the teaching of conversational grammar to students in English language teaching and many of them (e.g., Larasati et al., 2021; Leech, 2000) have paid greater attention to spoken grammar to focus on developing students' speaking skills. In addition, Saengboon (2017) revealed that the student participants in his study reported that grammar is considered an important part for using effective English. Moreover, teaching grammar will be more successful when the focus is on the communitive use of the grammar. With appropriate teaching of grammar for their speaking skills, students will be able to speak English naturally, appropriately , and confidently (Hilliard, 2014).

To enhance Thai EFL university students' speaking skills and improve the quality of English language teaching in the Thai context, this study; therefore, aim to explore Thai EFL university students' self-reported awareness of spoken grammar and their perceptions of teaching spoken grammar in order to gain insight into their understanding and their views on the spoken grammar instruction.

1.2 The research questions

1. What are the Thai EFL third-year university students' self-reported awareness of spoken grammar?

2. What are Thai EFL third-year university students' perceptions of spoken grammar instruction?

1.3 The research objectives

The objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To investigate Thai EFL third-year university students' self-reported awareness of spoken grammar.

2. To explore Thai EFL third-year university students' perceptions of spoken grammar instruction.

1.4 Significance of the study

The studies on spoken grammar have not been widely explored particularly in the EFL context. However, it is very vital to investigate students' awareness of spoken grammar and their perceptions of it as it will be very valuable data for English instructors in preparing the lesson regarding spoken grammar and adjusting the curriculum to match students' needs. This, in turn, may enhance their English proficiency, as awareness of the spoken grammar encourages students to speak English more naturally, fluently, and confidently.

Chapter 2 Literature Review

This chapter will review the literature on spoken grammar, including the features of spoken grammar, the teaching of spoken grammar, and research on spoken grammar and its instruction.

2.1 Spoken grammar

Grammar instruction has traditionally been presented based on standard of written English. However, recently, researchers have focused on the characteristics of spoken grammar and questioning whether written grammar rules and grammatical descriptions should be applied to the spoken language. With the adoption of communicative language teaching in the classroom, raising awareness of spoken grammar is important for helping students develop fluency in real-life conversations. This approach enhances the authenticity of speaking lessons and enables students to speak more naturally, instead of sounding overly formal or bookish (Hilliard, 2014). Grammar allows students to explore the nature of language. Students are not able to use grammar properly without understanding them (Demir & Erdogan, 2018).

2.1.1 Features of spoken grammar

Spoken grammar represents consistent grammatical features that reflect in speech as a result of typical situation in which speeches are produced (Cullen & Kuo, 2007). The spoken grammar features exist due to the spontaneous and unplanned nature of real time conversations, which cannot be edited (Cullen & Kuo, 2007; Hilliard, 2014; Leech, 2000). It is also related to the relationship between the speaker and the listener. The choices of grammar used are also considered through many aspects including tentativeness and politeness. Several basis forms of spoken language do not follow rules of the written language (McCarthy & Carter, 2006). Therefore, recognizing the features of spoken grammar can help students improve their speaking skills and enhance their grammar knowledge (Hilliard, 2014). Without being aware of using these spoken gramma features, native English speakers may struggle to communicate effectively. It would be inappropriate not to explore how speakers use real language in daily life because it can improve learners' communicative skills globally (McCarthy & Carter, 2006). Therefore, it is essential for EFL learners to learn these features as well in order to enhance their communication skills (Mumford, 2009).

Several scholars (e.g., Biber et al. 1999; Carter & McCarthy, 1997; Cullen and Kuo, 2007; Hillird, 2004; Goh and Burn, 2012) proposed characteristics of spoken grammar. For example, Cullen and Kuo (2007) classified the spoken grammar into three main categories; category A includes noun phrase tags, past progressive tense, and ellipsis; category B includes lexicogrammatical units; and category C covers items relating to informal and spoken interactions, which are often viewed as grammatically incorrect according to traditional prescriptive grammar norms. Later, Hilliard (2014) classified spoken grammar into six main categories including ellipsis, heads, tails, fillers, backchannels , and phrasal chunks which shared similarities with previous scholars (e.g., Biber et al., 1999; Cullen & Kuo, 2007; Goh & Burns, 2012).

To begin with, ellipsis is the omission of one or more elements of the phrases or the sentences (Hilliard, 2014). This happens as the parts that are omitted might be redundant within the given context. The decision can be made by the speakers whether to use ellipsis by considering the context where they share the mutual knowledge with the interlocutor. The speakers omit information that interlocutors can be understandable so it helps them deal with pressure during having real time conversations (Hilliard, 2014). Ellipsis is a characteristic of both spoken and written English. However, situational ellipsis which occurs and affects things and people in that situation immediately can be found in the spoken language (Carter & McCarthy, 1997; Cullen & Kuo, 2007). Ellipsis has also not been widely used in the conversations between non-native speakers. It is beneficial for students to be raise their awareness on the use of ellipsis as they might not understand this concept well (Goh & Burns, 2012).

Next, heads are commonly put at the beginning of the sentences or phrases to introduce the listener what the topic is (Cullen and Kuo, 2007). Due to the complexity of spoken language, speakers use heads to highlight to listeners their key issues earlier (Goh & Burns, 2012). With this strategy, it can reduce real time pressure of both speakers and listeners (Cullen & Kuo, 2007). Heads generally are in the form of nouns and noun phrases that are put before the key message (Goh &Burn, 2012). It also sometimes related to long complexed noun phrases which allow more processing time for interlocutors (Cullen & Kuo, 2007). However, heads can be in the form of clauses with more than one subject. Apart from this, it is considered incorrect grammar in written language, but generally being seen as a common feature of spoken language (Goh & Burns, 2012).

Next feature is tails which are an element added at the end of the phrases or clauses (Hilliard, 2014) to remind what have been said earlier (Cullen & Kuo, 2007). They are used for clarification, expressing personal attitudes or supporting interpersonal interaction (Timmis, 2010). Likewise, Goh and Burns (2012) point out that "tail are expressions used to reinforce, extend, elaborate, or clarify the main message (p.92)". Question tag is one type of tails that are commonly used. Moreover, tails can be in a form of single words or noun phrases depending on their functions. All in all, it is an important feature of spoken grammar in building interpersonal relationships between interlocutors and speakers.

Another feature called fillers which are words that might not have specific meaning such as 'um', 'er', or 'well' to allow more time for speakers to plan of what to say. On the other hand, backchannels are words or utterances that express to respond to what the speakers said and signal the speakers to continue their speech such as 'yeah', 'uh-huh' and 'I see'(Hilliard, 2014). Lastly, phrasal chunks are words or phrases that are fixed which can be added to other structures to form longer units (Cullen & Kuo, 2007; Hilliard, 2014). As they work as ready-made lexical unit of language (Cullen & Kuo, 2007), speakers can access and use them with less processing effort, reducing the demands of real-time language encoding (Leech, 2000).

Cullen and Kuo (2007) identified different types of phrasal chunks, including particles, which function as hedging devices to soften the specific of references such as 'sort of' and 'kind of'; vagueness tags, which are typically added at the end of the phrases to help the listener to recognize the general set of items previously mentioned such as 'something like that' and 'stuff like that'; and modifying expressions which show modification and politeness. They commonly work with adjectival and noun phrases such as 'a bit better' and 'a bit of a bore'; and discourse markers are used to signal boundaries from one topic to another. This allows the speakers to decide whether they would like to continue or end the topic, whether they agree with each other, or what are their reaction towards something such as 'right', 'I see', 'Okay'. It can be used for checking understanding of the interlocuter such as 'you know what I mean', softening their interaction, and interacting with the listeners (Carter & McCarthy, 1997). These phrases work as fillers to provide more time for speakers' thoughts under pressure they encounter during real-time conversation (Cullen & Kuo, 2007).

2.2 Teaching spoken grammar

While there is a controversial issue of whether spoken grammar should be introduced in English language teaching (Timmis, 2002, 2005), several proponents have supported (e.g., Timmis, 2005, Hillard, 2014) introducing spoken grammar into the classroom. It is worth noting that teaching grammar is far more important than initially thought (Putra et al., 2021). In the era that communicative language teaching approach has been emphasized, the evidence showing how people speak English in real situation would be beneficial (McCarthy & Carter, 2006). The results of Islam and Stapa (2021) also revealed that students' limited development in spoken language was partly caused by the complexity of spoken language. This raises an emphasis on teaching features of spoken language to particularly EFL students.

Recently, several scholars have paid attention to how to teach spoken grammar. Mumford (2009) proposed three approaches regarding native spoken forms of grammar. First, the world English/ EFL approach is supported by the notion that not all students will experience communicating with English native speakers. The goal for this approach is that students are able to speak understandably or intelligibly instead of following native English speaker norms. Second, the passive knowledge approach focuses on raising students' awareness of spoken grammar characteristics including recording native English speakers' conversation and tasks for noticing the features. Lastly, the productive approach which supports students to be able to produce real language based on native norms. This is a further step beyond simply having passive knowledge of spoken grammar. The goal is to help students understand when talking to native speakers. Having an awareness of their norms and being able to use such norms appropriately will be beneficial for students who are especially likely to contact with English native speakers. However, Hilliard (2014) suggested that teachers should examine whether the focus on presenting spoken grammar is on production or the acknowledgment of spoken grammar characteristics.

Carter and McCarthy (1995) insisted that it is an inappropriate way to teach written grammar for spoken language. They; therefore, proposed 'three Is' paradigm which includes illustration, interaction, and induction. To begin with, students are first introduced to authentic language use. In order to introduce spoken grammar in language teaching, there is a need in incorporating the authentic materials (Hilliard, 2014). English movies can be the suitable source for teaching spoken grammar to students (Larasati et al., 2021). Teachers can

encourage their students to be exposed to natural spoken language and allow them to notice the spoken grammar that is used in real conversations (Carter & McCarthy, 1995).

Apart from this, Hilliard (2014) pointed out the importance of highlighting features of spoken grammar in the textbook, while thoughtfully incorporating them into the curriculum. Timmis (2005) suggested that the main features of spoken grammar that should be added in the text rather than teaching a sentence. Teachers should find the texts for teaching spoken grammar that are interesting, authentic, and natural. Students are more accessible to the texts that can be related to their culture. This is because students could learn more if they generally understand the concept of the text. To promote an understandable outcome, the example of conversational grammar should simply be introduced interestingly to students (Al-wossabi, 2014).

The next step is interaction which refers to encouraging students to interact with others through discussion and observation (Carter and McCarthy,1995). The tasks should allow them to notice things and provide the opportunities for them to discuss the appropriate forms of language for the contexts (Timmis, 2005). Lastly, induction is the stage for students to finally induce the forms of usage as the stage of induction (Carter and McCarthy, 1995). Furthermore, students should be able to implement spoken grammar to improve student's speaking skills to be able to communicate in various situations(Hilliard, 2014).

Additionally, Al-wossabi (2014) suggested that teachers should identify two types of grammar such as named written grammar as 'general form' and spoken grammar as 'spoken form'. However, the proportion of presenting written grammar should be far more than that of spoken grammar. This can be done by presenting them at the end of the lesson. Written grammar and spoken grammar should be presented separately when they are first introduced to students and explain to them the purpose of using each form to avoid their confusion. Both forms can be practiced at the end of the lesson together through integrated practice to allow students to recognize their differences. Without a clear sequence of instruction, EFL students might be confused when being presented with both written and spoken grammar promptly. Teachers; therefore, should be more careful when adapting teaching materials for teaching both written and spoken grammar. It is also important for teachers to develop students' real-life communication skills by raising their awareness of how grammar functions in various contexts (Tripathi, 2022). However, Soruç and Griffiths (2015) suggested that EFL students should have their own choice of whether they would use the features of spoken grammar.

2.3 Research on spoken grammar and its instruction

In Thailand only a very few studies (e.g., Minkhatunnakhriyah et al., 2022; Phettongkam, 2017) have focused on grammar in spoken language. While there has been a questionable issue whether spoken grammar should be taught in the classroom (Timmis, 2002), several studies (e.g., Al-Wassabi, 2014, Timmis, 2005) have recently paid attention to teaching spoken grammar including how to teach and what to teach and explored both teachers and students' perceptions of the spoken grammar instruction.

Timmis (2002) studied to what extent the students would like to conform to native English speaker norms including spoken grammar and the consistency between teachers' and students' views towards this aspect. According to the findings, 63 % of the students could identify the conversation spoken by English native speakers. However, there was a high number of the students who were not sure what spoken grammar was. Those who strongly disagreed with using spoken grammar also were not aware of features of spoken grammar. Moreover, the majority of the students and students preferred following native speaker norms including an ability to use both formal and informal grammar. They reported that it was more flexible for speakers who could adjust their language according to their interlocutors. However, they viewed that using spoken grammar were valuable when communicate with only English native speakers. This was because using whole sentences with them might be boring. Both teachers and students agreed that students should be exposed to the authentic spoken language whereas some of them viewed that spoken grammar features were too complex for the students in the non-native contexts to learn. Interestingly, only a small proportion of them preferred using written- based grammar for speaking. Later, Timmis (2005) explored teachers' and students' perceptions on teaching spoken grammar through the teaching materials with the spoken grammar. The results revealed that 92% of the participants reported that the language tasks were useful or very useful, 80% agreed that the materials were interesting, and 86 % viewed that they had picked up something valuable regarding spoken English. The teacher participant reported that the materials were beneficial to the students as the majority of them had never been exposed to informal spoken language.

Apart from this, Goh (2009) studied Chinese and Singaporean teachers' views on teaching English spoken grammar. This study compared the perceptions of EFL and ESL teachers. According to the study, 87 % of Chinese teachers revealed that spoken grammar were beneficial and important. They believed that learning spoken grammar could help their

students speak more naturally. They found the CANCODE corpus, materials based on British spoken grammar norms useful for students living in the non-native context. On the other hand, those who disagreed with using spoken grammar reported that students should follow written based grammar which in turn could eventually help them improve their speaking skills. However, 60 % of Singaporean teachers reported that spoken grammar features related to British English were not quite beneficial to their students living in the contexts that had their own spoken grammar like 'Singlish'. In contrast, some of them agreed that it could be introduced as a set of standard norms and used for comparing between their own forms and British English forms. Additionally, 75% of the teachers viewed that teaching spoken grammar could increase students' awareness of the differences between spoken grammar and written grammar while 83 % of them agreed that this knowledge could improve their students' confidence and speak English naturally. Understanding the features of spoken grammar could help students feel less anxious about using perfect sentence structures. This was because focusing too much on grammar rules could interfere with their ability to communicate effectively. Having knowledge of both written and spoken grammar could provide more options for students to use the language appropriately. Speaking following written based grammar caused students sound unnatural. Some of them pointed out that spoken grammar suited with advanced students who had already mastered written grammar. The Singaporean teachers also added that learning spoken grammar might not be advantageous during high-take oral exam since not all examiners were familiar with the characteristics of spoken grammar used in English speaking countries. They may be more impressed with students who spoke English based on written based grammar. Moreover, they viewed that learning spoken grammar might have a negative impact on students' writing skills.

Later, more studies focusing on teaching spoken grammar to EFL students. Larasati et al.'s (2021) revealed the results of their study on students' perceptions on learning spoken grammar through movie subtitles. The participants reported that English movie was beneficial to them for learning spoken grammar. It enhanced their understanding of spoken grammar. Furthermore, Rashtchi and Afzali's (2011) study investigated whether the awareness of spoken grammar could enhance Iranian EFL university students' comprehension of real-life conversation. The results showed that the students in the experiment group who had been raised the awareness of spoken grammar understood everyday conversation better than the control group. However, Soruç and Griffiths (2015)

explored the implementation of spoken grammar features in the classroom with 19 EFL university students in Turkey. The results showed that while the students started using such features in the post-test, there was little evidence of continued use shown in the delayed posttest three weeks later. The participants reported during the group interview that spoken grammar norms were not align with their own sense identity which possibly made them feel unnatural, uncomfortable and being fake. This raises an awareness that the use of spoken grammar might not be comfortable for all students.

As mentioned above, while more studies have focused more on both teachers and students' perceptions on spoken grammar instruction, it is still an arguable issue whether to teach spoken grammar features and how to teach them. Apart from this, another important issue is that whether the students are aware that spoken grammar characteristics have been existed. It is worth nothing that the studies on students' awareness of spoken grammar and their views on teaching spoken grammar particularly in Thailand have been understudied. To gain an insight on these aspects in order to develop the teaching of speaking skills for Thai EFL students, this study; therefore, aims to explore Thai EFL university students' awareness of spoken grammar and their perceptions of its instruction to address the gap in the literature and provide more in-depth data to improve the quality of English pedagogy in Thailand.

Chapter 3 Methodology

This chapter will provide the methodology of the study including the research objectives, research design which consists of research participants, research instrument and procedure, and data analysis.

3.1 Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To investigate Thai EFL third-year university students' self-reported awareness of spoken grammar

2. To explore Thai EFL third-year university students' perceptions of spoken grammar instruction

3.2 Research Design

3.2.1 Research participants

This study employed a mixed-methods approach, collecting both quantitative and qualitative data through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The population consisted of all 89 third-year university students majoring in English, from which the sample of 89 students was selected through purposive sampling. The participants had completed several English courses covering speaking, listening, reading, writing, and grammar, enabling them to provide relevant data to address the research objectives.

3.2.2 Research instruments and procedure

The instrument used in the study for collecting quantitative data includes the questionnaire relating to their self-reported awareness of spoken grammar and the perceptions of spoken grammar instruction whereas the semi-structured interviews were employed to collect the qualitative data to gain an in-depth data. The questionnaire was constructed based on the existed literature regarding spoken grammar (e.g., Goh, 2009; Hilliard, 2014; Mumford, 2009; Timmis, 2002). The questionnaire contained 11items covering their awareness of spoken grammar and 26 items regarding their perceptions of spoken grammar instruction regarding the benefits, concerns and their preferred practices of spoken grammar instruction. The semi- structured interview included the questions to gain more in dept data related to the

research objectives. The Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC) was used to assess the questionnaire items by three experts, with all items achieving a score of 1.00. The questionnaire's reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, yielding a coefficient of 0.92. Additionally, the content validity of the semi-structured interview questions was assessed by three experts using the Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC). All items received a score of 1.00, except for two items, which received scores of 0.67 and were revised based on the experts' recommendation. The 89 participants were asked to voluntarily complete the questionnaire regarding their awareness of spoken grammar and their perceptions on its instruction. Subsequently, six of them were voluntarily interviewed by using the semi-structured interview to obtain in-depth data.

3.2.3 Data Analysis

While the quantitative data from the questionnaire were analyzed using the descriptive statistics including mean score, standard deviation and percentage, the qualitative data from the semi- structured interviews were transcribed and analyzed by using the thematic analysis regarding their awareness of spoken grammar and their perceptions on spoken grammar instruction. The interview data were transcribed verbatim and checked for accuracy. The transcripts were coded and grouped into categories based on recurring patterns and similarities in meaning. The codes were then organized into themes related to students' awareness of spoken grammar and their perceptions of spoken grammar instruction.

Chapter 4 Findings

This chapter provides the findings of the study including Thai EFL university students' awareness of spoken grammar and their perceptions of spoken grammar instruction.

4.1 Thai EFL university students' self-reported awareness of spoken grammar

Table 1

Students' awareness of spoken grammar

Awareness of spoken grammar	**Strongly disagree (%)**	**Disagree (%)**	**Neither agree nor disagree (%)**	**Agree (%)**	**Strongly agree (%)**	$\bar{x}$	**S.D.**
1. I am familiar with the concept of spoken grammar.	1.1	12.4	43.8	37.1	5.6	3.34	0.81
2. I am aware that the spoken grammar is different from written grammar.	0	11.2	27	32.6	29.2	3.80	0.99
3.I can recognize features of spoken grammar.	3.4	22.5	41.6	25.8	6.7	3.10	0.94
4. I am aware that when speaking, speakers do not have time to plan or fix our words which makes spoken grammar different from that of grammar.	1.1	7.9	29.2	34.8	27	3.79	0.97
5.I am aware that using incomplete sentences when speaking is normal.	0	7.9	25.8	34.8	31.5	3.90	0.94
6. I am aware that when speaking, speakers can use "Want coffee?"	10.1	12.4	25.8	32.6	19.1	3.38	1.22

instead of “Do you want coffee?”							
7.I am aware that when speaking, the speaker cannot omit the subject of the sentence even both speakers and listeners share the mutual understanding such as ‘sounds good’ and ‘glad I could help.’	5.6	12.4	37.1	23.6	21.3	3.43	1.13
8.I am aware that the sentences like **"This pizza,** I could eat it every day." and “She’s so funny, **your sister**.” can be used in real-life conversation to emphasize the information or the person the speaker is referring to.	0	12.4	34.8	36	16.9	3.57	0.92
9.I am aware that speakers can use fillers such as ‘Umm’ or ‘Well’ to pause or to allow more time for themselves to think of what to say.	0	6.7	19.1	30.3	43.8	4.11	0.95
10.I am aware that the words such as ‘yeah’, ‘uh-huh’ and ‘I see’ are the features of spoken grammar.	6.7	7.9	22.5	33.7	29.2	3.71	1.17
11.I am aware that phrasal chunks such as ‘you know’, ‘I know what you mean’, ‘I think so.’	2.2	4.5	19.1	31.5	42.7	4.08	1.00

	can help speakers sound more natural and fluent.

Note. Strongly agree =5, Agree =4, Neither agree nor disagree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly disagree = 1

4.1.1 Insufficient awareness of spoken grammar

The findings show that the student participants had limited awareness of spoken grammar. According to Table 1, only 42.7% of them strongly agreed or agreed that they are familiar with the concept of spoken grammar and 32.5% of them strongly agreed or agreed that they recognize the features of spoken grammar. The mean scores of these aspects were 3.34 and 3.10 respectively. Similarly, according to the qualitative data from the interviews, all of the participants reported that they had never been explicitly taught the features of spoken grammar. In addition, some of them reported that they heard the term 'spoken grammar' but did not know it in detail. They were just familiar with some spoken forms such as 'coffee please'. For example, Student B reported that "I heard that there might be spoken grammar features but I do not know exactly whether written grammar and spoken grammar are similar.". However, two participants (Student C and D) mentioned that they were not familiar with the term 'spoken grammar'.

While the results showed that many of them did not recognize the features of spoken grammar, the results reveal that 66.3% of them were aware that using incomplete sentences when speaking is normal with a mean score of 3.90. However, not many of them were aware of spoken grammar feature such as ellipsis as showed in items 6 and 7. As illustrated in Table 1, 51.7 % of them strongly agreed or agreed that when speaking, speakers can use "Want coffee?" instead of "Do you want coffee while 44.9 % of them agreed and strongly agreed that when speaking, the speaker cannot omit the subject of the sentence even both speakers and listeners share the mutual understanding such as 'sounds good' and 'glad I could help. This showed that they did not have an awareness on ellipsis. The mean scores for these aspects were 3.38 and 3.43 respectively. Additionally, 52.9% of them were certain about the use of heads and tails with the mean score of 3.57. The findings showed that almost half of them still lacked awareness of spoken grammar features. Likewise, during the interviews, Student D said that she only heard the phrase 'That sounds good.' She never knew that she could use 'sounds good' when speaking'. Student C said that "I guess I possibly can use 'sounds good' but I did not know if there are any rules about this." This reflects that the students demonstrated limited awareness of spoken grammar features.

Moreover, slightly more than half of them were aware of heads, one of the features of the spoken grammar. The findings revealed that only 52.9% of the participants strongly agreed or agreed that the use of heads can be applied in real- life conversation to emphasize the information or the person the speaker is referring to with a mean score of 3.57. However, 34.8% of them were uncertain about this feature.

On the other hand, the findings showed that the participants still recognized the spoken features to some extent. Over 70% of them recognized the use of fillers as a strategy to gain more time for themselves to think of what to say and the use of phrasal chunk to speak naturally and fluently. The mean scores for these aspects were 4.11 and 4.08 respectively. During the interviews, Student C said that when she could not think of the words, she used the phrasal chunk such as 'something like that.' Student F reported that she used fillers when she was thinking of what to say. Apart from this, 62.9 % of the participants were aware of backchannels as a feature of spoken grammar which was shown in items 10. The mean score was 3.71.

Additionally, the results showed that an equal percentage (61.8%) of student participants agreed and strongly agreed with items 2 and 4, indicating that there is a difference between spoken and written grammar because speakers do not have time to plan or fix their words when speaking. The mean scores for these aspects were 3.80 and 3.79 respectively. This is consistent with the data from the interviews, student A and E mentioned that there should be differences between spoken grammar and written grammar. During the interview, Student F added that she had seen these features before; however, she did not realize that they were spoken grammar.

4.2 Joint display of quantitative and qualitative findings on students' self-reported awareness of spoken grammar

Table 2

Joint display of quantitative and qualitative findings on students' self-Reported awareness of spoken grammar

Quantitative findings	Qualitative findings	Integrated findings
Students showed limited familiarity with spoken grammar (42.7%, $\overline{X}$= 3.34) and recognition of its features (32.5%, $\overline{X}$ = 3.10).	All interviewees reported no explicit instruction in spoken grammar. Some had heard the term but lacked detailed knowledge, while two were unfamiliar with it.	The qualitative findings explained the students' limited awareness, suggesting a lack of explicit instruction and conceptual understanding.
Students showed limited awareness of ellipsis and heads and tails. Only 51.7% recognized the use of "Want coffee?" and 52.9% reported awareness of heads ($\overline{X}$= 3.57). Meanwhile, 44.9% incorrectly believed that subjects could not be omitted in shared contexts.	Students C and D were unfamiliar with omitting subjects in expressions such as "Sounds good," indicating limited understanding of ellipsis.	Both data sources indicated limited awareness of certain spoken grammar features, particularly ellipsis.
More than 70% recognized fillers and phrasal chunks ($\overline{X}$ = 4.11 and 4.08, respectively), while 62.9% recognized backchannels (*M* = 3.71).	Students reported using fillers when thinking and phrasal chunks such as "something like that" in conversation.	Students demonstrated greater practical familiarity with common conversational features than explicit knowledge of spoken grammar.
61.8% recognized differences between spoken and written grammar ($\overline{X}$ = 3.80 and 3.79 for the two items).	Students A and E acknowledged differences between spoken and written grammar. Student F had encountered spoken grammar features but had not identified them as such.	Students recognized general differences between spoken and written grammar but lacked explicit awareness of the grammatical features involved.

Note. Percentages represent students who strongly agreed or agreed with each statement. $\overline{X}$ = mean score.

4.2 Thai EFL university students' perceptions of spoken grammar instruction

Table 3

Students' perceptions of spoken grammar instruction

Students' perceptions of spoken grammar instruction	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	$\bar{x}$	S.D.
1. I think it is important to learn spoken grammar in English class.	0	2.2	18	30.3	49.4	4.27	0.84
2. I think learning spoken grammar can improve speaking skills.	0	1.1	13.5	30.3	55.1	4.39	0.76
3. In my view, spoken grammar helps me speak English naturally.	1.1	3.4	11.2	28.1	56.2	4.35	0.89
4.In my view, spoken grammar enhances speakers' fluency.	0	0	16.9	30.3	52.8	4.36	0.76
5. I believe that spoken grammar helps speakers enhance the flow of conversation.	0	1.1	15.7	30.3	52.8	4.35	0.78
6. I think learning spoken grammar can enhance listening comprehension skills because it helps learners recognize informal sentences and common phrases used in speech. For example, understanding that the sentence 'You coming?' means 'Are you coming?'.	0	4.5	14.6	36	44.9	4.21	0.86

7. I think using phrasal chunks such as ‘I see’, ‘I guess so’ And ‘something like that’ decreases learners’ anxiety in speaking because learners do not need to create new sentences while speaking.	0	2.2	18	28.1	51.7	4.29	0.84
8.I believe that good speakers should use complete grammar.	1.1	6.7	31.5	31.5	29.2	3.81	0.98
9. In my view, having an awareness of spoken grammar increases speakers’ confidence.	0	0	20.2	25.8	53.9	4.34	0.80
10. I think using the written grammar rules from a book when speaking sounds unnatural. For example, saying that ‘The meeting which was originally scheduled for Thursday, has been postponed to Friday due to unforeseen circumstances.’ sounds bookish in conversation.	1.1	2.2	30.3	36	30.3	3.92	0.89
11.I think using spoken grammar might interfere students’ use of formal language when needed.	6.7	4.5	32.6	29.2	27	3.65	1.13
12. In my view, spoken grammar should not be used in formal situations.	11.2	9	22.5	30.3	27	3.53	1.29
13. I think learning written grammar serves as a basis for producing spoken grammar.	0	2.2	22.5	37.1	38.2	4.11	0.83

14. In my view, teaching spoken grammar could lead to errors in written grammar.	3.4	5.6	32.6	34.8	23.6	3.70	1.00
15.I think understanding both written grammar and spoken grammar allow speakers to speak English appropriately in various situations.	0	2.2	15.7	32.6	49.4	4.29	0.81
16.I believe that spoken grammar is only appropriate when talking to native English speakers.	9	19.1	28.1	22.5	21.3	3.28	1.25
17.I think teachers should focus more on written grammar than spoken grammar.	9	4.5	37.1	29.2	20.2	3.47	1.14
18. In my view, spoken grammar is too complex for Thai students to learn.	7.9	12.4	31.5	23.6	24.7	3.45	1.22
19.I think spoken grammar is more suitable for advanced students.	6.7	10.1	41.6	20.2	21.3	3.39	1.13
20.I think spoken grammar can be learnt through authentic materials such as movies, music and podcasts.	0	3.4	21.3	38.2	37.1	4.09	0.85
21. I believe spoken grammar that is used in daily conversations does not seem to be taught clearly in the classroom.	0	2.2	23.6	39.3	34.8	4.02	0.82
22. I think, teachers should introduce features of spoken grammar such	0	2.2	27	38.2	32.6	4.01	0.83

as Heads, Tails, Ellipsis and phrasal chunks.							
23. I think teachers should identify the difference between spoken grammar and written grammar.	0	2.2	23.6	40.4	33.7	4.06	0.82
24. I believe that spoken grammar should be presented in the textbook.	0	0	27	37.1	36	4.09	0.79
25. I think teachers should clearly separate spoken grammar and written grammar when teaching.	0	3.4	23.6	34.8	38.2	4.08	0.87
26. I think it is not necessary to teach spoken grammar in the classroom.	24.7	15.7	25.8	19.1	14.6	2.83	1.38

Note. Strongly agree =5, Agree =4, Neither agree nor disagree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly disagree = 1

4.2.1 Perceived benefits of spoken grammar instruction

According to Table 3, for some items, slightly more or less than 80% of them strongly agreed and agreed that spoken grammar instruction in the classroom is important and beneficial for their speaking skills, while for other items the agreement was slightly less than 80%. These items include 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 15. The results showed that 85.4 % of them strongly agreed or agreed that learning spoken grammar can enhance their speaking skills while 84.3% of them strongly agreed or agreed that spoken grammar helps speakers speak English naturally. The mean score for these aspects were 4.39 and 4.35 respectively.

The data revealed that 82% of them strongly agreed and agreed that understanding both written grammar and spoken grammar allow speakers to speak English appropriately in various situations. The mean score was 4.29. Student D reported that learning both spoken and written grammar could increase her confidence in speaking. Having knowledge of both written and spoken grammar can provide more options for students to use the language

appropriately (Goh, 2009). Moreover, both items 4 and 5 (83.1%) received the same level of agreement, suggesting that spoken grammar helps them improve their fluency and the flow of speech. The mean scores for these aspects were 4.36 and 4.35 respectively. The majority of the participants (79.7%) believed that spoken grammar instruction is important. The mean score was 4.27. Most of them (79.8%) believed that recognizing phrasal chunks can reduce their anxiety and 79.7% of them believed that learning spoken grammar improves their confidence. The mean scores for these aspects were 4.29 and 4.34 respectively.

In light of the interview data, Student B, C, D and E reported that having an awareness of spoken grammar could help them speak English naturally. Student F added that it could enhance her fluency. In addition, Student B pointed out the benefit of learning spoken grammar by saying that using written language when speaking might sound weird. Moreover, Student D added that the use of spoken grammar might help her maintain the flow of speech. In addition, Student E stated that learning spoken grammar could help her understand how native English speakers speak and help her converse smoothly and naturally. Apart from this, Students B and C reported that an awareness of spoken grammar helped her increase her confidence in speaking. This suggested that these participants seemed to value spoken grammar instruction. In addition to improving their speaking skills, 80.9% of them believed that learning spoken grammar can enhance listening comprehension skills as it helped them recognize informal sentences and common phrases used in speech. The mean score was 4.21.

4.2.2 Students' concerns regarding spoken grammar instruction

On the other hand, in this study, 74.1% strongly agreed and agreed that spoken grammar that is used in daily conversations does not seem to be taught clearly in the classroom. The mean score was 4.02. This highlights that although the students valued the spoken grammar instruction, spoken grammar was not introduced clearly and extensively in the classroom

As shown in Table 3, only 58.4% of them believed that teaching spoken grammar could lead to errors in written grammar. The mean score was 3.70. The findings showed that the participants perceived spoken grammar instruction in the classroom as beneficial, as many of them did not highlight its drawbacks. In addition, 49.4% of them viewed that teacher should focus more on written grammar than spoken grammar. The mean score was 3.47. During the interviews, although all of them reported that learning spoken grammar might lead to errors in written grammar, they insisted that spoken grammar should be introduced in the classroom. For example, Student C stated that if she learned spoken grammar, she might

possibly use it in her writing because she could get used to the spoken form. However, she said “it is still good to learn spoken grammar.” Apart from this, 48.3 % of them viewed that spoken grammar is too complicated for Thai students. The mean score was 3.45.

In addition, 43.8 % of the participants strongly agreed and agreed that spoken grammar that spoken grammar is only appropriate when talking to native English, and 41. 5% of them believed that spoken grammar only suits with advance students. The mean scores for these aspects were 3.28 and 3.39 respectively. However, the proportion was less than half of all participants. In terms of who should study spoken grammar, Students D and E said that not only advanced students should learn spoken grammar but, everyone should learn it. Student D said “Students who are starting to learn English should also acknowledge spoken grammar.” In addition, Student E stated that spoken grammar could be used with anyone as long as we are certain that they could understand us, not just with native English speakers.

4.2.3 Preferred practices of spoken grammar instruction

In terms of teaching spoken grammar in the classroom, 70.8% of the participants agreed and strongly agreed that spoken grammar features should be introduced in the classroom. The mean score was 4.01. Regarding teaching materials, 75.3% of them strongly agreed and agreed that such features can be introduced through authentic materials such as movies and podcast. The mean score was 4.09. Additionally, most of them strongly agreed and agreed that the teacher should identify the differences between spoken grammar and written grammar, and that spoken grammar should be presented in the textbook, and the teacher should clearly distinguish spoken grammar and written grammar when teaching with agreement rates of 74.1%, 73.1% and 73% respectively. The mean scores for these aspects were 4.06, 4.09 and 4.08 respectively.

Based on the interview data, Student C suggested that teachers should clearly separate written grammar and spoken grammar when teaching to avoid confusion. She added, “I myself got confused easily.” Student E agreed that teachers should point out the differences between spoken grammar and written grammar clearly.

Moreover, all of the participants agreed that authentic materials particularly movies can be used to introduce spoken grammar. In this study, all six participants agreed that spoken grammar should be included in the textbook. For example, Student D added that spoken grammar should be presented in the book by introducing each feature and providing

examples of phrases and dialogues in different situations for a better understanding. Interestingly, all of them suggested in the same way that the teachers should give them the situations where spoken grammar is employed and encourage them practice conversations.

4.4 Joint display of quantitative and qualitative findings on students' perceptions of spoken grammar

Table 4

Joint display of quantitative and qualitative findings on students' perceptions of spoken grammar

Quantitative findings	Qualitative findings	Integrated findings
Perceived benefits: Most students viewed spoken grammar instruction positively, particularly for improving speaking skills (85.4%, $\overline{X}$ = 4.39), naturalness (84.3%, $\overline{X}$ = 4.35), fluency, confidence, and listening comprehension (80.9%, *M* = 4.21).	Students B, C, D, E, and F highlighted benefits for naturalness, fluency, confidence, and maintaining the flow of speech.	Both data sources indicated that students perceived spoken grammar instruction as beneficial for developing communicative competence.
Concerns about instruction: 74.1% of students believed that spoken grammar was not clearly taught in the classroom ($\overline{X}$= 4.02).	Students emphasized the need to distinguish spoken grammar from written grammar to avoid confusion.	The findings suggest a perceived gap between the importance students attached to spoken grammar and its explicit instruction in the classroom.
58.4% believed spoken grammar instruction could lead to errors in writing ($\overline{X}$= 3.70), while fewer than half considered it suitable only for native-speaker interactions (43.8%) or advanced learners (41.5%).	Although students acknowledged potential interference with writing, they still supported instruction. Students D and E believed spoken grammar should be taught to learners at all proficiency levels and used with anyone who could understand them.	Students generally supported spoken grammar instruction despite concerns about written accuracy and its appropriate use.
Teaching approaches: Most students supported introducing spoken grammar	All interviewees supported using authentic materials, including movies, incorporating spoken grammar into	Both data sources supported explicit instruction using authentic materials, clear

features (70.8%, $\overline{X}$ = 4.01), using authentic materials (75.3%, $\overline{X}$ = 4.09), and distinguishing spoken from written grammar (74.1%, $\overline{X}$ = 4.06).	textbooks, and providing situational conversation practice. Students C and E emphasized clearly distinguishing spoken and written grammar.	explanations, textbook integration, and contextualized speaking practice.

Note. Percentages represent students who strongly agreed or agreed with each statement. $\overline{X}$ = mean score.

Chapter 5 Discussion

This chapter discusses the findings of the study regarding the objectives of the studies including EFL university students' self-reported awareness of spoken grammar and their perceptions towards its instruction.

5.1 Thai EFL university students' awareness of spoken grammar

5.1.1 Insufficient awareness of spoken grammar

According to the findings, less than half of the participants were familiar with the spoken grammar and recognize the spoken grammar characteristics. This is supported by Timmis's (2002) study which revealed that there was a high number of his student participants who were not sure what spoken grammar was. The findings also showed that almost half of them still lacked awareness of spoken grammar features including ellipsis and head and tails, however, approximately 66 % of them reported their awareness of incomplete sentence when speaking English. This is possibly because written grammar are more focused in the EFL classrooms (Al-wossabi, 2014; Leech, 2000). However, written-based grammar does not include features that exist commonly in English native speakers' conversation(Carter & McCarthy, 1995; Timmis, 2002). Therefore, it is not appropriate for teachers to teach written grammar for spoken language (Carter and McCarthy, 1995). Goh and Burns (2012) suggested that students should be raised their awareness of the use of ellipsis as they might not understand this concept well (Goh & Burns, 2012).

Additionally, the findings of the study are similar to the findings of Islam and Spata (2021) which revealed that students' limited development in spoken language was partly caused by the complexity of spoken language. This puts an emphasis on raising their awareness of spoken grammar and allow them to be exposed to spoken language in order to increase their English speaking skills (Hilliard, 2014; Mumford, 2009).

Moreover, over 70% of them recognized the use of fillers as a strategy to gain more time for themselves to think of what to say and the use of phrasal chunk to speak naturally and fluently. During the interview, one of the participants added that she had seen these spoken features before; however, she did not realize that they were spoken grammar. This suggests that spoken grammar features should be introduced in the classroom in order to increase

students' knowledge and confidence in speaking. It is necessary for students to acknowledge the features of spoken grammar to communicate in daily life (Rashtchi & Afzali, 2011).

5.2 Thai EFL university students' perceptions of spoken grammar instruction

5.2.1 Teaching spoken grammar: Gains and challenges

The results revealed that approximately 80% of them strongly agreed and agreed that spoken grammar instruction in the classroom is important and beneficial for their speaking skills. Additionally, the results showed that more than the majority of them strongly agreed or agreed that learning spoken grammar can enhance their speaking skills and most of them strongly agreed or agreed that learning spoken grammar can enhance their speaking skills. The data revealed that most of them strongly agreed and agreed that understanding both written grammar and spoken grammar allow speakers to speak English appropriately in various situations. This demonstrated that students viewed that introducing spoken grammar had a positive impact on their speaking. This is aligned with Goh (2009) which revealed that most of Chinese teachers reported that spoken grammar were valuable and important. It allowed them to speak English naturally. This is supported by Rashtchi and Afzali's (2011) study which showed that the students in the experiment group who had been raised the awareness of spoken grammar understood everyday conversation better than the control group. Likewise, Soruç and Griffiths' (2015) study found that through implementing spoken grammar feature in the classroom, the student participants started using such features in the post-test.

On the other hand, in this study, over 70% of the student participants strongly agreed and agreed that spoken grammar that is used in daily conversations does not seem to be taught clearly in the classroom. This reflects that conversational grammar that is used in daily conversations seem not to be recognized in the classroom settings (Al-wossabi, 2014). Moreover, during the interview, Student F reported that spoken grammar had not been emphasized in the classroom. Mainly, her teachers focused much on written grammar. This implies that grammar taught in the Thai EFL context focuses primarily on writing skills (Al-wossabi, 2014; Leech, 2000). Moreover, teaching materials for teaching speaking skills are mainly based on written grammar which are not presented key spoken features (Carter & McCarthy, 1995). Similarly, McCarthy and Carter (2006) stated that speakers will not speak naturally if the examples and practices are massively based on written language.

However, almost half of them viewed that spoken grammar is too complicated for Thai students. This is consistent with Timmis's (2002) study which revealed that some of the students viewed that spoken grammar features were too complex for the students in the non-native contexts to learn. Similarly, Goh's (2009) study showed that some of the Singaporean teacher participants viewed that learning spoken grammar might have a negative impact on students' writing skills.

Apart from this, some of them believed that spoken grammar only suits with advanced students. This is consistent with the results of Goh's (2009) study. In his study, the Singaporean teacher participants pointed out that spoken grammar suited with advanced students who had already mastered written grammar. Their teachers also added that learning spoken grammar might not be beneficial during high-take oral exam because not all examiners were familiar with the spoken grammar features. They may be more satisfied with students who speak English based on written based grammar. This is possibly due to the perceptions of the teachers might be different from that of the students. The teacher participants might highly concern much on the results of the exam which focused much on written grammar. However, the student participants in this study were willing to improve their speaking skills. With an awareness of spoken grammar and a focus on practice speaking, they expected that it could increase their English-speaking skills.

Moreover, during the interviews, all the participants in this study emphasized the importance of spoken grammar instruction in the classroom. This aligns with the findings of Rashtchi and Afzali's (2011) study which revealed that their student participants who had been raised the awareness of spoken grammar were able to understand everyday conversation more effectively.

5.2.2 Spoken grammar instruction

The data revealed that over 70 % of the participants agreed and strongly agreed that spoken grammar features should be introduced in the classroom. Additionally, most of them strongly agreed and agreed that such features can be introduced through authentic materials. They also strongly agreed and agreed that the teacher should identify the differences between spoken grammar and written grammar, and that spoken grammar should be introduced in the textbook. Furthermore, the teacher should clearly distinguish spoken grammar and written grammar when teaching. Apart from this, some of the participants also pointed out about this issue during the interviews. Al-wossabi (2014) suggested that written and spoken grammar

should be introduced separately when they are first introduced to students and the teacher should explain the purpose of using each form to prevent them from any confusion. With unclear instructions, EFL students might become confused when learning both written and spoken grammar spontaneously.

Moreover, all of the participants agreed that authentic materials, especially movies, can be used to teach spoken grammar. This is aligned with the results of Larasati et al.'s (2021) study which revealed that their participants reported that English movie is useful and interesting for learning spoken grammar. In this study, all six participants agreed that spoken grammar should be included in the textbook. One of the participants reported that spoken grammar should be presented in the book by introducing each feature and providing examples of phrases and dialogues in different situations for a better understanding. This is consistent with the results of Timmis's (2005) study which showed that the majority of their students reported that teaching materials with spoken grammar were useful and interesting. Hilliard (2014) and Timmis (2005) stated that the main features of spoken grammar should be included in the text rather than teaching only a sentence.

Interestingly, all of them suggested in the same way that the teachers should give them the situations in which spoken grammar is employed and encourage them practice conversations. This is similar to the productive approach proposed by Mumford (2009) that encourage students to produce real language, a level beyond simple awareness of spoken grammar. Students' real-life communication skills could be improved by raising their awareness of how grammar functions in different contexts (Tripathi, 2022). Additionally, Al-wossabi (2014) suggested that the example of conversational grammar should simply be introduced interestingly to students to get a better outcome.

5.3 Conclusion

This study addresses the gap in the literature on the Thai EFL university students' awareness of spoken grammar and their perceptions of its instruction. The findings reveal in-depth data regarding Thai EFL university students' awareness of spoken grammar and their views on spoken grammar instruction which previously has been under-researched. The study found that the students' participants had limited awareness of spoken grammar. Although, they had previously seen and used spoken forms, many of them did not know that spoken grammar exists.

Importantly, the majority of the participants believed that it is important to learn spoken grammar in order to improve their speaking skills. This highlights the urgent need to incorporate spoken grammar into speaking instruction. The participants also suggested that teachers should identify the differences between spoken grammar and written grammar explicitly to prevent them from any confusion. The students viewed that those teachers can teach spoken grammar by giving an example of conversations and allow them to practice conversing with their classmates. This implies that the students had a desire to practice speaking skills in the classroom, as it is important for Thai EFL students who do not have many opportunities to use English outside the classroom. They also suggested that spoken grammar features, including the examples of how to use them, should be included in the text book. Moreover, the use of authentic materials, such as movies, can be helpful for them to learn how spoken grammar are functioned in real life situations. The data echo students' voices regarding their desire for their teaching materials that meet their needs and learning styles.

All in all, the majority of them valued the benefits of spoken grammar instructions. They hold the view that it can help them maintain the flow of speech and reduce their anxiety of using perfect grammar when speaking. While they were concerned that spoken grammar might confuse them in their writing, the students were willing to learn it, as they considered that it will have a positive impact on their speaking skills. This study suggests the educators, teachers and curriculum designers to include spoken grammar in the curriculum and teaching materials, as it could improve their speaking skills. More importantly, using written grammar for speaking might not be an appropriated approach for speaking instruction. This study

highlights that with appropriate teaching of grammar for their speaking skills, students will be able to speak English naturally, appropriately, and confidently (Hilliard, 2014).

5.4 Limitations of the study / Future Research

The sample of the study included 89 Thai EFL third-year students majoring in English at a university in Thailand. While the findings may not be generalized to the entire population, the study employed different methods using both the questionnaire and the semi-structured interviews to collect both quantitative data and qualitative data. This approach was intended to increase the validity and reliability, and depth of the findings**.** By using a purposive sampling method, the study was able to gather more relevant data from the participants who had experience studying English in many courses, covering receptive skills and productive skills in order to address the research objectives. However, this awareness-related measures were self-reported and did not include a direct test of recognition or production. Therefore, this study suggests the future research to use performance-based assessment or classroom observation and longitudinal to explore instructional outcomes.

5.5 Ethics approval

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research at Sirindhorn College of Health, Yala (SCPHYLIRB-2568/631) on the 6th October 2025.

References

Al-wossabi, S. A. (2014). Spoken Grammar: An Urgent Necessity in the EFL Context. *English Language Teaching*, *7*(6), 19–26. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n6p19

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Longman.

Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1995). *Grammar and the spoken language* (Vol. 16). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/16.2.141

Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1997). *Exploring spoken english* (Vol. 2). Cambridge University Press.

Cullen, R., & Kuo, I. c. V. (2007). Spoken grammar and ELT course materials: A missing link? *Tesol Quarterly*, *41*(2), 361–386. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00063.x

Demir, S., & Erdogan, A. (2018). The role of teaching grammar in first language education. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *7*(1), 87–101. https://doi.org/doi: 10.12973/eu-jer.7.1.87

Ellis, R. (2019). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press

Goh, C. (2009). Perspectives on spoken grammar. *ELT journal*, *63*(4), 303–312. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp004

Goh, C. C., & Burns, A. (2012). *Teaching speaking: A holistic approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Gömleksi˙z, M. N. (2007). Effectiveness of cooperative learning (jigsaw II) method in teaching English as a foreign language to engineering students (Case of Firat University, Turkey). *European journal of engineering education*, *32*(5), 613–625. https://doi.org/10.1080/03043790701433343

Hilliard, A. (2014). Spoken Grammar and Its Role in the English Language Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, *52*(4), 2–13.

Islam, M. S., & Stapa, M. B. (2021). Students' low proficiency in spoken English in private universities in Bangladesh: reasons and remedies. *Language Testing in Asia*, *11*(1), 1–31. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-021-00139-0

Larasati, T. M., Rahmawanti, M. R., & Rahayu, N. (2021). Students' perception on the use of English-subtitled movies toward students'spken grammar understanding *Wiralodra English Journal (WEJ)*, *5*(2), 39–49. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00143

Leech, G. (2000). Grammars of spoken English: New outcomes of corpus-oriented research. *Language learning*, *50*(4), 675–724.

McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2006). Ten criteria for a spoken grammar. In *Explorations in corpus linguistics* (Vol. 27, pp. 27–52). Cambridge University Press

Minkhatunnakhriyah, M., Albiansyah, A., & Fahriany, F. (2022). An Analysis of Grammatical Use on Second Language Acquisition of Thailand Student. *Teknosastik*, *20*(1), 16–24. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.33365/ts.v20i1.882

Mumford, S. (2009). An analysis of spoken grammar: The case for production. *ELT journal*, *63*(2), 137–144. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn020

Panthito, B. (2018). A Study of the Problems of English Speaking Skills of the First Year Students at Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University *Journal of MCU Humanities Review*, *4*(2), 185–195. https://doi.org/https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/human/article/view/164535

Phettongkam, H. (2017). Grammatical errors in spoken English of undergraduate Thai leaners in a communicative business English course. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *10*(1), 95–118. https://doi.org/https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/135963

Pianpadungporn, S. (2024). The Development of English Grammar Learning Skills by Using Explicit Teaching Method of University Students: The Case Study of Thai University Students. *Higher Education Studies*, *14*(2), 70–78. https://doi.org/URL: https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v14n2p70

Putra, M. T. I., Maulina, M., Muthmainah, M., Asrifan, A., Apriani, E., Ejica, N. C. P., & Peroddin, A. D. D. (2021). Teaching Communicative Grammar: A Literature Review. *CAPE COMORIN: An International Multidisciplinary Double-Blind Peer-reviewed Research Journal*, *3*(02), 63–68.

Rashtchi, M., & Afzali, M. (2011). Spoken grammar awareness raising: Does it affect the listening ability of Iranian EFL learners? https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2011.1.4.4

Saengboon, S. (2017). English Grammar and Thai University Students: An Insurmountable Linguistic Battle? *English Language Teaching*, *10*(11), 22–36. https://doi.org/URL: http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n11p22

Saengboon, S., Kosin, P., & Toomaneejinda, A. (2022). The roles of grammar in English language teaching: Local viewpoints. *Pasaa*, *63*(1), 179–204.

Sha'ar, M. Y. M. A., & Boonsuk, Y. (2021). What Hinders English Speaking in Thai EFL Learners? Investigating Factors That Affect the Development of Their English Speaking Skills. *Mextesol Journal*, *45*(3), 1–16.

Soruç, A., & Griffiths, C. (2015). Identity and the spoken grammar dilemma. *System*, *50*, 32–42. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.03.007

Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and International English: a classroom view. *ELT journal*, *56*(3), 240–249. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.3.240

Timmis, I. (2005). Towards a framework for teaching spoken grammar. *ELT journal*, *59*(2), 117–125. https://doi.org/10.1093/eltj/cci025

Timmis, I. (2010). 'Tails' of linguistic survival. *Applied Linguistics*, *31*(3), 325–345. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp028

Tripathi, I. (2022). Comparing Methods: Analyzing Written and Spoken Grammar In R. Govindrao Govindrao & S. Jayant (Eds.), *Spoken Language* (pp. 9–15). Dominant Publishers & Distributors Pvt Ltd.

Yuh, A. H., & Kaewurai, W. (2021). An Investigation of Thai students' English-speaking problems and needs and the implementation collaborative and communicative approaches to enhance students' English-speaking skills. *The Golden Teak: Humanity and Social Science Journal*, *27*(2), 91–107. https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/tgt/article/view/252425/170806

Appendix A: Information Sheet for Research Participants

เอกสารชี้แจงข้อมูลสำหรับอาสาสมัครวิจัย

เนื่องด้วย ข้าพเจ้า	นางสาวกิตติยา พิศุทธางกูร	กำลังดำเนินการวิจัย เรื่อง
ความตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ		

โดยมีวัตถุประสงค์ของการวิจัย ดังนี้

1.ศึกษาความตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ

1. หลักการและเหตุผล

เนื่องจากการศึกษาเรื่องความตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ ดั้งนั้นงานวิจัยนี้จึงได้ความตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษา อังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ เพื่อจะได้นำข้อมูลมาพัฒนาการเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษ เพื่อส่งเสริมความมั่นใจ ความเป็นธรรมชาติ และความคล่องแล้วในการสื่อสารให้กับนักศึกษาในหลายๆ สถานการณ์

2. ขั้นตอนการทำวิจัย

งานวิจัยนี้จึงมีวัตถุประสงค์ที่จะเรื่องความตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ ผู้วิจัยจะดำเนินการชี้แจงข้อมูลที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการศึกษาให้แก่ผู้เข้าร่วม ก่อนการให้ความยินยอมเข้าร่วมการวิจัยอย่างเป็นลายลักษณ์อักษร ทั้งนี้ เพื่อให้ผู้เข้าร่วมเข้าใจถึงวัตถุประสงค์ ขั้นตอน อย่างถ่องแท้ก่อนตัดสินใจเข้าร่วม ประชากรของงานวิจัย นี้ คือนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 3 จำนวน 89 คน วิชาเอกภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อการสื่อสาร จากคณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลศรีวิชัย สงขลา เนื่องจากกลุ่มประชากรเป็นกลุ่มที่ได้ผ่านการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษในรายวิชาที่เกี่ยวข้องกับทักษะการฟัง พูด อ่าน เขียน และไวยากรณ์ภาษาอังกฤษ ซึ่งทำให้มีประสบการณ์การเรียนที่สามารถให้ข้อมูลเพื่อตอบจุดประสงค์ของงานวิจัยนี้ได้

ซึ่งจะใช้ระยะเวลาในการตอบแบบสอบถามประมาณ 30 นาที และขอรับสมัครอาสาสมัครนักศึกษาเข้าร่วมสัมภาษณ์เกี่ยวกับความตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ จำนวน 6 คน โดยต้องเป็นผู้ที่เคยตอบแบบสอบถามข้างต้น สถานที่ในการชี้แจงข้อมูลสำหรับอาสมัคร คือห้อง 55205 คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลศรีวิชัย

โดยอาสาสมัครที่ยินยอมเข้าร่วมสัมภาษณ์ สามารถติดต่อผู้วิจัยได้ในรายละเอียดที่ให้ไว้ในเอกสารนี้ โดยการสัมภาษณ์จะเป็นการสัมภาษณ์ทางระบบ Zoom ออนไลน์ และสัมภาษณ์โดยผู้วิจัยตัวต่อตัว ท่านสามารถนัดเวลาสัมภาษณ์ในเวลาที่ท่านสะดวก ตั้งแต่เวลา 9.00 – 18.00 น. ตั้งแต่วันจันทร์ - อาทิตย์ ซึ่งการสัมภาษณ์จะใช้เวลาคนละประมาณ 1 ชั่วโมง โดยผู้วิจัยจะเก็บข้อมูล โดยจะไม่ระบุตัวตนของผู้ให้ข้อมูล ข้อมูลจะถูกเก็บไว้ในที่ปลอดภัย โดยต้องใช้รหัสในการเข้าถึงข้อมูล ข้อมูลจะถูกทำลาย หลังจากงานวิจัยเสร็จสิ้นเป็นระยะเวลา 4 ปี อาสาสมัครมีสิทธิที่จะปฏิเสธการให้ข้อมูลในส่วนที่อาสาสมัครไม่ยินยอมในการให้ข้อมูล ข้อมูลใดที่อาจนำไปสู่การเปิดเผยตัวท่าน จะได้รับการปกปิด และจะไม่เปิดเผยแก่สาธารณชน ในกรณีที่ผลการวิจัยได้รับการตีพิมพ์ ชื่อและที่อยู่ของท่านจะได้รับการปกปิดข้อมูล

3.ความเสี่ยง/ประโยชน์ที่คาดว่าจะได้รับของอาสาสมัครวิจัย และชุมชน
ในการเข้าร่วมงานวิจัยครั้งนี้อาสาสมัครอาจมีความเสี่ยงเล็กน้อยที่ไม่มากว่าความเสี่ยงในชีวิตประจำวัน เนื่องจากท่านจะต้องสละเวลา เกิดความไม่สะดวกสบาย หรือ สูญเสียรายได้จากการสละเวลามาตอบแบบสอบถามและในบางท่านที่มาเข้าร่วมสัมภาษณ์ แต่การเข้าร่วมงานหรือไม่เข้าร่วมงานวิจัยนี้จะไม่ส่งผลกระทบต่อผลการเรียน

กรุณาแจ้งผู้ทำวิจัยในกรณีที่ท่านประสบปัญหาความไม่สะดวกในการเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัย ขอให้ท่านรายงานให้ผู้ทำวิจัยทราบโดยเร็ว ท่านอาจเกิดอาการอึดอัดใจ หรือความไม่สบาย นอกเหนือจากที่ได้แสดงในเอกสารฉบับนี้ ซึ่งอาการข้างเคียงเหล่านี้เป็นอาการที่ไม่เคยพบมาก่อน เพื่อความปลอดภัยของท่าน ควรแจ้งผู้ทำวิจัยให้ทราบทันทีเมื่อเกิดความผิดปกติใดๆ เกิดขึ้น หากท่านมีข้อสงสัยใดๆ เกี่ยวกับความเสี่ยงที่อาจได้รับจากการเข้าร่วมในโครงการวิจัย ท่านสามารถสอบถามจากผู้ทำวิจัยได้ตลอดเวลา
ประโยชน์ที่อาสาสมัครจะได้รับคือการได้ตระหนักความรู้เรื่องไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาชาวไทยระดับมหาวิทยาลัยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ เพื่อที่นักศึกษาจะได้สะท้อนระดับความรู้ของตนเองต่อไวยากรณ์การพูด ความรู้ที่จะต้องพัฒนาเพิ่มเติม รวมถึงสะท้อนถึงมุมมองของตนเองของการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูด และข้อมูลนี้ก็จะเป็นประโยชน์แก่สถาบันการศึกษาในการพัฒนาหลักสูตร และเพื่อพัฒนาทักษะการสื่อสารให้กับนักศึกษาต่อไป

4.มาตรการในการป้องกันแก้ไข และดูแล อาสาสมัครวิจัยที่เข้าร่วมโครงการ

หากพบอันตรายที่เกิดขึ้นจากการวิจัย ท่านจะได้รับการดูแลอย่างเหมาะสมทันที คำถามบางข้ออาจทำให้ท่านเครียดหรือรู้สึกไม่สบาย ท่านมีสิทธิเลือกที่จะไม่ตอบได้ หรือ หากเกิดภาวะเช่นนี้หรือมีความเหนื่อยล้าระหว่างการสัมภาษณ์ ขอให้แจ้งกับผู้สัมภาษณ์เพื่อหยุดพัก ผู้วิจัยจะเป็นผู้รับผิดชอบค่าใช้จ่ายในการแก้ไขหรือรักษาเหตุการณ์ไม่พึงประสงค์จากการที่อาสาสมัครเข้าร่วมการวิจัยอาจมีการบาดเจ็บ/เจ็บป่วยจากการวิจัย และการลงนามในเอกสารให้ความยินยอม ไม่ได้หมายความว่าท่านได้สละสิทธิ์ทางกฎหมายตามปกติที่ท่านพึงมีในอันตรายที่เกิดขึ้นอันเนื่องจากการวิจัยในกรณีที่ท่านได้รับอันตรายใด ๆ หรือต้องการข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมที่เกี่ยวข้องกับโครงการวิจัย ท่านสามารถติดต่อกับผู้ทำวิจัยได้ตลอดเวลาในการเข้าร่วมเป็นอาสาสมัครวิจัยของโครงการวิจัยครั้งนี้ ท่านสามารถถอนตัวเมื่อใดก็ได้โดยไม่กระทบกับผลการเรียนของท่าน ไม่ว่าท่านจะเข้าร่วม

การวิจัยครั้งนี้หรือไม่ ในกรณีที่ท่านเข้าร่วมการสัมภาษณ์ ครั้งละ 120 บาท รวมทั้งหมด 120 บาท จำนวน 1 ครั้ง

หากท่านมีข้อสงสัยประการใดหรือต้องการทราบข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับผลการวิจัย สามารถติดต่อสอบถามผู้วิจัยได้ตลอด 24 ชั่วโมง ที่ (ติดต่อกับผู้ทำวิจัยคือ ดร. กิตติยา พิศุทธางกูร เบอร์โทรศัพท์ 099-852-3599 e-mail: Kittiya.ph@rmutsv.ac.th)

หากท่านมีปัญหาสงสัยเกี่ยวกับสิทธิของท่านในการการวิจัยนี้
โปรดสอบถามได้ที่เลขานุการคณะกรรมการพิจารณาจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์
วิทยาลัยการสาธารณสุขสิรินธร จังหวัดยะลา
สำนักงานคณะกรรมการพิจารณาจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์
วิทยาลัยการสาธารณสุขสิรินธร จังหวัดยะลา
ห้อง 6522 ชั้น 5 อาคารอำนวยการ
เลขที่ 91 ถนนเทศบาล 1 ตำบลสะเตง อำเภอเมือง จังหวัดยะลา
โทรศัพท์ 073-212-863 ต่อ 131
โทรสาร 073-213-234

ลงชื่อ.. กิตติยา พิศุทธางกูร ...

(นางสาวกิตติยา พิศุทธางกูร)
นักวิจัย/หัวหน้าโครงการวิจัย

Appendix B: Informed Consent Form

ข้าพเจ้า		อายุ		ปี	ได้รับฟังคำอธิบายจาก
		เกี่ยวกับการเป็นอาสาสมัครในโครงการวิจัย เรื่อง			
ความตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ					

ก่อนที่จะลงนามในใบยินยอมให้ทำการวิจัยนี้ ผู้วิจัยได้อธิบายให้ข้าพเจ้าทราบถึงวัตถุประสงค์ของการวิจัย วิธีการวิจัย รวมทั้งประโยชน์และผลกระทบที่อาจจะเกิดขึ้นจากการวิจัยอย่างละเอียดตลอดจนให้เวลาในการซักถามข้อสงสัยต่างๆ จนเข้าใจ

ผู้วิจัยได้ขออนุญาตในการให้ตอบแบบสอบถาม ซึ่งใช้เวลาประมาณ 30 นาที และในกรณีอาสาเข้าร่วมสัมภาษณ์เกี่ยวกับความตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ ซึ่งใช้เวลาประมาณ 1 ชั่วโมง เพื่อนำข้อมูลที่ได้ไปศึกษางานวิจัยนี้จึงมีวัตถุประสงค์ที่จะเรื่องความตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ ผู้วิจัยจะนำเสนอเฉพาะในภาพรวมของผลการวิจัยและใช้ประโยชน์ทางวิชาการเท่านั้น

ข้าพเจ้าเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัยนี้โดยความสมัครใจและข้าพเจ้าสามารถถอนตัวจากการเป็นอาสาสมัครโครงการวิจัยนี้เมื่อใดก็ได้ถ้าข้าพเจ้าปรารถนาโดยไม่มีผลกระทบใดๆ ต่อข้าพเจ้า

ข้าพเจ้าสามารถติดต่อสอบถามผู้วิจัยได้ตลอด 24 ชั่วโมง ที่ (ติดต่อกับผู้ทำวิจัยคือ ดร. กิตติยา พิศุทธางกูร เบอร์โทรศัพท์ 099-852-3599 e-mail: Kittiya.ph@rmutsv.ac.th)

ข้าพเจ้าได้อ่านข้อความข้างต้นแล้วและได้ลงนามในใบยินยอมนี้ด้วยความเต็มใจ

ลงนาม.....อาสาสมัครวิจัย (.....) วันที่..... เดือน ..... พ.ศ.	ลงนาม.....นักวิจัย (.....) วันที่..... เดือน ..... พ.ศ. .....

Appendix C: The Questionnaire

แบบสอบถาม เรื่อง ความตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ

(Thai EFL Learners' Awareness of Spoken Grammar and Their Perceptions on Its Instruction)

ตอนที่ ๑ โปรดกรอกข้อมูลส่วนตัวของท่าน

ตอนที่ ๒ ให้ท่านทำเครื่องหมาย ✓ ในช่องที่มีระดับการตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดของท่าน

ตอนที่ ๓ ให้ท่านให้ท่านทำเครื่องหมาย ✓ ในช่องที่มีระดับมุมมองของท่านต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูด

ขอบพระคุณอย่างสูงในความร่วมมือ

ตอนที่ ๑ ข้อมูลทั่วไป

โปรดกรอกข้อมูลของท่านในแต่ละข้อด้านล่าง

เพศ ☐ หญิง ☐ ชาย ☐ ไม่ต้องการระบุ

ประสบการณ์การในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษในชั้นเรียน

☐ น้อยกว่า 5 ปี

☐ 5-10 ปี

☐ 10-15 ปี

☐ 15 ปี ขึ้นไป

นักศึกษาเคยรับรู้เกี่ยวกับไวยากรณ์การพูด (spoken grammar) มาก่อนหรือไม่

☐ เคย ☐ ไม่เคย

นักศึกษาเคยเรียนหรือเคยลงเรียนวิชาที่เกี่ยวข้องกับไวยากรณ์การพูด(spoken grammar) มาก่อนหรือไม่

☐ เคย ☐ ไม่เคย

ตอนที่ ๒ แบบสอบถามเกี่ยวกับความตระหนักรู้เรื่องไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ

ให้ท่านทำเครื่องหมาย ✓ ในช่องที่มีระดับการตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดของท่าน

ความตระหนักรู้เกี่ยวกับไวยการณ์การพูด (Spoken Grammar) ข้าพเจ้าตระหนักรู้ว่า.....	**ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง**	**ไม่เห็นด้วย**	**ไม่แน่ใจ**	**เห็นด้วย**	**เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง**
1 .ข้าพเจ้าคุ้นเคยกับเรื่องไวยากรณ์การพูด (spoken grammar)					
2.ไวยากรณ์การพูด (Spoken grammar) แตกต่างจากไวยากรณ์การเขียน (Written grammar)					
3.ข้าพเจ้าสามารถจดจำลักษณะของไวยากรณ์ที่ใช้ในการพูดได้					
4.ในขณะที่พูด ผู้พูดไม่มีเวลาในการเตรียมหรือแก้ไขคำ ทำให้ไวยากรณ์ในการพูดต่างจากไวยากรณ์การเขียน					
5. การใช้ประโยคไม่สมบูรณ์เป็นเรื่องปกติในการพูด					
6. ในการสนทนา ผู้พูดสามารถละประโยคส่วนหนึ่งโดยพูดว่า “Want coffee” แทนประโยค “Do you want coffee?” ได้					
7.ในการสนทนา ผู้พูดไม่สามารถละประธานของประโยคถึงแม้ว่าผู้พูดกับผู้ฟังเข้าใจบริบทตรงกัน เช่น พูด					

ว่า ‘sounds good’ แทนประโยค ‘That sounds good.’ และ พูดว่า ‘glad I could help’ แทนประโยค ‘I’m glad I could help.’					
8. ประโยคอย่างเช่น ‘**This pizza,** I could eat it every day.’ และ ‘She’s so funny, **your sister**.’ เป็นตัวอย่าง การใช้ไวยากรณ์การพูด ซึ่งสามารถใช้ในบทสนทนาในชีวิตจริง เพื่อเน้นข้อมูลหรือบุคคลที่ผู้พูดต้องการพูดถึง					
9.ผู้พูดสามารถใช้คำเติม (fillers) เช่น ‘Umm’ หรือ ‘Well’ เพื่อช่วยเว้นจังหวะและทำให้มีเวลาคิดถึงสิ่งที่กำลังจะพูดต่อไป					
10. กลุ่มคำดังต่อไปนี้ ได้แก่ yeah’, ‘uh-huh’ and ‘I see’ เป็นลักษณะของไวยากรณ์การพูด					
11. วลีสั้นๆ เช่น ‘You know’, ‘I know what you mean’, ‘I think so.’ สามารถทำให้ผู้พูดพูดเป็นธรรมชาติและคล่องแคล่วมากยิ่งขึ้น					

ตอนที่ 3 มุมมองของนักศึกษาต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูด (Students' perception on spoken grammar instruction)

คำชี้แจง

ไวยากรณ์การพูด (Spoken grammar) หมายถึง ชุดของกฎไวยากรณ์และรูปแบบที่ผู้คนใช้ตามธรรมชาติเมื่อพูดภาษาอังกฤษในการสนทนาในชีวิตประจำวัน ไวยากรณ์การพูดเกิดขึ้นเพราะผู้คนพูดกันแบบฉับพลันโดยไม่ได้วางแผนหรือแก้ไขสิ่งที่พูดล่วงหน้า

ไวยากรณ์การเขียน (Written grammar) หมายถึง ชุดของกฎไวยากรณ์ที่เรายึดถือเวลาเขียน โดยเฉพาะอย่างยิ่งการเขียนที่เป็นทางการหรือวิชาการ จะพบเจอโดยทั่วไปในหนังสือเรียนไวยากรณ์

ลักษณะของไวยากรณ์การพูด (Characteristics of spoken grammar)

1. **Ellipsis** คือ การตัดทิ้งคำหรือกลุ่มคำจากประโยคหรือวลี เมื่อคำหรือกลุ่มคำเหล่านั้นเป็นที่เข้าใจจากบริบท หรือเกิดจากการที่ต้องพูดแบบฉับพลันในขณะนั้น
   Example:
   A: Do you want coffee or tea?

   B: **Coffee, please**. (แทนที่จะพูดว่า 'I want coffee please.')

   A: **You like some pizza**? (แทนที่จะพูดว่า Would you like some pizza?)

   B: No, thank you.

2. **Heads** คือ ส่วนที่จะถูกวางไว้ต้นประโยคหรือวลีเพื่อเกริ่นหัวข้อให้ผู้ฟังทราบ
   Example:
   The food last night, it was so good. (The food last night คือ head)
   My teacher, she is so kind. (My teacher คือ head)

3. **Tails** จะถูกวางเพิ่มเติมในท้ายประโยคเพื่อย้ำเตือนให้ผู้ฟังทราบถึงสิ่งที่พูดไปก่อนหน้า
   Example: She is so funny**, your sister**. (Your sister คือ tail)
   It is easy, **this exam**. (The exam คือ tail)
   Question tag คือ รูปแบบหนึ่งของ tail เช่น She's a teacher, **isn't she?** เพื่อยืนยันข้อมูลหรือขอความเห็นด้วย
4. **Fillers** คือคำ เช่น '**um,**' '**er,**' **or** '**well**' ที่ไม่มีความหมายเฉพาะแต่ช่วยให้ผู้พูดได้หยุดและคิดก่อนพูด
5. **Backchannels** คือกลุ่มคำ เช่น '**yeah,**' '**uh-huh,**' **and** '**I see**' ที่แสดงให้เห็นว่าผู้พูดกำลังฟังอยู่และส่งสัญญาณให้ผู้พูดพูดต่อไป

๖. **Phrasal chunks** คือ กลุ่มคำที่มีรูปแบบคงที่และมักจะเป็นกลุ่มคำที่มักใช้ด้วยกันตลอด ใช้เพื่อให้ผู้พูดพูดได้อย่างไหลลื่น เป็นธรรมชาติ และคล่องแคล่วมากขึ้น เนื่องจากลดความยุ่งยากในการใช้ภาษาแบบทันทีทันใด มี 3 ประเภท หลักๆ ดังนี้

1. การใช้คำพูดที่ทำให้คำพูดฟังดูไม่แน่ชัดเพื่อให้ฟังดูไม่ตัดสินเกินไป หรือเบาลง เช่น sort of kind of, และ something like that.

   ตัวอย่างประโยค เช่น This bag is <u>kind of</u> expensive.

   Let's find a nice place to eat, or may be a lovely café' to drink coffee -<u>something like that.</u>

2.การใช้ภาษาเพื่อปรับแต่งน้ำหนักของภาษาหรือเพื่อแสดงความสุภาพ เช่น a bit และ a little bit ตัวอย่างประโยค เช่น I'm <u>a bit</u> tired today.

3. คำหรือวลีที่ใช้เพื่อเชื่อมประโยคหรือความคิด หรือเปลี่ยนทิศทางการพูด หรือเพื่อเป็นการส่งสัญญาณให้ผู้พูด หรือเพื่อแสดงจุดเปลี่ยนจากหัวข้อหนึ่งไปอีกหัวข้อหนึ่ง เช่น 'right', 'I see', 'I know what you mean', and 'you know.' เพื่อให้บทสนทนาไหลลื่น

ให้ท่านทำเครื่องหมาย ✓ ในช่องให้ตรงกับระดับมุมมองของท่านต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูด

มุมมองของนักศึกษาต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูด	ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง	ไม่เห็นด้วย	ไม่แน่ใจ	เห็นด้วย	เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง
1.ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าการเรียนไวยากรณ์การพูดในห้องเรียนเป็นสิ่งสำคัญ					
2.ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าการเรียนรู้ไวยากรณ์การพูดสามารถพัฒนาทักษะการพูด					
3.ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าไวยากรณ์การพูดสามารถช่วยให้ผู้พูดพูดภาษาอังกฤษอย่างเป็นธรรมชาติ					
4.ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่า ไวยากรณ์การพูดช่วยส่งเสริมความคล่องแคล่วของการพูด					
5.ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าไวยากรณ์การพูดช่วยในการส่งเสริมให้บทสนทนาให้ไหลลื่น					

6.ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าการเรียนรู้ไวยากรณ์การพูดส่งเสริมทักษะการฟังเพื่อความเข้าใจ เพราะผู้เรียนสามารถจำแนกประโยคไม่เป็นทางการและรูปแบบประโยคที่พบบ่อยในการพูดได้ เช่น เข้าใจว่าการที่ผู้พูดพูดว่า ‘You coming?’ หมายความว่า ‘Are you coming?’					
7. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าการจดจำกลุ่มวลีสั้นๆสำเร็จรูปต่างๆ เช่น ‘I see.’, ‘I guess so.’ และ ‘something like that’ สามารถช่วยลดความวิตกกังวลในการพูดได้ เนื่องจากผู้เรียนไม่ต้องเรียบเรียงประโยคใหม่ขณะพูดทันทีทันใด					
8. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าผู้พูดที่ดีควรใช้ประโยคที่สมบูรณ์					
9. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าการมีความรู้เรื่องไวยากรณ์การพูดช่วยส่งเสริมความมั่นใจของผู้พูด					
10.ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าการใช้ไวยากรณ์การเขียนจากในหนังสือเรียนสำหรับการพูดทำให้การพูดไม่เป็นธรรมชาติ ในการพูดไม่เป็นทางการ เช่น พูดว่า The meeting, which was originally scheduled for Thursday, has been postponed to Friday due to unforeseen circumstances.					
11. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าการใช้ไวยากรณ์การพูดอาจจะส่งผล					

กระทบต่อการใช้ภาษาที่เป็นทางการ					
12. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าไม่ควรใช้ไวยากรณ์การพูดในสถานการณ์ที่เป็นทางการ					
13. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าการเรียนไวยากรณ์การเขียนช่วยเป็นพื้นฐานสำหรับการใช้ไวยากรณ์การพูด					
14.ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดอาจจะทำให้ผู้เรียนสับสนเมื่อต้องไวยากรณ์การเขียนอย่างเป็นทางการ					
15. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าการเข้าใจทั้งไวยากรณ์การเขียนและไวยากรณ์การพูดจะช่วยให้ผู้พูดพูดภาษาอังกฤษได้อย่างเหมาะสมในสถานการณ์ต่างๆ					
16. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าการใช้ไวยากรณ์การพูดเหมาะกับการสื่อสารกับเจ้าของภาษาเท่านั้น					
17. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าผู้สอนควรจะมุ่งเน้นการสอนไวยากรณ์การเขียนมากกว่าไวยากรณ์การพูด					
18. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าไวยากรณ์การพูดอาจซับซ้อนเกินไปสำหรับผู้เรียนชาวไทย					
19. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าไวยากรณ์การพูดเหมาะกับผู้เรียนที่มีทักษะด้านภาษาอังกฤษดีอยู่แล้วมากกว่า					
20. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าการเรียนรู้ไวยากรณ์การพูดควรจะเรียนผ่านสื่อสภาพจริง เช่น					

ภาพยนตร์ เพลง หรือ พอต แคสต์					
21. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าไวยากรณ์การพูดที่ใช้ในพูดสนทนาในชีวิตประจำวันส่วนใหญ่มักไม่ได้ถูกสอนอย่างชัดเจนในห้องเรียน					
22. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าผู้สอนควรจะสอนลักษณะต่างๆของไวยากรณ์การพูด เช่น Heads, Tails, Ellipsis และ phrasal chunks.					
23. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าผู้สอนควรสอนความแตกต่างระหว่างไวยากรณ์การพูดและไวยากรณ์การเขียน					
24. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าไวยากรณ์การพูดควรได้รับการบรรจุไว้ในหนังสือเรียน					
25. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าผู้สอนควรสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดและไวยากรณ์การเขียนโดยแยกกันอย่างชัดเจน					
26. ข้าพเจ้าเห็นว่าไม่จำเป็นต้องมีการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดในห้องเรียน					

Appendix D: Interview Questions

คำถามสัมภาษณ์กึ่งโครงสร้างเกี่ยวกับความตระหนักรู้ต่อไวยากรณ์การพูดและมุมมองต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ

1. นักศึกษาเคยได้ยินเกี่ยวกับไวยากรณ์การพูด (Spoken grammar) มาก่อนบ้างไหม

2. นักศึกษาคิดอย่างไรต่อการสอนไวยากรณ์การพูด (Spoken grammar)

3. นักศึกษาคิดว่าการเรียนไวยากรณ์การพูดเป็นสิ่งสำคัญหรือไม่

4.ในมุมมองของนักศึกษา ท่านคิดว่าการเรียนไวยากรณ์การพูดมีประโยชน์หรือไม่ อย่างไร

5.ในมุมมองของนักศึกษา ข้อจำกัดของการเรียนไวยากรณ์การพูดคืออะไร

6.นักศึกษาเห็นว่าผู้สอนควรสอนไวยากรณ์การพูดอย่างไร