Is Non-Standard English a 'Broken Language' or 'Linguistic Innovation?' Exploring Higher Education ELF Linguistic Features in Thailand's Deep South

Fatimah Jeharsae[a], Theerat Chaweewan[b*], Yusop Boonsuk[c]

[a] fatimah.j@psu.ac.th, English Section, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Prince of Songkla University, Pattani Campus, Thailand
[b] theerat.ch@ku.th, Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Humanities, Kasetsart University, Thailand
[c] yusop.b@psu.ac.th, English Section, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Prince of Songkla University, Pattani Campus, Thailand
* Corresponding author, theerat.ch@ku.th

ABSTRACT

The global prevalence of English as a lingua franca (ELF) across diverse linguacultural communities within the three circles invites an in-depth analysis of its phonological and lexicogrammatical features, especially among non-native English speakers. This qualitative study investigated these features among 30 Thai students from English and non-English programs, emphasizing natural occurrences in academic settings. Participants were directed to record audio and video during collaborative activities with peers and lecturers inside and outside the classroom. Through Conversation Analysis, findings revealed a significant divergence in the phonological and lexicogrammatical features of ELF participants compared to speakers of standard British

English (BrE) and American English (AmE). Specifically, non-standard lexicogrammatical features concerning verb, noun, article, word choice, tense, and preposition emerged predominantly. Furthermore, common phonological deviations included omission of final consonant sounds, mispronunciation of the schwa sound, confusion in pronouncing the article 'the,' mispronunciation of words ending with '-ine,' and substitution of /ʌ/ with /ɔ/. The data suggests widespread use of non-standard English norms, indicating linguistic adaptation beyond traditional boundaries in various environments. Significantly, this study contributes by highlighting how ELF participants reshape language for effective communication, prioritizing intelligibility over native-like proficiency, with insights extending beyond the Thai context, valuable for educators, linguists, and intercultural communication practitioners.

Keywords: English as a lingua franca, linguistic features of English, phonological variations, lexicogrammatical variations, intelligibility

Introduction

English has evolved as a lingua franca (ELF), a unifying linguistic medium connecting individuals from diverse linguistic and cultural contexts. Given its widespread acceptance and utilization, particularly within the Expanding Circle, as a communicative instrument among diverse linguacultural groups, the study of ELF has become crucial. This imperative arises from the need to comprehend ELF "in its own right, and ELF speakers as language users in their own right" (Seidlhofer, 2001, p. 137), acknowledging the legitimacy and autonomy of both the language and its speakers. ELF often emerges as the preferred, and occasionally the sole, communicative medium among speakers of different first languages. Accordingly, ELF was described by Seidlhofer (2011, p. 7) as "any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option" because it is leveraged in diverse contexts where a shared mode of communication is essential (Jenkins, 2011). Broadening this perspective, ELF transcends norms associated with native speaker varieties and national confines. Users of ELF actively mold it to suit distinct communicative needs. Jenkins (2011, p. 931) articulated that users "skillfully co-construct English for their own purposes by treating the language as a shared communicative resource within which they have the freedom to accommodate to each other, code-switch, and

create innovative forms that differ from the norms of native English and do not require sanctioning by native English speakers." In this context, English serves as a conduit for communication across different cultural spheres, which occurs regardless of geographic location or nationality. People using ELF adapt and modify their speech patterns, cultivating "a fluidity of forms" (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 77). Given ELF's dynamic nature, there is growing scholarly interest in exploring the "communicative view of ELF" (Seidlhofer, 2009, p. 241), including the adaptations ELF speakers make and how they utilize linguistic resources to maintain intelligibility during interactions (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2009).

The current linguistic profile of English indicates that a substantial number of English speakers originate from countries outside the Inner Circle. This demographic evolution has catalyzed a surge in academic attention toward the unique attributes of ELF in diverse contexts, especially within the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), where its role is pivotal in sectors such as continuing education, business, and tourism (Jaroensak & Saraceni, 2019; Trakulkasemsuk, 2018). In Asia, English users often exhibit distinctive phonological and syntactic traits that diverge from the standard norms of British English (BrE) and American English (AmE) English (Kirkpatrick, 2010; Suntornsawet, 2022). These deviations are acknowledged as characteristic components of ELF in verbal communication rather than as deficiencies. The foremost concern in ELF environments is maintaining intelligibility and mutual understanding, sidelining adherence to native speaker norms (Cogo & Dewey, 2012). This stance emphasizes ELF's dynamic essence, illustrating how modifications are made as per situational demands. In the ASEAN context, strict adherence to native norms is not only impractical but also inconsistent with actual language practices. Consequently, the use of English based on these native norms as a linguistic reference is losing its practicality, reflecting a misalignment with the lived linguistic experiences of ASEAN English users. While there is abundant research on the linguistic features of ELF in Thailand, the emphasis has predominantly been on specialized contexts such as tourism (Jaroensak & Saraceni, 2019) and business (Rajprasit et al., 2022), leaving the academic domain relatively untapped. Unlike traditional English Language Teaching (ELT) studies emphasizing common L2 errors in general English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, this study explicitly explores the specific linguistic dynamics within ELF communication in academic setting. This study is therefore grounded in Jennifer Jenkins' ELF framework (2011), which recognizes ELF as a contact language among linguacultural communities, mainly comprising non-native English speakers. Addressing this gap, the study aims to explore the inherent linguistic features of ELF interactions among Thai university students in an academic setting. The research

specifically delves into the natural occurrence of ELF during communication with classmates and lecturers, both inside and outside classrooms. By investigating the linguistic dynamics within ELF communication, the study seeks to provide nuanced insights into the academic context, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of ELF adaptation and usage. The study's conclusions aim to shed light on the practical implications for educators and practitioners engaged in language instruction and intercultural communication within multilingual settings.

Linguistic Features of ELF in ASEAN

In the multilingual settings of Asia, phonological and lexicogrammatical variations distinctively characterize ELF, which is predominantly evident in spoken interactions in ASEAN. Before probing the exploration and categorization of these ELF characteristics, it is essential to clarify that within the ELF paradigm, the emphasis is principally placed on achieving mutual understanding between communicators, overshadowing the need to adhere to standard English norms (Matsuda, 2017). From this standpoint, deviations in English usage that do not cause a communication breakdown or obstruct understanding are not seen as errors but are embraced as linguistic innovations (Jenkins, 2011). This perspective contrasts with English as a Foreign Language (EFL) frameworks, where learners' and users' proficiency levels are often strictly measured against native English norms (Thienthong & Uthaikorn, 2023; Vettorel, 2020). In such contexts, any divergence from what is considered standard English, epitomized by BrE and AmE, the English varieties universally endorsed as standard by global scholars, is classified as a mistake.

ELF Phonological Features in ASEAN

In ASEAN landscapes, the phonological features of ELF are crucial, serving as the foundation for intelligibility among speakers. Incorrect application of these features can lead to loss of intelligibility and communication breakdowns (Cogo & Dewey, 2012). Given these stakes, embedding proper norms and pronunciation models within English curricula is crucial to enhance users' and learners' proficiency and intelligibility in lingua franca conversations. Several research initiatives across ASEAN have deepened the comprehension of ELF phonological elements, displaying consistent findings on shared phonological features among users across ASEAN (Baskaran, 2004; Jenkins, 2017; Kirkpatrick, 2010). For example, the distinctions between vowel lengths are typically minimal in Singapore and the Philippines. To illustrate, the difference between /ɪ/ and /iː/, as in words *sit'*

and *'seat,'* is often rendered indistinctly, with both typically pronounced as /ɪ/. A similar merging is observable with /ʊ/ and /uː/. Furthermore, /aː/ is often pronounced too short, leading to words such as 'staff,' which is pronounced with RP /aː/, to be perceived closer to 'stuff' by non-local listeners due to the lack of length in pronunciation. In addition, diphthongs are commonly pronounced more shortly and as monophthongs, altering words such as 'lawyer,' 'slayer,' and 'fire' to simpler vocalic structures. In Malaysia and the Philippines, the omission of the schwa is prevalent, leading to the absence of the /ə/ sound in words such as *about,' 'submit,'* and *'tiger.'* Beyond these principal phonological modifications, a number of studies (e.g., Kirkpatrick, 2010; Peerachachayanee, 2022) noted that ASEAN ELF users, especially those from Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand, frequently encounter difficulties with diphthongs such as /eɪ/, /əʊ/ and /eə/ as found in the words '*face*,' '*goat*,' and '*square*'. These dipthongs are commonly pronounced as long monophthongs: /eː/, /oː/, /ɛː/ respectively. In addition, when articulating multi-syllable words, there is a conspicuous absence of vowel reduction (Kirkpatrick, 2010), with the emphasis often placed on pronouns and final words (Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008).

In terms of consonant features, a consistent lack of distinction between /r/ and /l/ was identified, especially in Hong Kong and Singapore, resulting in interchangeable usage of words like *'red'* and *'led.'* Additionally, mispronunciations are common, with /ʃ/ often sounding as /s/, leading to 'ship' being heard as 'sip,' and voiced end consonants becoming voiceless, altering words like *'feed,' 'gave,'* and *'rob'* to *'feet,' 'gafe,'* and *'rop,'* respectively. The indistinctiveness in phonemic pairs such as /v/ and /w/ and the frequent omission of ending consonants are also observed. For example, the word *'checked'* often appears in sentences as *'I check the placard.'* Furthermore, there is a prevalent reduction of consonant clusters in final positions; *'first'* is articulated as /firs/, with the /t/ being omitted (Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008). In contrast, Thai speakers often articulate some consonant clusters, especially voiceless sounds ending with –ed in the past simple tense, with an additional /-ed/ (Kirkpatrick, 2010). For instance, the word *'tapped'* is realized as /tap-ped/ rather than /tapt/, and *'linked'* is enunciated as /linked/ instead of /linkt/.

ELF Lexicogrammar Features in ASEAN

ASEAN ELF has other elements than the distinctive phonological aspects. For example, lexicogrammatical elements exhibit unique and consistent deviations. These deviations are systematically utilized by speakers from diverse linguacultural roots and do not necessarily diminish communication effectiveness. In these ASEAN ELF interactions, a noteworthy characteristic is the use of "hybrid words" in a fusion of English

with local languages, giving birth to a localized English vocabulary like *'satay'* from Malay English, which is often understood internationally (Kirkpatrick, 2010). However, there are also instances of localized lexical items, predominantly those connected to traditional culture, that remain region-specific and are comprehensible only within specific localities. For instance, terms such as *'minor wife'* and *'make merit'* are specific to Thai contexts (Saraceni, 2015; Trakulkasemsuk, 2012), while *'kiasu'* is uniquely understood in Singapore English (Saraceni, 2015). Interestingly, a single term in a specific locale might embody multiple semantic connotations. For instance, *'Crocodile'* *in Malay English* is synonymous with *'a womanizer'* (Kirkpatrick, 2007). Moreover, studies such as Kirkpatrick (2010), and Schneider (2011) have uniformly identified the presence of distinctive lexical choices and semantic expansions in ASEAN ELF. For example, the term *'bogey'* is employed to refer to a *'railway carriage,'* while *'biodata'* is used interchangeably with *'curriculum vitae.'* Additionally, some words such as *'open/close'* are imbued with extended meanings, when used to denote *'turning the lights on/off.'* There are also observable instances of word amalgamation and linguistic borrowing in ASEAN ELF contexts. For example, in Singapore, the compound word *'distripark'* signifies *'a distribution park'* or *'a warehouse complex,'* while some terms such as *'lathi'* and *'mela,'* that have been adapted from different languages, are used to mean *'bamboo stick'* and *'crowd,'* respectively. Additionally, ASEAN contexts foster the creation of unique abbreviations and idioms, with *'funda'* symbolizing *'fundamental'* and *'gift of the gap'* being a localized rendition of the British idiom, *'gift of the gab,'* especially in Singapore.

The diversity and adaptability of grammatical features in ASEAN ELF have been noted in numerous studies (e.g., Schneider, 2011; Trudgill & Hannah, 2008). One important characteristic is the flexible use of articles, with phrases such as "*I know when we touch money issue it can be very controversial.*" often missing the required articles. Furthermore, the region typically exhibits a lack of plural marking on nouns of measurement, as seen in *"One three time or four time a years,"* which also includes a non-standard use of -s on years. For emphasis, reduplication is prevalent, illustrated by expressions like *"It was a big big cake."* The positioning of adverbs also tends to differ, being showcased by phrases such as *"always I drink coffee"* showcasing this. ASEAN ELF has its unique ways of forming questions, using structures like *"can or not,"* as seen in *"She wants to go, can or not?"* and invariant tag questions such as, *"He is going to buy a car, isn't it?"* and *"You went there yesterday, no?"* Frequently verb tenses, especially in the present and the simple past, frequently diverge from standard formations, as exemplified by *"I couldn't see, that's why I just sit and take a rest,"* *"I learn it privately,"* and *"I am here on holiday since Tuesday."* The third person singular present tense form is often unmarked, as in *"She drink milk,"* and

there is a noticeable preference for the present perfect over the simple past, illustrated by *"I have been in Italy twenty years ago."*

The linguistic features documented in ASEAN ELF demonstrate how ELF has evolved to meet the unique communicative requirements of its speakers, adapting with remarkable flexibility to various contexts, especially in multilingual settings where English is the common communicative medium. Speakers of ELF leverage their familiarity with English variants to foster effective communication, resulting in a form of ELF that is rich and diverse or "heterogeneous." This enriched variant of ELF is a composite, merging pieces of English with elements from other languages, representing its "multilingual nature" (Jenkins, 2017). Some of its linguistic features are unique to a 'similect,' a different form of ELF used among speakers with a common non-English mother tongue, while linguistic features are ubiquitous across regions and contexts. This reveals the extensive linguistic variability within ELF, which is reliant on the speakers' linguistic backgrounds and the specifics of the communicative situation. Therefore, ELF is not restricted to a singular, static variety of English but is instead perceived as a dynamic role English plays in international contexts, fluidly adjusting and aligning to various linguistic landscapes and communicative demands (Matsuda, 2017).

Research Methodology

Research Context and Participants

This qualitative study was undertaken in a university located in the linguistically and culturally rich region of Deep South Thailand, an area where the predominant use of Malay forms a contrasting linguistic landscape to the widespread utilization of Thai in the majority of the country. Data were collected from 30 Thai students studying EFL courses in various academic disciplines, including English and non-English programs. Within this participant pool, there were 12 students from the English Program (Faculty of Education), six from the English Program (Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences), six from the International Relations Program (Faculty of Political Science), and three each from the Arabic for Business and Thai Language and Literature Programs (Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences). The participants were selected using convenience purposive sampling (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). To elaborate, this method involves intentionally selecting participants based on predetermined criteria such as characteristics, knowledge, or experiences. At the same time, the selection process considers practical factors such as the participants' accessibility and willingness to participate. In other words, they are purposefully chosen for specific attributes, but their availability, willingness to take part, or ease of

access also facilitate the selection. Inclusion criteria were structured to identify eligible participants as those who were: (1) Thai students in their third or fourth year from any field of study, enrolled in courses where English is the medium of instruction (EMI); and (2) actively engaged in activities involving English, both within and beyond the classroom, wherein the language is utilized to present, discuss, and share ideas and experiences in both group and individual academic endeavors. To address the research aims, this study required criteria for participants who regularly used English as their primary language of education and engaged in various activities relying on English inside and outside the classroom. Without the inclusion criteria, obtaining responses that addressed the research aims would have been difficult.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected during one semester (four months), focusing on naturally occurring spoken ELF interactions among participants, peers, and lecturers. These interactions occurred during a variety of academic activities both inside and outside the classroom, where English was the medium of communication. Such activities included final project presentations, brainstorming sessions, individual and group discussions, Q&A sessions, experience sharing on instructor-specified topics, informal interactions outside of class hours, and field interviews with foreigners. Informed consent was obtained from the participants before data collection. The study's purpose, nature, and timeline of data collection, analysis, and dissemination were clearly explained, allowing participants to assess their willingness and convenience to participate. Subsequent to receiving initial consent, permission was further obtained for recording (video or audio, based on participant's preference) any interactions during the various English-mediated activities. Data were collected monthly during the fourth week based on scheduled appointments with the participant group and were securely stored on the researcher's personal computer, coded to ensure participant identity protection, and secured to prevent unauthorized access, ensuring utmost confidentiality and adherence to ethical standards (Psathas, 1995). The participants were informed of their rights to withdraw from the study at any point should they feel uncomfortable, with assurances that such withdrawal would not affect their academic pursuits.

For data analysis, this study aimed to explore the distinctive linguistic features of ELF in naturally occurring dialogs, in particular focusing on verbal interactions among participants in educational contexts. Conversation Analysis (CA), formulated to study language in its natural settings and to investigate diverse modes of language use in conversations, was adopted to

detail the unique pronunciation and lexicogrammatical features that surfaced during these interactions (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Liddicoat, 2011). The initial step involved transcribing all gathered files, which were then presented to the participants for validation and verification, ensuring accuracy and participant involvement in the process. Once this confirmation had been received, the validated transcriptions were analyzed using the OpenCode 4.03 software, with access codes implemented to ensure data security and maintain the confidentiality of the collected information. In addition, to address reliability concerns and ensure consistency, the qualitative data were reread several times and examined using a multistage analytical process. This process included multiple readings and a systematic examination of non-standard linguistic features of English, which were categorized into phonological and lexicogrammatical domains. Each identified feature underwent further scrutiny and subdivision based on distinct linguistic characteristics. This collaborative approach contributed to the reliability and consistency of the qualitative data. To provide a quantitative dimension, the data were categorized, counted, and percentages were used to rank each feature, contributing to a more detailed and comprehensive analysis. In the final phase, each delineated ELF linguistic feature was calculated to construct a holistic overview of the results and formulate coherent conclusions.

Besides, this study employed intercoder reliability to enhance the dependability of the data coding process. The data were analyzed for non-standard phonological and lexicogrammatical features in ELF that deviated from established linguistic norms. The researchers independently coded the data based on a defined coding scheme. Intercoder consistency was subsequently assessed by calculating the percent agreement between coders (O'Connor & Joffe, 2020). Consequently, a high 89% concordance was achieved, demonstrating strong agreement in identifying non-standard features. To further improve reliability, coding discrepancies were discussed to establish consensus and ensure uniform interpretation and application of codes.

Findings

The present study investigated the linguistic features used by ELF learners in the Deep South of Thailand, focusing on two distinct categories: lexicogrammatical and phonological features as discussed below.

ELF Lexicogrammatical Features

Based on the data, the top six prevalent lexicogrammatical features were the usage of verb, noun, article, words choice, tense, and preposition,

respectively. To elaborate, the analysis along with the examples are presented as follows.

Verb

To begin with, the participants frequently employed plural verbs for singular subjects, neglecting the addition of **'-s'** or **'-es'** that would be necessary to conform to standard English grammar rules. For instance, in Examples 1, 2, and 3, the participants did not appropriately modify the verbs ***'ask,' 'cause,' and 'mix'*** to match the singular subjects.

> Example 1: (The) Teacher ***ask**** student(s) to find the information. (Participant 9)
> Example 2: It ***cause**** like Canada, New Zealand, USA, and Australia. (Participant 7)
> Example 3: The English ***mix**** the other language. (Participant 10)

Conversely, ELF learners sometimes used the opposite phenomenon by linking singular verbs with plural noun subjects, as seen in Examples 4, 5, and 6. This mismatch between verb and subject plurality, such as using **'has'** instead of **'have'** or **'is'** instead of **'are'**.

> Example 4: Native speakers ***has*** their own English. (Participant 23)
> Example 5: Two more concepts ***is*** not relevant just about English… (Participant 9)
> Example 6: There ***is*** just 4 interviewing students that I will present you today. (Participant 10)

Additionally, there were instances of missing verbs, as demonstrated in Examples 7, 8, and 9. Here, the participants omitted verbs that should have aligned with the subject, showcasing an emerging feature of verb omission in certain contexts.

> Example 7: What _***** Global English teaching? (Participant 11)
> Example 8: Bua-Loi _***** Thai traditional culture. (Participant 10)
> Example 9: They didn't _***** attention sometimes make(made) noise in the class. (Participant 11)

Moreover, ELF participants occasionally employed double verbs unnecessarily, as seen in Examples 10, 11, and 12, where two verbs appear in a single sentence. Another notable occurrence involved the use of both finite and auxiliary verbs within sentences (Example 13), further indicating a

tendency toward overcomplicating sentence structures. Additionally, instances were observed of including double auxiliary verbs (Example 14) in sentence construction, contributing to a nuanced understanding of how these learners navigate verb usage.

> Example 10: This frame *is focus* on teaching as well. (Participant 9)
> Example 11: They *have* their knowledge *is* more reliable than us. (Participant 20)
> Example 12: Multilingual turn *is offer* a new way or new choice to second language… (Participant 9)
> Example 13: Thai English *is have* a very unique… (Participant 21)
> Example 14: They *are did* not adhere to the native speaker standard. (Participant 13)

Lastly, while less frequent, ELF learners demonstrated passive verb constructions that did not conform to standard English rules, as illustrated in Examples 15, 16, and 17. Some of the learners failed to include the auxiliary verb **'to be'** or to conjugate the main verb into the past participle form, suggesting an emerging linguistic feature related to passive voice construction.

> Example 15: Some feature(s) *divide* 2 group(s). (Participant 24)
> Example 16: Creole can *divided* into 2 groups. (Participant 7)
> Example 17: The same word *is use* in specific area. (Participant 23)

In addition to the previously discussed linguistic features, the study identified several noteworthy language characteristics of ELF usage, albeit in limited occurrences. These features included the use of present tenses to describe the past events, the deficiency of proper conjugations with past tenses, and the omission of the verb **'to be'** before the term **'gonna.'**

Noun

The most prevalent feature was the omission of plurality marking, whereby ELF learners often omitted the necessary **'s'** or **'es'** when pluralizing nouns. Additionally, the features involved the addition of **'-s'** to singular nouns, suggesting a tendency to over-pluralize nouns. Furthermore, nouns were omitted entirely from sentences, potentially causing ambiguity. For instance, Examples 18, 19, and 20 illustrate instances where plural marking was omitted, altering the intended meaning.

Example 18: What is standard that should be for teaching their ***student****? (Participant 5)
Example 19: There are some ***country**** that they use English in their own ***way****. (Participant 5)
Example 20: There are four ***channel*****… (Participant 7)

Conversely, there are cases where the participants incorrectly add plural marks to nouns that should remain singular, as seen in Examples 21 and 22. These instances occur despite clear indicators, such as the presence of articles or determiners, emphasizing singularity.

Example 21: So, English as an international ***languages***. (Participant 8)
Example 22: English is refer to as an international ***languages***… (Participant 12)

Moreover, there was a single instance of a missing noun in Example 23, where the objective noun is omitted, potentially leading to a misunderstanding of the sentence's meaning.

Example 23: The most of people to learn _ ******* from the movie, series and TV series. (Participant 7)

Beyond these patterns, there were instances where the participants occasionally used nouns to modify or describe other nouns instead of employing adjectives, as evidenced by participant 12's use of ***'multiculture'*** and ***'culture diversity.'***

Example 24: Thai ***multiculture universities***…" and "English speakers become so fast and rich in ***culture diversity***. (Participant 12)

Article

The findings indicated that the participants frequently used deviations from standard article usage in spoken English. These deviations were categorized into three main types: adding articles unnecessarily, omitting articles in necessary positions, and using the wrong article.

One prominent feature was the tendency for the participants to add articles unnecessarily, specifically the definite article ***'the,'*** where it is not needed. For instance, Examples 25, 26, and 27 demonstrate the overuse of

'the' with proper nouns, names of languages, and countries, contrary to English grammatical norms.

> Example 25: They have to know *the* English. (Participant 7)
> Example 26: Emmy say that the guide in *the* Thailand. (Participant 23)
> Example 27: We upload link of the game on *the* Facebook. (Participant 9)

Conversely, the participants also frequently omitted articles in contexts where they were necessary. Examples 28, 29, and 30 illustrate instances where the definite article **'the'** or the indefinite article **'a'** should have been used, according to English grammar rules.

> Example 28: He does not have _* bachelor degree in education. (Participant 20)
> Example 29: We have _*case pencil (pencil case) to play. (Participant 11)
> Example 30: Wait for me to think about _*question. (Participant 1)

Furthermore, the participants occasionally used the incorrect article type based on the initial letter of the following noun. For example, **'a'** should precede words starting with consonants, while **'an'** is suitable for words beginning with vowels. Examples 30, 31, and 32 reflect this pattern, where the participants incorrectly used **'an'** with words that required **'a'**.

> Example 30: The Pennycook give *an* definition… (Participant 7)
> Example 31: The word like *a* international sound (Participant 23)
> Example 32: The development of English can generally describe as *a* adaptation. (Participant 2)

Word Choice

One notable issue in word choice involved instances where the participants opted for words that do not align with the intended meaning. For instance, in Example 33, a participant sought to identify the seller's country of origin but inaccurately used the adjective *'Korean'* instead of the noun **'Korea,'** as the appropriate term to denote the country. Similarly, in Example 34, the word *'interaction'* is incorrectly used as a noun when it should function as the verb in the sentence. Example 34 further exemplifies this pattern, where the participant used *'understanding'* when **'understand'** is the appropriate verb form to convey comprehension.

Example 33: Seller is people that from that **_Korean_**. (Participant 21)
Example 34: They **_interaction_** between each other. (Participant 24)
Example 35: I think it's good because student(s) will more **_understanding_** the information. (Participant 9)

Tense

In Example 36, the participant should have replaced the irregular verb **_'do'_** with the simple past tense **'did'** to match the context of a past occurrence. Similarly, in Example 37, **_'say'_** should have been **'said'** to accurately reference a prior action. In Example 38, **_'rising'_** should have been **'rise'** to adhere to proper verb tense rules with adverbs of frequency.

Example 36: The buyer **_do_** not understand. (Participant 21)
Example 37: The context can be **_say_** that is ELF. (Participant 25)
Example 38: Almost of Thai people always **_rising_** intonation. (Participant 23)

Preposition

In the context of missing prepositions, the participants frequently omitted crucial prepositions such as **'of'** and **'with,'** leading to grammatical inconsistencies and reduced sentence clarity.

Example 39: The role _ * English in ASEAN. (Participant 24)
Example 40: Multilingual turn try to explain using English in variety _ * multilingual society. (Participant 9)
Example 41: To sum up, ELF is language that we use _ * people who speak the different mother tongue. (Participant 23)

As shown in the Examples below, incorrect preposition usage was also common, with the participants misapplying prepositions such as **_'to'_** instead of **'on'** and **_'for'_** instead of **'of'**.

Example 42: It is not only focus **_to_** native speaker. (Participant 11)
Example 43: Let's talk about the challenging **_for_** Global Englishes. (Participant 11)
Example 44: They use English as a second language **_to_** communication. (Participant 23)

Furthermore, the participants often added unnecessary prepositions, as seen in Example 45, where the superfluous *'for'* appears. Double prepositions compound this issue, like *'of'* in Example 46 or *'about'* in Example 47 highlighting the need for precision in preposition usage throughout their sentences.

Example 45: There are many challenges **for** nowadays. (Participant 11)
Example 46: They want us to point at **of** them. (Participant 20)
Example 47: They don't focus on **about** grammar. (Participant 8)

ELF Phonological Features

The data revealed two categories of phonological features: consonant and vowel articulation. Regarding consonant articulation, the most prevalent feature was the omission of final consonant sounds. As can be seen in Examples 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52, many participants had a consistent struggle with the omission of the final /t/ sound in words. This omission was observed in several instances, exemplified by the pronunciation of **'participant'** as *'participan'*, **'first'** as *'firs'*, **'suggest'** as *'sugges'*, *'adjust'* as *'adjus'*, and **'context'** as *'contex'*. Furthermore, as shown in Examples 53 and 54, the omission of final consonant cluster sounds at the end of words represented another phonological challenge, with instances such as **'created'** pronounced as *'create'* and **'localized'** as *'localize.'*

Example 48: **'participant'** pronounced as *'participan'* (Participants 1, 2, 4, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19, 25, 27, 30)
Example 49: **'first'** pronounced as *'firs'* (Participant 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 16, 19, 21, 25, 27, 30)
Example 50: **'suggest'** is pronounced as *'sugges'* (Participants 5, 12)
Example 51: **'adjust'** is pronounced as *'adjus'* (Participant 6)
Example 52: **'context'** is pronounced as *'contex'* (Participants 7, 21, 25)
Example 53: **'created'** is pronounced as *'create'* (Participant 21)
Example 54: **'localized'** is pronounced as *'localize'* (Participant 21)

Additionally, distinctions between sounds such as /r/ and /l/ represented a notable challenge. The observed instances such as Example 55, where **'read'** and *'lead'* are pronounced in a manner that suggests confusion between the sounds of /r/ and /l/. This particular challenge pertains to the differentiation between the English phonemes /r/ and /l/.

Example 55: **'read'** and **'lead'** pronounced the same (Participants 18, 27)

As shown in Examples 56 and 57, the transformation of voiced sounds to voiceless ones, represented by **'respond'** pronounced as **'respont'** and **'give'** as **'gife'**, indicates a notable challenge for these learners.

Example 56: **'respond'** pronounced as **'respont'** (Participant 1)
Example 57: **'give'** pronounced as **'gife'** (Participant 27)

In addition, Example 58 exemplifies the omission of initial consonant cluster sounds in the pronunciation of **'transcript'** as **'tanscipt'** and in Example 59 with the pronunciation of **'group'** as **'goup,'** demonstrating the difficulty ELF learners face in maintaining and pronouncing these clusters accurately.

Example 58: **transcript'** pronounced as **'tanscipt'** (Participant 18)
Example 59: **'group'** pronounced as **'goup'** (Participant 21)

Additionally, the substitution of specific sounds, particularly the replacement of the **/dʒ/** sound as in **'education'** /edʒʊkeɪʃən/ and the **/ð/** sound as in **'the'** /ðə/ with **/d/**, indicated in Examples 60 and 61, reflects a consistent challenge among learners.

Example 60: from **'education'** /edʒʊkeɪʃən/ to **/edʊkeɪʃən/** (Participant 21)
Example 61: from **'the'** /ðə/ to **/də/** (Participants 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30)

Furthermore, the least common phonological feature was the confusion between the sounds **/v/** and **/w/** as illustrated in Example 62, where the participant pronounced **'voice'** as **'woice'**.

Example 62: **'voice'** pronounced as **'woice'** (Participant 21)

The common challenges with vowel articulation included the mispronunciation of the schwa sound **/ə/** and confusion in pronouncing the article **'the'** /ðə/ or **/ðɪ/**, mispronunciation of words ending with **-ine**, the replacement of **/ʌ/** with **/ɔ/**, mispronunciation of the sound **/ɔ:/**, and the replacement of **/eɪ/** with **/aɪ/**, respectively

Specifically, the participants often omitted the schwa sound **/ə/** in words, opting for a more open vowel variant. For example, several participants pronounced the word **'about'** **/ə̲baʊt/** frequently as **/ɑ̲ːbaʊt**/ without the schwa sound (Example 63). Similarly, the words **'numerous'** **/nuːmər̲ə̲s/** pronounced as **/nuːmər̲ʌs/** and **'upon'** **/ə̲pɑːn/** pronounced as **/ʌ̲pɑːn/** substituted the schwa sound with the sound **/ʌ/** instead (Examples 64 and 65).

> Example 63: **'about'** **/ə̲baʊt/** pronounced as **/ɑ̲ːbaʊt**/ (Participants 2, 3, 6, 11, 16, 19, 21, 30)
> Example 64: **'numerous'** **/nuːmər̲ə̲s/** pronounced as **/nuːmər̲ʌs/** (Participant 6)
> Example 65: **'upon'** **/ə̲pɑːn/** pronounced as **/ʌ̲pɑːn/** (Participant 18)

The findings indicated the respondents were consistently challenged by the pronunciation of the definite article **'the.'** Notably, the participants frequently pronounced **'the'** as **/ðə̲/** when it preceded a vowel sound, deviating from the standard pronunciation **/ðɪ̲/**. For example, several participants consistently pronounced **'the'** as **/ðə̲/** in noun phrases like **'the important,'** and the same pattern was observed for **'the awareness,' 'the interaction,' 'the influence,' 'the age,'** and **'the existence.'** Furthermore, the substitution of **/ðə̲/** for **/ðɪ̲/** in noun phrases preceding vowels may affect the fluency and comprehensibility of their spoken English.

> Example 66: **'the important'** as **/ðə̲ ɪmpɔːrtə̲nt/** (Participant 3)
> Example 67: **'the awareness'** as **/ðə̲ ə̲weə̲rnə̲s/** (Participants 3, 19)
> Example 68: **'the interaction'** as **/ðə̲ ɪntə̲rækʃə̲n/** (Participant 6)
> Example 69: **'the influence'** as **/ðə̲ ɪnfluə̲ns/** (Participants 6, 21)
> Example 70: **'the age'** as **/ðə̲ eɪdʒ/** (Participant 26)
> Example 71: **'the existence'** as **/ðə̲ ɪgzɪstə̲ns/** (Participants 1, 25, 30)

In addition, this pattern highlighted the mispronunciation of words ending with **-ine** and **-ice** among the participants where words ending with **-ine** were consistently pronounced as **/aɪ̲/** instead of the correct **/ɪ/** sound. For example, this feature was evident in words such as **'determine,'** pronounced as **/dɪtɜːma̲ɪn/** by Participant 17. Likewise, Participants 13 and 20 demonstrated this pattern with words like **'examine,'** pronouncing it as **/ɪgzæma̲ɪn/**. A similar issue was observed with words ending in **-ice**, where

the participants substituted the correct pronunciation of the word **'prejudice'** with an **/aɪ/** sound as shown in Example 74.

> Example 72: **'determine'** pronounced as **/dɪtɜːmaɪn/** (Participant 17)
> Example 73: **'examine'** pronounced as **/ɪgzæmaɪn/** (Participants 13, 20)
> Example 74: **'prejudice'** pronounced as **/predʒuːdaɪs/** (Participant 2)

There were additional instances of the replacement of the specific vowel sounds of **/ʌ/** with **/ɔ/** and **/ɔː/** with **/aː/**. First, the participants replaced the **/ʌ/** sound with the **/ɔ/** sound, as evidenced in the word **'among'** **/əmʌŋ/**. This substitution was particularly notable in the pronunciation of **'/əmɔŋ/'** (Example 75). Furthermore, the sound **/ɔː/** was frequently mispronounced as **/aː/** in the word like **'toward'** /təwɔːd/ as **/təwaːd/** (Example 76). The participants also showed a tendency to substitute the **/eɪ/** sound with the **/aɪ/** sound. This substitution was observed in the word **'raising,'** **/reɪzɪŋ/** which was pronounced as **/raɪzɪŋ/** by Participant 13.

> Example 75: **'among'** pronounced as **/əmɔŋ/** (Participants 6, 19, 27)
> Example 76: **'toward'** pronounced as **/təwaːd/** (Participants 1, 9)
> Example 77: **'raising'** pronounced as **/raɪzɪŋ/** (Participant 13)

Discussion

This study aimed to examine natural occurrences of linguistic features including lexicogrammatical and phonological during communication among Thai university students inside and outside their classrooms. The findings revealed the emergence of distinctive linguistic patterns that represented unique language variations rather than categorical errors. It became evident that the participants, with diverse backgrounds and performance levels, engage in a dynamic linguistic adaptation shaped by regional influences, as observed in the Deep South of Thailand where Malay and Thai are predominantly used in daily life. The findings emphasize the need for tailored pedagogical approaches and support to enhance the proficiency of these learners in multilingual settings. This nuanced understanding of the complex interplay between language use, regional linguistic influences, and individual proficiency contributes valuable insights for educators and practitioners

aiming to enhance the intelligibility and effective communication of these learners in multilingual settings, moving beyond a strict focus on standard norms.

Based on the findings, it is evident that lexicogrammatical features considerably outweighed phonological features among these Thai ELF learners. This observation suggests that the participants encountered more challenges in lexicogrammatical features than in phonological features, which could be attributed to their multilingualism and familiarity with the nuances of pronunciation dynamics. To elaborate, the variants of lexicogrammatical features that emerged in this study could be divided into thirteen features, with the top six being verb, noun, article, word choice, tense, and preposition which aligned with other studies by Jenkins (2017), Kirkpatrick (2010), and Imperiani & Mandasari (2020). Specifically, non-standard subject-verb agreement patterns were frequently employed, including occasional verb omissions within sentences. It could be said that the confusion regarding non-standard forms of verb tenses and subject-verb disagreement in English might stem from the absence of verb tense features in the Thai language.

Notably, in the current study, commonly in speech, there was omission of the '-s' or '-es' endings in singular third person present tense verbs and plural nouns. This aligned with the findings of Impeirani & Mandasari (2019), who observed that students often omitted the third person present tense '-s' as seen in examples like *'The teacher ask* student to find the information'* and *'he ask* us to come.'* Obviously, this could be due to the fact that these contexts are home to languages with Malay roots, which is the first language for some participants, and in these languages, the use of the third person is not common (Impeirani & Mandasari, 2019). However, it is essential to recognize that dropping the third person present tense '-s' is one of the characteristics of lexicogrammatical features in ELF studies as pointed out by Jenkins, Cogo and Dewey (2011) and despite all non-standard forms, the speakers can still maintain the flow of communication effectively.

Other outstanding features were word choice and tense. These features represent the distinctions between Thai and English languages, which can present challenges in the learning process. Due to similarities in certain English words, the participants may have experienced confusion when selecting the appropriate words. Clearly, verb tenses, especially in the present and the simple past, frequently diverged from standard formations. The participants often used an incorrect tense in a sentence as the feature of verb tenses does not exist in Thai language (Jaroensak & Saraceni, 2019; Suntornsawet, 2022). However, these features constituted minor errors that did not substantially hinder comprehension in communication. Remarkably, disregarding such grammatical errors in English communication may contribute to increased student confidence (Boonsuk et al., 2021). In addition,

it is worth noting that these lexicogrammatical features do not alter the meaning of communication, unlike phonological features where variations in pronunciation can lead to misunderstandings or altered meanings, making them a critical consideration in linguistics and language comprehension (Sahatsathatsana, 2017).

Concerning the phonological features, which was the second focus in this study, while they constituted a relatively small portion of the observed occurrences, they played a vital role in effective communication as proposed by Yuzawa (2007) who emphasized the importance of pronunciation because "Intelligible English pronunciation is a basic and essential skill required for those who want to use English communicatively". In other words, clear and understandable English pronunciation is a fundamental and necessary ability for individuals aiming to effectively communicate in English. Noticeably, the majority of phonological features in this study pertained to consonant articulation. Specifically, the most common feature found in consonant articulation was that the participants often omitted final consonant sounds. This tendency may have arisen from the influence of the Thai language, which does not allow aspirated stops or fricatives at the end of a turn or before a pause, unlike in English where final sounds are crucial (Tantiwich & Sinwongsuwat, 2021). Another plausible reason is the difficulty in pronouncing certain English sounds like [tʰ] in the final position of words, as noted in the study by Sahatsathatsana (2017) where a participant admitted the [tʰ] sound in the final position of the word *'asked' is difficult to pronounce*, could be attributed to the absence of such sounds in the Thai language. When the participants encountered sounds that do not exist in their native language, they may have found them challenging to articulate accurately, leading to omissions. Another small yet attractive feature dealing with consonant articulation that emerged among the students was the confusion between /r/ and /l/. This commonly occurs in both the Thai and English language. Thai people recognize that /r/ and /l/ are distinct phonemes. However, they sometimes conflate /r/ and /l/ in free variation in colloquial speech (Peerachachayanee, 2022). This suggests that students may carry over this colloquial variation when switching between Thai and English, resulting in the occasional confusion between /r/ and /l/.

In addition to consonant articulation, another main category of phonological features was vowel articulation. As presented in the previous section, the most two common features were the mispronunciation of the schwa sound /ə/ and the confusion between the pronunciations of the article 'the' (/ðə/ or /ðɪ/). The schwa sound /ə/ is a weak sound in English, which Thai speakers often struggle with due to the equal weighting assigned to each syllable in Thai which can lead to stress errors in Thai-accented English (Suntornsawet, 2022). Additionally, the mispronunciation of the article 'the'

(/ðə/ or /ðɪ/) is a common issue among ELF speakers, both in writing (Nopjirapong, 2011) and speaking contexts (Impeirani & Mandasari, 2019; Jaroensak & Saraceni, 2019). This non-conventional feature in speaking might occur due to the grammatical rule of the word *'the'* in which the vowel of the word will change according to the initial letter of the following word; while the mistake in writing occurs due to the thinking process of the speaker being in their own language and then being translated into English (Nopjirapong, 2011). These phonological challenges highlight the complex interplay between linguistic systems, syllable timing, and grammatical rules in the acquisition of English pronunciation by Thai learners.

Since the current study was conducted in a multilingual setting, it is noteworthy that the linguistic features observed, or non-standard forms produced by the ELF speakers, that could possibly have been influenced by the participants' diverse backgrounds and varying levels of proficiency, did not affect the communication flow nor create any misunderstandings. A plausible reason could be that the peer speakers were experiencing the same context and shared the same cultures and mother tongues (Imperiani & Mandasari, 2020). Therefore, the current supported Jenkins (2017) by affirming that ELF represents a multilingual practice wherein numerous individuals with diverse backgrounds interact. It aligns with the overarching objective of ELF communication, which primarily focuses on achieving effective and intelligible communication among speakers from diverse linguistic backgrounds. In terms of the implications of the study, the results from the current study suggest a shift in ELT practices in Thailand with a departure from solely adhering to native English speakers' norms to encouraging the inclusion of various English varieties that Thai learners are likely to encounter (Boonsuk et al., 2021). Specifically, Boonsuk et al. (2021) emphasized that in the teaching of grammar and pronunciation, English educators in Thailand should prioritize intelligibility over strict accuracy. This change in emphasis is seen as a means to enhance the confidence of Thai EFL learners when communicating in English. In summary, it is clear that ELF educators have a crucial role to play and it is essential for them to foster a learning environment that welcomes linguistic diversity. Instead of rigidly sticking to native-speaker norms, students should be encouraged to prioritize effective communication. This pedagogical approach emphasizes the ultimate goal of ELF to bridge linguistic gaps and to facilitate mutual understanding.

Conclusion

In the multilingual settings of Asia, phonological and lexicogrammatical variations distinctively characterize ELF, which is predominantly evident in spoken interactions in ASEAN. This study

investigated the linguistic features, mainly in lexicogrammatical and phonological features, among Thai ELF learners in the Deep South of Thailand. Lexicogrammatical features, such as verb tense variations and subject-verb disagreement patterns, indicated the influence of the Thai language on English usage. Phonological challenges, including consonant articulation and vowel articulation, stem from differences in sound systems. It could be clearly seen from the study that despite these non-standard forms, effective communication remained intact, emphasizing the primary goal of ELF as bridging linguistic gaps for mutual understanding. This aligned with the perspectives of prominent scholars such as Jenkins et al. (2011), indicating that ELF is not standardized but rather embraces linguistic diversity, which is accepted in academic and professional settings, highlighting its role as a tool for global communication. In other words, the study's implications extend to practical applications in education, suggesting a paradigm shift in pedagogical approaches and language instruction. Instead of rigid adherence to native speaker norms, educators can leverage the findings to design curricula that prioritize students' exposure to diverse linguistic patterns, emphasizing intelligibility and effective communication over strict conformity to standard norms. This approach is particularly relevant in regions with multilingual environments, where tailored teaching methods can acknowledge and embrace linguistic diversity. The study also advocates for creating opportunities for students to practice and apply their language skills authentically through extracurricular activities or community engagement programs. By incorporating these insights, educators can enhance language learning outcomes in diverse educational contexts, fostering a more inclusive and effective language instruction approach.

However, this study was conducted with a small-scale focus on a multilingual university which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other contexts. While the study provided valuable insights for ELF educators in tailoring pedagogical approaches for both learners and educators, it is important to recognize that the specific context of the study might not fully represent the diversity of ELF interactions in different settings. To address these limitations and enhance the robustness of future research in this area, it is recommended to expand the participant pool to both learners and teachers from various disciplines. Additionally, further research could delve into the beliefs and attitudes of educational stakeholders including learners and their parents, teachers, policymakers, and curriculum designers with regard to applying ELF both in academic and non-academic environments. This broader scope would provide a more comprehensive understanding of ELF dynamics and pedagogical implications in diverse educational settings.

About the Authors

Fatimah Jeharsae: An English lecturer at Prince of Songkla University, Pattani campus since 2017, holds Bachelor's and Master's degrees in English. Combining her business experience with teaching, she's a recipient of the Excellent Teacher Award (2019-2021) and passionately pursues innovative teaching, project leadership, and community engagement.
Theerat Chaweewan: A lecturer in the Department of Foreign Languages, Kasetsart University, Thailand. His research interests are Global Englishes, English as a Lingua Franca, Translangauging and ELT.
Yusop Boonsuk: An Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics at Prince of Songkla University, Thailand. His research interests include Global Englishes, World Englishes, English as a Lingua Franca, Translanguaging, Transcultural Communication and Awareness, Intercultural Citizenship and ELT, English Medium Instruction, Teacher Education, and Language Beliefs, attitudes, and Identity.

References

Boonsuk, Y., Ambele, E. A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Developing awareness of Global Englishes: Moving away from 'native standards' for Thai university ELT. *System*, *99*, 102511. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102511

Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2012). *Analysing English as a lingua franca: A corpus-driven investigation*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. P. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage Publications.

Imperiani, E. D., & Mandasari, H. A. (2020). Lexicogrammatical features of ELF speakers in an Asian Students Association small talk in Indonesia. In *3rd International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education (ICOLLITE 2019)* (pp. 346-352). Atlantis Press.

Jaroensak, T., & Saraceni, M. (2019). ELF in Thailand: Variants and coinage in spoken ELF in tourism encounters. *rEFLections*, *26*(1), 115-133.

Jenkins, J. (2011). Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(4), 926-936. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.05.011

Jenkins, J. (2017). The future of English as a lingua franca? In J. Jenkins, W. Baker & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 594-605). Routledge.

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching, 44*(3), 281-315. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000115

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model.* Hong Kong University Press.

Matsuda, A. (Ed.). (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language.* Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783097036

Mesthrie, R., & Bhatt, R. (2008). *World Englishes.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511791321

Nopjirapong, R. (2011). *An analysis of article errors in Thai university student's composition.* Unpublished Master of Arts thesis, Srinakarinwirot University, Bangkok, Thailand.

O'Connor, C., & Joffe, H. (2020). Intercoder reliability in qualitative research: Debates and practical guidelines. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 19*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919899220

Peerachachayanee, S. (2022). Towards the phonology of Thai English. *Academic Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Burapha University, 30*(3), 64-92.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction.* Sage Publications.

Rajprasit, K., Sirisuksakulchai, J., Srimontra, K., Pitakpornsin, N., Letakulkit, P., Phaiboontham, P., & Dumrongruedee, S. (2022). Using business English as a lingua franca for written and spoken communication: Challenges encountered by Thai human resources professionals in an American multinational company. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature, 28*(4), 13-28. https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2022-2804-02

Sahatsathatsana, S. (2017). Pronunciation problems of Thai students learning English phonetics: A case study at Kalasin University. *Journal of Education, 11*(4), 67-84.

Saraceni, M. (2015). *World Englishes: A critical analysis.* Bloomsbury Publishing.

Schneider, E. W. (2011). *English around the world: An introduction.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780522781711

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied*

Linguistics, 11(2), 133-158. https://doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00011

Seidlhofer, B. (2009). Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes, 28*(2), 236-245. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01592.x

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford University Press.

Suntornsawet, J. (2022). A systemic review of Thai-accented English phonology. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand, 63*, 348-370.

Tantiwich, K., & Sinwongsuwat, K. (2021). Thai university students' problems of language use in English conversation. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 14*(2), 598-626.

Thienthong, A., & Uthaikorn, K. (2023). Thai learners' attitudes toward English accents: Fields and stages of study. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 16*(1), 676-702.

Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2012). Thai English. In E. Low & A. Hasmin (Eds.), *English in Southeast Asia: Features, policy, and language in use* (pp. 101-111). John Benjamin.

Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2018). English in Thailand: Looking back to the past, at the present and towards the future. *Asian Englishes, 20*(2), 96-105. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2017.1421602

Trudgill, P., & Hannah, J. (2008). *International English: A guide to the varieties of standard English*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203785225

Vettorel, P. (2020). Communication strategies in BELF: Implications for business English language teaching. *Status Quaestionis, 2*(19), 133-153. https://doi.org/10.13133/2239-1983/17131

Yuzawa, N. (2007). Teaching English pronunciation. *The Economic Journal of TCUE, 50*(1), 95-107.