A STUDY OF THE USE OF ENGLISH:
A CASE STUDY OF ENGLISH IN THAI SONGS

BY

MISS JUTHARAT NAWARUNGREUNG

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
FACULTY OF LIBERAL ARTS
THAMMASAT UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC YEAR 2015
COPYRIGHT OF THAMMASAT UNIVERSITY

A STUDY OF THE USE OF ENGLISH:
A CASE STUDY OF ENGLISH IN THAI SONGS

BY

MISS JUTHARAT NAWARUNGREUNG

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

FACULTY OF LIBERAL ARTS

THAMMASAT UNIVERSITY

ACADEMIC YEAR 2015

COPYRIGHT OF THAMMASAT UNIVERSITY

THAMMASAT UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF LIBERAL ARTS

DISSERTATION

BY

MISS JUTHARAT NAWARUNGREUNG

ENTITLED

A STUDY OF THE USE OF ENGLISH:
A CASE STUDY OF ENGLISH IN THAI SONGS

was approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

on August , 2016

Chairman P. Sripichan
(Asst. Prof. Dr.Passapong Sripicharn, Ph.D.)

Member and Advisor Nantawan Chuarayapratibk
(Assoc. Prof. Dr.Nantawan Chuarayapratibk, Ph.D)

Member Torpong Jamtawee
(Dr.Torpong Jamtawee, Ph.D.)

Member Kwanji C.
(Asst. Prof. Dr.Kwanjira Chatpunnarangsee, Ph.D.)

Member Saengchan Hemchua
(Asst. Prof. Dr.Saengchan Hemchua, Ph.D.)

Dean Dumrong Adunyarittigun
(Assoc. Prof. Dr.Dumrong Adunyarittigun, Ph.D.)

Thesis Title	A STUDY OF THE USE OF ENGLISH: A CASE STUDY OF ENGLISH IN THAI SONGS
Author	Miss Jutharat Nawarungreung
Degree	Doctor of Philosophy
Major Field/Faculty/University	English Language Studies Faculty of Liberal Arts Thammasat University
Thesis Advisor	Assoc. Prof. Nantawan Chuarayapratib, Ph.D.
Academic Years	2015

ABSTRACT

As an international language, English is used as a medium in various settings such as music and entertainment. The number of non-native users is continuously increasing around the world. People often use English for communication when they speak different mother tongues. Communication between non-native users and native speakers, as well as among non-natives themselves, leads to a wide variety of types of English. This can lead to problems of intelligibility. This research principally has aimed to determine the level of comprehensibility of English inserted in Thai popular music. The research comprised four groups of participants: Thais; non-native speakers of English who are not Thai citizens; native English speakers; and lyricists. The research tools included song lyrics, music videos, interviews, and a questionnaire. The study has shown that those who attained the highest level of understanding of the English words in Thai songs were Thais, followed by non-native speakers of English who were non-Thais. The lowest level of understanding was among native speakers of English. Songs showed positive side of World Englishes. Even though English in

Thai popular songs was different from standard English, participants could understand it.

Keywords: Attitudes , English in Thai songs, intelligibility, popular music, World Englishes

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The completion of this dissertation has been possible because of the assistance of many people. First of all, I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Nantawan Chuarayapratib, Ph.D., my dissertation's advisor, for her tireless support and valuable guidance. Also, I would like to express my gratitude to my committee members, Asst. Prof. Passapong Sripicharn, Ph.D., Asst. Prof. Kwanjira Chatpannarangsee, Ph.D., Torpong Jamtawee, Ph.D., and the external examiner, Asst. Prof. Saengchan Hemchua, Ph.D. for their contribution towards this dissertation.

In addition, I would like to thank Asst. Prof. Thomas Radzienda, the valuable proofreader of this dissertation. His contribution, comments and supports are always beneficial.

Moreover, I would like to thank to Asst. Prof. Sirinna Boonyasaquan, my bachelor degree's advisor at Srinakharinwirot University, who always supports and encourages me until the completion of the Ph.D. program and also to all of lecturers of the Western Department, Faculty of Humanities, Srinakharinwirot University for their supports.

Last but not least, I wish to express my thanks to all of my participants for their unlimited help until the success of the dissertation. My thank also expands to Asst. Prof. Somboon Pojprasat, Ph.D., a lecturer of the Faculty of Liberal Arts, Mahidol University, Miss Khanittha Thaicharoen, and Miss Tanatorn Ubolsathit, for their fruitful help and advice throughout the way to complete the program including their great friendship.

The most important thanks are to my dear parents who are always beside me anytime. All completions are from your love, care and understanding.

Miss Jutharat Nawarungreung

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT (3)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS (5)

LIST OF TABLES (11)

LIST OF FIGURES (12)

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Background of the study 1
1.2 Statement of the problem 4
1.3 Purpose of the study 5
1.4 Scope of the study 6
1.5 Significance of the study 7
1.6 The value of songs as sources for studying varieties of English 7
1.7 Objectives 9
1.8 Research questions 9
1.9 Definitions of terms 10

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE 12

2.1 Characteristics of Thai language 12
2.1.1 How English came into Thai language 12
2.1.2 How English is used in Thai language 15
2.1.3 Influence of mixture of foreign languages in Thai language 15
2.2 Thai English 16
2.2.1 Thai English in written contexts 21
2.3 Theoretical frameworks 27

2.3.1 World Englishes 27
2.3.1.1 Definitions 27
2.3.1.2 Kachru's model of types of World Englishes 27
2.3.1.3 Previous studies 29
2.3.2 Intelligibility 32
2.3.2.1 Previous studies 33
2.3.3 Pronunciation 35
2.3.3.1 Definitions 35
2.3.3.2 The importance of intelligibility English pronunciation 35
2.3.3.3 Elements of English pronunciation 36
2.3.3.4 Elements of Thai pronunciation 40
2.3.3.5 Previous studies 42
2.3.4 Nativization 48
2.4 Word stress 50
2.4.1 Stress problems for Thai EFL learners 51
2.4.2 Previous studies 52
2.5 Attitudes 54
2.6 Assessment based on native speakers of English 60

CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 62

3.1 Research design 62
3.2 Participants 62
3.3 Research instruments and triangulation 70
3.4 Data collection 74
3.5 Data analysis 76
3.6 Measurement to reliable of the research 79
3.7 Pilot study 80

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 102

4.1 Research question 1 106

4.2 Research question 2 135
4.3 Research question 3 216
4.4 Research question 4 237

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 241

5.1 Conclusion 241
5.2 Pedagogical implications 243
5.2.1 Raising the awareness on varieties of English 245
5.2.2 Teaching pronunciation 249
5.2.3 Teaching vocabulary 251
5.2.4 Materials selection 252
5.3 Suggestions for further studies 252

REFERENCES 254

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A 279
APPENDIX B 280
APPENDIX C 282
APPENDIX D 284
APPENDIX E 287
APPENDIX F 288
APPENDIX G 290
APPENDIX H 291
APPENDIX I 293
APPENDIX J 294
APPENDIX K 295
APPENDIX L 296
APPENDIX M 298
APPENDIX N 299

APPENDIX O 314
APPENDIX P 318

BIOGRAPHY 328

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
2.1 Monophthong	39
2.2 Diphthong	40
2.3 Non-existence of English sounds in Thai	44
3.1 Participants' pseudonym	69
3.2 English consonant sounds	84
3.3 English consonant sound in the initial position	85
3.4 English consonant sound in the final position	86
3.5 Substitution of English consonant sound in the initial position	86
3.6 Substitution of English consonant sound in the final position	87
3.7 Substitution of English consonant cluster	89
3.8 Replacement of English vowel sound	91
3.9 Replacement of English voiced sound	93
3.10 Participants' attitudes	97
4.1 Participants' scores of correct answers	104
4.2 Participants' scores of incorrect answers	105

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures Page

2.1 Kachru's model of World Englishes 28

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

English is an important international language of the world. It is used for different purposes such as communication in trade and business (Crystal, 2003) and a *lingua franca* for speakers of different mother tongues. English is also used in education such as English for academic purposes (EAP) and English for specific purposes (ESP). Additionally, it is used to distinguish users' type of language acquisition (Kachru, 1989) such as English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL). With regards to technology, English is a main language for accessing online information over the Internet from around the world. Furthermore, it is embedded in media to convey messages to large audiences especially through newspapers, radio and television.

1.1 Background of the study

The role of English has changed dramatically over time. Originally, it was mainly used in the daily life of native speakers of English until the colonial period. At that time, English was spread around the world by British colonizers. This was the expansion of language users' contact with English outside native English countries. In the last hundred years, innovation and globalization have become important factors spreading English throughout the world. Due to these factors, the number of non-native speakers of English has been increasing (Crystal, 2003). In the present time, the number of non-native speakers of English in the world is larger than the number of native speakers of English (Crystal, 2003). This circumstance implies that English does not solely belong to its native speakers anymore, but to everyone in the world who uses it.

English in this period is unique because characteristics such as accent, pronunciation and syntax differ under various circumstances. For example, Thais speak English with Thai idiosyncrasies such as omitting final voiced sounds at the end of words like /be:t/ instead of /beɪd/ in the word 'bed' and creating English sentences using Thai sentence structure such as 'car white' instead of 'white car'.

The role of this international language has expanded to various fields. Undoubtedly, it remains a tool for communication among language users who speak different mother tongues, whether in trade, business or education. English in technology is a primary language for searching for information which is widely recorded in English (Warschauer, et al., 2001) such as on websites. Media in which English is used as a means of communication include newspapers, radio and television. The development of media has increased its importance in recent decades. For instance, twenty to thirty years ago, audiences accessed songs via cassette tapes or CDs. At present, songs are available for free download over the Internet and audiences are easily able to access them. As a result, English is used more frequently. Users of English include both native speakers of English and non-native speakers of English (Frith, 1992).

English has been studied in many disciplines such as English in education (Lei & Wu, 2014; Nguyen, 2012; van Wyk, 2014) and English in social networks (Kabilan, et al., 2011; Liu, 2014). The most recent area considers English in songs (Ajibade & Ndububa, 2008; Kachru, 2006). Songs widely influence audiences' lives, especially in terms of language use and attitudes.

In terms of language use, English affects Thai language at all levels, especially concerning lexical, phonological and semantic aspects. English mixing in Thai songs mainly occurs at the word level. It is interesting to find reasons why lyricists mainly mix English at the word level. Regarding phonology, Thai audiences imitate singers' pronunciation when they

listen to songs as they believe the singers employ accurate pronunciation and serve as effective models of the language. However, audiences may not be aware of differences between English and Thai language use. For example, most singers pronounce English with Thai pronunciation and some words are different from native English such as the word ‘sure’ /ʃʊə/ as /tɕʰu:a/.

In terms of semantics, the meaning of English words in Thai lyrics is slightly or totally different from the original native English context. Changes in meaning mainly occur through the process of nativization. Nativization refers to the employment of English in a distinctively Thai style in the Thai cultural context. This process often changes the meaning from the original English context. For instance, the word ‘chill’ in Thai context comes from ‘chill out’ in native English context. It means ‘to take it easy’ in Thai context whereas native context refers to ‘go out and relax’.

With regard to attitudes, songs influence audiences’ lives and their thoughts. People have different viewpoints towards English in songs. For example, some may see English integration in songs for language learners to be useful because songs create an enjoyable setting for them. Moreover, songs can make learners interested in learning languages and have fun at the same time. In addition, learners pay more attention when using English in songs that they like. In doing so, it motivates language learners to learn new languages and leads to effective and successful learning.

English appeared in Thai songs many years ago, especially in country and folk songs. English inserted in Thai songs has been taking place more often since the 1990s, especially in Thai popular songs. The integration of English in Thai popular songs has been influenced from Japanese popular music (J-Pop) and Korean popular music (K-Pop). This trend has become a

mainstream characteristic of Thai popular music. Lyricists often add at least one English word into their Thai lyrics.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Based on the researcher's experience in music background, the influence of English in Thai popular songs is an issue nowadays. Popular songs are the most common music genre among young Thais according to music charts such as Green Wave and Cool Fahrenheit.

Teenagers and young adults are the main targets of this type of music. They admire and appreciate their favorite singers and follow their dressing style, lifestyle and especially their manner of singing and language use. Cheung (2001) stated that most young people follow popular culture. As a result, popular songs influence young learners. Many audiences imitate singers' pronunciation of English words that is different from native English.

However, very little research has been conducted in this field. Songs are a unique genre that include written and spoken texts, but remain distinct from both spoken and written styles. Songs are composed with rhyme, verse, and melody. In a song composition, a lyricist can include many kinds of language such as slang. If considering length of the contexts, it may be different from other genres as well depending on the lyricists' composition (Mayer, et al., 2008).

Even though it is English in songs, listeners must be aware of language use and recognize the existence of numerous varieties of English. A major concern here is the issue of intelligibility. This is a starting point to carefully consider whether lack of awareness of the varieties of English could create misunderstanding in daily communication. English in Thai popular songs, therefore, is an interesting topic worth studying.

1.3 Purpose of the study

This study focuses on English in Thai popular songs at the word level. In Thai popular songs, the appearance of language aspects includes lexis, code-switching and code-mixing, and semantics. Of these aspects, lexis occurs most frequently.

It is said that humans speak an infinite number of utterances every day to communicate, express feelings and have discussions (Katamba, 2005). Scholars define the concept of 'words' in different ways. For example, Katamba (2005) defines 'word' as "the smallest meaningful linguistic unit that can be used on its own. It is a form that cannot be divided into any smaller units that can be used independently to convey meaning". Even though concepts of 'word' vary greatly, they also share several similarities. That is, 'word' is a meaningful element in spoken and written forms that can be used to construct sentences.

For the last forty years, researchers focused on exploring English in other fields such as the use of English in newspapers (Narayana & Kapur, 2007; Roy, 2011; Shokouri & Amin, 2010) and the use of English in native English songs (Guo, 2007; Lee, 2009; Sevik, 2011). Those studies investigated how non-native speakers of English understood native speakers of English. Unfortunately, there are limited studies addressing popular cultures, especially Thai popular songs (Bofman & Prez, 2008; Eamsa-ard, 2006; Potipan & Worrawutteerakul, 2009). The researcher finds this to be an interesting gap that needs to be filled. As a result, this research aims at exploring the use of English by Thai singers and investigating the level of understanding of Thai-English of various English users who speak different mother tongues. These include native Thais, native speakers of English and non-native speakers of English who are non-Thais. This study focuses on the effectiveness of communication between native speakers and non-native speakers of English and among non-native speakers of English themselves. The researcher

focuses on level of understanding and effective communication because the higher the level of understanding, the more effective the communication will be. Effective communication leads to successful conveying of a message. Songs may not transmit communicative purposes directly but they help gain understanding of various aspects of language that can be applied to daily communication such as word use, accent and pronunciation.

1.4 Scope of the study

This study focuses on song lyrics retrieved from three of the most well-known Thai singing contest programs: Academy Fantasia (AF), KPN Awards, and The Star. The lyrics were newly composed between 2001 and 2014. This means all not all of the songs were sung during the contests and were composed for the finalists to sing after the contests were over.

This study classifies types of participants into three groups: native Thais, native speakers of English, and non-native speakers of English who are non-Thais, and also includes lyricists. Each group comprised three participants. Each participant listened to all of the songs. The researcher ensured that they could attend the entire listening session without interruption. In addition, the researcher conducted in-depth information of all aspects with each participant. Participants included both male and female.

Apart from three participants each group, this study also included one lyricist as a representative from each singing contest program. One lyricist from each program was selected as representative. However, all of the lyricists were male because there were not any female lyricists working for these three programs.

Finally, exposure to Thai language and culture is also a factor in the scope of this study. Each group of participants included both frequent and limited exposure to Thai language, culture, and people.

1.5 Significance of the study

This study raises awareness of varieties of English and its intelligibility. Realization should include different English characteristics that can be issues when having contact with others. Linguistic features such as lexical aspect and pronunciation help people to understand each other if listening with awareness and attention. Awareness of varieties of English is the first impression if a person can accommodate themselves to others and accept differences.

At the end of 2015, ASEAN countries became the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC). This is an area where the varieties of English will be more noticeable in the region. Each country has their own language but people must communicate with each other in English more often due to trade, business and education. English will be a *lingua franca* among ASEAN countries. This indicates that users should realize their own and others' usage of English and adapt themselves to the needs of the listeners (Butler, 1999). Simply put, understanding each other's usage of English is an important topical need.

1.6 The value of songs as sources for studying varieties of English

In this study, songs are the key to interesting results. It is vital to realize the value of songs as sources for studying varieties of English. Songs are universal language. They relate to human life since birth. For example, they are used as nursery rhymes for babies, health and mind

therapy, and entertainment. They are also symbolic of happiness, relieving stress and loneliness from human life (Pratumnan, 2006).

Globally, songs contain different genres such as pop, rock, folk, and country. Each genre has unique characteristics of their own but they also share characteristics. This is to say, songs continually build up energy. Each song contains elements such as lyrics, rhythm, and dynamics. When listening to a song, an audience should feel more powerful because songs tell a story. For instance, a love song tells the audiences about relationships.

Songs are unique and cannot be classified as a spoken or a written language. Rather, they are a unique combination of both types. Lem (2001) states that "through songs, students discover the natural stretching and compacting of the stream of English speech". Songs are also one of the powerful tools to learn a language in daily life (Saricoban & Metin, 2000). Songs are also good examples of English informal text because they present a corpus of the use of English in real situations (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). Songs present various aspects of language such as vocabulary, grammar and culture by inserting them in lyrics (Futonge, 2005).

Songs are easy to find and cost very little to access. Songs can be downloaded free of charge from many open sources on the internet. Listeners can listen to songs everywhere and at any time using a music player or a smart phone. Songs also offer a friendly atmosphere and reduce stress (Domoney & Harris, 1993; Ekem, 1996; Gardner, 1983; Oku & Suzuki, 2009). This leads to positive attitudes in acquiring a language because of enjoyable setting (Orlova, 1997). Songs draw attention and motivate listeners to learn a new language. They also develop and create imagination of the listeners. For example, listeners may imagine pictures of songs in their minds. They may also create their own way to acquire a language (Murphey & Maley, 2002). For example, they may look for meanings and translations of new words they hear.

Rhyming of English words in Thai songs is viewed as beautiful. Rhyme also contributes to memorable lyrics. Songs are easy to remember due to repetition such as in the hook verse that is usually sung two or three times in a song. Lem (2001) and Cunningham (2014) state that repetition is good for creating spontaneous memorization. Even though Thai-English was not widely acceptable in the past due to errors and deviation from native English, in the present age, it is considered a creative aspect of language use.

1.7 Objectives

The main objectives of this study are to investigate intelligibility and explore the phenomenon of the use of English in Thai popular songs with specific aims to:

1. Explore linguistic features at the word level of English words appearing in Thai popular songs.
2. Study the level of understanding of native speakers of English, non-native speakers of English who are non-Thais, and among native Thais, through listening comprehension of English words in Thai popular songs.
3. Examine the attitudes of native Thais, native speakers of English, non-native speakers of English who are non-Thais, native Thais and Thai lyricists towards the use of English in Thai popular songs.
4. Compare and contrast the attitudes of the lyricists and the participants.

1.8 Research questions

1. What linguistic features of Thai-English are evident in Thai popular songs?

2. How do variations in research question 1 affect the level of intelligibility of English words used in Thai popular songs by listeners of various cultures? What are the factors of different levels of intelligibility?

3. What are the participants and lyricists' attitudes towards the use of English in Thai popular songs?

4. What are the similarities and differences between participants and lyricists' attitudes?

1.9 Definitions of terms

1. Varieties of English: the differences of English characteristics on lexical aspect such as connotation, meaning shift, puns and phonological aspects such as pronunciation.

2. Thai-English: a combination of Thai and English at lexical, phonological, and sentence structure levels. It is the uniqueness of using English in Thai styles (Chamcharatsri, 2013).

3. Intelligibility: the level of understanding of people who have different mother tongues when they communicate with each other. The factors relating to intelligibility include clarity, explicitness, lucidity, comprehensibility, perspicuity, and precision.

4. Pronunciation: the way in which a particular person pronounces the words of a language (Hornby, 2001).

5. Loan words: words obtained from one language and employed in another such as "computer". The loan takes place through different means such as trade and education. Loan words can maintain the original form and meaning, slightly change or totally change when they appear in new settings.

6. Nativization: creation of the use of language/dialect in new settings in terms of words, phrases, sentences, pronunciation, and accents, which have been influenced by other languages/dialects. For example, a new forming can use a sentence structure from one language/dialect and vocabulary from another. Thai-English is formed of Thai sentence structure and English words with or without change. For example, 'inter' is a shortened form of 'international' in a sentence '*ลองเขียน letter ไปถึงเธอ she ดั่งดอกฟ้า inter*' (I try to write her a letter. She looks like an ***international*** flower).

7. Truncation: a process of word formation that shortens a word but retains its meaning or part of speech. For example, a shortened form of 'online' is 'on' in *จะ tag หัวใจเข้าไปให้เธอ on เมื่อไหร่ก็เจอแต่คำว่า love* (I will tag the heart to you, I always see the word love whenever I go ***online***) (Kannaovakun, 2001).

8. Conversion: a process in which a word is changed to another part of speech in another language such as the word 'sad' in *ไม่เห็นต้อง sad อะไรๆ มากมาย* (Don't have to be that ***sad***) as a verb not an adjective (Kannaovakun, 2001).

9. Semantic shift: a change of meaning of a word in a new language such as 'chill chill' meaning to take it easy in *chill chill ได้ไหม รู้ไหมควงใจฉันปลิว* (Could you ***take it easy***?) (Kannaovakun, 2001).

10. Attitude: response that reveal people's thoughts or ideas on a particular issue, either positive or negative.

11. Audience: participants of the study comprising native Thais, native speakers of English, and non-native speakers of English who are non Thais.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Varieties of English have been studied in terms of different features such as lexis, accents and dialects (Kamper & Niesler, 2014; Moinzaden, et al., 2012; Yang, 2013). Scholars have also focused their studies on different aspects such as mass communication and education. Similarly, this study set up a specific focus aiming to explore levels of intelligibility of song lyrics of English in Thai language by native speakers of English, non-native English users who are non-Thais, and native Thais.

This chapter reviews academic literature starting from characteristics of Thai language and Thai-English. Then the theoretical framework of this study is explored. World Englishes, intelligibility of pronunciation, nativization, lexis and word stress are discussed later in the chapter. Concepts of attitudes are surveyed in this chapter, plus an assessment based on native speakers of English.

2.1 Characteristics of Thai language

Originally, the Thai language was composed of single words with only one syllable such as กิน /gin/. As Thailand was exposed to the world through diverse contacts, influences of different languages came into Thai language including Bali, Sanskrit, and English. Kingkham (2007) presented the following points related to characteristics of Thai language.

2.1.1 How English came into Thai language

Foreign languages were used in Thai language because of different

factors. The first factor refers to the geography of Thailand. Thailand neighbors many countries including Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, and Myanmar. Local Thai people who live near the borders of these countries such as in Surin province in the northeastern region of Thailand and in Songkhla province in the southern region of Thailand have contact with these neighboring counties. As a result, they exchange languages through regular contact. For example, people living in Surin province can communicate in Khmer with Cambodian people and people living in Songkhla province can speak Malay with Malaysian people.

The second factor relates to the history of Thailand. Immigration of Thai people to a new place where local people such as the Khmer and Mon people were living led to the mixture of foreign languages into the Thai language. War also created a mixture of new language use because local people were arrested and moved to a new place during war. They brought their languages with them. When they arrived in a new place, they mixed their own languages with the language of the country in which they were relocated. For example, when Thailand defeated Burma, Burmese people were moved into Thailand. Those Burmese immigrants continued speaking Burmese when they lived in Thailand. This caused Burmese language to mix with Thai.

The third factor concerns religion. In Thailand, people have freedom to choose their own religion. People use the language of religion in their daily lives and this causes a mixture of other languages into Thai. For instance, Bali and Sanskrit came from India, home of Hinduism and Buddhism. These languages have had a profound influence on the Thai language, primarily through the widespread practice of Buddhism in Thailand.

The next factor concerns trade. Thailand started trade contact with other countries centuries ago such with China, France, India, and Portugal. Trade contact contributed

to the mixture of languages without boundaries. Literature is an important historical factor in the language mixture in Thai language. Both Sanskrit language in the Ramayana story from India and Jawa language of Inao from Indonesia have had a strong influence on Thai language and literature.

Cultures and traditions are other factors of language mixture. When Thailand and other countries contact each other, or when foreigners reside in Thailand, they bring with them cultures and traditions from their native countries. Languages from those cultures and traditions become intertwined with Thai people, culture, and language. Education and knowledge are also important factors to consider. Starting during the reign of King Rama IV, some Thai people especially royal family members and nobles studied abroad, especially in England, France and Germany. They brought back education and knowledge including the languages of those educational institutes to Thailand. In the present day, as Thailand joins the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), English is used as a *lingua franca* for everybody in the region. Meanwhile, many people also need to learn the native languages of other ASEAN countries.

Diplomatic missions have also contributed to language mixture in Thailand. Diplomats and missionaries have long mixed their native languages with Thai. Similarly, migration has influenced language mixture. Migration happens from different factors such as war, economics, and politics. When people migrate to a new country, they bring their languages with them as they communicate with local people. All of these interactions, from trade to migration, from diplomacy to education, contribute to the mixture of languages.

2.1.2 How English is used in Thai language

English is not directly used in Thai language but it has undergone various processes. Mainly, Thai language borrows words from English using three different methods. The first way is translation. This is a type of borrowing employed when Thai has no existing vocabulary such as in the phrases 'tea spoon' (ช้อนชา) and 'short story' (เรื่องสั้น).

The second way is creation. This approach draws on the ideas of English words that influence Thai words. This type of borrowing happens mainly in academic words such as television (โทรทัศน์) and globalization (โลกาภิวัฒน์).

The final way is transliteration. This method is to transfer sounds and scripts of English words to be used exactly the same in Thai words.

2.1.3 Influence of mixture of foreign languages in Thai language

Mixture of languages causes Thai language features to change. Originally, Thai was a mono-syllabic language using words such as เดิน /dɤ:n/ (walk), and เมือง /mɯ:aŋ/ (town). Mixture of language creates words with more than one syllable such as ราชา /ra:tɕʰa:/ (king), สามารถ /sa:ma:t/ (can), and โทรศัพท์ /to:rasap/ (telephone). The mixture of languages leads to various word choices. For example, the word 'bird' was used only as 'นก' /nok/ in the past. After mixture, other words such as 'สกุณา' /sakuna:/ and 'วิหค' /wihok/ came in. As a result, Thai language users now have more options to suit their intentions.

The mixture of languages creates more consonant clusters in Thai language such as free, spring and entrance. Final consonant sounds in Thai language also change

when mixing with other languages. In the past, Thai language had final consonant sounds that matched the sound pronounced such as /n/ for /น/ in the word ‘นอน’ /nɔ :n/ (sleep). However, the mixture of languages changed this feature. For instance, /s/ for /ด/ was used in the word ‘เทนนิส’ /tennit/ (tennis). Finally, the mixture changes the way people use the language. Thai people seem to use English and Thai in the same contexts. For example, ‘ฉันไม่มายด์นะ’ (I don’t mind).

Characteristics of the Thai language relate to various aspects such as lexis, phonology and grammar. Thai is a tonal language comprised of consonants, vowels, and tones. Thai characters are syllabic with forty-four consonants and twenty-one sounds. The consonants are divided into three classes: middle such as /อ/ (/o/), high such as /ส/ (/s/), and low such as /ท/ (/t/). Thai consonants determine the tone of a syllable. Thai language has five tones. These tones are middle, low, high, rising, and falling.

Thai language also has eighteen vowels divided into monophthongs such as /ิ/ (/i/), diphthongs such as /ั–าว/ (/a:w/) and triphthongs such as /เ็ียว/ (/iaw/). Thai vowels can appear in front of, above, below, or after consonants. Pairs of vowels are long and short which are different phonemes such as /ุ-/ (/u/) and /ู-/ (/u:/).

2.2 Thai English

“Tinglish, a variety within the notion of World Englishes”

[Quirk, 1962]

English is an important source of loan words in popular culture such as mass media, having a strong influence on the Thai language. Thai-English, also known as Tinglish,

Thenglish, Thainglish, and Thailish, is a newly coined word by mixing “Thai” and “English” to refer to the English language spoken by native Thai speakers. Thai-English is a creation or an incompleteness of language use by Thai people. It is a combination of Thai and English at the lexical and sentence structure levels and is mainly found in terms of vocabulary and pronunciation. Thai people use English with Thai influence such as pronunciation, grammar, and nativization. Thai-English is the uniqueness of using English in Thai style. As a result, only native Thais and speakers who have exposure to Thai language understand the meaning (Chamcharatsri, 2013; Chutisilp, 1984).

In order to understand the influences and the interferences of the Thai language on English, it is important to understand the unique characteristics of Thai language while discussing Thai-English. First of all, Thai is a tonal monosyllabic language consisting of five different tones. Even though all five tones can be inflected, only some of them convey meaning. Tones play a significant role in different levels ranging from syllables, words, phrases and sentences, to indicate the meaning. Thai is spoken with every syllable equally emphasized. On the other hand, English emphasizes stress and intonation to convey meaning. This leads to certain characteristics unique to English spoken by native Thais. For example, the word ‘apple’ is stressed on the first syllable as /'æpl/, but native Thais stress both syllables as /'æp'pn/.

Consonant clusters in the initial position are another concern. English allows two or three consonant sounds in the initial position. Thai language, in contrast, contains at most two sounds. An example of the initial consonant cluster is in the word ‘strong’ which consists of three consonant sounds /s/, /t/ and /r/. In Thai, only two sounds are found in the initial position. As a result, native Thais tend to assign a vowel to the first consonant leading to an additional syllable such as the cluster in the word ‘strong’ which is pronounced /satrɔ ŋ/.

The final consonants of Thai words are limited to only eight sounds: /k/, /p/, /t/, /m/, /n/, /ŋ/, /y/, and /w/. Consequently, English spoken by native Thais is limited to this range of final sounds, regardless of the original final consonant cluster in English. For instance, the word 'twelfth' is pronounced as /twew/ instead of /twelfθ/. Similarly, the gliding characteristic of English vowel sounds is also substituted by single vowel sounds. /oʊ / in the word 'go' /goʊ / becoming /go/ in Tinglish is an illustration of this point.

Another aspect to be taken into consideration is that negative markers in Thai and English are different. In English, negative markers must be placed after auxiliary verbs whereas they usually appear before (for some, after) an auxiliary verb in Thai language. Therefore, native Thais tend to use the word 'no' before words to make a negative sentence. In English, the auxiliary verb 'does' is needed to create a negative sentence such as 'He does not come to class.' To refer to the same sentence in Thai, native Thais usually drop the auxiliary verb in such a sentence. Simply put, 'He not come to class' (เขาไม่มาเรียน) is understandable among native Thais.

The way native Thais treat a negative question is also considered a uniqueness of English spoken by native Thais because it is completely different from English. Responding to a negative question is regarded as a confirmation of the fact asked. A Thai being asked "Haven't you had your lunch yet?" should answer with the word 'yes' if he or she has not yet had lunch. Also, the polite request 'Do you mind driving me home?' which requires an answer such as 'No, I do not mind' is commonly answered by 'Yes' in order to offer a friend a ride home.

In terms of word choice, native Thais tend to use a final particle at the end of a sentence such as 'How are you ka/krup/na/ja/la?". Using such a final particle presents ethnicity as well because each ethnic group uses a distinctive language associated with their ethnic identity" (Holmes, 2008).

Apart from the above features, the semantic aspect is also worth consideration. Some borrowed words from English are used with different meanings. For example, ‘to fit’ which means to be suitable for someone/something is used to say that something is too tight. Another illustration is the word ‘diet’. It refers to ‘food’ in English in general; however, if someone said ‘diet’ in Thai, it means ‘a person is trying to lose weight’. As a result, when Thai people speak English, they say such words with a different meaning leading to some misunderstanding.

Examples of Tinglish on vocabulary use are ‘open the light’ instead of ‘turn on the light.’ Repetition is also found in Tinglish vocabulary such as *same same*. The commonly used vocabulary is ‘chill chill’ instead of ‘chill out.’ Also, incorrect use of word occurs in Tinglish such as ‘check bill’ instead of either ‘check’ or ‘bill.’

Tinglish ignores the original English stress and employs stress on the final position instead. Tinglish omits final consonant sounds and changes to another sound such as /n/ for /l/ as in ‘ball’ and /t/ for /s/ as in ‘kiss.’ Other English sounds that do not exist in Thai language are substituted by nearly equivalent sounds such as /w/ for /v/ as in ‘love’ and /l/ for /r/ as in ‘row.’ Moreover, insertion of a vowel /a/ between consonants in a cluster especially in words starting with /s/ such as ‘sa-tyle’ instead of ‘style’ is also found in Tinglish.

Gender is another unique characteristic of Tinglish. In English, suffix changing is used to indicate whether the noun is masculine or feminine such as *waiter – waitress, actor – actress,* etc. Conversely, native Thais do not add or change any suffixes. They use the same word to indicate both masculine and feminine.

It is extremely difficult for native Thais to use proper forms of words in English. Pronouns, for example, remain the same no matter where they are or whether they are subjects or objects. This is because pronouns remain uninflected in Thai. When a pronoun is used in

different cases, many native Thais use the same forms of English pronoun as in the following example; Instead of saying ‘I love you’ and ‘You love me’, native Thais say ‘I love you.’ (ผมรักคุณ) and ‘You love I.’ (คุณรักผม).

Verbs, articles, numbers and pronunciation further contribute to the complications of Tinglish. Thai verbs do not indicate tense. Tinglish has no verb inflection. It is understandable to say, ‘I go to school yesterday.’ instead of saying ‘I went to school yesterday.’ Omission of articles occurs in Tinglish because there are no articles in Thai language at all. When native Thais communicate, the articles are left out as in ‘I have baby.’

Cardinal numbers are also instead of ordinal numbers and they follow nouns. “She lives in floor two” is an example for this point. It is seen that native Thais omit the article in the sentence. Also, the ordinal number ‘second’ becomes the cardinal number ‘two’, and it comes after a noun.

Lastly, regarding the syntactic structure of Tinglish, punctuation is regarded as a unique characteristic of the dialect. English employs a wide range of punctuation such as periods, commas and semicolons. Punctuation is not commonly seen in Thai. Consequently, a sentence in English that is supposed to come to a complete stop becomes a run-on sentence when written by native Thais.

Responses to questions starting with an auxiliary verb show a distinctive characteristic of Tinglish. In English, a contracted form of an auxiliary verb is used to replace the main verb when answering a ‘yes/no question’. However, native Thais tend to answer such an English question with the main verb instead of an auxiliary contraction. The following table demonstrates this idea.

English questions	Thai responses
Do you like to study English?	Yes, I like.
Will you study tomorrow?	Yes, I study (tomorrow).
Are you studying today?	Yes, I study (today).

2.2.1 Thai English in written contexts

Chutisilp (1984) and Watkhaolarm (2005) studied Thai-English in literature and found features of Thai-English such as transfer, translation, shift, lexical borrowing, hybridization, and reduplication. Details of each feature are discussed below.

1. Transfer

Transfer is when native Thais transfer Thainess into Thai-English by bringing Thai cultural and social aspects into the use of English. For example, "How are you?" is a common greeting among native speakers of English but native Thais say "Where are you going?" or "Have you eaten yet?" In practice, both examples are commonly used in Thai language but they are strange in the English context.

The transfer of Thainess into Thai-English is mainly found in kinship terms. In Thai-English, the pattern *kinship term + noun* (i.e. Uncle Chai) is commonly used when addressing someone. It is used to show respect and good manners because it is not polite to address someone, especially seniors, with only their names according to Thai customs. Kinship terms are also used to present family relations because Thai culture emphasizes respect for seniors. Kinship terms can be used with people related and unrelated to the speakers' families. Within

families, kinship terms are used to indicate seniority. In contrast, they are used to create a sense of in-group bonding when communicating with people outside the family.

Thai-English adds the neutral prefix *khun* to names such as Khun Kim to show politeness. Kinship terms also include titles, social status, and birth rank in front of names to address people such as Ajarn Thomas and Momluang Phin.

2. Translation

Loan translation from Thai into Thai-English occurs when native Thais encounter items, concepts, or idioms that have no equivalents in English. This can cause difficulty for non-Thai users who have limited exposure to Thai language and culture. For example,

> So ends my biographical sketch from the early part
> of my life to the completion of *the sixth cycle of age*.
>
> [Chutisilp, 1984: 131]

This example shows that *the sixth cycle of age* is a direct translation from Thai language. It refers to ‘a period of twelve years’ coming from the belief of native Thais that each year is ruled by a different star. The cycle of stars repeats every twelve years according to Thai traditional belief. The word *cycle* is, therefore, used to describe someone’s life or any important occasion. In native English, the word *jubilee* is used for a similar concept, but native Thais use *cycle* instead. In short, this phrase means a person is seventy two years old.

3. Shift

Shift is when native Thais shift the Thai writing style into English style. It is commonly found in proverbs and old sayings. Examples are shown below.

> I didn't say that you were all wrong but you shouldn't decide this matter yourself. You know *when you build a house you have to do it as the person who is going to live in likes.*
>
> [Chutisilp, 1984: 138]

> Father inclined to favor his third wife. The old saying *"New rice tastes better than the old,"* still held true.
>
> [Watkhaolarm, 2005: 150]

Thai-English writing style can also be found in Thai-English publications such as magazine articles and advertisements.

4. Lexical borrowing

Thai-English creates new words to explain particular items that cannot be explained in English. Loanwords in Thai-English show semantic features transferred from Thai language adapted with English grammatical features (Chutisilps, 1984).

Adding the suffix –s to singular nouns to become plural nouns is also found. For example, *kuti* (a monks' dwelling) becomes *kutis*. Adding the suffix also occurs in lexical

borrowing as Watkhaolarm (2005) explained that it occurs with translation as shown in the following extract:

> Mandy, who was familiar with the food, pointed out each dish and described it to Bellinger. The meal was composed of white rice, a beef curry, roasted strips of pork, soy-bean cakes fried with bean sprouts and chilies, and *Thai style omelet* called *Kai Cheo…*
>
> [Watkhaolarm, 2005: 154]

These loanwords are recognized widely by non-Thai speakers who have experience living in Thailand. Bolton (2003) stated that many Thai words have entered into English as follows:

Acharn

This Thai-English word refers to a teacher. It is normally used to address teachers at high school level and above. *Acharn* can be spelt as ajarn, ajaan, and archarn. Teachers at other levels are called Khru.

Farang

This word is also a Thai-English noun that means a foreigner of European racial origin or a white person.

Forest monk

This Thai-English word refers to a monk who mainly lives in the forest.

Khun

This is also a Thai-English noun. It is a polite title word used before the first name of a person when addressing someone such as Khun Thomas and Khun Prim.

Krengjai

This word contains two meanings. The first one is a Thai-English noun meaning deep respect for people in a superior position. The word implies behaving in a modest way towards elders and avoiding causing them trouble. The second usage is as a Thai-English verb meaning to behave towards someone in a way that shows ‘krengjai;. This word has been adapted into the English language from Thai and literally means “fearful heart”.

Muang

This is a Thai-English noun with two meanings. The first meaning refers to a city or a town and the second meaning means a place with its own local government; municipality.

Phi

This is another Thai-English noun with two meanings. The first one refers to an older brother or sister in the family. The second one is a polite form to address an older person outside the family as a way to show respect.

Phra

This is a Thai-English noun with three meanings. The first meaning is as a title used as a prefix to the name of a Buddhist monk. The second meaning is as a title as a prefix to a name to indicate holiness in any religion. For example, Phra Narai is the Hindu god Vishnu. The third meaning is as a title in front of the name of a royal person such as Phra Ram.

5. Hybridization

Hybridization is mainly found in informal Thai-English. This process occurs when native Thais combine a Thai word with an English word, for example, *a farang man*, *a big klong* (canal), etc. This allows Thai-English users to create many compound words (Chutisilp, 1984). As a result, hybridization can denote the creativity of Thai users and the way they maintain some Thai sense when they use English.

6. Reduplication

Reduplication is a process of lexical repetition. It is influenced by the Thai language and used to emphasize the repeated constituent. Reduplication can occur at word level as shown in the following example:

I started to dream about walking in the street with

many, many buildings on both sides, seeing myself

in a *big, big* school.

[Chutisilp, 1984: 144]

2.3 Theoretical frameworks

2.3.1 World Englishes

2.3.1.1 Definitions

World Englishes has various meanings. According to Bolton (2004), this term referred to all existing varieties of English in the world. It could be English spoken by native speakers, or it could be the English of non-native users whose English was acquired in a classroom setting. As a result, World Englishes focused on linguistic features of all varieties of English, identity (Kumaravadivelu, 2012), mutual intelligibility (Nelson, 2011), and pedagogical options (Nelson & Kern, 2012).

2.3.1.2 Kachru's model of types of World Englishes

English is considered a global language (Crystal, 2003). It is the most important language in the world whether it is used as a first, second or foreign language. Native speakers alone cannot claim ownership of the language anymore (Bryson, 1990). Rushdie (1991, cited in Crystal, 2003) shared the same perspective by explaining that the English language "ceased to be the sole possession of the English some time ago." The handover of the ownership, thus, results in the varieties of English which are regarded as "World Englishes".

English today is an important international language. It is used with different purposes such as English for academic purposes (EAP) and English for specific purposes (ESP) or different roles such as English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL). The role has changed over time. In the present day, the number of non-native users of English is larger than the number of native speakers of English (Crystal, 2003). The reasons for this include development of technology and media, innovation and contact.

Kachru's (1989) model classifies types of English language users and language acquisition of English in each circle. The model classifies types of language users as native speakers of English, non-native speakers of English who are non-Thais (represented by Asian participants as users of the outer circle in this study) and native Thais (representative of the expanding circle). The model can be summarized as shown in Figure 1:



Figure 2.1: Kachru's model of World Englishes (Kachru, 1989)

The inner circle is representative of native speakers of English. It is used in daily life in all contexts and settings. Six countries fall into this circle, namely, America, Australia, Britain, Canada, Ireland, and New Zealand.

The second circle is the outer circle. It refers to English as a second language used among non-native speakers of English whose countries were formerly colonized by Britain. The role of English in this circle is to perform as an official language such as in government functions, business and trade. Examples of countries in this circle are India, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and South Africa.

The final and the biggest circle is the expanding circle. Here, English serves as a foreign language among non-native speakers of English just like in the outer circle, but also in specific settings such as in the classroom and workplace. Language users in this circle have limited access to a native English environment. For instance, they speak English only in the classroom or workplace. Examples of the countries in this circle include China, Germany, Japan and Thailand.

Kachru's model of World Englishes is used to classify participants by types of language users – native in the inner circle, non-native in the outer circle and non-native in the expanding circle.

2.3.1.3 Previous studies

It is important to learn about variations of the World Englishes. According to Kachru's concepts of World Englishes, there are a variety of Englishes spoken in different parts of the world. Moreover, variation of English points out the fact that there is no standard English due to different geographical factors. People in different countries have their own way of speaking English.

Apart from variation, previous studies analyzed additional aspects.

Baker (2009) examined the relationship between English and culture within the English as a *lingua franca* (ELF) framework by focusing on how a group of Thai university students communicated in English in a Thai university. The findings revealed that the Thai participants engaged actively in speaking their own versions of English without any concern for "standard" British or American English. In addition, Baker found that the participants got involved in a culture that was neither their own culture nor the culture of English native-speaking people but a third-place culture. The participants' culture was identified with neither L1 nor L2.

Buripakdi (2012) studied perceptions of Thai professional writers towards Thai-English using in-depth interviews. The researcher found that standard English was suitable to this group of participants. This suggests that British and American English are still perceived as being the most "correct". In Thai society, no other varieties of English other than British and American ones are acceptable.

Ploywattanawong and Trakulkasemsuk (2014) explored attitudes of Thai graduates toward English as a *lingua franca* in ASEAN focusing on the acceptability and understandability of those varieties of English found in ASEAN. The study showed that the participants found deviated ASEAN ELF grammatical features were acceptable and understandable. Even though certain respondents found some incorrect grammatical features, those features did not negatively affect intelligibility of communication.

Snodin and Young (2015) investigated perceptions and attitudes of Thais toward native-speaker varieties of English. They found that American English was generally most favored. However, British and American accents were equally preferred over Australian English.

The above studies imply that research should be conducted about

World Englishes and local users of the language. Findings may show that World Englishes will play a role in Thai society, especially in higher education and international circles. Studies of the ASEAN community concerning the perceptions and attitudes of native Thais should be taken into account.

Knowledge of English variations is beneficial to English language teaching as a foreign language. For example, phonetics is considered one of the most difficult issues among students. When teaching students to pronounce English sounds, it is necessary to explain places and manners of articulation plus variations. Students then become aware of the possibility of different sounds heard in daily life. Most Thai students are unable to produce interdental sounds /ɵ/ and /ð/ because neither sound exists in the sound system of the Thai language. Many other problematic English consonant sounds for Thai learners include /z/, /r/, /v/, /tʃ/, /ʃ/, /ǯ/, and /ʤ/. Divergent location and manner of articulation between English and Thai make it difficult for native Thais to pronounce them the same as native speakers. This may lead to communication failure.

In terms of syntax, Thai learners are influenced by their native language especially in writing classes. For example, word order is rearranged. Noun + adjective is more commonly used by native Thais than adjective + noun. The passive voice is rarely seen in their works. This is why the passive voice is used to show negative meaning in Thai.

It is interesting to note that Thai students use literal translation frequently in translation class because the source language interferes with the target language. The different structures of English and Thai lead to different perceptions. To develop students' communicative skill, teachers need to find a way to convey meaning and at the same time to make themselves clear.

However, from a sociolinguistic point of view, differences are interesting. Englishes spoken by people from different geographical areas of the world give English a new status as a language of the world. It is known as a global language or international language. World Englishes begins a new era of universal communication.

2.3.2 Intelligibility

Scholars define intelligibility with various concepts (Derwing & Munro, 1997; Nelson, 1995; Smith & Nelson, 1985). Intelligibility is the level of understanding of language users who have different mother tongues when they communicate with each other. The factors that relate to intelligibility include clarity, explicitness, lucidity, comprehensibility, perspicuity, and precision.

The concept comprises intelligibility, comprehensibility and interpretability. Intelligibility refers to recognition of words and utterances. Comprehensibility is defined as meanings of words and utterances, whereas interpretability is conceptualized as the perception and understanding of the speakers' intentions (Smith & Nelson, 1985).

Intelligibility ranges from a low to a high level of understanding (Lu, 2008). To obtain intelligibility, an individual needs linguistic and social aspect competence. Linguistic features such as phonology and grammar may affect intelligibility. On the other hand, social aspect competence varies according to the situation of who is communicating and how much we want to understand (Lu, 2008). Intelligibility in this study, therefore, refers to a listener's understanding of a speaker's message at a certain time in a certain context and focuses on the word level.

Varieties of English are unique to each speaker and setting. Language

users from one country may not be able to understand language users from other countries. This gap inspires scholars to conduct research to see what features allow the language users to understand each other.

Intelligibility is difficult to identify. Scholars have focused their studies on pronunciation, especially on words, because it is more concrete to assess in terms of percentages. In order to understand each variety, familiarity is a key factor. Kirkpatrick and Saunders (2005) reveal that students in Australia who had experience with Singaporean English understood the variety better than those who had not encountered it. Features that help students improve intelligibility need to be considered more deeply than just basing intelligibility on native speakers.

Intelligibility is commonly assessed using transcription of utterances produced by non-native speakers of English. A researcher transcribes selected utterances and assigns a listener to write down what s/he hears. After that, all answers are compared to actual utterances used by native speakers of English. Correct answers are calculated to determine the degree of understanding. This method is widely used to assess the intelligibility of non-native speakers of English (Burda, et al., 2003; Burda & Hageman, 2005; Munro & Derwing, 1995).

2.3.2.1 Previous studies

Previous studies on intelligibility mainly focus on degree of intelligibility of non-native speakers of English towards native speakers of English. Scholars have conducted research to see how well native speakers of English understand utterances of non-native speakers of English. For example, the study of Schmid and Yeni-Komshian (1999) found that heavily accented speech is a factor of intelligibility. They found that the more heavily that speech is accented, the less intelligibility that occurs.

This finding is similar to van Wijnggaarden, et al. (2002) who investigated the relationship of degree of accent and intelligibility of non-native speakers' productions. They found that articulation is the main factor of intelligibility. Simply put, sounds that occur in articulation that never occur in another language are difficult to pronounce and make it hard for listeners to understand.

However, some scholars disagree with the above studies. For instance, Smith and Nelson (1985) argued that it is impossible for everyone to understand every other speaker. As a result, measures of intelligibility should focus on who the speakers want to communicate with. They also believe that intelligibility does not concern only linguistic features but also interaction with different varieties of English and familiarity. This is similar to Munro and Derwing (1995) who reveal that intelligibility varies according to degree of foreign accent. Put another way, the more non-native accent, the less intelligibility occurs.

Assessing intelligibility includes analysis of the causes of varying intelligibility scores. Intelligibility can be measured either by subjective or objective methods. These methods show no significant differences and do not require complicated methods for intelligibility assessment or testing. When testing intelligibility, test takers should be allowed to choose their own words. It is good to allow speakers choose their own words.

Familiarity is also an influential factor of intelligibility. Non-native speakers of English encounter difficulty making themselves understood by native speakers. This is why the majority of surveys focus on the intelligibility of non-native speech to native speakers of English.

2.3.3 Pronunciation

2.3.3.1 Definitions

Scholars define pronunciation of a language in many ways. Hornby (2001) states that pronunciation is the way in which a particular person pronounces the words of a language. In this study, pronunciation refers to a linguistic feature of sound when a person pronounces the words of a language.

2.3.3.2 The importance of intelligibility English pronunciation

According to Crystal (2003), English is no longer used merely among native speakers of English but has become a language of communication for language users around the world. Intelligible pronunciation is, therefore, important among language users as it makes communication easier whether with native or non-native speakers of English. Morley (1991) supports this by saying, "Intelligible pronunciation is an essential component of communication" (p. 488).

Unclear pronunciation is difficult to understand. Whether using advanced vocabulary or grammar, pronunciation is still difficult. Scholars see that intelligible pronunciation creates a first impression. People normally notice pronunciation before grammar or vocabulary. People enjoy talking to each other if good pronunciation is involved in the conversation. Intelligible pronunciation is an advantage. For example, people who speak native-like are perceived as being educated (Giles, 1970). Practicing native English means to be competent in order to communicate with other language users. Practice is the only way to obtain intelligible pronunciation. It leads people to pronounce with clarity and confidence. There are many ways to practice pronunciation such as through movies, news, and songs.

It is difficult to predict where and when people will prefer the use of native English. For example, if a workplace prefers native sounding English, a person can communicate right way. In contrast, people who speak non-native varieties may take more time to adapt themselves to a specific environment that prefers native English (Jones, 1988). Even though native English intelligibility is essential, varieties of English are also important to understand. People should be accurate using both native and varieties of English in order to achieve effective communication with native and non-native speakers of English in every context and setting.

Unintelligible pronunciation prevents people from understanding each other. This issue should be removed at all levels so that native and non-native speakers of English can effectively communicate with each other. In general, pronunciation is an important element of effective communication (Breitkreutz, et al., 2001; Derwing, 2003; Rajadurai, 2001).

2.3.3.3 Elements of English pronunciation

The elements of English pronunciation can be grouped into two categories: segmental and suprasegmental. The segmental aspect consists of consonant and vowel sounds while the suprasegmental aspect comprises stress, rhythm and intonation (Chongning, 2009). In this study, the focus is only on the word level. Discussion, therefore, covers only the segmental aspect. The segmental aspect is a combination of sounds to create an utterance (Florez, 1998; Gilakjani, 2012). It comprises consonant and vowel sounds that create a word. The segmental aspect is explained in detail below.

The phonological systems of English

The phonological features of English in this study can be classified as consonants, consonant clusters, vowels and voicing systems.

Consonants

This research focuses on place of articulation, manner of articulation, and voicing even though Brinton and Brinton (2010) state that consonant sounds have four criteria: voicing, orality/nasality, place of manner and articulation. Consonants can be classified based on place of articulation, manner of articulation, and voicing. Place of articulation is the point in the vocal tract where the obstruction of the consonant occurs. Manner of articulation is the method by which the consonant is articulated. Voicing is the vibration of the vocal cords.

English has twenty-one consonant letters, twenty-four consonant sounds, twenty found consonant phonemes, and two semivowels (Ariyapitipun, 2003). The table of English consonant sounds can be seen in Appendix A.

The study of English consonants refers to the position (initial or final) where the consonants occur, as they influence pronunciation. Some consonants can appear in both positions while some can occur exclusively in one position. In the initial position, the only English consonant that cannot occur is /ŋ/ as in the word ‘song’ /sɔŋ/. As a result, native speakers of English cannot pronounce this sound if occurring in the initial position. In contrast, almost every consonant can occur in the final position except /h/, /j/ and /w/. Native speakers of English cannot pronounce these sounds when they appear in the final position. Avery and Ehrlich (1992) have created a table of comparison of the English consonants in both positions. It can be seen in Appendix B.

Consonant clusters

Consonant clusters are "combinations of consonant sounds occurring together" (Wilkins, 1976). Theoretically, consonant clusters have no vowel in the sounds. They can occur in both initial and final positions. Two or three consonant sounds create a consonant cluster such as /sp/ in 'spoon' and /spl/ 'split'. Consonant clusters that occur in the initial position usually contain two consonant sounds. The ones with three consonant sounds all begin with /s/ followed by /p/, /t/, or /k/ and by /r/, /l/, /h/, or /w/ (Avery & Ehrlich, 1992). Examples of consonant clusters with a two-sound combination are 'global' and 'bring'. Examples of consonant clusters with a three-sound combination are 'strict' and 'sphere.' In the final position, consonant clusters with a three-sound combination cannot occur. Those sounds in the final position are mainly grammatical endings such as past tense and plural sounds such as 'glanced and 'glasses.' The table of comparison of both positions can be seen in Appendix C and D.

Vowels

Vowels are a type of sound that has no closure of the throat or mouth at any point while being spoken. A word must contain at least one vowel sound (McGuigan, 2007). Vowels are used to change the position of the tongue and shape the lips (Ariyapitipun, 2003). Vowels comprise monophthongs and diphthongs. A monophthong is a vowel sound occurring at one position whereas a diphthong is a vowel sound gliding from one vowel position to another. Vowel sounds are short or long. The length of the vowel relates to the voicing of the final consonants in English. Vowel sounds used by native Thais tend to transfer from the Thai language. Thais tend to make vowel sounds shorter or longer than the original ones in English

such as no /no/ rather than /noʊ/ (Low & Azirah, 2012). According to Celce-Murcia and Goodwin (1996), English vowel sounds can be divided into two types – monophthongs and diphthongs as follows:

Monophthongs

Monophthong sounds can also be called 'pure vowels.' They consist of twelve vowels as shown in this table (Lane, 1993):

Sound	**Example**
/i/	eel
/ɪ/	bill
/e/	fail
/ɛ/	set
/æ/	cat
/a/	hot
/ə/	of
/ɔ/	ball
/o/	hole
/ʊ/	pull
/u/	wool
/ʌ/	dove

Table 2.1: Monophthongs

Diphthongs

Diphthongs can be classified in different ways. Accordingly to Lane (1993), English has three diphthongs: /aɪ/, /ɔɪ/ and /aʊ/. However, Ariyapitipun (2003) believes that English has six diphthongs, adding three additional sounds: /ɪə/, /ɛə/ and /ʊə/. Examples of all these sounds are shown in the following table:

Sound	Example
/aɪ/	w<u>i</u>se
/ɔɪ/	ann<u>oy</u>
/aʊ/	n<u>ow</u>
/ɪə/	ch<u>ee</u>r
/ɛə/	sh<u>a</u>re
/ʊə/	s<u>u</u>re

Table 2.2: Diphthongs

2.3.3.4 Elements of Thai pronunciation

The phonological features of Thai in this study can be grouped as consonants, consonant clusters, and vowels.

Consonants

Thai has forty alphabet letters but only twenty one consonant sounds (Ariyapitipun, 2003). The Thai consonant system is different from English because it is divided into three classes: low, middle, and high. Each class indicates the tone of the vowels. The table of Thai consonants is in Appendix G.

The position of Thai consonants also includes initial and final positions as in English. All Thai consonants can occur in the initial position, but only ten of them can appear in the final position. Those consonants are /n/, /m/, /ŋ/, /p/, /b/, /d/, /t/, /k/, /j/ and /w/ such as ‘rong’ (sing) /rɔ:ŋ/ (McKenzie-Brown, 2006). The table of comparison of Thai consonant positions is in Appendix F.

Consonant clusters

Thai consonant clusters can occur only in the initial position and they are formed of two consonant sounds only (Ariyapitipun, 2003; McKenzie-Brown, 2006; Smyth, 2001). Consonant clusters can occur from the mixture of English into Thai language. The table of Thai consonant clusters is shown in Appendix F.

Vowels

According to Ariyapitipun (2003), Thai vowels can be divided into eighteen monophthongs and six diphthongs. Thai pronunciation relies heavily on vowels. A short or long vowel can change the meaning of a word. For example, /pa/ and /pa:/ are similarly pronounced; however, they have different meanings. The first word is pronounced with a short /a/ vowel to

mean to repair a hole of something such as a cloth, whereas the latter sound is a long /a/ vowel meaning to throw. As a result, it is important to pronounce vowels clearly in Thai.

2.3.3.5 Previous studies

Research on perceptive skills has revealed that pronunciation is one of the most difficult parts of language to study. In the past, researchers avoided study in this field because it was difficult to investigate and assess. Things began to change when English became widespread throughout the world and the number of English users greatly increased and significantly shifted from native speakers of English to non-native speakers of English (Crystal, 2003). Also, communication between native speakers of English and non-native speakers of English and between non-native speakers of English has been rising. Scholars have responded by focusing more on the study of pronunciation.

The majority of the studies of pronunciation are contrastive analysis between English and another language (Kapper, 1992; Kenstowicz & Suchato, 2006; Khamkhien, 2010; Richards, 1969; Tsukada, 2006; Tsukada & Roengpitya, 2008; Wei & Zhou, 2002). Contrastive analysis provides details on why and how sounds in a language are different from others. For example, the absence of triphthong sounds in Chinese led Chinese people to be unable to pronounce English triphthong sounds appropriately. This problem may confuse native speakers of English speaking with Chinese people. This is similar to the case of English and Thai which are in different language families, Indo-European and Sino-Tibetan, respectively. These languages differ in terms of alphabetical characters, sentence structure and pronunciation.

Previous contrastive analysis studies focused on varieties of English (Tsukada, 2006; Tsukada & Roengpitya, 2008). The results of those studies revealed that each language is unique in various ways, especially accent and pronunciation. Studies of English

and Thai confirm these differences. In early studies, researchers studied pronunciation features of non-native speakers of English to see how they pronounced English and how their pronunciation differentiated from native speakers of English. For example, Richards (1969) studied pronunciation features of Thais who lived in New Zealand and found that interference of different phonetic symbols in both languages caused different pronunciation of English for Thais. Unfortunately, research during the first period only focused on investigation of linguistic features. The researchers did not present any solutions or suggestions for further studies.

At the beginning of the 2000s, researchers still studied pronunciation of non-native speakers of English but focused more on details. It was possible that English played a greater role in daily life such as communication devices and as a medium of teaching in education. Wei & Zhou (2002) studied factors that led to problems of English pronunciation by Thai students and revealed that factors such as consonant clusters, loanwords, and characters of Thai sounds were the main reasons that Thai students pronounced English differently. This can cause problems when Thais communicate with native speakers of English or non-native speakers of English who are non-Thais because their conversational counterparts may confuse or misunderstand a message.

Even though English and Thai belong to different language families, it is interesting to study how the pronunciation of each language differs. This makes it possible to observe the effect on communication between native speakers of English and non-native speakers of English and Thai native speakers. Study of language based on the lyrics in music is an interesting new path to explore and it serves as a natural source of language. Due to the limitation of previous studies of English in Thai songs, this study aims to fill the gap. Details in the following parts are divided into three sub-sections: consonants, consonant clusters and

vowels. Consonant and consonant clusters are touched upon, plus the nature of initial and final positions, and the characteristics of voiced and voiceless sounds. Vowels include monophthong, diphthong and triphthong. Some features that occur in English are non-existent in Thai and vice-versa. Lack of sounds in one language creates a problem of pronunciation in another language. Table 3 shows the English consonant sounds that do not exist in Thai (Phattaratuny, et al., 2007).

Sound	**Example**
/v/	van, live
/θ/	thin, truth
/ð/	the, smooth
/z/	zebra, freeze
/tʃ/	chance, watch
/ʃ/	shut, wash
/dʒ/	George, garage
/ʒ/	ship, vision
/r/	run, blur
/l/	lemon, ball

Table 2.3: Nonexistence of English sounds in Thai

Study of consonants relates to initial and final position, plus voiced and voiceless sounds and mainly focuses on two issues, substitution and discrimination of sounds. The most popular sound that researchers have studied is /v/. The sound /v/ is a voiced labiodental fricative sound. This sound can create a problem for non-native speakers of English. The /v/ sound is familiar to

native speakers of English but not to some non-native speakers of English. The /v/ sound is replaced with different variants depending on the first language of the person using it and the position where it occurs. For instance, Japanese people substitute /b/ when pronouncing /v/ such as in the words “vast” and “very” (Carruthers, 2006; Ohata, 2004). Generally, speakers of East Asian languages cannot differentiate between the /v/ and /b/ sounds.

Hide and Van de Poel (2002) stated that Chinese language has no dental and voiced fricatives. As a result, Chinese people substitute the /w/ sound for the /v/ sound in the initial position and /f/ for /v/ in the final position.

Chunsuvimol and Ronakiat (2000) have studied the phonetic realizations and stylistic variations of /f/ and /v/ sounds of Thai university students. Their study revealed that /v/ has three variants [v], [w], and [f] in the initial position and five variants [v], [f], [b], [p], and [ø] in the final position. Speakers of Southeast Asian languages tend to substitute /w/ for /v/ when occurring in the initial position. For example, Thai speakers pronounce “very” as “wery” (Chunsuvimol & Ronakiat, 2001). In another study, Ukachoke (2005) revealed that grade 10 Thai students also replaced /w/ for /v/ in the initial position and /f/ for /v/ in the final position.

In the Thai contexts, research on /r/ pronunciation was conducted by Chunsuvimol (1993). The writer discovered that Thais’ pronunciation of /r/ can be pronounced as /r/, /ɹ/, /l/ in prevocalic position and consonant clusters, and dropped /r/ in consonant cluster. The finding is similar to the study of Hirunyupakorn and Chaimano (2014) who studied Thai pronunciation of only the sound /r/ with specific examination of the association between the speaker’s English proficiency and how the /r/ sound was pronounced. Their findings indicated the effects of proficiency and the contexts where /r/ occurs in sound production.

Regarding all studies on substitution of unfamiliar sounds, the researcher sees that the most plausible reason is the lack of a sound in a mother tongue that may cause people to substitute sounds from their first language. Not only did the researchers conduct studies on substitution of sounds, but some of them also investigated a discrimination problem of sounds. All previous studies are in accordance with Flege and Hillenbrand (1987) who explained that speakers of a target language seem to pronounce unfamiliar sounds in a target language with familiar or equivalent sounds from their first language.

Apart from the /v/ sound, /θ/ is another phoneme that creates a problem for non-native speakers of English. /θ/ is a voiceless interdental fricative sound. It is familiar to native speakers of English but may not be familiar to non-native speakers of English, particularly speakers of Thai language, where this sound does not exist. In English, /θ/ can occur in the initial position such as "think," in clusters such as "three," in the middle position such as in "author," and in the final position such as "cloth." Non-native speakers of English may therefore replace /θ/ with /t/ or /d/ sounds in those positions.

Khirin (2011) studied the ability of language users to pronounce the /θ/ sound. His study revealed that the participants with high English language experience can pronounce the /θ/ sound correctly. On the other hand, respondents with less English language experience replace /θ/ with /t/.

Not only are the above two sounds difficult for certain non-native speakers of English, but /ʃ/ and /tʃ/ must also be considered. These sounds are also non-existent in Thai language. The /ʃ/ sound is often replaced by /tʃ/ (Smyth, 2000), /tɕ^{h}/ in Thai (Kanokpermpoon, 2007) or /t/ in the final position (Wei & Zhou, 2001) whereas /tʃ/ is substituted with the /tɕ/ sound (Kanokpermpoon, 2007) or /t/ in the final position (Wei & Zhou, 2001).

In the case of Thai language users, Wongsiripaisan (2005) investigated pronunciation of /ʃ/ by assigning participants to read passages and words out loud. She found that pronunciation of the /ʃ/ sound while reading individual words was more accurate than while reading passages. Surprisingly, the participants substituted /ʃ/ with /tʃ/ more than the /tɕʰ/ sound that is more often used in Thai language. Similarly, Olome (1998) studied pronunciation of /ʃ/ in reading words of Thai language users. The study revealed that /ʃ/ occurring in the initial position was correctly pronounced more than in the final position. Both studies prove that position and style of assignment influence /ʃ/ pronunciation. An important factor is that the Thai language cannot have the /ʃ/ sound in the final position. Also, the participants pronounced /tʃ/ more than /tɕʰ/, because /tʃ/ is closer to /ʃ/. Meanwhile, /tɕʰ/ was selected for some words because it is nearly equivalent to /ʃ/ and it exists in the Thai language.

In terms of voiced and voiceless sounds, English and Thai have different sounds. For example, Thai has only voiceless final sounds /p/, /t/, and /k/ while English has these three voiceless sounds plus their counterparts as voiced sounds /b/, /d/, and /g/, respectively. The lack of voiced sounds in the final position also leads to substitution (Yangklang, 2006).

In addition, the grammatical structures of the languages are different, especially in the construction of plural and past tense sentences. Thai language adds *words* to indicate time and the quantity of a thing, whereas English adds *sounds* at the end of words. For instance, -s is added at the end of a verb to indicate a third person single subject or to a noun to identify a plural noun. When Thai language users pronounce these sounds, they normally silence them. ‘Suits,’ for example, is pronounced only as ‘suit’ in Thai language because there is no final /s/ sound (Moore & Rodchue, 2005).

Researchers have found that Thai language users exhibit varying degrees of accuracy pronouncing consonant clusters. In the study of Mano-im (1999), it was easiest for participants to pronounce a nasal followed by a stop /-nt/ sound. They also produced a nasal followed by fricative /-ns/; a lateral followed by a stop /-lt/; a nasal followed by an affricate /-nt∫/; a stop followed by a fricative /-ks/; and a fricative followed by a stop /-sk/; respectively. The participants used methods of deletion, replacement and insertion to handle these sounds.

English loan words are considered a problem for Thai speakers of English. Korsuwan (2001) studied the assimilation of English loan words by Thai speakers. It was found that the problem of pronunciation occurred from background knowledge. Most Thai speakers determined accuracy by imitating the phonological patterns that they had heard. The study indicated that consonant sounds, vowel sounds and clusters were problematic for Thai learners especially final cluster consonants such as /l/ and /ch/. Most Thai speakers substituted familiar sounds for difficult English sounds by creating their own rules of pronunciation.

Pronunciation of vowels raises many other issues. Park's (2010) study revealed that mother tongue influences vowel pronunciation in English, especially diphthongs that are non-existent in Korean. In this study, /ai/, /au/ and /ɔi/ are nearly equivalent to Korean vowels in terms of length of diphthongs such as 'surrounding,' 'society' and 'employment.' Korean English speakers, therefore, have fewer problems pronouncing these three sounds. The rest of English diphthongs create difficulty for them as they cannot find near equivalence when pronouncing in English.

2.3.4 Nativization

Nativization refers to "an emergence of linguistic features in new varieties

of English across the globe that are categorical" (Richards, 1982). In this study, nativization refers to the use of language/dialect in new settings in terms of words, phrases, sentences, pronunciation and accents, which have been influenced by other languages/dialects. A new formation can use, for example, a sentence structure from one language/dialect and vocabulary from another. Thai-English is formed of Thai sentence structure and English words with or without change.

It is believed that nativization leads to the birth of a variety of English styles as it creates distinctness from other English styles in the world. Nativization can be seen at different levels of linguistic analysis such as phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics (Adegbija, 2004). Kannaovakun (2001) categorizes six types of nativization. They comprise truncation, hybridization, conversion, semantic shift, reduplication and word order.

Truncation is a word-formation process of a shortened word in form but that remains unchanged in meaning. For example, *firm* หัวใจเลยว่าใช่เธอ (Confirm my heart it's you). 'Firm' in this context comes from 'confirm.' Its form is shortened but the meaning is the same as in English. Hybridization is a combination of one language with another part of a different language. For instance, *hug* ทีได้ไหม อยากได้จังอ้อมกอดเธอ *(Can I hug you? I want to have your hug).* On the contrary, conversion is a word that appears in a sentence with different parts of speech from the original. For example, ไม่เห็นต้อง *sad* อะไร อะไรมากมาย *(No need to be sad that much)* shows that 'sad' is a verb in this context even though it is an adjective in the original native context.

Semantic shift refers to a meaning of a word that is changed from the

original native context. For instance, *chill chill* ได้ไหม รู้ไหมดวงใจฉันปลิว *(Can we chill chill? You know my heart is flying).* 'Chill chill' in this context comes from 'chill out;' however, the meaning is totally changed. 'Chill out' in native English context means 'to go out and relax' whereas 'chill chill' in this context means 'to take it easy.'

Reduplication is a repetition of a word in the same sentence. For example, อยากมี *someone someone* กุมมือฉันเวลาไปไหน *(I want to have someone holding my hands everywhere)* shows repetition of the word 'someone' in the same sentence. Word order, finally, refers to a change or modified order. For instance, มองเธอคนนั้นที่ *look hi-so (Look at that person who looks hi-so)* shows that 'look hi-so' is a rearrangement of a noun plus an adjective which is a Thai sentence structure. This is different from English native context where the adjective comes before the noun.

Nativization mainly appears in non-native environments. It occurs most frequently in Kachru's expanding circle (Mollin, 2007). Nativization in non-native speaker situations is believed to be different from the native context. Cohen (2005) has shown that lexical level is one of the obvious parts occurring in Mongolian English. For example, 'serious' in English became 'intense' in Mongolian English. This kind of nativization normally happens in Mongolian English but it might have been seen differently from American English.

2.4 Word stress

When listening to spoken English language or producing a word, a person probably recognizes that some syllables are more prominent than others. This emphatic feature is known as word stress. According to Roach (2001), stressed syllables in English are louder and longer

than unstressed ones and they employ differentiated pitch. Jotikasthira (1999) wrote that "stress is the loudiness" (p. 29). As a result, a stressed syllable is more prominent than an unstressed one.

According to Katamba (1989), Ladefoged (1993) and Kaplan (1995), stressed syllables are produced with greater respiration energy than unstressed syllables. Consequently, the most salient thing for a listener to hear is that a stressed syllable regularly has a longer vowel than if it were unstressed. However, this does not imply that all long vowels are necessarily stressed. For example, the second and third vowels in "radio" are comparatively long, but they are not stressed (Ladefoged, 1993). Stressed syllables have higher pitch and longer duration than their non-stressed counterparts. They are noticeably louder than unstressed syllables (Katamba, 1989).

Unlike English, Thai language employs two phonetic features: high pitch and long duration to indicate a stressed syllable (Ronakiat, 2005). Hirunburana (1971) and Luangthongkum (1973) cited in Vairojanavong (1984) agree with the supposition that pitch and length determine a stressed syllable in Thai.

2.4.1 Stress problems for Thai EFL learners

The most distinctive feature of Thai is that it is a tonal language. It does not differentiate words based on stress (Wei & Zhou, 2002). Wong-opasai (1992) and Warotsikhadit (2002), Isarankura (2009), Rattanaikorm (1999) agree that the primary stress in Thai words is nearly always assigned to final syllables. When speaking English, Thai speakers most often place stress on the final syllable of an English word, regardless of the actual syllabic stress of that word. This is why Thai learners produce words that are distinct from the original word.

2.4.2 Previous studies

Scholars study word stress in various aspects. Chuleethongrerk (2006) studied primary stress variation of English disyllabic words by sixty-eight Thai undergraduate students. The study investigated the ability of the students to place primary stress on first-syllable-stressed disyllabic words and second-syllable-stressed disyllabic words in a context-free environment, in context-rich environments, and their variants according to context. The researcher found that second-syllable-stressed disyllabic words were stressed more correctly than first-syllable-stressed disyllabic words. Word stress was placed more accurately in a context-free environment than words in a context-rich environment.

Sasi-smit (2005) explained that familiarity with Thai speakers' pronunciation of English is a reason for native speakers' comprehensibility. The researcher mentioned that the subjects did not apply L1 stress patterns when pronouncing the target words in a word test. It is likely that the third-syllable word stress pattern was the most difficult for the participants to produce among the three patterns.

Jarusan (1997) studied the relationship between perception and production of English word stress by native speakers of Thai. A positive relationship was found between word stress perception and production. Students with good listening ability seemed to be capable of identifying the primary stress of each word accurately. The results also revealed that the third syllable word stress pattern was the most difficult for the subjects as they avoided placing the primary stress at that location.

Vairojanavong (1984) conducted a contrastive study of the accentual systems of English and Thai and performed an error analysis of English polysyllabic medical

terms. The study indicated that the phonetic correlates of stressed syllables in the two languages were dissimilar. The results showed that out of 380 terms, medical students made 319 interference errors and stressed 24 words accurately. Resident doctors made 355 interference errors and stressed only 7 words accurately. In fact, the researcher believed that errors in word stress of English polysyllabic medical terms occurred due to L1 interference.

Aungcharoen (2006) investigated the English word stress perception and production skills of Thai 12th grade students at Benchamaratcharungsarit School. A positive correlation was found between students' word stress perception and production skills. The students preferred to place primary stress on the final syllable than those on the penult or the antepenult syllable. Not surprisingly, the students with high proficiency in English had better skills in word stress perception and production than students with low proficiency.

A number of researchers focusing on English pronunciation problems of Thai learners have created their own experiments and tests. For example, an insightful study focusing on Thai learners' pronunciation of English was conducted by Kanoksilapatham (1992). The findings of her study indicated that Thai learners of English had difficulty with English pronunciation, especially in pronouncing four-syllable English words. Specifically, among four types of the words tested: nouns, verbs, adjective, and adverbs, verbs were found to be least-well pronounced, whereas the nouns with an –ity ending were most often correctly pronounced. The findings demonstrate that incorrect placement of word stress was evident. In certain words, final syllables seemed to be stressed rather than the first syllables.

Looking at the relationship between the perception and the production of English word stress by Thai learners, Jarusan (1997) found that the learner's English experience played a vital role in the perception and production of English word stress. The study suggested

that language learning experience and exposure to the language could help learners learn a foreign language and have a constant measure of their language ability. However, listening ability was individualistic as constant practice and continuous exposure to the language helped them develop their language ability over the long term.

2.5 Attitudes

Attitudes are reactions that reveal an individual's thoughts or ideas on a particular issue. Scholars define attitudes in many different ways. Some believe that attitudes are linked to beliefs and behaviors. Others think that they relate to feelings. Allport (1961) referred to attitudes as "the most distinctive and indispensable concept in contemporary social psychology." Early scholars believed that attitudes related to feelings. Thomas and Znaniecki (1918) claimed that attitude was "a state of feeling continuously constructed by individual experiences, which finally leads to perception towards an object or situation of which a person is related to." Attitudes deal with a person's feelings and are needed in order to judge a particular issue. This is similar to Mantel-Bromley (1995) who views attitudes as "a distinctive evaluation of the thoughts and emotions of people toward their surroundings."

Attitudes are responses to a particular issue that include viewpoints, objects and people (Ajzen, 1988). Attitudes are based on the experience of a person towards a certain thing being judged that affects their point of view (Fazio, 2007).

Attitudes comprise three components. Wender (1987) and Baker (1992) have proposed similar elements including cognition, affection and behavior. Cognition refers to a person's belief or knowledge about a particular situation, person or object. Affection is an emotional response to the surroundings that reflect a person's feeling such as love and hatred. Behavior is a

person's actions towards a certain thing or situation. For example, parents with a positive attitude towards English send their children to a bilingual or international school to acquire English as a second or foreign language.

Scholars have proposed more specific components of attitudes towards language. Gardner (1986) and Lambert (1980) mention two types: instrumentional and integrative orientation. Instrumentional orientation is motivation for acquiring a language because of social achievement, personal success or economic benefit. For example, a person learns a language to find a good job. On the other hand, integrative orientation is motivation for learning a language due to social community and communication. For example, a person learns a language for communication with people from other parts of the world. Integrative orientation tends to be more successful than instrumentional orientation because people have motivation and encouragement to study a language.

Scholars first conducted research on the attitudes of non-native speakers of English towards native English. The research revealed that native English received positive attitudes because the language users preferred to use it. The following studies present the circumstances of earlier research.

The first group of studies generally stated that language users preferred native English to non-native styles. However, the researchers did not state which native variety they preferred. Schmied (1985) explained that native English was preferable to other varieties of English even though the language users struggled to achieve native English. Some people think that varieties of English are inappropriate for communication with native speakers of English. Young and Faux (2012) state that non-native speakers of English try to find faults in using their own English but they accept native English.

In Asia, most people prefer native English. Hong Kong and Japan are examples of this point. Chan (2013) studied the attitudes of Hong Kong students concerning native and non-native English. The students understood both accents but preferred native English especially in formal settings such as written tasks. A study by Tokumoto and Shibata (2011) similarly revealed that Japanese students preferred native accents even though they were aware of other accents and pronunciation.

In some countries, however, people prefer native English because they have limited access to varieties of English. In Finland, for example, students lack sufficient access to varieties of English as practiced in commercial textbooks. They are far away from varieties of non-native materials (Kopperoinen, 2011).

Additionally, communication with native English demonstrates social status. In Germany, people prefer to communicate with native speakers in English even though they could speak German. Anyone who can speak English is viewed as being well educated in Germany (Hilgendorf, 2007).

The second group of studies clearly presents which native variety people prefer. Undoubtedly, British and American English receive the highest preference. Ladegaard (1998) studied the attitudes of Danish secondary and university students on British English (Received Pronunciation, Scottish and Cockney English), American English and Australian English. Received Pronunciation received the most positive attitudes in terms of personal integrity, social status and attractiveness. Furthermore, Ladegaard found that British and American English were more identifiable than Australian English.

Javella, et al. (2001) and Nejjari, et al. (2012) also found the highest preference for British English. Javella, et al. (2001) explored the attitudes towards English of advanced Danish

learners who listened to Irish, British and American English accents. British English was the favorite among the varieties presented. Learners were most comfortable with British, followed by American English. Similarly, Nejjari, et al. (2012) investigated attitudes towards the intelligibility of British English accent, slight Dutch English accent and moderate Dutch English accent. They found that British English accent was the most intelligible.

In Asia, most people also prefer British English. Evan (2010) studied the perceptions of Chinese students towards native English and found that British English received the most positive perception as a model and standard of English. It is embedded in people's minds that British English is the best model to follow. In former colonies, British English also receives positive attitudes such as in Sri Lanka (Bernaisch, 2012).

Some studies reveal that British and American English accents receive equally positive attitudes. Xu, et al. (2010) studied the attitudes of varieties towards English before the 2008 Olympic Games in China. Their study revealed that British and American English were favored over Chinese English. Zhang and Hu (2008) studied the attitudes towards British, American and Australian English of advanced Chinese ESL students. The results showed that British and American English received more positive attitudes than Australian English due to comfortableness and naturalness. Both varieties were used as a medium of teaching rather than Australian English in China.

In America, American English is preferred. For example, Bresnahan, et al. (2002) explained that Hispanic English of immigrants was available but those immigrants preferred American English because it was attractive and intelligible.

The study of Wiebesiek, et al. (2011) on attitudes towards South African Indian English disclosed that people acknowledged this spoken variety, but they preferred standard English

because it suggests good education and social status. This is similar to McKenzie (2004) who showed that Japanese students held more positive attitudes towards standard Scottish English than the Glasgow vernacular due to clarity.

McKenzie (2008) investigated Japanese college students on six standards of English: two American (mid-west and southern US), two British (standard Glasgow and Glasgow vernacular) and two Japanese English (moderate and heavily accented). American English received the highest attractiveness followed by British and Japanese English. Southern US and Glasgow vernacular, however, were considered higher than the pairs of each accent due to social status.

The trends of the study of attitudes have changed from non-native English towards native English aspects and to non-native English itself when people become more aware of varieties of English. The following part discusses various studies that demonstrate local varieties and teaching preferences. Sari and Yusuf (2009) disclosed that all non-native speakers of English in their study accepted their own English when talking with others because it was non-native English just like theirs. Even though they still thought that standard English should be used, they agreed that if people understand each other, regardless of which variety is used, this qualifies as successful communication. Therefore, teachers should take varieties of English into account.

Kang and Rubin (2012) have explained that students preferred to study with non-native English teaching assistants because they felt more relaxed than with native teachers. Students cooperated more with the assistants, created solidarity within a group and tended to be friendlier than with teachers.

Bian (2009) discovered that Chinese college students held different attitudes toward varieties of English. Even though standard English is preferred, students questioned how they

could acquire native-like accents. They also stated that intelligibility should be considered when assessing spoken English and should not take influence of mother tongue into consideration.

Some studies have provided suggestions for creating positive attitudes. Abidin (2012) stated that students have negative attitudes towards learning English because they are not aware of the importance of English, they lack any need for English, and it is not a compulsory subject in Libya. The researcher suggested that students could see the positive side if their needs were assessed before conducting a class. When students were involved in what they needed, they had more positive attitudes.

The educational system itself can lead to negative attitudes towards English language. When the education system in a country does not focus on English, students find it unnecessary to learn. However, students must learn English so that when they become adults they will be able to communicate with others. Both factors led them to express significantly negative attitudes towards learning English (Karahan, 2007).

The level of familiarity has a direct influence on attitudes. People tend to prefer standard English because they are familiar with it. For example, students use commercial textbooks and materials which are based on native English, mainly British and American. Standard English receives high preference in terms of social status. In contrast, people are more aware of varieties of English nowadays. Attitudes towards language differ due to aspects of language usage and qualifications of language itself. People do not use native English at all times. Varieties of English may be accepted among non-native speakers due to solidarity, for instance. As a result, attitudes towards language depend on which aspects are under consideration.

2.6 Assessment based on native speakers of English

This part discusses how to assess the usage of English. English is widely used as a medium in various fields such as communication and education. We cannot avoid the increase of bilingual or multilingual language users. Assessment must therefore be set to the highest standard in order to measure users' achievement in a target language. As a result, a native standard is believed to be an appropriate standard for foreign language users (Davies, 2003).

Even though a native standard is credited as the most appropriate model to assess foreign language learners' achievement, some people argue this point. As it is difficult for learners to have the same proficiency as native users, assessment should be more flexible relative to the environment. For example, a native-like model should be replaced because it is flexible.

The researchers, however, used native variety to evaluate participants because native English can be seen in standardization tests such as TOEFL and IELTS.

Previous studies on language assessment also relate to native English. For example, Khamkhien (2010) stated that productive skills in Thailand were mainly assessed by native speakers of English because communicative language replaced rote learning. The problem is that teachers of English in Thailand are Thai individuals who teach in Thai. Students rarely have a chance to practice with native speakers of English. Also, the classroom might not be a good setting for them as there is limited chance to practice. Local languages are the main medium for teaching. For example, students are assigned to prepare their dialogues to speak in front of the class. In real practice, students are unable to prepare anything prior to having conversations. Consequently, students have problems when they communicate with native speakers of English.

A serious gap exists in these theoretical frameworks. The present study aims to bridge this theoretical gap with solid evidence and methodology. The methodology and results can be seen in the following chapters.

CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents how the research was conducted and what was found from the study. It includes research design, participants, research instruments, data collection, data analysis, measurement of reliability, and pilot study.

3.1 Research design

This study was designed to use both qualitative and quantitative research methods. The qualitative method was the initial step to present linguistic features in Thai popular songs, factors of intelligibility, plus comparison of the attitudes of the participants and lyricists towards the use of English in Thai popular songs. This step also explored participants' exposure to Thai language, culture, and people.

In contrast, the quantitative research method was used to determine the participants' frequency of contact with Thai language, culture, and people. The participants' scores were measured to determine their level of understanding by comparing correct and incorrect answers of each participant.

3.2 Participants

The participants were purposively selected. The research started with circulation of an e-mail invitation to all the participants on the contact list. When a participant accepted the invitation to participate, their names were listed and divided into three groups: native speakers of English; non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai; and native Thais, according to Kachru's model of World Englishes. Three people were randomly selected from each group to

be representatives of their respective groups. The number of participants was established at three per group because participants must listen to all songs. The researcher had to ensure that they could attend the entire listening session without interruption. Working with a small number of participants allowed the researcher to spend adequate time with each person to gather in-depth information on all aspects of the research. Purposeful selection was useful so the researcher could ensure that no data loss occurred during the study. The researcher could control variables such as types of language users, and effectively manage time interviewing participants.

Twelve purposively selected people participated in the study. Nine of the participants were general audiences and three were professional lyricists. The general audience participants included native speakers of English, non-native speakers of English who were non-Thais, and native Thais. All three of the lyricists were male, native Thais. Each one was a representative from each singing contest program. They had been working with those singing programs for more than ten years.

The following section lists the participants' qualifications and exposure to Thai language, culture, and people in detail.

The native speakers of English participants

The native speakers of English participants were representatives of language users in the inner circle according to Kachru's model of World Englishes. The participants included a British, an American and a Canadian. They were two females and a male. Their ages ranged from twenty to sixty years old and educational background was from college to master degree level. They were an immigration officer, a marketing officer and a student. The workplaces of the British and the American participants had native Thai staffs employed. The British

participant had been working in Thailand for three years whereas the American participant had resided in Thailand for six years. The Canadian student was the only participant who had never been to Thailand and had no contact with Thai language and people. The British and American participants considered their Thai language proficiency as pre-intermediate level as they could understand and communicate in Thai language at a certain level such as greeting and ordering food whereas the Canadian participant did not understand Thai at all.

The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants

The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants represented the language users of the outer circle of Kachru's concept of World Englishes. They included a Chinese, a Vietnamese and a Singaporean with one female and two males. Their ages were from fifteen to fifty years old. Their educational backgrounds ranged from high school to master degree. They were an interpreter/translator, an engineer, and a student. The Chinese participant was an exchange student in Thailand on a year program. She had been working for a Thai government sector in China. The Vietnamese participant was also an exchange student in Thailand on a year program. His school employed native Thai teachers. Both were currently pursuing Thai language in their home countries. The Singaporean participant had no contact with Thai language and the people except for a short visit for personal or business purpose.

The Chinese and Vietnamese participants assessed their Thai language proficiency as upper intermediate. They could communicate in Thai language during official meetings and in a Thai class, respectively, plus interact with native Thais in their daily lives. The Singaporean participant had no knowledge of Thai language except for a greeting word, hello.

The native Thai participants

The native Thai participants were representatives of the language users of the expanding circle of World Englishes. The participants' ages were from fifteen to sixty years old. Their educational backgrounds were from high school to master degree level. Their occupations were an interpreter/translator, a programmer, and a student. Two of them were employees of international organizations where English was used as a medium of communication. The third one was a student attending a bilingual program at a Thai school. All of them assessed their English proficiency as upper intermediate level. All could communicate in English in daily life at work and in school.

The lyricists

Three lyricists were also included in the research for in-depth information and comparison of thoughts as song composers. The lyricists were all male, native Thais. They were representatives from each singing program used in this study. Their ages were between thirty five and forty years old and each had completed undergraduate level education. They were professional lyricists of Thailand with more than ten years of experience in song composition. All three of them had worked for the host companies of each singing contest program from the beginning when the programs were launched.

Exposure of Thai language, culture, and people of the participants

Exposure of Thai language, culture, and people was one of the factors of familiarity and level of understanding of the participants. In this study, the native Thai participants had close exposure of Thai language, culture, and people because Thai language was their mother tongue

and Thai culture was attached to their daily lives. The native Thai participants spoke Thai language every day and had contact with Thai culture. In addition, they also communicated with native Thais in their daily lives.

The Chinese participant had close exposure with Thai language, culture, and people. She was an exchange student in Thailand on a year program. As an exchange student, she studied and lived in Thailand with a host family for one year. After she completed the exchange program, she continued learning Thai language at a school in China. She also maintained contact and practiced Thai with native Thais through e-mails, WeChat and QQ. At the time of this research, she was working for a Thai government organization in China. She watched Thai television programs and movies and listened to Thai songs on a regular basis. She visited Thailand at least twice a year for personal and business purposes. In total, she had been in contact with Thai language, culture, and people for fifteen years.

The Vietnamese participant also had close exposure to Thai language, culture, and people. He was an exchange student in Thailand on a year program. He had studied and lived in Thailand with a host family for one year. When he returned to Vietnam, he took extra Thai courses at school and also learnt by himself through reading Thai books and speaking with his Thai teachers. He kept contact and practiced Thai language with native Thais through Skype and Facebook video calls. At the time of this research, he was enrolled in Thai courses at school. At his school, there were Thai exchange students studying with him. This means he had frequent contact with Thai language, culture, and people. He kept in communication with Thai friends in Thailand through Line video call. He sometimes watched Thai television programs and movies and also listened to Thai songs. He visited Thailand once a year. In total, he had been in contact with Thai language and culture for three years.

The Singaporean participant was the only one of the non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants who had no exposure to Thai language, culture, and people. This participant had a few Thai neighbors in his community but they used English as a medium of communication. His visit to Thailand was for a short period of time for personal or business purposes only.

Similarly, the Canadian participant who was the only native speaker of English participant without exposure to Thai language, culture, and people. This participant had no Thai citizens living in his community and had never visited Thailand.

The exposure of Thai language, culture, and people of the American and the British participants was similar to the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants. The American participant had been residing in Thailand for six years. Her workplace had Thai staffs employed. She practiced Thai language with her colleagues. She could make daily life conversations such as greetings and ordering food. However, she could not read or write Thai language. Her Thai language proficiency was considered pre-intermediate level.

The British participant had been working in Thailand for three years. Her company also had Thai staffs employed. She occasionally communicated with her Thai colleagues in Thai. Her Thai language proficiency was considered pre-intermediate level. She could not read or write Thai.

Exposure to Thai language, culture, and people, proficiency in Thai, and familiarity were the major factors of the participants' comprehension. The more the participants were familiar with Thai language, culture, and people, the more they understood the use of English in Thai popular songs.

For the participants who claimed they were not song lovers, their English and Thai proficiency was not a factor of understanding. They stated that they guessed meaning from the sounds and context clues.

Confidentiality

In this study, the researcher took confidentiality of each participant into account. Code names were created for each person and are not their real names. The following table lists the pseudonyms for each of the participants:

Participant	Pseudonym	Sex	Age	Educational background	Occupation	Length of stay in Thailand	Exposure to Thai language and culture
British	B1	Female	45	Bachelor degree	Immigration officer	3 years	Pre-intermediate level
American	A1	Female	60	Master degree	Marketing officer	6 years	Pre-intermediate level
Canadian	C1	Male	20	College	Student	None	None
Chinese	C2	Female	35	Bachelor degree	Interpreter/translator	15 years	Upper-intermediate level
Vietnamese	V1	Male	15	High school	Student	3 years	Upper-intermediate level
Singaporean	S1	Male	50	Master degree	Engineer	None	None
Thai 1	T1	Female	15	High school	Student	Citizen	Native speaker
Thai 2	T2	Female	60	Master degree	Interpreter/translator	Citizen	Native speaker
Thai 3	T3	Male	40	Bachelor degree	Programmer	Citizen	Native speaker
Lyricist 1	L1	Male	35	Bachelor degree	Lyricist	Citizen	Native speaker
Lyricist 2	L2	Male	38	Bachelor degree	Lyricist	Citizen	Native speaker
Lyricist 3	L3	Male	40	Bachelor degree	Lyricist	Citizen	Native speaker

Table 3.1: Participants' pseudonym

3.3 Research instruments and triangulation

Triangulation refers to a mixed method research having more than one type of analysis in the study (Risjord, et al., 2001). It comprises two methods: the across method and the within method. The across method is a combination of qualitative and quantitative research. The researcher used these tools to collect and analyze data (Casey & Murphy, 2009). In contrast, the within method employs only one type of data collection, either qualitative or quantitative (Thurmond, 2001). In this study, the across method was applied. Data was tested at different times and with different people who were in the same category. Listening comprehension, interview sessions and questionnaire contribution were conducted with the native speakers of English, the non-native speakers of English who were non-Thais and the native Thais to see if the results remained the same before conducting the main study.

As this study used different research instruments – lyrics, music videos, interviews, and a questionnaire, triangulation was used to confirm the reliability and validity of the tools. In doing so, it reduced the weaknesses of each tool and strengthened the results of the study because information did not come from only one source. In addition, information from different sources could confirm if the results revealed similarities.

Research instruments were tools used to determine the level of understanding, linguistic features of English in Thai popular songs and attitudes towards the use of English in Thai popular songs. To obtain information, the following instruments were integrated into the study:

3.1 Lyrics

Thai popular songs were first released in the 1960s and reached large audiences by the 1990s as the majority of the albums sold at least one million copies. The first Thai lyrics mixed with English were also launched in the 1990s. These appeared at the word level and sentence level, with word level being most common. Each lyric contained at least one English word, phrase, clause or sentence.

Singers who sang the songs mixed with English were limited to people with mixed racial identity because the audience viewed them as representatives of the best English users of the period. Examples of the singers include Raptor, Giant, Raffy and Nancy, JR and Voy, and Bazoo. This trend began changing at the beginning of the 2000s when singers who sang songs mixed with English included anyone who had English proficiency or was educated in English. English in this period represented modernization as Loveday (1986) wrote, "English is for conveying modernity and internationalization." People also viewed the singers who could sing in English as stars due to their English proficiency. Frith (1999) echoed this statement saying, "to sing in English no longer means to sing in English; it just means to be a pop star." The singers of this period included Golf and Mike, and Chin Chinnawut.

As Thai popular songs became famous, singing contest programs began. The most well-known programs were Academy Fantasia (AF), KPN, The Star, and The Voice. KPN actually was the first national singing contest program in Thailand that started in 1982 and changed its program theme in 2008 to become a reality show. Academy Fantasia and The Star were launched in 2001 as reality shows. The most recent program, The Voice, was launched in 2012 but was not a reality show. All programs released newly composed songs for each finalist after the contest

was over each year. The newly composed songs were songs that had never been sung during the contests and all were composed after the programs were over each year.

As lyrics were interesting due to mixture and different features of language use, they were used for listening comprehension in this study. All the selected songs were checked by the researcher applying suggestions from Lems (2001) that lyrics should be clear and loud enough for participants to hear. Moreover, musical instruments should not be louder than the singers' voices. This ensured that participants could hear the singers' voices clearly. As a result, lack of clarity was not a factor in listening comprehension.

Lyrics were collected from three official websites of entertainment companies hosting the singing contest programs in Thailand – Academy Fantasia, KPN and The Star. The websites were for public use. These programs were selected because songs were newly composed and had never been sung during the contest. The lyrics were collected from songs between 2001 and 2014. The Voice was the only program that the researcher did not include because the number of years and songs was different from the other programs. The total number of newly composed songs launched between 2001 and 2014 was nine hundred and forty six. Two hundred and fifty two of the songs contained English. As this study focused on the word level, seventy words from sixty nine songs were used in this research. All words included consonants, consonant clusters, voicing, vowels, and nativization. The focus was on word level only because the words occurred frequently in the lyrics. The majority of lyrics had at least one English word mixed in with the Thai. In contrast, frequency of phrases, sentences and stanzas were unpredictable. Phrases mainly occurred as code-switching and code-mixing. Sentences appeared mainly in fast-paced songs and stanzas rarely happened in Thai lyrics.

Song list is shown in Appendix P.

3.2 Music video

Music video was another research instrument of this study. Participants watched music videos after they had listened to all songs on audio files. Music videos showed motion. This was used to determine whether or not music videos could help participants better understand English in Thai popular songs. The music videos did not contain any subtitles. Each one was played only twice.

3.3 Interviews

Interviews were designed as a semi-structured pattern. The interview was divided into two parts – interview with the participants and interview with the lyricists. The interviews were conducted both in person and online. The participants who took in-person interviews included all native Thais, the American, the British, and all lyricists. Others were interviewed through Skype since they lived abroad.

The interview with the lyricists was the primary source to help explain reasons and attitudes why they included English in the lyrics.

The researcher prepared a group of questions beforehand, but allowed the interview sessions to be conversational. Questions were added or removed as necessary. In doing so, the researcher could provide explanations or skip irrelevant questions. The participants were open to talk without time limit, while the ideal interview session was one hour. The viewpoints from the participants were compared and contrasted with the lyricists. The questions are shown in Appendix L and M.

3.3 Questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed to retrieve information on the demographics of the participants and their attitudes towards the use of English in Thai popular songs. Due to capability of collecting a large amount of data rapidly, a questionnaire was used to collect participants' attitudes towards use of English in Thai popular songs and knowledge of World Englishes in order to compare with the interviews. The questionnaire was divided into two parts:

Part I

The first part of the questionnaire was designed to collect participants' personal information to gain an overall picture of their background. The information included age, sex, nationality, educational background, job and length of stay in Thailand and/or contact with Thai language, culture, and people.

Part II

This part was an open-ended question for participants to reflect on their attitudes towards use of English in Thai popular songs, knowledge, and understanding of World Englishes. Each participant received the questionnaire after the interview session. The questionnaire allowed the participants to reflect on any thoughts that might have not arisen during the interview session. The completed questionnaire and its translation are shown in Appendix N.

3.4 Data collection

The first step was to retrieve all newly composed songs from the three song contest websites between 2001 and 2014. All the songs mixed with English were selected for the study. In total, nine hundred and forty six songs were considered but only two hundred and fifty two

songs contained English. From those songs, seventy words from sixty nine songs were finally selected for study.

Those seventy words from sixty nine songs were categorized into six groups of words after the revision of the pilot study results. The first group of songs employed words that were understood by native speakers of English. The second group employed words understood by non-native speakers of English who were non-Thais. Similarly, the third group of songs contained words understood by native Thais. The fourth and fifth groups contained words that were not understandable to native speakers of English, and non-native speakers of English who were non-Thais, respectively. The final group of songs employed words that had undergone a process of nativization. This is to say, participants could provide correct pronunciation but not correct meaning due to differences in context.

Each participant was introduced to the purposes of this study and was assured of confidentiality before activities were conducted. Each participant listened to seventy words from sixty nine songs. Each song was played only twice. The participants were asked to write down the words they heard and to provide the meaning of those words to ensure they totally understood the words. The participants were then assigned to watch music videos of those songs. Each music video was played twice, without subtitles. After the end of each song, they were asked to write down the words they heard and provide the meaning of those words. This was done on a separate piece of paper from the audio-only listening.

The next phase was to interview the participants. Each of them was asked the initial relevant questions. The final step was to distribute questionnaires to the participants. Each of them was asked to complete and return the questionnaire to the researcher within a week.

Data collection of the lyricists was based on interviews with them. The interviews applied the same criteria as with the participants.

3.5 Data analysis

After retrieving all information, data analysis was conducted. It was also divided into data analysis of the participants and data analysis of the lyricists. The first phase was to transcribe all seventy words from sixty nine songs. Those words employed the linguistic features of consonants, consonant clusters, vowels, voicing, and nativization. The table of transcription is in Appendix O. Comparison of native English and native Thai pronunciation presented similarities and differences.

The second phase was to check the answers of each participant from listening comprehension through audio files and also from music videos. The answers were grouped into types of understanding as discussed in the data collection section. This made it possible to determine which words the participants accurately understood. Correct and incorrect answers might reveal other factors of comprehension.

After that, the researcher compared the answers of each participant to see whether audio files and music videos were factors of understanding. If the participants answered more correctly with audio files than with music videos, it might be possible that actions might help them understand better than listening to audio files only.

The researcher then grouped the participants' points during the interviews into categories and provided examples of each category retrieved from the participants. This revealed participants' attitudes towards the use of English in Thai popular songs.

The final phase was to group the participants' points from the questionnaire and to list examples from each category. This step might seem similar to the interviews, but the grouping of

the questionnaires was based on the questions listed on the questionnaire and not by points raised by participants.

Information from the interviews with the lyricists was grouped into categories. Examples from each category were collected in the same manner as the interviews with the participants.

Content analysis

Content analysis is a research technique to describe a situation of a study (Berelson, 1971). Research tools are reliable and results are valid if using content analysis (Krippendorff, 1980). In this study, content analysis was used to measure the reliability of research tools and to ensure validity of the results. Content analysis was used to retrieve information from categories of listening comprehension. Categories used in the study were divided into six types. The first type included words understood by native speakers of English such as *check, enjoy* and *like*. The second type included words understood by non-native speakers of English who were non-Thais, such as *care, surprise* and *want*. The third type included words understood by native Thais such as *air, happy,* and *share*. The fourth type included words that were not understandable to native speakers of English such as *ball, everything* and *sure*. The fifth type included words that were not understandable to non-native speakers of English who were non-Thais such as *charge, feel* and *mouth*. The final group included words that had become nativized in Thai language such as *'ver' from 'over', 'ber' from 'number* and *'in' from inner*.

Information was also drawn from categories of interviews and questionnaires. The main categories were divided into positive and negative sides. The positive side was grouped into five sub-types. The first one was "English is modern" such as: *"เวลาที่ได้ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในบริบทไทย มันดูทันสมัยมาก (When I am using English in Thai context, I feel it is modern)"*, *"พอมีใครทักว่าร้องเพลง*

ภาษาอังกฤษได้ รู้สึกว่าตัวเองอินเทรนด์มาก" (When I have been told I can sing in English well, I feel in trend), and *"I am comfortable to use English in my language. It is modern."*

The second sub-type was "English shows education." People who could use or sing in English had good educational background such as *"ภาษาอังกฤษบอกระดับการศึกษาได้ (English can tell education background)", "I am proud of using English. You know, it means good education to me",* and *"In my country, English classifies us from another. It is about educational level."*

The next sub-type was that "people learn new vocabulary from mixing of English in a song." The other sub-type was that "mixing English was more understandable than a local language" such as the word "care." The final sub-type was "English opened the world" such as *"It is good to see Thai people are more open to the world"* and *"I think that foreigners, like me, understand what you are conveying to us. It is not 100% understandable, but, yes, I say I understand."*

The negative side was divided into three sub-types. The first one was that it "ruins language and identity" such as *"The language can be ruined from listening to mixture of English in a local language.", "Identity can be lost from absorbing this kind of music"* and *"I think about correct pronunciation, no matter it is native-like or local dialect."*

The second sub-type was "inappropriate pronunciation" such as *"I feel it is not ok for some singers. They sing and pronounce English and Thai incorrectly to me. For example, "ท" should be pronounced as /t/ but 99% pronounce it as /ch/ like "เธอ". When they sing in English, they are supposed to pronounce "t" as /t/ but they sing as /tj/, a combination of /t/ and /j/. I do not know why they sing this way. I do not know how they are trained.", "I think mixture of*

English and Thai may lead to misunderstanding due to deviated pronunciation" and *"It can build a bad habit of Thai people to use incorrect pronunciation and even grammar."*

The final sub-type was "prevention of beauty of music" such as *"English should be composed in English; Thai should be composed in Thai. Music should be composed in a language of a target audience. If not, beauty of melody is gone." "I feel it is humorous having more than one language in a song. I do not know the intention but it is strange to me"* and *"You have to pay attention to elements of each verse rather than listen for relax."*

However, content analysis in the main study showed more types than stated in this part because participants expressed more points during the interview and also raised new points on the questionnaire.

3.6 Measurement to reliability of the research

To check reliability, the researcher worked with a Thai graduate student. This inter-rater held a master degree in Teaching English as a Foreign Language from Nottingham University in the United Kingdom. She had been a teacher of Thai language in Singapore for two years. She was also a freelance interpreter and translator of Thai, English, Chinese and German.

The following steps were applied for reliability check:

The first step was to create a wordlist used in listening comprehension. The researcher transcribed them first and handed a copy of it to the inter-rater to transcribe. This step showed if the researcher and the inter-rater transcribed similarly or differently from each other.

The second step was to classify wordlist categories. The researcher grouped all words into six categories as stated above. The inter-rater was then given all of the words to categorize. Comparison of the researcher and the inter-rater showed if all categories were aligned.

The third step was to classify and code interview points. The researcher grouped the points into categories and collected examples of each category. Then the inter-rater randomly selected the points to classify and match examples. In this step, classification by the researcher and the inter-rater could be compared to see if they were consistent.

The final step was to classify and code answers from the questionnaire answers. The researcher listed all the answers and placed examples into categories. After that, the inter-rater randomly selected the questions and examples to match with each other. Comparison of the researcher and the inter-rater could prove reliability.

In each step, the researcher set up ten percent for randomly selected English words, interview points, and questionnaire answers for the inter-rater to transcribe, group and code, respectively. If her transcription, grouping, and coding were seventy percent similar to the researcher, it revealed successful rating.

3.7 Pilot study

Participants

A pilot study was conducted with twenty purposively selected participants from the researcher's contact list. They were seven native speakers of English, six non-native speakers of English who were non-Thais and seven native Thais. All participants were mixed between close and limited exposure to Thai language, culture, and people. Native speakers of English were two Americans, an Australian, two British, a Canadian, and a New Zealander. They were four females and three males. Their ages were between thirty five and fifty years old. Their educational background varied from college to master degree level. Their occupations included

business owner, immigration officer, lecturer, and translator. All of them had been working in Thailand at least three years and had regular contact with Thai language, culture, and people.

Six non-native speakers of English who were non-Thais included a Chinese, a Filipino, a Malaysian, a Singaporean, and two Vietnamese. They were divided into two groups. The first group was the participants who used English as a second language. They included a Filipino, a Malaysian and a Singaporean. The second group was participants who used English as a foreign language. They were a Chinese and two Vietnamese. This group of participants consisted of three males and three females. Their ages were between thirty five and forty years old. Their occupations were interpreter and graduate student. Their educational background ranged from undergraduate to master degree level. Some participants in this group were exchange students learning Thai language and had visited Thailand at least twice a year. The rest of them had limited exposure to Thai language, culture, and people.

The group of seven native Thais included six females and one male. Their ages ranged from thirty five to fifty years old. Their educational backgrounds ranged from undergraduate to doctoral degree. Their occupations included administrative officer, marketing officer, and receptionist. They had been working for international organizations where English was used as a medium of communication. As a result, their English proficiency was considered good.

Each participant was assigned to listen to twelve purposively selected songs. These songs included all six categories and linguistic features as stated in the research instrument section. Each category included two songs, one slow-paced and one fast-paced.

Listening comprehension

The study revealed that the participants held different degrees of understanding English in Thai popular songs. Undoubtedly, the native Thai participants had the highest level of understanding followed by the native speakers of English participants, followed by the non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants, respectively. The factors of understanding included familiarity and frequency of contact with Thai language, culture, and people including similarities and differences of linguistic features.

In terms of familiarity, the participants who had frequently been in touch with Thai language had an advantage over the ones with less frequent contact. The more the participants were familiar with Thai language, culture and people, the more they understood English in Thai popular songs. In this study, the native Thai participants had daily contact with their own language, Thai language. Therefore, they understood English in Thai popular songs the best. According to the number of their answers, the native Thai participants provided all correct answers with only repeat at most during listening activity.

The native speakers of English participants also understood English in Thai popular songs even though the level of understanding was lower than the native Thai participants. Considering their backgrounds, they had regular contact with Thai language, culture, and people because they worked in organizations where native Thais were employed or they had business contact with Thai people. No matter how regular it was, the native speakers of English could understand English in Thai popular songs at a high level. According to the number of their answers, they provided all correct answers after the second round of listening except for some meanings such as those that had undergone nativization. For example, the words ‘ver’ from ‘over’ and ‘ber’ from ‘number’ were included in this category.

The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants understood English in Thai popular songs the least. The participants who could communicate in Thai language understood English in Thai popular songs better than the ones who had less frequent contact. In this study, the participants with regular contact with Thai language, culture, and people were the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants. All of them were exchange students in Thailand for a year and were still learning Thai language in their home countries. The Chinese participant was working with native Thais in her home country. In addition, the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants watched Thai television programs and spoke to Thai people regularly through Skype. It could be seen from their number of answers that they could understand all words after the second round of the listening activity; however, some meanings were still not understandable to them when they had gone through the nativization process such as ‘ver’ from ‘over’ and ‘mem’ from ‘remember.’

The pace of the song did not influence the participants’ understanding. Also, being a native speaker could not prove that their level of understanding was always the best. In learning a language, the more the participants were familiar with the language they learnt, the more they understood. The researcher recommends that teaching a language should add a number of varieties of English in textbooks and teaching materials. In doing so, students can gain familiarity with different varieties of English and their level of understanding will be higher. In daily life, it is unpredictable which varieties of English students might encounter in communication, work, or further study.

Not only did familiarity affect the level of understanding, but different linguistic features of each language were also a factor. In this study, the differences of linguistic features included consonants, consonant clusters, vowels, voicing, and nativization as discussed below.

Consonants

The first feature is consonants. As stated in chapter 2, English has twenty four consonant sounds whereas Thai has only twenty one sounds. In the initial position, all English consonant sounds can occur except for the /ŋ/ sound whereas all Thai consonant sounds can occur in this position. In contrast, all English consonant sounds can occur in the final position except for /h/, /j/, and /w/ sounds but Thai language had only ten consonant sounds that can occur in the final position. These are /n/, /m/, /ŋ/, /p/, /b/, /d/, /t/, /k/, /j/, and /w/ sounds. Among these sounds, nine English sounds never occur in Thai language as shown in the following table:

Place and manner of articulation	**Consonant sound**
Labiodental fricative	/v/
Interdental fricative	/θ/, /ð/
Alveolar fricative	/z/
Post alveolar fricative	/ʃ/, /ʒ/
Post alveolar affricate	/tʃ/, /dʒ/
Velar plosive	/g/

Table 3.2: English sounds

No specific consonant sounds in Thai language can substitute for these English consonant sounds. Replacement strategies are often used; strategies differ between the initial and the final positions as shown in the following tables:

Initial position

English consonant sound	Thai substitution sound	Example
/v/	/f/	Van
/θ/	/t/, /s/	This
/ð/	/d/, /t/, /s/	The
/ʃ/	/tɕ/, /tɕ^{h}/	Cheer
/z/	/s/	Zero
/r/	/l/	Return

Table 3.3: English consonant sound in the initial position

Final position

English consonant sound	Thai substitution sound	Example
/d/	/t/	Trend
/θ/	/t/	Everything
/ð/	/t/	Breath
/s/	/t/	*Surprise*
/z/	/t/	Freeze
/ʃ/	/t/	Mouth
/ʒ/	/t/	Beige
/tʃ/	/t/	Watch

/dʒ/	/t/	Garage
/v/	/p/	Leave
/f/	/p/	Leaf
/l/	/n/	Ball

Table 3.4: English consonant sound in the final position

Some sounds that occurred in Thai language were substituted differently when they appeared in the initial and the final positions. Generally, eight English consonant sounds occurred in this study: /tʃ/, /ʃ/, /dʒ/, /θ/, /v/, /l/, /t/, /z/. Among these sounds, some occurred either in the initial or final position but some occurred in both positions. In the initial position, five consonant sounds – /tʃ/, /ʃ/, /dʒ/, /θ/, /v/ – occurred. In Thai language, these sounds do not exist. Therefore, native Thais substituted these sounds with near equivalent Thai sounds as shown in the following table:

English sound	**Thai near equivalent sound (substitution)**	**Example**
/tʃ/	/tɕʰ/	Cherry
/ʃ/	/tɕʰ/	Chill
/dʒ/	/tɕ/	George
/θ/	/t/	Think

/v/	/w/	Van

Table 3.5: Substitution of English consonant sounds in the initial position

In the final position, five consonant sounds – /tʃ/, /dʒ/, /θ/, /v/, /l/ – occurred which did not exist in Thai language. Again, native Thais replaced these sounds with near equivalent Thai sounds as shown in the following table:

English sound	**Thai near equivalent sound (substitution)**	**Example**
/tʃ/	/t/	Watch
/dʒ/	/t/	Garage
/θ/	/w/	Though
/v/	/f/	Leave
/l/	/n/, /w/	Ball

Table 3.6: Substitution of English consonant sounds in the final position

However, /v/ and /l/ in some words had no substitution so Thais simply omitted the final sound. Also, /t/ and /z/ in the final position had no replacement but both sounds occurred with omission in Thai pronunciation.

Unsurprisingly, the Thai participants totally understood English in Thai popular songs because they were familiar with substitution and omission as shown in the previous tables. In contrast, the different linguistic features of consonant sounds between English and Thai created

unintelligibility for native speakers of English participants and non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants, especially those with limited contact with Thai language, culture, and people.

For native speakers of English participants, different linguistic features, especially in the final position, might lead to different words or meanings. Examples from this study were “chill,” “feel,” and “match.” The native speakers of English participants understood “chill” as “chew;” they heard the word “feel” as “few;” and they thought that “match” was “mat” due to a lack of final consonant sound in pronunciation by the native Thais. It could be seen that these changed the words and meanings.

Non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants had similar problems. However, participants with less contact with Thai language, culture, and people had mother tongue interference. The most outstanding feature occurred due to final sound omission. The Filipino and Malaysian participants had difficulty when hearing words such as “style.” Final sound omission in Thai-English pronunciation led them to uncertainty of understanding.

Consonant clusters

The next linguistic feature difference was consonant cluster sounds. Similar to consonant sounds, consonant cluster sounds were studied in both initial and final positions. Even though consonant cluster sounds did not occur frequently in this study, it was interesting to explore. In Thai language, consonant cluster sounds exist such as /kw/ in “ความ” /kwa:m/. Surprisingly, native Thais did not pronounce consonant cluster sounds when singing in English. They also inserted a syllable when a consonant cluster started with /s/. The following table demonstrated this substation strategy.

English sound (initial position)	Example	Thai pronunciation (deletion)	Example	English sound (final position)	Example	Thai pronunciation (deletion)	Example	English sound	Example	Thai pronunciation (insertion)	Example
bl/	Blur	/b/	Ber	/kt/	Kicked	/k/	Kik	/sp/	Spring	/s(a)p/	Saping
cl/	Clear	/k/	Kear					/st/	Start	/s(a)t/	Satat
cr/	Crack	/k/	Kack								
fr/	Fridge	/f/	Fid								
pr/	Proud	/p/	Pow								
tr/	Train	/t/	Tain								

Table 3.7: Substitution of English consonant clusters

The preceding table shows that the native Thai participants had no difficulty understanding consonant cluster insertion or omission because Thai language also had consonant clusters. However, both insertion and omission created a problem for the native and non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants.

For native speakers of English participants, consonant cluster sounds, especially in the initial position, were important because they differentiate one word from another. Examples from this study were “click,” “free” and “trend.” These words were understood as “kick,” “fee”, and “ten” respectively when pronounced by the native Thais. The native English participants misunderstood due to the omission of the consonant clusters. Also, insertion of a syllable in consonant cluster sounds created a problem for them. In the word “style” for instance, the native Thais inserted a syllable in the initial position, creating a word that sounded like “sa-tyle.” The native English participants did not understand this word because two syllables made this new word unintelligible in English.

Similarly, the non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants encountered this problem. They misunderstood words due to omission and insertion of consonant cluster sounds in Thai pronunciation. This group faced the same problems as the native English participants as stated above.

Vowels

The next difference in linguistic features that was studied in this research concerns vowels. This study focused on two points: monophthongs and diphthongs. In the study, replacement of vowel sounds was a primary concern. The following table

compares monophthongs and diphthongs and how they were substituted in Thai pronunciation.

English monophthong	Thai substitution	Example	English diphthong	Thai substitution	Example
/ɜ:/	/ɤ:/	Ber	/eə/	/ɛ:/	Blur
/ɪ/	/e:/, /i/, /i:/	Fit	/eɪ/	/e:/	Bed
/æ/	/ɛ:/	Care	/əɪ/	/a:j/, /aj/	Bye
/ʌ/	/ɤ:/	Dove	/ɔɪ/	/ɔ:j/	Boy
			/ɪə/	/i:a/	Beer
			/oʊ/	/o:/	Flow
			/ʊə/	/u:a/	Sure

Table 3.8: Replacement of English vowel sounds

In terms of monophthongs, vowels were substituted by nearly equivalent vowel sounds in Thai language. Short vowels in English were replaced by long vowels in Thai. The most troublesome vowel sound occurred in the word “love.” In English, the /ʌ/ sound was pronounced but the native Thais pronounced it with the /ɤ:/ sound. The /ɤ:/ sound was not a nearly equivalent vowel sound to /ʌ/ but was closer to

the /ɤ/ sound in Thai language itself. The sound /ʌ/ was a short vowel sound but it was replaced by /ɤ:/, long vowel sound in Thai language. This feature occurred when a vowel was marked by a tone. This was why /ɤ:/ became a long vowel. Another noticeable point was that monophthongs in English were replaced by monophthongs in Thai.

Diphthongs went through two types of substitution. The first type was monophthongs replacing diphthongs regardless of whether they were short or long vowel sounds. This feature took place because Thai language has no diphthongs that were created from two monophthongs in the final position. The Thais simply replaced them with monophthongs. For example, /oʊ/ in "condo" was replaced by /o:/. Another example was /eə/ in "care" became /ɛ:/.

The second type of substitution was diphthongs replacing diphthongs. Diphthongs were replaced by long vowel sounds. For instance, /aɪ/ in "bye" became /a:j/.

In Thai language, both monophthongs and diphthongs occur. It is no surprise that the native Thai participants understood all the words in the songs correctly. On the other hand, the native English participants and the non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants had problems when they heard words with replacement of short vowels with long vowels because this changed the words and

meanings. For example, /ɪ/ in “fit” became /i/. The native English participants were not sure if it meant “fit” or “feet.”

When a vowel sound was substituted by another vowel sound in Thai, both non-Thai groups experienced comprehension problems. For instance, /ʊə/ in “sure” became /u:a/. The participants answered this word incorrectly because they were unsure what the Thai singers were singing.

Voicing

The final linguistic feature explored in this study was voicing. Voicing focuses on the voiced and unvoiced quality of consonants. In this study, voiced sounds were replaced by unvoiced sounds as shown in the following table:

English sound	**Example**	**Thai substitution**	**Example**
/b/	Sub	/p/	Sup
/v/	Dove	/p/, /f/, /w/	Dofe
/z/	Freeze	/s/	Freese

Table 3.9: Replacement of English voiced sounds

All voiced sounds were replaced by unvoiced sounds. The reason is that /b/, /v/, and /z/ voiced sounds cannot occur in the Thai language. As a result, they were substituted by unvoiced sounds in Thai, especially in the final position of a word. For example, /v/ in “love” became /f/ because Thai language does not have a /v/ sound at

the end of word. Another noticeable point was that the /s/ sound at the end of a word was not pronounced. Thai language does not allow for a final /s/ sound.

Somewhat predictably, the native Thai participants totally understood voicing pronounced by Thais. However, proper voicing was quite important, especially for the native speakers of English. Voicing was used to differentiate one word from another. For instance, /t/ in “great” and /d/ in “grade” were obviously different from each other in meaning. This feature may or may not be important to non-native speakers of English depending on familiarity and mother tongue interference.

Apart from the above linguistic features, nativization was also an important factor of understanding. It was clearly observed in this study that the participants who understood the sounds might not understand the meaning in context. Eight words that had become nativized in Thai language occurred in the song lyrics. Those were ‘ber’ from ‘number’, ‘celeb’ from ‘celebrity’, ‘chill’ from ‘chill out’, ‘in’ from ‘inner’, ‘mem’ from ‘remember’, ‘o’ from ‘ok’, ‘spec’ from ‘specification’ and ‘ver’ from ‘over’. The native Thais used truncation, conversion and semantic shift processes to nativize words.

The study revealed that truncation ranked in the top position in 62.5 percent of the nativized words. This type of nativization appeared frequently in Thai popular songs whereas conversion occurred in 25 percent and semantic shifts only occurred in 12.5 percent of nativized words. The following section shows the findings concerning truncation, conversion and semantic shifts in greater detail.

Truncation is a process of word formation that shortens a word but retains its meaning or part of speech (Kannaovakun, 2001). In this study, truncation was found in 62.5 percent of words. An example from lyrics is as follows:

*"เอา**เบอร์**ไปแล้ว ก็ต้องใช้ รับผิดชอบกันซะบ้าง"*

(You have my (num)ber and you should use it. You must take responsibility.)

Conversion is a process in which a word changes to another part of speech in another language (Kannaovakun, 2001). It was found in 25 percent of the words in this study. Examples from lyrics were:

*"อย่ามาทำหน้า**เวอร์** เพราะเธอไม่ใช่คน ๆ นั้น"*

(Do not make your face that ver because you are not that person.)

*"ตั้งแต่เธอเข้ามา มาสบตาอยากให้รู้ไว้ว่า ตื่นขึ้นมาก็**อิน**เลิฟ นอนก็**อิน**เลิฟ"*

(Since you have come and seen my eyes, please know that I am in love when I wake up. I am in love when I sleep.)

A semantic shift is a change of meaning of a word in a new language (Kannaovakun, 2001). It was found in 12.5 percent of the words. An example from lyrics is shown below:

*"รู้ไหมไปเจอใครๆ แต่ใจเหงาอยู่ บอกตัวเองให้**ชิลๆ** หน่อย ก็ทำไม่ได้เลย"*

(You know I meet many people but I am still lonely. I told myself to chill chill but I cannot.)

Lack of sound in one language is a major linguistic problem when transferring to another language. The participants encountered difficulties when pronouncing a word in a native-like manner. Also, nativization created a problem and participants could not totally understand a message.

Interviews

During the interviews, the participants revealed various interesting points. Some of them had had regular contact with Thai language, culture, and people while some had not. They revealed that regular contact with Thai language, culture, and people helped them understand English in Thai popular songs more easily. Some participants with less contact with Thai language, culture, and people tried to develop contacts, especially business owners, because they worked with Thai customers. However, the rest of them did not feel that contact with Thai language, culture, and people were important to them. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants had scores of understanding ranked at the bottom.

Many participants believed that the use of English by people of any other native language suggests that those people are modern and educated. Here are several examples from the participants' viewpoints:

Modern	**Educated**
"เวลาที่ได้ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในบริบทไทย มันดูทันสมัย มาก อย่างเวลาร้องเพลง"	*"รู้สึกว่าตัวเองดูมีการศึกษา เวลาร้องเพลงที่มี ภาษาอังกฤษ"*

(When I am using English in Thai context, I feel it is modern such as in songs.)	*(I feel I am educated when I sing in English.)*
"พอมีใครทักว่าร้องเพลงที่มีภาษาอังกฤษได้ รู้สึกว่าตัวเองอินเทรนด์มาก" *(When I have been told I can sing in English, I feel in trend.)*	*"ภาษาอังกฤษบอกระดับการศึกษาได้ ร้องเพลงที่มีภาษาอังกฤษก็บอกให้รู้ว่ามีการศึกษา"* *(English presents educational background. Singing in English also indicates educational background.)*
"I feel modern when singing along in English."	*"In my country, English classifies us from another. It is about educational level. So, if I sing in English, it means I am educated"*
"I am comfortable to use English in my language. It is modern."	*"I am proud of using English. You know, it means good education to me. That is why I like listening to any songs with English"*
"Song can be modernized by the change of society."	

Table 3.10: Participants' attitudes

Some participants felt that songs were good for language learning. They stated that they could acquire new vocabulary from the songs and apply them to their daily communication. Some saw songs encouraged learners to learn a language because it

brought English closer to their lives. It was considered a natural way of language learning. The following statements are examples from the participants.

"Songs are tools to encourage people to learn English."

"When people are familiar with English, they can learn and remember vocabulary well from listening to the songs."

The interviews showed clearly that the participants had positive attitudes towards the use of English in Thai songs. Actually, they expressed positive attitudes towards the use of English in any language because it shows modernity and education, regardless of whether English was a second or a foreign language to them. The participants stated that English was helpful in expression more than a local language because it was easier to understand. For instance, the word 'care' was more easily understood by all non-Thai listeners when used in song lyrics than if a Thai word had been used.

Some participants expressed positive attitudes towards globalization. They stated that using English in a local language shows that we are open to the world. One participant said, *"It is good to see Thai people are more open to the world"*. Some of them also thought that foreigners could understand English in Thai lyrics. For example, *"I think that foreigners, like me, understand what you are conveying to us. It is not 100% understandable but, yes, I say I understand".*

However, some participants saw mixing English in Thai songs had a negative impact on language and identity. Some participants stated that people might learn different English from native context if they relied on mixing English with a local

language because it was not true to either language. In case of Thai songs, they suggested that songs should be purely composed in Thai language, not a mixture of English and Thai. Here are several examples that demonstrate this attitude:

"The language can be ruined from listening to mixture of English in a local language."

"Identity can be lost from by absorbing this kind of songs."

"I think about correct pronunciation, no matter it is native-like or local dialect."

In accordance with different English from native context, the participants saw that some singers sang and pronounced inappropriately to native context in both English and Thai. Examples are shown below:

"I feel it is not ok for some singers. They sing and pronounce English and Thai incorrectly to me. For example, "ท" should be pronounced as /t/ but 99% pronounce as /ch/ like "เธอ (you)". When they sing in English, they are supposed to pronounce "t" as /t/ but they sing as /tj/, a combination of /t/ and /j/. I do not know why they sing this way. I do not know how they are trained."

"I think mixture of English and Thai may lead to misunderstanding due to deviated pronunciation."

"It can build a bad habit of Thai people to use incorrect pronunciation and even grammar."

Finally, people felt that a mixture of English in Thai songs damaged the beauty of music. This group of people thought that pure language was good for musical compositions rather than mixture of languages. The following quotes reveal these attitudes:

"English should be composed in English; Thai should be composed in Thai. Songs should be composed in a language of a target audience. If not, beauty of melody is gone."

"I feel it is humorous having more than one language in a song. I do not know the intention but it is strange to me."

"You have to pay attention to elements of each verse rather than listen for relax."

Knowledge of World Englishes

Apart from the above details, the participants were asked what "World Englishes" meant. Most of the participants admitted that they had never heard this word before. When they were asked to guess, the answers revealed several different opinions:

"World Englishes is English, a language of the world." (x10)

"Why English has –es at the end? Does English become a plural noun?" (x3)

"Many kinds of English people use." (x7)

Implications for language learning and teaching

Due to having limited knowledge of World Englishes, the participants were asked their preference between native English and varieties of English language learning and teaching. The majority of the native speakers of English participants preferred native English to be taught as they viewed it as a model for language learners. On the other hand, the non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants thought that integration of native English and varieties of English should give the greatest advantage. They said that native English could be presented in terms of grammar and writing, whereas varieties of English should be taught together with native English as a speaking skill.

To sum up, participants had different degrees of understanding English in Thai popular songs. Different linguistic features of English and Thai were one of the factors. If the participants were familiar with Thai, they understood the use of English in Thai popular songs better. Nativization was also a key point that influenced the participants' confidence in understanding English in Thai popular songs. They seemed to understand the vocabulary but could not understand the meaning.

The participants expressed both positive and negative attitudes towards the use of English in Thai popular songs. Some viewed it as modern and educated while others felt that it could destroy the language and identity of the language if people absorbed it unconsciously.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter reports the findings of the study in reference to the research questions stated in chapter one. This chapter demonstrates the differences of linguistic features between English and Thai languages (replacement in the initial and final positions of consonant sounds, insertion and omission of consonant cluster sounds, replacement of monophthong and diphthong in vowel sounds, replacement of voicing quality, and nativization), factors of intelligibility (exposure to Thai language and familiarity), variables of intelligibility (age, gender, educational background, occupation, and length of contact with Thai language, culture, and people), attitudes of the participants and the lyricists towards the use of English in Thai popular songs, and comparison of the attitudes of the participants and lyricists.

Each participant was assigned to listen to all seventy words from sixty nine songs. The duration of each song was from three to five minutes. The researcher played each song twice only and without pause. Each participant listened to songs from audio files and also watched music videos. Thais, British, and American participants attended the listening activity in person with the researcher. The rest participated in the listening activity through Skype. The researcher sent them one song each time and they were allowed to listen to the songs when the researcher told them to do so. This also applied to music videos because they were sent to the participants one by one and the participants were assigned to watch them when the researcher asked to watch only.

The participants could write down the answers at any time they thought they heard English words. They had unlimited time between songs until they were ready to

go on. When the participants listened to and wrote down the answers, the researcher observed and recorded their actions towards the songs. The researcher used information from observation to ask the participants during the interview session why they did those actions and how they felt about the particular songs.

Before the presentation and discussion of the results in details, this part presents an overview of the results and scores of the participants.

English and Thai are in different language families. The researcher, therefore, hypothesized that English and Thai languages should have different linguistic features as well. The results of this study confirmed the researcher's hypothesis by revealing that linguistic features of English and Thai languages were different. In addition, the linguistic features that were evident in Thai popular songs related to lexis and phonological systems, consonant sounds, consonant cluster sounds, vowel sounds, and voicing quality. Nativization was also considered as an additional linguistic feature. The following section presents the scores of the participants.

Feature	**Total**	**Correct answer**								
		Participant								
		T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Consonant sound – initial position	69	69	69	69	69	69	69	69	69	69
Consonant	11	11	11	11	11	10	5	10	9	1

sound – final position										
Consonant cluster – insertion	3	3	3	3	2	2	0	2	1	0
Consonant cluster – omission	8	8	8	8	7	6	3	4	3	2
Vowel – replacement in monophthong	6	6	6	6	5	4	4	4	4	3
Vowel – replacement in diphthong	22	22	22	22	21	21	20	20	20	18
Voicing	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	5	3
Nativization	8	8	8	8	8	8	3	5	4	0

Table 4.1: Participants' scores of correct answers

Feature	**Total**	**Incorrect answer**								
		Participant								
		T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Consonant	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

sound – initial position										
Consonant sound – final position	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	2	10
Consonant cluster – insertion	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	2	3
Consonant cluster – omission	8	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	5	6
Vowel – replacement in monophthong	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	3
Vowel – replacement in diphthong	22	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	4
Voicing	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4
Nativization	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	8	8

Table 4.2: Participants' scores of incorrect answers

4.1 Research question 1: What linguistic features of Thai-English are evident in Thai popular songs?

This part presents an analysis of the use of English in Thai popular songs of each word used in the study that relates to linguistic features.

"Air"

This word is pronounced /eə(r)/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /ɛ:/.

"Air" showed only one linguistic feature. It was a vowel shift strategy. In this word, the native speakers of English pronounce this word with diphthong /eə/ but the Thais pronounce it with monophthong /ɛ:/. This phenomenon can be explained by the study of Kruatrachue (1960). Thai vowels have short and long sounds but English vowels are tense and lax. Thais normally replace English lax with short sound and tense with long sound. As English diphthong /eə/ is tense, Thais replace it with a long sound /ɛ:/. Thai has no diphthongs comprised of two monophthongs. As a result, Thais use near equivalent Thai vowel sounds to replace English diphthong in this word.

"Baby"

This word is pronounced /beɪbɪ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /be:bi:/. "Baby" showed two aspects of linguistic features in the first syllable. The first aspect was a consonant sound in the initial position. The /b/ sound

was understood by all participants because the /b/ sound occurs in both English and Thai. As a result, it did not create a problem for participants to understand this sound in the initial position. This word also showed a vowel shift strategy in two aspects. In the first syllable, the Thais replaced a diphthong /eɪ/ with a monophthong /e:/. This is because Thai has no diphthongs comprised of two monophthongs. The Thais, therefore, replaced /eɪ/ with /e:/ because /e:/ was near equivalent to the sound that they could provide from Thai language in order to pronounce this sound.

In the second syllable, the monophthong /ɪ/ was substituted by a monophthng /i:/ by the Thais. This is because word stress in Thai is at the end of the word. As a result, the second syllable of this word was stressed and the English short monophthong was replaced by the Thai long monophthong. The Thai vowel ี /i:/ was a long sound that occurred from a tone.

"Ball"

This word is pronounced /bɔ:l/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /bɔ:n/. "Ball" shows two aspects of linguistic features. The first one was a consonant sound in the initial position. The /b/ sound was understood by all participants, most likely because the /b/ sound occurs in both English and Thai. As a result, it did not create a problem when occurring in the initial position. This word also showed a consonant sound in the final position. The /l/ sound was replaced by the /n/ sound when the Thais pronounce this word, probably because Thai has limited consonant sounds at the final position. English, in contrast, has more consonant

sounds that can occur in the final position. Also, the /l/ sound never occurs in the final position in Thai. As a result, Thais replace the /l/ sound with /n/ sound.

"(Num)ber"

This word is pronounced /bə(r)/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it /bɤ:/. This word shows three aspects of linguistic features. The first one was a consonant sound in the initial position. The /b/ sound was understood by all participants because the /b/ sound occurs in both English and Thai. It did not create any problem for the participants. It also showed vowel replacement. Thais replace a Thai long monophthong /ɤ:/ for an English monophthong /ə/ because /ə/ does not exist in Thai. Thais substitute this sound with the /ɤ:/ sound which exists in Thai and is near equivalent to the /ə/ sound.

This word also presents nativization. "Ber" comes from the word "number" in English. In Thai, it has been truncated to "ber". Thais often prefer to shorten words for easy communication. As a result, only Thais and speakers who knew Thai language understood this type of nativization.

"Blur"

This word is pronounced /blɜ:(r)/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it /bɤ:/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first aspect was a consonant sound in the initial position. The /b/ sound was understood by all participants. The word also contains a consonant cluster sound. Thais pronounce only the /b/ sound and omit the /l/ sound even though Thai language has consonant

clusters. Thais, especially teenagers, pronounce consonant clusters with only a single sound, the first sound of the word. This is a creation of language use in teen language.

"Boyfriend"

This word is pronounced /bɔɪ frend/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it /bɔ:jfe:n/. It showed four aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /b/ sound was understood by all participants. The second feature was a vowel shift. The English diphthong /ɔɪ/ in the first syllable of this word was replaced by a Thai monophthong /ɔ:/ when pronounced by Thais. Thai has no diphthongs comprised of two monophthongs. As a result, Thais use a near equivalent Thai vowel sound to replace the English diphthong in this word.

The next feature was consonant cluster. The second syllable of this word showed that the Thais omitted /r/ sound and pronounced only /f/ sound. Thais often pronounce consonant clusters with only a single sound, the first sound of the word. The final feature was consonant sound in the final position. The second syllable of this word presents the sound /d/ that is not pronounced by Thais but is pronounced by native speakers of English. Thai pronunciation does not require final sound pronunciation when ending a word even though Thai has final sounds available.

"Bye"

This world is pronounced /baɪ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it /ba:j/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first

aspect was consonant sound in the initial position. The second feature was a vowel shift. Thais use monophthong /a:/ to replace diphthong /aɪ/. Thai language has no diphthongs comprising two monophthongs. Thais, therefore, replace /aɪ/ with /a:/ because /a:/ is a near equivalent sound that Thais can draw on from the Thai language.

"Care"

This word is pronounced /keə(r)/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /kɛ:/. This word showed two linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /k/ sound appears in both English and Thai. It does not create any problem for participants when listening to this song. The second aspect was vowel shift. The Thais use monophthong /ɛ:/ to replace diphthong /eə/. Thai language has no diphthongs comprising two monophthongs. Thais replace /eə/ with /ɛ:/ because /ɛ:/ is a near equivalent sound.

"Celeb(rity)"

This word is pronounced /sɪleb/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /se:lep/. This word revealed three aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /k/ sound appears in both English and Thai. In terms of voicing, Thais used voiceless sound /p/ to replace voiced sound /b/. Thai language has no voiced sound /b/ at the end of a word. As a result, they used voiceless sound as a substitute.

With reference to nativization, Thais used truncation strategy to shorten the word. "Celeb" comes from 'celebrity'. Thais prefer to shorten words for easy

communication. As a result, only Thais and speakers who knew Thai language understood this type of nativization.

"Charge"

This word is pronounced /tʃɑ :dʒ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /tɕ ^{h}a:t/. This word presents two aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. Native speakers of English pronounce the initial sound as /tʃ/ but Thais pronounce it as /tɕ^{h}/. Thais replace the /tʃ/ sound with the /tɕ^{h}/ sound because the /tʃ/ sound does not exist in Thai. Thais also replaced a non-existent English sound /dʒ/ with /t/ sound which is available in Thai.

"Check"

This word is pronounced /tʃek/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce /tɕ ^{h}ek/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position, which was similar to the word 'charge'. Native speakers of English pronounce the initial sound /tʃ/ but Thais pronounce it as /tɕ^{h}/. Thais replace the /tʃ/ sound with the /tɕ^{h}/ sound because the /tʃ/ sound does not exist in Thai. The second aspect was consonant sound in the final position. Thais did not pronounce /k/ sound at the end. Thai pronunciation does not require final sound pronunciation as in English.

"Cheer"

This word is pronounced /tʃɪ ə(r)/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /tɕ ^{h}i:a/. This word revealed two aspects of linguistic features. The first aspect was the consonant sound in the initial position. This was similar to the word ‘charge’ and ‘check’ because the Thais replaced the English sound /tʃ/ with the Thai sound /tɕ^{h}/ because the /tʃ/ sound does not exist in Thai. The next aspect was the vowel shift. Thais replaced the dipththong /ɪə/ with monophthong /i:a/ because Thai language has no diphthongs comprising two monophthongs. The Thais, therefore, replaced /ɪə/ with diphthong /i:a/ because /i:a/ was near equivalent sound from Thai language.

“Chill (out)”

This word is pronounced /tʃɪ l/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /tɕ ^{h}iw/. This word showed three aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. Again, the Thais replaced the English sound /tʃ/ with the Thai sound /tɕ^{h}/ because the /tʃ/ sound does not exist in Thai. The next feature was consonant sound in the final position. The final sound /l/ of this word was replaced by the sound /w/ by the Thais because Thai language has no /l/ sound at the end of words. As a result, the Thais used /w/ to replace /l/ because /w/ is near equivalent to /l/ when occurring in the final position.

The final feature was nativization. “Chill” comes from “chill out”. The Thais used truncation and semantic shift strategies. “Chill out” in the native English context refers to ‘to go out and relax’ but in Thai context it means ‘take it easy’.

“Clear”

This word is pronounced /klı ə(r)/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /ki:ɑ /. “Clear” showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant cluster. The Thais used omission strategy for this word. Native speakers of English pronounce this word with the sound /kl/ but Thais omit the /l/ sound and pronounce only the /k/ sound. This word also showed vowel shift. Native speakers of English use diphthong /ɪə/ but Thais use monophthong /i:/ for. Thais replace /ɪə/ with diphthong /i:a/ because /i:a/ is a near equivalent sound.

“Click”

This word is pronounced /klɪk/ by native speakers of English while Thais pronounce it as /kik/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first feature was consonant cluster. The word “click” was similar to the word “clear” so Thais use omission strategy to pronounce it. Native speakers of English pronounce it with the sound /kl/ as /klɪk/ but the Thais omit the /l/ sound so and pronounce it as /kik/. As is typical in Thail language, Thais omit the final sound of this word.

“Condo”

This word is pronounced /kɒndoʊ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /kɔ:ndo:/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first feature was consonant sound in the initial position. The /k/ sound appears in both English and Thai and did not cause any problems. The second feature was vowel shift.

As is common in Thai language, Thais replaced the diphthong /oʊ/ with monophthong /o:/ as explained in many cases above.

"Confirm"

This word is pronounced /kənfɜ:m/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /kɔ:nfɤ:m/. This word also showed two aspects. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The sound /k/ occurs in both English and Thai and causes no problems. Thais used Thai monophthong /ɤ:/ to replace English monophthong /ɜ:/ because /ɜ:/ does not exist in Thai so the Thais use /ɤ:/ to replace /ɜ:/ because it was near equivalent to /ɜ:/.

"Crazy"

This word is pronounced /kreɪzɪ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /ke:si:/. This word presents three aspects of linguistic features. Native speakers of English pronounce this word beginning with /kr/ sound but Thais omit the /r/ sound and pronounce only /k/ sound. Native speakers of English pronounce the voiced /z/ sound but Thais pronounce it as an unvoiced /s/ because no voiced sounds exist in Thai language. Concerning vowel shift, one again the Thais used Thai monophthong /i:/ to replace the English monophthong /eɪ/. They replaced /eɪ/ with diphthong /i:/ because /i:/ was near equivalent sound.

"Date"

This word is pronounced /deɪt/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /de:t/. This word showed three aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The sound /d/ appears in both English and Thai and presents no problems. As typical, Thais perform a vowel shift and substitute Thai monophthong /e:/ for English diphthong /eɪ/. Native speakers of English pronounce the sound /t/ at the end but the Thais omit the sound because Thai language has no /t/ sound at the end of a word.

"Enjoy"

This word is pronounced /ɪndʒɔɪ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /entɕɔ:j/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position of the second syllable. Even though the Thais replaced the /dʒ/ sound with the /tɕ/ sound, this sound was near equivalent to /dʒ/. As a result, it did not cause any problems for the participants to understand. Vowel shift occurs in the second syllable of this word. The Thais used monophthong /ɔ:/ to replace English diphthong /ɔɪ/ as explained earlier.

"Everything"

This word is pronounced /evrɪθɪŋ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /epwalitiŋ/. This word showed three aspects of linguistic features. Firstly, it was consonant cluster of the first syllable. The Thais inserted a syllable between the first and the second sounds. This word also showed a consonant sound in

the initial position in the second syllable. The English sound /θ/ was substituted by the Thai sound /t/ because Thai language has no /θ/ sound in the initial position. Thais used Thai monophthong /i/ to replace the English monophthong /ɪ/, which shows transliteration of the /i/ sound.

"Fair"

This word is pronounced /feə(r)/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /fɛ:/. This word showed two aspects. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The sound /f/ occurs in both English and Thai language. As a result, it did not cause any problem for the participants. Thais use the Thai monophthong /ɛ:/ to replace English diphthong /eə/. They replaced /eə/ with diphthong /ɛ:/ because /ɛ:/ was a near equivalent sound from Thai.

"Fan"

This word is pronounced /fæn/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /fɛ:n/. This word showed only one aspect of linguistic features. It was consonant sound in the initial position. The sound /f/ appears in both English and Thai. As a result, this sound did not create any problems for the participants.

"Feel"

This word is pronounced /fi:l/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /fi:w/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first feature was consonant sound in the initial position. Again, the /f/ sound appears in

both English and Thai language. As a result, it did not create any problem for the participants. The second feature was consonant sound in the final position. The /l/ sound occurs in English but not in Thai language. As a result, the Thais replaced the /l/ sound with /w/ sound when pronouncing this word.

"Firm"

This word is pronounced /fɜ:m/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /fɤ:m/. This word also showed only one linguistic features. It was consonant sound in the initial position. The /f/ sound appears in both English and Thai. As a result, it did not cause any problems for the participant.

"Fit"

This word is pronounced /fɪt/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /fit/. This word showed three aspects of linguistic features. The first aspect was consonant sound in the initial position. The sound /f/ appears in both English and Thai. As a result, it did not create any problems for the participants. The second feature was vowel shift. In this word, Thais used Thai monophthong /i/ to replace English monophthong /ɪ/. Both sounds were similar so that this vowel sound did not create any problems for the participants.

The final feature was consonant sound in the final position. The /t/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. However, the Thais omit the stress of /t/ sound when pronouncing this word.

"Form"

This word is pronounced /fɔ:m/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /fɔ:m/. This word showed only one aspect of linguistic feature. It was consonant sound in the initial position. Again, the /f/ sound appears in both English and Thai. This sound did not cause any problems for the participants.

"Free"

This word is pronounced /fri:/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /fi:/. This word showed only one aspect of linguistic features. It was consonant cluster sound. The Thais omit the second sound of the consonant cluster /r/ and pronounce only /f/.

"Game"

This word is pronounced /geɪm/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /ge:m/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /g/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, it did not create problems for the participants. Thais used Thai monophthong /e:/ to replace English diphthong /eɪ/ as explained in many cases above.

"Go"

This word is pronounced /goʊ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /go:/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first

aspect was consonant sound in the initial position. The /g/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, it did not create problems for the participants. Vowel shift takes place when Thais replace diphthong /oʊ/ with /o:/ from the Thai language.

"Happy"

This word is pronounced /hæpɪ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /hɛppi:/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first feature was consonant sound in the initial position. The /h/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, this sound did not create any problems for the participants. Thais used Thai monophthong /i:/ to replace English diphthong /ɪ/. This could be because the second syllable was stressed. As a result, the vowel in this position was lengthened due to tonal indication in Thai as well.

"Hello"

This word is pronounced /həloʊ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /henlo:/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /h/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, it did not cause any problems for the participants. Thais replace /n/ for /l/ between the first and the second syllable because Thai language has no /l/ in the final sound of a word. The second feature was vowel shift. As explained above, Thais use Thai monophthong /o:/ to replace English diphthong /oʊ /.

"Hi5"

This word is pronounced /haɪ faɪv/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /ha:j faj/. This word was divided into two parts. The first part was the syllable "Hi". It showed two aspects of linguistic features: consonant sounds in the initial position and vowel shift. The /h/ sound occurs in both English and Thai. It did not cause any problems for the participants. The second aspect of the first syllable was vowel shift. Thais use the Thai monophthong /a:/ to replace English diphthong /aɪ/. The second syllable showed three aspects. The first aspect was consonant sound in the initial position. The /f/ sound appears in both English and Thai. As a result, this sound did not create any problems for the participants. In terms of vowel shift, Thais use monophthong /a/ to replace English diphthong /aɪ/. The final aspect was voicing. The final sound of the second syllable ended with voiced sound /v/. However, Thais pronounce it with voiceless sound /f/ because Thai language has no /v/ sound in the final position. Thais, therefore, replace it with near equivalent sound /f/.

"Hit"

This word is pronounced /hɪt/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /hit/. This word revealed two aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /h/ sound did not create any problems for the participants. The consonant sound /t/ in the final position was not pronounced by Thais even though /t/ occurs in Thai language. In Thai language, there

is no stress on the final sound when pronouncing a word, so the Thais did not pronounce it.

"Hot"

This word is pronounced /hɒt/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /hɔt/. This word is similar to the word "hit". This word revealed two aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound /h/ in the initial position. It did not create any problems for the participants. Regarding consonant sound in the final position, the native speakers of English pronounce /t/ sound at the end. As stated earlier, Thais do not pronounce it.

"In(ner)"

This word is pronounced /ɪn/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /in/. This word showed one aspect of linguistic feature. It was nativization. "In" as a nativized word has undergone the process of truncation. It was shortened from "inner" to "in" for ease of communication among Thais.

"Kiss"

This word is pronounced /kɪs/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /kit/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /k/ sound appears in both English and Thai. As a result, it did not create any problems for the participants. The second feature was consonant sound in the final position. Native speakers of English

pronounce the sound /s/ at the end of this word but Thais omit this sound because Thai language has no /s/ sound at the end of a word.

"Like"

This word is pronounced /laɪk/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /laj/. This word showed three aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /l/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, it did not create any problems for the participants. Regarding vowel shift, the Thais used Thai monophthong /a/ to replace English diphthong /aɪ/ as in many words in this study. This word also showed consonant sound in the final position. The native speakers of English pronounce the /k/ sound at the end of this word but the Thais omit it as discussed above.

"Love"

This word is pronounced /lʌv/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /lɤ:f/. This word showed three aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /l/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, this sound did not cause any problems for the participants. The final /v/ sound can occur in English but not in Thai language at the final position. As a result, the Thais used /f/ sound to replace it. The /v/ sound also has a voicing aspect. In Thai, Thais do not pronounce voiced sound /v/ but they use /f/ voiceless sound instead.

"Man"

This word is pronounced /mæn/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /mɛ:n/. This word showed one aspect of linguistic features. It was consonant sound in the initial position. In the initial position, the /m/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, it did not cause any problems for the participants.

"Match"

This word is pronounced /mætʃ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /mɛ:t/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /m/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, it did not create a problems for the participants. Regarding consonant sound in the final position, the native speakers of English pronounce the /tʃ/ sound at the end of the word. However, the Thais used replacement of the sound. Thai language has no /tʃ/ sound. The Thais, therefore, replace it with /t/ sound.

"(Re)mem(ber)"

This word is pronounced /mem/ by native speakers of English but Thais also pronounced it as /mem/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /m/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, it did not create a problems for the participants.

Another aspect was nativization. This word has undergone nativized process of truncation. The word was shortened from ‘remember’ to ‘mem’. Thais prefer to shorten words for easy communication. As a result, only Thais and speakers who knew Thai language understood this type of nativization.

“Message”

This word is pronounced /mesɪdʒ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /mɛ:tse:t/. This word showed three aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /m/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. The second aspect was vowel shift. Thais used Thai monophthong /e:/ to replace English diphthong /ɪ/. In terms of consonant sound in the final position, the Thais used /t/ sound to replace /dʒ/ sound because Thai language does not have this sound at the end of words.

“Mouth”

This word is pronounced /maʊθ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /maw/. This word also showed three aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /m/ sound, again, appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, it did not create any problems for the participants. In terms of vowel shift, the Thais used /a/ sound to replace /ʊθ/ because the /ʊθ/ sound does not occur in Thai language. Thai language has no diphthongs comprising two monophthongs. The Thais, therefore, replaced / ʊθ / with diphthong

/aw/ because /aw/ was near equivalent sound . Thais used the final /w/ sound to replace the /θ/ sound because the /θ/ sound does not exist in Thai language.

"No"

This word is pronounced /noʊ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /no:/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The sound /n/ appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, it did not create any problem for the participants.

The second aspect was vowel shift. The Thais used the Thai monophthong /o:/ to replace the diphthong /oʊ/. This could be explained that the diphthong /oʊ/ never occurs in Thai language. Thai language has no diphthongs comprising two monophthongs. The Thais, therefore, replaced /oʊ/ with /o:/ because /o:/ was near equivalent sound that the Thais could provide from Thai language in order to pronounce this sound.

"O(K)"

This word is pronounced /oʊ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /o:/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first one was vowel shift. This word is pronounced /oʊ/ by native speakers of English but the Thais pronounce it as /o:/. The diphthong /oʊ/ never occurs in Thai language. Thai language has no diphthongs comprising two monophthongs. The Thais, therefore, replaced /oʊ/ with /o:/. This word also revealed nativization. It has undergone nativized process of truncation. It was shortened from 'OK' to 'O'. Thais prefer to

shorten words for easy communication. As a result, only Thais and speakers who knew Thai language understood this type of nativization.

"OK"

This word is pronounced /oʊkeɪ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /o:ke:/. This word can be divided into two syllables. The first syllable showed one aspect of linguistic feature. It was vowel shift. The Thais used monophthong /o:/ to replace diphthong /oʊ/ because this diphthong does not exist in Thai language. The diphthong /oʊ/ never occurs in Thai language. Thai language has no diphthongs comprising two monophthongs. The Thais, therefore, replaced /oʊ/ with /o:/ because /o:/ was near equivalent sound. The second syllable showed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /k/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, this sound did not cause any problems for the participants. The second aspect was vowel shift. The Thais used monophthong /e:/ to replace diphthong /eɪ/ because this diphthong does not exist in Thai language. Thai language has no diphthongs comprising two monophthongs. The Thais, therefore, replaced /eɪ/ with /e:/ because /e:/ was near equivalent sound.

"On"

This word is pronounced /ɒn/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /ɔ:n/. This word showed only one aspect: vowel shift. The Thais

replaced /ɒ/ with /ɔ:/ because /ɒ/ does not exist in Thai. As a result, Thais found a near equivalent sound to replace it.

"Out"

This word is pronounced /aʊt/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /awt/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first one was vowel shift. The Thais used monophthong /aw/ to replace English diphthong /aʊ/. Thais replace /aʊ/ with diphthong /aw/ because /aw/ was near equivalent sound . The second aspect was consonant sound in the final position. Native speakers of English pronounce the sound /t/ at the end of the word. However, Thais omit it. In Thai language, there is no stress on the final sound when pronouncing a word.

"Party"

This word is pronounced /pɑ:tɪ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /pa:ti:/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first aspect was consonant sound in the initial position. The sound /p/ appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, this sound did not create any problems for the participants. The second aspect was vowel shift. The Thais used long monophthong /i:/ to replace English short monophthong /ɪ/. This word was unstressed in the final syllable by native speakers of English. The vowel, therefore, was short and lax. In contrast, the Thais stressed it on the final syllable. The vowel sound became longer.

"Perfect"

This word is pronounced /pəfekt/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /pɤ:fek/. This word showed three aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /p/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, it did not cause any problems for the participants. The second aspect was consonant sound in the final position. Native speakers of English pronounce /t/ sound at the end of this word, but Thais do not. Thais do not pronounce it even though /t/ occurs in Thai language. In Thai language, there is no stress on the final sound when pronouncing a word. The final aspect was vowel shift. The Thais used monophthong /ɤ:/ to replace schwa /ə/. This word is unstressed in the final syllable and is short and lax. In contrast, Thais stress it on the final syllable, causing the vowel sound to become longer.

"Return"

This word is pronounced /rɪtɜ:n/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /li:tɤ:n/. This word can be divided into two syllables. The first syllable showed two aspects of linguistic feature. They were consonant sound in the initial position and vowel shift. The /r/ sound in the initial position appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, it was not a problem for the participants even though the Thais replaced /r/ with /l/. This word is unstressed in the final syllable but Thais stress it on the final syllable causing the vowel to become longer. In terms of vowel shift, the Thais used long monophthong /i:/ to replace short monophthong /ɪ/. The second syllable showed only one aspect. It was consonant sound in the initial position. The /t/ sound occurs in both English and Thai language and caused no problems.

"Sad"

This word is pronounced /sæd/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /sɛ:t/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /s/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, it did not create any problems for the participants. Thais used the final /t/ sound to replace /d/ sound. Thai language has no voiced /d/ sound at the end of words so Thais replace it with the voiceless /t/.

"Say"

This word is pronounced /seɪ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /se:/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. Again, the /s/ sound could occur in both English and Thai language. Therefore, it was not a problem for the participants. Concerning vowel shift, the Thais used long monophthong /e:/ to replace diphthong /eɪ/. Thai language has no diphthongs comprising two monophthongs. The Thais, therefore, replaced /eɪ/ with /e:/ because /e:/ was near equivalent sound that the Thais could provide from Thai language.

"Share"

This word is pronounced /ʃeə(r)/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /tɕ^{h}ɛ:/. This word also revealed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. Thais used near equivalent sound

/tɕʰ/ to replace /ʃ/ because Thai language has no /ʃ/ sound to begin words. The second aspect was vowel shift. The Thais replaced diphthong /eə/ with long monophthong /ɛ:/. Thai language has no diphthongs comprising two monophthongs. The Thais, therefore, replaced /eə/ with /ɛ:/ because /ɛ:/ was near equivalent sound.

"Shock"

This word is pronounced /ʃɒk/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /tɕʰɔk/. This word also revealed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. It could be seen that the Thais used near equivalent sound /tɕʰ/ to replace /ʃ/ because Thai language has no /ʃ/ sound to begin words. The second aspect was consonant sound in the final position. The native speakers of English pronounce /k/ at the end of this word while Thais omit it because there is no stress on the final sound when pronouncing a word.

"Show"

This word is pronounced /ʃəʊ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /tɕʰo:/. This word also presents two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. Similarly, the Thais used near equivalent sound /tɕʰ/ to replace /ʃ/ because Thai language has no /ʃ/ sound to begin words. The second aspect was vowel shift. The Thais used long monophthong /o:/ to replace diphthong /əʊ/. Thais replace /əʊ/ with /o:/ because /o:/ is near equivalent sound.

"Spec(ification)"

This word is pronounced /spek/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /sapek/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic features. The first aspect was consonant cluster sound. The Thais used insertion strategy for this word. This They added a syllable between /s/ and /p/ sounds to become /sapek/ instead of /spek/. The second aspect was nativization. Thais use truncation for this word. They shorten this word from 'specification' to 'spec' for easy communication. As a result, only Thais and speakers who knew Thai language understood this type of nativization.

"Style"

This word is pronounced /staɪl/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /sata:j/. This word showed three aspects of linguistic feature. The first aspect was consonant cluster sound. Again, the Thais used insertion strategy for this word. They added a syllable between /s/ and /t/ sounds to become /sata:j/ instead of /staɪl/. The second aspect was vowel shift. The Thais used monophthong /a:/ to replace English diphthong /aɪ/ because it is the closest available sound in Thai. The final aspect was consonant sound in the final position. Native speakers of English pronounce the /l/ sound in this word but the Thais omit it. In Thai language, there was no stress on the final sound when pronouncing a word.

"Surprise"

This word is pronounced /səpraɪz/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /sɤ:paj/. This word can be divided into two syllables. The first syllable showed two aspects. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /s/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. As a result, this sound did not create any problems for the participants when it appeared in the initial position.

The second aspect was vowel shift. Thais used Thai long monophthong /ɤ:/ to replace English schwa /ə/ because /ɤ:/ is near equivalent to /ə/. Also, the first syllable of this word was unstressed by native speakers of English but the Thais stressed it. The vowel in native English was reduced to schwa /ə/ but the Thais pronounce it with a full sound of the vowel /ɤ:/. The second syllable also revealed two aspects. The first one was consonant cluster sounds. The Thais used omission strategy on this word. They omit the /r/ sound. The consonant sound in the final position was also an aspect of this word. Native speakers of English pronounce the /z/ sound at the end of the word but the Thais omit it because Thai language has no /z/ voiced sound at the end of a word.

"Sure"

This word is pronounced /ʃʊə(r)/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /tɕ^{h}u:ɑ/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /ʃ/ sound of this word was replaced by Thai near equivalent sound /tɕ^{h}/. Even though replacement was used, this

sound did not create any problems for the participants. The second aspect was vowel shift. Thais used monophthong /u:/ to replace diphthong /ʊə/.

"Taxi"

This word is pronounced /tæksɪ/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /tɛksi:/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /t/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. Regarding vowel shift, the Thais used long monophthong /i:/ to replace short monophthong /ɪ/. This could be explained that the native speakers of English do not stress the final syllable of this word but Thais stress it. As a result, the vowel of this word was shorter when pronouncing as native speakers of English and longer when pronouncing as Thais.

"Trend"

This word is pronounced /trend/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /ten/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant cluster sound. Thais omitted the /r/ sound. The second aspect was consonant sound in the final position. The native speakers of English pronounce the sound /d/ at the end of this word but the Thais omit it. In Thai language, there is no stress on the final sound when pronouncing a word.

“TV”

This word is pronounced /ti:vi:/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /ti:wi:/. This word also showed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /t/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. The second aspect was voicing. The Thais replace voiced sound /v/ by

voiceless sound /w/ because Thai language has no voiced sound /v/ to use.

“(O)ver”

This word is pronounced /və(r)/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /wɤ:/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was voicing.

The native Thais replaced voiced sound /v/ by voiceless sound /w/ because Thai language has no /v/ sound to begin a word. As a result, the Thais replaced /w/ which was near equivalent sound to pronounce this word. Another aspect was nativization. The Thais used truncation for this word.

“Want”

This word is pronounced /wɒnt/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /wɔn/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /w/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. The second aspect was consonant sound in the final position. The native speakers of English pronounce the /t/ sound at the end of this

word but the Thais omit it because in Thai language there is no stress on the final sound.

"Work"

This word is pronounced /wɜ:k/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /wɤ:k/. This word showed two aspects of linguistic feature. The first one was consonant sound in the initial position. The /w/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. The second aspect was consonant sound in the final position. Native speakers of English pronounce the /k/ sound at the end of the word but Thais omit it.

"You"

This word is pronounced /ju:/ by native speakers of English but Thais pronounce it as /ju:/. This word showed one aspect of linguistic feature. It was consonant sound in the initial position. The /j/ sound appears in both English and Thai language. It did not cause any problems for the participants.

4.2 Research question 2: How do variations in research question 1 affect the level of intelligibility of English words used in Thai popular songs by listeners of various cultures? What are the factors of different levels of intelligibility?

"Air"

"Air" was understood by all participants. The following table shows the participants' scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Air	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants listened with one repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants requested repeat twice.

The participants' confidence was also shown in this study. The T1 participant showed confidence of listening to this word. She could answer the word right after she listened to the song. However, the rest of Thai participants (T2 and T3) hesitated when listening to this word. The T2 participant stated that this was a fast-paced song. She was unsure that she could get it correct when listening to the entire song.

The T3 participant also expressed that his hesitation happened because he was not familiar with the song. However, he could get the answer when the entire song was played.

Concerning the non-native speaker of English who were-non Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants, their hesitation was expressed in aspects of repeat. Familiarity was not a factor of understanding this word.This word was understood by all participants even though the number of repeat and level of confidence were different because the vowels in English and Thai were near equivalent to each other. As a result, the participants had no problem when listening to this word.

"Baby"

"Baby" was understood by all participants except the Singaporean and the Canadian participant. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Baby	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. In contrast, the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants asked for repeat once. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song twice. After listening, the Singaporean and the Canadian participants did not understand this word.

In terms of confidence, the T1 participant had confidence of listening to this word. She could answer the word right after she listened to the song. Conversely, the T2 and T3 participants showed little hesitation when listening to this word. The T2 participant stated that she thought the singer did not sing clearly to her but she could get the answer when listening to the entire song.

The T3 participant also expressed that he was not familiar with this song so that he waited until he listened to the end of the song to understand what the singer sang.

All non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants also showed hesitation when listening to this song. However, all of them finally understood this word except for the Singaporean and the Canadian participant. The Singaporean participant wrote down his answer as

"bobby" whereas the Canadian participant understood it as "body". Both participants expressed that they had no idea what the singer sang exactly. As a result, they guessed from the sound they thought they understood their answers appeared as stated above.

In a nutshell, it could be seen that familiarity with Thai language was a factor of understanding this word. The participants who were familiar with Thai language could get the answer correctly. However, the participants who were unfamiliar with Thai language did not understand the word correctly.

"Ball"

"Ball" was understood by all participants except for the Singaporean and the Canadian participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Ball	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants needed one repeat whereas the Singaporean and all native speakers of English participants requested to listen to this song twice.

Concerning level of confidence, the T1 participant had confidence of listening to this word. She could answer right after she listened to the word. However, the T2 and T3 participants showed little hesitation when listening to this word. Both

similarly stated that the word occurs in the fast-paced song and they were unsure what the singer sang until they listened to the entire song to get a message.

Conversely, the non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants showed level of hesitation differently. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants had little hesitation and waited until the end of the song to write down the answers. However, the Singaporean participant showed he was unsure about the word he listened to. His answer to this word was "bom" expressing that it was from a guess only.

The native speakers of English participants also showed hesitation because all of them waited until the end of the song to write down the answers. The American and the British participants explained that they could guess this word because they seemed familiar with it as they heard their Thai colleagues spoke. However, the Canadian participant could not understand this word and left his answer blank.

In short, familiarity with Thai language was a factor of understanding this word as shown by the number of correctness, repeat and confidence. The Singaporean and the Canadian participants had the lowest level of exposure to Thai language. As a result, both of them could not understand this word as other participants.

"(Num)ber"

This word was understood by all participants except for the Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
(Num)ber	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants listened to this song with one repeat. In contrast, the Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants requested for repeat twice.

In terms of level of confidence, the T1 participant showed she was confident when listening to this word as she could get it right after she listened to the song. In contrast, the T2 and T3 participants had little hesitation when listening to this word. The T2 participant expressed that she was firstly unsure if this word was ‘blur’ or ‘ber’. She, therefore, decided to wait until she listened to the entire song. The T3 participant revealed that he did not understand this word if listening to the word only but he got the answer from guessing from context clues in the songs.

The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants showed different level of hesitation as well. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants showed little hesitation when listening to this word but the Singaporean participant showed that he was not confident when listening to this song. The Singaporean participant left this word blank as an answer.

The native speakers of English participant also showed hesitation when listening to this song. All of them waited until the end of the song to write down the answers. The American participants guessed this word might be pronounced “bird” whereas the British participant stated she thought it was “birth”.

In short, it was undoubtedly that familiarity was a main factor of understanding at this point. However, unclear utterance to the participants in this song might be a variable in this song.

"Blur"

This word was understood by all participants except for the Singaporean and the Canadian participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Blur	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x

Thai participants listened to this word without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants listened to the song with one repeat. However, the Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants requested repeat twice.

In terms of level of confidence of Thai participants, the T1 participant showed no hesitation when listening to the song. However, the T2 and T3 participants showed hesitation.

The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants also showed hesitation when listening to the song. All of them waited until the end of the song to write down the answers.

Again, it could be seen that the participants who had close exposure to Thai language, culture, and people, could understand this word easier than the ones with limited exposure.

"Boyfriend"

This word was understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Boyfriend	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Native Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants listened to the song once. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song twice.

With regards to the level of confidence, the T1 participant did not hesitate when listening to this song. She could provide the answer right after she heard the word. The T2 and T3 participants showed little hesitation when listening to the song.

The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants also showed hesitation when listening to the songs. All of them waited until the end of the song to write down the answers.

In sum, the participants who had close exposure to Thai language, culture, and people, presents that they understood the use of English in Thai songs better than the participants who had limited exposure.

"Bye"

"Bye" was understood by all participants except for the Canadian participant. The following table showed the participant's scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Bye	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants requested repeat only once and the native speakers of English participants listened to the song twice.

The degree of confidence was also different. This is to say, the T1 listened to this song with full confidence as she could write down the answer right after she listened to the song. Conversely, the T2 and T3 participants showed little hesitation when listening to the song. Both stated that they intended to wait until the end of the song.

The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants also showed hesitation as they could answer after the song was over.

In terms of the native speakers of English participants, the American and the British participants showed hesitation but they could answer correctly. They stated that they tried to guess from the sound and it was clearer after watching the music video. Regarding the Canadian participant, he showed hesitation even when he wrote down the answer. He understood this word as "bi".

Results in listening to this word showed that the participants who had close exposure to Thai language, culture, and people, understood better than the participants who had limited exposure. Also, if an English word in other languages was similar to the use of English in the participants' first languages, they also understood as well.

"Care"

This word was understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Care	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

The Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. However, the non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants listened to this song with one repeat and the native speakers of English participants requested repeat twice.

In terms of level of confidence, Thai participants listened to the song with no hesitation. All of them could write down the answers right after they heard the word. In contrast, the nom-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants showed hesitation as all waited until the end of the song before writing down the answers. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants stated that they wanted to make sure they understood correctly. The Singaporean participant mentioned that he understood this word because he also used this word in Singaporean contexts. The American and the British participants

understood this word because they heard their Thai colleagues used it. However, the Canadian participant was only person who admitted that he guessed from the sound he heard and also interpreted the meaning from a music video he watched.

In brief, the word "care" showed that the participants who were familiar with the use of English by Thais understood better than the ones who had limited familiarity with the use of English by the Thais.

"Celeb(rity)"

This word was understood by all participants except for the Canadian participant. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Celeb(rity)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x

Thai participants listened to this word without repeat. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants requested repeat once and the native speakers of English participants listened to the song twice.

Regarding level of confidence, Thai participants had no hesitation when listening to this song. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants showed hesitation as all of them waited until the end of the song to write down the answers.

Undoubtedly, it could be seen that the participants who were familiar with the use of English in Thai language understood this word better than the ones who had

limited exposure. In this study, Thai participants, the Chinese participant, the Vietnamese participant, the American participant, and the British participant were familiar with Thai language. As a result, they could understand this word. However, the Singaporean participant stated that he understood this word because this word was also used in Singaporean context especially among teenagers. The Canadian participant was only person who did not understand this word as he left the answer blank. He stated that he did not hear this word was shortened in use before and he could not even guess near equivalence of this word when listening to the song.

"Charge"

This word was understood by all participants except for the Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants. The following table showed that participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Charge	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants listened to this song with one repeat and the native speakers of English participants listened to the song twice.

Concerning level of confidence, it was undoubtedly that Thai participants had confidence when listening to this song. All of them could write down the answers after they heard the word. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants showed little

hesitation but they could write down the answers when the song was over. The Singaporean and all native speakers of English participants hesitated when listening to this song. They took more time after the song was over to write down the answers. All of them understood this word as “chart”.

It could be seen that the participants who were familiar with the use of “charge” by Thais understood this word correctly. In contrast, the participants who were not familiar with this word used by the Thais could not understand this word correctly. Also, it could be said that the final sound of the word was also a factor of understanding this word.

“Check”

This word was understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants’ scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Check	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants needed repeat once and the native speakers of English participants asked for repeat twice.

In terms of level of confidence, Thai participants were confidence when listening to this word. They could answer right after they heard the word. The non-

native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants and the native speakers of English participant showed hesitation when listening to this song.

Even though the consonant sound in the initial and the final positions were different from native English, all participants could understand this word because they could understand this word. Thai participants were familiar with their own mother tongue. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants including the American and the British participants were familiar with this word. As a result, they understood this word easily. The Singaporean and the Canadian participants understood this word from guessing of the sound.

"Cheer"

This word was understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Cheer	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this word without repeat. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants listened to this song with one repeat and the native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

Regarding level of confidence, Thai participants had confidence when listening to this word. In contrast, the non-native speakers of English who were non-

Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants showed hesitation as they waited until the end of the song to write down the answers.

It could be seen that linguistic features of this word was not a factor of understanding. However, it could also see that the participants who were familiar with the use of English in Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure and familiarity.

"Chill (out)"

This word was understood by all participants except for the Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Chill (out)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants listened to this song with one repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

Concerning level of confidence, the T1 participant listened to this song without hesitation whereas the T2 and T3 participants showed little hesitation. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also showed hesitation when listening to this song. They spent more time after the song was over before writing down the answers.

Conversely, the Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants seemed to lack confidence when listening to this song. The Singaporean participant could not provide the answer. The American and the British participants understood this word as “chew” whereas the Canadian participant did not understand this word as same as the Singaporean participant.

It could be seen that nativization was a factor of understanding. This is to say, nativization changed linguistic features from native context. In this word, it was shortened to “chill”. This caused some participants not to understand it. Also, it could see that the participants who understood this word must have close exposure to Thai language.

“Clear”

This word was understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants’ scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Clear	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants listened to this song with one repeat and the native speakers of English participants requested repeat twice.

Regarding level of confidence, Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants showed

little hesitation before writing down the answers. The native speakers of English participants also showed little hesitation.

In this word, it could be seen that consonant cluster was not a factor of understanding. However, the number of repeat and level of confidence revealed that the participants who had close exposure to Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Click"

This word was understood by all participants except for the Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants. The following table showed the participants' cores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Click	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants listened to this song with one repeat. The Singaporean participant and the native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

In terms of level of confidence, it was undoubtedly that Thai participants had no hesitation when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answer. The Singaporean

participant and all native speakers of English participants hesitated to write down the answers.

The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants thought this word is pronounced “kick” because the singer pronounced only /k/ sound and omitted /l/ sound. Also, they did not pronounce the consonant sound in the final position. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants stated that they could understand this word when watching music video. At first, they also confused if this word could be “kick” as well.

“Condo”

This word was understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants’ scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Condo	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants did not need any repeat also. The Singaporean participant needed one repeat and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song twice.

The level of confidence varied. Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. Similarly, the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also showed confidence when listening to this song. However, the Singaporean participant

and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before they wrote down the answers.

It could be seen from the analysis of this word that the participants who were familiar with Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Confirm"

This word was understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Confirm	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. Similarly, the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song with no repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with one repeat.

Regarding level of confidence, Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants were also confident in listening to this song. In contrast, the Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants revealed little hesitation when listening to the song.

It could be seen that this word did not cause any problems for the participants as all of them could understand. However, the number of repeat and level of confidence showed that the participants who had close exposure to Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Crazy"

This word was understood by all participants except for the Canadian participant. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Crazy	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants understood this song after one repeat and the native speakers of English participants listened to this song twice.

Concerning level of confidence, Thai participants had no hesitation when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also had no hesitation of listening. However, the Singaporean participant, the American participant, and the British participant presents little hesitation before writing down the answer. In contrast, the Canadian participant had no confidence when listening and writing down the answer. He stated that he could not catch what the singer sang.

Also, he mentioned that watching music video of this song could not help him understand this word. As a result, he could not write down the answer.

"Date"

This word was understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Date	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants requested one repeat and the native speakers of English participants listened to this song twice.

In terms of level of confidence, Thai participants listened to this song without hesitation. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants showed little hesitation. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants waited until the end of the song before they wrote down the answers. The Singaporean participant spent more time after the song was over to write down the answer. The native speakers of English participants also showed hesitation. The American and the British participants showed little hesitation whereas the Canadian participant showed more hesitation before answering.

It could be seen that this word was not a problem for the participants to listen to and understand. The participants who had close exposure to Thai language could

understand this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Enjoy"

This word was understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Enjoy	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants listened to this song with one repeat and the native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

With reference to the level of confidence, Thai participants showed confidence when listening to this song. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen this word was not difficult for the participants to understand. The number of repeat and the level of confidence showed that the participants who had close exposure to Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Everything"

This word was understood by all native Thai participants only. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Everything	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

In terms of level of confidence, Thai participants did not hesitate when listening to this song including when writing down the answers. In contrast, the non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants revealed that they had no confidence when listening to this song. This is to say, they thought a lot before writing down the answers. They also stated that watching music video of this song could not help them understand what the singer sang.

It could be seen that a word with more than one or two syllables seemed to create a problems for the participants especially ones that were different from native English and mother tongues of the participants. In this case, it could be seen that only native Thai participants understood this word. This meant familiarity to Thai language was not a factor of understanding this word.

"Fair"

This word was understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Fair	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also needed no repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants asked for repeat only once.

Regarding level of confidence, Thai participants had confidence when listening to this song. Similarly, the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also had no hesitation when listening to this song. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation when listening to this song. This is to say, they waited until the end of the song to write down the answer.

It could be seen that this word caused no problems for the participants. Thai participants, the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants, had close exposure to Thai language. As a result, they understood this word easily. The Singaporean participant stated that he understood this word because he used it in Singaporean context as well. The American and the British participants mentioned that they understood this word because they got used to their Thai colleagues' pronunciation. The Canadian participant stated that he understood this word because he also used it in his context and he also added that the singer sang quite clear to him.

"Fan"

This word was understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Fan	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. Similarly, the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened without repeat. The Singaporean and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

Their level of confidence varies. Thai participants listened to this song with confidence as same as the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answer.

It could be seen that this word was easy for the participant to understand. The number of repeat and level of confidence also confirmed the participants' understanding.

"Feel"

This word was understood by all participants except for the Singaporean and the Canadian participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Feel	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants listened to the song with one repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants requested repeat twice.

Thai participants were undoubtedly confident in listening to this song as they could provide the answers right after they heard the word. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also performed similarly after a repeat. The American and the British participants also wrote down after the second repeat as expressed that they wanted to make sure they understood correctly. The Singaporean and the Canadian participants were only two persons who did not understand this word. Both thought that this word should be “few”.

It could be seen that this word created a problems for some participants because the singer did not pronounce the consonant sound in the final position. The Singaporean and the Canadian participants, therefore, thought of another word. However, it revealed that the participants who had close exposure to Thai language could understand this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

“Firm”

This word was understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants’ scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Firm	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Fit"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Fit	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word. Even though the Thais omitted the final sound, the participant could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Form"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Form	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Free"

This word was understood by all participants except for the Canadian participant. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Free	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants listened to this song once and the native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers. The Canadian participant understood this word as "fee" because the singer omitted the sound /r/ when singing.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for all participants except for the Canadian participant. This could be explained that the Canadian participant was not familiar with this word used by Thais. He, therefore, could not understand it.

"Game"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Game	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Happy"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Happy	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants listened to this song once and the native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

"Hello"

This word was understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Hello	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Hi5"

This word was understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Hi5	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

Thais, the Chinese and the Vietnamese, the American, and the British participants stated that they were familiar with this word. The Singaporean and the Canadian participants, in contrast, revealed that they understood this word due to two reasons. The first one was that they guessed from the first syllable when listening to audio. They fully understood when watching music video because the motion in the music video also showed the Hi5 chatting program.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants. The participants were familiar with it and could understand this word. Also, the number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

“Hit”

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants’ scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Hit	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Hot"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Hot	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"In(ner)"

This word was understood by native Thai participants only. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
In(ner)	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. In contrast, the non-native speakers of English who were-non Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

Thai participants totally understood this word both sound and meaning. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants understood what the singer sang but could not provide correct meaning to the context. This is similar to the American and the British participants. However, the Singaporean and the Canadian participants did not understand this word totally.

It could be seen that nativization was a factor of understanding. This is to say, nativization changed linguistic features from native context. In this word, it was shortened to "in". This caused some participants not to understand it. Also, it could see that the participants who understood this word must have close exposure to Thai language.

"Kiss"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Kiss	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

Thais, the Chinese, and the Vietnamese participants could understand this word since listening to audio file. However, the Singaporean and all native speakers of English participants understood this word because of the story of the music video they watched.

It could be seen that this word showed different level of understanding. Some could understand from listening and some needed visual perception for understanding.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Like"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Like	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Love"

This word was understood by all participants except for the Singaporean and the Canadian participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Love	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants and all native speakers of English participants showed hesitation before writing down the answers.

Thai participants understood this word because they had close exposure to their own mother tongue. However, the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants understood this word because of their familiarity to Thai language as well. The American and the British participants revealed that they understood this word because they heard their Thai colleagues spoke. This was different from the Singaporean and

the Canadian participants because they did not understand this word at all. Both could not provide the answer of this word neither listening to audio file nor watching music video.

It could be seen that this word created a problems for the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language because they could not understand this word at all. Put another way, voicing in native English was important in different one word from another.

"Man"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Man	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Match"

This word was also understood by all participants except for the Singaporean and the Canadian participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Match	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

Thai participants also showed the highest level of confidence as they could write down the answers right after they heard the word. Conversely, the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants showed little pause before writing down the answers. This was different from the Singaporean and all native speakers of English participants because they were not confident when listening to this word.

Thais, the Chinese, the Vietnamese, the American, and the British participants could provide all correct answers. Thai participants were close to exposure to Thai language. As a result, they could answer correctly without doubt. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants revealed that they got used to this word when communicating with Thai friends. The American and the British participants stated that they understood this word because they heard their Thai colleagues spoke.

It could be seen from the analysis of this word that the participants who had close exposure to Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"(Re)mem(ber)"

This word was understood by native Thai participants only. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
(Re)mem(ber)	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. In contrast, the non-native speakers of English who were-non Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

Thai participants totally understood this word both sound and meaning. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants understood what the singer sang but could not provide correct meaning to the context. This is similar to the American and the

British participants. However, the Singaporean and the Canadian participants did not understand this word totally.

It could be seen that nativization was a factor of understanding. This is to say, nativization changed linguistic features from native context. In this word, it was shortened to “in”. This caused some participants not to understand it. Also, it could see that the participants who understood this word must have close exposure to Thai language.

“Message”

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants’ scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Message	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problem even though the consonant sound in the final position was replaced.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Mouth"

This word was understood by all participants except for the Singaporean and all native speakers of English participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Mouth	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants listened to this song with one repeat. The Singaporean and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

Also, Thai participants showed confidence when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese were reluctant before writing down the answers. The Singaporean and all participants were unsure what the singer sang.

The Singaporean and all native speakers of English participants guessed this word should be "mouse". The music video did not help them understand this word because no motion linked to this word.

It could be seen that the participants who had close exposure to Thai language understand this word but the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language did not understand it.

"No"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants even though diphthong was replaced by monophthong. The non-Thai participants revealed that the replaced vowel was similar to diphthong in native English. As a result, they had no problem when listening to this song.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"O(K)"

This word was understood by native Thai participants only. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
In(ner)	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. In contrast, the non-native speakers of English who were-non Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

Thai participants totally understood this word both sound and meaning. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants understood what the singer sang but could not provide correct meaning to the context. This is similar to the American and the British participants. However, the Singaporean and the Canadian participants did not understand this word totally.

It could be seen that nativization was a factor of understanding. This is to say, nativization changed linguistic features from native context. In this word, it was shortened to "in". This caused some participants not to understand it. Also, it could

see that the participants who understood this word must have close exposure to Thai language.

"OK"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
OK	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because it was commonly used in all contexts of all languages. The participants, therefore, had no problem with this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"On"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
On	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants. The participants stated that the singer sang clearly to them. Also, it was possible to explain that this word was used in common context of all languages so that the participants were familiar with it.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Out"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Out	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants. The participants stated that the singer sang clearly to them. Also, it was possible to explain that this word was used in common context of all languages so that the participants were familiar with it.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Party"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Party	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Perfect"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Perfect	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Return"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Return	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Sad"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Sad	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Say"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Form	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Share"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Share	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants even though consonant sound in the initial position was replaced by near equivalent sound in Thai language. Thai participants had close exposure to Thai language. As a result, they understood this word correctly. The Chinese and the Vietnamese

participants also had high level of exposure to Thai language. Both participants, therefore, understood this word as well. The American and the British participants stated that they understood this word due to familiarity of this word from their Thai colleagues. The Singaporean and the Canadian participants revealed that their understanding came from guessing of the sound.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Shock"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Shock	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that

same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants even though consonant sound in the initial position was replaced by near equivalent sound in Thai language. Thai participants had close exposure to Thai language. As a result, they understood this word correctly. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also had high level of exposure to Thai language. Both participants, therefore, understood this word as well. The American and the British participants stated that they understood this word due to familiarity of this word from their Thai colleagues. The Singaporean and the Canadian participants revealed that their understanding came from guessing of the sound.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Show"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Show	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants even though consonant sound in the initial position was replaced by near equivalent sound in Thai language. Thai participants had close exposure to Thai language. As a result, they understood this word correctly. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also had high level of exposure to Thai language. Both participants, therefore, understood this word as well. The American and the British participants stated that they understood this word due to familiarity of this word from their Thai colleagues. The Singaporean and the Canadian participants revealed that their understanding came from guessing of the sound.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Spec(ification)"

This word was understood by native Thai participants only. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Spec(ification)	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. In contrast, the non-native speakers of English who were-non Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

Thai participants totally understood this word both sound and meaning. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants understood what the singer sang but could not provide correct meaning to the context. This is similar to the American and the British participants. However, the Singaporean and the Canadian participants did not understand this word totally.

It could be seen that nativization was a factor of understanding. This is to say, nativization changed linguistic features from native context. In this word, it was shortened to "in". This caused some participants not to understand it. Also, it could see that the participants who understood this word must have close exposure to Thai language.

"Style"

This word was understood by all participants except for the Singaporean and all native speakers of English participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Style	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. Similarly, the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song with no repeat. The Singaporean and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

Undoubtedly, the level of confidence varied. Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. This was the same as the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants because they also had confidence when listening to this song. The Singaporean and all native speakers of English participants were not confident when listening to this song. They showed that they were unsure when writing down the answers. All of them could not provide the answer and left it blank.

It could be seen that the participants who had close exposure to Thai language could understand this word even though it was stressed in the first syllable by the Thais. In contrast, the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language did not understand this word. However, the American and the British participants who had a certain level of exposure to Thai language did not understand this word. They stated that they were not familiar with this word pronounced in this way by Thais.

"Surprise"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Surprise	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants even though the second sound of the consonant cluster in the second syllable was omitted. As a result, they had no problem when listening to this song.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Sure"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Sure	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants even though diphthong was replaced by monophthong. The non-Thai participants revealed that the replaced vowel was similar to diphthong in native English. As a result, they had no problem when listening to this song.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Taxi"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Taxi	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Trend"

This word was understood by all participants except for the Singaporean and the Canadian participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	Participant								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Trend	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

Regarding the level of confidence, Thai participants were confident when listening to this song as they could write down the answers right after they heard the word. The Chinese and the Vietnamese also presents similarly. This is to say, they also had confidence when listening to this song and could write down the answers once heard the word.

The Singaporean and all native speakers of English participants understood this word as “ten”. All stated that they misunderstood because the singer omitted the /r/ sound. As a result, they understood it as “ten”.

It could be seen that the participants who had close exposure to Thai language could understand this word whereas the participants who had limited exposure to Thai participants did not understand it. Put another way, the more the participants knew linguistic features used by Thais, they understood the use of English in Thai popular songs better than the participants who had limited knowledge of Thai language.

"TV"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
TV	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"(O)ver"

This word was understood by native Thai participants only. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
(O)ver	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. In contrast, the non-native speakers of English who were-non Thai participants and the native speakers of English participants listened to this song with two repeats.

Thai participants totally understood this word both sound and meaning. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants understood what the singer sang but could not provide correct meaning to the context. This is similar to the American and the British participants. However, the Singaporean and the Canadian participants did not understand this word totally.

It could be seen that nativization was a factor of understanding. This is to say, nativization changed linguistic features from native context. In this word, it was shortened to "in". This caused some participants not to understand it. Also, it could see that the participants who understood this word must have close exposure to Thai language.

"Want"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Want	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

In addition, even though the consonant sound in the final position was not pronounced, it could be seen that the participants also understood this word easily.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"Work"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
Work	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

"You"

This word was also understood by all participants. The following table showed the participants' scores.

Word	**Participant**								
	T1	**T2**	**T3**	**C2**	**V1**	**S1**	**A1**	**B1**	**C1**
You	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Thai participants listened to this song without repeat. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also listened to this song without repeat. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants listened to this song with only one repeat.

It was definitely understood that Thai participants were confident when listening to this song. The Chinese and the Vietnamese participants also revealed that same. The Singaporean participant and all native speakers of English participants showed little hesitation before writing down the answers.

It could be seen that this word did not create a problems for the participants because the consonant sound in the initial and in the final positions could occur in both English and Thai. As a result, the participants were familiar with it and could understand this word.

The number of repeat and level of confidence also presents that the participants who were close to exposure of Thai language understood this word better than the participants who had limited exposure to Thai language.

From the above report, it could be sum up in general with the following tables. The first table started with consonant sounds in the initial position.

Participant	**Total**	**Correct answer**	**Incorrect answer**
T1	69	69	0
T2	69	69	0
T3	69	69	0
C2	69	69	0
V1	69	69	0
S1	69	69	0
A1	69	69	0
B1	69	69	0
C1	69	69	0

It could be seen that all participants understood all words even though replacement of sounds occurred. The next table referred to consonant sounds in the final position.

Participant	Total	Correct answer	Incorrect answer
T1	11	11	0
T2	11	11	0
T3	11	11	0
C2	11	11	0
V1	11	10	1
S1	11	5	6
A1	11	10	1
B1	11	9	2
C1	11	1	10

It could be seen that sounds in this position created various types of problems to the participants when replacement was used. This is to say, the participants understood each song differently.

The next table presents the scores of the participants on consonant cluster sounds when insertion happened.

Participant	Total	Correct answer	Incorrect answer
T1	3	3	0

T2	3	3	0
T3	3	3	0
C2	3	2	1
V1	3	2	1
S1	3	0	3
A1	3	2	1
B1	3	1	2
C1	3	0	3

This table was similar to the previous one because insertion of sound in consonant clusters also created problems to the participants in different ways. The following table revealed similarly that omission of consonant cluster sounds also led to different level of understanding.

Participant	**Total**	**Correct answer**	**Incorrect answer**
T1	8	8	0
T2	8	8	0
T3	8	8	0
C2	8	7	1
V1	8	6	2
S1	8	3	5
A1	8	4	4
B1	8	3	5

C1	8	2	6

Vowel sounds were also created problems to the participants differently. The following table showed the scores that reflected the participants' level of understanding when monophthong was used to replace English vowels.

Participant	**Total**	**Correct answer**	**Incorrect answer**
T1	6	6	0
T2	6	6	0
T3	6	6	0
C2	6	5	1
V1	6	4	2
S1	6	4	2
A1	6	4	2
B1	6	4	2
C1	6	3	3

In addition, replacement of diphthong to English vowels could create different levels of understanding to the participants as shown by the scores on the following table.

Participant	**Total**	**Correct answer**	**Incorrect answer**
T1	22	22	0

T2	22	22	0
T3	22	22	0
C2	22	21	1
V1	22	21	1
S1	22	20	2
A1	22	20	2
B1	22	20	2
C1	22	18	4

Apart from the above aspects, voicing was also another aspect that should be explored. It could be seen that the participants understood voiceless sounds better than voiced sounds because it was not existed in Thai language. This was presents through the scores of the participants on the following table.

Participant	**Total**	**Correct answer**	**Incorrect answer**
T1	7	7	0
T2	7	7	0
T3	7	7	0
C2	7	7	0
V1	7	7	0
S1	7	7	0
A1	7	6	1

B1	7	5	2
C1	7	3	4

Finally, nativization was taken into account. This study significantly revealed that the participants who had close exposure to Thai language understood nativization better than the participants who had less or limited exposure to Thai language. The following table presents the participants' scores that reflected this aspect.

Participant	**Total**	**Correct answer**	**Incorrect answer**
T1	8	8	0
T2	8	8	0
T3	8	8	0
C2	8	8	0
V1	8	8	0
S1	8	3	5
A1	8	5	3
B1	8	4	8
C1	8	0	8

To sum up, it could be seen that songs had positive elements. In World Englishes, the focus was mainly on the differences of varieties of English from standard English. However, this research revealed that even though the use of English

in songs was different from standard English, people could understood it as in the consonant sounds in the initial position.

Analysis of exposure to Thai language, culture, and people

Apart from the above word analysis, exposure of Thai language, culture, and people should be taken into consideration.

The exposure of Thai language, culture, and people played a significant role in this study. The participants who had high exposure of Thai language, culture, and people were more familiar with Thai language and the use of English in Thai language.

It was obviously seen that Thai participants had the highest level of exposure of Thai language because Thai was their mother tongue. This means they used Thai language in daily life in every context and setting. As a result, the Thais were familiar with Thai language, culture, and people the most.

Considering the number of answer, Thai participants was only group that could provide all correct answers. Even though their level of confidence was different, their high level of exposure and familiarity with Thai language led them to understand all words in this study.

Regarding the non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants, they revealed different level of exposure of Thai language, culture, and people. According to the background, the Chinese participant had the highest level of exposure of Thai language, culture, and people. This correlated with her correct scores as well because she was the only participant who could earn the highest correct

scores in this group. Even though she mainly needed one repeat, she could answer the majority of words correctly.

The Vietnamese participant was another person who had exposure of Thai language, culture, and people. Even though his exposure of Thai language, culture, and people seemed to be high, his background on age and experience could not compare to the Chinese participant. Simply put, the Vietnamese participant was only fifteen years old and was a student. The Chinese participant, in contrast, was thirty five years old and worked with Thai colleagues. It was obviously that they Vietnamese participant had less exposure of Thai language compared to the Chinese participant.

However, the Vietnamese participant's correct answers remained high. Even though he sometimes requested to listen to the songs twice, he finally understood the words.

The Singaporean participant was the only person of this group who had limited exposure of Thai language, culture, and people. From his background, it could be seen that he was not familiar with Thai language, culture, and people. This revealed on his scores because he obtained the lowest scores among others in this group.

The results of the non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants could confirm that exposure and familiarity of Thai language, culture, and people helped the participants obtained high level of understanding of the use of English in Thai popular songs.

With reference to the native speakers of English participants, the American participant seemed to be the person who had the highest exposure to Thai language,

culture, and people. Comparing her scores to other participants in the same group, she got the highest scores. Her familiarity to Thai language through her colleagues could be a choice.

The British participant had less exposure of Thai language than the American participant. Even though she also worked with Thai citizens, she had limited level of familiarity with Thai language. Her scores showed that she obtained little less than the American participant.

The Canadian participant was the only person who had limited exposure of Thai language and culture. Due to his background, he had never been in touch with any aspect of Thai language. His scores supported this phenomenon because he got the lowest score and he did not understand some points even though he listened to and repeated twice.

Analysis of age

Age could be a variable of this study. The participants' age was wide range from fifteen to sixty years old.

The results of the study revealed that the participants at younger age enjoyed listening to songs more than the senior participants. However, age only could not confirm that the senior participants could understand the use of English in Thai popular songs better than the younger ones.

According to the participants' scores, it could be seen that age did not a factor of understanding. In terms of Thai participants, the T2 participant who was older than the T3 participant showed more confidence in listening activity.

In terms of the non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants, the Chinese participant showed the highest level of understanding even though she was older than the Vietnamese participant.

Regarding the native speakers of English participants, the American participant who was older than the British participant understood the use of English in Thai popular songs better than the British participant.

This is possible to mention that age was not a factor of understanding the use of English in Thai popular songs but the exposure and familiarity of Thai language, culture, and people was.

Analysis of gender

In this study, gender could be as another variable of understanding. This is to say, the female participants revealed that they understood the use of English in Thai popular songs better than the male participants. Their scores showed that the female participants provided higher correct answers than the male participants.

Analysis of occupation

The participants of this study included various occupations. Those were engineer, immigration officer, interpreter/translator, marketing officer, programmer, and student.

In this study, the results showed that occupation was not a factor of understanding. The engineer was a Singaporean participant. He was the only person of the group who held the lowest level of understanding because he had limited exposure to Thai language, culture, and people.

The immigration officer, the British participant, understood the use of English in Thai popular songs but her level of understanding was less than the American participant who worked as a marketing officer.

The interpreter/translation, the T2 and the Chinese participants, understood the use of English in Thai popular songs well. The T2 understood better than the Chinese participant because she was a native Thai.

The programmer was a native Thai participant. This participant also understood the use of English in Thai popular songs but his confidence in listening was less than other native Thai participants.

The students included Thais, the Vietnamese and the Canadian participants. Thais and the Vietnamese participants understood the use of English in Thai popular songs well but the Canadian participant, in contrast, understood less than both participants. Thais understood better than the Vietnamese participant undoubtedly.

Analysis of educational background

The educational background was not a factor of understanding. This is to say, the participants who had higher education might not understand the use of English in Thai songs whereas the participants who had less educational background might understand better. For example, the Vietnamese participant was only a high school student but he could understand the use of English in Thai popular songs better than the Singaporean participant.

It could be stated that this study revealed that familiarity was the main factor of intelligibility. This is to say, the more the participants were familiar with Thai

language, culture, and people, the more they understood the use of English in Thai popular songs.

Familiarity occurred when the participants had frequent contact to Thai language, culture, and the people.

4.3 Research question 3: What are the participants and lyricists' attitudes towards the use of English in Thai popular songs?

In the researcher's perspectives, the participants should reflect positive, negative and neutral attitudes towards the use of English in Thai popular songs. In addition, the lyricists may also have different viewpoints using English in Thai popular songs as well. The researcher, therefore, decided to ask for opinions from the general audience participants and the lyricists to reflect their thoughts and reasons of using English in Thai popular songs in details. The attitudes were collected from the interview and questionnaire as shown on the following section.

Interview

Interview presents the attitudes of the use of English in Thai popular songs from the general audience participants and also from the lyricists. The first part captured on thoughts of the general audience participants. The interview questions can be seen in Appendix L.

Attitudes of the general audience participants

The general audience participants revealed various points during the interview. Those viewpoints could be classified into positive and negative points and no neutral attitudes occurs in the interview as hypothesized.

Positive attitudes

The first part talked about positive attitudes towards the use of English in Thai popular songs. All the positive attitudes included the possibility of mixture of English for all languages, modernity, educated ground, motivation and encouragement for language learning, vocabulary acquisition, and bringing Thai songs to the international market.

Possibility of mixture of English for all languages

The participants expressed positive attitudes towards the use of English in Thai popular songs that it could be applied to any language and not only to Thai language. Examples below show how the participants think about this point.

The T1 participant stated that her experience of listening to all kinds of music in Thai and foreign languages led her to understand that English could be mixed in all languages not only for Thai language as she could see English is mixed in the songs in different languages such as Korean and Japanese. She thought that it was not new because English is used in daily life in the present day.

Similarly, the T2 participant also has the same thought as the T1 participant. She stated that English can be used in any contexts in the present day because English

is an international language and we cannot avoid using English in our lives. She has no doubt if English is mixed in songs of other languages as well. Jan expressed that English is an international language of the world today. It is used in all contexts and it is not a surprise if English is mixed in the songs of other languages as well.

Modernity

The participants believed that the use of English by people of any other non-native language users referred modernity because English is today's international language and it is used in people's every day life in different settings and contexts.

The T1 participant reflected her attitudes on modernity that the mixture of English in Thai language, popular songs or even in other languages led to modernity. She stated that she felt good when she spoke in English as she felt she's non-Thai. She also added that she was proud that she could speak English as she was viewed modern.

In addition, the T2 participant supported the T1 participant's attitudes by expressing her favor towards modernity. The T2 participant stated that she likes the mixture of English in Thai popular songs because she felt that she was modern when listening to or singing those songs. She stated that speaking in English looks modern and better than others in Thai society. Also, English indicates modernity and trendy in the society. People prefer ones who have English language proficiency to the ones who have not because English is modern and trendy.

The T3 participant echoed this point that he compared modernity with other contexts such as in news report. People who have good English language proficiency

are viewed modern. He stated that he has limited experience and knowledge of songs. He, therefore, compared to other contexts such as news report. He thought that people with good English language proficiency should be viewed as modern people.

In terms of non-native speakers of English who are non-Thais, the Chinese participant strongly agreed that people who can communicate in English well are viewed modern. She also mentioned about the Chinese society today that even though Chinese people are proud of speaking Chinese, they realize the importance of English in the present day especially for new generation. English is important for their lives such as studying in a good institution and working in a higher position. She stated that she understood that English language proficiency is very important and creates good impression. English shows that a language user is modern. In Chinese society, people are proud of speaking Chinese as it is their identities but the new generation realizes the importance of English because they can study in a good school if they have good English proficiency. They can also work in a higher position if they can speak English. It is important in China in the present day. English is important for them to be seen as modernity.

Similarly, the Vietnamese participant agrees with the Chinese participant that English is an indicator of modernity. He stated that English is important in Vietnam in the present day. People are fond of the ones who can speak English well. They have a feeling on those people that they are modern than others in the society. He expressed that in Vietnam it is very important today that Vietnamese people should know English because English shows modernity of the language users in Vietnamese society.

This is partially agreed by the Singaporean participant. Even though he agreed that English shows modernity of the language users, English is not new to him and to Singaporean people because they must speak English well no matter which accents they are.

With regards to the native speakers of English participants, they are only group that did not see English is modern for the language users. In their view, English is a language of daily life and they could not see anything new to them. However, they did not refuse that English is important to the people all around the world.

The American participant stated that it depended on individual's viewpoint on English. As a native speaker of English, she did not see anything new to her language but not refuse it is important nowadays as an international language.

The British participant also agreed with the American participant that native speakers of English did not see that using English in the world today is new to them. However, she realized that it is a must for all of us as we must communicate each other especially the ones from different mother tongues in English.

Similarly, the Canadian participant also expressed that the use of English in a language is modern because the users could open their world to access many kinds of information.

In general, it could be seen in this point that no matter who they are, they see the use of English in any language modern.

Educational background

Apart from modernity, the mixture of English is seen as an indicator of educational background. Thais and the non-native speakers of English who are non-

Thai participants had similar attitudes but the native speakers of English viewed it as a common practice in daily life.

The T1 participant revealed that English is important to her as it indicated her educational background. She stated that if she told others that she had English background and could communicate in English, she was viewed an educated person.

The T2 participant also has a similar view to the T1 participant. She expressed that English is an indicator of education. She mentioned that people who know English or study English is viewed educated in Thai society.

This is also similar to the T3 participant who agreed that English is important in Thai society in the present day. In his case, he is trying to improve English language skill as well because he understands that English shows educational level of each person. If he knows English better than others, it means he is educated. In addition, it is a gateway for better life in terms of further study and career path.

In terms of non-native speakers of English who are non-Thai participants, the Chinese participant was another participant who agreed that English is an important factor of educational level. She expressed that students in China try in improve their English language skill to get good profile in education. In doing so, they are marked educated persons.

In addition, the Vietnamese participant is another person who strongly agreed that English is an educational level marker. He stated that it is important in Vietnamese society that new generation must be good at English. People who are able in English communication are viewed educated. He expressed his view that in Vietnam, the new generation must have great English background. When they apply for further study, they expect the best school. If they are good at English, they get a

chance to study in a good school. If they apply for a job, they also need a great one. English is one of the requirements.

Furthermore, the Singaporean participant is the participant who also expresses that English is important in marking educational level. He stated that there are high competitions in Singapore. Even though the majority of Singaporean can speak English, they still require individuals who are native-like.

Concerning the native speakers of English participants, they showed the same attitudes that they did not think English shows educational background to the users as it depended on their overall knowledge rather than focusing on language only.

In a nutshell, this part showed different aspects. Thai participants and the non-native speakers of English who are non-Thai participants viewed that English is a tool to confirm their educational level; however, the native speakers of English participants did not see this point important to them.

Learning benefit

Learning benefit involved two aspects: motivation and vocabulary acquisition. The participants viewed songs as a good device for language teaching and learning because songs encouraged learners to learn a language as they brought languages closer to their lives. For example, the T1 participant saw that songs care motivate and encourage learners to learn new languages especially the ones who like listening to songs. She provided examples of herself that she also learned languages from listening to songs of the target languages mainly. She gradually acquired languages and she felt that this is also an effective strategy to new learners. Her statement that reflected this point is shown below.

In terms of non-native speakers of English who are non-Thai participants, the Chinese participant viewed mixture of songs in language learning created a friendly setting for learners. She stated that a friendly setting motivates learners to learn quickly and effectively. It can be seen that the participants who viewed this point important are Thais and the non-native speakers of English who are non-Thai participants. Even though not all of them expressed this aspect, they showed greater attitudes that it is interesting to add songs in to a classroom.

In contrast, the native speakers of English participants did not see using English in a language motivated learners because they could learn from different medium. For instance, Helen expressed that she could acquire Thai language through talking to her colleagues and maids.

Even though the participants viewed the use of English in a language differently, it also had advantages on vocabulary acquisition. The participants stated that learning English through songs help the language learners acquire new vocabulary from the songs and applied them to their daily life communication. The following examples showed the participants' thoughts.

The T1 participant stated that learning through listening to songs help acquire new vocabulary. In her case, she also acquired vocabulary when listening to songs. She explained that when she heard new vocabulary, she searched for translation and meaning. She learned from this action a lot.

The Chinese participant agreed with the T1 participant that learning through songs help learners acquire new vocabulary quickly. She explained that if listening to one song a day, we got one new vocabulary a day. If we did every day, it meant we learned a lot.

The American participant also agreed in this way. She stated that when she was a language teacher in Thailand, she noticed that students liked listening to songs. If we added it in language teaching, it could be more effective for them.

In short, it seemed that the participants agreed that the use of English in a language could help learners learn new vocabulary from listening to songs.

Bringing Thai songs to the international market

The participants revealed that the mixture of English in Thai songs could bring Thai popular songs to international entertainment market. Also, it might draw audiences' attention on Thai songs and create new kinds of songs if mixed with songs of other cultures. The following examples expressed the thoughts of the participants. However, only Thai participants reflected this point.

The T1 participant stated that using English in songs could bring us to the world. Foreigners knew Thailand and Thai language more. She expressed that mixture of English in Thai songs is good to present Thai culture to the world. She also added that the mixture leads to understanding of the foreigners on Thai language and cultures.

Negative attitudes

Apart from the positive side, the participants revealed another side of thoughts, negative perspectives towards the use of English in Thai songs. Even though they saw advantages of the mixture, they also realized that everything had both sides. This part presents negative attitudes towards the use of English in Thai popular songs.

All the negative attitudes included damage the beauty of music, ruin of language and identity, and different pronunciation from native English.

Damage the beauty of music

The participants felt that a mixture of English in Thai songs damaged the beauty of music. They thought that it would be good for some songs to have pure language. The T3 participant expressed his thought that he liked listening to some songs with pure Thai language composed. He felt English mixtures in Thai lyrics is strange to him personally. He also added that he believed that mixtures of English and Thai together caused confuse to audiences.

Ruin of language and identity

The participants revealed that mixture of English and Thai ruined the language and identity. They mentioned that the audiences might listen to broken English and Thai such as pronunciation and grammar. In case of young audiences or teenagers, they might imitate and use broken language in daily life communication. It could lead to misunderstanding and miscommunication at the end if the songs were not exactly unclear.

The T2 participant stated that the continuing of mixture of English in Thai songs may cause a problem with teenagers when they use broken language unconsciously and value it. She though that English words sometimes were not well-mixed in Thai songs.

Different pronunciation from native English

In accordance with different English from native context, Thais participant saw that some singers sang and pronounced inappropriately.

The T2 participant expressed her thought that teenagers today see the celebrities as their models. This is another point that the singers should realize and practice themselves to appropriate pronunciation of both Thai and English.

The T3 participant also revealed this thought that he accepted the mixture of English in Thai songs but he thought that the singers should receive a good training on pronunciation in Thai and English before they release a song.

In general, it was interesting to learn from the general audiences that even though they accepted mixture of English in Thai songs, they could see some impacts of the use.

From all attitudes, it could be seen that no matter how positive or negative they were, the participants who are familiar with Thai language could provide more thoughts on the use of English in Thai rather than the ones with limited familiarity.

Attitudes of the lyricists

The following part discussed about the lyricists' attitudes toward the use of English in Thai songs. The researcher analyzed the lyricists' attitudes and the interview questions can also be found in Appendix G.

The lyricists also held both positive and negative sides of the perspectives. Similarly, the lyricists expressed no neutral attitudes towards the use of English in Thai songs. The attitudes of the lyricists could be classified into six groups: influence

of other cultures, impact on international audience, impact on Thai language, and learning benefits.

Positive attitudes

The lyricists also had positive and negative of the mixture of English in Thai songs. In terms of positive attitudes, they expressed five points – influence of other cultures, necessity of mixing English in the songs, impact on international audience, impact on Thai language, and learning benefits.

Influence of other cultures

The lyricists stated that the mixture of English in Thai songs was not new but a typical characteristic and phenomenon of the songs today. The lyricists revealed that they expected to see their audiences especially young teens to use mixture of English in Thai songs due to the development of the songs all the time in the present day.

The lyricists accepted that influence of other cultures such as K-Pop was a factor of song composition. They used English in their works to succeed in the market and serve the audiences' needs.

The L1 lyricist expressed this idea that he thought Thai society accepted this trend due to western culture influences. He also added that English is easier to rhyme with the words in lyrics. This is similar to the L2 lyricist who echoed that he accepted that the audiences liked mixtures of English in the songs and it was a reason he inserted English in his composition. Also, he viewed that it was not strange to the

lyricists to add English in Thai songs if others could use English in Thai language in other contexts.

The L3 lyricist reflected that it was good to share and exchanged our own cultures to other cultures if we wanted to spread ours globally. He listened to various genres of songs and those were his models or inspiration of his composition. The mixture of English in his songs was to entertain the audiences.

Necessity of mixing English in Thai songs

The lyricists also stated that mixture of English is necessary in their works. Even though it was not a must, it could, for example, go along well with melody.

The L1 lyricist reflected that he thought it depended on a song he was composing. It was fine to him no matter if English was inserted into his songs. He viewed English was just a part of his composition.

Similarly, the L2 lyricist saw that it was not a must to have English in the songs but no one said it was useless.

The lyricists also explained that sometimes mixture of English in Thai songs occurred because it is a commercial marketing and promotion to draw audiences' attention.

The L2 lyricist expressed this idea that he inserted English into his songs because a producer preferred. He could not avoid this demand because it linked to a singer's appearance as well.

The L3 lyricist also reflected similarly that the demand and proper of a producer was a must to follow as it was a singer's appearance or what they called

‘concept’ which indicated income and popularity of the singer and the production team.

Impact on international audience

In addition, the lyricists added that mixture of English in the songs could help foreign audiences understand Thai songs and it sometimes drew attention of the listeners. However, they stated that the mixture of English went well case by case only.

The L1 lyricist revealed this point that he thought foreign audiences might be interested in Thai songs if the lyricists used English in the songs. His attitude is similar to the L3 participant who expressed that the mixture of English in Thai songs conveyed Thai messages to foreigners.

Impact on Thai language

Also, the lyricists saw that English was useful to Thai society. The L1 lyricist expressed on this point that he thought it was useful for teens especially for ones who are good at English because they easily understood the message.

Similarly, the L2 lyricist also reflected that he thought it was fine if English was appropriate use in the contexts. The L3 lyricist added this point that mixture of English and Thai was fine as everything always changed. Music was unable to avoid the changes as well. Mixture of English in the songs also changed as time went by. The songs should match the audiences’ needs in each period.

Learning benefits

Finally, learning benefit is one of the aspects that the lyricists agreed with the participants. They thought that the mixture of English could improve their English skills even though it was only part of them. The L2 lyricist expressed that he thought some audiences might learn new vocabulary, phrases, or else from the songs. If they were inserted more in it, they might search for meaning and translation. This also helped them improve language skill.

The L3 lyricist also agreed with the L2 lyricist that the mixtures helped the listeners familiar with English and some of them could learn new vocabulary and meaning later on.

Negative attitudes

Even though the lyricists stated positive viewpoints of the mixture of English in Thai songs, they also revealed impact of this phenomenon in similar way.

The L1 lyricist expressed that he thought a coin had both sides. If we were worrying about how the audiences perceived his works on the mixture of English, he could say some might like it and some might not. If we preferred to teenagers, they might like it. If they talked about the adults, they might not. He thought that it was an impact on audiences' perceptions and it reflected on how the mainstream accepted composition styles.

This is similar to the L2 lyricist that he thought it was an impact if the audiences did not realize the lyricists' intentions. Not different from the L3 lyricist, he expressed that main impact was about the society not the audiences. If the society did

not accept, it was the lyricists who decided if they wanted to serve the mainstream or create something new and wait for acceptance.

Reasons of mixing English in the compositions

Apart from the attitudes of the use of English in Thai songs, the lyricists were asked for the reasons of mixture of English in their compositions. The following part discussed about this in details. The data was collected from the interview and the questions could be seen in Appendix M.

Fashionable and easy to remember

The lyricists stated that they used English in their works because they wanted them to be fashionable and easy to remember. Also, they thought the mixture could create entertainment of the songs.

The L1 lyricist stated that it was a choice to make songs outstanding like “Too Much So Much Very Much” in his view. Similarly, the L2 lyricist thought that mixture created something new and interesting to the audiences if mixing English in the songs. The audiences might remember easily.

The L3 lyricist agreed that if English could replace some Thai words and keep original meaning, it should be fine and interesting.

Rhyme

In addition, the lyricists stated that they used English because they wanted to find words that could be rhymed well with the Thai lyrics. They stated that it was sometimes difficult to find a good rhyme in Thai language. If they did not use English, rhyming would sound funny.

The L2 lyricist reflected that he used English because it rhymed well with others in the lyrics. Also, it matched well with the contexts. The L3 lyricist agreed with Beer that he thought it was easier to use English especially songs theme words such as ‘love’. If he wanted to emphasize some words like ‘no’, he normally used English instead of Thai. For example, he preferred the singers to sing ‘no no no’ instead of ‘ไม่ ไม่ ไม่’.

Deep meaning expression

Furthermore, the lyricists stated that English could express deep meaning rather than Thai language because English was used as a keyword of the lyrics. In doing so, it caused outstanding of the songs.

The L1 lyricist stated that if he wanted to repeat a word in his song, he definitely used English as a key word. For example, he used ‘baby’ rather than ‘ที่รัก’.

The L2 lyricist expressed this point that it sounded more emphasis when using English because it was different from others in Thai language.

English for fast-paced songs

Apart from the above reasons, the lyricists revealed that they used English mainly for fast-paced songs because it went along well with this kind of song. Also, it

created enjoyable setting and some viewed it a new kind of song. The following example was received from their thoughts. The L3 lyricist reflected that fast-paced song was good for the mixture of English because it created enjoyable setting for audiences.

Specific target groups

Moreover, the lyricists used English for specific target groups especially for teenagers. They thought that the teenagers understood English the best than other groups of audiences. The following example showed the claim.

The lyricists stated that they mainly used English words rather than phrases, clauses and sentences because words were easy to understand and used in daily life. Ham stated that he sometimes used nativization in his songs such as ‘mem’ from ‘remember’. Beer reflected similarly that he used simple words that the listeners got used to such as ‘OK’ and ‘love’.

Questionnaire

Apart from interview, the general audience participants were also asked to complete a questionnaire. Questionnaire also presents the attitudes of the use of English in Thai popular songs of the general audience participants but they have more time to think about the attitudes they might not reflect during the interview. The questionnaire can be seen in Appendix N.

The results of this part are interesting because the participants provided only additional positive attitudes without any negative to be discussed. The additional

points from the participants include natural source, better feeling expression, and globalization.

Natural source

Songs are a natural source in the view of the participants as everyone listens to the songs in daily life. They expressed that using natural source of different contexts for language learning is a good idea because this helps the language learners realized how people use English in daily life. In addition, they could realize the differences of English, or varieties of English, and understand others more and better. The following statements echoed from the participants' thoughts.

The T1 participant stated that she thought this was a good way of language learning and it would be greater if songs could teach clearer and correct pronunciation and grammar because the learners could use it in daily life.

The Chinese participant also reflected similarly that song was another natural source she could think of. She knew that some of them did not accept songs as a good device for language teaching. However, if we opened our minds and used something new, that should be a great way for learners.

Better feeling expression

The majority of the participants also viewed the use of English in songs can express feeling better than using a local language on some words. They stated that English was helpful in expression better than a local language because it is easier to understand. In addition, some words of a local language are too long to be added in the songs. In case of Thai language, for example, the word 'care' was more easily

understood by all Thais non-Thai listeners when used in song lyrics rather than using a Thai word “ใส่ใจ”. The following examples are retrieved from the participants’ answers.

The T1 participant reflected that some Thai words were too long for communication. Some did not understand to the others. She thought that some English words were more understandable and no need for explanation.

Also, the Vietnamese participant agreed that in Vietnam, Vietnamese people used short English words in the contexts. For example, the word ‘OK’ and ‘care’ were used in daily life and they did not need any Vietnamese language to explain what those words meant. They understood when they used it.

The Chinese participant stated that Chinese people mixed English and Chinese in their contexts. The older generation used only Chinese but the new generation mixed both languages. They felt it was easier to communication using English as it was easier to pronounce and express the feeling.

Globalization

Some participants expressed positive attitudes towards globalization. They stated that using English in a local language showed that the language users and their contexts such as people and society are open to the world.

The T1 participant stated that it was good to see Thai people were more open to the world by inserting English in mass media.

The American participant reflected her thought that she thought that foreigners like her understood what Thai people were conveying. Even though it was not 100% understandable but native speakers of English understood.

Knowledge of World Englishes

Another part of this study was to ask the participants about their knowledge of "World Englishes" in order to know if they realize the existence of varieties of English. Most of the participants admitted that they had never heard this word before. When they were asked to guess, the answers revealed several different opinions.

The participants revealed that they did not hear about World Englishes before attending this study. They had no idea about it but they guessed that World Englishes is English as a world language.

Due to having limited knowledge of World Englishes, the participants were asked their preference between native English and varieties of English for a classroom. The native speaker of English preferred native English to be taught as she viewed it as a model for learners. On the other hand, non-native speaker of English who is non-Thai thought that integration of native English and varieties of English should give the greatest advantage. She said that native English could be presents in terms of grammar and writing, whereas varieties of English should be taught together with native English as a speaking skill.

From the above results, it is believed that native language is an important factor of learner's pronunciation of foreign accents. If the learners are familiar with the sound system of their native language, they will be able to find their own difficulties and overcome those difficulties by raising the awareness on their own learning (Kenworthy, 1987). This is to say, first language interference tends to cause errors in aspiration, intonation, rhythm, and melody in the target language.

To sum up, the participants have different degrees of understanding English in Thai songs. In this study, all of them were familiar with Thai-English but at different levels. It also proved that native English was not only one to easily understand (Smith, et al., 1982). However, they could understand all words, no matter both pronunciation and meanings. Nativization was also a key point that influenced the participants' confidence in understanding English in Thai language. They seemed to understand the vocabulary but they could not understand the meaning.

The participants expressed positive, negative and neutral attitudes towards the use of English in Thai songs. Some viewed it as modern and educated while others felt that it could destroy the language and the identity of the language if people absorb it unconsciously.

The lyricists are slightly different from general audiences because they hold positive attitudes towards the use of English in songs. That is a reason why they add English in their compositions even though there are a lot of external factors related.

Comparison of the attitudes from general audiences and the lyricists shows that positive and negative attitudes can occur. It depends on who perceives the songs and in which contexts they are used.

4.4 Research question 4: What are the similarities and differences between participants and lyricists' attitudes?

Both general audiences and lyricists expressed similar and different attitudes towards the use of English in Thai songs. Both groups held positive and negative of using it but not neutral.

Similarities

The general audience participants and the lyricists shared the similarities of the thoughts in various ways. However, the two outstanding points from both groups referred to influence of other cultures and learning benefits.

Influence of other culture

The general audience participants and the lyricists viewed the mixture of English in Thai songs similar to each other that it is an influence from other cultures, English, in this case. The mixture of English in Thai popular songs occurred when we had contact with western cultures. As a result, we received, adapted and used English in Thai language since then. English is mixed in Thai language in the majority of contexts such as social media, news and songs.

Learning benefits

The participants and the lyricists viewed the use of English in Thai popular songs benefits to the language learners. They stated that using songs in language learning helped the learners especially the ones who liked songs acquired a target language quicker. For example, they could acquire new vocabulary from listening to songs. When they encountered new words they did not know, they extended their learning by searching for meanings or translation.

In addition, songs encouraged and motivated them to learn at any time. As songs are easy to access and created entertainment setting, learning a language could

be more friendly and it seemed the learners opened their minds to new languages more and better.

Differences

In terms of differences, the general audience participants and the lyricists viewed many points differently. The following points showed in greater details.

Modernity vs necessity of mixture

In terms of the general audience participants, they viewed the using of English in Thai popular songs and in Thai language modern. They expressed that if they could communicate in English, they were viewed modern and more accepted in the society. English is an indicator to classify one from another. An individual with English language proficiency is viewed in a positive way such as modern rather than the ones with limited language proficiency.

In contrast, the lyricists saw the use of English in Thai popular songs necessity to mix it in the songs due to commercial issues and appearances of the singers. The lyricists mentioned that if a producer prefers them to add English into songs, they must follow. This related to commercial issue and proper of appearances of the singers. It is also necessity to add in without any reason if the producer viewed it is suitable for a piece of work.

Impact on Thai vs impact on others

The general audience participants focused their attitudes on impact on Thai language which influenced from others. For example, they thought that mixture of

English in Thai popular songs have changed the way we used the language such as we spoke English and Thai instead of pure Thai only. In addition, we mixed English in various contexts such as in teaching and mass media.

In contrast, the lyricists viewed that creation of mixture of English in their compositions might influence foreigners if they are in contact to Thai language, people and cultures. For example, if they listen to Thai song and understand some of them, they may learn Thai words and some parts of cultures of Thai popular songs and even Thai cultures in general as well.

In a nutshell, all the participants have similar and different attitudes towards the use of English in Thai popular songs depending on their experiences and viewpoints. The same issues can be thought similarly if participants share the same experiences. On the contrary, they can be seen differently if their backgrounds are various.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final chapter of the study presents the conclusion of the findings, offers pedagogical implications and provides suggestions for further studies.

5.1 Conclusion

The whole study has presented different levels of understanding of the use of English in Thai popular songs that each group of participants holds. Frequent contact with Thai language was a main factor of familiarity and language acquisition. Participants who were in frequent contact with Thai language, culture, and people understood English used by Thais better than the ones who had less contact with Thai language and people.

The other factors of understanding were linguistic features – consonant, consonant cluster, vowel and voicing – that are different between English and Thai. The more differences of linguistic features the participants knew, the more they understood the use of English in Thai popular songs. In contrast, if the participants had limited knowledge, their understanding was also limited.

Thais use replacement strategy for consonant sounds in the initial and in the final positions, vowel sounds and voicing quality and also use insertion and omission strategies for consonant cluster sounds. These strategies lead to differences of the use of English in Thai language which leads to different levels of understanding. The more the differences are close to native English and the participants' mother tongues, the more the participants understood.

Nativization was also a linguistic feature found in this study. Nativized processes include truncation, conversion, and semantic shift. Truncation was mainly observed in this study because the majority of words that have undergone nativized process are shortened from the original words in English. Conversion and semantic shift happened at a quarter each type.

Participants held positive and negative attitudes towards the use of English in Thai popular songs. In terms of positive attitudes, they viewed it as modern and educated when mixing English in Thai popular songs and language. Ability to communicate in English is preferred in Thai society. English is also an indicator of classifying people. A person who can communicate in English is viewed modern and educated in the Thai society.

Participants also expressed negative attitudes towards the use of English in Thai popular songs and language. They said that the mixture of English in Thai popular songs ruined the beauty of language and also identity. The mixture of English in Thai popular songs created a new type of language that was neither native English nor native Thai. As a result, it ruined both languages.

The lyricists revealed that they inserted English in Thai popular songs because of producers' consideration of singers' physical appearances and characteristics. However, the lyricists think that insertion of English in Thai popular songs helps language learning such as vocabulary acquisition.

The participants and the lyricists expressed both similar and different viewpoints. Each person held particular perspectives depending on their experience and thoughts on a particular thing, person and issue.

5.2 Pedagogical implications

The integration of English in Thai popular songs is significance in the study of varieties of English as it provides an insight into the pedagogical aspects through the singers' linguistic choices and the participants' understanding. The results of this study can lead to useful recommendations on language learning and teaching. The researcher recommends songs for language learning and teaching due to several benefits. One of those are songs create enjoyable settings.

Songs are believed to be one of the good materials for language learning and teaching. This is to say, songs provide various advantages to the learners to acquire a language. For example, if a teacher plays songs at the beginning of the class, it creates The integration of English in Thai popular songs is significant in the study of varieties of English as it provides an insight into the pedagogical aspects through the singers' linguistic choices and the participants' understanding. The results of this study can lead to useful recommendations for language learning and teaching. The researcher recommends songs for language learning and teaching due to several benefits. One of those benefits is that songs create enjoyable settings. Songs are believed to be good materials for language learning and teaching. They provide advantages to learners as while learning a language. For example, if a teacher plays songs at the beginning of the class, it creates a relaxed atmosphere for learners and prepares them with happiness and joy to study. If students like songs, they will be motivated to learn more. Songs also change a classroom setting from boring to interesting due to rhyme and rhythm and draw the students' attention the students to content because it is lively and cheerful.

However, careful consideration is required when selecting songs. Teachers must consider factors before selecting songs into classroom. They must carefully examine contents to be taught. If teachers want to teach vocabulary, they should select songs that introduce texts on vocabulary they want learners to learn. Teachers should also think about the level of language proficiency of the students. They must assess the learners' ability before selecting songs for effective teaching because not every song can be used in the classroom due to content and appropriateness. Similarly, teachers should consider the age of the learners because each age prefers different songs. For example, teenagers like contemporary or popular songs but adults may like country or folk songs. Teachers should also take cultural issues into account. They cannot rely on their own cultural norms but should teach learners to know different cultures through songs. In doing so, students learn something new and raise their awareness of different cultures.

Attitudes are also important to language teaching and learning. Teachers should take attitudes on varieties of English into account. Teachers can use this information for selecting songs to suit students' abilities and interests. Attitudes of participants can be the beginning of the awareness and consideration when selecting songs for language teaching because songs have benefits and impacts at the same time. Conversely, unclear pronunciation of some Thai singers may affect students' pronunciation in daily life and lead to unsuccessful communication or create a problem during conversations. If teachers choose songs for language teaching, they must ensure that the selected songs are clear and suit the students.

It would be even greater if teachers encouraged students to select songs themselves, bring in, and share with their peers. In doing so, students gain motivation

and learn how to work individually and in groups. Also, students are encouraged to learn a language because they get involved in selection as they choose of their own volition.

Self-selection supports learner-centered education. Sarobol (2012) found that students like cooperative learning because they accomplish the assignment by sharing different language abilities and ideas. It is better if students get involved in the lesson as much as possible as it increases motivation and positive attitudes towards learning a language. Teaching should be based on students' needs or demands. They should be assigned to do group work and individual assignments as much as possible. If teachers assign students to choose their own songs and learn new vocabulary from those songs, students will acquire a lot of new words and learn easily.

Teachers should foster students to learn and realize the differences of linguistic features used in a language including all aspects of varieties of English as much as they can. In doing so, students familiarize themselves with various linguistic features. It is also a benefit to students when they react to others in daily life. If students are familiar with varieties of English, they can listen to their conversational counterparts better and accommodate themselves effectively.

The following section discusses pedagogical implications from the results of this study. These include raising the awareness of varieties of English, teaching pronunciation, and material selection. The following part provides information on each topic.

5.2.1 Raising the awareness on varieties of English

Language users can raise their awareness of varieties of English

by perceiving the use of language characteristics and functions of language mixtures. Previous studies found that the number of non-native speakers of English has been increasing. English of non-native speakers of English is unique. Results of this study revealed differences in linguistic features. As a result, raising awareness is one implication of this study.

Different levels of understating presented in this study lead language users to raise their awareness of varieties of English. Language users understand that English belongs to everyone in the world and not only to native speakers of English any longer. They realize that each individual has unique English accents and characteristics. This should be a springboard of awareness and acceptance of the differences when language users have contact with each other. They should not judge others only on where they are from or on their English language use because everyone speaks English in a unique way.

Awareness comes from familiarity. Teachers should select and provide various types of English linguistic features for students. In doing so, students gain familiarity and understand that each English variety is unique. Raising awareness is a useful point to start studying linguistic features of each variety. It is also beneficial for teachers to emphasize students' understanding of English pronunciation. Teachers are able to compare Standard English and varieties of English to students and provide advantages and impacts of each type. They should also be able to indicate the problems arising from the use of English without realization and awareness. For example, if students have no awareness of varieties of English and stick to native English only, they may have communication problems when talking to non-native speakers of English. In contrast, if students realize that there are varieties of English,

they can learn and adapt themselves to the conversational counterparts better. For example, they learn to recognize various accents.

It is believed that students should be familiar with different varieties of native and non-native accents. Each institution should include varieties of English in the curriculum and assessment should be fairly based on those differences. Each teacher should be trained to understand varieties of English in order to facilitate students' language development in different settings especially when they are not in a native speaking setting. Overall, conducting a needs analysis is a must before setting up a course in order to know which variety students are using and how a teacher can integrate each variety into a classroom.

Even though native English is considered standard, students should have a choice to choose if they want to focus on native English, varieties of English, or integration of both. It depends on their current circumstances and future expectation. It would be better if students are familiar with and open their minds towards varieties of English. This should be embedded since pre-school level for better pronunciation, cognitive development, creativity, critical thinking, and higher scores on standardized tests.

The results of this study disclose that the participants agree with the awareness of mixing English in Thai language and also other languages. Mixing English in other languages has advantages to language learners because they know that the use of English in each language is different from others. Learners should raise their awareness so they can effectively adapt their English to their conversational counterparts.

Degrees of contact and familiarity are important to language

learning and teaching because the more the learners are familiar with the language, the more they understand. Contact and familiarity with a language can be a springboard to language learning and teaching. Teachers should be aware of varieties of English and add them into materials such as textbooks and classroom activities as much as they can. This helps students realize, raise awareness, and understand different types of English such as accents, dialects, pronunciation and sentence structures. This is a benefit to students because it is unpredictable who they will encounter and communicate with in daily life. If they meet native speakers of English but they speak English with their own characteristics, the conversational counterparts may not understand them and this lead to communication failure. In contrast, if the students understand native English, they can adapt their way of speaking to their conversational counterparts better. Not only is the communication successful, but it makes a good first impression as well. Nativization, for example, relates to communication and making a good impression. Teachers can raise students' awareness of varieties of English and different ways of usage in other languages. Students should be aware of the differences so that they can adapt themselves to the contexts well when communicating with others.

Raising awareness leads to effective communication because students can understand and adapt themselves when communicating with people from different mother tongues with different characteristics of English such as accents and pronunciation.

In general, if students know many varieties of English, they are familiar with English well and can communicate effectively. If they know a language English is mixing with, they benefit from knowing both English and that language.

For example, if students know Thai language and they find English words mixed in the language, they can better understand English words in Thai.

5.2.2 Teaching pronunciation

Participants were concerned about different pronunciation of native speakers of English and Thais. This was a good start for teaching pronunciation because it can be clearly seen that the participants saw various types of English pronunciation. As a result, the researcher realized that teaching pronunciation with various accents in classrooms should be a benefit to the learners.

Teaching pronunciation is an important practice arising from this study. Previous studies revealed that native and non-native speakers of English and among non-native speakers of English themselves did not understand each other, especially due to pronunciation. This study showed that misunderstanding comes from different linguistic features. Therefore, pronunciation should be taught both on native English and varieties of English.

In teaching pronunciation, teachers should use authentic materials to enable students to listen to many accents. This is to facilitate the students with varieties of English so they can raise the awareness and recognize accents. In doing so, students step close to the highest degree of understanding.

Teaching pronunciation can be done with various ways. Firstly, the use of technology may help students improve their pronunciation effectively and with fun. Teachers or institutions may create or adapt software to use in a language classroom. This will create a friendly setting and good software may indicate students' level of language that leads them to find a proper solution for themselves.

Secondly, teachers should provide good example to students to avoid mispronunciation that leads to communication breakdown. Teachers should assign appropriate and proper assignments and continuously provide feedback to students.

Training and practice on pronunciation is a must for students in a long term plan as they can lose it along the way if they do not use it. Teachers should integrate pronunciation in all classrooms and activities to enhance students' abilities. Teachers should promote autonomous learning on pronunciation. They can let students learn based on their own interests such as watching movies, listening to music and chatting online.

Teachers do not need to pronounce like native speakers of English but they must be able to teach intelligible pronunciation. This is important to students because they will make themselves understand English well (Tominaga, 2009).

With different sound systems of English and Thai, pronunciation is the main issue of this study. The results of this study should lead teachers how to teach pronunciation effectively to language learners in terms of native and varieties of English to ensure they understand English well and accept the differences of others.

The differences of linguistic features of English and Thai are important for language learning and teaching. If learners understand and realize the systems and the differences of English linguistic features in each language, they understand the use of English in those languages better. If learners understand that the use of English linguistic features in Thai language is different from native English, they will realize and accept those issues well. It also leads to a higher degree of

understanding because the learners will accommodate themselves and gain their familiarity to the differences.

Linguistic features found in this study can be used in teaching pronunciation. Teachers should emphasize each sound when teaching pronunciation, especially problematic sounds such as consonant sounds in the final position and consonant cluster sounds. Consonant cluster sounds can create problems in pronunciation. Both insertion and omission were used with English sounds when Thais pronounced them. Both strategies were adapted from pronunciation in Thai language. Teachers should teach students that English and Thai are different in this aspect. Students should be aware of this and make their pronunciation clear.

Songs can be used for teaching pronunciation because they are natural sources and corpus of real language use.

5.2.3 Teaching vocabulary

The study revealed on participants and lyricists' belief that vocabulary acquisition can happen through songs. For example, the native Thai participant stated that learners could learn new vocabulary and also share it with their friends. Similarly, the Chinese participant viewed that using songs in language learning helped learners learn quicker. Even the native speakers of English participant agreed that using songs for Thai students could help them learn more proficiently.

Due to the various positive attitudes on vocabulary acquisition from songs, teaching vocabulary is also an implication arising from this study. Studies in the past showed vocabulary acquisition did not stay long term. Songs are a good device for teaching vocabulary and vocabulary acquisition because of rhyme and

rhythm. Rhyme and rhythm helps students remember vocabulary well and stay long term. Teachers should add songs into lessons so that students can practice with fun and remember vocabulary well. They should encourage students to look for meanings and synonyms of vocabulary. In doing so, students will be motivated to find songs with similar meanings and synonyms. They may expand their interest to other sources such as advisements.

5.2.4 Materials selection

The final implication is material selection. This study revealed that participants and lyricists held similar and different attitudes towards the use of English in Thai popular songs.

When selecting teaching materials, assessment of attitudes, interests, and preferences should be conducted before selection. Songs can be used as materials for language teaching and learning to show modernity and educational background. However, teachers must carefully consider for students because not all students are interested in songs. In this case, teachers should state the benefits of songs for language learning and find songs that suit students to motivate them. Teachers can also mix songs with other sources for more variety and effectiveness in language learning and teaching.

5.3 Suggestions for further studies

In this study, there are four limitations. The first one is that participants were purposively selected. The researcher purposively selected the participants to control the qualifications of the participants and ensure that they understood the aims of the

study well. In addition, the researcher was able to contact them after the study was over if further discussion was needed. However, this criterion might limit the results to a group of language users and could not generalize to the public. The researcher suggests that future researchers should expand the scope of the participants to be more general. Participants should be randomly selected from the public such as tourists. It may be more difficult to control but the results of the study can be used more to wider groups of people.

The next limitation is that all lyricists are males. The researcher would suggest that the future studies should include both males and females in each category.

Another limitation was that all of the non-native speakers of English who were non-Thai participants were Asian. The researcher suggests that future studies should include different nationalities such as from Europe and Africa.

The final limitation is that the lyrics were only from 2001 to 2014 only and retrieved from three national singing contest programs. Future researchers should expand lyrics to more general settings. For example, asking participants to name songs they think have English mixed in. It would be more generalizable to the public.

REFERENCES

Books and Book Articles

Adegbija, E. (2004). *The Domestication of English Language in Nigeria*. In A Feschrift in Honor of Adetugbo, A. Awonusi, S. & Babalola, E.A. (Eds.), Lagos: University of Lagos Press.

Ajzen, I. (1988). *Attitudes, Personality and Behavior*. Chicago: Dorsey Press.

Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern in Personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Ariyapitipun, S. (2003). *Introduction to Linguistics.* Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Printing House.

Avery, P. & Ehrlich, S. (1992). *Problems of Selected Language Group.* In Avery, P. & Ehrlich, S. In Teaching American English Pronunciation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Berelson, W. (1971). *Content Analysis in Communication Research*. New York: Routledge.

Bolton, K. (2004). World Englishes. In Davies, A. & Elder, C. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Bolton, K. (2009). Varieties of World Englishes. In Kachru et al (Eds.) *The Handbook of World Englishes*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Brinton, L. & Brinton, D. (2010). *The Linguistic Structure of Modern English* (2nd ed). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002). *World English*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bryson, B. (1990). *The Mother Tongue: English and How It Got That Way*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Celce-Murcia, M. & Brinton, D. M. & Goodwin, J. M. (1996). *Teaching Pronunciation: A Reference for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chunsuvimol, B. & Ronakiat, N. (2000). *Stylistic Variation of (f) and (v) in the English of Thai students*. Bangkok: Thammasat University, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Department of Linguistics.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, A. (2003). *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Denzin, N. K. (1970). *The Research Act in Sociology*. Chicago: Aldine.

Frith, S. (1992). The Industrialization of Popular Music. *Popular Music and Communication*. London: Sage.

Frith, S. (1999). Globalisation and the Third World. In Kiely, R. & Marfleet, P. (Eds.). London: Routledge.

Fromkin, V. & Rodman, R. & Hyams, N. (2007). *An Introduction to Language (8th ed.)*. Boston: Thomson Wadsworth.

Gardner, D. M. (1986). The Effect of Divided Attention on Attitude Change Induced by a Persuasive Marketing Communication. In Hass, R. M. (Ed.). *Science, Technology, and Marketing*. Chicago: American Marketing Association.

Gardner, R. C. (1983). Focus on the Learner: Pragmatic Perspectives for the Language Teacher. Rowley: Newbury House.

Harmer, J. (1993). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. New York: Longman.

Holmes, J. (2008). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.

Hornby, A. S. (2001). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hu, W. & Renadya, A. (Eds.), *Principles and Practices for Teaching English as an International Language.* New York: Routledge.

Hudson, R. A. (1980). *Sociolinguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jackson, A. (1982). *Analysing English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jones, D. (1988). *The Pronunciation of English*. (16th ed.). Cambridge: The University Press.

Jotikasthira, P. (1999). *Introduction to the English Language: System and Structure*. (2nd ed.). Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.

Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, Codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the Outer Circle. In *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*. Edited by Quirk, R. and Widdowson, H. G. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. (1992). The Other Tongue. *English Across Cultures* (2nd ed.). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, Y. & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian Contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kaplan, P. J. (1995). *English Grammar Principles and Factor*. (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Katamba, F. (1989). *An Introduction to Phonology*. London: Longman.

Kirkpatrick, A. & Saunders, N. (2005). The Intelligibility of Singaporean English: A Case Study in an Australian University. In Deterding, D. & Brown, A. & Ling, L. E. (eds.). *English in Singapore: Phonetic Research on a Corpus*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.

Kenworthy, J. (1987). *Teaching English Pronunciation*. Harlow: Longman.

Krippendorff, B. F. (1980). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. London: Sage.

Ladefoged, P. (1993). *A Course in Phonetics*. (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Harcourt Brace.

Lambert, J. (1980). *Social Psychology*. New York: Macmillan.

Lane, L. (1993). *Focus on Pronunciation: Principles and Practice for Effective Communication*. New York: Longman Publishing Group.

Loveday, L. (1986). *Explorations in Japanese Sociolinguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Low, E. L. & Azirah, H. (2012). *English in Southeast Asia Features: Features, Policy and Language in Use.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

McArthur, T. (1998). *The English Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an International Language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Medina, S. L. (2002). Using Music to Enhance Second Language Acquisition: From Theory to Practice. *Language, Literacy and Academic Development for English Language Learners.* Boston: Pearson Custom Pub.

Moore, G. (1969*). The Chosen Tongue*. London: Longman, Green and Co.

Moore, J. & Rodchue, S. (2005). *Colloquial Thai: The Complete Course for Beginners*.London: Routledge.

Murphey, T. & Maley, A. (1992). *Music & Songs.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nelson, M. & Kern, R. (2012). Language Teaching and Learning in the Postlinguistic Condition. In Alsagoff, L. & Mckay, S. L. & Hu, G. & Renadya, W. A. (Eds.). *Principles and Practices for Teaching English as an International Language.* New York: Routledge.

Pride, J. (1982). *New Englishes*. Rouley: Newbury House Publishers.

Quirk, R. (1962). *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing.

Roach , P. (2001). *Phonetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robins, R. H. (1970). *General Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rushdie, S. (1991). *Imaginary Homeland: Essays and Criticism 1981-1991*. New York and London: Viking.

Sarawit, M. E. (1984). *Linguistics for English Teachers of Thai Speakers – Part I Phonetics and Phonology*. Pitsanulok: Srinakharinwirot University.

Smyth, D. (2001). Thai Speakers. In Swan, M. & Smith, B. *Learner English: A Teacher's Guide to Interference and Other Problems*. (2nd ed.). London: Cambridge University Press.

Stockwell, P. (2002). *Sociolinguistics: A Resource Book for Students*. London and New York: Routledge.

Thomas, W. I. & Znanneicki, F. (1918). *The Polish Pleasant in Europe and American*.Boston, MA: Badger.

Todd, L. & Hanncock, I. (1986). *International English Usage*. London: Croom Helm.

Trudgill, P. (1992). *Introducing Language and Society*. London: Penguin Group.

Trudgill, P. & Hannah, J. (1994). *International English: A Guide to the Varieties of Standard English*. London: Edward Arnold.

Vandergrift, L. & Goh, C. (2012). *Teaching and Learning Second Language Listening: Metacognition in Action*. New Jersey: Routledge.

Wender, A. (1987). *Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy*. London: Prentic Hall International.

Wells, J.C. (1982). *Accents of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilkins, D. A. (1976). *Notional Syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

นันทนา รณเกียรติ (2548). *สัทศาสตร์ภาคทฤษฎีและภาคปฏิบัติ*. กรุงเทพฯ: สำนักพิมพ์มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์.

Articles

Abidin, M. J. Z. (2012). EFL Students' Attitudes towards Learning English Language: The Case of Libyan Secondary School Students. *Asian Social Science*. 8(2). pp. 119-134.

Ajibade, Y. & Ndububa, K. (2008). Effects or Word Games, Culturally Relevant Songs, and Stories on Students' Motivation in a Nigerian English Language Class. *TESL Canada Journal*. 25(2). pp. 27-48.

Babalola, T. & Taiwo, R. (2009). Code-switching in Contemporary Nigerian Hip-hop Music. *Itupale Online Journal of African Studies*. 1. pp. 1-26.

Baker, W. (2009). The Cultures of English as a Lingua Franca. *TESOL Quarterly. 43*(4). pp. 567-592.

Bao, Z. & Wee, L. (1998). Until in Singapore English. *World Englishes*. 17. pp. 31-41.

Bian, Y. W. (2009). Chinese Learners Identity in their Attitudes towards English Pronunciation/Accents. *CELEA Journal*. 32. pp. 66-74.

Bernaisch, T. (2012). Attitudes towards Englishes in Sri Lanka. *World Englishes*. 31(3). pp. 279-291.

Bofman, T. & Prez, P. (2008). Thai Pop Music: Corpus Analysis and Second Language Learning. *Journal of South East Asian Language Teaching*. 14. pp.1-21.

Breitkreutz, J. A. & Derwing, T. M. & Rossiter, M. J. (2001). Pronunciation Teaching Practices in Canada. *TESL Canada Journal*. 19(1). pp. 51-61.

Bresnahan, M. J. & Ohashi, R. & Nebashi, R. & Liu, W. Y. & Shearman, S. M. (2002). Attitudinal and Affective Response toward Accented English. *Language and Communication*. 22(2). pp. 171-185.

Burda, A. N. & Scherz, J. & Hageman, C. F. & Edwards, H. (2003). Age and Understanding Speakers with Spanish or Taiwanese Accents. *Perceptual & Motor Skills*. 97. pp. 11-20.

Burda, A. N. & Hageman, C. F. (2005). Perception of Accented Speech by Residents in Assisted Living Facilities. *Journal of Medical Speech-language Pathology*. 13. pp. 7-14.

Buripakdi, A. (2012). On Professional Writing: Thai Writers' Views on their English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 22(2). pp. 245-264.

Butler, S. (1999). A View on Standards in South-East Asia. *World Englishes.* 18. pp. 187-198.

Casey, D. & Murphy K**.** (2009). Issues in Using Methodological Triangulation in Research.*Nurse Researcher.* 16(4). pp. 40-55.

Chamcharatsri, P. (2013). Perception of Thai English. *Journal of English as an International Language*. 8(1). pp. 21-36.

Chan, J. Y. (2013). Contextual Variation and Hong Kong English. *World Englishes*. 32(1). pp. 54-74.

Cheng, F. (1998). The Teaching of Pronunciation to Chinese Students of English. *English Teaching Forum.* Jan-Mar. pp. 37-39.

Cheung, C. K. (2001). The Use of Popular Culture as a Stimulus to Motivate Secondary Students' English Learning in Hong Kong. *ELT Journal*. 55(1). pp. 55-61.

Chunsuvimol, B & Ronakiat, N. (2001). (v) Is really a Problem Sound for Thai Speakers. *Thammasat Review*. 6(1). pp. 177-195.

Chongning, X. (2009). Student Feedback to their Pronunciation Learning. *Teaching English in China-CELEA Journal*. 32(5). pp. 42-43.

Clatford, J. C. (1950). Intelligibility. *English Language Teaching.* 5(1). pp. 7-15.

Cogo, A. (2008). English as Lingua Franca: Form Follows Function. *English Today. 24*(3). pp. 58-61.

Cohen, R. (2005). English in Mongolia. *World Englishes.* 24. pp. 203-216.

Davidson, L. (2007). The Relationship between the Perception of Non-native Phonotactics and Loanword Adaptation. *Phonology.* 24. pp. 261-286.

Derwing, T. M. & Munro, M. J. (1997). Accent, Intelligibility, and Comprehensibility. *SSLA.* 20. pp. 1-16.

Derwing, T. (2003). What Do ESL Students Says about their Accents? *Canadian Modern Language Review*. 59. pp. 545-564.

Deterding, D. (2010). Norms for Pronunciation in Southeast Asia. *World Englishes.* 29. pp. 364-377.

Eken, D. K. (1996). Ideas for Using Pop Songs in the English Language Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*. 34. pp. 46-47.

Evans, B. E. (2010). Chinese Perceptions of Inner Circle Varieties of English. *World Englishes*. 29(2). pp. 270-280.

Fazio, R. H. (2007). Attitude as object-evaluation associations of varying strength. *Social Cognition.* 25(5). pp. 603-637.

Figueiredo, E. H. D. (2010). To Borrow or Not to Borrow: The Use of English Loanwords as Slang on Websites in Brazilian Portuguese. *English Today.* 26. pp. 5- 12.

Futonge, K. (2005). Using English Videos and Music in EFL, ESL Classroom. *ESL Magazine: Read & Publish ESL Articles*.

Gilakjani, P. A. (2012). A Study of Factors Affecting EFL Learners' English Pronunciation Learning and Strategies for Instruction. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 2(3). pp. 1-12.

Giles, H. (1970). Evaluation Reaction to Accents. *Education Review*. 20. pp. 211-227.

Glass, T. (2009). Why Thais Write to Other Thais in English. *World Englishes. 28*(4). pp. 532-543.

Guo, H. Y. (2007). Teaching English in the Songs of Music: Toward a Systemic Framework for Using English Songs in EFL Teaching. *Sino-US English Teaching*. 4(8). pp. 1-5.

Haggerty, G. & Hilsenroth, M. J. (2011). The Use of Video in Psychotherapy Supervision. *British Journal of Psychotherapy*. 27(2). pp. 193-210.

Hilgendorf, S. K. (2007). English in Germany: Contact, Spread and Attitudes. *World Englishes*. 26(2). pp. 131-148.

Hu, P. (2004). Adapting English into Chinese. *English Today*. 20(2). pp. 34-39.

Jarvella, R. J. & Bang, E. & Jakobsen. A. L. & Mees, I. M. (2001). Of Mouths and Men: Nonnative Listener' Identification and Evaluation of Varieties of English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 11. pp. 37-56.

Jenkins, J. (2005). Implementing an International Approach to English Pronunciation: The Role of Teacher Attitudes and Identity. *TESOL Quarterly*. 39(5). pp. 535-543.

Kabilan, M. K. & Adina, W. F. W. & Embi, M. A. (2011). Online Collaboration of English Language Teachers for Meaningful Professional Development Experiences. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*. 10(4). pp. 94-115.

Kachru, B. B. (1989). Teaching World Englishes. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics.* 15. pp. 85-95.

Kachru, Y. (2006). Mixers Lyricing in Hinglish: Blending and Fusion in Indian Pop Song. *World Englishes*. 25(2). pp. 223-233.

Kamper, H. & Niesler, T. R. (2014). The Impact of Accent Identification Errors on Speech Recognition of South African English. *South African Journal of Science*. 110(12). pp. 63-68.

Kang, O. & Rubin, D. L. (2012). Intergroup Contact Exercises as a Tool for Mitigating Undergraduates' Attitudes toward Nonnative English-Speaking Teaching Assistants. *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching*. 23(3). pp. 159-166.

Kanokpermpoon, M. (2007). Thai and English Consonantal Sounds: A Problems or A Potential for EFL Learning?. *ABAC Journal*. 27. pp. 57-66.

Karahan, F. (2007). Language Attitudes of Turkish Students towards the English Language and Its Use in Turkish Context. *Journal of Arts and Sciences*. 7. pp. 73-87.

Kenstowicz, M. & Suchato, A. (2006). Issues in Loanword Adaption: A Case Study from Thai. *Lingua.* 116. pp. 921-949.

Khamkhien, A. (2010). Thai Learners' English Pronunciation Competence: Lesson Learned from Word Stress Assignment. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research.* 1. pp. 757-764.

Khazaee, R. (2011). Mutual Intelligibility or Native-like Proficiency? Iranian Teachers' Attitudes toward Implementing a L2 Pronunciation of English. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*. 1(2). pp. 55-65.

Kopperoinen, A. (2011). Accents of English as a Lingua Franca: A Study of Finnish Textbooks. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 21(1). pp. 71-93.

Ladegaard, H. J. (1998). National Stereotype and Language Attitudes: The Perception of British, American and Australian Language and Culture in Denmark. *Language and Communication*. 18. pp. 251-274.

Lee, L. Y. L. (2009). An Empirical Study on Teaching Urban Young Children Music and English by Contrastive Elements of Music and Songs. *US-China Education Review*. 6(3). pp. 28-39.

Lei, J. & Wu, G. (2014). Is English-medium Instruction Effective in Improving Chinese Undergraduate students' English Competence? *IRAL*. 52(2). pp. 99-126.

Liu, H. (2014). Design and Development of the College English Test System based on Network. *Journal of Applied Science.* 14(11). pp 1168-1173.

Lu, A. (2008). Intelligibility in Singapore: Survey and Discussion. *Journal of English as an International Language*. 3. pp. 34-60.

McArthur, T. (1992). Models of English. *English Today.* 32. pp. 12-19.

Mondiano, M. (1999). Standard English(s) and Educational Practices for the World's Lingua Franca. *English Today.* 15(4). pp. 3-13.

Mahboob, A. & Liang, J. (2014). Research and Critiquing World Englishes. *Asian Englishes.* 16(2). pp. 125-140.

Mantel-Bromley, C. (1995). Positive Attitudes and Realistic Beliefs: Links to Proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*. 79. pp. 371-376.

Masavisut, N. & Sukwiwat, M. & Wongmontha, S. (1986). The Power of the English in Thai Media. *World Englishes.* 5. pp. 197-207.

Matsuda, Y. (1986). Cross-over Languages: Japanese and English: Part 2. *Kwansei Gakuin University Annual Studies*. 35. pp. 47-80.

Matsuura, H. & Chiba, R. & Fujieda, M. (1999). Intelligibility and Comprehensibility of American and Irish Englishes in Japan. *World Englishes.* 18(1). pp. 49-62.

Mayer, R. & Neumayer, R. & Rauber, A. (2008). Rhyme and Style Features for Musical Genre Classification by Song Lyrics. *ISMIR*. 3. pp. 337-342.

Mustafaevik, A. (2013). Teacher Views about Using Songs in Teaching English to Young Learners. *African Journal Music of Education*. 1(2). pp. 22-30.

McKenzie, R. M. (2004). Attitudes of Japanese Nationals towards Standard and Non-standard Varieties of Scottish English Speech. *East Asian Learner*. 18. pp. 48-62.

McKenzie, R. M. (2008). Social Factors and Non-native Attitudes towards Varieties of Spoken English: A Japanese Case Study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 18(1). pp. 63-88.

Millington, N. (2011). Using songs effectively to teach English to young learners. *Language Education in Asia*. 2(1). pp. 134-141.

Moinzadeh, A. & Rezaei, O. & Dezhara, S. (2012). The Effect of Non-native Accent on Iranian EFL Learners' Listening Comprehension Focusing on Persian Accent of English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 3(5). pp. 967-972.

Mollin, S. (2007). New Variety or Learner English? *English World-Wide.* 28. pp. 167-185.

Morley, J. (1991) The Pronunciation Component in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. *TESOL Quarterly*. 25(1). pp. 51-74.

Munro, M. J. & Derwing, T.M. (1995). Foreign Accent, Comprehensibility, and Intelligibility in the Speech of Second Language Learners. *Language Learning*, *45*(1). pp. 73-97.

Narayana, U, & Kapur, P. (2007). Indian Media Framing of the Image of Muslims: An Analysis of News' Coverage of Muslims in English Newspapers of India. *Mass Media Journal*. 38(3). pp. 153-162.

Nejjari, W. & Gerritsen, M. & Haagen, M. & Korzilius, H. (2012). Responses to Dutch-English. *World Englishes*. 31(2). pp. 248-267.

Nelson, C. (1995). Intelligibility and World Englishes in the Classroom. *World Englishes*. 14(2). pp. 273-279.

Nelson, C. (2011). Narratives of Classroom Life: Changing Conceptions of

Knowledge. *TESOL Quarterly*. 45(3). pp. 463-485.

Nguyen, H. T. (2012). General Education and Special Education Teachers Collaborate to Support English Language Learners with Learning Disabilities. *Issues in Teacher Education*. 21(1). pp. 127-152.

Orlova, N. (1997). Developing Speech Habits with the Help of Songs. In *English Teaching Forum*. 35 (3). pp. 41.

Park, H. (2010). A Study of Co-relation between the Length of English Vowels and Diphthong by Korean Exchange Students. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*. 14(2). pp. 25-39.

Petzole, R. & Berns, M. (2000). Catching up with Europe: Speakers and Functions of English in Hungary. *World Englishes*. 19(1). pp. 113-124.

Ploywattanawong, P., & Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2014). Attitudes of Thai Graduates toward English as a Lingua Franca of ASEAN. *Asian Englishes.* 16(2). pp. 141-156.

Rajadurai, J. (2001). An Investigation of the Effectiveness of Teaching Pronunciation to Malaysian TESL Students. *English Teaching Forum*. 39(3). pp. 10-15.

Richards, J. (1969). Pronunciation Features of Thai Speakers of English. *ERIC.* pp. 66-75.

Richards, J. C. (1982). Singapore English: Rhetorical and Communicative Styles. *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures.* pp. 154-167.

Risjord, M. & Moloney, M. & Dunbar, S. (2001). Methodological Triangulation in Nursing Research. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences.* 31(1). pp. 40-59.

Roy, T. (2011). Language Press in India: A Study of Contemporary Bengali

Journalism. *Global Media Journal*. June. pp. 1-9.

Saengboon, (2015). An Exploratory Study of Thai University Students' Understanding of World Englishes. *English Language Teaching*. 8(11). pp. 131-154.

Sari, D. F & Yusuf, Y. Q. (2009). The Role of Attitudes and Identity from Nonnative Speakers of English towards English Accents. *English as an International Language Journal*. 4. pp. 110-128.

Sarobol, N. (2012). Implementing Cooperative Learning in English Language Classroom: Thai University Students' Perception. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*. 6(10). pp. 112-122.

Schmied, J. (1985). Attitudes towards English in Tanzania. *English World-Wide.* 6. pp. 237-269.

Schmidt, K. L. & Cohn, J. F. (2001). Human Facial Expressions as Adaptations: Evolutionary Questions in Facial Expression Research. *Yearbook of Physical Anthropology*. 44. pp. 3-24.

Schmid, P.M. & Yeni-Komshian, G.H. (1999). The Effects of Speaker Accent and Target Predictability on Perception of Mispronunciations. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research. 42.* pp. 56-64.

Seferoglu, G. (2005). Improving Students' Pronunciation through Accent Reduction Software. *British Journal of Educational Technology*. 36(2). pp. 303-316.

Sevik, M. (2011). Teacher Views about Using Songs in Teaching English to Young Learners. *Educational Research and Review*. 6(21). pp. 1027-1035.

Shokouri, H. & Amin, F. (2010). A Systemist 'Verb Transitivity' Analysis of the

Persian and English Newspaper Editorials: A Focus of Genre Familiarity on EFL Leaner's Reading Comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research.* 1(4). pp. 387-396.

Smith, L. E. & Rafiqzad, K. (1979). English for Cross-cultural Communication: The Question of Intelligibility. *TESOL Quarterly*. 13(3). pp. 371-380.

Smith, L. E. & Bisazza, J. A. (1982). The Comprehensibility of Three Varieties of English for College Students in Seven Countries. *Language learning*. 32(2). pp. 259-269.

Smith, L. E. & Nelson, C. L. (1985). International Intelligibility of English: Directions and Resources. *World Englishes*. 4(2). pp. 333-342.

Snodin. S. N. (2014). English Naming and Code-Mixing in Thai Mass Media. *World Englishes.* 33(1). pp. 100-111.

Thurmond, V. A. (2001). The Point of Triangulation. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship.* 33(3). pp. 253-258.

Tingsabadh, K. & Abramson, A. (1993). Thai. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association.* 23(1). pp. 24–28.

Tokumoto, M. & Shibata, M. (2011). Asian Varieties of English: Attitudes towards Pronunciation. *World Englishes*. 30(3). pp. 392-408.

Tominaga, Y. (2009). An Analysis of Successful Pronunciation Learners: In Search of Effective Factors in Pronunciation Teaching. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*. 13(1). pp. 127-140.

Tripathi, P.D. (1992). English: The Chosen Tongue. *English Today.* 32. pp. 3-11.

Troyer, R. (2012). English in the Thai Linguistic Netscape. *World Englishes.* 31(1). pp. 93-112.

Tsukada, K. (2006). Cross-language Perception of Word-final Stops in Thai and English. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition.* 9(3). pp. 309-318.

Tsukada, K. & Roengpitya R. (2008). Discrimination of English and Thai Words Ending with Voiceless Stops by Native Thai Listeners Differing in English Experience. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association.* 38. pp. 325-347.

Van Wijngaarden, S. J. (2001). The Intelligibility of Non-native Dutch Speech. *Speech Communication*. 35. pp. 103–113.

Van Wyk, A. (2014). English-medium Education in a Multilingual Settings: A Case in South Africa. *IRAL*. 52(2). pp. 205-220.

Wadsorn N. & Panichkul S. (2014). 'River' or 'Liver'? Exploring the Intelligibility of Thai's (Mis)pronunciation of English 'r' and 'l'. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network (LEARN) Journal*. 7(2). pp. 51-67.

Warschauer, M. & Shetzer, H. & Meloni, C. (2001). Internet for English Teaching. *Teaching English as a Second of Foreign Language*. 5(1). pp. 159-178.

Watkhaolarm, P. (2005). Think in Thai, Write in English. *World Englishes*. 24(2). pp. 145-157.

Wei, Y. & Zhou, Y. (2002). Insights into English Pronunciation Problems of Thai Students. *ERIC.* pp. 1-13.

Wiebesiek, L. & Rudwick, S. & Zeller J. (2011). South African Indian English: A Qualitative Study of Attitudes. *World Englishes*. 30(2). pp. 251-268.

Xu, W. & Wang, Y. & Case, R. E. (2010). Chinese Attitudes towards Varieties of

English: A Pre-Olympic Examination. *Language Awareness*. 19(4). pp. 249-260.

Yang, J. H. (2013). Taiwanese Perceptions of Indian English: A Perceptual Change in the Learning of English Variation. *English Teaching and Learning*. 37(4). pp. 91-148.

Yano, Y. (2009). English as an International Lingua Franca: From Societal to Individual. *World Englishes. 28*(2). pp. 246-255.

Yiamkhamnuan, J. (2010). The Implication for English-Thai Mixing and Possibility of Internet Chat Rooms as Alternative Learning Environments. *Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*. 6(2). pp. 123-158.

Young, R. W. & Faux, W. V. (2012). Native and Non-Native English Speakers' Perceptives of Ineffectiveness and Inappropriateness in Difficult Conversations. *Communciation Research Reports*. 29(3). pp. 185-192.

Zhang, W. & Hu, G. (2008). Research Note: Second Language Learner's Attitudes towards English Varieties. *Language Awareness*. 17. pp. 342-344.

Electronic Media

Brown, P. M. (2006). A Study in Thai. *http://languageinstinct.blogspot.com/2006/11/thai-language.html*. Accessed July 21, 2010.

Carruthers, S. (2006). *Pronunciation Difficulties of Japanese Speakers of English: Prediction based on a Contrastive Analysis*. Retrieved November 26, 20013, from http://web1.hpu.edu/images/GraduateStudies/TESL_WPS/05Carruthers_Phono_a17236.pdf.

Florez, M. A. C. (1998) *Improving Adult ESL Learners' Pronunciation Skills* (ERIC Digest ED-LE-98-04). Retrieved April 7, 2013, from ERIC database http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED427553.pdf

Hyde, O. & Van de Poel, K. (2012). *Interlanguage Phonology: Implications for a Remedial Pronunciation Course of Chinese Learners of English*. Center for Language and Speech, University of Antwerp, Belgium. Retrieved January 7, 2013, from http://webh01.ua.ac.be/april/april100/Hide.pdf.

Kannaovakun, P. (2001). The Mixing of English and Thai in Thai Televisions Programs: Characteristics, Attitudes, Perceptions, and Motivations. Retrieved from http://elibrary.trf.or.th/

Lems, K. (2001). Using Music in the Adult ESL Classroom. *National Center for ESL Literacy Education.* Retrieved on 27 December 2013 from http://www.marshalladulteducation.org.pdf/briefs2/Using_Music_in_the_Adult_ESL_Classroom.pdf.

McGuigan, B. (2007). *What is a Vowel?* Retrieved on 17 April 2014 from http://www.wisegeek.com/what-is-a-vowel.htm

McKenzie-Brown, P. (2006). *Language Matters: A Study in Thai*. Retrieved on 17 April 2014 from http://languageinstinct.blogspot.com

Ohata, K. (2004). *Phonological Differences between Japanese and English: Several Potentially Problematic Areas of Pronunciation for Japanese ESL/EFL Learners*. Asian EFL Journals and Research Articles, 6(4), Retrieved January 7, 2013, from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/december_04_KO.php.

Saricoban, A. & Metin, E. (2002). Songs, Verse and Games for Teaching Grammar. *TheInternet TESL Journal*, Retrieved July 1, 2016, from http://iteslg.org/Techniques/Saricoban-Songs.html

Other Materials

Aungcharoen, N. (2006). *An Investigation of the English Word Stress Perception and Production Skills of Thai 12th-Grade Students*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Srinakharinwirot University, Faculty of Humanities, English Department, Bangkok, Thailand.

Bott, A. (2005). *Computer-aided Self-access Pronunciation Materials Designed to Teach Stress in American English*. Unpublished Master Degree Dissertation. Brigham: Brigham Young University.

Chunsuvimol, B. (1993). *Relationship between the Social Variation of (r) in Thai and (r) in English in the Speech of Bangkok Thai Speakers.* Ph.D. Dissertation. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.

Chuleethongrerk, S. (2006). *Primary Stress Variation of English Disyllabic Words by Thai Undergraduate Students*. Unpublished Master's Research Paper, Thammasat University, Language Institute, Teaching English as a Foreign Language, Bangkok, Thailand.

Chutisilp, P. (1984). *A Sociolinguistic Study of the Additional Language: English in Thailand*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.

Eamsa-ard, L. (2006). *Thai Popular Music: The Representation of National Identities and Ideologies within a Culture in Transition*. Thesis. Edith Cowan University.

Hirunyupakorn, P. & Chaimano, K. (2014). *Variation of /r/ in Syllable-initial Consonant Clusters of English Words according to Style and English-language Experience of English Major Students.* Paper presented at Graduate Research Conference 2014, Khon Kaen University. Khon Kaen, Thailand.

Kapper, J. (1992). *English Borrowing in Thai as Reflected in Thai Journalistic Texts.* Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. University of North Dakota. 36. pp. 1-17.

Khirin, P. (2011). *The Production of /?/ in English Words by Speakers with Different English-language Experiences.* Unpublished Master Thesis. Thammasat University.

Korsuwan, N. (2001). A Study of English Loan Words in Standard Thai: A Preliminary Phonological Analysis of their Assimilation. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ramkhamhang University.

Likhitphongsathorn, T. (2012). A Study of English Code-Mixing and Code-Switching in Thai Pop Songs. Master Thesis, English for Career, Thammasat University.

Mano-im, R. (1999). *The Production of English Final Consonant Clusters by Thai Students*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Chulalongkorn University, Graduate School, Department of Linguistics.

Matsuda, A. (2000). *Japanese Attitudes toward English: A Case Study of High School Students*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette,Indiana.

Olome, O. (1998). *The Pronunciation Variation of /ʃ/ Phoneme by Thai Students*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Thammasat University Press, Faculty of Liberal Arts.

Phattaratunya, K. & Booncham, S. & Laolah, S. (2007). *A Study of English Pronunciation Problems of Graduate Students at Naresuan University*. Unpublished Master's Research Paper, Naresuan University, Phitsanulok, Thailand.

Phlaichum, S. (2013). *The Study of Thai EFL Learners' Production of Polysyllabic English Word Stress.* Research Paper. English for Career. Language Institute, Thammasat University.

Potipan, P. & Worrawutteerakul, N. (2009). *A Study of the Korean Wave in order to be a Lesson to Thailand for Establishing a Thai Wave*. Master thesis. Maladaren University.

Sarkar, M. & Sarkar, K. & Winer, L. (2005). *Multilingual Code-switching in Montreal Hip-hop: Or, "Tout Moune Qui Talk Trash Kiss Mon Black Ass Du Nord"*. Proceeding of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism (pp. 2057-2074). Somerville, MA.: Caascadilla Press.

Sasi-smit, M. (2005). *A Study of the Effect of Omission of English Word Stress on Comprehensibility: A Case Study of Thai Staff Using English on a Group of Company*. Unpublished Master's Research Paper, Thammasat University, Language Institute, Teaching English as a Foreign Language, Bangkok, Thailand.

Šišková, D. (2008). *Teaching Vocabulary through Music*. Marsaryk University in Brno. Czech Republic.

Sudajak, W. (2006). A Study of English Loanwords in Thai Newspapers. Pathumthani: Faculty of Liberal Arts, Rangsit University.

Ukachoke, P. (2008). *A Study of M. 4 at Chitralada School on Perception and Production of English /v/.* Unpublished Master's Research Paper, Thammasat University, Language Institute, Bangkok, Thailand.

Wongsiripaisan, S. (2005). *The Pronunciation of English Fricatives in Syllable Final Position by Mattayom 6 Students, Nonsi Wittaya School*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Kasetsart University, Facultry of Humanities.

Yang, Y. M. A. (2010). Attitudes of Learners toward English: A Case of Chinese College Students. Dissertation. The Ohio State University.

Yangklang, W. (2006). *Improving English final /-l/ Pronunciation of Thai Students through Computer Assisted Instruction Program.* Unpublished Master's Research Paper. Suranaree University of Technology, English Language Studies, Nakhon Ratchasima, Thailand

ฐิตินันท์ ประทุมนันท์. (2549). ‘‘การเปรียบเทียบผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษและความคงทนในการจำของนักเรียนชั้นมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 5 โรงเรียนบรมราชินีนารถราชวิทยาลัย ที่มีความสามารถทางภาษาอังกฤษแตกต่างกัน โดยวิธีการสอนอ่าน แบบ MIA.’’ วิทยานิพนธ์ปริญญามหาบัณฑิต สาขาวิชา การสอนภาษาอังกฤษ บัณฑิตวิทยาลัย มหาวิทยาลัยบูรพา.

นิตยา วัยโรจนวงศ์ (2527). *การศึกษาเปรียบต่างของระบบเสียงหนักเบาในภาษาอังกฤษและภาษาไทย และการวิเคราะห์ข้อผิดในการออกเสียงคำศัพท์แพทย์หลายพยางค์ในภาษาอังกฤษ*. วิทยานิพนธ์ปริญญามหาบัณฑิต, จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย, บัณฑิตวิทยาลัย, ภาควิชาภาษาศาสตร์.

ปรัศนียา จารุสันต์ (2540). การรับรู้และการออกเสียงหนักเบาในคำภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 มหาวิทยาลัยรังสิต. วิทยานิพนธ์ปริญญามหาบัณฑิต, จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย, บัณฑิตวิทยาลัย, ภาควิชาภาษาศาสตร์.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ENGLISH CONSONANTS

	Bilabial	**Labiodentals**	**Dental**	**Alveolar**	**Post alveolar**	**Palatal**	**Velar**	**Glottal**
Nasal	m			n			ŋ	
Plosive	p b			t d			k g	
Affricate					tʃ dʒ			
Fricative		f v	θ ð	s z	ʃ ʒ			h
Approximant				ɹ		j	w	
Lateral				l				

Fromkin et al. (2007)

APPENDIX B

PHONETIC SYMBOLS OF ENGLISH CONSONANTS IN THE INITIAL AND THE FINAL CONSONANTS

English letter	Phonetic symbol	
	Initial	Final
p	/p/	/p/
b	/b/	/b/
t	/t/	/t/
d	/d/	/d/
k	/k/	/k/
g	/g/	/g/
f	/f/	/f/
v	/v/	/v/
th	/θ/	/θ/
th	/ð/	/ð/
s	/s/	/s/
z	/z/	/z/
sh	/ʃ/	/ʃ/
-ge	/ʒ/	/ʒ/
h	/h/	-
ch	/tʃ/	/tʃ/
j, -dge	/dʒ/	/dʒ/

m	/m/	/m/
n	/n/	/n/
ng	-	/ŋ/
r	/r/	-
l	/l/	/l/
w	/w/	-
y	/j/	-

Ariyapitipun (2003)

APPENDIX C

ENGLISH CONSONANT CLUSTERS IN THE INITIAL POSITION

English letter	Phonetic symbol of consonant cluster
bl	/bl/
gl	/gl/
pl	/pl/
cl	/kl/
fl	/fl/
br	/br/
gr	/gr/
pr	/pr/
cr	/kr/
fr	/fr/
dr	/dr/
tr	/tr/
sk	/sk/
sc	/sk/
sm	/sm/
sn	/sn/
sp	/sp
st	/st/

sw	/sw/
sl	/sl/
spl	/spl/
spr	/spr/
str	/str/
scr	/skr/
squ	/skw/
scl	/skl/
shr	/ʃr/
sph	/sf/
thr	/θr/
thw	/θw/
tw	/tw/
dw	/dw/
qu	/kw/

APPENDIX D

ENGLISH CONSONANT CLUSTERS IN THE FINAL POSITION

English letter	Phonetic symbol of consonant cluster
ct	/kt/
ft	/ft/
lt	/lt/
nt	/nt/
pt	/pt/
st	/st/
lb	/lb/
ld	/ld/
lf	/lf/
lk	/lk/
lm	/lm/
lp	/lp/
lve	/lv/
lth	/lθ/
lse	/ls/
lsh	/lʃ/
lch	/ltʃ/
lge	/ldʒ/
ln	/ln/

mp	/mp/
nd	/nd/
nk	/nk/
ns	/nts/
nth	/nθ/
nch	/nʧ/
nge	/nʤ/
sk	/sk/
sm	/sm/
sp	/sp/
nst	/nst/
rst	/rst/
rp	/rp/
rt	/rt/
rd	/rd/
rk	/rk/
rgue	/rg/
rf	/rf/
rve	/rv/
rth	/rθ/
rse	/rs/
rsh	/rʃ/

rch	/rʧ/
rge	/rdʒ/
rm	/rm/
rn	/rn/
rl	/rl/
fth	/fθ/
pt	/pt/
pse	/ps/
pth	/pθ/
x	/ks/
dze	/dz/
xt	/kst/
xth	/ksθ/
mpt	/mpt/
mpse	/mps/
nce	/nts/
ltz	/lts/
rpse	/rps/
rtz	/rts/
rld	/rld/
Charles	/r(p)θ/

Ariyapitipun (2003)

APPENDIX E

ENGLISH VOWELS

	Front		Central		Back	
	Long	**Short**	**Long**	**Short**	**Long**	**Short**
Close	iː	ɪ			uː	ʊ
Mid		ɛ	ɜː	ə	ɔː	
Open		æ		ʌ	ɑː	ɒ

Fromkin et al. (2007)

APPENDIX F
PHONETIC SYMBOLS OF THAI CONSONANTS IN THE INITIAL AND THE FINAL POSITIONS

Thai letter	Phonetic symbol	
	Initial	**Final**
ก	/k/	/k/
ข, ฃ, ค, ฅ, ฆ	/k^h/	-
ง	/ŋ/	/ŋ/
จ	/c/	-
ฉ, ช, ฌ	/c^h/	-
ซ, ศ, ษ, ส	/s/	-
ญ, ย	/j/	/j/
ฎ, ด	/d/	/t/
ฏ, ต	/t/	-
ฐ, ฑ, ฒ, ถ, ท, ธ	/t^h/	-
ณ, น	/n/	/n/

บ	/b/	/p/
ป	/p/	-
พ, ภ, ผ	/p^h/	-
ฟ, ฝ	/f/	-
ม	/m/	/m/
ร	/r/	-
ล, ฬ	/l/	-
ว	/w/	/w/
ห, ฮ	/h/	-
อ	/?/	-

Ariyapitipun (2003)

APPENDIX G

THAI CONSONANTS AND VOWELS

	Bilabilal	**Labiodentals**	**alveolar**	**Post alveolar**	**Palatal**	**Velar**	**Glottal**
Nasal	m (ม)		n(ณ,น)			ŋ (ง)	
Plosive	p (ป) p^h (พ,ผ) b (บ)		t (ฏ, ต) t^h (ฐ, ฑ, ฒ, ถ, ท, ธ) d (ฎ, ด)			k (ก) k^h (ข,ฃ, ค,ฅ,ฆ)	? (อ)
Fricative		f (ฝ, ฟ)	s (ซ,ศ,ษ,ส)				h (ห,ฮ)
Affricate				tɕ (จ) $tɕ^h$ (ฉ,ช,ฌ)			
Trill			r (ร)				
Approximant					j (ญ,ย)	w (ว)	
Lateral approximant			l (ล,ฬ)				

APPENDIX H
THAI FINAL SOUNDS

	Bilabilal	**Labiodentals**	**alveolar**	**Post alveolar**	**Palatal**	**Velar**	**Glottal**
Nasal	m (ม)		n (ญ,ณ,น, ร,ล,ฬ)			ŋ (ง)	
Plosive	p (บ,ป,พ,ฟ,ภ)		t (จ,ช ,ซ,ฌ,ฎ,ฐ, ฑ,ฒ,ด,ต,ถ ,ท,ธ,ศ, ษ,ส)			k (ก,ข,ค,ฆ)	? (อ)
Fricative							
Affricate							
Trill							
Approximant					j (ย)	w (ว)	
Lateral							

approximant							

APPENDIX I

THAI MONOPHTHONG VOWELS

	Front		**Back**			
	Unrounded		**Unrounded**		**Rounded**	
	Short	**Long**	**Short**	**Long**	**Short**	**Long**
Close	/i/ ◌ิ	/i:/ ◌ี	/ɯ/ ◌ึ	/ɯ:/ ◌ื	/u/ ◌ุ	/u:/ ◌ู
Close-mid	/e/ เ-ะ	/e:/ เ-	/ɤ/ เ-อะ	/ɤ:/ เ-อ	/o/ โ-ะ	/o:/ โ-
Open-mid	/ɛ/ แ-ะ	/ɛ:/ แ-			/ɔ/ เ-าะ	/ɔ:/ -อ
Open			/a/ -ะ, ั-	/a:/ -า		

APPENDIX J
THAI DIPHTHONG VOWELS

Long		Short	
Thai	**IPA**	**Thai**	**IPA**
–าย	/a:j/	ไ–, ใ–, ไ–ย, ะย	/aj/
–าว	/a:w/	เ–า	/aw/
เ–ีย	/i:a/	เ–ียะ	/ia/
		–ิว	/iw/
–ัว	/u:a/	–ัวะ	/ua/
–ูย	/u:j/	–ุย	/uj/
เ–ว	/e:w/	เ–็ว	/ew/
แ–ว	/ɛ:w/		
เ–ือ	/ɯ:a/	เ–ือะ	/ɯa/
เ–ย	/ɤ:j/		
–อย	/ɔ:j/		
โ–ย	/o:j/		

APPENDIX K

THAI TRIPHTHONG VOWELS

Thai	IPA
เ◌ียว	/iaw/
◌วย	/uaj/
เ◌ือย	/ɯaj/

Tingsabadh, & Abramson, (1993)

APPENDIX L
INITIAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR GENERAL AUDIENCES

1. Please tell us about your circumstances in workplace/school.
2. Are there any Thais in your workplace/school?
3. (If yes) Please tell us about them.
4. (If no) Have you ever been in contact with Thai culture such as people and language? How?
5. How do you understand words you listen to?
6. Why do you understand particular words? Why not others?
7. Please provide examples of words you understand and not understand.
8. How do you feel about listening to audio and watching music video? Does it help you understand better?
9. (If yes) How?
10. (If no) Why not?
11. What do you think about the use of English in Thai popular songs after you listen to all songs? Please provide your thoughts as much as you can.
12. Do you think there is the use of English in a local language? Why or why not?
13. In your opinion, what are the reasons of mixing English in a local language?
14. (If yes) Please provide contexts and examples you think English mixed in a local language can be found.
15. Do you accept the use of English in that way? Why or why not?

16. Do you think native and non-native speakers of English understand English of each other? Why or why not?

17. Have you ever heard about World Englishes?

18. (If yes) Please provide details.

19. (If no) Can you guess?

20. Please describe World English in your opinion.

21. In your opinion, native English or non-native English should be taught? Why?

22. Do you agree if songs are used in a classroom? Why? Why not?

APPENDIX M
INITIAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR LYRICISTS

1. Please tell us briefly about your personal and workplace circumstances.

2. The use of English in Thai popular songs is increasing. What is your opinion about this trend? Please provide your thoughts in details as much as you can.

3. Do you include English in your songs? Why? Why not?

4. What are criteria of adding English in the songs? How do you choose the words? Why?

5. Do you think that mixing of English in Thai songs is appropriate for language learning? Why or why not?

APPENDIX N
QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is part of thesis required for Ph.D. student in English Language Studies (International Program), Thammasat University. It aims to examine participants' perspectives on world Englishes in Thai contemporary popular music. Your response and personal information will be kept confidential and used for educational purpose only.

PLEASE MARK THE BOX BEST REPRESENT YOU

I. General information

1. Sex

☐ Male

☐ Female

2. Age

☐ 15-20

☐ 21-25

☐ 26-30

☐ 31-35

☐ 36-40

☐ 41-45

☐ 46-50

☐ 51-55

☐ 55 and over

3. Nationality (possible for more than one answer)

☐ Thai

☐ Other (please specify) _____

4. Educational background

☐ Secondary/high school/vocational school

☐ College

☐ Bachelor degree

☐ Master degree

☐ Ph.D.

☐ Other (Please specify) _____

5. Career (possible for more than one answer)_____

6. Length of stay in Thailand or contact to Thai people and language _____

7. Channel of contact _____

II. PLEASE RESPONSE YOUR THOUGHTS ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AND PROVIDE EXAMPLES AS MUCH AS YOU CAN

1. Please describe your circumstances at personal level and at workplace/school.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Have you every communicated with Thai people? If so, please provide examples of the situation and circumstances of communication. For example, who you communicate with, in what occasion, when and how long? Is it effective?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Do you think how much you understand Thai language and Thai English? Please self-assess and provide your degree of understanding and samples of words and meaning of those words you understand.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. What linguistic features do you find different from your English? Please provide examples in form of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences where possible.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. What factors do you think differentiate linguistic features from each other?

_____

_____

_____

6. Have you ever listened to Thai popular music before this activity? If so, please provide examples where possible. If not, why not?

7. Have you ever seen English in Thai lyrics? Please explain how you have seen them and provide examples.

8. Do you think why English occurs in Thai popular music?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. Are there any insertions of English in your language? Please provide situations and circumstances you come across.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Do you think it is possible to integrate Thai popular music into other fields? Why or why not? If so, to what extent can it be integrated to? Please provide examples.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. What is World Englishes/varieties of English? Please provide details and examples from your understanding as much as you can.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. If popular songs are chosen as materials for classroom, do you think it is acceptable? Why? Why not?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

แบบสอบถาม

แบบสอบถามชุดนี้ เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการทำวิจัยวิทยานิพนธ์ของหลักสูตรดุษฎีบัณฑิต สาขาภาษาอังกฤษศึกษา (หลักสูตรนานาชาติ) มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์ โดยมีวัตถุประสงค์ที่จะเก็บข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับความรู้และทัศนคติเกี่ยวกับความหลากหลายของภาษาอังกฤษที่เกิดขึ้นในเพลงไทยสากลสมัยใหม่ ข้อมูลที่ได้รับจะเก็บเป็นความลับและใช้เพื่อวัตถุประสงค์ในการศึกษาเท่านั้น

กรุณาทำเครื่องหมาย X ในช่องที่ตรงกับความเป็นจริง

1) ข้อมูลทั่วไปเกี่ยวกับผู้ตอบแบบสอบถาม

1. เพศ

☐ ชาย

☐ หญิง

2. อายุ

☐ 15-20

☐ 21-25

☐ 26-30

☐ 31-35

☐ 36-40

☐ 41-45

☐ 46-50

☐ 51-55

☐ มากกว่า 55

3. สัญชาติ (สามารถตอบได้มากกว่า 1 คำตอบ)

☐ ไทย

☐ อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____

4. ระดับการศึกษา

☐ มัธยมศึกษา/ประกาศนียบัตรวิชาชีพ

☐ อนุปริญญา

☐ ปริญญาตรี

☐ ปริญญาโท

☐ ปริญญาเอก

☐ อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____

5. อาชีพ (สามารถตอบได้มากกว่า 1 คำตอบ) _____

6. ระยะเวลาที่อาศัยอยู่ในประเทศไทย หรือติดต่อกับคนไทยและภาษาไทย _____

7. วิธีการในการติดต่อหรือใช้ภาษาไทย _____

2) โปรดแสดงความคิดเห็นของคุณที่มีต่อคำถามต่อไปนี้ กรุณายกตัวอย่างต่อคำถามแต่ละข้อให้ได้มาก ที่สุด

1. คำว่า “World Englishes” และ “varieties of English” คืออะไร?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. คุณเคยติดต่อสื่อสารกับคนไทยหรือไม่ หากเคย โปรดยกตัวอย่างสถานการณ์ที่คุณได้สื่อสารกับคนไทย ตัวอย่างเช่น คุณสื่อสารกับใคร ในโอกาสหรือสถานการณ์อะไร เมื่อไหร่ เป็นระยะเวลานานเท่าไหร่ และสื่อสารได้สัมฤทธิผลหรือไม่

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. คุณคิดว่าคุณเข้าใจภาษาอังกฤษแบบไทยมากน้อยเพียงใด กรุณาประเมินความเข้าใจของตนเองและระบุระดับความเข้าใจพร้อมยกตัวอย่างของคำและความหมายที่คุณเข้าใจ รวมถึงบอกวิธีที่ทำให้คุณเข้าใจคำต่าง ๆ เหล่านั้น

4. คุณคิดว่าสัทศาสตร์ทางภาษาไทยและภาษาอังกฤษเหมือนหรือต่างกัน อย่างไร กรุณายกตัวอย่างในรูปของคำ กลุ่มคำ วลี และประโยค

5. คุณคิดว่าปัจจัยอะไรที่ทำให้สัทศาสตร์ทางภาษาไทยและภาษาอังกฤษมีความเหมือน และ/หรือ แตกต่างกัน

6. คุณเคยฟังเพลงไทยสากลหรือไม่ กรุณายกตัวอย่างเพลง (หากไม่ทราบชื่อเพลง สามารถเขียนเนื้อเพลงสั้น ๆ และบอกชื่อนักร้องได้) หากไม่เคย กรุณาระบุเหตุผล

7. คุณเคยเห็นเนื้อเพลงไทยสากลหรือไม่ กรุณายกตัวอย่างเนื้อเพลงที่คุณเคยเห็น

8. คุณคิดว่าเหตุใดจึงมีการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในเพลงไทยสากล

9. ในภาษาของคุณ มีการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษร่วมด้วยหรือไม่ กรุณายกตัวอย่างสถานการณ์ที่คุณทราบ

10. คุณคิดว่าเป็นไปได้หรือไม่ที่จะใช้เพลงไทยสากลในด้านอื่น ๆ กรุณาระบุเหตุผล และยกตัวอย่างตามที่ท่านเข้าใจ

11. คำว่า “World Englishes” คืออะไร กรุณาอธิบายพร้อมยกตัวอย่างให้มากที่สุดเท่าที่ท่านสามารถทำได้

12. หากเพลงไทยสากลได้รับเลือกให้ใช้เป็นสื่อการสอนในห้องเรียน คุณคิดว่าเหมาะสมหรือไม่ เพราะเหตุใด

_____

_____

_____

_____

ขอบคุณที่สละเวลาในการตอบแบบสอบถามชุดนี้

APPENDIX O

TRANSCRIPTION OF ENGLISH AND THAI PRONUNCIATION

Word	**Thai singers' pronunciation**	**Native speakers of English's pronunciation**
air	/ɛ:/	/eə(r)/
baby	/be:bi:/	/beɪbɪ/
ball	/bɔ:n/	/bɔ:l/
(num)ber	/bɤ:/	/bə(r)/
blur	/bɤ:/	/blɜ:(r)/
boyfriend	/bɔ:jfe:n/	/bɔɪfrend/
bye	/ba:j/	/baɪ/
care	/kɛ:/	/keə(r)/
celeb(rity)	/se:lep/	/sɪleb/
charge	/tɕ^{h}a:t/	/tʃɑ:dʒ/
check	/tɕ^{h}ek/	/tʃek/
cheer	/tɕ^{h}i:a/	/tʃɪə(r)/
chill (out)	/tɕ^{h}iw/	/tʃɪl/
clear	/ki:ɑ/	/klɪə(r)/
click	/kik/	/klɪk/
condo	/kɔ:ndo:/	/kɒ ndəʊ /, /kɒ ndoʊ /

confirm	/kɔ :nfɤ:m/	/kənfɜ :m/
crazy	/ke:si:/	/kreɪ zɪ /
date	/de:t/	/deɪ t/
enjoy	/entɐ ɔ :j/	/ɪ ndʒ ɔ ɪ /
everything	/epwali:tiŋ/	/evrɪ θɪ ŋ/
fair	/fɛ :/	/feə(r)/
fan	/fɛ :n/	/fæn/
feel	/fi:w/	/fi:l/
firm (n)	/fɤ:m/	/fɜ :m/
firm (v)	/fɤ:m/	/fɜ :m/
fit	/fit/	/fɪ t/
form (n)	/fɔ :m/	/fɔ :m/
form (v)	/fɔ :m/	/fɔ :m/
free	/fi:/	/fri:/
game	/ge:m/	/geɪ m/
go	/go:/	/gəʊ /, /goʊ /
happy	/hɛ ppi:/	/hæpɪ /
hello	/henlo:/	/hələʊ /, /həloʊ /
Hi5	/ha:j faj/	/haɪ faɪ v/
hit	/hit/	/hɪ t/
hot	/hɔ t/	/hɒ t/
in(ner)	/in/	/ɪ n/
kiss	/kit/	/kɪ s/

like	/laj/	/laɪ k/
love	/lɤ:f/	/lʌ v/
man	/mɛ :n/	/mæn/
match	/mɛ :t/	/mætʃ /
(re)mem(ber)	/mem/	/mem/
message	/mɛ :tse:t/	/mesɪ dʒ /
mouth	/maw/	/maʊ θ/
no	/no:/	/nəʊ /, /noʊ /
O(K)	/o:/	/əʊ /, /oʊ /
OK	/o:ke:/	/əʊ keɪ /, /oʊ keɪ /
on	/ɔ :n/	/ɒ n/
out	/awt/	/aʊ t/
party	/pa:ti:/	/pɑ :tɪ /
perfect	/pɤ:fek/	/pəfekt/
return	/li:tɤ:n/	/rɪ tɜ :n/
sad	/sɛ :t/	/sæd/
say	/se:/	/seɪ /
share	/tɞ ^{h}ɛ :/	/ʃ eə(r)/
shock	/tɞ ^{h}ɔ k/	/ʃ ɒ k/
show	/tɞ ^{h}o:/	/ʃ əʊ /
spec(ification)	/sapek/	/spek/
style	/sata:j/	/staɪ l/
surprise	/sɤ:paj/	/səpraɪ z/

sure	/tɐ ^{h}u:ɑ /	/ʃ ʊ ə(r)/
taxi	/tɛ ksi:/	/tæksɪ /
trend	/ten/	/trend/
TV	/ti:wi:/	/ti:vi:/
(O)ver	/wɤ:/	/və(r)/
want	/wɔ n/	/wɒ nt/
work	/wɤ:k/	/wɜ :k/
you	/ju:/	/ju:/

APPENDIX P
SONGS LIST

The Star

ศิลปิน	ชื่อเพลง
สน The Star 1	1. สบายใช้ได้อยู่ 2. มอเตอร์ไซค์คนจน 3. แฟนเก่า
นิว & จิ๋ว The Star 1	1. คนเจ้าน้ำตา 2. ตกลงมั้ย 3. Goodnight Kiss 4. อยากเป็นคนนั้น 5. อย่าเอาความเหงามาลงที่ฉัน 6. รอแล้วได้อะไร 7. เรื่องนี้ต้องเห็นแก่ตัว 8. ตัวจริงไร้ตัวตน 9. ไม่รักไม่ต้อง 10. อยากได้ดอกไม้ 11. อย่าเอาเขามาเกี่ยวเรื่องนี้

	12. ประตูใจ 13. เธอมาจากไหน 14. เกิดเป็นผู้หญิง 15. อ้วนจัง 16. หนีไม่พ้น 17. หลังคาเดียวกัน
พีท The Star 2	1. First Kiss
เอ็ม The Star 2	1. เธอทำให้ฉันคิดถึงแต่เธอ 2. เอาแล้วไง 3. หนีร้อนมาพึ่งเย็น 4. ยินดี...ไม่เต็มใจ 5. เหมือนเดิม 6. ไม่โรแมนติก 7. I don’t care 8. หากฉันเจ้าชู้จริง 9. ทุกครั้งที่คิดถึงเธอ
นิก The Star 2	1. พี่ไม่ใช่ผมพี่ก็พูดได้

อาร์ The Star 3	1. หัวอกเดียวกัน 2. กล้า ๆ หน่อย 3. อย่าผิดนัด 4. หน้าตาดีไม่มีแฟน 5. หลอกว่ารัก 6. Miss You 7. บ้านเราจงเจริญ
บี้ The Star 3	1. I Need Somebody 2. ตัดใจไม่ไหว 3. ถ้าคืนนี้คุณนอนไม่หลับ 4. รหัสรัก 5. จังหวะหัวใจ 6. Someone 7. อยากถูกเรียกว่าแฟน 8. Miss Call Miss You 9. Love At First Sight 10. I Love You Too 11. Hug 12. มากมาย

	13. Wait A Minute 14. หายใจบอกรักเธอ 15. รักบี้ 16. ก่อนเพลงสุดท้าย 17. กลัวที่ไหน 18. Look Like Love 19. พ่อแง่แม่งอน 20. Thinking Of You 21. ดู ๆ กันไป 22. Freeman แฟนไม่มี 23. เสียงของบ้าน 24. It's Alright 25. เพลงรัก 26. In Love 27. Everything 28. จูนคลื่นหัวใจ 29. ฟิตหัวใจ 30. ฉันไม่อยู่ใครจะดูแลเธอ 31. ณ บัด Now

	32. รักจับใจ 33. Smile 34. สมการ Love
แก้ม The Star 4	1. ไม่สวยเลือกได้ 2. ไม่เหลือเหตุผลจะรัก 3. ไม่ไหวจะเคลียร์ 4. Help Me 5. Leave Me Alone 6. Baby, It's You
เม The Star 4	1. แก้เหงาให้ไหม
รุจ The Star 4	1. เพราะเธอ (Because Of You) 2. หัวใจไม่ลืม 3. ไม่มีอะไรจะคุย
ต้น The Star 4	1. Perfect Day
ภัทร The Star 4	1. รัก Bad Boy มั้ยครับ
แม็กซ์ The Star 4	1. เธอมันน่า
แป้ง The Star 4	1. ความรักมาทักทาย
สิงโต The Star 5	1. ไม่อยากได้ยินเสียงเธอ

	2. หัวก้อย 3. อย่าเอาเพื่อนเป็นแฟน 4. สะดุดรัก 5. เสียงของคนเจ็บ 6. Lovely Girl
ดิว The Star 5	1. คนน่ารักที่ไม่น่าไปรัก
ฟลุค The Star 5	1. คนไม่เคยถูกรัก 2. Baby, Come Back To Me
กิ่ง The Star 5	1. แด่เธอผู้อดทน 2. ฉันในมุมอ่อนแอ
แกรนด์ The Star 5	1. สะกดใจ 2. เธอเป็นแฟนฉันนะ 3. คนในกระจก 4. ตุ๊กตาบลายธ์ 5. เว้นวรรค 6. ตื่นได้แล้ว (Wake Up)
นัท The Star 5	1. Party Girl

กัน The Star 6	1. ระยะทำใจ 2. แค่คิดถึงกัน 3. ปลุกฉันได้ไหม 4. เธอจะเลือกใคร 5. เหวี่ยงก็รัก 6. Bad Valentine
ริท The Star 6	1. How To 2. ใช่สิ 3. กขค 4. เพี้ยง 5. หน้าเธอรบกวน 6. คู่ปรับ
เซน The Star 6	1. รักแรกพบ 2. ความในใจจากเพื่อนสนิท
เก่ง The Star 6	1. ปากเก่ง
ตูมตาม The Star 7	1. ไม่ใช่ฝัน ฉันตื่นแล้ว 2. ลมหนาวเดือนธันวา

นท The Star 7	1. ถ้าไม่รักกัน ฉันจะไป 2. เก็บไว้ทำกับแฟน 3. เธอคิดยังไงกัน 4. เขิน 5. White Lies 6. Just Fine 7. เจ้าชู้เพราะเธอ Especially For You
แอมป์ The Star 7	1. ภวังค์
แอปเปิ้ล The Star 7	1. รักเดียวใจเดียว...แป๊บเดียว
จูเนียร์ The Star 7	1. เจ็บแต่ยิ้มได้
แกงส้ม The Star 8	1. รักเธอ 24 ชั่วโมง 2. I Love Your Smile
ฮั่น The Star 8	1. บิด
แคน The Star 8	1. เหตุผลหรือข้ออ้าง
สต๊อป The Star 8	1. Don’t Stop (หยุดไม่ได้แล้ว)
ฮัท The Star 8	1. ไม่ว่าจะ
เฟรม The Star 8	1. ฉันขอลา

KPN

ศิลปิน	ชื่อเพลง
ใบตอง	1. ก็คนมันใช่
หนึ่ง	1. ชินสายตา ชาหัวใจ
กาย	1. Return 2. แค่ฝัน
สา	1. Love Explosion
ต้อง	1. นี่แหละผู้หญิง
บี้	1. ผิดคนหรือเปล่า 2. ครั้งแรก 3. Till The End
ไต้ฝุ่น	1. คนน่ารักอกหักได้
โฟนลิ้งค์	1. รักซะ

Academy Fantasia

ศิลปิน	ชื่อเพลง
พัดชา AF2	1. อยากบอกเธอ 2. โอ้ว...เหรอ 3. คุณสมบูรณ์ 4. คนดี ๆ กับที่จอดรถ
รอน AF5	1. พร้อมหรือยัง
ปอ AF7	1. โสดกระปริบกระปรอย
แพรว AF8	1. ได้รักเธอก็พอแล้ว
เจมส์ AF8	1. กอดสักทีคงหาย
แพรวา AF8	1. แว้ก

BIOGRAPHY

Name	Miss Jutharat Nawarungreung
Date of Birth	April 3, 1983
Educational Attainment	2007: Master of Arts
	2005: Bachelor of Arts
Work Position	Entry Clearance Assistant
	British Embassy

Publications

A Study of Miscegenation in Sui Sin Far's Two Short Stories "Pat and Pan" and "A Story of One White Woman Who Married a Chinese"

Work Experiences	: Entry Clearance Assistant
	British Embassy
	: Junior Administrative Assistant
	PSI Asia