

OUT-OF-CLASS LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES  
OF THAI UNIVERSITY STUDENTS DURING  
PARTICIPANT IN THE SUMMER WORK AND TRAVEL  
PROGRAM

Miss Thunyaporn Thanasumbun



A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Arts in English as an International Language  
Inter-Department of English as an International Language  
Graduate School  
Chulalongkorn University  
Academic Year 2019  
Copyright of Chulalongkorn University

กลยุทธ์ในการเรียนรู้ทางภาษาออกชั้นเรียนของนักศึกษาไทยที่เข้าร่วมโครงการ **Summer  
Work and Travel**



วิทยานิพนธ์นี้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษาตามหลักสูตรปริญญาศิลปศาสตรมหาบัณฑิต  
สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษานานาชาติ สหสาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษานานาชาติ

บัณฑิตวิทยาลัย จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

ปีการศึกษา 2562

ลิขสิทธิ์ของจุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

Thesis Title                                   OUT-OF-CLASS LANGUAGE LEARNING  
STRATEGIES OF THAI UNIVERSITY STUDENTS  
DURING PARTICIPANT IN THE SUMMER WORK  
AND TRAVEL PROGRAM  
By   Miss Thunyaporn Thanasumbun  
Field of Study                               English as an International Language  
Thesis Advisor                               Associate Professor Dr. PUNCHALEE  
WASANASOMSITHI, Ph.D.

---

Accepted by the Graduate School, Chulalongkorn University in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Master of Arts

..... Dean of the Graduate School  
(Associate Professor Dr. THUMNOON NHUJAK,  
Ph.D.)

THESIS COMMITTEE

..... Chairman  
(Assistant Professor Dr. APASARA CHINWONNO,  
Ph.D.)

..... Thesis Advisor  
(Associate Professor Dr. PUNCHALEE  
WASANASOMSITHI, Ph.D.)

..... External Examiner  
(Dr. Nawarat Siritaratn, Ph.D.)

จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย  
CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY

ธันยพร ธนสัมพันธ์ : กลยุทธ์ในการเรียนรู้ทางภาษานอกชั้นเรียนของนักศึกษาไทยที่เข้าร่วมโครงการ

**Summer Work and Travel. ( OUT-OF-CLASS LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES OF THAI UNIVERSITY STUDENTS DURING PARTICIPANT IN THE SUMMER WORK AND TRAVEL PROGRAM)**

อ.ที่ปรึกษาหลัก : รศ. ดร.ปัญญาธิ วาสนสมสิทธิ์

เชื่อกันว่าการเรียนการสอนในห้องเรียนเพียงอย่างเดียวไม่น่าเพียงพอต่อการพัฒนาทักษะภาษาของผู้เรียนภาษาที่สองและภาษาต่างประเทศ ดังนั้น การใช้เวลาช่วงปิดเทอมในประเทศที่ใช้ภาษาเป้าหมายจึงเป็นหนทางหนึ่งที่จะช่วยพัฒนาทักษะภาษานอกห้องเรียนของผู้เรียน งานวิจัยชิ้นนี้มุ่งศึกษาพฤติกรรมการเรียนภาษานอกห้องเรียนและทักษะสมรรถนะระหว่างวัฒนธรรมของนิสิตปริญญาตรี จำนวน 353 คน ที่เข้าร่วมโครงการทำงานพิเศษและท่องเที่ยวภาคฤดูร้อน (Summer Work and Travel Program) ในปี พ.ศ. 2561 ณ ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา เครื่องมือวิจัยเก็บข้อมูลเชิงปริมาณที่ใช้ได้แก่ การสำรวจจากวิธีการเรียนภาษา (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning- SILL) ของ Oxford (1990) และแบบสำรวจและประเมินสมรรถนะระหว่างวัฒนธรรม (Exploring and Assessing Intercultural Competence) ของ Fantini และ Tirmizi (2006) นอกจากนี้ ยังมีการสัมภาษณ์แบบกึ่งโครงสร้างกับผู้เข้าร่วมโครงการ จำนวน 10 คนที่มีคุณสมบัติตรงตามเกณฑ์ในการคัดเลือกเพื่อเก็บข้อมูลเชิงคุณภาพเชิงลึก ผลการวิจัยแสดงว่าความถี่ในการใช้กลยุทธ์การเรียนภาษานอกชั้นเรียนของผู้ร่วมโครงการอยู่ในระดับปานกลางถึงสูง โดยเฉพาะกลยุทธ์เรียนรู้ด้านสังคม นอกจากนี้ ยังพบว่าการทำงานร่วมกับคนที่มีมาจากต่างวัฒนธรรมยังช่วยพัฒนาทักษะสมรรถนะระหว่างวัฒนธรรมของผู้เรียนในเวลาเดียวกันอีกด้วย ดังนั้นจึงมีข้อเสนอแนะว่าครูผู้สอนภาษาจึงควรพัฒนาโปรแกรมการสอนที่ช่วยให้ผู้เรียนในอนาคตเกิดความรู้และเข้าใจพฤติกรรมการเรียนภาษานอกห้องเรียน และสร้างเสริมทักษะความรู้ด้านพหุวัฒนธรรม เพื่อช่วยให้ผู้เรียนสามารถก้าวข้ามอุปสรรคด้านภาษาและความแตกต่างทางวัฒนธรรมได้อย่างมีความมั่นใจและมีประสิทธิภาพมากขึ้น เพื่อให้ผู้เรียนสามารถใช้ประโยชน์จากการเข้าร่วมโครงการทำงานพิเศษและท่องเที่ยวภาคฤดูร้อนให้เกิดผลดีมากขึ้น

จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย  
CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY

สาขาวิชา           ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษานานาชาติ  
ปีการศึกษา       2562

ลายมือชื่อนิสิต .....

ลายมือชื่อ อ.ที่ปรึกษาหลัก .....

# # 5987558520 : MAJOR ENGLISH AS AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE  
 KEYWORD Out-of-Class Learning, Language Learning Strategies, Intercultural  
 D: Competence Skills, The Summer Work and Travel Program

Thunyaporn Thanasumbun : OUT-OF-CLASS LANGUAGE LEARNING  
 STRATEGIES OF THAI UNIVERSITY STUDENTS DURING  
 PARTICIPANT IN THE SUMMER WORK AND TRAVEL PROGRAM.  
 Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. PUNCHALEE WASANASOMSITHI, Ph.D.

It has long believed that in-class instruction alone is not sufficient to promote language skill development of second and foreign language learners, so spending time during school break in a country where the target language is spoken is one way to further increase their language proficiency outside classes. The present study aimed to investigate out-of-class language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills of 353 Thai undergraduate students who participated in the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States in the year 2018. Quantitative data were collected using the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) developed by Oxford (1990) and the Exploring and Assessing Intercultural Competence survey form Fantini and Tirmizi (2006). In addition, a semi-structured interview protocol was employed to elicit in-depth qualitative data from ten participants who met the inclusion criteria. The study findings revealed that the participants' frequency of use of learning strategies was at a medium to the high level, especially social learning strategies. Furthermore, while performing their work with others from different cultures, their intercultural competence skills were simultaneously developed. It is recommended that language teachers develop a training program to equip prospective program participants with necessary understanding of out-of-class language learning strategies and intercultural knowledge and skills to enable them to more confidently and effectively handle language barriers and cultural differences, hence more likelihood to find their participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program more beneficial and fruitful.

จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย  
 CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY

Field of Study:	English as an International Language	Student's Signature
Academic Year:	2019	.....
		Advisor's Signature
		.....

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Associate Professor Dr. Phunchalee Wasanasomsithi, Ph.D. for the continuous support of my M.A. study and research, for her patience, motivation, enthusiasm, and immense knowledge. Her guidance helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis. I could not have imagined having a better advisor and mentors for my M.A. study. Besides my advisor, I would like to thank the rest of my thesis committee: Assistant Professor Dr. Apasara Chinwonno, Ph.D. and Dr. Nawarat Siritaratn, Ph.D., for their encouragement, insightful comments and guidance.

I would also like to thank my family who has been supporting me spiritually and financially throughout my study life and all the people who have supported me to complete the research work directly or indirectly.

Last but not the least, praises and thanks to the God, the Almighty, for His showers of blessings throughout my research work to complete the research successfully.

Thunyaporn Thanasumbun

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
.....	iii
ABSTRACT (THAI) .....	iii
.....	iv
ABSTRACT (ENGLISH) .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Background of the Study .....	1
1.2 Study Objectives .....	6
1.3 Research Questions .....	6
1.4 Scope of the Study .....	6
1.5 Definition of Terms .....	7
1.6 Significance of the Study .....	9
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW .....	11
2.1 Out-of-Class Learning .....	11
2.1.1 Definition of out-of-class learning .....	11
2.1.2 Characteristics of out-of-class learning activities .....	12
2.1.3 Benefits of out-of-class language learning activities .....	14
2.2 Language learning strategies .....	18
2.2.1 Definition of language learning strategies .....	18
2.2.2 Classification of language learning strategies (Oxford, 1990) .....	19
2.2.3 A study on Oxford (1990)'s classification of language learning strategies .....	22
2.2.4 Factors affecting language learning strategies .....	23
2.3 Intercultural Competence Skills .....	27

2.3.1 Concept of culture and intercultural competence.....	27
2.3.2 Definition of intercultural competence.....	28
2.3.3 Components and characteristics of intercultural competence .....	29
2.3.4 Significant differences in intercultural competence training.....	31
2.3.5 Roles teachers in intercultural competence learning .....	33
2.4 The Summer Work and Travel Program.....	34
2.4.2 Program background .....	35
2.4.3 Purposes of the program.....	36
2.4.4 Eligible program participants .....	36
2.4.5 Program benefits.....	37
2.4.6 Studies on participation in the program .....	38
2.4.7 Perception of program value .....	40
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	43
3.1 Research Design .....	43
3.2 Population and Sampling.....	45
3.3 Research Instruments.....	46
3.3.1 A questionnaire adapted from SILL (Oxford, 1990) and AIC (Fantini and Tirmizi, 2006).....	47
3.3.2 The semi-structured interview protocol .....	48
3.4 Data collection .....	49
3.5 Data Analysis.....	51
CHAPTER IV FINDINGS .....	54
4.1 Out-of-Class Language Learning Strategies.....	54
4.2 Intercultural Competence Skill .....	63
4.3 Additional Findings regarding Job Positions and Frequency of Use of Language Learning Strategies and Intercultural Competence Skills .....	66
CHAPTER V DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION .....	74
5.1 Out-of-Class Language Learning Strategies.....	74
5.2 Intercultural Competence Skills .....	78
5.3 Implication of the findings.....	80



5.4 Recommendations for Further Studies .....	82
REFERENCES .....	84
APPENDICES .....	90
Appendix A.....	91
Appendix B.....	99
VITA.....	101



## LIST OF TABLES

		<b>Page</b>
Table 4.1	Overall language learning strategies used	55
Table 4.2	Frequency of use of each strategy	57
Table 4.3	Most Frequently used strategies under each category of language learning strategies	59
Table 4.4	Least frequently used strategies under each category of language learning strategies	61
Table 4.5	Findings regarding intercultural competence skill development	63
Table 4.6	Frequency of use of each strategy and intercultural competence skill of participants with different job positions	66

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of the Study

Over the years, English has become a global language. It is undeniable that English is one of the most dominant languages of the world, with an influence on almost every field of study and work. English is likely to be a key to unlock job or study opportunities among English speaking people, and undoubtedly, it also plays a significant role in non-English speaking countries, including Thailand.

The role of English in Thailand is increasing significantly as it is in many other developing countries. In higher Thai language education, the English language has been a core subject in the university admission public examinations; therefore, most of the Thai university students tend to be immersed in exam-oriented learning being trained in grammar-oriented ways to pass examinations. Thus, most homework and assignments, which are claimed to help students practice what they have learned in class to promote students' language proficiency, are mostly designed to develop grammatical knowledge; reading, and writing other language skills are likely to be overlooked. Additionally, in-class traditional lectures are not fulfilling the learning potential of typical university students today and hardly serve the purpose of learning a language to communicate in real life outside classes.

As a matter of fact, the nature of human learning is developed when inspired by something else the classroom cannot offer. Learners may prefer more interaction and something inspiring to learn rather than being part in a classroom with one-way

learning. The world outside the university is richly inspiring, giving learners plenty of opportunities to naturally be motivated to learn outside as it is the source of all language learning. This is why language learners can learn language through cultures, business, and relationships with other people from all over the world.

To better the learning outcomes, out-of-class learning activities may be needed to supplement what students lack in class. Teachers should encourage students to be aware of the importance of out-of-class language learning so that they can learn and practice any skill anywhere and anytime at their own pace. They should take charge of their own learning, engaging themselves in out-of-class activities requiring English to accomplish the goal of the activities. They probably perform the activities independently or with others to acquire the language. Surrounded with English used in the environment, students can find that learning English is more enjoyable. Thus, in order to become successful language learners, they need to take control of their own learning both in class and out-of-class.

As out-of-class learning serves as a platform where students could fully develop their autonomy through authentic learning activities, university students should be able to take charge of their own language learning, developing the capacity for learner autonomy. What's more, with the realistic setting of out-of-class learning, students should be able to develop their own language learning strategies or invent their own learning plans according to their own situations, including performing real world tasks with a variation of English in the real world. Thus, the world outside the school is richly inspiring what is learned within the classroom, and it is also the source of all our learning. Students can acquire the target language, establish

relationships with each other, and become accustomed to a variety of cultures, all of which are important for language learning and education.

Still, Thailand is where opportunities for out-of-class learning appear to be limited. The lack of learning contexts prevents Thai language learners from using and mastering English in their daily life. This therefore can be considered a major problem in language education in Thailand. One of the promising solutions to this problem is to engage oneself in an English-speaking environment so that out-of-class experiences can supplement what students lack in class. Seeing that students will gain experience from diverse contexts including formal and informal interaction with peers or others, it is widely believed that the Summer Work and Travel Program is one way for Thai language learners to gain a meaningful out-of-class language learning experience, resulting in a higher number of program participants every year.

During participation in the program, students will learn to appreciate the value of things they actually encounter in the real world, which are considered extracurricular activities and they can reap benefits from engaging in and learning from out-of-class activities. Then the habit of learning can be increasingly generated when students feel that learning has actually taken place.

The Summer Work and Travel Program is an exchange visitor program administered by the U.S. Department of State under the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. The program is designed to achieve the educational objectives of international exchange by directly involving students in an English-speaking environment. The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, U.S. Department of State, claims that the program allows college and university

students who are at least 18 years of age to apply to enroll full time and pursue studies at post-secondary accredited academic institutions located outside the United States to come to the United States to share their cultures and ideas with people of the United States through three-month temporary work and travel opportunities through the J-1 Visa Program during their university vacations. Students are legally offered a variety of job positions, such as food and beverage, cashier, lifeguard, housekeeping, shop assistant, ride attendant, customer service, house and ground, etc., according to their language placement tests which are differently tested by a program agency.

Over the years, the US Summer Work Travel program showed a growth of 15% in 2012, which marked the first increase in participant numbers since 2007 (EurekaFacts, 2017). This expansion is primarily fueled by a gap between a growing number of affluent people and a lack of quality domestic institutions.

Similarly, there has been a sharp rise in the number of Thai university students participating in the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States. The increasing number of Thai program participants reflects their enthusiasm to gain work experience and language development through English communication and social interactions in an authentic English-speaking environment.

When they are embedded in English speaking circumstances, Thai university students as program participants are naturally forced to develop their out-of-class language learning strategies to achieve tasks in order to interact with others appropriately and effectively. In so doing, Thai university students as exchange visitors are forced to interact with native and non-native English speakers who have different cultural backgrounds in the workplace and while doing other routine

activities. Therefore, their intercultural competence can also be simultaneously developed.

Besides, as stated by EurekaFacts (2017), program participants are encouraged to learn more about American culture by getting involved in their communities outside of their work hours. Program sponsors and employers offer participants additional opportunities to gain a broader cultural understanding of the American people and their customs and values through programs and events they organize. In short, it can be simply summarized that culture is inextricable from language. If language learners are exposed to a multicultural context, including having a chance to engage in cultural activities, their language skills as well as their intercultural competence skills are likely to be developed unconsciously through their engagement and integration in language learning. Thus, to achieve a language purpose successfully, engaging in cultures of English-speaking people seems very beneficial.

To summarize, leaning English in class is not sufficient for all levels of basic education, including higher education. Hence, it seems difficult for university students to be able to use the language effectively since they are mostly trained in grammar-oriented classrooms for examinations. They need more supportive out-of-class activities to practice speaking and listening that are essential skills for communication. The Summer Work and Travel Program offers Thai university students opportunities to naturally use the language involving them in an authentic English speaking environment and to be exposed to the cultures of the owners of the language. When students find themselves in an unfamiliar situation, they are expected to develop their own out-of-class language learning strategies in order to learn how to

live and achieve their goals either to work or travel or to develop their English proficiency. Therefore, it was interesting to investigate out-of-class language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills of Thai university students participating in the Summer Work and Travel Program in order to subsequently prepare a training program with an aim to help them boost their linguistic and cultural competence before going to work and travel in the United States.

## **1.2 Study Objectives**

1.2.2 To investigate out-of-class language learning strategies of Thai university students during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program

1.2.2 To explore Thai university students' intercultural competence skills during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program

## **1.3 Research Questions**

1.3.1 What are out-of-class language learning strategies of Thai university students during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program?

1.3.2 What are Thai university students' intercultural competence skills during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program?

## **1.4 Scope of the Study**

The present study aimed to investigate language learning strategies used by Thai university students during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program in 2017 and 2018. The other purpose this study was to explore Thai university students' intercultural competence skills during participation in the



Summer Work and Travel Program. The study participants could be divided into two groups: 353 participants who completed the online questionnaire and ten participants who were interviewed. The instruments used in data collection collected by two means of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (Oxford,1990) and the Assessing Intercultural Competence (AIC) by Fantini and Tirmizi, (2006) questionnaire adapted and translated into Thai to investigate frequency of use of strategies and skills. A set of semi-structured interview questions was used to elicit more insight and examples of learning strategies use and intercultural competence skills of Thai university students during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States. The data collection was administered once the students returned from the program in August 2018.

## **1.5 Definition of Terms**

**1.5.1 Out-of-class learning:** Out-of-class learning is one of the modes of learning beyond the context of a classroom. Benson (2015) views out-of-class learning as any kind of learning that takes place outside the classroom and involves self-instruction, naturalistic learning, and self-directed naturalistic learning. In this study, out-of-class learning took place during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States, during the term break of Thai universities. Thai university students learned English and other skills naturally through interaction, communicating in English with both native English speakers and non-native English speakers during the program.

**1.5.2 Language learning strategies:** Language learning strategies refer to specific plans, actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques that individual learners use,

with some degree of consciousness, to improve their progress in developing skills in a second or foreign language (Oxford, 1990). In this study, leaning strategies referred to out-of-class language learning strategies that were used by Thai university students during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States. Students used, adopted, and invented their own learning strategies or techniques to survive and work in a new English-speaking environment surrounded by English speaking people from different cultural backgrounds to enhance their speaking and listening skills, which are hardly practiced in class in Thailand.

**1.5.3 Intercultural competence:** Intercultural competence is defined as a complex of abilities needed to perform effectively and appropriately when interacting with others who are linguistically and culturally different from oneself (Fantini, 2009). Skills of intercultural competence are skills that address the acquisition and processing of knowledge: observation, listening, evaluating, analyzing, interpreting, and relating. In the context of the Summer Work and Travel Program in this study, Thai university students were exchange visitors living in a new environment surrounded with colleagues and other people from different social and cultural backgrounds. They need to be aware of the significant intercultural skills which would help them communicate effectively and behave appropriately to others during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program, which also involved observation, listening, evaluating, analysis, interpretation, and making connections.

**1.5.4 The Summer Work and Travel Program:** As defined by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, U.S. Department of State, the Summer Work and Travel Program is the program which aims to promote mutual understanding between

the people of the United States and the people of other countries by means of educational and cultural exchanges, allowing college and university students located outside the United States to go to the United States to share their culture and ideas with people of the United States through temporary work and travel opportunities. In this study, the Summer Work and Travel Program was considered a popular out-of-class learning activity among Thai university students. The program offers opportunities to develop English proficiency and language intercultural competence skills simultaneously during their university break.

### **1.6 Significance of the Study**

First, it was hoped that the findings of the study would play a significant role in preparing future program participants to help them make the most, linguistically as well as culturally, out of their brief stay in the target language environment during their participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program. The study findings could be used in a training session or an orientation for the program participants to develop necessary language learning strategies and to enable them to gain understanding of cultural differences, which would allow them to explore the varieties of the target cultures in comparison with their own cultures, which benefits their acquisition of the target language. Once trained to learn how to adopt some of the most and least frequently used language learning strategies as well as intercultural competence skills, the program participants should be ready to handle language barriers, cultural differences, or English language skills, which are once beyond their level of proficiency, confidently and productively. The findings of this study could also be utilized as a guideline for language instructors to observe effective strategies

used by the former program participants in order to further recommend them for the future program participants.

More importantly, the findings regarding language learning strategies used by Thai university students during the Summer Work and Travel Program would be useful for university instructors to encourage students to explore and experiment with out-of-class English learning strategies to help promote their English language learning. Teachers can use the findings to seek ways to implement activities to expose learners to the target culture, while learning to realize the characteristics of their own culture and the diversity within their culture.

Besides, it is hoped that the findings may raise instructors' and administrator's awareness of the significance of out-of-class leaning, helping students find useful strategies to benefit their language development. The more instructors know about students' strategies, the more effectively they can orient their second language instruction to help them develop and master such strategies (Oxford, 1990). Thus, classroom instruction should become more effective once teachers learn about out-of-class language leaning strategies preferred by students to supplement what students learn in class. Thus, it can be expected that language learning of students can become more meaningful and successful.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter mainly focuses on the existing literature and research related to the topic under study. The main topics reviewed in this chapter include of out-of-class learning, language learning strategies, intercultural competence skills, the Summer Work and Travel Program.

#### **2.1 Out-of-Class Learning**

##### **2.1.1 Definition of out-of-class learning**

In general, the term “out-of-class” language learning has widely been used in a number of studies. According to Richards, (2015), out-of-class learning activities equip students with a wider range of affordances for language use and second language acquisition than generally available in the classroom.

Later, has similarly defined out-of-class learning as any kind of learning that takes place outside the classroom and involves self-instruction, naturalistic learning, and self-directed naturalistic learning (Benson, 2015). All of these activities are believed to help supplement in-class instruction and make language learning more successful.

In brief, out-of-class learning refers to any kind of activities in any context learners are involved in so that their language learning can be developed in some way while doing outside supportive activities. In the present study, out-of-class English language learning is considered any informal language learning activities that are

available for learners to be able to learn, practice, and use English outside the class with a certain degree of teacher or technology involvements.

### **2.1.2 Characteristics of out-of-class learning activities**

In order to successfully achieve the purpose of out-of-class language learning, language learners should probably realize and consider significant characteristics of activities in which they are involved.

According to Benson, (2011), out-of-class language learning activities are activities that supplement classroom learning, such as homework, self-access work, extracurricular activities, and the use of self-instructional materials. However, the activities are mostly done according to learners' interests and intention of learning. Thus, learners' personal pleasure and motivation could initiate extracurricular activities outside the class. Benson, (2011) has also used a framework to categorize the activities into three broad classifications as follows: 1) Self-instruction activities refer to search for resources to help learners learn and improve their target language. The activities in self-instruction function are plans carried out by learners themselves to reach a particular goal of their language learning. 2) Naturalistic language learning activities, which are in contrast to a previously mentioned type of language learning activities, are more unintentional engagement in the target language where learners do social activities while directly communicating with uses of that target language, so learners can interact with native or non-native speakers of English. 3) Self-directed naturalistic language learning activities are a combination of two previously mentioned types, where learners do activities with a focus being placed on doing them

for pleasure than for the purpose of language development, such as watching movies and listening to music for fun.

In other words, Benson, (2001) has proposed three types of out-of-class language learning activities that learners can carry out to learn English informally or pleasurably outside the class. Learners can do different types of activities at different times depending on their intention or language learning purposes at the moment. In the present study, out-of-class learning activities were considered self-directed naturalistic language learning since the participants who participated in the Summer Work and Travel Program were embedded in an English speaking environment, so they could engage in language learning activities during work and social interactions but they may not intentionally focus on learning the language while they were doing those activities.

A great number of researchers have emphasized the significance of the setting of out-of-class learning activities that the setting of the activities that learners engage in outside of the class as they believe it is one of the keys to a language learning. According to Brown, (2007), a learning context outside the class should be meaningful and effective for learners to acquire language knowledge. Meaningful activities should be relevant to language learners' knowledge and interests, allowing them to connect new information with something that is already known. As a result, the connection between new and known information can maintain learners' language retention, which makes them more likely to remember it for future use.

In addition to the relevance to language learners' knowledge and interests, another significant characteristic that also seems to play a crucial role in second

language learning is the significance of context. It has been claimed by Norton and Toohey, (2011) that of social and cultural contexts are important because learners will be motivated by various elements and attitudes that exist in a particular social and cultural context such as values, meaningfulness, etc.

### **2.1.3 Benefits of out-of-class language learning activities**

Out-of-class language learning is done to supplement in-class language learning, with learners benefiting from opportunities that are difficult to create in the classroom. In this study, learners can benefit from out-of-class activities divided into three kinds: linguistic benefits, psychological benefits, as well as physical benefits. Still, beneficial elements such as culture, social value, confidence, essential life skills, and other intangible elements in target language environment are also investigated.

In terms of linguistic benefits, according to a study undertaken by Richards, (2015), out-of-class learning activities provide students with a wider range of affordances for language use and second language acquisition than generally available in the classroom due to linguistic input and output abundantly available in out-of-class language learning activities that enable learners to meaningfully engage in authentic communications. They get a chance to work on their English skills through interactions with other English speakers and also deal with any unexpected conversation that probably happens during their communication. As a result of authentic and meaningful activities, learners naturally develop their use of language through actual communication.

Likewise, another study by Coskun, (2016) has found that when engaging in out-of-class language learning activities, learners found that speaking activities



contributed to their fluency, vocabulary, and pronunciation development. The study examined five out-of-class speaking activities, including fantasy role-playing, continuous story, debate, radio program, and broadcasting on Periscope. It was claimed that each activity helped boost speaking ability differently. For instance, fantasy role-playing helped learners practice unprepared speaking, vocabulary, and pronunciation development in a fun way, while continuous story allowed them to gain creativity, fluency, and vocabulary development.

Considering speaking activities, which usually require listening ability, it is clear that those who learn a target language overseas tend to have more chance to develop pronunciation faster than learners who learn the language in a domestic setting (Diaz-Campos, 2006). This is because they have more contact with native speakers, thus, their oral competence and pronunciation improve through informal conversations while engaging in affordable out-of-class language learning activities.

Moreover, in the light of what the Internet and technological devices provide for learners, Suthuwarnarueput and Wasanasomsithi (2012) have reported that using a blog as a free online space outside the classroom gave learners opportunity to practice English writing skills and improve their grammar competence. In addition to useful online websites, language learners could take advantages from other supportive English language learning resources that are available via mobile phone applications as well.

Together with learners' development in language skills, the activities outside of the classroom raise learners' awareness of English in their living environment after the activity. According to Guo, (2011), the level of learners' attention changed

dramatically in regard to awareness of English usage on campus, on daily products that they used, on street signs, on store merchandise, and on restaurant menus. Therefore, learners who are surrounded with English although they are in a non-English speaking country can learn from out-of-class activities in their surrounding while they are struggling to achieve mastery of the target language.

In addition to linguistic development, out-of-class language learning activities are also good sources for emotional and cognitive development. For instance, according to Hanf (2014), television series and movies are pleasurable resources for language learners, who can make use of textual captions or subtitles to ease their comprehension for language learners. In so doing, it is obvious that television is a fun, supportive, and adjustable resource for both language development.

It has been found that the use of Internet and media plays a significant role in handling learners' emotion. The results of a study by Elias and Lemish (2008) have indicated that social network is beneficial for children who are young immigrants as it could be a protective tool that prevents young immigrants from feeling embarrassed and disoriented compared to face-to-face interaction with local people due to language and cultural barriers. Hence, through the assistance of media, young immigrants who are language learners can confront the challenges of new language and cultural learning experiences.

Last but not least, out-of-class language learning activities can facilitate learners, providing convenient tools and limitless supportive resources which learners may not be able to afford from in-class instruction. (Richards, 2015) additionally, describes that out-of-class activities offer a number of advantages for learners. The

activities allow learners flexibility and convenience in learning so that they can manage their places, modes, and manners of learning in different contexts and situations. Through watching movies, playing games, and chatting online, for example, learners are provided with a pleasurable and positive language experience that helps them enjoy learning and increase their motivation to learn.

As regards in out-of-class language learning activities in an overseas context, it has been reported that they provide even greater opportunities for learners to improve their language development. According to Cadd, (2015), who investigated how out-of-class language learning activities could contribute to students participating in a program abroad through the assignments assigned in class, contact assignments together with a self-evaluation and a report back to their professors and fellow students on a class website provides learners with opportunities to use Spanish for authentic communication with native speakers or other advanced learners. Furthermore, contact assignments helped learners gain insightful perspective on the target language and culture, mostly from native speakers. Thus, contact assignment requiring learners to participate in out-of-class activities could minimize anxiety of public interaction while enabling learners to more socialize with people in a new cultural environment. Likewise, Isabelli, (2004) has pointed out that out-of-class language learning activities encourage students to develop understanding of culture simultaneously with language learning, particularly through social networking with native speakers that offer more opportunities to practice and improve the target language.

In summary, learners themselves should be aware of the significance of out-of-class language learning in order to enhance and master their language proficiency and achieve mastery of the target language. Teacher should equip learners with beneficial language learning strategies while raising their awareness that beneficial strategies they learn in class can also be applied out-of-class to enhance their language learning.

## **2.2 Language learning strategies**

### **2.2.1 Definition of language learning strategies**

In the field of education, definitions of language learning strategies vary considerably. According to O'Malley and Chamot, (1990) learning strategies are defined as sets of operations or steps, including special thoughts or behaviors used by learners that will facilitate the acquisition, storage, retrieval, or use of information as well as comprehend, learn or retain new information.

Oxford, (1989) describes language learning strategies broadly including the excitement or richness of learning strategies. Oxford expands the original definition by including significance of language learning strategies, or specific actions taken by learners to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective and more transferable to new situations. Later, it was concluded that language learning strategies are specific plans, actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques that individual learners use, with some degree of consciousness, to improve their progress in developing skills in a second or foreign language.

Around the same time, Schumaker (2006) defines learning strategies in general as an individual's approach to a task, including how a person thinks and acts when planning, executing, and evaluating performance on a task and its outcomes. Much of this thinking about learning is done unconsciously. Learners make use of a variety of strategies to help them organize and remember key elements of the learning process.

Obviously, researchers in later generation have focused on the consciousness and unconsciousness when learners behave and think in their language learning, as well as learner characteristics in language learning which cover how they can enjoy learning and manage themselves during their own learning through employment of learning strategies. Despite varied definitions of learning strategies, the aforementioned researchers have defined something in common, stating that learning strategies are techniques learners employ to help to achieve a certain goal of language learning.

For language learners, they need both in-class and out-of-class language learning strategies in order to choose suitable actions or behaviors to make language learning successful. Language learning strategies facilitate them to acquire and store new knowledge, as well as overcome any language difficulty on their own.

### **2.2.2 Classification of language learning strategies (Oxford, 1990)**

In the present study, the classification of language learning strategies proposed by (Oxford, 1990) was adopted even though the goal of the study was to explore out-of-class language learning strategies. This is because it was believed that strategies that learners used in class could also be applied outside class when they were engaged

in language learning tasks. According to Oxford (1990), language learning strategies are grouped under two super ordinate categories: direct strategies and indirect strategies, which are described as follows:

## **1. Direct Strategies**

**1.1 Memory:** Creating mental linkages, applying images and sounds, reviewing well, and employing action

**1.2 Cognitive:** Practicing, receiving and sending messages, analyzing and reasoning, and creating structures for input and output

**1.3 Compensation strategies:** Guessing intelligently, and overcoming limitations in speaking and writing

## **2. Indirect strategies**

**2.1 Metacognitive strategies:** Centering learning, arranging and planning learning, and evaluating learning

**2.2 Affective strategies:** Lowering anxiety, encouraging oneself, and taking emotional temperature

**2.3 Social strategies:** Asking questions, cooperating with others, and empathizing with others

Apparently, direct strategies contain memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies, which are more directly associated with the learning and the use of the target language. These strategies require mental processing of the language to reach a certain aim. Learners are required to apply some type of action either mentally or physically to acquire, understand, and store their language knowledge. Learners apply memory strategies to store information through pictures, sounds, or physical actions. In order to memorize and make sense of their learning, learners can employ cognitive

strategies when needed, including practicing, finding the reason, or structuring input and output. However, if there is any knowledge gap during language learning, learners can overcome the gap to continue the communication through the use of compensation strategies.

In contrast, some of the learners are likely to use the other type of learning strategies, or indirect strategies, which include metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. These strategies help the learning process internally or support and manage language learning without directly involving the target language. Metacognitive strategies help learners regulate their learning and evaluate their language outcome. In addition to self-regulation in their own language learning, learners can use affective strategies which are related to learner's emotional requirements to increase their confidence when using the language or social strategies to interact with the target language with others.

Clearly, in spite of being distinguished into two distinct categories, learning strategies share common characteristics. The abovementioned subcategories allow learners to become self-directed requiring some special behaviors and cognitive approaches. Learning strategies support learning both directly and indirectly through flexibly applying the strategies as solutions towards problem-oriented language tasks. Morita (2010) has similarly pointed out that language learning strategies can be changed if language learners are submerged in an environment surrounded by a target language and culture even for a short term.

Oxford (1990) has pointed out that since the strategies used by language learners can be influenced by a variety of factors, they are not always observable. Yet,

one of the most important aspects of learning strategies is that they increase the role of teachers as it is claimed that learning strategies are teachable, so language teachers should be aware of the importance of language learning strategies as in-class instruction alone is not sufficient for a language learner to achieve high proficiency in a target language. In other words, language learners should be encouraged to invent and use language learning strategies when they are exposed to the target language outside the class as well.

### **2.2.3 A study on Oxford (1990)'s classification of language learning strategies**

A number of studies have used Strategies Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford (1990) to investigate language learning strategies used by learners in the contexts of in-class instruction and out-of-class language learning. For example, according to Morita (2010) who used Oxford (1990)'s classification to examine change in language learning strategies experienced by learners in a short-term study abroad, has reported that even a study abroad program of two weeks could produce significant changes in language learning strategies. The frequency of learning strategy use increased after the program. The study has shown that learners used four out of six types of learning strategies more, namely memory, cognitive, affective and, social strategies, after engaging in the intercultural communication program. However, the other two types of strategies, compensation and metacognitive, were used widely both before and after the program.



#### 2.2.4 Factors affecting language learning strategies

When language learners are exposed to the target language, choices determining which learning strategies each learner will use vary depending on different factors. According to Oxford (1990), factors that influence the choice of strategies used by learners learning a second language include degree of awareness, stage of second language learning, task requirements, age, cultural background, general learning style, and motivation level. Hence, given an identical language task, each learner may use a different learning strategy to accomplish the same task. These following factors can explain the reasons why language learners learn and use strategies differently.

**2.2.4.1 Motivation:** Previously, Gardner (1985) has pointed out that motivation assists in the successful acquisition of a second language. Motivation can be categorized into two types based on the purpose of learning: 1) integrative motivation which is arisen from learners who desire to integrate with the second language culture, such as for immigration or marriage, and 2) instrumental motivation which usually refers to learners who wish to achieve goals utilizing second language, such as for a career or examination (Oxford, 1990). In other words, international students have a higher level of integrative motivation. This may be due to the reason that international students usually have a specific aim in mind when they opt to study overseas.

That is to say, language learning is mostly likely to occur when learners want to learn, then learners with higher motivation to learn, which can be derived from

some important reason, tend to use more strategies in language learning than those with a lower level of motivation.

**2.2.4.2 Cultural background:** It is undeniable that learners from different national origins or ethnicities typically have different uses of language learning strategies. Previous studies have reported that cultural background has a strong influence on the kinds of strategies used by language learners. For example, Politzer, (1983), has pointed out that Hispanics and Asians differ strongly in the kinds of strategies they use for language learning; Hispanics choose more social, interactive strategies, while Asians opt for greater memorization. (Trice, 2004) has pointed out a possible reason that Asian learners prefer less interaction with other English-speaking people than memorization when learning a target language.

**2.2.4.3 Attitude and belief:** Attitude and belief are among strong factors affecting selection of language learning strategies. According to Oxford and Shearin, (1994), attitudes have been reported to have a profound effect on the strategy that learners choose. As a result, negative attitudes and beliefs can cause poor strategy use or lack of arrangement of strategies or even decrease their motivation to learn, whereas learners who have positive attitudes toward the target language tend to develop higher integrative motivation, consequently facilitating second language acquisition progress. If they have positive attitude or a strong belief towards something they are trying to accomplish, they will do it happily and successfully.

**2.2.4.4 Types of tasks:** In general, each type of language task usually requires different language learning strategies to complete. According to Oxford (1990), learners will determine which language learning strategies to use depending

on the type of task. The nature of the task helps learners determine language learning strategies, which are usually adjustable and appropriate to them. In this sense, learners may have to consider the skills required for the tasks and steps to follow so as to achieve the task goal. As a consequence, when carrying out an identical task outside the class which has the exact same purpose, each learner probably similarly uses different language learning strategies they consider effective and useful.

In short, strategies that are claimed to be very useful in one particular task may be ineffective for another type of task. As a result, learners need to understand the nature of the task that they are required to do in order to consider appropriate language learning strategies while language teachers also need to find out what learning strategies learners are already using to accomplish different tasks they are assigned both in-class and outside language learning.

**2.2.4.5 Age and second language stage:** It is believed that age and second language stage are one of the main factors in selection and use of language learning strategies. A number of studies have found that age and second language stage are related to learners' use of language learning strategies. To explain learning strategies chosen during an early stage of language learning and at a young age are usually simple as they are still not proficient enough. When learners become older and more proficient, the strategies they choose can be more complex and sophisticated. In summary, learners of different ages and stages of second language learning use different strategies due to different needs, competences, and cognitive skills (Harmer, 2004).

**2.2.4.6 Learning styles and preferences:** Another factor which seems to affect choices of language learning strategies use is learners' learning style. According to a study carried out by (Maros & Mat Saad, 2016), to investigate language learning strategies of 250 international students in an institution in Malaysia, it has been revealed that learners preferred to learn English through watching television programs or movies and utilize tools mainly technology-affiliated in advancing themselves in the target language.

In short, it can be said that if learners are introduced to language learning strategies that suit their learning styles and preferences, they are more likely to use them to enhance their language learning outcome.

**2.2.4.7 Tolerance of ambiguity:** Naturally, when people encounter with unknown information during learning something, they tend to be anxious. Similarly, when learners find language input during their out-of-class language learning activities ambiguous, some may be able to tolerate what they do not understand while others may not be able to tolerate the ambiguity happening during their learning activities. Thus, the outcome of learning may vary according to learners' tolerance of ambiguity.

According to Ehrman and Oxford, (1989), learners with a higher level of tolerance of ambiguity will persevere when facing complicated language tasks. They may attempt to push forward by relying on strategies such as guessing the meaning from the context to ease their comprehension.

In addition, El-Koumy, (2000) has reported that middle ambiguity tolerance group performed better than low and high tolerance of ambiguity groups in reading

comprehension. That is to say, the right amount of tolerance of ambiguity may influence on learners' selection and use of certain language learning strategies.

To sum up, numerous studies have shown that language learning strategies are always vital tools in driving learners to accomplish the tasks effectively and learners also use different language learning strategies depending on varying factors. Thus, teaching language learning strategies is a necessity which needs careful considerations by language teachers (Oxford, 1990). Teachers should take learning strategies into consideration when designing a lesson and assigning learning tasks.

Beside this, in order to make a study abroad program fruitful in terms of language development, it is essential for teachers to prepare learners appropriately. Such preparation should include not only language knowledge but also language learning strategies (Morita, 2010). That is to say, the preparation should equip learners with learning strategies they need for learners to learn. When trained and taught how to learn, adopt, and invent language learning strategies, language learners can be autonomous and successful in language learning regardless of where they are.

## **2.3 Intercultural Competence Skills**

### **2.3.1 Concept of culture and intercultural competence**

Culture is a set of values that is embedded in a society. Different groups of people develop different identities, which may be acceptable or not acceptable in others'. Cultural values arise from social structures, including economic and political factors and finally passed on or adapted to the next generations (Nieto, 2010). However, culture can be a barrier to improve learners' English proficiency, which is

one of the main purposes in participation in an exchange program, when encountering a new cultural environment. They may confront culture shock, or anxiety that results from losing all familiar signs of social intercourse, which learners do not carry at the level of conscious awareness (Brown, 2007). Culture shock is one of the main factors that prevent most international students from seeking to improve their English beyond the classroom (Liu, 2012). Hence, educational institutes should be aware of cultural differences and realize the significance of integrating intercultural dimensions in language teaching and learning to develop essential awareness and intercultural competence.

According to (Alred & Byram, 2002) 'being intercultural' means being able to reconstruct the others' frame of reference and see things through their eyes in order to overcome our ethnocentric tendency to impose our categories and values on their behavior. It also means to enhance our self-awareness as cultural beings. In this sense, learners should be able to accept others' beliefs and values, even if they do not approve them, including being aware of the disquieting tension in the intercultural experience. Clearly, intercultural competence is significantly required for those who are going to be exposed to a new cultural environment.

### **2.3.2 Definition of intercultural competence**

According to (Deardorff, 2006), intercultural competence is regarded as the ability to behave and communicate effectively and appropriately based on one's intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes to achieve his or her goals to a certain degree. In this study, the definition of intercultural competence proposed by (Fantini, 2009) was developed. It is considered as a complex of abilities needed to perform

effectively and appropriately when interacting with others who are linguistically and culturally different from oneself.

However, effectiveness and appropriateness of one's cultural performance is viewed differently. To define if someone perform culturally effectively, depends on an outsider's perception of the host culture, while the terms "appropriate" relates to how one's performance is perceived by an insider's point of view. In spite of different perceptions, it is instructive to compare and contrast them because they arise from differing cultural approaches to the same situation.

In sum, intercultural competence has been defined as a set of required abilities when confronting a new culture, including the ability to understand other people from different cultural backgrounds or social identities, ability to communicate with them effectively using skills they have learned, and ability to interact appropriately with them based on knowledge and skills they acquire before, during, or after encountering different cultures.

### **2.3.3 Components and characteristics of intercultural competence**

In order to become culturally competent, learners have to consider a variety of cultural aspects which constitute to intercultural competence. Overall, most of the studies have classified the components similarly. According to Fantini, (2009), learners should possess a dimension that includes knowledge, attitudes, skills, and awareness. In order to perform a dimension to gain intercultural competence, learners should have the following characteristics which learners should possess in order to gain intercultural competence are: are flexibility, humor, patience, openness, interest, curiosity, empathy, tolerance for ambiguity, and suspending judgments.

However, in this study, the term “intercultural competence skills” proposed by Fantini, (2009) are mainly used to refer to observation, listening, evaluating, analyzing, interpreting, and relating since the skills they use are hopefully beneficial for the Summer Work and Travel program participants, especially for those with no prior intercultural contact or exposure.

During the same time, Deardorff, (2006) has classified important elements in intercultural competence, developing the “pyramid model” to clarify learners’ qualifications of gaining intercultural competence. The model includes four steps depending on five dimensions for learners to achieve the intercultural competence. 1) The first dimension as the beginning step is called “requisite attitudes” which contains the respect for others, openness to intercultural learning and other cultures, curiosity and exploring. 2) The second step contains two dimensions: “knowledge and comprehension”. Which means learners should have an awareness of their own cultures, and other’s cultures, and other dimension in the second step is “skills” which is related to previous dimension, including listening to people from other cultures, observing their cultures, interpreting and evaluating them. 3) The next dimension is “desired internal outcome” consisting of adapting to new cultural environments, flexibility about choosing and using appropriate communication, and empathy. When learners understand and appreciate the differences of cultures, they are able adapt their communication suitably to their interlocutors and even enter into the feelings of another. 4) the last dimension is “desired external outcome” which is the skills of having of communication and behaving according to their intercultural attitude from the previous dimensions as they are related to one another. As a result, learners will



be able to communicate effectively and behave appropriately when being in new or different cultural contexts.

In sum, the core components of intercultural competence are somewhat similar to one another. They are classified into about the same components from learners' internal and external qualifications, including positive attitudes, awareness of one's own culture and others', sufficient amount of general and specific knowledge, and external qualifications learners should have in order to communicate and behave appropriately based on their general and specific knowledge, attitudes, and skills.

#### **2.3.4 Significant differences in intercultural competence training**

In order to gain intercultural skills learners acquired abroad intercultural learning should be trained and promoted for increased employability. It has been proved by a number of studies that learners with prior intercultural competence training tend to be more skillful. According to Mahalingappa, Hughes, and Polat, (2018), who used intercultural competence scale developed by Fantini and Tirmizi, (2006) to investigate difference between learners who gathered information about Turkey before coming and those who did not. The results showed that ones who learned and gathered general and specific information about Turkey before coming had higher level of intercultural competence in terms of knowledge and attitude than those who did not.

Moreover, results also indicated that countries or continents students came from affect the difference. It was discovered that European students who live in multicultural contexts than do Asian and African students, gain highest level of intercultural competence. Stated another way, students who basically have more

opportunities to encounter culture differences or more similar background with Turkish culture and Turkish language proficiency tend to gradually develop intercultural competence, understanding, communicating and interacting with others more effectively and appropriately.

Another study by Karabinar and Guler (2012), which examined the reasons why teachers teach culture in English language classes to develop intercultural competence at preparatory schools in Turkey, has revealed benefits of having culture information in teaching. The study suggested there is a strong connection between language and culture, resulting in the integration of culture into language teaching. Thus, there is a mutual interaction between language and culture. It was found that majority of the participants have pointed out that culture provides a context for communication and numerous benefits, including raising cultural awareness and arousing curiosity and attention about that culture. The findings have revealed that most of the participants believe that cultural teaching helps promote accurate communication and culturally specific knowledge and helps acquire wider perspective. Besides, all teachers agreed that know about culture when communicating with people of that culture is highly important. The participants in the study support their opinion by saying cultural knowledge is needed when promoting communication based on cultural backgrounds. Also, learning culture, learners can apply the norms of culture appropriately and appreciate differences and similarities among cultures.

As the previous studies have presented positive correlation between intercultural competence and language proficiency, language teachers should offer

learners opportunities to learn information about that country and engage them to learn the language spoken and used in that culture. Thus, learners prepared with language teaching and cultural training will be able gain high level of intercultural competence. In order to reach some level of intercultural competence, learners should be trained before they actually encounter new culture. Obviously, intercultural competence can be learned and trained in a formal education. Hence, when learners are engaged with multiple cultures and identities comprised in one community, they are able to deal with complexity and people from different cultural backgrounds.

### **2.3.5 Roles teachers in intercultural competence learning**

As the aim of intercultural competence learning it to give learners intercultural competence as well as linguistic competence; to prepare them for interaction with people of other cultures; to enable them to understand and accept people from other cultures as individuals with other distinctive perspectives, values and behaviors; and to help them to see that such interaction is an enriching experience (Byram, Gribkova, and Starkey, 2002). The importance of teacher's role should be taken into account.

According to Byram (2002), teachers should help learners see relationships between their own and other cultures. This can be done by provoking their interest in and curiosity about other cultures. As such language teachers need to have knowledge of other cultures. The should also process skills to create promoting an atmosphere in the classroom which allows learners to take risks in exploring others' cultures.

Deardorff and Jones (2012) have suggested means for language teachers to attempt to integrate culture in class in order to enhance learners' intercultural competence. Language teachers should recognize the importance of their role in

designing intercultural competence training courses and facilitating activities to foster learners' intercultural competence. This can be done by creating a supportive technological-based environment to open up channels for learners to be exposed to other cultures.

Learners can be assigned to do activities which require the use of technology to search for information about other cultures while working on the language tasks. With some assistance from teachers, language learners should be able to develop their intercultural competence which will enable them to interact with people of different cultural backgrounds appropriately in actual situations outside the classroom, using necessary tools to acquire intercultural competence, both in class and while participating in the language learning activities outside their classroom.

## **2.4 The Summer Work and Travel Program**

### **2.4.1 Overview of the Summer Work and Travel Program**

According to Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (1961), the Summer Work and Travel Program provides bona fide foreign post-secondary students an opportunity to become directly involved in the daily life of the people of the United States through travel and temporary work for a period up to four months during their summer vacation. Thus, college and university students who enroll full time or pursue studies at post-secondary accredited academic institutions located outside the United States can come to the United States to share their cultures and ideas with people of the United States through temporary work and travel opportunities.

### 2.4.2 Program background

In 1961, a series of programs were set up by the American State Department in order to support and encourage non-American citizens or non-American students to experience the lifestyle and culture of the Americans. One of the popular programs among the university students around the world is the program called “USA Work and Travel Program.” As stated by Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, the program offers students a challenging opportunity to experience life and cultures in the United States during their summer or spring holiday period through the J-1 Visa. At first, only students from Europe and Latin America were allowed to attend the program, but when the Asian financial crisis occurred in 1997, the US Government offered this opportunity to the students in Asia as well. Therefore, the Asian students including Thai students since then have had a chance to explore the U.S. by earning a living and travel expenses by themselves during their stay in the country.

A temporary work permit gives the students access to a range of employment opportunities. The sponsors also assist in finding jobs and provide support services while the students are in the U.S. In turn, the sponsors appoint country agencies who interview students to assess eligibility to participate in the program, assisting in preparing the necessary documents to support the DS 2019 application, as well as helping the students to prepare an application for a visa to travel to America (EurekaFacts, 2017).

In the Thai context, CHI (2018) has pointed out that the Summer Work and Travel Program was first introduced in Thailand more than 12 years ago and has been very popular among Thai university students. It is believed that more than a thousand

of Thai students go to the U.S. in each year. According to the terms and conditions which follow all local, state, and federal laws, program participants can work legally in a various field of employment for up to four months. Most positions offered are service or casual jobs in theme parks, national parks, resorts, hotels, and fast-food restaurants. These workplaces that accept the program participants to work in the spring and summer are likely to be opened seasonally and need extra employees temporarily in high season periods.

#### **2.4.3 Purposes of the program**

The objectives outlined in its authorizing legislation, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 include educational exchange between participants and the U.S. community, cultural exchange between participants and the U.S. community, and the promotion of peace exemplified by the Summer Work and Travel Program operators and the U.S. community.

#### **2.4.4 Eligible program participants**

According to Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of 1961, university students must be sufficiently proficient in English to successfully interact in an English-speaking environment. The status of the students must be post-secondary school students and they must be actively pursuing a degree or other full-time courses of study at an accredited classroom-based or post-secondary educational institution outside the U.S. Besides, students must have successfully completed at least one semester or equivalent of post-secondary academic study and pre-placed in a job prior to entry unless they are from a visa waiver country.

#### 2.4.5 Program benefits

Students, as Summer Work Travel Program participants, are part of a U.S. Department of State cultural exchange program in which they, will have the opportunity to share the language, culture, and customs with the Americans they meet in their local communities, places of employment, and travel destinations over the course of their semester break from college or university back home.

One of the program benefits is present in a number of the studies. A survey of the 31 participants of United Towers Philippines for the summer 2015 Work and Travel Abroad Program. It was revealed that participants believed they gained new knowledge and skills that could not be learned in class, met new friends, and had upgraded their credentials for future employment (Espiridion, Padilla, and Macasaet, 2015).

It can be claimed that the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States is one of the best ways to discover the US, which has many different places and things to see. The program participants will have international work experience and improve their English language skills while making new friends from the U.S. or other countries. Also, perhaps most importantly, they will learn how to survive in a new and challenging environment, developing skills which they cannot get in a classroom or reading a book. Skills such as interpersonal skills, negotiating skills, and survival skills will prove invaluable in the students' future career after graduation.

Furthermore, it has reported that program participants agreed that they gained a better understanding of their own, and their host country's, had more awareness of cultural differences, and increased their level of self-confidence, global-mindedness,

patience, assertiveness, maturity, flexibility, and adaptability. Therefore, it could be stated that participants in the program reaped other benefits in addition to language development and intercultural competence.

#### **2.4.6 Studies on participation in the program**

As the Summer Work and Travel Program is popular among Thai university students, it is worth investigating the factors affecting decision-making over participation in the program and the reasons why the program is becoming more popular among Thai university students. A number of Thai researchers have conducted the studies investigating main factors which have great impacts on decision making to participate in the Summer Work and Travel Program. However, most of the studies have been conducted by researchers in the fields of hotel and tourism management, economics, and business management. There are hardly studies investigating how the program supports program participants' educational growth. Thus, it is worth noting that the students who participated in previous studies were viewed as customers of the companies or agencies, rather than learners who decided to take part in the program for educational purposes.

Recently, Maeluskul (2017) has carried out a study to investigate three influential factors which affected the decision of Thai university students to participate in the program through the use of questionnaires. The data were elicited from 400 students who participated in the program and the findings revealed interesting results which could be divided into three main parts of the factors: population factor, external factors, and marketing mix. Most of the program participants were women aged 20-30 years They learned about the program from



former program participants, the Internet, and agencies and they later interpreted the data and finally made a decision to participate in the program with their friends. The findings of the study also revealed the financial status of the program participants, indicating their monthly income from their parents. It was indicated that most students had income as living expenses of 10,000-15,000 baht per month, which meant that their family were able to support them to participate in the Summer Work and Travel Program. In other words, financial support from their family was one of the most important internal factors that determined whether students were able to cover the program fee and other payments or not. However, some of the program participants took their own savings to pay the program fee on their own.

Apart from internal factors from the students themselves, other factors such as social factors also play a vital role in students' decision to participate in the program. The findings suggested that an image of the country they are going matters a lot when they have to choose whether they are going or not. The students explain that circumstances happening the U.S., currency exchange rate at that time, and safety are things they have to contemplate when making a decision or choosing the states they are going. Similarly, Pitimol (2005) has pointed out that family and friends, family's financial status, the reliability of the agency, and wage offered are consecutively the most influential factors in making decision to participate in the program. In addition, most of the students become interested in the program with the beliefs that the program can provide a lot of opportunities.

With regard to the reason for participation in the program, it has been reported that students showed high interest in improving their English language skills and

compensation they will gain from their jobs. Thus, a desire to enhance English language skills is a significant factor to participate in the program. Therefore, despite high program fees, a number of Thai university students are willing to pay for a chance to develop English language skills in the country where it is spoken through the Summer Work and Travel Program.

#### **2.4.7 Perception of program value**

According to EurekaFacts (2017), most participants report high levels of overall satisfaction with the program. The majority of participants also report personal and professional gains as a result of their participation. For example, the majority of participants believe that the participation in the program will help their future careers, and others indicate cultural exchange as their primary motivation for joining the program. Moreover, previous findings have also reported making lasting friendships with American peers is another reason, as they show a more favorable attitude toward American people and culture. Finally, cultural exchange is also an important decision for the program participants.

In the Thai context, as the Summer Work and Travel program allows Thai university students to work and travel abroad during a three-month semester break, a number of agencies attempt to attract customers promoting the value of the program and benefits students will gain during participation.

Supath and Jirachot (2015), for example, have done research studying student's perception of and reaction to the program. They consider these two concepts as important in terms of prediction of sustainability of the Summer Work and Travel Program business. The relationships among destination image, perceived benefits had

an impact on both perceived value towards the program and travel motivation. In addition, time, effort, possible risks affected perceived value of the program and affective destination, while monetary host cost has less effects on travel motivation to participate in the program. Besides this, Supath and Jirachot (2015) also explored product value divided into: functional value, social value, emotional value, epistemic value, which could indirectly inform significance and value of the program. They found that in terms of functional value, Thai university students as program participants were able to develop English skills while working in an English-speaking country. They expected the program to provide work experience which would benefit their future careers. In addition, social value seemed to be a dominant reason why students wanted to participate in the program as well. The program participants in the study perceived social value from their living experience in a foreign country. They knew that they actually lived, worked, traveled and got paid as other American residents, not as tourists travelling for only a short period of time. They learned to gain social acceptance from surrounding people after participation in the program. More importantly, the program participants realized epistemic value, a value perceived through experience, from their workplaces. They learned how to adjust themselves when working with their colleagues and living abroad. In short, once students could acculturate to a new culture or new aspect of life which could be beneficial to their interests or their future, they will value the importance of the program from the opportunities they would receive.

In summary, a number of studies have investigated significant concepts, including factors affecting decision making to participate in the program and students' perceived benefits of their participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program.

However, none of the studies has investigated how Thai university students as program participants actually learn and develop their out-of-class language learning strategies to accomplish tasks and intercultural competence skills to interact with other people in multicultural country appropriately and effectively, as well as to achieve the purpose of the program which is to gain mutual understanding between the program participants and people in the United States during participation in the program.



## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

In this chapter, the research methodology will be discussed regarding the population and participants, research procedures, data collection, and data analysis.

#### **3.1 Research Design**

The present study was descriptive survey research which aimed to describe a particular phenomenon with a single small group of participants; that is, to describe Thai university students' use of language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States.

The two research questions of the study were “What are out-of-class language learning strategies of Thai university students during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program?” and “What are Thai university students' intercultural competence skills during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program?” In order to identify, these language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills, the participants were later asked to describe how they behaved in a particular situation , what language learning strategies they used to accomplish the tasks at their workplaces, and what intercultural skills they had when communicating with their colleagues and other English speaking people in their daily lives while living in the United States.

The processes of data collection were involved two main sources. Quantitative data were collected from online questionnaire adapted from Strategy Inventory for

Language Learning (SILL) (Oxford, 1990) and the Assessing Intercultural Competence skills questionnaire (Fantini and Tirmizi, 2006). The researcher took only a section of “Skills” from the original questionnaire to explore intercultural competence only in terms of skills that suited the Summer Work and Travel Program context collected through Google Forms. The questionnaire was translated into Thai in order to overcome language barriers to increase accuracy of the data collected from the participants.

The other research instrument was a face-to-face semi-structured interview protocol to gain insightful information and observe interactions of the participants while responding to the questions. The interviews obtained data were audio-recorded and interpreted narratively regarding language learning strategies, intercultural competence skills, and other intangible aspects, including language behaviors, perceptions, and attitudes of the participants toward the strategies and the Summer Work and Travel Program. Data collection took place during August-September, 2018.

As for data analysis, the researcher tried to uncover the meaning and frequency of the language behaviors or language learning strategies of each participant, classifying the data into five levels. Then relationships resulting from the questionnaire and interviews were identified to allowed the researcher to develop the conclusion describing frequency of use of out-of-class language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills of Thai university during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program.

### **3.2 Population and Sampling**

Asking and counting the number of the program participants from a number of agencies, the researcher roughly estimated that there are approximately 3,000 program participants in each year in total. The present study was composed of two groups of participants: 1) 353 Thai undergraduate students from a public university in Northern Thailand who completed the online questionnaire and 2) ten undergraduate students to be interviewed. Both groups of the participants were eligible to apply for any position in the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States. The students' age range was mostly between 19 and 22 years old.

#### **3.2.1 Inclusion criteria**

The selection of participants in this study was done by means of purposive sampling in order to serve the specific purpose of the study which was to investigate language learning strategies use of Thai university students and their perceptions of those strategies. In terms of demographic background information, the participants who were able to be included in the study must be Thai undergraduate students aged between 19 and 22 years old. When tested by the Summer Work and Travel agency, the participants had to pass an English requirement in any position they applied for. The researcher selected full time university students from different areas of educational backgrounds, ages, and previous work positions since a variety of these differences would allow the researcher to better understand program participants' language learning strategies when they encountered various kinds of tasks and working environment. In terms of previous work experience, the number of times students participated in the program also mattered in the study since it could reveal

some differences, including development of program participants' language learning strategies use, language proficiency resulting from participation in the program, or even the reasons to participate the program the following time and comparison of experiences they had when participating in the program.

### **3.2.2 Size of participants**

As for the size of participants, there were 353 participants who completed the online questionnaires and ten participants who were selected for the in-depth interview, including eight female and two male undergraduates from different universities in Thailand.

### **3.3 Research Instruments**

To determine Thai university students' language learning strategies, use during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States, the data were collected in the form of responses to two research instruments. A questionnaire which consisted of three parts and a set of ten semi-structured interview questions were used in the study. The questionnaire was adapted from SILL (Oxford, 1990) and AIC (Fantini and Tirmizi, 2006) questionnaires to investigate frequency of out-of-class language learning strategies of Thai program participants and their intercultural skills, while the interviews were conducted to further explore answers to research questions and freely allow the participants to describe their experiences during the program.



### 3.3.1 A questionnaire adapted from SILL (Oxford, 1990) and AIC (Fantini and Tirmizi, 2006)

**Stage 1:** The researcher divided a questionnaire into three parts: 1) the demographic backgrounds, including age, gender, educational background, number of times and years participating in the program, latest workplaces and positions, as well as job responsibilities, 2) out-of-class language learning strategy statements, and 3) intercultural competence skills statements.

**Stage 2:** The researcher selected the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford, (1990), which is an existing instrument considered the most often used strategy scale around the world and checked for reliability and validated in multiple ways, to investigate Thai program participants' frequency of use of out-of-class language learning strategies.

**Stage 3:** To develop a new Thai questionnaire of strategy inventory for out-of-class language learning for this particular study, the researcher developed new descriptors of language strategies based on the original SILL which comprised two main classes: direct class (memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies) and indirect class (metacognitive, affective and social strategies). The researcher selects 25 strategy descriptors out of 50 items which are likely to be used during the program while working, travelling, or living in the United States.

**Stage 4:** The researcher also explored an existing questionnaire, the Assessing Intercultural Competence (AIC) by Fantini and Tirmizi (2006), which had been used in a lot of previous studies. The researcher selected ten skills of intercultural competence.

The questionnaire was arranged in the pattern of a 5-point Likert scale for which participants were guided to respond to indicate the frequency of use to each language learning strategy and intercultural competence skill descriptors according to the rating scale as follows:

Level of Frequency	Description of Frequency
• 5 points	students used the strategy / skill very frequently
• 4 points	students used the strategy / skill frequently
• 3 points	students used the strategy / skill occasionally
• 2 points	students rarely used the strategy / skill
• 1 points	student never used the strategy / skill

### 3.3.2 The semi-structured interview protocol

The semi-structured interview protocol was also employed in this study. The researcher allowed participants to freely describe their language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills they used, giving some examples of situations they used strategies to overcome language difficulties as well as social interactions they had done to develop their language skills and interact with other people from a variety of cultures. The semi-structured interview protocol was developed in the following manner:

**Stage 1:** The researcher classified significant aspects to be investigated during participation in the program, in addition to language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills, such as purposes of participants, essential out-of-class language learning strategies for their particular work, sense of belonging in a

multicultural society, similarities and differences among cultures, problems arisen from misunderstanding of language use and culture, and so on.

**Stage 2:** The researcher developed ten questions and ensured that they covered all aspects needed to encourage the participants to describe and give examples in details.

### 3.3.3 Validation of the instruments

To validate the questionnaire and the semi-structured interview protocol, the Thai version of both instruments was used. The researcher asked three experts in English language instruction to judge the appropriateness of form and questions in terms of contexts, semantic, idiomatic, experiential, conceptual equivalence and the Cronbach's alpha reliability of the Thai version of questionnaire and the semi-structured interview protocol was 0.721. Later, the questionnaire was piloted with 30 program participants who were not the main participants of the study. After the pilot, the researcher worked with the advisor to revise and improve the piloted questionnaire.

### 3.4 Data collection

In this study, the data were elicited directly from the participants of the study from two sources: the online questionnaire and the semi-structured interview protocol. The questionnaire was to investigate the frequency of language learning strategies use intercultural competence skills of Thai university students while working and living in the United States. To gain more insightful data to ensure deeper understanding, the

semi-structured interview protocol was also employed. The processes of data collection are as follows:

**Stage 1:** The researcher adapted an online questionnaire and the semi-structured interview protocol after conducting a pilot study to ensure suitability for the purposes of the study. Then, the researcher chose Google Form to create an online questionnaire which was divided into three sessions to capture demographic backgrounds, frequency of use of 25 out-of-class language learning strategies, and intercultural competence skills of Thai participants.

**Stage 2:** In this stage, the researcher asked for corporation from members of the Facebook page entitled “Work and Travel Thailand” who had Participated in the program before and were willing to complete the online questionnaire. The researcher provided an online link to complete the questionnaire in the Work and Travel Thailand group during from to September, 2018. According to Yamane (1973), 10% with 95% confidence level of the target population of approximately 3,000 who participated in the program each year was headed. Therefore, the sample size was 353 participants.

**Stage 3:** Once receiving the responses from the members in the group, the researcher selected the ten qualified participants from the Facebook page “Work and Travel Thailand” according to the selection criteria previously set to conduct an oral interview individually.

**Stage 4:** The researcher selected informed two male and eight female undergraduate students who had participated in the program at least twice for the

interviews. When they agreed to take part in the study, they were asked to sign the informed consent form to indicate their willingness to participate in the study.

**Stage 5:** Researcher conducted semi-structured interviews in order to allow participants to express their ideas and share their experiences freely. Each interview took approximately 15 minutes. The participants were encouraged to explain the phenomena happening during participation in the program. They were allowed some time to describe their experiences in terms of working, travelling, living, learning and developing strategies and skills to accomplish linguistic and cultural purposes. However, they could further express their opinions or ask additional questions if they wished. During the interview, the researcher could also observe their actual interactions, gained the information needed, and truly comprehended the situations provided with examples. The frequency of the data collection conducted was only once; however, the second interview could be administered if there were some interesting or ambiguous issues needed to be further investigated or clarified.

### 3.5 Data Analysis



At this stage, the data gained from the two sources were analyzed to answer research questions investigating language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills of Thai university students who participated in the Summer Work and Travel Program. To organize and prepare the data for analysis, the researcher completed the following stages:

**Stage 3:** The researcher firstly collected the data from the online questionnaires done through Google Form to check the frequency of use of each language learning strategy and intercultural competence skill during participation in

the program. In order to investigate out-of-class language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills, the researcher analyzed the numbers of frequency using the SPSS software.

**Stage 2:** Descriptive statistics of frequency, including frequency, mean, as well as standard deviation (SD) were calculated. The researcher interpreted and classified the results gained from the questionnaire into five levels of frequency of use of out-of-class language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills used into five divided levels as follows:

<b>Mean</b>	<b>Level of Frequency</b>
• 4.50-5.00	very high use of strategies / skills
• 3.50-4.49	high use of strategies / skills
• 2.50-3.49	medium use of strategies / skill
• 1.50-2.49	low use of strategies / skills
• 1.00-1.49	very low use of strategies / skills

**Stage 3:** the qualitative data obtained from the semi-structured interviews were carefully analyzed and interpreted. The researcher began by preparing the interview data for analysis by transcribing audio-recordings. Once the transcription was completed, the researcher read it while listening to the recording and corrected any errors. The researcher made sure that the participants could not be identified from anything that was said, such as names, places, significant events regarding dealing with English speaking people along with language difficulties and cultural interactions.

**Stage 4:** The researcher continued checking details in the transcriptions, highlighting and coding the names of answers revealed through the participants' narratives and examples of situations relevant to significant terms, including out-of-class language learning strategies, attitudes toward the program, overall use of intercultural competence skills, and other necessary skills.

**Stage 5:** The data gained from the interviews were conceptualized, allowing the researcher to reflect the factors affecting language learning strategy selection and intercultural competence skills, including job positions and working environments. Thus, in this stage, the researcher could comprehend the phenomenon from each participant's perspectives and find out what language learning strategies and intercultural skills students developed as well as some of other hidden interesting elements in the cultural context when they were engaged in a new culture. In order to increase the reliability of the findings, the researcher asked another researcher to go over the categorizations and later discussed any similarities and differences using the expert validation technique.

Accordingly, the researcher was able to see relationships, similarities, and differences of the results from the group of participants completing the questionnaires and those who were orally interviewed. The findings gained from these two sources, called triangulation, were expected to help the researcher determine essential out-of-class language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills, which seemed to be used more or less often than the others, in order to subsequently design a training program as an orientation session for future program participants before they travel to the United States.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **FINDINGS**

In this chapter, the quantitative and qualitative findings regarding out-of-class language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills of Thai undergraduate students who participated in the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States are presented.

#### **4.1 Out-of-Class Language Learning Strategies**

Quantitative data regarding out-of-class language learning strategies were collected by means of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) developed by Oxford (1990). The findings revealed that the participants used learning strategies at a medium to high level. The category of learning strategies which was most frequently used by the participants was social strategies, with the mean score of 3.92 (SD = 0.80). This was followed by the metacognitive and compensation strategies, whose mean score was equal to 3.82 (SD = 0.79) and 3.78 (SD = 0.94), respectively. In addition to this, it was found that the mean scores of other two types of language learning strategies, namely cognitive and memory strategies, were also at a moderate to high level, equal to 3.54 (SD = 0.94) and 3.49 (SD = 0.69), respectively. It is worth noting that only the mean score of the affective strategies was at low level at 2.97, as shown in Table 4.1 below.



**Table 4.1**

*Overall language learning strategies used (n = 353)*

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Level</b>
<b>Memory</b>	3.38	3.49	0.691	Medium
<b>Cognitive</b>	2.84	3.54	0.946	High
<b>Compensation</b>	3.24	3.78	0.941	High
<b>Metacognitive</b>	3.67	3.82	0.795	High
<b>Affective</b>	2.70	2.97	0.906	Low
<b>Social</b>	1.67	3.92	0.800	High

Table 4.2 below shows the frequency of use of each item under the six categories, namely memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social. As for memory strategies, the item which received the highest mean score was item 3 “I remembered a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used while participating in the program” (*Mean* = 3.60; *SD* = 0.80), while the item which had the lowest mean score was item 1 “I associated what I already knew and new things I learned in English while participating in the program (*Mean* = 3.38; *SD* = 0.76).

When it came to cognitive strategies, which consisted of seven items, the items which received the highest mean score to indicate the most frequent use by program participants was item 7 “I started conversation in English” (*Mean* = 4.04; *SD* = 0.87). On the other hand, the item which had the lowest means core, which suggesting the least frequent use by program participants, was item 10 “I looked for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English” (*Mean* = 2.84; *SD* = 0.95).

Following cognitive strategies, it could be seen that the item under the compensation strategies which received the highest mean score was item 12, “I used gestures when I could not think of a word during a conversation in English” (*Mean* = 4.09; *SD* = 0.81), whereas the item which had the lowest mean score was item 13 “I made up new words if I did not know the right ones in English” (*Mean* = 3.24; *SD* = 1.19).

With regard to metacognitive strategies, the strategy which was most frequently used by the participants during their participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program was item 16 “I paid attention when someone was speaking English” (*Mean* = 4.05; *SD* = 0.78). In contrast, the metacognitive strategy which was least frequently used by the program participants was item 19 “I had clear goals for improving English skills while participating in the program” (*Mean* = 3.67; *SD* = 0.82).

As regards affective strategies, there were three items in this category. The item which had the highest mean score, which suggested most frequent use by the participants, was item 20 “I tried to relax whenever I felt afraid of using English during work” (*Mean* = 3.21; *SD* = 0.85), while the item which received the lowest mean score, indicating least frequent use by the participants, was item 22 “I talked to someone else about how I felt when I was learning English” (*Mean* = 2.70; *SD* = 1.02).

Finally, in terms of social strategies, it could be seen that of the three items under this category, the item which received the highest mean score was item 23 “If I did not understand something in English, I asked the other person to slow down or say it again” (*Mean* = 4.02; *SD* = 0.74). On the other hand, the item which had the lowest

mean score was item 24 “I asked English speakers or my Thai colleagues to correct me when talked” (Mean = 3.76; SD = 0.94).

**Table 4.2**  
**Frequency of use of each strategy**

Category	Strategy Statement	Mean	SD
<b>Memory</b>	1. I associated what I already knew and new things I learned in English while participating in the program.	3.38	0.78
	2. I used new English words I heard during work in a sentence so that I could remember them.	3.48	0.51
	3. I remembered a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might have been used while participating in the program.	3.60	0.80
<b>Cognitive</b>	4. I said or wrote new English words several times so that I could remember them.	3.46	0.89
	5. I tried to speak like native English speakers.	3.95	0.86
	6. I practiced the sounds of English with native English speakers.	3.92	0.86
	7. I started conversations in English.	4.04	0.87
	8. I watched English language TV shows spoken in English or went to movies spoken in English.	3.44	1.07
	9. I read online articles, short stories, or magazines for pleasure in English.	3.14	1.00
	10. I looked for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	2.84	0.99

Category	Strategy Statement	Mean	SD
<b>Compensation</b>	11. I tried to understand unfamiliar English words by making guesses.	3.92	0.88
	12. I used gestures when I could not think of a word during a conversation in English.	4.09	0.81
	13. I made up new words if I did not know the right ones in English.	3.24	1.19
	14. I tried to guess what the other person would say next in English.	3.88	0.89
<b>Metacognitive</b>	15. I noticed my English mistakes and used that information to help me do better.	3.68	0.72
	16. I paid attention when someone was speaking English.	4.05	0.78
	17. I tried to find out how to be a better learner of English.	3.81	0.88
	18. I looked for people I can talk to in English.	3.90	0.78
	19. I had clear goals for improving my English skills while participating in the program.	3.67	0.825
<b>Affective</b>	20. I tried to relax whenever I felt afraid of using English during work.	3.21	0.85
	21. I noticed if I was tense or nervous when I was studying or using English.	3.00	0.85
	22. I talked to someone else about how I felt when I was learning English	2.70	1.02
<b>Social</b>	23. If I did not understand something in English, I asked the other person to slow down or say it again.	4.02	0.74
	24. I asked English speakers or my Thai colleague to correct me when I talk.	3.76	0.94
	25. I tried to learn about the culture of English speakers.	3.97	0.72

When considering the most frequently used language learning strategies of participants who took part in the Summer Work and Travel Program, it could be seen that the strategy that was adopted more often than other strategies was the compensation strategy of “I used gestures when I could not think of a word during a conversation in English (Mean = 4.09; SD = 0.81). On the other hand, among the most frequently used strategies of each of the six categories, the affective strategy of “I tried to relax whenever I felt afraid of using English during work” (Mean = 3.21; SD = 0.85), as shown below.

**Table 4.3**

*Most frequently used strategies under each category of language learning strategies*

<b>Categories</b>	<b>Most frequently used strategy</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>Memory</b>	<b>3.</b> I remembered a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might have been used while participating in the program.	3.60	5
<b>Cognitive</b>	<b>7.</b> I started conversations in English.	4.04	3
<b>Compensation</b>	<b>12.</b> I used gestures when I could not think of a word during a conversation in English.	4.09	1
<b>Metacognitive Strategies</b>	<b>16.</b> I paid attention when someone was speaking English.	4.05	2
<b>Affective</b>	<b>20.</b> I tried to relax whenever I felt afraid of using English during work.	3.21	6
<b>Social</b>	<b>23.</b> If I did not understand something in English, I asked the other person to slow down or say it again.	4.02	4

Simply put, most of the program participants tended to use gestures when they could not think of a word during a conversation in English to compensate for their

lack of linguistic knowledge, and they were less likely to relax whenever they felt afraid of having to use the English language to communicate while they were fulfilling their job requirements. As regards the other four categories of strategies, when it came to metacognitive strategies, the participants had the highest tendency to pay attention when someone was speaking English during work and while they were travelling during their stay in the United States. Furthermore, the program participants employed cognitive strategy by starting conversations in English the most, and among social strategies, it became apparent that the participants were likely ask the other person or their interlocutor to slow down or repeat the same messages if they were unable to comprehend. Also, it is noteworthy that the program participants had less tendency to employ memory strategies compared to other categories of language learning strategies, except for affective strategies. Only some of them tried to memorize new English words by making a mental picture of the situation in which the words might be used.

The findings from the in-depth interviews of the ten Thai program participants also revealed similar findings that the participants chose to rely on gestures most of the time when they could not think of a word while they were having a conversation in English with their interlocutors, as some of the interview participants described:

*“I usually asked others and used hand gestures when I did not understand English or even used another language, a third language such as Spanish or Mexican.”* [Interview participant #2]

*“Sometimes I knew what they were going to ask me, so I used gesture instead of the words I did not know. I also used my hands to communicate with the guests while we were having a conversation.”* [Interview participant #4]

When analyzing the least frequently used language learning strategies in each category, it was discovered that the affective strategy of “I talked to someone else about how I felt when I was learning English” had the lowest mean score ( $Mean = 2.70$ ;  $SD = 1.02$ ). The least frequently used strategies under each category are presented in Table 4.4 below.

**Table 4.4**

*Least frequently used strategies under each category of language learning strategies*

<b>Categories</b>	<b>Least frequently used strategy</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>Memory</b>	<b>3.</b> I remembered a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might have been used while participating in the program.	3.60	4
<b>Cognitive</b>	<b>4.</b> I said or wrote new English words several times so that I could remember them.	3.46	3
<b>Compensation</b>	<b>13.</b> I made up new words if I did not know the right ones in English.	3.24	2
<b>Metacognitive</b>	<b>15.</b> I noticed my English mistakes and used that information to help me do better.	3.68	5
<b>Affective</b>	<b>22.</b> I talked to someone else about how I felt when I was learning English	2.70	1
<b>Social</b>	<b>24.</b> I asked English speakers or my Thai colleague to correct me when I talk.	3.76	6

Following the affective strategy involving talking to someone about how the participants felt when learning English which was least frequently opted for by the participants, the second least frequently used strategy was the compensatory of making up new words when the participants did not know the correct words in the English language. The third least frequently used strategy was the cognitive of saying

or writing new English words several times in order to memorize them. After that, the memory strategy involving remembering a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used while participating in the program ranked fourth, closely followed by the metacognitive strategy of noticing the participants' English mistakes and using that information to help them do better and the social strategy of asking English speakers or Thai colleagues to correct the participants, respectively.

The qualitative data elicited during the in-depth interviews of the ten participants yielded support to the quantitative finding that the participants usually noticed their own use of the English language, including their mistakes and corrections, as evident in the following excerpt:

*“When I spoke English with my colleagues, I usually noticed my English mistakes and asked them whether I needed to use them correctly or if they could understand what I was trying to say. Anyway, I did not tell others how I felt when I made mistake in English.”* [Interview participant #7]

However, there were some of the interview participants who explained that they shared the feelings they had when using English with their friends, as one of them described:

*“I usually shared my feeling with my Thai friends. I told them that I was nervous when I used English. I was not confident to speak English, especially with native English speakers.”* [Interview participant #7]



## 4.2 Intercultural Competence Skill

According to the study findings, intercultural competence skill development of the participants ranked from a moderate to high level. The learning strategy involving use of culture-specific information to improve their style and professional interaction with the hosts appeared to be the most frequently employed strategy to develop intercultural competence skills ( $Mean = 3.87$ ;  $SD = 0.82$ ). On the other hand, the least frequently employed strategy was monitoring their behavior and its impact on their learning, growth, and especially on the hosts ( $Mean = 3.32$ ;  $0.85$ ).

There were five statements denoting intercultural competence skill development with moderate frequency of usage ( $Mean = 2.50$ - $3.49$ ) as follows: “I monitored my behavior and its impact on my learning, growth, and especially on the hosts” ( $Mean = 3.34$ ;  $SD = 0.85$ ); “I used models, strategies, and techniques to aid the learning of the host language and culture” ( $Mean = 3.34$ ;  $SD = 0.80$ ), which had the same mean score as “I used strategies for learning the host language, culture, adapting to the host culture, and reducing stress” ( $Mean = 3.34$ ;  $SD = 0.72$ ); “I helped resolve cross-cultural conflicts and misunderstandings when they arose” ( $Mean = 3.43$ ;  $SD = 0.81$ ); and “I adjusted my behavior, dress, etc., as appropriate to avoid offending the hosts” ( $Mean = 3.44$ ;  $SD = 0.73$ ), as presented in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5**

*Findings regarding intercultural competence skill development*

<b>Intercultural Competence Skill Statement</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
1. I demonstrated flexibility when interacting with persons from the host culture.	3.64	0.70
2. I adjusted my behavior, dress, etc., as appropriate to avoid	3.44	0.73

<b>Intercultural Competence Skill Statement</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
offending my hosts.		
3. I was able to contrast the host culture with my own.	3.66	0.78
4. I used strategies for learning the host language, culture, adapting to the host culture, and reducing stress.	3.34	0.72
5. I demonstrated a capacity to interact appropriately in a variety of different social situations in the host culture.	3.50	0.76
6. I used models, strategies, and techniques that aided my learning of the host language and culture.	3.34	0.80
7. I monitored my behavior and its impact on my learning, my growth, and especially on my hosts.	3.32	0.85
8. I used culture-specific information to improve my style and professional interaction with my hosts. For example, I left some tips after having meal at a restaurant.	3.87	0.82
9. I helped to resolve cross-cultural conflicts and misunderstandings when they arose.	3.43	0.81
10. I employed appropriate strategies for adapting to my own culture after returning to Thailand.	3.70	0.77

Qualitative findings obtained from the in-depth interviews of the ten participants had offered further support to the quantitative findings elicited with the survey form. For instance, the participants discussed the skills that they employed to ensure that they behaved culturally appropriately during their participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States as follows:

*“I tried not to speak Thai when there were other foreign friends sitting at the table because they would think we were rude or we were probably gossiping about them.”* [Interview participant #2]

Some interviewees provided an example of the situations in which they could gain cultural skills during work, stating:

*“When I was assigned the responsibility to greet customers or guests, I had to please even little children who were waiting in line, waving my hands, talking to them, and playing with them even though I first think it was weird talking to strangers like this. Later on, I learned that it was the way the American people tried to do in order to please their customers.”* [Interview participant #3]

*“I saw my friends from Honduras eat some kind of food with a strong smell, which I did not really like. He offered me a piece of that, so I smiled and took it anyway. I thought it may have been an opportunity to try authentic food, which I could not find in Thailand.”* [Interview participant #10]

The above excerpts illustrated the participants’ willingness to adjust themselves to suit the culture of their hosts who possessed different cultural backgrounds. They believed that doing so would help them avoid offending their American hosts unnecessarily.

In addition to the most frequently employed strategy to develop intercultural competence skills by using culture-specific information to improve their style and professional interaction with the hosts ( $Mean = 3.87$ ;  $SD = 0.82$ ), high frequency of usage, with the mean scores falling somewhere between 3.50 and 5.00 could also be observed in other four statements denoting intercultural competence skill development as follows: “I employed appropriate strategies for adapting to my own culture after returning to Thailand” ( $Mean = 3.70$ ;  $SD = 0.77$ ), “I was able to contrast the host culture with my own ( $Mean = 3.66$ ;  $SD = 0.78$ ); “I demonstrated flexibility when interacting with persons from the host culture ( $Mean = 3.64$ ;  $SD = 0.70$ ); and “I demonstrated a capacity to interact appropriately in a variety of different social

situations in the host culture” (*Mean* = 3.50; *SD* = 0.76), all of which helped confirm that the participants had awareness of cultural differences and developed intercultural competence skills while they were taking part in the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States during their school break.

### 4.3 Additional Findings regarding Job Positions and Frequency of Use of Language Learning Strategies and Intercultural Competence Skills

In this section, additional findings regarding job positions and frequency of use of language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills are presented in table 4.6.

**Table 4.6**

*Frequency of use of each strategy and intercultural competence skill of participants with different job positions*

Job Position	Frequency of use of each strategy						Mean	Intercultural competence skill
	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6		
Food and beverage	3.60	3.56	3.78	3.88	2.93	4.05	3.63	3.61
Cashier and sale Associate	3.53	3.72	3.83	3.85	2.86	3.54	3.56	3.48
Park attendant and Ride operator	3.24	3.65	3.89	3.76	2.97	3.82	3.56	3.64
Housekeeping	3.51	3.50	3.80	3.89	3.14	4.06	3.65	3.45
Lifeguard	3.42	3.14	3.55	3.58	3.06	3.82	3.43	3.26
Others	3.28	3.36	3.71	3.53	3.00	3.83	3.45	3.18

S1 = Memory, S2 = Cognitive, S3 = Compensation, S4 Metacognitive, S5 = Affective, S6 = Social

As presented in table 4.6, the participants with different job positions had different frequencies use of language learning strategies. According to the study findings, those working in housekeeping had the highest mean score of use of language learning strategies, at 3.65, whereas those who worked as lifeguards during their participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program had the lowest mean score of use of learning strategies, at 3.43. Moreover, when it came to intercultural competence skills, the findings indicated that the participants who worked as park attendants and ride operators had the highest mean score of intercultural competence skills, at 3.64, while those who worked in other positions such as photographers and crew members at tourist attractions had the lowest mean score of intercultural competence skills, at 3.18.

When considering job positions of the participants in the Summer Work and Travel Program, it can be seen that the participants who worked in the food and beverage department appeared to often use social strategies (*Mean* = 4.05), metacognitive strategy (*Mean* = 3.88), and compensation strategies (*Mean* = 3.78) more. They sometimes used memory strategies (*Mean* = 3.6) and cognitive strategies (*Mean* = 3.56), but they used affective strategies least often. Their overall intercultural competence skills were at a high level (*Mean* = 3.61).

As for the participants who worked as cashiers and sale associates, they seemed to more frequently use metacognitive strategies (*Mean* = 3.85), compensation strategies (*Mean* = 3.83), and cognitive strategies (*Mean* = 3.72). Furthermore, they appeared to occasionally used social strategies (*Mean* = 3.54) and memory strategies (*Mean* = 3.53). Like the participants who worked in food and beverage, they were

least likely to use affective strategies ( $Mean = 2.86$ ). Their overall intercultural competence skill was at a moderate level ( $Mean = 3.48$ ).

For participants who worked as park attendants and ride operators, compensation strategies ( $Mean = 3.89$ ), social strategies ( $Mean = 3.82$ ), and metacognitive strategies ( $Mean = 3.76$ ) were most frequently used. The participants in this department seemed to occasionally use cognitive strategies ( $Mean = 3.65$ ) and memory strategies ( $Mean = 3.24$ ). The least frequently used strategy of the park attendants and ride operators were affective strategies ( $Mean = 2.97$ ). Their overall intercultural competence skills were at a high level ( $Mean = 3.64$ ).

An example of the differences in strategy use and job position could be found in one of the interview participants' description. This participant worked at an amusement park. He explained that he used social strategies most of the time as the position itself required interacting with others, both the park visitors and other workers at the park, as could be seen in the following statement:

*“I worked as a park attendant at the game booth. I had to attract the visitors to play and join my games. During the first few weeks, I still could not remember the equipment I needed for my games, so I made up words and used gestures to explain it to the kids.”* [Interview participant #2]

As regards the housekeeping department, social strategies were ranked as the most frequently used strategies ( $Mean = 4.06$ ), followed by metacognitive strategies ( $Mean = 3.89$ ) and compensation strategies ( $Mean = 3.80$ ), respectively. The participants who worked in housekeeping seemed to occasionally use memory strategies ( $Mean = 3.51$ ) and cognitive strategies ( $Mean = 3.50$ ). Similar to most participants with other job positions, the participants who worked in housekeeping

used affective strategies least frequently (*Mean* = 3.26). Their overall intercultural competence skills were at a moderate level (*Mean* = 3.14).

Furthermore, the participants who worked as lifeguards appeared to rank social strategies as their most frequently used strategies (*Mean* = 3.82). They probably sometimes employed metacognitive strategies (*Mean* = 3.58), compensation strategies (*Mean* = 3.55), and memory strategies (*Mean* = 3.42). The two least frequently used strategies were cognitive strategies (*Mean* = 3.14) and affective strategies (*Mean* = 3.06). Their overall intercultural competence skills were at a moderate level (*Mean* = 3.26).

Finally, the participants who worked in other departments apart from the positions mentioned above seemed to frequently used social strategies (*Mean* = 3.83) and compensation strategies (*Mean* = 3.71) more. They sometimes made use of metacognitive strategies (*Mean* = 3.53) and cognitive strategies (*Mean* = 3.36). The two least frequently used strategies of the participants with other job positions were memory strategies (*Mean* = 3.28) and affective strategies (*Mean* = 3.00). Their overall intercultural competence skills were at moderate level (*Mean* = 3.18).

Findings from the interviews have indicated that on the overall, all of the participants agreed that their work in a natural English language learning context helped boost their language skills, especially speaking and listening, as there were plenty of opportunities to practice these two skills while they were working throughout the program. Some of the interviewees also revealed that they were naturally forced to use the target language so that they would be able to accomplish

their tasks faster and more effectively, regardless of their job positions, as evident in the following excerpts:

*“I worked as a cashier at a Disney store, so I really had to pay attention when the guests asked me to explain the details of the products on sales. It was like I was forced to carefully listen to the customers and to communicate with the guests.”* [Interview participant #1]

*“I worked in a kitchen of a resort. I had a Mexican friend who usually worked as a food runner with me. He spoke English very well, so I always asked him to help me when I had communication breakdown. He helped me overcome the language barriers, and he also encouraged me to speak as well.”* [Interview participant #6]

*“My Thai friend and I joined free English courses at a church in the evening. I thought I became more confident to speak English after my participation in the class.”* [Interview participant #7]

Besides this, it was found that the participants had problems with speaking skill. They had to face a language barrier when communicating with both English and non-English speaking people. Their problems included accents, intonations, slangs, idioms, as well as some technical terms. In addition to speaking, they also had problems with listening skill. One interview participant claimed that:

*“There were many students from many countries working at my workplace, so I usually had a hard time speaking English with them due to their unfamiliar accents.”* [Interview participant #7]



It can be said that when first participating in the program, most of the Thai university students, as non-native English speakers, encountered language difficulties and cultural conflicts during work. The problems could be solved when their work continued because they had learned to make use of language learning strategies as well as to monitor themselves when using intercultural competence skills. Thus, they made fewer mistakes. When they had problems, they usually sought assistance from others, opted for gestures, and made a guess when they tried to overcome the unknown. Furthermore, the findings revealed that one important factor that may have contributed to frequent use of language learning strategies was students' supportive workplaces and social interactions which provided them with affordable language use. Also, it was interesting to see that even a third language, such as Spanish and Mexican, could be acquired during participation in the program. For example, the participants who were the only Thai students working their position tended to have more foreign friends and were more likely to spend time hanging out with foreign friends more than with others. In so doing, their unintentionally, or perhaps unknowingly, developed their target language skills.

More importantly, the findings of the interviews showed that almost all of the interviewees were more comfortable communicating with Non-Americans. Put another way, they would rather communicate or ask for help from Hispanic or Mexican people rather than Americans. However, it is worth noting that although the participants acknowledged that they had much more chances to communicate in English both while working and while living their life outside work, more than half of them felt that the accuracy of their English language use did not improve as much as they had expected. Nevertheless, they realized that learning did actually take place,

even though it seemed to take a longer time of practice and use than they had thought. One participant who generally texted her foreign friends explained that texting could increase her writing ability because she could learn abbreviations, slangs, idioms, etc. simultaneously. She saw this as extra chances to develop her English language skills, particularly writing, in addition to speaking skills which she was continuously required to use when she was working.

In terms of intercultural competence skills, the study participants showed their sense of belonging in their work environment and they used culture-specific information they knew to interact with other people with different cultural backgrounds. The following excerpts from the in-depth interviews reflected how the participants adjusted themselves to co-exist with people whose cultural background was different from them:

*“I did not feel inferior to those who permanently lived in the States even though I came here for a short term.”* [Interview participant #3]

*“During the first week of work, I sometimes felt that I was left behind because I had no friends at work. Later, people at work became my close friends and we shared fun moments together.”* [Interview participant #6]

Interestingly enough, the participants acknowledged that they needed more culturally specific knowledge in order to avoid misunderstanding among people with different cultures, especially non-American cultures which they may not have been familiar with. However, some of the participants may have had perceived people from a different background with stereotypes, as evident in the following excerpt:

*“I would prefer to work with American to African American people if I could choose. Anyway, it was just my personal feeling towards African American stereotypes I saw in the movies, which seemed to be too intimidating to me.”*

[Interview participant #5]

However, when hanging out, it was found that most of the program participants were invited to go out by Non-Americans more than by Americans and they felt more comfortable joining them and using their language, as one of them explains:

*“I would rather hang out with friends who also spoke English as an international language because I felt more confident when speaking.”*

[Interview participant #8]

Despite negative stereotypes, the participants were able to behave themselves appropriately and understand the norms of a variety of cultures through different social interactions either while working or while hanging out with ‘international friends’ outside work. In summary, on the overall, the interview findings indicated that Thai university students as program participants had positive attitudes towards their participation in the Summer Work and Travel program, which also result in their development of language proficiency and intercultural competence skills.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

In this chapter, the findings of the present study previously mentioned in regards to the out-of-class language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills are discussed.

#### **5.1 Out-of-Class Language Learning Strategies**

Overall, the findings showed that the participants used learning strategies based on Oxford's (1990) classification at a medium to high level. Unsurprisingly, the participants employed several strategies, especially direct strategies, to complete their language goals, which are essential in communication during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States. Such a finding yielded support to a study conducted by Benson (2011) which has reported that learners were able to learn unintentionally through communication and interaction with the target language groups and engagement in social activities, which required the use of direct communication strategies in the target language.

Put another way, the Summer Work and Travel program allows naturalistic language learning activities and cultural contexts, which make it necessary for language learners to employ different strategies to convey their messages and to accomplish the goals of communication. Supported by the interview results, it was found that most of the participants agreed that being embedded in natural English language learning situations in the United States with cultural diversity helped boost their desire to use the language, especially speaking. This is probably because Thai

program participants who have been in the non-English speaking community have far less opportunity to use English in their communication. Therefore, without the use of language, they are unlikely to attempt to apply or develop strategies to achieve any language learning goals.

In this study, Thai university students as international participants were naturally motivated to learn and use the language at a naturalistic workplace setting, resulting in high-frequency use of language learning strategies. The overall use of strategies conforms with a previous study undertaken by Chu and Nie (2016), which has claimed that international students usually have a specific aim and higher use of both deep and surface learning with a strong focus on concepts and connections as well as memorization when going overseas. Similarly, Nguyen and Terry (2017) have found that Vietnamese students' strategy use is framed by the immediate learning contexts and social environment. Simply put, language learners can expect a higher linguistic development when going abroad and being exposed to the target language in the learning and socializing environment.

Besides this, as the Summer Work and Travel Program self-proclaim the benefits of improving English while learning a range of cultures, students who are program participants tend to make considerable efforts and focus on using English, resulting in high-frequency use of language learning strategies. Such efforts are considered an effective way for language learners to enjoy success in learning the target language (Gardner, 2000). Another plausible factor that may contribute to high-frequency use of language learning strategies is the students' workplaces, accommodations, as well as attractions they have been to, all of which could provide them with affordable language use. Even a third language, such as Spanish and

Mexican, can be acquired during participation in the program as well. The findings of the present study yielded support to the findings reported by Richards (2015) that students are equipped with a wider range of affordances for language use and second language acquisition when engaging in unprepared and authentic activities.

Still, in terms of grammar advancement, more than half of the students shared the sentiments that the accuracy of their language use did not improve as much they had expected despite working with English speaking people. The interview results also indicated that students were not certain about their grammatical competence when compared to working in Thailand. Such findings were not consistent with the findings of a previous study done by Isabelli (2004) which has indicated that a natural context allowed learners to develop more grammatical competence than a domestic context. This may have been because the participants in the study spent only a short period of three months in the host country during which they were responsible for work. Thus, they had to communicate with native and non-native speakers of English with the focus being placed on getting the messages across. In other words, they had to pay more attention to fluency rather than accuracy to fulfill their job requirements, so their grammatical competence did not improve as much as they had hoped.

Moreover, some of the participants considered participating in the program beneficial to their writing ability, which might predict higher awareness and use of grammar. These participants often use texts to communicate with their foreign friends on their phone, and in so doing they had a chance to observe and correct their grammatical mistakes. Thus, it could be assumed that technological devices could help increase learners' ability to write more accurately, allowing learners to further develop their reading and writing during communication with the aid of technology.

The quantitative findings from the questionnaires indicated that the participants used various language learning strategies, with the mean scores of three direct strategies (metacognitive, cognitive, and social) fell in the range of 3.49 to 3.78, reflecting high frequency of strategy use. On the other hand, the other three categories of strategies, namely affective, memory, and compensation, had their mean scores at a medium frequency of strategy use, ranging from 2.97 to 3.92. However, a study carried out by Morita (2010) has revealed that four out of six categories of language learning strategies are used more frequently, namely memory, cognitive, affective, and social strategies, after students had participated in an intercultural communication program overseas. Furthermore, it was found these four strategies were significantly used within a two-week program, whereas compensation and metacognitive strategies were widely used both and after the program. However, it might be argued that compensation and metacognitive strategies are relatively broadly used among learners in a domestic and target language learning environment. Regardless of where learners are, it is common that they arrange and plan their learning, overcoming limitations through guessing and evaluating their learning. As previously discussed, language learners can generally produce significant changes in language learning strategies according to various factors, including activities they engage in during the program, individual aptitude, perseverance, learning style preferences, assigned tasks, and attitudes (Oxford, 1990; Nguyen and Terry, 2017). Therefore, it is possible that every single learner potentially develops different language learning strategies depending on the aforementioned factors.

According to the findings of the present study, one of the plausible reasons why the participants chose to rely on different language learning strategies while

participating in the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States. As Oxford (1990) has pointed out, the type of task can affect language learning strategy uses of learners. Put another way, the nature of the job helps determine the strategies which are going to be used. In this study, it became evident that working environments played a role in strategy selection. For instance, the participants who worked in the food and beverage department appeared to use social strategies more often, whereas affective strategies were the least frequently used ones. This could be explained that most of the participants in this position worked in a team in a supportive environment, and their nature of work required dealing verbally with customers and co-workers. Therefore, they were inclined to be more sociable than those working in other positions, which may involve fewer human interactions such as housekeeping. When they had more chances to use the target language to communicate with others, ask questions, and respond to the demands of the work, they had to rely on social strategies to make their communication effective. Thus, it can be assumed that learners who can create social networks with both native and non-native speakers of English have more opportunities to practice and improve their language proficiency.

## **5.2 Intercultural Competence Skills**

Employment of learning strategies involves using culture-specific information to improve language learners' interactions, and professional interactions with the hosts appeared to be the most frequently employed strategy to develop intercultural competence skills. On the other hand, the least frequently employed strategy was monitoring their behavior and its impact on their learning, growth, and especially on



the hosts. Most of the program participants may have utilized culture-specific information that they had acquired to interact with people in the United States appropriately, such as leaving tips at the restaurants, greeting people they met, and using culturally acceptable gestures and eye contacts when communicating with others.

A study conducted by Karabinar and Guler (2012) has reported that language learners believe that prior culture teaching would help promote accurate communication and specific knowledge, thus enabling them to acquire wider perspectives about the owners of the target language and their culture. Teaching culture, therefore, is regarded as one of the significant preparation steps when going abroad and living among people with different cultural backgrounds. Similarly, the findings of the interviews in this study suggested that more culturally specific knowledge was needed in order for the participants to avoid misunderstanding among people from different cultures. When asked to give examples of specific information and norms of cultures, most of the participants seemed to know a little specific information about other people, including Americans and non-Americans. In fact, so as to be truly competent users of the target language, it is believed that learners should learn to observe others people's cultures, interpret them, as well as evaluate and relate such cultures in order to understand them, hence a chance for intercultural competence development to take place (Deardorff, 2006).

Furthermore, the preparation that includes not only linguistic competence but also intercultural competence would enable learners to use the target language more successfully and to behave more culturally appropriately. As pointed out by Pulverness and Tomlinson (2003), if language learners know nothing about the people

who speak the target language and the country, the language seems senseless for them. This could be explained that most of the program participants in the present study had an opportunity to be exposed to cultural knowledge prior to program participation and their preparation enabled them not only to use the language but also to behave appropriately during their participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program.

Another possible reason that might have contributed to less use of some intercultural competence skills is the participants' lack of the skill to monitor their behavior and its impact on their learning and progress and on other people who had different cultural backgrounds, as well as the skill to use models, strategies, or techniques that aided their learning of the host language and culture. One possible explanation is that some of the program participants were passive in nature or had an introvert personality, so they did not give significance to control of their cultural characteristics or behavioral ability in order to impress the host or other native and non-native speakers of the language. In short, they were probably unaware of or ignored the effects of intercultural competence on their cultural and language learning during their participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program.

### **5.3 Implication of the findings**

In order prepare language learners for participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program in the United States, where the English language is spoken, teachers need to understand what language learning strategies would be more beneficial for the learners. After that, they should offer their learners' language learning strategy training so that when they are working overseas, they will have more resources

available to overcome language barriers and to accomplish their communication goals, regardless of the different types of positions they may have. Apart from this, the teachers cannot overlook the significance of intercultural competence, which is one of the requirements of successful international communication in a globalization context. During the program, Thai university students should understand cultural differences because such an understanding is seen as a way to allow them to explore the varieties of their own cultures and the diversity within their cultures, in addition to benefiting their acquisition of the target language. This can be done by organizing activities that help students develop a better understanding of their own culture as well as the empathy towards the target culture by activities that allow them to analyze similarities and differences between their own culture and the target culture, for example. In addition, teachers should try to seek ways to implement activities to expose students to the target culture, while learning to realize the characteristics of their own culture and the diversity within their culture. In so doing, they can learn to understand and accept people from other cultures as individuals with different distinctive perspectives, values, and behaviors (Byram et al., 2002).

In brief, if language learners have a chance to receive sufficient preparation in terms of both language learning strategies and intercultural competence before participating in the Summer Work and Travel Program, it is more likely that they should encounter fewer communication problems. Moreover, they are also less likely to find themselves in a situation in which cultural conflicts arise. As a consequence, they should be able to make the most, linguistically as well as culturally, out of their brief stay in the target language environment.

#### 5.4 Recommendations for Further Studies

Based on the limitations of the present study, there are two recommendations for future studies regarding the study participants and the development of research instruments as follows:

As the sample size of the interview participants in the present study was rather small, consisting of only ten Thai university students, with the majority of them being female, further research should be carried out with a larger sample size with rather similar numbers of male and female participants. Also, job position of the participants, another factor that may have affected how language learning strategies were chosen by the participants and how their intercultural competence skills were developed, was not explored in detail. Thus, research should also be conducted with a wider variety of job positions so as to shed more light on frequency of use of out-of-class language learning strategies and intercultural competence skills of Thai participants of the Summer Work and Travel Program.

Moreover, the questionnaire used to collect quantitative data on language learning strategies in this study was chosen and adapted from existing instruments, the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) designed by Oxford (1990). However, only 25 statements of strategies were selected from a total of 50 statements representing six language learning strategy categories. Consequently, the findings of the present study may not be generalized to all learning strategies of Thai university students during participation in the Summer Work and Travel program. Besides, the questionnaire was originally developed with the purpose to explore language learning strategies language learners use in class. For this reason, an instrument to specifically

elicit data regarding out-of-class language learning strategies should be developed and further studies should be undertaken to determine the validity and reliability of the developed instrument so that it can be employed to examine out-of-class language learning strategies of learners in more detail.



## REFERENCES

- Alred, G., & Byram, M. (2002). Becoming an Intercultural Mediator: A Longitudinal Study of Residence Abroad. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 23(5), 339-352.
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Autonomy in Language Learning*. *Applied Linguistics in Action Series*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Benson, P. (2011). *Teaching and Researching: Autonomy in Language Learning*. London: Routledge.
- Benson, P. (2015). Language Learning Beyond the Classroom *ELT Journal* (Vol. 70, pp. 110-113).
- Brown, L. (2007). The Incidence of Study-Related Stress in International Students in the Initial Stage of the International Sojourn. *Journal of Studies in International Education - J STUD INT EDUC*, 12, 5-28.
- Byram, M., Gribkova, B., & Starkey, H. (2002). *Developing the Intercultural Dimension in Language Teaching: a practical introduction for teachers: a practical introduction for teachers*. Strasbourg, France: Language Policy Division, Directorate of School, Out-of-School and Higher Education, Council of Europe.
- Cadd, M. (2015). *Increasing the linguistic and cultural benefits of study abroad*. New York: Routledge.
- Chue, K., & Nie, Y. (2016). International Students' Motivation and Learning Approach: A Comparison with Local Students. *Journal of International Students*, 6, 678-699.

Coskun, A. T. (2016). *BENEFITS OF OUT-OF-CLASS SPEAKING ACTIVITIES FOR EFL STUDENTS*.

Deardorff, D. (2006). The Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization at Institutions of Higher Education in the United States. *Journal of Studies in International Education - J STUD INT EDUC*, 10(3), 241-266.

Deardorff, D., & Jones, E. (2012). Intercultural competence: An emerging focus in international higher education (pp. 283-304).

CHI (2018). USA Work & Travel Student Handbook. San Anselmo, CA: CHI Student Handbook Press. Dekwork (2008). Background of Work and Travel Program in Thailand.

Diaz-Campos, M. (2006). The Effect of Style in Second Language Phonology: An Analysis of Segmental Acquisition in Study Abroad and Regular-Classroom Students.

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(1), 1-13.

El-Koumy, A. S. (2000). Differences in FL Reading Comprehension Among High-, Middle-, and Low-Ambiguity Tolerance Students. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

Elias, N., & Lemish, D. (2008). Internet and immigrant youth hybrid identities: The case of Former Soviet Union immigrant adolescents in Israel (pp. 173-192).

Espiridion, M. G. T., Padilla, M., D.L., F., & Macasaet, E. (2015). Factors affecting the availment of LPU-LAGUNA CITHM students of the work and travel abroad

- program. *LPU–Laguna Journal of International Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 3(1), 247-264.
- EurekaFacts (Producer). (2017, 22 August ) Summer Work Travel (SWT) Program Review.
- Fantini, A. (2009). *Assessing Intercultural Competence: Issues and Tools*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.
- Fantini, A. E., & Tirmizi, A. (2006). *Exploring and Assessing Intercultural Competence*. Saint Louis, Mo.: Federation EIL.
- Fishbein, M. (1976). A Behavior Theory Approach to the Relations between Beliefs about an Object and the Attitude Toward the Object *Mathematical Models in Marketing: A Collection of Abstracts* (pp. 87-88). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Gardner, H. (2000). *Frames of mind: the theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic.
- Gardner, R. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Guo, M. (2011). Impact of an Out-of-class Activity on Students' English Awareness, Vocabulary, and Autonomy. *Language Education in Asia*, 2, 246-256.
- Hanf, A. (2014). *Resourcing authentic language from television series*. New York Routledge.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach*. United Kingdom: Pearson Education.
- Isabelli-Garcia, C. (2004). *A case study of the factors in the development of Spanish linguistic accuracy and oral communication skills : motivation and extended*



- interaction in the study abroad context.* Lewiston, N.Y: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Karabinar, S., & Guler, C. Y. (2012). The Attitudes of EFL Teachers Towards Teaching Culture and Their Classroom Practices *Journal of Educational and Social Research* 2(2), 113-126.
- Liu, L. (2012). An International Graduate Student's ESL Learning Experience Beyond the Classroom. *TESL Canada Journal*, 29(1), 77-92.
- Mahalingappa, L., Hughes, E. M., & Polat, N. (2018). Developing preservice teachers' self-efficacy and knowledge through online experiences with English language learners. *Language and Education*, 32(2), 127-146.
- Maros, M., & Mat Saad, N. (2016). The Out-of-Class Language Learning Strategies of International Students in Malaysia. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 6, 478-486.
- Morita, L. (2010). The sociolinguistic context of English language education in Japan and Singapore. *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies*.
- Nieto, S. (2010). *Language, Culture and Teaching*. Routledge, London and New York: Critical Perspectives.
- Nguyen, H. & Terry, D. R. (2017). English learning strategies among EFL learners: A Narrative Approach. *Journal of Language Learning*, 3(1), 4-19.
- Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching*, 44(4), 412-446.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the

- theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(1), 12-28.
- Oxford, R. L. (1989). Use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. *System*, 17(2), 235-247.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*: Boston Heinle & Heinle.
- Politzer, R. L. (1983). An Exploratory Study of Self Reported Language Learning Behaviors and their Relation to Achievement. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6(1), 54-68.
- Pulverness, A., & Tomlinson, B. (2003). *Developing Materials for Language Teaching*. London.
- Richards, J. (2015). The Changing Face of Language Learning: Learning Beyond the Classroom. *RELC Journal*, 46.
- Schumaker, J. B., & Deshler, D.D. (2006). *Teaching adolescents to be strategic learners*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Sheth, J., Newman, & Gross, B. (1991). *Consumption Values and Market Choice*. Cincinnati, Ohio: South Western.
- Suthuwartnarueput, T. & Wasanasomsithi, P. (2012) Effects of using Facebook as a medium for discussions of English grammar and writing of low-intermediate EFL students. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*.
- Trice, A. (2004). Mixing It Up: International Graduate Students' Social Interactions With American Students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45, 671-687.

## ภาษาไทย

นุจรี สุพัฒน์ และ ชนิดา จิรัฏฐิโชติ. (2558). อิทธิพลของภาพลักษณ์ของประเทศปลายทางที่มีผลต่อการ

รับรู้คุณค่าและแรงจูงใจในการเข้าร่วมโปรแกรม Work and Travel ของนักศึกษาไทย.

วารสารวิชาการบริหารธุรกิจ ปีที่ 4 ฉบับที่ 2 ประจำเดือนกรกฎาคม – ธันวาคม 2558: สมาคม

สถาบันอุดมศึกษาเอกชนแห่งประเทศไทย (สสอท.).

ปีติมล, จ. (2548). ปัจจัยที่มีอิทธิพลต่อการตัดสินใจเข้าร่วมโครงการ *Work and Travel Program in*

*USA*. ภาควิชาศึกษานักศึกษาปริญญาตรี มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่, เชียงใหม่.

เมล์ลุสกุล, ธ. (2560). ปัจจัยที่มีอิทธิพลต่อการตัดสินใจเข้าร่วมโครงการ Work and Travel in USA

ของนักศึกษาไทย. วารสารวิทยาลัยดุสิตธานี ปีที่ 11 เดือนมกราคม-เมษายน 2560.



จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย  
CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY



**APPENDICES**

จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย  
**CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY**

## Appendix A

### แบบสอบถามออนไลน์

กลยุทธ์ในการเรียนรู้ทางภาษาอังกฤษนอกห้องเรียน และสมรรถนะทางวัฒนธรรมด้านทักษะต่างๆ  
ของนักศึกษาไทยระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการ The Summer Work and Travel Program

แบบสอบถามนี้จัดทำขึ้นเพื่อศึกษาความถี่ในการใช้กลยุทธ์ในการเรียนรู้ทางภาษาอังกฤษนอกห้องเรียนและ ทักษะ  
ระหว่างวัฒนธรรมของนักศึกษาไทยระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการ The Summer Work and Travel Program

**คำชี้แจง:** กรุณาเขียนคำตอบลงในช่องว่างและทำเครื่องหมาย ✓ ลงในช่องทำรายการ

#### ส่วนที่ 1 ข้อมูลส่วนตัว

1. อายุ.....ปี
2. เพศ.....
3. ระดับการศึกษาชั้น.....คณะ.....มหาวิทยาลัย.....
4. ปีที่เข้าร่วมโครงการล่าสุดก่อนปี 2018 .....ตำแหน่งและสถานที่ทำงาน.....
5. เข้าร่วมโครงการปี 2018 ในตำแหน่ง.....สถานที่ทำงาน.....

#### ส่วนที่ 2: กลยุทธ์ในการเรียนรู้ทางภาษาอังกฤษนอกห้องเรียน

**คำชี้แจง:** คำถาม 25 รายการต่อไปนี้ เป็นการถามเกี่ยวกับกลยุทธ์ในการเรียนรู้ทางภาษาอังกฤษนอกห้องเรียน  
และสมรรถนะทางวัฒนธรรมด้านทักษะต่างๆ ของคุณระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการ ในแต่ละข้อคำถามให้คุณเลือกตอบ  
คำถามที่ตรงกับความรู้สึกของคุณมากที่สุดเพียงคำตอบเดียว โปรดเขียนเครื่องหมาย ✓ ลงในช่องระดับความถี่ที่  
คุณทำรายการ และเขียนคำตอบลงในช่องว่าง

- 1 หมายถึง ไม่เคยทำรายการนั้นเลยใน 1 สัปดาห์ ระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการ
- 2 หมายถึง ทำรายการนั้นประมาณ 1-3 ครั้งใน 1 สัปดาห์ ระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการ
- 3 หมายถึง ทำรายการนั้นอาทิตย์ละ 1-2 ครั้งใน 1 สัปดาห์ ระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการ
- 4 หมายถึง ทำรายการนั้นอาทิตย์ละ 3-4 ครั้งใน 1 สัปดาห์ ระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการ
- 5 หมายถึง ทำรายการนั้นเป็นประจำทุกวันใน 1 สัปดาห์ ระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการ

ข้อ	รายการกลยุทธ์ในการเรียนรู้ทางภาษาอังกฤษ ระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการ	ความถี่ในการทำรายการ				
		1	2	3	4	5
<b>กลยุทธ์การจำ</b>						
1.	ฉันคิดเชื่อมโยงความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างสิ่งที่เรารู้ก่อนเข้าโครงการกับ สิ่งที่ได้เรียนรู้ใหม่ระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการ					
2.	ฉันนำเอาความรู้ใหม่ ๆ ในภาษาอังกฤษที่ได้ยินระหว่างเข้าร่วม โครงการมาใช้ในประโยค เพื่อให้จดจำได้ดียิ่งขึ้น					
3.	ฉันจดจำคำหรือประโยคใหม่ ๆ โดยการคิดถึงภาพของเหตุการณ์ซึ่งคำ เหล่านั้นน่าจะถูกใช้ในระหว่างการทำงาน หน้าที่ต่าง ๆ ระหว่างเข้า ร่วมโครงการ					
4.	ฉันฝึกพูดหรือเขียนคำใหม่ ๆ ในภาษาอังกฤษซ้ำแล้วซ้ำอีกหลาย ๆ ครั้ง เพื่อช่วยจดจำคำนั้น ๆ					
<b>กลยุทธ์ปริชาน</b>						
5.	ฉันพยายามพูดให้มีสำเนียงใกล้เคียงกับเจ้าของภาษา					
6.	ฉันฝึกฝนการออกเสียงภาษาอังกฤษกับเจ้าของภาษา					
7.	ฉันเริ่มต้นบทสนทนากับผู้อื่นโดยใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ					
8.	ฉันดูรายการโทรทัศน์หรือภาพยนตร์ภาคภาษาอังกฤษ					
9.	ฉันอ่านสิ่งพิมพ์หรือบทความภาษาอังกฤษ ต่าง ๆ ที่ทำให้เพลิดเพลิน					
10.	ฉันค้นหาคำในภาษาไทยที่มีความหมายใกล้เคียงกับคำศัพท์ใหม่ใน ภาษาอังกฤษ					
<b>กลยุทธ์การชดเชย</b>						
11.	ฉันใช้วิธีการเดา เพื่อให้เข้าใจคำในภาษาอังกฤษที่ไม่คุ้นเคย					
12.	ฉันใช้ท่าทางประกอบระหว่างการสนทนาภาษาอังกฤษ เมื่อนึกคำ ภาษาอังกฤษไม่ออก					
13.	ฉันใช้คำอื่นแทน เมื่อไม่รู้คำที่ถูกต้องในภาษาอังกฤษ					
14.	ฉันพยายามเดาหรือคาดการณ์เป็นภาษาอังกฤษว่าผู้สนทนา ชาวต่างชาติจะพูดอะไรต่อไป					
<b>กลยุทธ์อภิปริชาน</b>						
15.	ฉันสังเกตข้อผิดพลาดต่าง ๆ ในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ และใช้ ข้อผิดพลาด เหล่านั้นเป็นบทเรียนเพื่อช่วยให้ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในครั้ง ต่อไปดีขึ้น					
16.	ฉันให้ความสนใจ เมื่อมีใครก็ตามพูดภาษาอังกฤษ					
17.	ฉันพยายามที่จะหาวิธีการที่จะทำให้พัฒนาการด้านภาษาอังกฤษได้ดี ขึ้น					
18.	ฉันมองหาผู้ที่สามารถพูดภาษาอังกฤษกับฉันได้					

ข้อ	รายการกลยุทธ์ในการเรียนรู้ทางภาษาอังกฤษ ระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการ	ความถี่ในการทำรายการ				
		1	2	3	4	5
19.	ฉันมีเป้าหมายชัดเจนในการปรับปรุงทักษะภาษาอังกฤษและมี คาดหวังในความก้าวหน้าทางทักษะภาษาอังกฤษ					
<b>กลยุทธ์ทางอารมณ์</b>						
20.	ฉันพยายามผ่อนคลาย เมื่อรู้สึกกลัวที่ต้องใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในการ ทำงานและในชีวิตประจำวัน					
21.	ฉันสังเกตว่ารู้สึกเป็นกังวลหรือเครียดในขณะที่กำลังใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ ระหว่างที่เข้าร่วมโครงการหรือไม่					
22.	ฉันพูดคุยกับผู้อื่นเกี่ยวกับความรู้สึกเมื่อฉันเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ					
<b>กลยุทธ์ทางสังคม</b>						
23.	ฉันขอร้องให้ผู้พูดพูดช้าลงหรือพูดซ้ำ ถ้าไม่เข้าใจภาษาอังกฤษที่เขา พูดอยู่ในขณะนั้น					
24.	ฉันขอให้เพื่อนร่วมงานคนไทย หรือเจ้าของภาษาภาษาอังกฤษช่วย แก้ไขภาษาอังกฤษเมื่อตนพูดผิด					
25.	ฉันพยายามศึกษาวัฒนธรรมของอเมริกันและวัฒนธรรมอื่น ๆ					

### ส่วนที่ 3 สมรรถนะทางวัฒนธรรมด้านทักษะต่าง ๆ

ข้อ	รายการสมรรถนะทางวัฒนธรรมทางทักษะต่าง ๆ ระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการ	ความถี่ในการทำรายการ				
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	ฉันแสดงออกถึงความพร้อมที่จะปรับตัวและเรียนรู้เมื่ออยู่ร่วมกับ ชาวอเมริกันและผู้อื่นที่มาจากต่างวัฒนธรรม					
2.	ฉันปรับเปลี่ยนพฤติกรรมและการแต่งกาย เพื่อหลีกเลี่ยงความไม่ พอใจที่อาจจะเกิดขึ้น					
3.	ฉันสามารถเปรียบเทียบความแตกต่างของวัฒนธรรมอเมริกันกับ วัฒนธรรมไทยได้					
4.	ฉันใช้กลยุทธ์ต่าง ๆ เพื่อส่งเสริมการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษและ วัฒนธรรมอเมริกัน การปรับตัวให้เข้ากับวัฒนธรรมอเมริกัน และ เพื่อคลายความตึงเครียดจากเรื่องต่างๆ					
5.	ฉันแสดงออกถึงความสามารถในการปฏิบัติตนอย่างเหมาะสมเมื่อ อยู่ร่วมกันกับผู้อื่นในสถานการณ์ต่าง ๆ					
6.	ฉันใช้ต้นแบบ กลยุทธ์ และเทคนิคต่าง ๆ เพื่อช่วยในการเรียนรู้ทาง ภาษาและวัฒนธรรม					
7.	ฉันจัดการและวางแผนการเรียนรู้ ผลการเรียนรู้ และการพัฒนาการ ต่างๆ ที่เกิดขึ้นต่อตนเอง และชาวอเมริกัน					
8.	ฉันปฏิบัติตนอย่างเหมาะสมตามหลักวัฒนธรรมเฉพาะของชาวอม อเมริกัน เช่น การจ่ายทิปอย่างน้อย 10% เมื่อรับประทานอาหารที่ ร้าน					

ชื่อ	รายการสมรรถนะทางวัฒนธรรมทางทักษะต่าง ๆ ระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการ	ความถี่ในการทำรายการ				
		1	2	3	4	5
9.	ฉันช่วยแก้ไข อธิบายเมื่อมีความขัดแย้งทางวัฒนธรรม และการเข้าใจผิดระหว่างวัฒนธรรมเกิดขึ้น					
10.	ฉันใช้กลยุทธ์ และวิธีการที่เหมาะสมในการปรับตัวต่อวัฒนธรรมไทยหลังจากกลับมาประเทศไทย					





## Appendix A

### Online Questionnaire

### **Out-of-class language learning strategies of Thai university students and intercultural competence skills during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program**

**Direction:** This questionnaire is aimed to investigate frequency use of out-of-class language learning strategies of Thai university students and intercultural competence skills during participation in the Summer Work and Travel Program. Please write the answer in the blank and mark ✓ in the table.

#### **Part I:** Demographic Backgrounds

1. Age.....
2. Gender.....
3. Year level.....Faculty.....University.....
4. Latest participation before 2018 .....Position / Workplace
5. Position / Workplace in 2018 .....

#### **Part II:** Frequency of use of out-of-class language learning strategies

**Directions:** Please mark ✓ in the table, using the scale as follows:

<b>Level of Frequency</b>	<b>Description of Frequency</b>
1 =	never used the strategy / skill
2 =	rarely used the strategy / skill
3 =	used the strategy / skill occasionally
4 =	used the strategy / skill frequently
5 =	used the strategy / skill very frequently

No.	Out-of-Class Language Learning Strategy Descriptors	Frequency of Use				
		1	2	3	4	5
<b>Memory Strategies</b>						
1	I associated what I already knew and new things I learned in English while participating in the program.					
2.	I used new English words I heard during work in a sentence so that I could remember them.					
3.	I remembered a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might have been used while participating in the program.					
4.	I said or wrote new English words several times so that I could remember them.					
<b>Cognitive Strategies</b>						
5.	I tried to speak like native English speakers.					
6.	I practiced the sounds of English with native English speakers.					
7.	I started conversations in English.					
8.	I watched English language TV shows spoken in English or went to movies spoken in English.					
9.	I read online articles, short stories, or magazines for pleasure in English.					
10.	I looked for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.					
<b>Compensation Strategies</b>						
11.	I tried to understand unfamiliar English words by making guesses.					
12.	I used gestures when I could not think of a word during a conversation in English.					
13.	I made up new words if I did not know the right ones in English.					

No.	Out-of-Class Language Learning Strategy Descriptors	Frequency of Use				
		1	2	3	4	5
14.	I tried to guess what the other person would say next in English.					
<b>Metacognitive Strategies</b>						
15.	I noticed my English mistakes and used that information to help me do better.					
16.	I paid attention when someone was speaking English.					
17.	I tried to find out how to be a better learner of English.					
18.	I looked for people I can talk to in English.					
19.	I had clear goals for improving my English skills while participating in the program.					
<b>Affective Strategies</b>						
20.	I tried to relax whenever I felt afraid of using English during work.					
21.	I noticed if I was tense or nervous when I was studying or using English.					
22.	I talked to someone else about how I felt when I was learning English					
<b>Social Strategies</b>						
23.	If I did not understand something in English, I asked the other person to slow down or say it again.					
24.	I asked English speakers or my Thai colleague to correct me when I talk.					
25.	I tried to learn about the culture of English speakers.					

**Part III:** Frequency of use of intercultural competence skills**Directions:** Please mark ✓ in the table, using the identical scale as mentioned above.

No.	Intercultural Competence Skill Descriptors	Frequency of Use				
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	I demonstrated flexibility when interacting with persons from the host culture.					
2.	I adjusted my behavior, dress, etc., as appropriate to avoid offending my hosts.					
3.	I was able to contrast the host culture with my own.					
4.	I used strategies for learning the host language, culture, adapting to the host culture, and reducing stress.					
5.	I demonstrated a capacity to interact appropriately in a variety of different social situations in the host culture.					
6.	I used models, strategies, and techniques that aided my learning of the host language and culture.					
7.	I monitored my behavior and its impact on my learning, my growth, and especially on my hosts.					
8.	I used culture-specific information to improve my style and professional interaction with my hosts. For example, I left some tips after having meal at a restaurant.					
9.	I helped to resolve cross-cultural conflicts and misunderstandings when they arose.					
10.	I employed appropriate strategies for adapting to my own culture after returning to Thailand.					

## Appendix B

### ชุดคำถามสัมภาษณ์

คำถามสัมภาษณ์นักศึกษาไทยที่เข้าร่วม The Summer Work and Travel Program เกี่ยวกับการ  
กลยุทธ์ในการเรียนรู้ทางภาษาอังกฤษที่ และสมรรถนะทางวัฒนธรรมด้านทักษะต่าง ๆ ระหว่างเข้าร่วม  
โครงการ

1. เพราะเหตุใดคุณจึงสนใจเข้าร่วมโครงการ คุณคาดหวังที่จะปรับปรุงและพัฒนาทักษะทางภาษาอังกฤษ  
ของคุณระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการหรือไม่ ทักษะภาษาอังกฤษของคุณได้รับการพัฒนาหลังจากเข้าร่วมโครงการหรือไม่  
อย่างไร
2. คุณคิดว่าทักษะภาษาอังกฤษใดมีประโยชน์ต่อการทำงานของคุณมากที่สุด คุณได้พยายามพัฒนา  
ความสามารถในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษของคุณเพื่อที่จะช่วยส่งเสริมให้คุณทำงานได้มีประสิทธิภาพมากขึ้นหรือไม่  
อย่างไร
3. คุณมีปัญหาทางภาษาขณะทำงานบ้างหรือไม่ คุณจัดการรับมือกับปัญหาที่เกิดจากความสามารถทาง  
ภาษานั้นอย่างไร กรุณายกตัวอย่างประกอบ
5. คุณได้เรียนรู้ทักษะอื่น ๆ ที่สำคัญและจำเป็นต่อการทำงานและการดำรงชีวิต ขณะเข้าร่วมโครงการ  
หรือไม่ อย่างไร
6. คุณเคารพและเห็นคุณค่าในความหลากหลายของความเป็นมนุษย์ในกลุ่มเพื่อนร่วมงานของคุณหรือไม่  
คุณเรียนรู้วัฒนธรรมอื่น ๆ บ้างหรือไม่ อย่างไร
7. คุณสามารถบอกถึงความเชื่อมโยง หรือความเกี่ยวข้องระหว่างวัฒนธรรมต่าง ๆ ที่มีอยู่ได้หรือไม่  
อย่างไร
8. คุณมีความสุขกับการอยู่ร่วมกับผู้อื่นและรู้สึกสบายใจขณะที่อยู่และทำงานในสภาพแวดล้อมที่มีความ  
แตกต่างทางวัฒนธรรมหรือไม่ อย่างไร
9. คุณสามารถปรับตัวเข้ากับสถานการณ์ทางสังคมต่าง ๆ ที่เปลี่ยนแปลงระหว่างเข้าร่วมโครงการหรือไม่  
อย่างไร
10. คุณรู้สึกมีสำนึกความเป็นเจ้าของร่วมกับสังคมชาวอเมริกัน และกลุ่มอื่น ๆ หรือไม่ อย่างไร

## Appendix B

### The semi-structured interview protocol

**The semi-structured interview protocol for Thai university students who participated in the Summer Work and Travel Program.**

1. Why were you interested in participating in the Summer Work and Travel Program? Did you expect to improve your English skills during participation? Was it improved at certain level after participation? How?
2. Which language skill did you consider the most useful and essential for you work? Did you intentionally try to use English to work more effectively? How?
3. Did you encounter any language difficulties during work? If yes, please give examples of situation showing how you handled them?
5. In addition to language development, did you learn any other essential life skills during participation in the program? How?
6. Did you value and pay respect to a cultural diversity at work? Did you get an opportunity to learn other cultures? How?
7. Could you relate the similarities and differences among cultures? Please provide some examples.
8. How would you consider working and interacting with other from different cultural backgrounds? Were you happy? How?
9. Could you adjust yourself to social circumstances during participation in the program? How?
10. Did you process a sense of belonging with other people who also live in the United States? How?

## VITA

**NAME** Thunyakorn Thanasumbun

**DATE OF BIRTH** 2 March 1992

**PLACE OF BIRTH** Uttaradit

**INSTITUTIONS ATTENDED**

- Uttaradit Daruni School, Uttaradit, Thailand
- Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand
- English Language Institute University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA

**HOME ADDRESS** 138/3 M.6 Thasao, Muang, Uttaradit, Thailand 53000



จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย  
CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY