



in Future Literature and Foreign Languages

www.journalhi.com/Lit/

A Study of English-Speaking Problems of the Vocational Students at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School

Shima Mansourmahani^{1*}, Pahtthara-bhorn Singhthongchai², Rattarin Nacheangtai³

- 1- Liberal Art Department, Faculty of Industry and Technology Rajamangala University of Technology Isan Sakon Nakhon Campus, Thailand. Email:shimamansouri99@yahoo.com
- 2- Liberal Art Department, Faculty of Industry and Technology Rajamangala University of Technology Isan Sakon Nakhon Campus, Thailand. Email: pahttharabhorn.si@gmail.com
- 3- Liberal Art Department, Faculty of Industry and Technology Rajamangala University of Technology Isan Sakon Nakhon Campus, Thailand. Email: Rattarin.na@rmuti.ac.th

Abstract

This research aims to investigate English speaking problems of the vocational students at the Engineering and Technology School with three main objectives. These include 1) to investigate the English speaking problems of the vocational students at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School; 2) to examine English speaking problems of the vocational students majoring in accounting, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, and civil engineering; and 3) to find out the differences in English speaking problems according to levels of study of the vocational students. The participants were 180 vocational students studying in vocational curriculum, academic year 2022, including 45 vocational students of each field obtained through a purposive sampling method. The research instrument used to collect data is a questionnaire. The data in this study was analysed by percentages, mean score, standard deviation, and analysis of variance. The findings found that: 1) the majority of vocational students have high levels of linguistically-related problems ($\vec{x} = 3.70$) and affective-related problems ($\vec{x} = 3.62$); 2) the vocational students of the four fields have high levels of English speaking problems in the linguistically-related and affective-related problem categories; and 3) there was no statistically significant difference in English speaking problems among the vocational students' levels of study (p > 0.05).

Keywords: English, Speaking, problems, levels of study, vocational students

1. Introduction

During current modern communication environment, English is a major element of human comprehension between individuals who speak various languages in terms of enhancing work productivity levels. Additionally, English is not the native language of all regions. Therefore, nonnative speakers exhibit distinct perspectives and challenges with language acquisition.

Thailand has consistently realised the importance of utilising English. According to the national education management, English language courses include listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Areerak and Siriporn, 2010). Basic education, particularly the fundamental curriculum, has been scheduled to be taught from primary to secondary level (Oraphan, 2011), however, the English language instruction has always been a difficulty. As a result, students cannot employ English adequately until they attend tertiary English language education (Buppha, 2012). Problems develop until students who attend higher English language study because their English competence is below standard (Prapphal, 2001). Although speaking skills are imperative to students in Thailand, English speaking skills are the most problematic that Thai students face. (Tribolet, 2012; Sarkis, 2012). According to Teo et al. (2004), the cause and obstacle to the development of speaking skills among Thai students was the number of learners in each class being too large, a lack of proficient teachers, or time constraints spent learning English, with most of the time spent teaching other skills that are considered more necessary, such as reading, which made the students' speaking skills ineffective. As a consequence, students are not able to communicate in English. According to the accomplishment data on real-life English courses of students with a first-year vocational certificate in the academic department at the college that conducted the research in the academic year 2017, the accomplishment value in real-life English courses was at an unsatisfactory level. The students had an average score of 52.13 percent of their English language learning achievement in real life, which was at the level of necessitating improvement, and 70 percent lower than the specified standard (Academic Department, Sakon Nakhon Technical College, 2018: 120). Thus, this consequence indicates that vocational students in Sakon Nakhon province experienced communicating in English especially speaking skills in real

Based on the outcome of an informal interview conducted with the English teacher, Miss. Walaiporn Keawhome, at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School, Rajamangala University of Technology Isan Sakon Nakhon Campus, found that vocational certificate students' English language performance has declined each year respectively.

In addition, most students cannot speak or respond in English at all. At this point, the teacher conjecture rough questions about the language study of vocational students. For example, students are biased towards English because they think English is difficult and each has a dissimilar background in English from a previous school. From the assessment of the teacher from the classroom circumstance directly, it can be clearly stated that less than 5 percent of students are confident in speaking English and are courageous enough to interact with teachers in class. It is almost impossible to talk about the routine of English in real life by students outside the classroom. Consequently, the researchers recognise the prominence of the problems mentioned above and have a strong desire to study of English speaking problems of vocational students. This study's purpose is to categorically perceive the English speaking problems of vocational students along with studying the minor problems of students in each field and differences in problems in each educational level at the Engineering and Technology Demonstration School, Rajamangala University of Technology Isan Sakon Nakhon Campus.

2. Objectives of the Study

This study is to investigate the key determinants of the problems of English speaking skills of the vocational students at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School as follows:

- 1. To investigate English speaking problems of the vocational students at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School.
- 2. To examine specific English speaking problems of the vocational students majoring in accounting, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, and civil engineering at the Engineering and Technology Demonstration School.
- 3. To find out the differences in English speaking problems according to levels of study of the vocational students at the Engineering and Technology Demonstration School.

3. Research Questions

There are three research questions in this study:

- 1 What are the English-speaking problems of the vocational students at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School?
- 2 What are the specific English speaking problems of the vocational students majoring in accounting, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, and civil engineering at the Engineering and Technology Demonstration School?
- 3 What are the differences in English speaking problems according to levels of study of the vocational students at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School?

4. Scope of the Study

Before disclosing relevant articles and constructing the research framework, the following scopes of this current study should be explained at the beginning of this research report to determine the concentration of this study as below:

1 This study investigated the English speaking problems of the vocational students at the Engineering and Technology Demonstration School, Rajamangala University of Technology Isan Sakon Nakhon Campus.

2 This research focused on the English speaking problems and found out the differences in English speaking problems among the vocational students' levels of study at the Engineering and Technology Demonstration School, Rajamangala University of Technology Isan Sakon Nakhon Campus.

5. Significance of the Study

This study will be beneficial not only in enlightening the researchers about the problems that the vocational students in the participant group face in speaking English, but also in enabling the researchers to be more enthusiastic about enhancing the English-speaking skills of various vocational students. This study might contribute to the development of an English-language teaching curriculum in additional institutions in the future. Speaking skills are necessary for conveying sentiment or contemplation; however, this is a significant and problematic problems that most vocational students struggle with. Nevertheless, vocational students are regarded as a vital national labour resource; there should be more stimulation and emphasis on these issues. The consequences to be prefigured consist of the following: the problems in speaking English will be revealed as a director for the researchers to conduct the study: the questionnaire will be used as evidence of collecting data form: and the researchers will be able to use as a reference for educators and curriculum planners.

6. Reviews of Related Literature

Background of Speaking Skills

Speaking is an ability that thus provokes nervousness. Individuals who communicate in the target language frequently experience serious levels of anxiety and hence become less prepared to participate in conversational activities (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986). Speaking is a crucial skill for learners since it allows them to interact with others who speak English in their everyday lives. Despite this, English is a transition plan for individuals to attain their goals in the worlds of business and education, and this language places a priority on grammar and linguistic structure. According to Bashir et al. (2011), speaking is a fruitful talent in the oral modality. It is comparable to the other talents in that it is more difficult than it appears at first and entails more than merely pronouncing words. Furthermore, speaking for special communication is typically delivered in circumstances where the speaker is visible to the listener in a variety of scenarios. The development of special communication speaking is intimately connected to the principles of public speaking. Speaking is more sophisticated than regular conversation and other talents when contemplating a speech that is pertinent to the listener. Other aspects of the speaking process include selecting a topic, integrating concepts, adjusting the message, and adapting to the listener's perspective (Lucas, 2001). Brown (2004) continues to state that there are certain fundamental sorts of speaking, as illustrated by the following categorisation: Imitative. The capacity to simply regurgitate back or imitate a word, phrase, and perhaps a sentence is at one extreme of a spectrum of sorts of speaking performance. Although this is essentially a phonetic level of oral synthesis, the criteria performance may encompass a number of lexical, prosodic, and grammatical features of language: Intensive. Short lengths of spoken language are intended to emphasize skill in a certain subset of phonological, lexical, grammatical, or phrasal

linkage: Responsive. Interaction and test understanding are included in responsiveness, albeit at a relatively limited level of quite brief dialogues, conventional salutations, pleasantries, simple requests, and remarks. It is a brief response to an instructor query or remark, providing instructions and guidance. These responses are generally adequate and significant: Interactive. Transactional language is used to exchange particular information or for interpersonal interactions. Interaction can occur in two forms: transactional language, which includes numerous transactions or several participants, or non-transactional language, which does not contain multiple exchanges or multiple participants. The duration and complexity of the conversation, which may encompass many exchanges, distinguish responsive and interactive speaking: Extensive (monologue). Speeches, oral representations, and narratives are examples of extensive oral production tasks in which the potential for oral participation from listeners is either laboriously limited, possibly to nonverbal answers, or completely precluded. As a result, speaking skills are not only composed of oral pronunciation but also include the process of thinking and various imitation behaviors. Fraser (2000), being able to speak English entails a variety of subskills, the most significant of which is pronunciation (other sub-skills of speaking include, grammar, vocabulary, and pragmatics). With correct pronunciation, a speaker is comprehensible notwithstanding obvious flaws; with weak pronunciation, understanding a speaker could be quite challenging, irrespective of correctness in plenty of other respects. Besides, adults can obtain relatively close fluency, and that can be acquired in a rather short period of time without causing substantial interruption to the L2 acquisition education program if proper pronunciation training is provided (Elliott, 1995). Ur (1996) highlights an essential principle: the appropriate quality of the language employed. It is possible for an instructor to do this by adopting activities with language levels that are equivalent to the students' linguistic levels. Such oral assignments encourage students by allowing them to convey their thoughts and opinions effectively through fluent speech.

7. English Speaking Problems

Common English-Speaking Problems

Speaking is an essential skill in English language acquisition and a key component of human communication. Learning English as a foreign language in non-English speaking nations is an integrated process in which the student cannot disregard one or more of the four core skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. However, some students continue to lack the four essential abilities, particularly speaking. It might be because English is difficult for them to grasp, and they are terrified of making errors to practice confidently. In terms of international relations, the ability to speak English is critical since it allows non-native speakers to engage on a global scale. At this level, speaking abilities are judged by the ability to have a successful conversation in the target language. This might cause second or foreign language learners to feel that their speaking talents will help them advance in their careers (Khampreted, 2012). In terms of anxiety-related speaking problems, investigations have revealed that increased worry over speaking English has been detected in many other nations. Xiugin (2006) questioned Chinese students and found and summarised the following causes of their public speaking concern: The first issue was connected to a lack of English

competence, the second to a fear of making mistakes and being ridiculed, and the third to huge class numbers, which was followed by an inability to take chances, low tolerance for ambiguity, and lastly, the competitive atmosphere of the classroom. Khampreted (2012), ineffective language acquisition is hampered by a lack of English competence. Students may find it difficult to comprehend the teacher at times, and as a result, they are unable to appropriately answer questions. Some students want to ask the instructor to repeat themselves, but they are afraid that other students will think they have terrible English. This sort of student keeps silent and avoids eve contact with the teacher to show that they do not comprehend, allowing the teacher to assume that they are ready to answer questions. Over a quarter of a million people around the globe struggle with their selfconfidence. Self-confidence is recognising that a person has the ability to do well and think positively. According to Fitriani et al. (2015), the idea of self-confidence refers to selfassurance in one's personal judgment, skill, power, which can sometimes be excessive. A focus on the self leads to good self-confidence (self-consciousness). Lack of self-confidence can be caused by a variety of factors, including guilt, shyness turned inward, excessive expectations of perfection, a false sense of humility, fear of change or making mistakes, and despair. Baldwin (2011), amongst the most prevalent phobias most students have, is speaking in front of others, and the sense of awkwardness causes their thoughts to go empty or that they will forget what to express. According to them, their incapacity to demonstrate their ability to talk is also heavily impacted by their feelings of shyness. Anxiety is a state of stress, apprehension, and uneasiness linked with the condition of learning a foreign language (Horwitz et al, 1989). Another consideration is geographical location. One of the factors that impacts instructors' issues in the classroom is their geographical region. As an example, there are two situations or places that create substantial distinctions in teaching English. There are two types of areas: urban and rural. Urban areas provide the areas that are neighboring metropolises with glowing inhabited areas, in contrast to rural areas, which are sporadically occupied areas and are usually countryside or agricultural areas (Hossain, 2016). While learners are engaged, students' language backgrounds are a difficult barrier to overcome. In their regular lives, the majority of students communicate in their native language and are struck by their mother tongue. In this circumstance, their native tongue serves as the primary language. In point of fact, some students do not originate from well-educated households, and English is not their first language (Rasheed, et al., 2017).

8. English speaking problems in Thailand

Thailand has both benefits and drawbacks as a country that has never been colonised by a foreign country. As a matter of fact, another of the deficiencies is a lack of skills, competence, and expertise in acquiring other languages, such as English, which is utilised as an official global language. Correspondingly, Thailand is increasingly concentrating on strengthening the English language abilities of the students. English appears to have a modest effect in Thailand forthwith. Oral language skills are one of the four English skills that students typically find the most challenging to master (Yusica, 2014). According to the Thai curriculum, English is taught as a vital topic from kindergarten to the highest educational levels in Thailand.

Conversely, it has frequently been shown that English instruction in Thailand has become a failure (Kwandee & Sawaddikun, 2012). Furthermore, Sahatsathatsana (2017) revealed that numerous research investigations conducted with Thai students (Prachanboriban, 1958; Lakhawatana, 1969; Chanyasupab, 1982; Malarak, 1998; and Mano-im, 1999) discovered Thai students tend to pronounce English sounds by employing Thai consonant sounds and, in general, have a high proclivity to struggle with English pronunciation. This is because the Thai language's sound system is entirely different from English. Besides, to be able to speak English fluently, there must be opportunities for practice, both in terms of vocabulary and opportunity. They also feel that if given enough time to practice, everyone can speak English, as they believe about Thai students' English language selfperception (Wang & Rajprasit, 2015). Typically, students were merely required to study the grammatical and syntax parts. As a result, Thai students, particularly those in isolated areas with a scarcity of English-native speakers, were determined to be unable to accurately pronounce English words (Wongsuriya, 2020). There are two apparatuses of educational processes that have been detected as a source of information about websites that exist on the internet specifically and have been discovered as a source of listening and speaking English proficiency. According to Bradshaw (2018), the host of the Thai English programme, speaking English in real life does not necessitate a concentration on grammar. Even if we do not really speak flawless English, we can help strangers comprehend what we are saying. To communicate, try using sign language, body language, and other nonverbal signals. Wongsuwana (2006) stated that speaking abilities could be taught and that talent was not required. Nevertheless, it continues to be a concern for many Thai students. Learners' anxiety, enthusiasm, and lack of confidence before performing a speaking test in the classroom are also issues in teaching and learning English (Ratanapinyowong et al., 2007). Similarly, Punthumasen (2007) discovered that the majority of learners do not desire to study English since the source material is monotonous and the teaching approach in the classroom is uninteresting. Furthermore, there are not enough fascinating textbooks and resources in English to motivate them to study. In the case of workers using English for professional purposes, Bulphong (2003) observed that a lack of understanding of vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar was a key listening and speaking obstacle in the research of language learning methodologies used by Thai receptionists to increase their listening and speaking capabilities. As another illustration, Tipmontree (2007) found the tourist police officers who functioned in the Radio Center and the Patrol and Service Bangkok Airport Section made extensive use of their English abilities, particularly listening and speaking. Listening was identified as the most challenging issue in Thai tourist police English usage, followed by speaking. Moreover, the majority of Thai tourist police officers considered telephone calls as a predicament that they commonly encountered in their routine tasks, accompanied by providing guidance and listening to complaints. The Thai tourist police regularly experienced issues while speaking to international visitors because they frequently used unsuitable jargon, could not grasp what the term meant and were not able to comprehend regional accents. They commonly employed gestures to solve obstacles, prompted by requests for assistance from translators, volunteers, and coworkers. Apparently, Wattanavitukul (2006), it is worth highlighting that the

students at all levels of education, as well as educated citizens, continue to pursue English language tutoring institutions. Numerous students, in particular, desire to learn to speak English. This phenomenon reflects the failure of English language learning in education sectors that were previously unable to satisfy the demands of learners in accordance with educational management objectives. Furthermore, research has been provided to Thai society and the world indicating that up to 99 percent of the Thai population is unable to speak English.

English Speaking Problems of Vocational Students

Vocational education is a component of the educational system that educates students to increase their effectiveness in cooperating in teamwork or in a specific field of labour (Murniati & Usman, 2009). Occupational alignment is to be the center of education in vocational school, preparing students with a wide range of competencies in each particular skill. As Kapur & Chakraborty (2008) stated, the main group of skilled workers is mostly people experiencing more opportunities to find jobs worldwide than in their own country by speaking English. Most of the skilled workers are vocational school graduates. For achievement in this branch competition, English aptitude is imperative and individuals who possess English speaking skills are more likely to retain employment and be more industrious (Chiswick, 2008). Tani (2005) discovered that students in Asian nations prefer to keep silent during the teaching and learning process for fear of making a mistake. The "Culture of Silence" is also becoming thicker as a result of teacher evaluations that view monosyllable in relation to the students. As a result, students have a poor level of involvement in the classroom learning experience. Educators, according to the national education system (2003), have a key role in making learning relevant, exciting, creative, dynamic, and participatory. This results in student-centered learning, in which students are viewed as the primary actors in classroom activities. Such learning is also supposed to enable students to become self-directed learners, particularly for vocational school students who are expected to work following graduation. Therefore, vocational school students must be given the chance to engage in the teaching and learning process, including English topics, in order to be able to project their knowledge in the workplace (Faridi, et al., 2016). As a consequence of having more challenging theoretical and practical lessons than high school students, vocational students experience fatigue and disinterest in English because they consider it superfluous and complex to comprehend for students who do not use English as their first language. As revealed by Mustafa (2013), instructors are less competent, particularly in classroom management and the use of media as instructional materials. Furthermore, many teachers encountered difficulties in teaching English speaking courses and developing the materials, which might be attributed to inadequate training, material substance, and the provision of supplemental materials, as well as a lack of resources. The selection and decision process are important difficulties that instructors encounter in the learning process, particularly in English education for vocational high schools. Syamsinar & Jabu (2016) discovered eleven issues concerning the professional competency of English teachers in vocational high schools. The issues discovered are as follows: The issues discovered are as follows: 1) unfamiliar with the vocabulary of distinctive terminology for distinct disciplines of study, 2) deficiency in the pronunciation of particular phrases, 3)

difficulty conveying the lecture, 4) difficulty achieving the essential competency and purpose of learning objectives. 5) As a result of a scarcity of curriculum design. 6) Trouble to pick materials based on students' levels in various fields of study. 7) Struggle to develop appropriate content for students in various disciplines. 8) Difficulty to collect material from other sources; and 9) There is a deficiency in instructional activities for professional development. 10) Do not use information and communication to transmit as much as is achievable; and (11) Inadequate classroom management. Anam & Tantri (2020) found that vocational students have been affected by the psychological problems of speaking English: anxiety, shyness, fear of making mistakes, and lack of confidence. First, the students had anxiety when speaking. Moreover, they were apprehensive, uncomfortable, and queasy before delivering their speeches. When they spoke, their demeanor appeared awkward. The students appeared terrified, fearful of being persecuted by their classmates. The students were unwilling to make eye contact with their classmates. Students' anxiousness and nervousness affected their public speaking skills. Second, despite having fluency, a student felt shy and unconfident when speaking in front of their classmates. They also spoke in hushed tones so that their classmates could not overhear what they were saying. According to the findings from the interview with the other student, the student claimed that English was tough and impossible to be proficient in. It had an impact on the student, who felt embarrassed and shy if they made mistakes when speaking in front of their classmates. Third, Students were terrified of making indiscretions. When the students moved forward, their voices were readily heard, although in other cases, they muted their voices because they weren't sure what they were saying. They were also terrified of being mocked by their classmates when they made mistakes in pronunciation. They wanted to speak in reverent whispers so that their faults would not be noticed or heard by their classmates. It is because when students make mistakes in their public speaking engagements, their classmates will laugh, harass, and yell at them. As a result, when they make mistakes, the students will lower their voices to escape being observed by their classmates. Finally, as per the student response, the source of the students' lack of confidence was internal to them. When speaking, the student stated that they felt unconfident and mentioned that they felt insecure since they did not speak English fluently. In addition to the internal cause of their lack of confidence, they also attribute an external cause to their lack of confidence. The problem was either the students' surroundings or the condemnation of their classmates. The student performs well in English speaking but they were frightened of being judged or criticised for being an egotistical student when they spoke English in class. Khamprated (2012) examined the English listening and speaking problems and causes of these problems among private vocational school students. The study's participants were third-year certificate students in the fall term of the 2011 academic year at a private vocational school in Bangkok, Thailand. In terms of the resulting speaking difficulties, students noted that it was difficult to speak English with the proper intonation, to communicate as smoothly as a native speaker, and to repeat speaking with a student with a lower level of English ability. They were reluctant to make mistakes in front of their classmates, and consequently, they frequently failed to complete the ending pronunciation. Their limited grammar skills make it difficult for them to speak English; as a result,

they become nervous and apprehensive when speaking to foreigners. They were also petrified that if they made any mistakes when speaking, other people would laugh at them. Preedatawat (2010) explored the approaches applied by international undergraduate students in Bangkok while speaking English in realistic circumstances. The researcher required to question whether there were slightly differences in the communication strategies used by students from diverse cultures, institutions, and ethnicities. undergraduate students from four Bangkok universities were invited to complete questionnaires and participate in semi-structured interviews. The data found that most performed circumlocution, self-sustaining, approximation, and enquiring for assistance. There were discrepancies in the usage of interactive techniques among students of different cultures, academies, and genders. Phuliamkam et al. (2019) studied 49 students from the Northeastern Vocational Institute of Agriculture and the Khon Kaen College of Agriculture and Technology in their third year of Vocation Certificate. The research findings revealed that the guidelines for developing the most important skills in English, Listening and Speaking, were as follows: 1) Instructional methods should be enjoyable, and technology should be used to interconnect all activities; 2) Instructors could perhaps make adjustments to their instruction from Passive to Active, and create activities by incitement; 3) Grammar is not required when speaking English; and 4) Listening is essential to speaking. Kaharuddin & Rahmadana (2020) investigated problembased group discussion: an effective ELT technique to improve vocational high school students' transactional speaking skills (group discussion) by discussing how to enhance the students' transactional speaking skills at Vocational High School 5 Gowa. Twenty students were purposefully chosen to participate in two courses, ten for the experimental class and ten for the controlled class at the intermediate level. This research was performed using a quantitative research design with assistance from the data gathering tool, namely the speaking video test (group discussion). They discovered that the problem-based group discussion technique can help students enhance their transactional speaking skills. According to the findings of this study, this technique can successfully increase students' transactional speaking abilities in transferring information, participating informal talks, and even acquiring knowledge to work in real-life circumstances.

9. Methodology

Research Design

This study was designed to investigate English speaking problems of the vocational students among three levels of study in four fields, which include accounting, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, and civil engineering, by answering the Likert Scale questionnaire at the Engineering and Technology Demonstration School, Rajamangala University of Technology Isan Sakon Nakhon Campus.

10. Participants

180 vocational students from the Engineering and Technology Demonstration School of Rajamangala University of Technology Isan Sakon Nakhon Campus, academic year 2022, were the participants of this study. Accounting, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, and civil engineering students in their first, second, and third

years were chosen as samples. Hence, the participants were all 45 vocational students from each of the four fields. They were selected through purposive sampling. The participants were of similar ages, ranging from 15 to 18 years old at the time of the study.

11. Research Instrument

Questionnaire

The speaking skills problems questionnaire, based on Irismet (2006) and developed by Asakereh & Afshar (2016), was adapted in this study. It was written in both English and Thai to minimise misinterpretation and was divided into two sections. In the first section, collect participants' demographic data, which includes 3 inquiries designed to gather information on respondents' backgrounds, such as gender, age, and level of study in the vocational curriculum. The second section is composed of 35 questions, each of which contains a five-item Linkert Scale questionnaire of English speaking problems. There are five response options for each item: "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Neutral," "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree."

Data Collection

The data collection procedure was conducted with the vocational students of the Engineering and Technology Demonstration School, Rajamangala University of Technology Isan Sakon Nakhon Campus, during the months of June and July 2022. In order to collect data, the researchers first designed a questionnaire on English speaking problems among vocational students based on Irismet (2006) and developed by Asakereh & Afshar (2016), including the sample circumstances described in the literature reviews.

Data Analysis

The datasets were quantitatively analysed in response to the study questions. A questionnaire was employed in the quantitative analysis, which included a frequency distribution of English speaking problems experienced by vocational students. This quantitative data from parts I and II was analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) programme. The questionnaire data was provided in percentages and computed to characterise the demographic profile of the respondents. The frequency with which each sort of English speaking problem was employed by participants in each group was enumerated and tabulated.

Descriptive statistics are employed to respond to the first and second research questions. The problems with the English-speaking skills of vocational students at DSET are represented in terms of the level of problems with English-speaking skills indicated by the mean range of Likert Scale analysis. Rensis Likert (1932) created the scale to express the participants' levels of agreement or disagreement that the researchers applied in the research questionnaire:

Table 1 The Mean Range of Likert Scale Analysis of Rensis Likert (1932)

| Scale | Agreement | Mean Range | Level of problem |
|-------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|
| 5 | Strongly agree | 4.50 - 5.00 | Very high |
| 4 | Agree | 3.50 - 4.49 | High |

| 3 | Neutral | 2.50 - 3.49 | Moderate |
|---|----------------------|----------------|----------|
| 2 | Disagree | 1.50 - 2.49 | Low |
| 1 | Strongly disagree | 1.00 - 1.49 | Very low |

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is utilised to disentangle the statistically substantial differences in the third research question among the three levels of study of the vocational students at DSET.

Results

Demographic data of respondents

In this study, 180 vocational students from Engineering and Demonstration School majoring in accounting, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, and civil engineering at Rajamangala University of Technology Isan Sakon Nakhon Campus, participated in the study. The researchers collected the respondents' information in terms of age, gender, and level of study. Table 2 displays the frequency and percentages by age.

Table 2 Age of the Respondents

| Age | Frequency of Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------|--|------------|
| 15-16 | 64 | 35.6 |
| 17-18 | 116 | 64.4 |

From Table 2, there were 180 vocational students from Engineering and Demonstration School majoring in accounting, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, and civil engineering at Rajamangala University of Technology Isan Sakon Nakhon Campus. The data revealed that most of the vocational students responding to the questionnaire were aged 17–18 years old (64.4%), followed by 15–16 years old (35.6%).

Table 3 Gender of the Respondents

| Gender | Frequency of Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------|--|------------|
| Male | 112 | 62.2 |
| Female | 68 | 37.8 |

According to Table 3, there are more male students than female students among the 180 selected vocational students, with a proportion of 62.2% and 37.8% correspondingly.

Table 4 Level of Study of the Respondents

| Level of Study | Frequency of Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|----------------------|--|------------|
| 1st year | 60 | 33.3 |
| 2 nd year | 60 | 33.3 |
| 3 rd year | 60 | 33.3 |

According to Table 4, there were equally 60 vocational students in each of the four fields out of 180 selected vocational students who participated in the study, majoring in accounting, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, and civil engineering.

Research Question 1

What are the English speaking problems of the vocational students at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School?

To demonstrate the level of English speaking problems, the English speaking problems of vocational students at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School are presented in terms of mean (\bar{x}) , standard deviation (S.D.), and interpretation of each item and categories of the English speaking problems in Table 5

Table 5 The Results of Descriptive Statistics of English Speaking Problems

| No. | Items | \bar{x} | S.D. | Interpretation |
|-----|---------------------------------|-----------|-------|----------------|
| | Affective-related problems | | | |
| 1 | | 3.81 | 0.934 | TT* -1. |
| 1 | I am afraid of making mistakes. | 3.81 | 0.934 | High |
| 2 | Some of my classmates | 3.39 | 0.881 | Moderate |
| | speak very effectively, | | | |
| | but I cannot. This | | | |
| | demotivates me. | | | |
| 3 | Shyness prevents me | 3.59 | 0.950 | High |
| | from speaking. | | | |
| 4 | I cannot speak well in | 3.70 | 0.962 | High |
| | the classroom because | | | |
| | my self-confidence is | | | |
| | low. | | | |
| 5 | My anxiety is too high. | 3.60 | .931 | High |
| | This prevents me from | | | |
| | speaking well. | | | |
| | Overall | 3.62 | 0.932 | High |
| Soc | ially-related problems | | | |
| 6 | I have difficulty finding | 3.43 | 0.946 | Moderate |
| | opportunities to | | | |
| | practice my speaking | | | |
| | outside the classroom. | | | |
| 7 | My speaking classes | 3.12 | 1.060 | Moderate |
| | are not useful enough | | | |
| | to help us | | | |
| | communicate with | | | |
| | English speaking | | | |
| | people. | | | |

| | 1 | | | 1 |
|----|---|------|---------|----------|
| 8 | I do not think I will | 2.98 | 1.019 | Moderate |
| | make use of English | | | |
| | speaking skills in my | | | |
| | country. | | | |
| 9 | There is no | 3.16 | 1.004 | Moderate |
| | cooperation spirit | | | |
| | among my classmates | | | |
| | in my speaking classes. | | | |
| | Overall | 3.17 | 1.007 | Moderate |
| | Instructor-related | | | |
| | problems | | | |
| 10 | My instructors do not | 2.54 | 1.110 | Moderate |
| | have a good command | | | |
| | of English speaking | | | |
| | skills. | | | |
| 11 | It would be better if | 3.12 | 1.034 | Moderate |
| | there were more than | | | |
| | one instructor teaching | | | |
| | speaking so that they | | | |
| | could provide a speech | | | |
| | model for students. | | | |
| 12 | My instructors make | 2.84 | 0.956 | Moderate |
| | too much use of | | | |
| | our students' mother | | | |
| | tongue in the | | | |
| | classroom. | | | |
| 13 | My instructors' | 2.71 | 1.066 | Moderate |
| | pronunciation is not | | | |
| | good enough to be a | | | |
| | model for us. | _ | | |
| 14 | My instructors do not | 2.71 | 1.127 | Moderate |
| | encourage students to | | | |
| | speak. | _ | | |
| 15 | The intervention and | 2.55 | 1.085 | Moderate |
| | error correction of my | | | |
| | instructors is too | | | |
| L | harsh. | | | |
| 16 | My instructors do not | 2.77 | 1.138 | Moderate |
| | show the tendency to | | | |
| | speak English with me | | | |
| | outside the classroom | | | |
| 1 | when I try to do so. | 2.01 | 1 4 4 4 | Made |
| 17 | My instructors neglect | 2.81 | 1.114 | Moderate |
| | to focus on idiomatic | | | |
| | expressions, proverbs, | | | |
| 10 | and collocations. | 2.83 | 0.994 | Modoreta |
| 18 | My classes are teacher- | 4.83 | 0.994 | Moderate |
| | centered; therefore, I cannot find the chance | | | |
| | | | | |
| | to express my ideas and participate in class | | | |
| | discussion activities. | | | |
| 19 | My speaking | 2.94 | 1.068 | Moderate |
| 19 | | 2.94 | 1.008 | wouerate |
| | instructors spend a | | | |
| | large proportion of class time asking | | | |
| | S | | | |
| | questions about things to which I already | | | |
| | - | | | |
| | knew the answers; therefore, no real | | | |
| | communication takes | | | |
| | place. | | | |
| 20 | My instructors do not | 2.92 | 1.179 | Moderate |
| 20 | encourage any group | 2.72 | 1.1/9 | Moderate |
| | work or pair work; this | | | |
| | inhibits student- | | | |
| | student interaction in | | | |
| | class. | | | |
| 21 | My instructors do not | 2.79 | 1.114 | Moderate |
| 41 | teach us how to | 2./9 | 1.114 | Mouerale |
| | express appropriate | | | |
| | speech acts (e.g., | | | |
| ı | | Ī | | |
| | greeting, complaint, | | | |

| | | 1 | 1 | T |
|------------|---|------|-------|-----------|
| | refuse invitations or offers and so on). | | | |
| 22 | My instructors do not | 2.92 | 1.088 | Moderate |
| | tell us what to do when | ,,_ | 1.000 | Froutrace |
| | we cannot find the | | | |
| | correct and | | | |
| | appropriate word, | | | |
| | structure and sentence | | | |
| | during our speaking. In other words, they do | | | |
| | not teach us oral | | | |
| | communication | | | |
| | strategy use. | | | |
| 23 | My instructors do not | 2.78 | 1.064 | Moderate |
| | present interesting | | | |
| 24 | topics for discussion. My instructors put less | 2.92 | 1.033 | Moderate |
| 24 | emphasis on speaking | 2.92 | 1.033 | Moderate |
| | skills in comparison to | | | |
| | other skills. | | | |
| | Overall | 2.81 | 1.078 | Moderate |
| | ai educational system | | | |
| | and facility-related | | | |
| 25 | problems There are not enough | 2.99 | 1.025 | Moderate |
| 43 | and efficient facilities | 2.99 | 1.023 | Mouerate |
| | in language laboratory. | | | |
| 26 | Our class is | 2.96 | 1.077 | Moderate |
| | overcrowded. | | | |
| 27 | The time of our | 3.17 | 1.024 | Moderate |
| | speaking classes is not | | | |
| | appropriate. That is, our speaking classes | | | |
| | are held at the time | | | |
| | when we do not have | | | |
| | enough energy to | | | |
| | participate effectively | | | |
| | in class discussions. | | | |
| 28 | Only speaking and | 3.32 | 1.011 | Moderate |
| | listening 1 and 2 courses in vocational | | | |
| | curriculum cannot help | | | |
| | us to develop our | | | |
| | speaking ability. | | | |
| 29 | Educational system of | 3.49 | 1.086 | Moderate |
| | Thailand has | | | |
| | contributed to my lack of speaking ability. | | | |
| | Overall | 3.19 | 1.045 | Moderate |
| L | inguistically-related | | | |
| | problems | | | |
| 30 | My poor general | 3.70 | 0.957 | High |
| | English knowledge results in my having | | | |
| | difficulty making | | | |
| | questions and | | | |
| | directing them to my | | | |
| | instructor or my | | | |
| | classmates. | | | |
| 31 | I do not have enough | 3.76 | 0.955 | High |
| | vocabulary knowledge. | | | |
| 32 | I do not have enough | 3.72 | 0.952 | High |
| ~ - | knowledge of | | | |
| | collocations. | | | |
| 33 | I think in Thai when I | 3.64 | 0.901 | High |
| | speak in English, which | | | |
| | leads to my lack of fluency and | | | |
| | naturalness in | | | |
| | speaking. | | | |
| | | | | |
| 34 | I do not have enough grammar knowledge | 3.62 | 0.952 | High |

| | which leads to lack of accuracy in my speaking. | | | |
|----|---|------|-------|------|
| 35 | My pronunciation is not good enough which causes difficulty in my communication. | 3.74 | 0.996 | High |
| | Overall | 3.70 | 0.952 | High |

According to Table 5, the data shows that the majority of vocational students have high level in linguistically-related problems ($\bar{x}=3.70$) and affective-related problems ($\bar{x}=3.62$), followed by moderate levels in the Thai educational system and facility-related problems ($\bar{x}=3.19$), socially-related problems ($\bar{x}=3.17$), and instructor-related problems ($\bar{x}=2.81$).

12. Research Question 2

What are the specific English speaking problems of the vocational students majoring in accounting, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, and civil engineering at the Engineering and Technology Demonstration School?

To demonstrate the specific English speaking problems, the English speaking problems of vocational students at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School are presented in terms of mean (\bar{x}) , standard deviation (S.D.), and interpretation of each item that is the most problematic in English speaking. Table 6 shows the overview results of finding the specific English speaking problems in each field that are more comprehensive in brevity for reading.

Table 6 The Results of Finding Specific English Speaking Problems

| Fields | The Specific | \overline{x} | S.D. | Interpretati |
|------------|-----------------|----------------|------|--------------|
| | English- | | | on |
| | Speaking | | | |
| | Problem | | | |
| Accountin | 1) I am | 4.0 | .996 | High |
| g | afraid of | 9 | | |
| | making | | | |
| | mistakes. | | | |
| Civil | 35) My | 4.0 | .852 | High |
| Engineeri | pronunciatio | 4 | | |
| ng | n is not good | | | |
| | enough | | | |
| | which causes | | | |
| | difficulty in | | | |
| | my | | | |
| | communicati | | | |
| | on. | | | |
| Mechanic | 1) I am | 3.9 | .928 | High |
| al | afraid of | 6 | | |
| Engineeri | making | | | |
| ng | mistakes. | | | |
| Electrical | 31) I do not | 3.6 | 1.04 | High |
| Engineeri | have enough | 4 | 8 | |
| ng | vocabulary | | | |
| | knowledge. | | | |

According to Table 6, the data indicate the item that is the most specific problem of the English speaking problems of the vocational students in each of the four fields at DEST school. The accounting students are afraid of making mistakes ($\bar{x} = 4.09$); the civil students encounter

pronunciation problems such that their pronunciation is not good enough, which causes difficulty in communication (\bar{x} = 4.04); the mechanical students are afraid of making mistakes similarly to the accounting students (\bar{x} = 3.96); and the electrical students do not have enough vocabulary knowledge (\bar{x} = 3.64).

13. Research Question 3

What are the differences in English speaking problems according to levels of study of the vocational students at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School?

To demonstrate the level of English speaking problems, the English speaking problems of vocational students at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School are presented in terms of mean (\bar{x}) , standard deviation (S.D.), and P-value (sig.) of each item and categories of the English speaking problems in Table 7.

Table 7 The Results of the ANOVA Test of English Speaking Problems

| The English | Level | \overline{x} | S.D. | P- | Pattern |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------|--------|-----------|
| speaking | of | | | value | of |
| problems of the | Study | | | (sig.) | Variation |
| vocational | | | | | |
| students | 1 st | 3.67 | 1.115 | .208 | |
| I am afraid of making mistakes. | | 3.67 | 1.115 | .208 | - |
| making mistakes. | year 2nd | 3.97 | .758 | | |
| | year | 3.97 | ./36 | | |
| | 3rd | 3.78 | .885 | | |
| | year | 3.70 | .003 | | |
| 2) Some of my | 1 st | 3.38 | .993 | .175 | _ |
| classmates speak | year | 0.00 | | | |
| very effectively, | 2 nd | 3.55 | .723 | | |
| but I cannot. This | year | | | | |
| demotivates me. | 3 rd | 3.25 | .895 | | |
| | year | | | | |
| 3) Shyness | 1st | 3.52 | 1.112 | .382 | - |
| prevents me | year | | | | |
| from speaking. | 2 nd | 3.73 | .841 | | |
| | year | | | | |
| | 3^{rd} | 3.53 | .873 | | |
| | year | | | | |
| 4) I cannot speak | 1 st | 3.60 | 1.012 | .069 | - |
| well in the | year | | 0.11 | | |
| classroom | 2 nd | 3.93 | .861 | | |
| because my self- confidence is | year | 2.57 | 001 | | |
| low. | 3rd | 3.57 | .981 | | |
| | year 1st | 3.48 | .965 | .087 | |
| 5) My anxiety is too high. This | _ | 3.48 | .965 | .087 | - |
| prevents me | year 2 nd | 3.82 | .873 | | |
| from speaking | | 3.02 | .073 | | |
| well. | year 3 rd | 3.50 | .930 | | |
| | year | 3.30 | .730 | | |
| Socially-related | , , , , , | | | | |
| problems | | | | | |
| 6) I have | 1st | 3.30 | .979 | .258 | - |
| difficulty finding | year | | | | |
| opportunities to | 2 nd | 3.58 | .869 | | |
| practice my | year | | | | |
| speaking outside | 3 rd | 3.42 | .979 | | |
| the classroom. | year | | | | |
| 7) My speaking | 1 st | 3.28 | 1.027 | .227 | - |
| classes are not | year | | | | |
| useful enough to | 2 nd | 3.13 | .999 | | |
| help us | year | | | | |
| communicate | 3 rd | 2.95 | 1.141 | | |
| with English | year | | | | |
| speaking people. | | | | | |

| 18 16 not thinkt 1st year 2mt 3.02 .725 year 3.02 .725 year 3.08 1.018 .753 2mt 2m | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|-------|---------|------|---|
| Semilish speaking skills in my country. Semilish speaking skills in my country. Semilish speaking speaking classes. 1 st year 2 md year 3 | 8) I do not think I | 1st | 3.08 | 1.078 | .382 | - |
| English speaking skills in my country. 3rd year 2.83 1.196 2.83 1.196 2.83 2.83 1.196 2.83 2 | will make use of | year | | | | |
| Skills in my country. Syear Syea | English speaking | | 3.02 | 725 | | |
| Second transfer Second tra | 0 1 | _ | 5.02 | ., 20 | | |
| 9) There is no cooperation spirit among my classmates in my speaking classes. Instructor-related problems 10) My instructors do not have a good command of English speaking skills. 11) It would be better if there were more than one instructor teaching speaking so that they could provide a speech model for students mother tongue in the classroom. 13) My instructors make too much use of our students' mother tongue in the classroom. 13) My instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors is too harsh. 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on the cours do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on the cours do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 2 | - | | 2.02 | 1 107 | | |
| 1 | country. | _ | 2.83 | 1.196 | | |
| Second Sprint among my classmates in my speaking classes. Second Sprint among my classmates in my speaking classes. Second Sec | | | | | | |
| Spirit among my classmates in my speaking classes. 3ad year 3.18 1.066 | There is no | 1 st | 3.08 | 1.013 | .753 | - |
| Classmates in my speaking classes. 3rd year 3.18 1.066 1.066 1 | cooperation | year | | | | |
| Classmates in my speaking classes. 3rd year 3.18 1.066 1.066 1 | spirit among my | 2 nd | 3.22 | .940 | | |
| Speaking classes. 3rd year 3.18 1.066 | | vear | | | | |
| Instructor-related problems 10 My 1st 2.80 1.299 .082 10 My 1st 2.80 1.299 11 It would be better if there were more than one instructor teaching speaking so that they could provide a speech model for students. 12 My 12 My 1st 3.00 2.61 12 My 1st 3.07 3.05 13 My 1st 2.92 3.16 13 My 1st 2.92 2.61 14 My 1st 2.92 2.91 15) The 1st 2.91 2.92 15) The 1st 2.91 2.92 16) My 1st 2.93 2.91 17) My 1st 2.93 2.91 17) My 1st 2.93 2.92 17) My 1st 3.05 2.92 17) My 1st 3.05 2.92 18) My 1st 2.93 2.93 19) My 1st 2.93 2.93 11) My 1st 2.93 2.93 11) My 1st 2.93 2.93 11) My 1st 3.05 2.92 11) My 1st 3.05 2.92 12) My 1st 3.05 2.92 1 | | | 2.10 | 1.066 | | |
| Instructor-related problems 10 My instructors do not have a good command of English speaking skills. 2.4d 2.4 | speaking classes. | _ | 5.10 | 1.000 | | |
| Telated problems 10 My 1st 2.80 1.299 .082 2 2 2 2 2 889 2 2 2 2 2 2 889 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | _ | year | | | | |
| 10) My | Instructor- | | | | | |
| 10) My instructors do not have a good command of English speaking skills. 2.4d 2.4d 2.4d 1.077 2.4d 2.4d 1.077 2.4d | related | | | | | |
| instructors do not have a good command of English speaking skills. 11) It would be better if there were more than one instructor teaching speaking so that they could provide a speech model for students. 12) My instructors make too much use of our students' mother tongue in the classroom. 13) My instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and | problems | | | | | |
| instructors do not have a good command of English speaking skills. 11) It would be better if there were more than one instructor teaching speaking so that they could provide a speech model for students. 12) My instructors make too much use of our students' mother tongue in the classroom. 13) My instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and | 10) Mv | 1st | 2.80 | 1.299 | .082 | - |
| 2nd year 2.42 889 | | | | | | |
| Second S | | | 2.42 | 000 | | |
| Semilish speaking skills. | - | _ | 2.42 | .009 | | |
| 11 It would be better if there were more than one instructor teaching speaking so that they could provide a speech model for students. 12 My instructors make too much use of our students' mother tongue in the classroom. 13 My instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 2nd year 14 My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 22nd year 2.87 2.88 1.136 2.92 1.078 1.155 1.170 1.151 1.1 | | | | | | |
| 11) It would be better if there were more than one instructor teaching speaking so that they could provide a speech model for students. 12) My instructors make too much use of our students' mother tongue in the classroom. 13) My instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 1st year 2.92 | | 3^{rd} | 2.40 | 1.077 | | |
| better if there were more than one instructor teaching speaking so that they could provide a speech model for students. 12) My instructors make too much use of our students' mother tongue in the classroom. 13) My instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and | skills. | year | | | | |
| better if there were more than one instructor teaching speaking so that they could provide a speech model for students. 12) My instructors make too much use of our students' mother tongue in the classroom. 13) My instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and | 11) It would be | | 3.30 | 1.154 | .261 | - |
| 2nd year 3.02 .983 .983 .984 year 3rd 3.02 .983 year 3.065 065 065 year 3.07 2.80 .997 year 3.07 2.80 3.07 2.80 3.07 2.80 3.07 2.80 3.07 3.07 3.065 065 year 3.07 2.20 3.07 3 | , | | | | |] |
| one instructor teaching speaking so that they could provide a speech model for students. 12) My instructors make too much use of our students' mother tongue in the classroom. 13) My instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when 1 try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and | | | 3 0 = | 916 | | 1 |
| teaching speaking so that they could provide a speech model for students. 12) My instructors make too much use of our students' mother tongue in the classroom. 13) My instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and | | _ | 3.05 | .740 | |] |
| Speaking so that they could provide a speech model for students. | | | | 0.7. | | 1 |
| they could provide a speech model for students. 12) My instructors make too much use of our students' mother tongue in the classroom. 13) My instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and | U | 3^{rd} | 3.02 | .983 | | |
| 12) My | | year | | | | |
| Table Tabl | they could | - | | | | |
| Table Tabl | provide a speech | | | | | |
| Students. 12) My | | | | | | |
| 12) My 1st year 2.67 .816 year mother tongue in the classroom. 3rd year year mother tongue in the classroom. 13) My 1st year year year year year year 13) My instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 2nd year year 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 3rd 2.57 1.170 year 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors is too harsh. 3rd year 2.73 1.071 .233 - year 16) My 1st year 2.40 1.061 year 16) My 1st year 2.40 1.061 year 16) My 1st year 2.67 1.115 year 17) My 1st year 2.72 1.223 year 17) My 1st year 2.73 2.74 2.75 1.155 year 1.155 y | | | | | | |
| instructors make too much use of our students' mother tongue in the classroom. 13) My instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and | | 1 at | 2.07 | 4.007 | 0.65 | |
| too much use of our students' mother tongue in the classroom. 13) My instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors is too harsh. 16) My instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and | | 1 st | 3.07 | 1.087 | .065 | - |
| our students' mother tongue in the classroom. 13) My instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 2nd year 22nd year 3rd 2.53 1.127 year 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 3rd year 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors is too harsh. 16) My instructors is too harsh. 2nd year 22nd year 2.57 1.170 year 2.73 1.071 2.233 - intervention and error correction of my instructors is too harsh. 2nd year 2nd 2.40 1.061 year 16) My instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and | | | | | | |
| Table Tabl | too much use of | 2 nd | 2.67 | .816 | | |
| Table Tabl | our students' | year | | | | |
| 13) My 1st 2.92 1.078 .135 - | mother tongue in | | 2.80 | .917 | | |
| 13) My 1st 2.92 1.078 .135 - | _ | - | 2.00 | .,,,, | | |
| instructors' pronunciation is not good enough to be a model for us. 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors not good enough to be a model for year 2nd year 2nd year 2.57 1.170 year 2.73 1.071 .233 - 1st 2.73 1.071 .233 - 2.52 1.112 year 2nd year 2.52 1.112 year 2nd year 2.52 1.112 year 2nd year 2.52 1.112 year 3rd year 2.52 1.112 year 2nd year 2.52 1.112 year 3rd year 2.40 1.061 year 2nd year 2.40 1.061 year 2nd year 2.70 1.115 year 2nd year 3rd year 2.80 1.167 year 2.81 2.83 1.136 year 2.82 2.83 1.136 year 2.83 1.071 year 2.83 1.071 year 2.83 1.170 year 2.84 2.85 1.170 year 2.85 2.85 1.170 year 2.85 2.85 2.85 year 2.86 2.87 1.112 year 2.87 2.88 1.136 year 2.88 1.136 year 2.89 2.89 year 2.80 2.89 year 2.80 3.05 year 2.80 3.05 year 3rd year 3rd year 2.80 3.1.127 year 2.80 3.05 year 3.80 3.98 3.08 year 3.80 3.98 3.08 year 3rd year 4.80 3.08 3.08 year 4.80 3.08 year | | | 2.02 | 4.050 | 405 | |
| 2nd year y | | 1 st | 2.92 | 1.078 | .135 | - |
| Not good enough to be a model for us. 3rd year 2.53 1.127 2.88 1.136 .292 - 2.88 2.67 2.67 1.068 2.57 2.73 2.57 2.73 2.57 2.73 2.57 2.73 2.57 2.73 2.57 2.73 2.57 2.73 2.57 2.73 2.57 2.73 2.57 2.73 2.57 2.73 2.57 2.73 2.57 2.73 2.57 2.73 2.73 2.57 2.73 2.73 2.73 2.73 2.73 2.73 2.74 2.52 2.73 2.74 2.52 2.74 2.52 2.57 2.74 2.57 2.74 2.57 2.74 2.57 2.74 2.57 2.74 2.75 | | year | | | | |
| to be a model for us. 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors is too harsh. 16) My instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and | pronunciation is | 2 nd | 2.67 | .968 | | |
| to be a model for us. 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 15) The intervention and error correction of my instructors is too harsh. 16) My instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and | not good enough | year | | | | |
| us. year Image: structure of the part of the | to be a model for | _ | 2.53 | 1.127 | | |
| 14) My instructors do not encourage students to speak. 1st year 2.88 1.136 2.92 - 1.068 year - 1.071 year - | | _ | 2.55 | 1.127 | | |
| instructors do not encourage students to speak. 3rd 2.57 1.170 1.51 1.52 1.112 1.55 | | _ | 2.00 | 1 1 2 6 | 202 | |
| 2nd year 3rd 2.57 1.170 year 1.50 The intervention and error correction of my instructors is too harsh. 3rd year year is too harsh. 3rd year year 16) My instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and 2nd year 2.72 1.115 year 1.223 year | | 1 st | 2.88 | 1.136 | .292 | - |
| Students to speak. 3rd year 2.57 1.170 year 1.50 The intervention and error correction of my instructors is too harsh. 3rd year 2.40 1.061 year 1.60 My instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and 3rd year 2.77 1.155 year 1.167 | instructors do | | | | | |
| Students to speak. 3rd year 2.57 1.170 year 1.51) The intervention and error correction of my instructors is too harsh. 3rd year 2.40 1.061 year 16) My instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and 3rd year 2.77 1.155 year year 1.155 year year 1.155 year year year year year 1.155 year | | 2 nd | 2.67 | 1.068 | |] |
| 3rd 2.57 1.170 | | year | | | | 1 |
| 15) The 1st 2.73 1.071 .233 - | | _ | 2.57 | 1 1 7 0 | | 1 |
| 15) The 1st year |) Speara | - | 2.37 | 1.1/0 | |] |
| intervention and error correction of my instructors is too harsh. 16) My | 4 E) m) | | 2.50 | 1.051 | 222 | 1 |
| error correction of my instructors is too harsh. 2nd year 2.52 1.112 3rd year 1.061 3rd year 2.40 1.061 396 - < | | | 2./3 | 1.071 | .233 | - |
| of my instructors is too harsh. 3rd 2.40 1.061 | intervention and | | | | | 1 |
| 3rd year 2.40 1.061 | error correction | 2 nd | 2.52 | 1.112 | |] |
| 3rd year 2.40 1.061 | of my instructors | year | | | |] |
| 16) My | | | 2.40 | 1.061 | |] |
| 16) My 1st 2.93 1.071 .396 - | | - | 2.70 | 1.001 | | 1 |
| instructors do not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and year 2nd year year 2.72 1.223 year 3rd year 2.72 1.223 year 2.72 1.223 year 1.115 year 2.72 1.223 year 2.72 1.223 year 1.155 year 2.77 1.155 year 3rd year 3rd year 3rd year | 4034 | | 2.00 | 1.051 | 206 | 1 |
| not show the tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and speak English year | , , | 1 st | 2.93 | 1.071 | .396 | - |
| tendency to speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and speak English year | | | | | |] |
| speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and side the classroom when I try to do so. 2rd year 2.77 1.155 year 2.60 1.167 | | 2 nd | 2.67 | 1.115 | | 1 |
| speak English with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and side the classroom when I try to do so. 2rd year 2.77 1.155 year 2.60 1.167 | tendency to | year | | | | 1 |
| with me outside the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and year in the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My ist 3.05 .982 .081 | | | 2.72 | 1.223 | | 1 |
| the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My | | - | | 1.220 | |] |
| when I try to do so. Ist 3.05 .982 .081 - 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and 2nd year 2.77 1.155 - 3rd year 2.60 1.167 - - | With me oursine | y cai | | | |] |
| so. 17) My 1st year neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and 2nd year year 2.77 1.155 year 1.167 year | | | | | | 1 |
| 17) My instructors year neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and instructors year 1.155 1.167 1. | the classroom | | | | | 1 |
| instructors year neglect to focus 2nd 2.77 1.155 on idiomatic year expressions, proverbs, and year | the classroom when I try to do | | | | | |
| instructors year neglect to focus 2nd 2.77 1.155 on idiomatic year 2expressions, 3rd 2.60 1.167 proverbs, and year 3rd 2.60 1.167 | the classroom when I try to do so. | | | | | |
| neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and year 2nd 2.77 1.155 year 2.60 1.167 | the classroom when I try to do so. | 1 st | 3.05 | .982 | .081 | - |
| on idiomatic year expressions, 3 rd 2.60 1.167 proverbs, and year | the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My | | 3.05 | .982 | .081 | - |
| expressions, 3 rd 2.60 1.167 proverbs, and year | the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors | year | | | .081 | - |
| proverbs, and year | the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus | year 2 nd | | | .081 | - |
| | the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic | year 2 nd year | 2.77 | 1.155 | .081 | - |
| rouncations I I I I I | the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, | year 2 nd year 3 rd | 2.77 | 1.155 | .081 | - |
| conocations. | the classroom when I try to do so. 17) My instructors neglect to focus on idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and | year 2 nd year 3 rd | 2.77 | 1.155 | .081 | - |

| 18) My classes | 1 st | 3.07 | 1.056 | .028 | 1 st year |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|--------|----------|---------------------------|
| are teacher- | year 2nd | 2.05 | 026 | | > 3 rd year |
| centered; therefore, I | _ | 2.85 | .936 | | 3 rd year |
| cannot find the | year 3 rd | 2.58 | .944 | | |
| chance to | year | 2.50 | .,,11 | | |
| express my ideas | J | | | | |
| and participate in | | | | | |
| class discussion | | | | | |
| activities. | | | | | |
| 19) My speaking | 1 st | 3.25 | 1.099 | .018 | 1st year |
| instructors spend | year 2nd | 2.02 | 077 | | > 3 rd year |
| a large proportion of | _ | 2.83 | .977 | | 3 rd year |
| class time asking | year 3 rd | 2.73 | 1.071 | | |
| questions about | year | 2.73 | 1.071 | | |
| things to which I | year | | | | |
| already knew the | | | | | |
| answers; | | | | | |
| therefore, no real | | | | | |
| communication | | | | | |
| takes place. | 1 et | 242 | 1.050 | 255 | |
| 20) My | 1 st | 3.12 | 1.059 | .255 | |
| instructors do not encourage | year 2nd | 2.88 | 1.209 | | |
| any group work | year | 2.00 | 1.209 | | |
| or pair work; this | 3rd | 2.77 | 1.254 | | |
| inhibits student- | year | 2.// | 1.234 | | |
| student | y car | | | | |
| interaction in | | | | | |
| class. | | | | | |
| 21) My | 1 st | 3.03 | 1.089 | .048 | 1st year |
| instructors do | year | | | | > |
| not teach us how | 2 nd | 2.80 | 1.070 | | 3 rd year |
| to express | year | 0.50 | 4.4.10 | | |
| appropriate speech acts (e.g., | 3rd | 2.53 | 1.142 | | |
| greeting, | year | | | | |
| complaint, refuse | | | | | |
| invitations or | | | | | |
| offers and so on). | <u> </u> | | | <u> </u> | |
| 22) My | 1 st | 3.13 | 1.081 | .154 | - |
| instructors do | year | | | | |
| not tell us what | 2 nd | 2.85 | 1.022 | | |
| to do when we | year | 0 | 44.0 | | |
| cannot find the | 3 rd | 2.77 | 1.140 | | |
| correct and | year | | | | |
| appropriate word, structure | | | | | |
| and sentence | | | | | |
| during our | | | | | |
| speaking. In | | | | | |
| other words, | | | | | |
| they do not teach | | | | | |
| us oral | | | | | |
| communication | | | | | |
| strategy use. | | | | | |
| 22) M | 1 ct | 2.00 | 1.072 | 017 | 1 st |
| 23) My instructors do | 1 st | 3.08 | 1.062 | .016 | 1 st year |
| not present | year 2nd | 2.73 | 1.006 | | > 3 rd year |
| interesting topics | year | 2./3 | 1.000 | | J year |
| for discussion. | 3rd | 2.53 | 1.065 | | |
| | year | 2.55 | 1.000 | | |
| 24) My | 1st | 3.13 | .965 | .022 | 1st year |
| instructors put | year | | | | > |
| less emphasis on | 2 nd | 3.00 | .921 | | 3 rd year |
| speaking skills in | year | | | | |
| comparison to | 3 rd | 2.63 | 1.149 | | |
| other skills. | year | | | | |
| Thai | | | | | |
| educational | | | | | |
| system and | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | l |
| | | | | | |

| 25) There are not enough and efficient facilities in language laboratory. 26) Our class is overcrowded. 27) The time of our speaking classes is not appropriate. That is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in vocational | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 1st year 2rd year 3rd year 2nd year | year 2nd year 3rd 2.9 year | 00 .838 05 1.199 1.2 1.075 1.221 1.221 1.221 1.221 1.221 1.221 1.221 | 9 5 .238 1 1 .099 | 8 - |
|---|---|--|---|----------------------------|-----|
| enough and efficient facilities in language laboratory. 26) Our class is overcrowded. 27) The time of our speaking classes is not appropriate. That is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | year 2nd year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 2nd year 3rd year 3rd year 2nd year 1st year 3rd year | year 2nd year 3rd 2.9 year | 00 .838 05 1.199 2 1.075 78 .904 07 1.221 38 1.121 | 9 5 .238 1 1 .099 | 8 - |
| efficient facilities in language laboratory. 26) Our class is overcrowded. 27) The time of our speaking classes is not appropriate. That is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | 2nd year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 2nd year 2nd year | 2 nd year 3 rd year 2 nd year 3 rd year 3 rd year 3 nd year 3 nd year 2 nd year 3 nd year 2 nd year 9 nd y | 25 1.199 22 1.075 78 .904 97 1.221 98 .833 | 5 .238 1 .099 | |
| laboratory. 26) Our class is overcrowded. 27) The time of our speaking classes is not appropriate. That is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 1st year 2nd year 3rd | year 3rd 2.5 year | 25 1.199 22 1.075 78 .904 97 1.221 98 .833 | 5 .238 1 .099 | |
| 26) Our class is overcrowded. 27) The time of our speaking classes is not appropriate. That is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | year 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 3rd | year s 1st 3.1 year 2nd 2.7 year 3rd 2.9 year f 1st 3.3 year 2nd 2.9 year 3rd 3.3 year 2nd 2.9 year 2nd 3.3 year 2nd 2.9 | 2 1.075 78 .904 07 1.221 88 1.121 98 .833 | 5 .238 1 .099 | |
| 27) The time of our speaking classes is not appropriate. That is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 3rd | 1st year 2.7 year 3.1 year 3.1 year 2.9 | 78 .904 97 1.223 98 1.123 98 .833 | 1 .099 | |
| 27) The time of our speaking classes is not appropriate. That is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | year 2nd year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 3rd | year 2.0 year 3rd 2.0 year 3rd year 2.0 year 2.0 year 2.0 year 2.0 year 3rd year 8 year 8 year 9 yea | 78 .904 97 1.223 98 1.123 98 .833 | 1 .099 | |
| 27) The time of our speaking classes is not appropriate. That is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | 2nd year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 3rd | 2nd 2.7 year 3rd 2.9 year 3.5 year 2nd 2.9 year 2nd 2.9 year g 3rd 3.1 year en e | 07 1.221 08 1.121 08 .833 | 1 .099 | 9 - |
| our speaking classes is not appropriate. That is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 3rd | year 2.9 year | 07 1.221 08 1.121 08 .833 | 1 .099 | 9 - |
| our speaking classes is not appropriate. That is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | 3 rd year 1 st year 2 nd year 3 rd | 3rd 2.9 year f 1st 3.3 year 2nd 2.9 year g 3rd 3.1 year g year en e | 38 1.121 08 .833 | 1 .099 | 9 - |
| our speaking classes is not appropriate. That is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | 1st year 2nd year 3rd | year f | 88 1.121 98 .833 | | 9 - |
| our speaking classes is not appropriate. That is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | year 2nd year 3rd | year 2nd 2.9 at year g 3rd 3.1 year e year | 08 .833 | | 9 - |
| classes is not appropriate. That is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | 2 nd year 3 rd | at year g 3rd 3.1 d year en e | | 1 | |
| appropriate. That is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | year 3 rd | at year g 3 rd 3.1 d year en | | 1 | |
| is, our speaking classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | 3 rd | g 3 rd 3.1 d year en | 5 1.071 | 1 | |
| classes are held at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | - | d year en e | 1.07 | | |
| at the time when we do not have enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | year | en e | | | |
| enough energy to participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | | | | | |
| participate effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | | to | | | |
| effectively in class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | | | | | |
| class discussions. 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | | | | | |
| 28) Only speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | | ne | | | |
| speaking and listening 1 and 2 courses in | 1st | | 7 1.057 | 7 .811 | 1 - |
| listening 1 and 2 courses in | year | | | | |
| | 2 nd | | .876 | | |
| vocational | year | | | | |
| | 3 rd | | 3 1.100 | 0 | |
| curriculum cannot help us to | year | | | | |
| develop our | | | | | |
| speaking ability. | | y. | | | |
| 29) Educational | 1st | | 1.235 | 5 .297 | 7 - |
| system of | year | | | | |
| Thailand has | 2 nd | | .811 | | |
| contributed to my lack of | year 3 rd | , , , , | 7 1.160 | | |
| speaking ability. | _ | | | 0 | |
| | vear | | 1.100 | 0 | |
| related | year | | 1.100 | 0 | |
| | year | | 1.100 | 0 | |
| problems | | <i>'-</i> | | | |
| 30) My poor | 1 st | 1st 3.6 | | | 0 - |
| 30) My poor general English | 1 st year | 1st 3.6 year | 55 1.022 | | 0 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge | 1 st year 2 nd | 1st 3.6 h year 2nd 3.7 | 55 1.022 | | 0 - |
| 30) My poor general English | 1 st year | 1st 3.6 h year 2nd 3.7 year | 55 1.022 75 .856 | | 0 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making | 1 st year 2 nd year | 1st 3.6 h year 2nd 3.7 year y 3rd 3.7 year | 55 1.022 75 .856 | | 0 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and | 1st year 2nd year 3rd | 1st 3.6 h year 2nd 3.7 year year year | 55 1.022 75 .856 | | 0 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to | 1st year 2nd year 3rd | 1st 3.6 year 2nd 3.7 year year year 1tto | 55 1.022 75 .856 | | 0 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or | 1st year 2nd year 3rd | 1st year 2nd 3.7 year year year to or | 55 1.022 75 .856 | | 0 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. | 1st year 2nd year 3rd | 1st year 2nd 3.7 year year year to or s. | 55 1.022 75 .856 70 .997 | | |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. 31) I do not have enough | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year | 1st year 2nd 3.7 year 3.7 year 1st year 3.6 year | 55 1.022 75 .856 70 .997 | 2 .850 | |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. 31) I do not have enough vocabulary | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year | 1st year 2nd 3.7 year 3.7 year 1st year 3.6 year | 55 1.022 75 .856 70 .997 | 2 .850 | |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. 31) I do not have enough | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year | 1st year 2nd 3.7 year 3.7 year 1st year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 3.9 year 3.0 year 3.0 year 3.0 year 3.0 year 3.0 year 3.0 year | 55 1.022 75 .856 70 .997 63 .920 97 .901 | .109 | |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. 31) I do not have enough vocabulary | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 2nd year | 1st year 2nd 3.7 year 3.7 year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 3.6 year | 55 1.022 75 .856 70 .997 63 .920 97 .901 | .109 | |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. 31) I do not have enough vocabulary knowledge. | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 3rd year | 1st 3.6 year 2nd year 3.7 year 1st year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 3.6 year 3rd year 3.6 year 3rd year 3.6 year 3rd year 3.6 | 55 1.022 75 .856 70 .997 63 .920 97 .901 57 1.020 | .109 | 9 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. 31) I do not have enough vocabulary knowledge. | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 2nd year 2nd year 3rd year | 1st year 2nd year 3.7 year 1st year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 3.6 year 3rd year 3rd year 3rd year 7e 1st 3.6 | 55 1.022 75 .856 70 .997 63 .920 97 .901 57 1.020 | .109 | 9 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. 31) I do not have enough vocabulary knowledge. | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 3rd year | 1st 3.6 year 2nd 3.7 year 3rd year 2nd 3.6 year 2nd 3.6 year 2nd 3.6 year 3rd year 3rd year 4 year 4 3.6 year 4 year 4 2nd year 4 3.6 year 4 2nd year 4 3.6 year 4 3. | 55 1.022 75 .856 70 .997 63 .920 97 .901 67 1.020 60 .995 | .109 | 9 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. 31) I do not have enough vocabulary knowledge. | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 2nd year 2nd year 3rd year 1st year | 1st year 2nd year 3.7 year 1st year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd 3.6 year 3rd year 3rd year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd 3.6 year 2nd 3.6 year 2nd 3.6 year 3.6 y | 55 1.022 75 .856 70 .997 63 .920 97 .901 67 1.020 60 .995 | .109 | 9 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. 31) I do not have enough vocabulary knowledge. | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 2nd year 2nd year 1st year 1st year 2nd | 1st 3.6 year 2nd year 3.7 year 3.6 year 2nd 3.6 year 3.6 year 3.6 year 3.6 year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 3.6 year 2nd year 3.6 | 35 1.022 75 .856 70 .997 33 .920 97 .901 57 1.020 50 .995 | .109 | 9 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. 31) I do not have enough vocabulary knowledge. 32) I do not have enough knowledge. | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 2nd year 1st year 2nd year 1st year 3rd year 3rd year | 1st year 2nd 3.7 year 3.6 year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 3rd year 2nd year 2nd year 3rd 3.6 year 3rd | 55 1.022 75 .856 70 .997 63 .920 67 .901 67 1.020 60 .995 60 .896 67 .951 | .109 | 9 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. 31) I do not have enough vocabulary knowledge. 32) I do not have enough collocations. | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 2nd year 3rd year 2nd year 2nd year 3rd year 2nd year 1st year 2nd year 1st | 1st 3.6 year 2nd year 3rd year 2nd 3.6 year 3rd year 2nd 3.6 year 2nd year 3rd year 3rd year 2nd year 2nd year 3rd 3.6 year 3.6 y | 55 1.022 75 .856 70 .997 63 .920 67 .901 67 1.020 60 .995 60 .896 67 .951 | .109 | 9 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. 31) I do not have enough vocabulary knowledge. 32) I do not have enough knowledge of collocations. | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 2nd year 1st year 2nd year 2nd year 1st year 2nd year | 1st year 2nd year 3.7 year 3.6 | 55 1.022 75 .856 70 .997 .03 .920 .07 .901 .07 .905 .00 .995 .00 .896 .07 .951 .03 .920 | .109 | 9 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. 31) I do not have enough vocabulary knowledge. 32) I do not have enough knowledge of collocations. | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 2nd year 3rd year 1st year 2nd year 1st year 2nd year 2nd year 3rd year | 1st year 2nd 3.7 year 3rd year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd year 2nd 3.6 year 3rd year 4nd year 4nd year 3rd | 55 1.022 75 .856 70 .997 .33 .920 .77 .901 .67 1.020 .60 .995 .60 .995 .67 .951 .63 .920 | .109 | 9 - |
| 30) My poor general English knowledge results in my having difficulty making questions and directing them to my instructor or my classmates. 31) I do not have enough vocabulary knowledge. 32) I do not have enough knowledge of collocations. | 1st year 2nd year 3rd year 2nd year 1st year 2nd year 2nd year 1st year 2nd year | 1st year 2nd 3.7 year 3.6 year | 55 1.022 55 .856 70 .997 63 .920 67 .901 67 1.020 60 .995 60 .995 67 .951 63 .920 68 .833 | .109 | 9 - |
| Linguistically- related | | "-" | 1.100 | 0 | |

| naturalness in speaking. | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------|-------|-------|---|
| 34) I do not have | 1 st | 3.50 | .983 | .470 | - |
| enough grammar | year | | | | |
| knowledge which | 2 nd | 3.70 | .743 | | |
| leads to lack of | year | | | | |
| accuracy in my | 3 rd | 3.67 | 1.100 | | |
| speaking. | year | | | | |
| 35) My | 1 st | 3.69 | 1.021 | .558 | - |
| pronunciation is | year | | | | |
| not good enough | 2 nd | 3.85 | .820 | | |
| which causes | year | | | | |
| difficulty in my | 3rd | 3.67 | 1.130 | | |
| communication. | year | | | | |
| Overall | | 3.17 | 1.013 | 0.276 | |

According to Table 7, the concluding results found out that there was no difference in the English speaking problems among the levels of study of vocational students at DSET School (p > 0.05). In the case of specific items, there are differences in items: 18) My classes are teacher-centered; therefore, I cannot find the chance to express my ideas and participate in class discussion activities (p <0.05). 19) My speaking instructors spend a large proportion of class time asking questions about things to which I already knew the answers; therefore, no real communication takes place (p <0.05). 21) My instructors do not teach us how to express appropriate speech acts (e.g., greeting, complaint, refusing invitations or offers, and so on) (p < 0.05). 23) My instructors do not present interesting topics for discussion (p < 0.05); 24) My instructors put less emphasis on speaking skills in comparison to other skills (p < 0.05).

14. Discussion and Conclusion

The discovery of this research contains some notable points that value further discussion in the following area: the English speaking problems of vocational students at the Engineering and Technology Demonstration School.

Firstly, the finding indicated that the majority of vocational students have high levels of linguistically-related problems (\bar{x} = 3.70) and affective-related problems (\bar{x} = 3.62), followed by moderate levels in the Thai educational system and facility-related problems ($\bar{x} = 3.19$), sociallyrelated problems ($\bar{x} = 3.17$), and instructor-related problems (\bar{x} = 2.81). Definitively, the linguistically-related problems category illustrated that they do not have enough vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation knowledge, which results in them having difficulty making conversations, asking questions, and directing them to their instructor or their classmates. Additionally, in terms of affective-related problems, shyness prevents them from speaking English, and they cannot speak well in the classroom because their self-confidence is low, followed by their anxiety being too high. This prevents them from speaking well. The study of Krongbuaban (2017) supports the findings of this study. It indicated that when speaking a foreign language other than their own tongue, Thai students face several general and major barriers, such as limited vocabulary and short phrases. Despite the fact that their English fluency is so low while speaking a second language, their English speaking issues were somewhat severe.

Secondly, the statistics justified which item is the most particular difficulty among the English-speaking problems of Engineering and Technology Demonstration School vocational students in each of the four fields. Accounting students are afraid of making mistakes (\bar{x} = 4.09); electrical students do not have enough vocabulary knowledge (\bar{x} = 3.64); mechanical students are afraid of making mistakes in the same way that accounting students are (\bar{x} = 3.96); and civil engineering students have pronunciation problems, which cause difficulty in communication ($\bar{x} = 4.04$). Summarily, they all have high levels of English speaking of in linguistically-related and affective-related problems categories. In speaking class, vocational college students are exposed to a variety of language learning situations. According to Fitriani & Zulkarnain's (2019) research findings, there are various typical mistakes made by vocational college students in the speaking class. All of the problems discovered were classified as pronunciation and grammatical problems. Following the data analysis, it was discovered that the most prevalent problems in their level of English language speaking proficiency were in their pronunciation.

Thirdly, there was no statistically significant difference among the levels of study at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School in the total mean score of English speaking problems (p > 0.05). Their general English speaking problems are identical, according to the findings. Meanwhile, there were only 5 specific items of English speaking problems among the levels of study that were different (p < 0.05): 18) My classes are teacher-centered; therefore, I cannot find the chance to express my ideas and participate in class discussion activities (p <0.05). 19) My speaking instructors spend a large proportion of class time asking questions about things to which I already knew the answers; therefore, no real communication takes place (p <0.05). 21) My instructors do not teach us how to express appropriate speech acts (e.g., greeting, complaint, refusing invitations or offers, and so on) (p < 0.05). 23) My instructors do not present interesting topics for discussion (p <0.05); 24) My instructors put less emphasis on speaking skills in comparison to other skills (p < 0.05). The research findings are consistent with Juhana's (2012) idea regarding the types of psychological problems that students encounter when speaking, which are fear of mistakes, anxiety, shyness, lack of confidence, and lacking motivation.

Finally, the findings of this research covered all the research questions that should be mentioned. For the first research question to investigate the English speaking problems of vocational students at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School, the results were shown in high, medium, and low levels for each of the items and an overall mean score for each category of the English speaking problems. The finding was focused on high level categories that were problematic: linguistically-related ($\bar{x} = 3.70$) and affective-related problems ($\bar{x} = 3.62$). Each of the detailed items in all categories was presented in the results of the study in Chapter IV. For the second research question, the results were focused on the specific problems of vocational students at DEST among the four fields of study. The results were presented in terms of each problematic item in the English speaking problems. First, the accounting and mechanical engineering students' most specific problem was item 1 (I am afraid of making mistakes); the mean score was 4.09 and 3.96, respectively. Next, the electrical engineering student's specific problem was item 31 (I do not have enough vocabulary knowledge) with a mean score of 3.64. The last one was civil engineering students; their specific English

speaking was at a 4.04 mean score in item 35 (My pronunciation is not good enough, which causes difficulty in my communication). For the third research question, the results focused on the differences in English speaking problems among the levels of study; the findings found that there was no significant difference in English speaking problems among the levels of study of vocational students at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School. According to the results of this study, the statistic found the following high-level English speaking problems among the vocational students at Engineering and Technology School: linguistically-related problems and affectively-related problems.

Furthermore, the most specific English speaking problems among the four fields of vocational students were found to be the following: accounting (I am afraid of making mistakes), electrical engineering (I do not have enough vocabulary knowledge), mechanical engineering (I am afraid of making mistakes), civil engineering (My pronunciation is not good enough, which causes difficulty in my communication). Finally, no statistically significant difference in English speaking problems was found among vocational students' levels of study.

15. Recommendation

Researchers may conduct additional studies with a greater number of participants or students from multiple universities. In this case, the research mainly investigated the English speaking problems of vocational students at Engineering and Technology Demonstration School; consequently, subsequent research might include a strategy for improving respondents' English speaking problems. This research might contribute to scheming an English-language teaching curriculum at other institutions in the future. The researchers will also be capable of using it as a resource for educators and curriculum developers.

References

- Anam, M. & Tantri (2020) Psychological Problems in Speaking English of The Students of Vocational Senior High School. English Language Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Islam Lamongan. *E-Link Journal*, 7(2), 72-82. https://doi.org/10.30736/ej.v7i2.338.
- Areerak, M. & Siriporn, P. (2010). The development of training based on problem-based learning for second key stage English teachers. Education Journal Naresuan University, 12(2), 17-31.
- Asakereh & Afshar. (2016). Speaking Skills Problems Encountered by Iranian EFL Freshmen and Seniors from Their Own and Their English Instructors' Perspectives. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 13(1), 112-130.
- Baldwin, C. (2011). How to overcome shyness during an oral presentation. http://www.ehow.com/how_7852354_overcomeshyness-during-oralpresentation.html.
- Bashir, M., Azeem, M., & Dogar, A., H. (2011). Factor Effecting Students' English speaking skills. British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences, 2(1). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228840274_Factor_Effecting_Students'_English_Speaking_Skills.
- Bradshaw, A. (2018). Speak out! Grammar is important to a certain extent, but when we are communicating in real life. If you keep [Image attached] [Status update]. Facebook.

- $\label{eq:https://www.facebook.com/146244852086420/photos} $$ /a.669889273055306/1998193503558203/?type=3. $$$
- Brown, H. D. (2004). Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices. San Francisco State University.
- Bulphong, P. (2003). A study of language learning strategies used by Thai hotel receptionists in developing their listening and speaking skills [Master's thesis, University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce, Bangkok].
- Buppha, U. (2012). The development of tertiary students' learning autonomy through English for communication and study skills course. SDU Research Journal Humanities and Social Science, 8(2), 189-204.
- Chanyasupab, T. (1982). An analysis of English pronunciation of English major students at higher certificate of education level [Master's thesis, Chulalongkorn University].
- Chiswick, R., B. (2008). The Economics of Language: An Introduction and Overview. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1 155862.
- Elliott, A.R. (1995). Foreign Language Phonology: Field independence, attitude, and the success of formal instruction in Spanish pronunciation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(4), 530-542. https://doi.org/10.2307/330005.
- Faridi, A., Bahri, S. & Nurmasitah, S. (2016). The Problems of applying student centered syllabus of English in vocational high schools in Kendal Regency. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 231-240.
- Fitriani, D.A., Apriliaswati, R. & Wardah. (2015). A study on students' English speaking problems in speaking performance, Teacher training and education faculty of Tanjungpura University, Pontianak. *Journal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa*, 4(9), 1-13. https://jurnal.untan.ac.id/index.php/jpdpb/article/view/11345/10753.
- Fitriani, N., & Zulkarnain, S. I. (2019). Vocational college students' common errors in EFL speaking performance. Studies in English Language and Education, 6(1), 141-151.
- Fraser, H. (2000). Coordinating improvements in pronunciation teaching for adult learners of English as a second language. Canberra: DETYA (Australia National Training Authority Adult Literacy Project). https://helenfraser.com.au/publications-speaking-andlistening/.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. The Modern Language Journal, 70(2), 125-132. https://doi.org/10.2307/327317.
- Hossain, M., Md. (2016). English Language Teaching in Rural Areas: A Scenario and Problems and Prospects in Context of Bangladesh. Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 7(3), 1-12.
- Irismet, A. (2006). The analysis of the speaking problems in the English language teaching department at Ahmed Yasawi International Kazakh Turkish University [Master's thesis, Gazi University].
- Kaharuddin & Rahmadana, A. (2020). Problem-Based Group Discussion: An Effective ELT Technique to Improve Vocational High School Students' Transactional Speaking Skills. JURNAL ILMU BUDAYA, 8(2), 247-258. https://doi.org/10.34050/jib.v8i2.11032
- Kapur, S. & Chakraborty, T. (2008) English Language Premium: Evidence from a Policy Experiment in India. Washington University in St. Louis unpublished paper.
- Khamprated, N. (2012). The problems with the English listening and speaking of students studying at a private vocational school in Bangkok, Thailand [Master's thesis, Srinakharinwirot University]. http://thesis.swu.ac.th/swuthesis/Tea_Eng_For_Lan(M. A.)/Nualsri_K.pdf.
- Krongbuaban, B. (2017). A Study of The Problems of English Speaking Skills of the First Year Students at

- Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University [Master's thesis, Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University].
- Kwandee, S. & Sawaddikun, S. (2012). Building up Awareness of Pronunciation and Connected Speech for the Improvement of Thai Students Accent when Speaking English. 1st Mae Fah Luang University International Conference 2012. http://docplayer.net/38074180-Building-up-awareness-of-pronunciation-andconnected-speech-for-the-improvement-of-thaistudents-accent-when-speaking-english.html.
- Lakhawatana, P. (1969). A constructive study of English and Thai. Bangkok: The English language center.
- Lucas, S. E. (2001). The art of public speaking. (7th Ed.).
 Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
- Malarak, P. (1998). The variation of pronunciation of /s/ at the final position, when reading message of middle school students [Master's thesis, Chulalongkorn University].
- Mano-im, R. (1999). The pronunciation of English final consonant clusters by Thais [Master's thesis, Chulalongkorn University].
- Murniati, AR. & Usman, N. (2009). The Implementation of the Strategic Management: in the Empowerment of Vocational Schools. Bandung:Citapustaka Pioneering Media.
- Mustafa, M. N. (2013). Professional Competency Differences among High School Teachers in Indonesia. *International Education Studies*, 6(9), 83-92. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n9p83.
- Oraphan, W. (2011, December 4). Thai students focus on learning English for university entrance exams. MGR Online.
 - https://mgronline.com/qol/detail/9540000154471.
- Phuliamkam, N., Worakham, P. & Chanthachum, N. (2019).
 The Development of Listening and Speaking Skills in English for the 3rd Year of Vocation Certificate students at Northeastern Vocational Institute of Agricultural.
 Journal of Roi Et Rajabhat University, 13(1), 162-173.
 https://so03.tci
 - thaijo.org/index.php/reru/article/view/186034.
- Prachaboriban, B. (1958). The studies of the difficulties of Thai students in pronunciation English consonant clusters [Master's thesis, Chulalongkorn University].
- Prapphal, K. (2001). English proficiency of Thai learners and directions of English teaching and learning in Thailand. *Journal of Studies in the English Language*. https://so04.tci
 - thaijo.org/index.php/jsel/article/view/21840.
- Preedawat, W. (2007). An Investigation of Communication Strategies of International Undergraduate Students in Bangkok [Unpublished master's thesis]. King Mongkut's University of Technology North Bangkok.
- Punthumasen, P. (2007). International program for teacher education: An approach to tackling problems of English education in Thailand. The 11th UNESCO-APEID international conference. http://backoffice.onec.go.th/uploaded/Category/EngBo ok/ProblemEngEd13dec07-03-03-2011.pdf.
- Rasheed, S., Zeeshan, M., & Zaidi, N., A. (2017). Challenges of Teaching English Language in a Multilingual Setting: An Investigation at Government Girls Secondary Schools of

- Quetta, Baluchistan, Pakistan. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(4), 150-157.
- Ratanapinyowong, P. Poopon, K. & Honsa, Jr.S. (2007).
 Problems and solutions in teaching and assessing English skills in Thai higher education and the need for professional development. Voices of Asia 2007 Symposium, MARA University of Technology (UiTM), Malaysia.
- Sahatsathatsana, S. (2017). Pronunciation Problems of Thai Students Learning English Phonetics: A Case Study at Kalasin University. *Journal of Education, Mahasarakham University*, 11(4), 67-84. http://edu.msu.ac.th/journal/home/journal_file/383.pd
- Sarkis, R. (2012). Using Cognitive Strategies to Improve English Speaking Skill and Self-confidence. *American Journal of Education Sciences*, 2(4), 19-23.
- Syamsinar, S., & Jabu, B. (2016). The Problems in Professional Competence of Teachers in Teaching English Subject at Vocational High Schools. *ELT WORLDWIDE*, 2(2), 95–109.
- Tani, M. (2005). Quiet, but only in class: Reviewing the inclass participation of Asian students. Australian Defense Force Academy, University of New South Wales. http://conference.herdsa.org.au/2005/pdf/non_referee d/030.pdf.
- Teo, A., Chatupote, M., Chiramanee, T., Sripetphan, W., Prasertsan, S., Khamcharoen, P., Musigrungsi, S., Sukseemuang, P. & Karavi, P. (2007). Profile of foreign language education at tertiary level in southern Thailand. The Thailand Research Fund (TRF).
- Tipmontree, S. (2007). The Use and the Problems of English and Intercultural Communication Skills of Thai Tourist Police Officers [Master's thesis, University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce, Bangkok].
- Tribolet, C. (2012). Using Cognitive Strategies to Improve English Speaking Skill and Self-confidence. *American Journal of Education Sciences*, *2*(3), 36-40.
- Ur, P. (1996). A course in language teaching: Practice and theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, T. & Rajprasit, K. (2015). Identifying affirmative beliefs about English language learning: self-perceptions of Thai learners with different language proficiency. English Language Teaching, 8(4),1-13. https://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article /view/46805
- Wattanavitukul, P. (2006). Spoken English: Why 99% of Thai and Chinese Failed in Learning Oral English.
- Wongsuriya, P. (2020). Improving the Thai students' ability in English pronunciation through mobile application. Educational Research and Reviews. *Academic journal*, 15(4), 175-185. https://academicjournals.org/journal/ERR/article-abstract/BE7011863359.
- Wongsuwana, T. (2006). Speech could be trained. *Thailand Education Journal*, 21, 44-50.
- Xinqin, Z. (2006). Speaking skills and anxiety. Yanshan University. *CELEA Journal Bimonthly*, 23(1), 34-39.
- Yusica, U. (201
 4). Problem faced by Thai student in speaking English. Faculty of education English language department. The state Islamic institute of Tulungagung. https://www.academia.edu/9423968/PROBLEM_FACE D_BY_THAI_STUDENT_IN_SPEAKING_ENGLISH.