PASAA

It's Not What We Say but How We Say It: The Use of their Linguistic Repertoire by Two Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers in the EFL Classroom in Thailand

Sarah Elizabeth Schefers[a*] and Maria-Luz Celaya[b]

[a]Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

[b] University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

Corresponding author: s.e.schefers@gmail.com

Article information	
Abstract	The primary goal of this study was to analyze the use of the linguistic repertoire of non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) in the EFL classroom. This was done through a study of two EFL teachers in Thailand. Results show that while teachers were partially aware of the factors that impacted what language they chose for specific classroom tasks, it was often their perceptions of their own proficiency that played the largest role. Students, in turn, often responded in the same language that teachers used. This led to the conclusion that NNESTs' sense of identity as L2 users as well as their sense of agency as professional language instructors should be promoted to enhance greater use of the target language (TL) in the classroom.
Keywords	linguistic repertoire, non-native English-speaking teachers, EFL classrooms, multilingualism
APA citation:	Schefers, S. E., & Celaya, M. (2025). It's not what we say but how we say it: The use of linguistic repertoire by two non-native English-speaking teachers in the EFL classroom in Thailand. *PASAA, 70*, 443–470

1. Introduction

Learning languages in non-naturalistic contexts requires the guidance and expertise of professional language instructors. Floris and Renandya (2020) have noted that, out of the roughly 15 million English language teachers working globally, 80% or 12 million were classified as non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs). This is a large section of the professional pool and is the primary focus of the present study, analyzing how NNESTs use their languages in the English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom within an Asian context and the impact of these choices on classroom communication. To this aim, two Thai, public secondary school teachers were asked to perform a succession of tasks beginning and ending with class observations and discussions.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Native English-Speaking and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers in the EFL Context

The prominence of NNESTs within the field of teaching EFL is sorely mismatched with their underrepresentation within both professional organizations and research (see Hayes, 2009) and the prevalence of the notion of the ideal native-English speaker found throughout SLA research (Agudo, 2017b; Floris & Renandya, 2020). In their study examining English teacher position postings on English as a second language (ESL) websites, Mahboob and Golden (2013) found that 79% required native-speaker status of the target language (TL), while 49% would only consider holders of specific passports. Additionally, some schools give preference to unqualified native English-speaking teachers (NESTs), due to their perceived superiority as language role models, over qualified NNESTs, despite their lack of certification or work experience in some cases (see, among others, Floris & Renandya, 2020; Gurkan & Yuksal, 2012; Inbar, 2010).

Such differential treatment often leads to experiences of psychological distress by NNESTs in the form of lower self-esteem and a more passive role as teachers when they are working with NESTs (Floris & Renandya, 2020). In contrast

with the standard classification, Hayes (2009) argued that their nativeness to the educational context might be a better descriptor of the local teachers than their status as non-native English speakers. Additionally, one of the most touted values of NNESTs is their shared native language with the students (Agudo, 2017b) can facilitate classroom communication and the creation of a supportive learning environment. Further research has concluded that both NESTs and NNESTs need to work together to provide their students with the most successful learning environment (Agudo 2017a; Floris and Renandya, 2020). While working together, it can be understood that the two groups serve different functions while bringing complementary strengths into the classroom. The NNESTs can serve as models of successful language learners, and NESTs as models of successful language users.

2.2 Use of the Students' L1 in the L2 Classroom: Translation and Code-Switching

As English becomes more and more entrenched as the lingua franca of international business, entertainment, and research, greater pressure is being put on governments to provide quality language instruction. For instance, Pan and Pan (2010) noted that countries such as Taiwan and Korea implemented target language (TL)-only policies to provide their students with what they perceived as improved learning conditions. Focusing on teachers in private language schools in Iran, Mohebbi and Alavi (2014) found that language centers, as well as private and public schools, have adopted a policy of English-only instruction in a bid to attract a greater number of students and increase the fees they can demand from the students' families. Garcia (2009) examined how bilingual programs are structured and operated, noting that many have strict language separation policies. Faculty and students are expected to engage in specific languages for specific subjects, hours, or days, as segregated by strict school policies. This trend was also seen in study abroad (SA) programs where the TL was taught in isolation from the languages spoken by the students in their native countries (Garcia & Otheguy, 2019).

Most of these policy decisions have not been based on actual research

(Mohebbi & Alavi, 2014), which shows that utilizing L1 serves a multitude of purposes in the classroom and is beneficial to the students. Many teachers report using L1 to teach grammar, provide feedback, explain abstract or complex vocabulary, encourage linguistic scaffolding, increase comprehension, share cultural aspects of the TL, build a sense of community with the students, reduce affective barriers, and maintain classroom discipline (De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Edstrom, 2006; Hayes, 2009; Macaro, 2005; Mohebbi & Alavi, 2014; Turnbull, 2001).

The use of the students' L1 by the teacher can take a variety of forms, the two most common being translation and code-switching (CS). It is important to note that the concept of translation that is used nowadays is not the same as in traditional grammar-translation pedagogy; instead, González-Davies (2017) defined translation as a mediation skill and a natural learning strategy that language learners access in order to complete a linguistic task. Translation in the second language classroom has been found to involve cognitive skills such as remembering, applying, analyzing, and creating (see Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001), and to allow both students and teachers to use the full scope of their linguistic knowledge, which increases their sense of self-esteem and agency as language learners and instructors (see Wilson & González-Davies, 2017).

Another way teachers frequently use their L1 within the EFL classroom is the use of CS. Recognition of the value of CS in research has not often translated into the classroom where it is often seen as being neither a linguistic tool nor an asset in second language acquisition (Macaro, 2005). In fact, Macaro (2000) found that most bilingual teachers view CS as a linguistic failure. The reaction against CS is also due in part to the notion of the idealized bilingual (see Weinreich, 1953), which posited that bilinguals develop two independent language-specific lexicons that do not positively interact with one another. This is in stark contrast to more modern research in neurology which has supported the idea that linguistic information is stored in a singular location leading to cross-language activation

(Libben, 2000). As seen in many studies, CS serves a multitude of different functions within the foreign language classroom: using humour (Braga, 2000), clarifying class activities and encouraging the students to speak the TL (Cipriani, 2001), and building relationships within the classroom (Macaro, 2000), to name but a few. According to Macaro (2005), when teachers avoid CS, they must modify the input that they provide to the students. This is either done through simplification, repetition, circumlocution, or avoidance which leads to less authentic input and decreased levels of interaction from the students. Thus, the use of CS leads to the production of more realistic input for the students. Still, Macaro (2005) cautions that there is a point at which CS stops being a communicative strategy, and the class then becomes an L1 class about the TL; hence, he advocates that CS should be kept below 10% of the general classroom discourse.

2.3 Plurilingualism and Translanguaging in the EFL Context

It is important to note that language often plays an integral role in the formation of identity on both the personal and national levels. This notion of one-nation, one-language, one-identity has been explored in a variety of papers including Dooly and Unamuno (2009), Dooly and Vallejo (2019), and Ludi and Py (2009), among others. Governments often take this into consideration when they design national curriculum standards. Previous research by Del Valle (2000) and Garcia (2009) has shown that the monolingual lens impacts the way that bilingualism and multilingualism are both perceived. The impact of this linguistic bias on the personal level leads language learners to often abandon the study of a second language when they become discouraged at the prospect that they will never become a 'true bilingual' (Garcia & Otheguy, 2019). On the national stage, it led many developing countries in Africa and Asia to design national curriculums that promoted a unifying, identity-building, national language with a European language offered as a foreign language, as seen in Martín-Chazeaud and Celaya (2020) and Heller and McElhinny (2017), respectively.

It was in response to this monolingual bias that the theory of plurilingualism

emerged. According to the Council of Europe Language Policy Division, plurilingualism is "the dynamic and developing linguistic repertoire of an individual /.../ the fundamental point is that plurilinguals have a single, inter-related repertoire that they combine with their general competencies and various strategies to accomplish tasks" (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 28). Another key element in plurilingualism is the protection it provides to the language learners' L1 and their right to quality education (Helot & Cavalli, 2017). Plurilingualism was designed to empower language learners with a greater sense of agency over their education, and it has had the same effect on language teachers who are teaching their L2. Oftentimes, NNESTs' sense of identity and value are tied to their perception of their own proficiency and how they compare to the ideal native speaker. Plurilingualism allows teachers to create a more empowered identity as both language learners and instructors while bringing to the classroom the full benefit of their individual linguistic repertoire (Lubliner & Grisham, 2017; Wernicke, 2018).

As a feature of plurilingual practices, translanguaging (or the use of the multilingual speaker's linguistic repertoire as an integrated system) can improve the language learners' metacognition and their ability to fully understand the topic (Canagarajah, 2011; Garcia & Wei, 2014), and can also aid in how individual students develop their identities as language users (Creese & Blackledge, 2015). According to Garcia and Otheguy (2019), both plurilingualism and translanguaging are reactionary responses against the traditional understanding of bilingualism founded on the monolingual bias that has shaped foreign language education. They both recognize the value and existence of the multilingual practices that occur in communities all over the world, argue that the way individuals use their linguistic repertoire is strategic, and aim to reconceptualize the way we understand languages and how they function.

It is noteworthy that such ideas emerged within the European and American contexts and, hence, the bulk of research has been based in Europe. It was the

goal of this study to address this gap in the literature by bringing these concepts into an Asian context (Thailand). The present study explored how two local NNESTs incorporated these ideas into their EFL instruction. We also examined how and why teachers used their languages in the classroom, what linguistic tools they relied on, and the impact of increasing self-awareness as well as knowledge of current research. The aim was to accomplish these goals through a collaborative process with the teachers as we used observational, reflective, and productive tasks to gain deeper insights into the research questions mentioned below.

> RQ1: What factors impact the language choices of NNESTs in secondary EFL classrooms in Thailand?
>
> RQ2: What is the impact of language choices of NNESTs on classroom communication?
>
> RQ3: To what extent will their language choices be influenced by participating in this study?

3. Methodology

3.1 Context

In 2018, there were 63,450 Thai teachers teaching English to approximately 9.6 million children (Hayes, 2009). They work in the 37,175 primary and secondary schools that are located throughout the country, the majority of which are small in size, with only 7% categorized as large or extra-large (Ministry of Education, 2024). The two schools in this study differ in several key aspects (for purposes of anonymity, they will be referred to as school A and school B). School A is located in a city in central Thailand and is a former boys' high school. It has a student body of over 3,000 and is well-known for its science and math program. Admittance to this school is highly competitive, and students come from neighboring provinces. This study focused on three out of 12 classes from Mathayomsuksa 3 or Grade 9). Class size averaged 40 to 50 students. In contrast, school B is located in a smaller northern town and has a student body of about 800. This school serves the local population; however, it suffers from 'brain-drain' as a majority of the more talented

students test into the larger, more prestigious high schools in the city. The participating teacher used class recordings from Mathayomsuksa 3 and 6 (Grades 9 and 12). As this is a rural school, class sizes are smaller and average between 30 and 40 students.

3.2 Participants

There were two participants in the present study, one teacher from each school. The information provided below was gathered through a questionnaire and our interactions throughout the study. All personal information has been anonymized to protect their privacy, and they chose a nickname to be used as their alias. Participant 1: Jane was an English teacher at school A. Her L1 was Thai and her L2 was English, which she began studying in primary school. She identified as monolingual. Jane had been teaching for about 25 years and held a doctorate in curriculum and instruction after obtaining an MA in English and a BA in the same subject. In addition to teaching English to lower secondary students, she was also a homeroom teacher, and she taught in the school's scouts program. Jane served as her department head and performed duties within the financial office.

Participant 2: Joe was an English teacher at school B. His L1 was Thai, and his L2 was English, which he began studying in primary school. Joe began studying his L3, Japanese, about ten years ago, taking a 10-month, intensive course in Bangkok. He identified as bilingual. Joe had an MA in English after obtaining an undergraduate degree in the same field and had been teaching for about 20 years. He taught Japanese and English to upper-secondary students. Additionally, he worked in the academic affairs department as a registrar.

3.3 Instruments and Materials
3.3.1 Questionnaire

A questionnaire was given to the participants to gather information about their academic and professional backgrounds, their teaching environments, their linguistic repertoires, and how they perceived their use of languages in their school

contexts. It was piloted with a panel of six Thai linguistic professors employed at a major university in Bangkok and adjusted according to their feedback. The questionnaire was conducted via Google Forms. Although the use of questionnaires is common in studies that examine the beliefs, teaching practices, and other classroom behaviors of teachers, as seen in Nikoopour and Esfandiari (2017), further information-gathering tools were implemented.

3.3.2 Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were also conducted every two weeks throughout the study to gain more insight into the participants' thoughts (Agudo, 2017a). These were centered around discussions or completing a central task (see below); however, the researchers allowed the participants to determine the speed and direction of the conversations.

3.3.3 Recorded Class Observations

A self-observation scheme was created and used in this study. Both participants recorded themselves on their phones teaching selected classes, and the recordings were later discussed with the researchers. They also provided the researchers with a general outline of the classes and all the course materials. This task was completed twice—once to establish pre-study classroom language patterns and the second time to observe any potential impact of participating in the study.

3.3.4 Role-Plays

Under the guidance of the researchers, the teachers gave explanations and homework instructions pertaining to key grammatical structures they taught in the classroom. This was done in relation to two different situations: a high English proficiency class and a mixed English proficiency class. The main purpose of this task was to encourage both teachers to be more cognitively aware of their utterances in their L1 and the TL. This task was completed twice in preparation

for the final self-observation task. The recordings of these activities were transcribed with the assistance of two professional English/Thai translators.

3.3.5 Literature Review Sections

During our initial conversations, one of the participants expressed interest in what research had been read in preparation for conducting this study. Based on this, it was decided to incorporate the literature review used by the researchers as a tool for the teachers. Each section was condensed and simplified to provide them with the necessary information while still respecting their valuable, yet limited, time. Three sections were discussed focusing on the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom, translating and code-switching, and plurilingualism and translanguaging.

3.4 Procedure

Potential participants were contacted through work contacts on Facebook and snowball sampling. All communication took place via email, Zoom, and the Line application. Once they agreed to participate in this study, the two teachers filled in the questionnaire and were then interviewed a second time in which their responses to the questionnaire were discussed and the first self-observation task was explained. The participants were given two weeks to complete every task. Upon completion and submission of their observation materials, the researchers reviewed them. A third interview was conducted to discuss these classes and the teachers' feedback and reasoning for language choices were solicited. Next, the teachers were given two sections from the literature review, which were discussed with the researcher and the role-play task was completed. This procedure was repeated twice. Finally, the teachers were instructed to incorporate all that had been discussed into their teaching for a final self-observation task.

Since one of the goals of this study was to establish a collaborative relationship with the two participants based on mutual respect and open

communication, the researchers engaged in frequent communication with the two participants using their preferred line of communication.

4. Findings

4.1 Questionnaire Findings

The primary goal of the questionnaire was to gather information concerning how the participants defined their role within their academic communities and their sense of identity as professional language instructors. One element that could be a factor in how teachers use their languages within the classroom (RQ1) is their sense of identity as language users. On the questionnaire, they were asked to self-identify, given the options of monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual. Jane self-identified as monolingual, and Joe self-identified as bilingual. This was unexpected as both teachers taught languages that were not their native language (they both taught English, and Joe also taught Japanese). When asked about their answers, they both cited a lack of sufficient proficiency required to claim the title of bilingual or multilingual. Jane stated that she felt comfortable using English within a very limited context and so did not view herself as being bilingual. Joe stated that his Japanese was basic and that he had only begun teaching it recently. He viewed himself as being a Thai/English bilingual. This lack of confidence stemming from low perceptions of their own proficiency matched what had been found in numerous studies including Floris and Renandya (2020) and Tatar and Yildz (2010).

4.2 First Observation Task Findings

Examining the factors that impacted Jane's choice of language usage (RQ1), several important patterns emerged. Most of her language choices in the classroom matched her self-reported responses to the questionnaire. For example, the most used language was Thai. It was used to give instructions, explain the key concepts of the class, and forge an emotional connection with the students through humour and empathy as seen in Cipriani (2001) and Macaro (2000). English was mostly limited to technical, grammatical terms. When asked what

specific purposes English served in the EFL classroom, she said "It's up to my topic. I mean that if I have to explain something complex or multidimensional, I try to use Thai to make them understand clearer." When she was told that she used more of the L1 with her more TL-proficient class, Jane replied, "It's up to my skill. I think my skill is not good enough… I don't think that I can explain them to understand well by using English so that's why I use Thai."

In the questionnaire, she selected that it is important to use the TL to encourage the students to do likewise. During our discussion of her class recordings, however, Jane was very insistent that as a Thai person, it was especially important that she spoke Thai with the students. This is in agreement with Dooly and Vallejo (2019) and Ludi and Py (2009) and their perspective of the relationship between language and identity. Her strong identification with her L1 as a monolingual speaker partially explained her reliance on it in her classroom. Jane also stated that she actively encouraged the students to speak the TL, stating that "I'm encouraging them to use English in class as much as they can." However, when we focused on the impact of her language choices on classroom communication (RQ2), we found that the students often responded in the language that was used to address them. If Jane spoke to them in Thai, they responded in Thai 100% of the time. When this was pointed out to the participant, she continued to insist that her speaking the TL was secondary to students speaking the TL.

Similarly, the dominant language used by Joe was Thai. However, the time split between the two languages was closer to being even. Joe identified as a bilingual user of Thai and English, and he seemed more confident switching between the two languages. The most common linguistic tool used by Joe was unmarked translation as described by González-Davies (2017), which he used to explain core grammatical concepts and give instructions. An interesting divergence between the two teachers was the language they chose to use humour with the students. Jane told jokes in Thai; Joe told jokes in Thai and English, and his jokes

were often repeated by the students in English. This reflects the impact of their language choices on classroom communication.

Focusing on the factors that impacted his choice of language usage in the classroom, a clear pattern emerged as Joe said, "when I explain difficult thing...to clarify my homework, I use the Thai language." When asked about when he used English, Joe replied, "easy question. They can answer my question. I usually use English and the easy word they can understand," which agreed with studies conducted by Mohebbi and Alavi (2014) and Pan and Pan (2010) which supported the idea that the use of the TL to explain simple concepts provided students with much needed authentic input. Such a finding was also consistent with previous research conducted by De la Campa and Nassaji (2009) and Hayes (2009) on the use of the L1 to build a sense of community with the students.

4.3 Literature Review Sections Findings

Throughout the interactive process, a clear divergence could be noticed between the two participants. Jane regularly conducted her own classroom-based research, so she seemed more comfortable engaging with academic writing and concepts. She would ask specific questions about concepts, vocabulary, or sentence structures that she did not understand. Jane largely directed the course of those conversations. In contrast, Joe was more interested in being an active listener. He was very reluctant to express his own opinions, he had no questions of his own, and he had to be encouraged to engage with the ideas being presented. This matched previous research conducted by Floris and Renandya (2020), Hayes (2009), and Mohebbi and Alavi (2014) which found that NNESTs tended to take on a more passive role during their interactions with NESTs due to their perceptions of NESTs as being more proficient language users.

Focusing on what factors impacted the teachers' choice of language usage in the EFL classroom, Jane had some interesting and self-contradictory thoughts on the literature review and what it meant. Agreeing with Harbord (1992), Jane

stated that the L1 should be reserved to explain concepts or ideas that were too complex or abstract to be explained succinctly in the TL, but that simpler explanations and instructions should be carried out in the TL. However, she stated that the use of CS in the EFL classroom was detrimental to the students since it prevented teachers and students from thinking in the TL. This mirrored the concerns of other teachers, as cited by González-Davies (2017), specifically that the use of the L1 in the classroom would make teachers and students fail to engage cognitively in the TL.

Based on her responses, it is possible that Jane still held to the idea of the coordinate bilingual model (Weinreich, 1953). Unfortunately, this did not match more recent studies that have shown a positive impact from the strategic use of the L1 in the EFL classroom as seen in Braga (2000), Cipriani (2001), and Macaro (2005). Most interestingly, her comments did not match the realities of how she used languages in her classes. It was as if she was describing an ideal that she herself was unable to attain but still had to defend out of principle.

When looking at what factors impact NNESTs' use of languages in the EFL classroom, Jane stated that it was very important that NESTs not speak Thai with students as it served no benefit to the students. In stark contrast, she was defensive of how much Thai teachers used Thai in the classroom even while admitting that they used it too much. She said that teachers spoke Thai instead of the TL because speaking English made them uncomfortable and it was often a waste of time. She emphasized on several occasions that it was more important for teachers to encourage students to speak English than for them to speak it themselves.

While discussing what factors impacted teachers' choices of language usage in the EFL classroom, Joe was focused more on why Thai teachers used CS frequently. He said "they don't have the confidence to use English in their class because they do not use it in daily life. In my daily life, they use the Thai language

only." As seen in Caballero and Celaya (2022), the use of CS gives the speaker access to knowledge stored in their long-term memory while reducing negative emotions such as anxiety. He also feared that students would not be able to comprehend input delivered entirely in the TL, which matched previous research by Turnbull (2001). Joe then stated that many teachers were afraid of making a mistake and consequently losing face in front of the students, which was a major concern within the Thai culture. Personally, Joe stated that he tried not to worry too much about whether the English he used was 100% correct or not, and he just used English in the classroom to encourage his students to do the same.

Joe also spoke very openly in support of CS in the EFL classroom. He stated that this was most used by Thai teachers when they were unable to think of a specific word in the TL. It was also a useful tool as sometimes Thai students were unable to understand instruction delivered entirely in the TL. Joe did have a negative response to the mention of translation as a linguistic tool within the EFL classroom. He stated that CS was used by good and modern teachers while translating was old-fashioned and was favored by much older teachers. Through conversation, it was determined that he was remembering the grammar-translation methodology that had been favored when he had been a student. The concept of pedagogically-based translation as described by González-Davies (2017) was clarified, and this led to a more productive discussion of how and when translation could be used successfully within the EFL classroom. Joe, who worked at a school that was closer to a land border, was far more interested in the concepts of translanguaging and plurilingualism. Joe stated that he had been able to find information on plurilingualism in Thai, but not any previous research that focused on plurilingualism in Thailand. He had never heard of translanguaging and only one study had been found on the subject in Thailand, which was Kampittayakul (2018). He agreed that both topics needed to be investigated further within Asia.

4.4 Role-Play Findings

The variable of student proficiency in relation to language choices by the teachers was selected for analysis, as both teachers indicated that the proficiency levels of their students were one of the primary determinants for the use of their linguistic repertoire. When asked what percentage of the discourse should be in the TL for a high-proficiency group of students, both teachers indicated it should be as close to 100% as possible. For the mixed-proficiency group of students, the goal was set to 50% TL use. Both teachers selected what concepts they would like to focus on. Jane selected cohesive devices for the first role-play and identification of the main verb in a sentence for the second. Joe chose reported speech for the first role-play and conjunctions for the second.

In Jane's recordings, the main difference between the two student profiles was the amount of depth and detail that was provided in the explanations and instructions when she was allowed to use her L1. This could be seen clearly in her instructions for the first task (cohesive devices). In the mixed proficiency class, she explicitly stated what she was looking for in this assignment and reminded the students to write an outline first. When forced to rely fully on the TL, her instructions were less clear and came across as suggestions as she struggled to access the required vocabulary to complete the task. The use of the L1 by Jane reduced her affective barriers such as anxiety, enabling her to communicate more effectively and fluently (González-Davies, 2017). Jane seemed more comfortable when she was not expected to communicate fully in the TL. Caballero and Celaya (2022) had similar findings, noting that equipping speakers with the knowledge stored in their long-term memory of their L1 enabled them to communicate more easily in the TL. Jane used unmarked translations to reiterate key pieces of information such as definitions, explanations, and instructions, which matches Macaro's (2000) idea of using the L1 to build relationships within the classroom. In Joe's recordings, the most notable difference was in the overall length of recordings and the complexity of the language used. When expected to speak only in the TL, much simpler language patterns emerged with shorter explanations. This

was predicted by Macaro (2005) and Pan and Pan (2010). Avoiding the L1 led Joe to heavily modify his output, favouring simplicity and saliency. When he was encouraged to use his L1, three out of four situations produced longer recordings with higher rates of fluency. Interestingly, the number of English words used increased as well. This agreed with previous findings that the use of the L1 encouraged greater use of the TL as seen in a study undertaken by Shamash (1990). When encouraged to use his L1, Joe provided deeper explanations, focusing on explicitly describing how the verb tense would need to shift and encouraging students to produce the new required verb tense. This matched previous research by Macaro (2000) that found that teachers often used the L1 to explain complex concepts. Joe also included more examples in the L1, matching the findings of Cipriani (2001) as to the use of the L1 to clarify class activities.

4.5 Final Class Observation Findings

When they completed the initial recording, both teachers were asked to teach their classes like they normally would. For the final observation, the task was to do the opposite; they were asked to be mindful of everything that had been discussed, of the research summaries they had read, of the role-play tasks we had completed, and to incorporate all of that into how they taught. The same goal of 50% use of the TL from the role-play task was kept as both teachers felt this would be beneficial to them. While this fell far from the 10% advocated in Macaro (2001), it represented a more realistic goal for them.

Unfortunately, the final class recordings from Jane were of classes that were mostly students performing independent work. She apologized and shared that she had to use the classes she had available as the academic year was ending. Jane stated that she tried to speak more of the TL, but due to the nature of the class and the type of work the students needed to complete, she felt that their L1 would be the more appropriate language. She did have shorter utterances in Thai and used more frequent CS, even joking with the students in the TL. When we were discussing the factors that impacted her language choices, we discussed why she

used more of the L1 with her more proficient class and more of the TL with her less proficient class. Jane was unable to explain this. A possible explanation might be her fear of losing face in front of a class where she perceived the students as having a higher level of proficiency than she did.

When asked about the impact of her language choice on classroom communication, Jane pointed back to a linguistic choice made by the government that impacted both her language choices and ultimately those of her students as well, which was the fact that Thai teachers were required to submit their lesson plans in Thai. Therefore, if the lesson plans were in Thai, they were more likely to conduct the class in the same language. Throughout the study, specific instances in her classes were discussed where students responded to her in the language that she used to address them.

When discussing the extent to which her language choices would be influenced by participating in this study, Jane had a positive, though slightly vague response. She said, "I learned new things, new vocabulary, new strategy...I apply this in my classroom, and while I am teaching, I think when I stand in front of class and I have something in my mind, I have a plan...I am conscious...when I go into class with your blueprint or your article, I teach the same topic but I am conscious." When asked what she learned from her participation, she replied, "I think teachers should use English in class as much as they can, and if students don't understand, do not blame them but teachers need to try another way to explain them. It is their duty to explain them. And the third thing is, all things that teachers do in class, they have to consider them first. The first person you have to think of is the students, not materials or lessons or anything else. Teachers must focus on their students."

Like Jane, Joe did not hit the goal of 50% TL use. In fact, his use of the TL decreased from his initial recordings. When discussing what factors impacted the teacher's choice of language, we realized that the curriculum itself was having an

impact. The initial observations were the last two lessons in a unit, so they were going over concepts that had been mastered and were being refined. Joe said that might make him feel more comfortable using the TL as the students would be less likely to be confused. However, the last observations were the first two lessons in a new unit. He wanted to make sure they understood all key grammatical features completely. Interestingly, Joe switched to more frequent CS with shorter utterances in the L1. While the amount of Thai increased, it was more frequently punctuated by words and phrases spoken in the TL. When we spoke about why Thai teachers specifically relied so heavily on their L1, Jane said, "I think the most important thing is the teachers not confident in themselves to speak English in their class because I think they are afraid it is wrong to speak to the students and the students remember what they taught. Most of them were shy to speak English to the students, so they use less English in their class."

When asked to what extent his language choices would be influenced by participating in this study (RQ3), Joe said, "the teaching strategy in English, how to encourage the student to go to their target English is the best thing I learned." When asked about how this would impact his teaching, he said "maybe, maybe, up to the situation, but I will try to use the English. I will try my best." Joe was more interested in hearing the researchers' opinions and suggestions rather than offering his own.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations for Further Research

The analysis of the factors that may impact the language choices of NNESTs in secondary EFL classrooms in Thailand (RQ1) have shown that the responses given by the teachers did not completely match the reality of their classrooms. While both teachers stated that it was the needs of the students and the complexity of the topic that determined what language they used to communicate with their students, it was apparent that their own levels of proficiency and sense of identity with the TL were also major factors. When considering the impact of their language choices on classroom communication, it was found that students

usually responded in the language they were addressed in. Both teachers said their primary objective was to encourage the students to speak the TL; however, only one teacher, Joe, acknowledged the impact of his linguistic decisions on his students. Jane did make a valid point on the impact of lesson plans on classroom discourse. As teachers were required to submit lesson plans in Thai, the teachers themselves structured the lesson in the common L1 and not the TL. This would have an impact on how they used their linguistic repertoire. Finally, the extent to which their participation in this study would influence how they used their linguistic repertoire in the future, both teachers indicated an increase in their metalinguistic awareness. While no major differences were noticed between the initial and final class observations, both teachers reported being more mindful of how they were using their languages; in fact, they used shorter utterances in the L1 and more frequently switched to the TL.

As previously mentioned, teachers who took part in this study were required to write lesson plans in Thai. As a result, it would be interesting to study the impact of the language used to construct lesson plans on how teachers use their languages in the classroom to check by collecting data from teachers teaching in other settings where English is used to write lesson plans to see whether lesson plans written in the TL are likely to produce a classroom environment more conducive to soliciting the TL from both the NNESTs and their students or not.

6. About the Authors

Sarah Schefers is currently a PhD candidate in Multicultural Studies at the Research Institute of Languages and Cultures of Asia, Mahidol University. She holds a Master's degree in Applied Linguistics and Language Acquisition in Multilingual Contexts from the University of Barcelona. Her research focuses on identity construction within the educational context, drawing on over 15 years of experience working as an English language teacher. She can be reached at s.e.schefers@gmail.com.

M. Luz Celaya is Associate Professor (Senior Lecturer) in Applied Linguistics in the Modern Languages and Literatures and English Studies Department at the University of Barcelona. Her research encompasses several key areas, including cross-linguistic influence, interlanguage pragmatics, the integration of the first language (L1) within foreign language pedagogy, and the impact of age on the development of written production in English as a Foreign Language (EFL). She has been a full member of the GRAL research team since its inception. Additionally, she has served as the coordinator for both the PhD program and the Master's program in "Applied Linguistics and Language Acquisition in Multilingual Contexts" at the University of Barcelona, and she is the founder and co-chair of the International Association for Teaching Pragmatics (ITAP). She has presented her papers at both national and international conferences. She has co-authored three books and several book chapters and articles published in key journals in the field of SLA and has supervised more than thirty MA theses and nine Ph.D. dissertations. She can be contacted at mluzcelaya@ub.edu.

7. References

Agudo, J. d. D. M. (2017a). *Native and non-native teachers in English language classrooms: Professional challenges and teacher education*. De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501504143

Agudo, J. d. D. M. (2017b). What EFL student teachers think about their professional preparation: Evaluation of an English language teacher education programme in Spain. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *42*(8), 62–76. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2017v42n8.5

Anderson, L., & Krathwohl, D. (2001). *Taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing. A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. Lavoisier.

Braga, M. C. O. (2000). *Humor in the EFL classroom: A sociointeractionist perspective* (Unpublished master's dissertation). Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Brazil.

Caballero, N., & Celaya, M. L. (2022). Code-switching by primary school bilingual EFL learners: A study on the effect of proficiency and modality of interaction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 25*(1), 301–313. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1671309

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *2*(2011), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1

Cipriani, F. de F. (2001). *Oral participation strategies in the foreign language classroom: An ethnographic account* [Master's thesis, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina]. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina Repositório Institucional. http://repositorio.ufsc.br/xmlui/handle/123456789/79579

Council of Europe. (2018). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion volume with new descriptors. European Union.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational setting. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *35*, 20–35. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233

De la Campa, J. C., & Nassaji, H. (2009). The amount, purpose, and reasons for using L1 in L2 classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals*, *42*(4), 742–759.http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2009.01052.x

Del Valle, J. (2000). Monoglossic policies for a heteroglossic culture. Misinterpreted multilingualism in modern Galicia. *Language and Communication*, *20*(2),*105*–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309(99)00021-X

Dooly, M., & Unamuno, V. (2009). Multiple languages in one society: Categorization of language and social cohesion in policy and practice. *Journal of Education Policy*, *24*, 217–236. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930902823039

Dooly, M., & Vallejo, C. (2019). Bringing plurilingualism into teaching practice: a quixotic quest? *International Journal of Bilingual Education*, *23*(1), 81–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1598933

Edstrom, A. (2006). L1 use in the L2 classroom: One teacher's self-evaluation. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *63*(2), 275–292.

Floris, F. D., & Renandya, W. A. (2020). Promoting the value of Non-Native English Speaking Teachers. *PASAA*, *59*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.58837/CHULA.PASAA.59.1.1

Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st Century: A global perspective*. Wiley/Blackwell.

Garcia, O., & Otheguy, R. (2019). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *23*(1),17–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1598932

Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education.* Palgrave Macmillan.

González-Davies, M. (2017). The use of translation in an Integrated Plurilingual Approach to language learning: Teacher strategies and best practices. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching*, *4*(2),124–135. https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2017.1407168

Gurkan, S., & Yuksal, D. (2012). Evaluating the contributions of native and non-native teachers to an English language teaching program. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46*, 2951–2958. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.596

Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, *46*(4), 350–355. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/46.4.350

Hayes, D. (2009). Non-native English-speaking teachers, context and English language teaching. *System*, *37*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.06.001

Heller, M., & McElhinny, B. (2017). *Language, capitalism, colonialism: Toward a critical history.* Toronto University Press. Helot, C., & Cavalli, M. (2017).

Bilingual education in Europe: Dominant languages. In O. Garcia, A. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 471–488). Springer.

Inbar, O. (2010). English only? The linguistic choices of teachers of young EFL learners. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *14*(3), 351–367. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006910367849

Kampittayakul, T. (2018). A Role of translanguaging in improving Thai learners' interactional competence in dyadic English as a foreign language tutorial sessions. *PASAA, 56*, 80–111. https://doi.org/10.58837/CHULA.PASAA.56.1.5

Libben, G. (2000). Representation and processing in the second language lexicon: The homogeneity hypothesis. In J.A. Archibald (Ed.), *Second language grammars* (228-248). Blackwell Press.

Lubliner, S., & Grisham, D. L. (2017). *Translanguaging*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Ludi, G., & Py, B. (2009). To be or not to be… a plurilingual speaker. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *6*, 154–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710902846715

Macaro, E. (2000). Issues in target language teaching. In K. Field (Ed.), *Issues in modern foreign languages teaching* (pp. 171–189). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203005682

Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teacher's code switching in the foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, *85*(4), 531–548. https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00124

Macaro, E. (2005). Code-Switching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers. Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 63–84). Springer.

Mahboob, A., & Golden, R. (2013). Looking for native speakers of English: Discrimination in English language teaching job advertisements. *Voices in Asia Journal*, *1*(1), 72–81.

Martín-Chazeaud, A., & Celaya, M. L. (2020). The role of language for succeeding in tests: An experimental study in secondary schools of rural Senegal. *Journal of Popular Education in Africa, 4*, 202–221.

Ministry of Education. (2024). *Educational Data and Information* [in Thai]. https://www.moe.go.th

Mohebbi, H., & Alavi, S. M. (2014). An investigation into teacher's first language use in a second language learning classroom context: A Questionnaire-based survey. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, *7*(4), 57–73.

Nikoopour, J., & Esfandiari, N. (2017). The Relationship between emotional, social, cultural, spiritual intelligence and EFL teachers' teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 8*(1), 138–148. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0801.17.

Pan, Y.-C., & Pan, Y.-C. (2010). The use of L1 in the foreign language classroom. *Discussions on Theoretical Issues*, *Colombian Applied Linguistics*, *12*(2), 87–96.

Shamash, Y. (1990). Learning in translation: Beyond language experience in ESL. *Voices*, *2*(2), 71–75.

Tatar, S., & Yildz, S. (2010). Empowering nonnative-English speaking teachers in the classroom. In A. Mahboob (Ed.), *The NNEST lens* (pp. 114–128). Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but... *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *57,* 531–540. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.4.531

Wernicke, M. (2018). Plurilingualism as an agentive resource in L2 identity. *System, 79,* 91–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.07.005

Wilson, J., & González-Davies, M. (2017). Tackling the Plurilingual Student/Monolingual Classroom Phenomenon through translation. *TESOL Quarterly*, *51*(1), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.336

8. Appendix: Transcription and Translation of Sample Role Play Tasks

Task 1

Jane

Students with Mixed Levels of English Proficiency

Cohesive Devices Homework Explanation

ค่ะนักเรียน วันนี้เราจะเรียนเรื่อง Cohesive device นะคะ (Hi students! Today we are studying cohesive devices.) Cohesive device คืออะไร (What is a cohesive device?) Hi Cohesive device is words or phrases we use to connect our ideas or connect parts in our texts in writing texts or something like that ก็คือเป็นเหมือนกับเครื่องมือที่เชื่อมโยง (It is like a tool which connects) ที่ใช้ในการเชื่อมโยงข้อความความที่เราจะเขียนให้มันต่อเนื่องกัน (…which connects the message of the texts we write to make them flow) ให้มัน flow กัน ให้มัน connect (…to make them flow…to make them connect.) อย่างเช่นเรามีไอเดียที่หนึ่งที่สอง เราก็ connect กันด้วยตัว device ตัวนี้นะคะ (For example, we have idea 1, idea 2, and we connect them by using this device.) ซึ่ง ถามว่าทำไมเราต้องใช้ (Why do we do this?) เพราะว่าเราต้องการที่จะให้งานเขียนเรามัน สอดคล้องสัมพันธ์กัน (Because we want our writing to be well-connected and coherent.) While we use this devices we use them to connect ideas to make our writing task flow or I mean that its a high cohesion or coherence they are something like that there are two types of cohesive devices that I will present you today ก็มี 2 แบบนะคะนักเรียนขา แบบแรกก็คือ (There are two types, my dear students, this first one is) Grammatical cohesion and the second one is lexical cohesion แบบแรกก็คือ เราจะเป็นลักษณะของเครื่องมือที่ช่วยให้เกิดการเชื่อมโยงข้อความที่เน้นในเรื่องไวยากรณ์ ที่ดูในเรื่องไวยากรณ์ (The first one is…it's like we use a tool to connect texts. We focus on grammar. We pay attention to grammar.) And the second thing แบบที่สองเราจะทำให้งานเขียนของเรามีความสอดคล้องกันในเรื่องของการใช้คำศัพท์ (The second one, we will make our writing coherent in terms of vocabulary usage…by that) Why we use this devices That because we don't need to use the same word in our writing task it's very boring if you use words words and words for all your passage

Task 1

Lucky

Students with High Levels of English Proficiency

Cohesive Devices Homework Explanation

Okay so now cohesive devices could be words or phrases that we use to connect the ideas or the ideas or connect a part of our text to make it flow there are many kinds of many many types of cohesive devices but today I would like to focus on only two main types so for me I divided into two main types the first one is grammatical grammatical cohesion and the second one is lexical cohesion grammatical focus on the grammar I mean to make your grammar flow and lexical can be focus on vocabulary or words that you use to make your writing cohesion

Task 1

Joe

Students with Mixed Levels of English Proficiency

Reported Speech Homework Explanation

Okay everyone please listen again okay okay okay please listen again okay yesterday yesterday my mom worked in the kitchen is okay the kitchen what does it mean kitchen do you know the kitchen kitchen is the place you can cook ทำอะไรก็ได้ (do whatever you want) Okay you can cook okay kitchen what does it mean in Thai ห้องครัว (kitchen) And then she saw a cat a bad cat in the kitchen Okay okay then today I will reveal I will present you what my mother talk to me yesterday okay understand yes or no เดี๋ยวพรุ่งนี้ เดี๋ยววันนี้ (So tomorrow, well today) today ครูจะมาบอกว่าเมื่อวาน (I'm going to tell you what my mother said to me yesterday.) yesterday what my mother talk to me อะไรที่แม่ของพวกเขาพูด (What did their mother say?) My mother told me that she saw a cat in her kitchen the day before okay listen again my mother told me that she saw a cat in her kitchen the day before โอเคครับ มีอะไรแตกต่างไหม (Ok. Is there any difference?) What is different? No no okay who know that what is the meaning มันมีความหมายว่าไงครับซาร่า (What does it mean 'Sarah)Please help your friends ชิเข้าใจไหมครับ (Do you understand?)Understand? No? งั้น ครูก็จะมารายงานเนอะ มา reported speech ของ

another person ของคนอื่นที่พูดไว้นั้นเอง (So, I'm going to tell you the reported speech of another person, or of the person who spoke before.)

Students with High Levels of English Proficiency
Reported Speech Homework Explanation

Okay this is your homework today okay I want you to write three sentences about what your friend to speak to you yesterday three sentences but listen to me the first one the first thing you have to write his or her sentences direct sentences and after that you try to change him or her sentence to your own sentence in direct speech okay understand yes or no but if yesterday you didn't talk to your friend or someone else okay you can use your family sentences from your mother or your father or sister or brother if three sentences okay understand