

Intercultural Communicative Competence in the Global South: A Case Study of Thai Students

Jatuporn Simmali

The English and Foreign Languages University, Hyderabad, India

ORCID: 0009-0001-4290-4396

Muthyala Udaya

The English and Foreign Languages University, Hyderabad, India

ORCID: 0000-0002-2541-4205

Bethala Jyothsna

The English and Foreign Languages University, Hyderabad, India

ORCID: 0009-0003-1203-0565

Chatuporn Nimol

The English and Foreign Languages University, Hyderabad, India

Tsegaye Abie Gebeyehu

The English and Foreign Languages University, Hyderabad, India

ORCID: 0000-0001-8334-1625

ABSTRACT

In increasingly globalized academic environments, intercultural communicative competence (ICC) is crucial for navigating diverse linguistic landscapes and achieving academic success. This qualitative exploratory case study examines the ICC of Thai students in Indian higher education within the framework of World Englishes. Conducted at The English and Foreign Languages University, the study investigates how Thai students negotiate meaning and manage linguistic and cultural challenges in multilingual academic interactions. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with six Thai students and analyzed using systematic coding and thematic analysis guided by established intercultural communication strategy frameworks. The findings indicate that participants prioritized intelligibility and comprehension over grammatical accuracy, employing strategies such as simplification, approximation, paraphrasing, meaning replacement, and form avoidance to sustain conversational flow and minimize breakdowns. The study reveals that intercultural communication in Global South academic contexts relies heavily on adaptability and pragmatic negotiation rather than adherence to native-speaker norms. These insights contribute to discussions on English as a Lingua Franca and offer pedagogical implications for internationalized higher education.

Keywords: communication strategies, English as a lingua franca, intercultural communication, intercultural communicative competence, Thai students, world Englishes

© Author(s), 2026. Published by Star Scholars Press.

This article is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

INTRODUCTION

The increasing internationalization of higher education has transformed English into a global medium of communication among speakers from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Boonsuk et al., 2021; Namsaeng & Ambele, 2024). Within this context, English is no longer confined to native-speaker norms but functions as a flexible communicative resource shaped by multilingual users across different sociocultural settings. Contemporary scholarship in World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) emphasizes that successful communication depends less on grammatical conformity and more on intelligibility, adaptability, and intercultural negotiation (Kachru, 1992; Seidlhofer, 2011). As a result, the growing use of English in multicultural academic environments has generated increasing interest in how international students develop intercultural communicative competence while navigating linguistically diverse interactions.

The concept of Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) highlights an individual's ability to communicate effectively and appropriately across cultural boundaries through cultural awareness, empathy, adaptability, and strategic communication (Byram, 1997a; Pattaraworathum, 2025). In multilingual academic contexts, ICC extends beyond linguistic proficiency and involves the ability to negotiate meaning, manage misunderstandings, and maintain interactional cooperation during intercultural encounters. Consequently, communication strategies such as paraphrasing, simplification, clarification, approximation, and code-switching play a crucial role in enabling learners to sustain communication despite linguistic limitations (Cogo, 2010; Dörnyei & Scott, 1997; Kulsawang & Ambele, 2025).

For Thai learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), participation in international academic environments often presents significant communicative and cultural challenges (Witayarat, 2023). English language education in Thailand has traditionally been influenced by native-speaker-oriented pedagogies that prioritize grammatical accuracy and standardized forms of English (Chanwaiwit & Kantisa, 2022). However, when Thai students enter multicultural universities, they encounter diverse English accents, multilingual speakers, and varied communicative norms that differ considerably from classroom-based English learning experiences (Baker, 2012). Such contexts require students to move beyond rigid notions of correctness and develop flexible communicative practices that facilitate mutual understanding in intercultural interactions (Namfah & Kulsitthiboon, 2025).

This transition is particularly relevant in the context of The English and Foreign Languages University, a multilingual and multicultural academic institution in India that attracts students from various linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Within this environment, English functions primarily as a shared communicative medium among non-native speakers, creating opportunities for the practical realization of World Englishes in everyday academic and social interactions. Thai students studying in such contexts must therefore negotiate meaning across linguistic and cultural boundaries while adapting to unfamiliar communicative practices and interactional expectations.

Situation and Research Gap

Although previous studies have examined intercultural communication and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) in Asian educational settings, limited research has specifically explored how Thai students employ communication strategies to negotiate meaning in Global South academic environments. Recent scholarship has increasingly highlighted the transition from traditional EFL models to ELF paradigms across Asia. For instance, Suoc et al. (2025) examined how ELF is transforming higher education across ASEAN universities, while Tsai (2025) explored Asian university students' evolving perceptions of ELF arising from intercultural communication in a globalized society and Thu et al. (2026) further investigated intercultural dynamics. Building upon this regional context and drawing on survey data from 352 undergraduates across six Vietnamese universities, this research investigates how these strategies influence three foundational dimensions of pedagogical communication competence: building and sustaining interpersonal connections, transmitting cognitive, affective, and behavioral insights, and effectively utilizing linguistic and communicative instruments.

Furthermore, the role of dynamic language practices and ELF in identity construction among international students in English-Medium Instruction (EMI) environments continues to gain critical attention across Asia (Fenilli et al., 2026; Shibata, 2026). Within Thai educational contexts, recent studies have similarly focused heavily on domestic settings. Boonsuk (2025, 2026) investigated how multilingual students negotiate intelligibility and intercultural communication in ASEAN EMI classrooms, expanding upon earlier work that identified specific ELF communication strategies utilized within Thai EMI environments. Additionally, recent investigations into Thai professional and academic sectors reveal a growing reliance on targeted intercultural communication and politeness strategies to overcome language barriers during cross-cultural encounters (Khuanmuang & Wongthai, 2026; Wongnam & Jaroongkhongdach, 2026). Likewise, Kosashunhanan (2025) investigated the intercultural communicative competence of Thai EFL undergraduates at a private university in Bangkok to identify ongoing pedagogical barriers.

While these recent studies demonstrate a growing interest in intercultural awareness, classroom communication, and pedagogical approaches within Thai and wider Asian educational contexts, comparatively little attention has been paid to the lived communicative experiences of Thai students studying abroad, particularly in multilingual Indian higher education settings. Addressing this gap, the present study investigates how Thai students at EFLU utilize intercultural communication strategies to overcome linguistic barriers and sustain effective interaction in multicultural contexts.

Using a qualitative approach, this study examines the communicative practices and adaptive strategies employed by Thai students during intercultural interactions in Indian higher education. By focusing on the intersection of World Englishes, intercultural communicative competence, and multilingual communication practices, the study contributes to ongoing discussions on English as a global language in the Global South and highlights the importance of strategic communicative adaptability in contemporary international education.

Research Questions

1. How do Thai students at The English and Foreign Languages University negotiate meaning in World Englishes contexts?
2. Which specific intercultural communication strategies do Thai students prioritise to overcome linguistic barriers in these interactions

LITERATURE REVIEW

As English expands as a global lingua franca, scholarly focus has shifted from rigid native-speaker norms toward the pluralistic paradigms of World Englishes. Consequently, effective communication in diverse academic settings now relies on Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) and dynamic negotiation strategies rather than grammatical perfection (Smith, 2025). This shift poses a challenge for Thai students transitioning from traditional, accuracy-focused classrooms to highly diverse international environments, particularly because communication skills are a main component of the collaboration skills required for future career professionals, supporting effective interaction with colleagues, international students, and clients (Saienko, 2026). While existing empirical research extensively explores Thai learners' communicative strategies within domestic or broader East Asian contexts (e.g., Boonsuk, 2026; Tsai, 2025), a significant gap remains regarding their experiences in the Global South. Therefore, this study investigates how Thai university students employ intercultural communication strategies to navigate the multilingual landscape of Indian higher education.

World Englishes and English as a Global Language

The global spread of English has significantly transformed the nature and functions of the language across multilingual societies. Traditional perspectives that viewed English primarily through native-speaker norms have increasingly been challenged by the emergence of World Englishes, which recognizes the pluralistic and localized varieties of English used worldwide. Kachru's (1992) influential model highlights the sociolinguistic diversity of English, emphasizing that legitimacy in English usage should not be restricted to Inner Circle varieties alone. Building upon this, the concept of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) prioritizes intelligibility, negotiation of meaning, and communicative effectiveness among speakers from different linguistic backgrounds over strict adherence to grammatical accuracy (Seidlhofer, 2011).

While these foundational texts established the theoretical basis of ELF, recent empirical studies demonstrate its practical application in contemporary education. For example, in a multi-institutional analysis of ASEAN universities, Boonsuk and Fang (2026) found that ELF usage is actively reshaping higher education policies by prioritizing functional communication over standardized testing. Conversely, exploring the learner perspective, Tsai (2025) surveyed Asian university students, revealing that their perceptions of ELF evolve dynamically as they engage in intercultural communication. Both studies highlight that in contemporary higher education, multilingual students are required to negotiate diverse accents and sociocultural expectations, moving beyond native-speaker constraints to achieve mutual understanding (Mauranen, 2012).

Intercultural Communicative Competence

The concept of Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) has become central to discussions of global communication. Byram (1997a) conceptualizes ICC as the ability to communicate effectively across cultural boundaries through a combination of linguistic knowledge, cultural awareness, and critical understanding. In unfamiliar intercultural interactions, learners must manage uncertainty and anxiety, which requires strategic awareness and adaptability (Gudykunst, 2005).

Contemporary empirical research has shifted toward examining how these theoretical competencies are developed in practice. In a qualitative exploration, Channuwong et al. (2025) investigated Thai university students, concluding that intercultural competence is gradually constructed through broader life experiences and multicultural engagement rather than formal education alone. Taking a more targeted pedagogical approach, Liu et al. (2025) conducted a case study on Thai undergraduates enrolled in a specific English for Intercultural Communication course. By comparing these contexts, it becomes evident that while broad life experiences build foundational cultural awareness (Boonmatun & Huttayavilaiphan, 2025),

structured intercultural activities significantly enhance students' immediate appreciation of linguistic diversity and sensitivity to varying communicative practices (Simmali & Huttayavilaiphan, 2025). Together, these findings illustrate that ICC requires active, context-dependent negotiation beyond mere linguistic proficiency.

Communication Strategies in Intercultural Interaction

Communication strategies play a crucial role in enabling multilingual speakers to overcome linguistic limitations. Early foundational taxonomies categorized these practices into achievement strategies (e.g., paraphrasing, approximation) used to actively solve communication problems, and reduction strategies (e.g., topic avoidance) used to minimize linguistic difficulty (Canale & Swain, 1980; Dörnyei & Scott, 1997; Færch & Kasper, 1983; Tarone, 1980).

However, modern empirical research within ELF contexts reframes these strategies from compensatory mechanisms to highly collaborative practices. For instance, observational research by Boonsuk (2026) in ASEAN English-Medium Instruction (EMI) classrooms demonstrated that multilingual students actively utilize translanguaging and explicit clarification as preventative strategies to minimize potential misunderstandings, rather than relying on avoidance. Similarly, Canagarajah (2013) argues that accommodation strategies such as simplification, repetition, and slower speech are essential, proactive tools for negotiating meaning. These studies collectively suggest that flexible communicative practices are prioritized over rigid grammatical accuracy to sustain interaction and express cultural identity in diverse academic settings.

Thai Students and Intercultural Communication

For Thai learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), navigating international environments presents distinct challenges, as domestic education has traditionally favored native-speaker models (Baker, 2012). However, recent empirical investigations reveal an ongoing pedagogical shift within the country. In a longitudinal study of Thai English teachers, Suminto and Ena (2024) observed a progressive departure from rigid native-speaker norms toward recognizing English as a practical international tool. This macro-level shift in educator attitudes aligns with the micro-level student behaviors documented by Khamwan (2023). Through classroom observations, they reported that Thai university students frequently rely on interactional pragmatic strategies, such as clarification and negotiation of meaning, to sustain communication in English-medium environments.

Furthermore, Huttayavilaiphan (2024) investigated secondary ELT stakeholders, finding that exposure to diverse English varieties directly correlates with greater intercultural sensitivity. Yet, despite these positive trends, structural challenges persist. Chittaphone and Huttayavilaiphan (2026) assessed Thai EFL undergraduates at a private university in Bangkok, finding that while students conceptually understand ICC, traditional pedagogical barriers continue to limit their communicative confidence in practice. While these empirical studies provide a robust understanding of Thai learners within their domestic contexts (Baker et al., 2025), they underscore a critical gap: the lack of research on the lived communicative experiences of Thai students navigating the highly diverse, multilingual environments of the Global South, particularly within Indian higher education. Addressing this gap, the present study explores how Thai students in India employ these established communication strategies to successfully navigate complex academic interactions.

THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This study employs a targeted theoretical model to analyze the Intercultural Communication Strategies (ICSs) utilized by Thai students to overcome linguistic, cultural, and social barriers when interacting with international peers. Rather than relying on classical deficit models, this study's analytical lens focuses explicitly on Modern Cooperative Strategies. In contemporary global contexts where English functions as a shared mediating language (English as a Lingua Franca and World Englishes), communication strategies are no longer viewed merely as remedial tools for linguistic errors. Instead, they are recognized as proactive, collaborative practices essential for fostering stronger transnational connections (Shofiya & Basuni, 2023).

Within this framework, the study evaluates strategic competence across three highly collaborative dimensions:

Accommodation and Preventative Strategies

The framework examines how speakers actively moderate their speech such as selecting accessible vocabulary, adjusting pronunciation, or modifying speech rates to ensure mutual comprehension and foster solidarity (Jenkins, 2014; Seidlhofer, 2011). Recent empirical investigations underscore the continued relevance of these tactics; for instance, Albl-Mikasa and Gieshoff (2024) found that in contemporary ELF environments, interlocutors actively intervene and improve linguistic formulations to successfully accommodate their audience. Similarly, the framework accounts for preventative strategies, where speakers preemptively repeat or rephrase points to avoid communication breakdowns, thereby maintaining the fluidity of academic and social discourse (Mauranen, 2012).

Collaborative Meaning Construction and Translanguaging

Furthermore, the framework analyzes how speakers from different cultures collaboratively construct meaning. Multilingual students frequently use flexible tactics, such as code-switching, to show solidarity and embrace their diverse language backgrounds (Cogo, 2010; Kirkpatrick, 2010). In contemporary higher education, this is frequently conceptualized through translanguaging practices. As demonstrated by Ngo (2024), multilingual students leverage their full linguistic repertoires to actively negotiate academic knowledge and create highly inclusive environments.

Socio-pragmatic and Face-Saving Strategies

Beyond mere verbal exchanges, this framework incorporates strategies for managing identity and protecting "face" (preserving dignity and demonstrating mutual respect). These social strategies help maintain relational harmony, show empathy, and demonstrate the genuine cultural awareness needed to be a successful global communicator (Byram, 1997b; Ting-Toomey, 1999). Recent systematic analyses of intercultural communication competence further confirm that managing these sociopragmatic dynamics such as cultural sensitivity and relational harmony remains a critical skill for overcoming systemic friction and achieving mutual understanding in highly diverse settings (Hussain et al., 2025).

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative case study design to explore how Thai students negotiate meaning and manage intercultural communication in multilingual academic contexts. A qualitative approach was considered appropriate because it facilitates an in-depth exploration of individuals' lived experiences, communicative practices, and personal perceptions regarding complex phenomena, such as intercultural interaction in World Englishes contexts (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Furthermore, a case study methodology was specifically selected because it allows for a detailed, contextualized analysis of a specific "bounded system" in this instance, a defined group of Thai students studying at a single institution in India within its real-world setting (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The study focused on understanding how these students employ communication strategies to overcome linguistic and cultural barriers while interacting with peers from diverse international backgrounds. While quantitative methods are useful for identifying broad trends, this qualitative methodology was essential for eliciting highly nuanced personal narratives, despite inherent drawbacks such as being resource-intensive and susceptible to researcher bias (Mwita, 2022).

Research Context

This study was conducted at The English and Foreign Languages University (EFLU), a central university located in Hyderabad, India, which serves a diverse student body of 2,253 individuals and over 100 foreign students across its academic programs, including a community of 6 Thai students. EFLU is uniquely dedicated to the advanced study of English and various foreign languages, making it a highly multicultural academic hub. The institution draws a diverse demographic of international students from across the globe, cultivating a rich, multilingual environment. This setting serves as an ideal context for investigating cross-cultural interactions and the practical application of the World Englishes paradigm, as students routinely negotiate daily discourse with peers from fundamentally different linguistic backgrounds.

Participants

The study utilized a purposive sampling method, selecting six Thai international students who are currently enrolled at EFLU. From the broader population of Thai students attending the university, these six participants were specifically selected based on two key delimiting factors: they had resided in India for at least one full academic year, and they were enrolled in programs requiring regular engagement in multilingual academic settings. These criteria ensured that the participants had accumulated sufficient real-world exposure to the multilingual environment to reflect meaningfully on their communication strategies. As the research aimed to gain a profound understanding of specific, individualized approaches to overcoming language barriers, this focused sample size was intentionally chosen. In qualitative case study research, a smaller, deliberately selected sample allows for a highly in-depth, nuanced exploration of the students' lived experiences and daily interactions with foreign peers on campus, prioritizing deep thematic analysis over broad statistical generalization.

Data Collection and Instrument

The primary method of data collection was qualitative, employing semi-structured interviews and audio recordings. The interview protocol was systematically designed around a comprehensive theoretical framework of 20 established intercultural communication strategies, which were categorized into achievement and reduction strategies adapted from Færch and Kasper (1983) and Tarone (1980),

accommodation strategies adapted from Jenkins (2000) and Seidlhofer (2011), and preventative strategies adapted from Mauranen (2012).

During the semi-structured interviews, participants were asked to reflect on their conversational habits and provide concrete, experiential accounts of how they negotiate meaning when faced with linguistic barriers. To ensure data integrity and capture the exact nuances of these reflections, all interview sessions were audio-recorded with the participants' prior consent for subsequent verbatim transcription. This interview format ensured that the core 20 communication strategies such as Simplification, Approximation, Meaning Replacement, Paraphrasing, and Form Avoidance were systematically explored while allowing the students the flexibility to elaborate on their distinct communicative objectives. This approach effectively captured how the participants dynamically adapt their vocabulary and sentence structures to prioritize listener comprehension and conversational flow over lexical and grammatical perfection.

Data Analysis

To process the data collected from the semi-structured interviews, this study employed systematic coding and thematic analysis (Aspers & Corte, 2019; Creswell & Creswell, 2018). First, all audio recordings of the interviews were transcribed verbatim to ensure the accuracy and authenticity of the participants' narratives. The transcripts were then read repeatedly to achieve deep familiarization with the data. Following this, the textual data were systematically coded using a deductive approach, guided by the study's conceptual framework of 20 established intercultural communication strategies (encompassing achievement, reduction, accommodation, and preventative strategies). Textual segments where participants described their methods for overcoming linguistic or cultural barriers were highlighted and categorized into these specific strategy types. This thematic analysis allowed for the identification of clear patterns regarding which specific adaptive tactics the Thai students prioritized to maintain conversational flow and mutual intelligibility in diverse academic contexts.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations were carefully observed throughout the study. Prior to data collection, the research protocol was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee at The English and Foreign Languages University (EFLU), Hyderabad. Participation was strictly voluntary, and all participants were fully informed about the purpose of the research before the interviews were conducted. Written informed consent was obtained from each participant. Participants were assured that their identities would remain confidential and that the information provided would be used solely for academic purposes. To maintain anonymity, pseudonyms were used during data analysis and reporting. Furthermore, participants were explicitly informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any stage without penalty or negative consequences.

Trustworthiness of the Study

To establish the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), the researcher maintained careful documentation of the interview and analysis process, creating a reliable audit trail of the methodological decisions (Tisdell et al., 2025). The use of semi-structured interviews allowed participants to provide detailed and authentic accounts of their experiences, generating the "thick description" necessary for qualitative validity (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Repeated reading and systematic coding of the data helped ensure consistency in theme identification and analytical interpretation (Ahmed et al., 2025). Furthermore, the findings were actively interpreted in relation to established theoretical

frameworks and previous studies in intercultural communication and World Englishes research. This process of theoretical triangulation further corroborates the data and strengthens the overall validity of the study's conclusions (Yin, 2018).

RESULTS

The interview data revealed that Thai students effectively employ a comprehensive repertoire of verbal, interactive, and non-verbal communication strategies encompassing achievement, education, and accommodation tactics to successfully navigate linguistic barriers during interaction with international peers at EFLU. The most frequently identified techniques involved modifying lexical choices and syntactic structures to prioritize listener comprehension.

Specifically, the findings provided concrete examples of these methods in action, linking directly to established 20 communication strategies.

Table 1

Analysis of Intercultural Communication Strategies Among Six Students

Participant	Strategy Type	Communication Strategies Used	Evidence from Interview	Functional Purpose / Communication Outcome
Student 1	Accommodation Strategy	Simplification (#14)	"When I talk, I change hard or complicated words into simple ones. Instead of giving up or stopping the conversation when I don't know a high-level word, I just find a basic way to say it."	The student prioritizes intelligibility by simplifying vocabulary for international listeners. This strategy reduces misunderstanding and ensures that the main idea is communicated clearly despite lexical limitations.
Student 2	Mixed Strategy (Achievement, Reduction)	Approximation (#2) Meaning Replacement (#8)	"If I cannot remember the exact academic word, I don't stop talking. I just quickly find an easier alternative that has a similar meaning so my international friends can still understand my point."	These strategies help maintain conversational flow, minimize hesitation, and prevent awkward pauses. They also support faster listener comprehension and smoother intercultural interaction.
Student 3	Mixed Strategy (Achievement, Reduction & Accommodation)	Approximation (#2) Form Avoidance (#10) Paraphrasing / Rephrasing (#12)	"I realized that using long, complex grammar makes it harder to follow. Now, I just break my ideas down into short, direct sentences and use simpler expressions to make sure my core message is clear."	By reducing linguistic complexity, the student enhances clarity and avoids communication breakdowns. The listener is able to understand the core message without becoming confused by grammar or lengthy explanations.
Student 4	Preventative Strategy	Comprehension Checks (#19) Metadiscourse Signposting (#20)	"To prevent confusion, I organize my speech using transition markers like 'First' or 'Next.' Then, I intentionally pause and ask them, 'Does that make sense so far?' before I move on to the next topic."	These strategies proactively monitor listener understanding and structure the interaction clearly. They help prevent misunderstandings before they escalate into communication difficulties.
Student 5	Mixed Strategy (Achievement & Accommodation)	Borrowing / Code-Switching (#5) Self-Repair (#15)	"Sometimes I slip in a Thai word because it expresses my exact emotion better than English. But when I make an English grammar mistake right after, I make sure to catch it and correct myself aloud."	The student balances cultural identity with communicative clarity. Code-switching preserves emotional authenticity, while self-repair ensures that linguistic inaccuracies do not obstruct understanding.
Student 6	Mixed Strategy (Reduction & Preventative)	Meaning Replacement (#8) Self-Paraphrasing (#18)	"When I explain our cultural traditions, I start with a very broad, simple concept. Then, I repeat the explanation again using different, easy-to-understand expressions just to make absolutely sure they get the picture."	These strategies compensate for limited specialized vocabulary while ensuring listener comprehension. Repetition and paraphrasing strengthen intercultural understanding of culturally specific concepts.

The thematic analysis of the interview data revealed several core commonalities in how the participants operationalize intercultural communication strategies to overcome language barriers. Rather than relying on a single approach, the findings indicate that students flexibly combine tactics across four distinct thematic areas.

Theme 1: Lexical Simplification to Sustain Conversational Flow

A primary theme that emerged from the data was the intentional use of vocabulary adjustments to maintain conversational momentum. Several participants prioritized the successful delivery of their general message over strict lexical precision, thereby reducing the cognitive load on the foreign listener. For example, Student 1 relied heavily on Simplification, purposefully downgrading complex terminology into basic vocabulary. As Student 1 explained, "When I talk, I change hard or complicated words into simple ones. Instead of giving up or stopping the conversation when I don't know a high-level word, I just find a basic way to say it." Similarly, Student 2 utilized Approximation and Meaning Replacement to substitute difficult terms with more accessible synonyms, noting: "If I cannot remember the exact academic word, I don't stop talking. I just quickly find an easier alternative that has a similar meaning so my international friends can still understand my point." This shared tactical approach is crucial for conversational pacing; it prevents extended silences and maintains a natural flow without confusing the interlocutor.

Theme 2: Syntactic and Structural Adaptation

Beyond vocabulary, the analysis revealed a shared awareness among participants that complex grammatical structures can impede cross-cultural understanding just as easily as advanced vocabulary. To address this, participants demonstrated a common strategy of structural modification. Student 3, for instance, actively deconstructed long, convoluted sentences into short, direct statements by combining Approximation with Form Avoidance and Paraphrasing/Rephrasing. Highlighting this deliberate effort, Student 3 stated: "I realized that using long, complex grammar makes it harder to follow. Now, I just break my ideas down into short, direct sentences and use simpler expressions to make sure my core message is clear." This commonality highlights a deliberate effort to ensure the core message is transmitted rapidly and unambiguously.

Theme 3: Proactive and Preventative Communication

Another significant theme was the shift from reactive language repair to proactive communication management. Rather than simply reacting to language gaps as they occurred, participants utilized strategies designed to prevent misunderstandings altogether. Student 4 exemplified this by using Metadiscourse Signposting to structure their thoughts, paired with frequent Comprehension Checks. Describing this preventative mindset, Student 4 shared: "To prevent confusion, I organize my speech using transition markers like 'First' or 'Next.' Then, I intentionally pause and ask them, 'Does that make sense so far?' before I move on to the next topic." Student 6 applied a similar preventative approach when discussing complex cultural traditions, using Meaning Replacement to introduce a broad concept, immediately followed by Self-Paraphrasing to explain the idea a second time using simpler terminology: "When I explain our cultural traditions, I start with a very broad, simple concept. Then, I repeat the explanation again using different, easy-to-understand expressions just to make absolutely sure they get the picture."

Theme 4: Balancing Cultural Identity with Linguistic Accuracy

Finally, the data highlighted a theme regarding the delicate negotiation between maintaining cultural identity and ensuring linguistic clarity. Participants demonstrated specific strategies to insert their

native identity into the discourse without derailing the English conversation. Student 5 showcased this by employing Borrowing/Code-Switching, intentionally inserting native Thai words to convey distinct cultural nuances or emotions. To ensure this did not disrupt mutual intelligibility, the participant actively paired this with Self-Repair, catching and correcting their own grammatical mistakes aloud. Articulating this balance, Student 5 explained: "Sometimes I slip in a Thai word because it expresses my exact emotion better than English. But when I make an English grammar mistake right after, I make sure to catch it and correct myself aloud." This preserves the accuracy of the surrounding English framework while protecting cultural expression.

Conclusion of Findings

Overall, the thematic analysis demonstrates that these students do not rely on isolated or static methods to communicate. Instead, a strong commonality exists in how they flexibly combine strategies modifying their vocabulary, simplifying their syntax, actively structuring their dialogue, and proactively checking for understanding. These shared practices illustrate a collective prioritization of listener comprehension and mutual intelligibility over strict linguistic perfection within World Englishes contexts. Ultimately, this study challenges the traditional view of non-native linguistic deviations as mere "deficits." Instead, it reframes these behaviors as sophisticated accommodation moves demonstrating that Thai students in India actively and intelligently negotiate meaning to achieve intercultural harmony.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Connecting Findings with Previous and Current Research: The findings of this study reveal that Thai students at EFLU prioritize mutual intelligibility and conversational flow over grammatical and lexical perfection. As Student 2 emphasized regarding their interactions, "If I cannot remember the exact academic word, I don't stop talking. I just quickly find an easier alternative... so my international friends can still understand my point." This strongly aligns with the foundational research of Jenkins (2000) and Seidlhofer (2011) on English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) but is more robustly supported by recent scholarship on Global Englishes in Asian higher education. For example, Boonsuk et al. (2021) and Albl-Mikasa and Gieshoff (2024) argue that successful cross-cultural communication in modern, super-diverse academic settings relies inherently on pragmatic adaptability rather than strict adherence to native-speaker norms. The participants' willingness to adjust their speech to suit their interlocutors also reflects Rose and McKinley's (2025) recent assertions that ELF environments are driven by cooperative, mutual meaning-making rather than linguistic correction.

Similarities to Classical and Contemporary Frameworks: The lexical and structural adaptations observed in Students 1, 2, and 3 (Simplification, Approximation, Meaning Replacement, and Form Avoidance) strongly corroborate the classic taxonomies of communication strategies developed by Færch and Kasper (1983) and Tarone (1980). Like the subjects in those early studies, the Thai students actively modify their linguistic output to bypass knowledge gaps and prevent communication breakdowns. However, they also demonstrate highly advanced, proactive discourse management. The preventative strategies used by Students 4 and 6 (Metadiscoursal Signposting and Comprehension Checks) mirror not only Mauranen's (2012) early findings but also recent research in intercultural pragmatics. Grounding this in the data, Student 4 explicitly noted, "To prevent confusion, I organize my speech using transition markers like 'First' or 'Next.' Then, I intentionally pause and ask them, 'Does that make sense so far?'" As Walkinshaw (2023) demonstrates, proficient speakers in diverse settings anticipate potential linguistic hurdles and employ preemptive clarification tactics to prevent misunderstandings before they occur.

Differences and New Perspectives: Where this study diverges from traditional Second Language Acquisition (SLA) literature is in its framing. Historically, strategies like "Simplification" or "Form Avoidance" have been categorized as "deficit" or "reduction" strategies workarounds used when a learner

lacks proficiency (Roberts, 2015). However, this study demonstrates that in a World Englishes context, these are actually highly competent accommodation strategies. For instance, Student 5's use of Borrowing/Code-Switching paired with Self-Repair illustrates a sophisticated, conscious choice to negotiate cultural identity without sacrificing clarity. As Student 5 articulated, "Sometimes I slip in a Thai word because it expresses my exact emotion better than English. But when I make an English grammar mistake right after, I make sure to catch it and correct myself aloud." This aligns directly with the latest advancements in translanguaging theories (Özkaynak, 2023; Yang, 2025). It shows that students are not failing to find the "correct" English word; rather, they are creatively and purposefully using their full linguistic repertoires to express complex cultural identities while maintaining mutual intelligibility in an international context.

Conclusion

In addressing how Thai students at EFLU negotiate meaning in World Englishes contexts, the findings demonstrate that they actively prioritize clear communication and listener comprehension over grammatical and lexical perfection. To overcome linguistic barriers in these diverse interactions, the students primarily rely on a targeted, flexible mix of achievement, reduction, accommodation, and preventative tactics. By intentionally substituting complex vocabulary with familiar alternatives, breaking down convoluted sentences into brief, direct statements, and proactively checking for understanding, the students successfully maintain a natural conversational flow. Ultimately, this research highlights a paradigm shift: adaptable communication strategies rather than flawless linguistic accuracy are the vital tools that allow students to confidently and effectively engage with international peers in highly multicultural environments. Furthermore, by centering the lived communicative experiences of Thai learners in India, this study offers a meaningful contribution to the ongoing conversation regarding linguistic negotiation and World Englishes within Global South higher education.

Research outcome

The research demonstrates that Thai students at The English and Foreign Languages University (EFLU), India successfully navigate diverse World Englishes contexts by prioritizing listener comprehension over lexical and grammatical perfection, utilizing adaptive tactics like Simplification, Approximation, Meaning Replacement, and Paraphrasing to maintain a smooth conversational flow. For future Thai students aspiring to study at EFLU, the primary benefit of these findings is the reassuring evidence that flawless English is not a strict prerequisite for social and academic integration; rather, by consciously adopting these practical communication strategies to bypass complex vocabulary and break down convoluted sentences, prospective students can confidently overcome language barriers, reduce their communication anxiety, and engage effectively with international peers in a highly multicultural environment.

Limitations of the Study

While this research provides valuable insights into the linguistic adaptation of Thai students, it is subject to certain limitations. The primary limitation is the extremely small sample size, as the study relies on data collected from only six participants. Furthermore, the research scope is restricted to a single academic environment. The English and Foreign Languages University (EFLU). Because the findings are based on the experiences of a very small group of individuals within one specific institutional context, the results may not be fully representative of the broader Thai student population. Consequently, this limits the generalizability of the findings to other educational settings or larger demographics.

IMPLICATIONS

To build upon the foundational insights of this study, it is highly recommended that future research expands both the sample size and the geographic scope of the investigation. Subsequent studies should include a significantly larger number of Thai international participants to ensure a more comprehensive and statistically robust understanding of their communication strategies. Additionally, to determine if these findings are applicable on a wider scale, future research should extend beyond a single campus by incorporating students from various universities across the city (Hyderabad) or throughout the entirety of India. Investigating this topic across different academic and regional contexts will help clarify whether these specific communication tactics are universal among Thai students abroad or influenced by their specific environment.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). The publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. K., Mohammed, R. A., Nashwan, A. J., Ibrahim, R. H., Abdalla, A. Q., Ameen, B. M. M., & Khdir, R. M. (2025). Using thematic analysis in qualitative research. *Journal of Medicine, Surgery, and Public Health*, 6, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glmedi.2025.100198>
- Albl-Mikasa, M., Ehrensberger-Dow, M., Gieshoff, A. C., & Hunziker Heeb, A. (2024). English as a lingua franca in interpreting and translation: A survey of practitioners. *Frontiers in Communication*, 9, 1413110. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1413110>
- Aspers, P., & Corte, U. (2019). What is qualitative in qualitative research. *Qualitative Sociology*, 42(2), 139–160. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-019-9413-7>
- Baker, W. (2012). English as a lingua franca in Thailand: Characterisations and implications. *Englishes in Practice*, 1(1), 18–27. <https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/395235/>
- Baker, W., Boonsuk, Y., Ra, J. J., Sangiamchit, C., & Snodin, N. (2025). Thai study abroad students as intercultural citizens: Developing intercultural citizenship through English medium education and ELT. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 45(1), 194–209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2022.2096569>
- Boonmatun, S., & Huttayavilaiphan, R. (2025). Intercultural communication in the temple: Challenges and strategies for Thai monks using English to share Buddhist teachings. *World Journal of English Language*, 15(5), 141–154. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n5p141>
- Boonsuk, Y. (2025). “Oh, this person speaks English in this way; they ‘must be Thai’ or they ‘must be Chinese’”: Developing global Englishes awareness among Thai secondary ELT stakeholders. *System*, 133, 103733. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103733>
- Boonsuk, Y. (2025). “Sorry, again again...”: ASEAN ELF communication strategies in multilingual Thai EMI classrooms. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 36(1), 593–607. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12796>
- Boonsuk, Y. (2026). When EFL meets ELF: Negotiating intelligibility and intercultural communication in ASEAN EMI classrooms. *Language Awareness*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2026.2626503>
- Boonsuk, Y., & Fang, F. (2026). IELTS through test takers' eyes: Insights into academic impact and Global Englishes integration. *ITL - International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.25003.boo>

- Boonsuk, Y., Ambele, E. A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Developing awareness of Global Englishes: Moving away from 'native standards' for Thai university ELT. *System*, 99, 102511. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102511>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE Publications.
- Byram, M. (1997a). Cultural awareness as vocabulary learning. *Language Learning Journal*, 16(1), 51–57.
- Byram, M. (1997b). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Multilingual Matters.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203073889>
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>
- Channuwong, S., Weerachareonchai, P., Wang, X., Naude, A., & Kanchanasomsak, R. (2025). Teacher origin and the development of English proficiency and cross-cultural competence to improve quality education of Thai university students: A phenomenological inquiry. *Scientific Culture*, 11(4).
- Chanwaiwit, P., & Kantisa, P. (2022). Thai teachers' attitudes towards English as a lingua franca: A longitudinal study. *ELT Echo: The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Context*, 7(2), 119–133.
- Chittaphone, V., & Huttayavilaiphan, R. (2026). An Investigation of Barriers and Strategies in English-Speaking Skills for Buddhist Monks during Chatting Activities with Foreigners. *Journal of Social Science Panyapat*, 8(1), 263-282.
- Cogo, A. (2010). Strategic use and perceptions of English as a lingua franca. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 46(3), 295–312. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10010-010-0013-7>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(3), 124–130. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903_2
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dao Thi Thu, T., Vu Thuy, H., Nguyen Thi Thu, T., & Tran Thi, Y. (2026). Evaluating the impact of emotional regulation on the pedagogical communication skills of students in educational training universities: Evidence from quantitative analysis. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education*, 15(5), 97-124. <https://doi.org/10.32674/ryrzw39>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47(1), 173–210. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.51997005>
- Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1983). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. Longman.
- Fenilli, L., Pok Ting, S. S., Suzuki, A., & Cogo, A. (2026). Chapter I. English language: 12. English as a lingua franca. *The Year's Work in English Studies*, maaf105. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ywes/maaf105>
- Gudykunst, W. B. (2005). *Theorizing about intercultural communication*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.34044/j.kjss.2026.47.2.15>
- Hussain, S., Nshom, E., & Lin, J. (2025). Intercultural communication competence from 2000 to 2024: A systematic review. *Review of Communication*, 25(4), 229–249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15358593.2025.2555009>
- Huttayavilaiphan, R. (2024). Embracing global voices: An exploration of Thai teachers' attitudes and practices on culturally diverse ELT materials in a northern Thai university. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 24(3), 11–23. <https://doi.org/10.36923/jicc.v24i3.813>
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.

- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. Routledge.
- Kachru, B. B. (Ed.). (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.). University of Illinois Press.
- Khamwan, T. (2023). Developing communication strategies instruction used in an English as a lingua franca academic context. *English Language Teaching*, 16(2), 141-152. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v16n2p141>
- Khuanmuang, C., & Wongthai, N. (2026). Politeness strategies and speech acts used when handling problems during intercultural encounters: A case study of Thai cruise embarkation officers. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 47(2), 470215-470217.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (Ed.). (2010a). *The Routledge handbook of world Englishes*. Routledge.
- Kosashunhanan, K. (2025). Investigating intercultural communicative competence of Thai EFL undergraduates: Implications for pedagogies. *Social Sciences Research and Academic Journal*, 20(2), 27–42. <https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/JSSRA/article/view/276702>
- Kulsawang, P., & Ambele, E. A. (2025). Interactional pragmatic strategies in a Thai university English language classroom. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 14(3), 236–253. <https://ideas.repec.org/a/asi/ijells/v14y2025i3p236-253id5544.html>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Liu, Y., Nguyen, N. D. D., Nguyen, H. C., & Wannaruk, A. (2025). Rhetorical move structures and politeness strategies employed in request and refusal emails by international students in a Thai ELF context. *Cogent Education*, 12(1), 2466284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2025.2466284>
- Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mwita, K. (2022). Strengths and weaknesses of qualitative research in social science studies. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 11(6), 618–625.
- Namfah, N., & Kulsitthiboon, S. (2025). Promoting intercultural awareness among Thai EFL tertiary students through inquiry-based learning and digital platforms in a virtual classroom. *THAITESOL Journal*, 38(1), 62–84. <https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/thaitesoljournal/article/view/276184>
- Namsaeng, P., & Ambele, E. A. (2024). Integrating intercultural competence into the curriculum: A catalyst for critical thinking in Thai tertiary education. *THAITESOL Journal*, 37(2), 74–95. <https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/thaitesoljournal/article/view/268999>
- Ngo, P. L. H. (2024). EMI programmes in Vietnamese higher education: A case study of translanguaging practices for inclusive education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 13(1), 163–184. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2024-2008>
- Özkaynak, O. (2023). Translanguaging in applied linguistics: A comprehensive systematic review. *L2 Journal*, 15(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L2.2460>
- Pattaraworathum, N. (2025). Investigating intercultural awareness development and attitudes towards intercultural activities in an English for intercultural communication course: A case study of Thai university students. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 18(2), 430–455. <https://doi.org/10.70730/GLIW9414>
- Roberts, G. (2015). *A study of the English language learning challenges that inhibit displaced medical professionals from returning to practice in the UK* [Doctoral dissertation, Cardiff Metropolitan University]. <https://doi.org/10.25401/cardiffmet.11744085.v1>
- Rose, H., & McKinley, J. (2025). Global Englishes and TESOL: An editorial introduction to innovating research and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 59(1), 5–23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3373>
- Saienko, N., & Bogdan, Z. (2026). Enhancing Engineering Students' Flexible Communication Skills through Digital Learning Environments to Support International Cooperation. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education*, 15(3), 243-262. <https://doi.org/10.32674/qt05q533>

- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford University Press.
- Shibata, M. (2026). Japanese in an EMI environment: Language practices and identity construction among Chinese international students in Japan. *Frontiers in Education*, 11, 1712009. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2026.1712009>
- Shofiya, A., & Basuni, M. (2023). Communication strategies performed in an English as lingua franca context and their contributions toward students' engagement. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 1–12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v8i2.1439>
- Simmali, J., & Huttayavilaiphan, R. (2025). Intercultural communication barriers and strategies of Thai Buddhist monks with foreigners at an international Buddhist center in Thailand. *Journal of Social Science Panyapat*, 7(1), 223–240.
- Smith, O. (2025). Cultural contexts in English language teaching: Balancing global standards with local relevance. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 30(10), 16–28. DOI: 10.9790/0837-3010021628
- Suminto, E. A., & Ena, O. T. (2024). The use of English as a lingua franca in teaching Thai students: The perspectives from Indonesian teachers. *Premise: Journal of English Education*, 13, 725. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v13i3.8880>
- Suoc, M. F., Lastino, J., Lukingan, J., Baraoil, M. R., & Pelila, J. R. (2025). How is English as a lingua franca (ELF) transforming education in ASEAN universities? *Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.56916/jmrd.v2i1.1024>
- Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning*, 30(2), 417–431. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1980.tb00326.x>
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across cultures*. Guilford Press.
- Tisdell, E. J., Merriam, S. B., & Stuckey-Peyrot, H. L. (2025). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Tsai, Y. (2025). Asian students' perceptions of English as a lingua franca arising from intercultural communication in the global society. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 14(4), 12–20. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v14n4p12>
- Walkinshaw, I. (2023). Pragmatic strategies in English as a lingua franca: Preventative and reactive approaches to mutual understanding. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 12(1), 45–68. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2023-2003>
- Witayarat, N. (2023). Where multicultural worldviews begin: Development of Thai university students' intercultural competence through their life experiences and formal education. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 44(1), 187–198. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/kjss/article/view/264464>
- Wongnam, P., & Jaroongkhongdach, W. (2026). Intercultural communication challenges and strategies for the Thai undergraduate hotel interns. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 68.
- Yang, S. (2025). Identity, investment, and poetic autoethnography: Becoming an agentive TESOL professional through critical translanguaging. *International Journal of TESOL Studies*, 250713, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.58304/ijts.250713>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications* (Vol. 6). SAGE Publications.
-

Jatuporn Simmali is a PhD researcher at The English and Foreign Languages (EFL) University. He holds a Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) and a Master of Arts (M.A.) in English from top-tier universities in Thailand. An active scholar with over six publications in reputable national and international peer-reviewed journals, his academic and research focus centers on World Englishes and Intercultural Communicative Competence. Through his work, he aims to develop and enhance the practical communication strategies of Thai EFL learners, preparing them to navigate linguistic diversity and foster meaningful intercultural connections in an increasingly changing global world. Email: jatupornphdele25@efluniversity.ac.in

Dr. Muthyala Udaya is an Associate Professor and Head of the Department of ESL Studies at The English and Foreign Languages University (EFLU), Hyderabad. She holds a Ph.D. in English Language Education and brings over sixteen years of dedicated university-level teaching, research, and administrative experience. Her primary research and academic focus centers on multilingual second language acquisition, corpus linguistics, digital pedagogy, and inclusive teacher education. A published scholar and global conference presenter, she has successfully supervised numerous doctoral and master's dissertations while actively contributing to international research projects like ICNALE. Email: udaya@efluniversity.ac.in

Bethala Jyothsna is a PhD Research Scholar in the Department of English Language Education (ELE) at The English and Foreign Languages University (EFLU), Hyderabad. Drawing on her hands-on classroom experience as a Teaching Assistant, her research and academic focus centers on English Language Teaching (ELT), digital pedagogy, and the integration of Artificial Intelligence in language learning. An active emerging scholar with publications in reputable national and international peer-reviewed journals, she has presented her work at global forums, including the Vietnam TESOL conference. Through her research, she aims to develop technology-mediated pedagogical frameworks and foster learner agency, preparing language educators and students to navigate digital transformations in language education. Email: jyothsnaphdele24@efluniversity.ac.in

Chatuporn Nimol, currently pursuing a Master of Arts (M.A.) in English (TESL) at The English and Foreign Languages University (EFLU), India. I hold a Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) in English Language Teaching from Mahamakut Buddhist University, Thailand. My academic interests include intercultural communication in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts and the development of English language skills among EFL learners. I am particularly interested in conducting research on intercultural communication and language skill development to enhance English language learning and teaching in EFL settings.

Tsegaye Abie Gebeyehu is an Assistant Professor in English Literature at Wachemo University, Hosaena, Ethiopia. He received his BA from Wollo University in 2011 and his MA in English literature from Bahir Dar University in 2013. He published several scholarly articles on oral literature, literature in the language classroom, and literary techniques. He is now a PhD scholar in English Literature at the English and Foreign Languages University, Hyderabad, India. His research areas include literary theory and criticism, literary trauma studies, memory studies, literature, violence and torture, eco-criticism, gender studies, etc. Email: tsegayeabiephd2023@efluniversity.ac.in

Appendix

Table 2
Achievement Strategies

Strategy / กลยุทธ์	Definition / คำจำกัดความของการสื่อสาร	Example / ตัวอย่าง
1. Circumlocution (Paraphrasing) การอธิบายความ หรือ การถอดความ	EN: Describing the characteristics, function, or appearance of an object or concept when you do not know the exact word. TH: การอธิบายลักษณะ หน้าที่ หรือรูปร่างของสิ่งของหรือแนวคิดนั้นๆ แทน เมื่อคุณนึกคำศัพท์ที่ถูกต้องไม่ออก	EN: Saying "the tool you use to open a bottle of wine" instead of saying the word <i>"corkscrew"</i> **. TH: พูดว่า "เครื่องมือที่เอาไว้ใช้เปิดขวดไวน์" แทนการใช้คำว่า "ที่เปิดจุกคออร์ก (Corkscrew)"
2.Approximation การใช้คำที่มีความหมายใกล้เคียง	EN: Using an alternative word that shares the same general category or meaning as the target word to get the point across. TH: การใช้คำอื่นที่อยู่ในหมวดหมู่เดียวกัน หรือมีความหมายใกล้เคียงกับคำที่ต้องการจะสื่อมากที่สุด	EN: Saying "ship" instead of "sailboat" or saying "flower" instead of <i>"orchid"</i> **. TH: ใช้คำกว้างๆ อย่าง "เรือ" แทนคำว่า "เรือใบ" หรือพูดว่า "ดอกไม้" แทนที่จะเจาะจงว่าเป็น "ดอกกล้วยไม้"
3.Word Coinage การสร้างคำศัพท์ใหม่	EN: Creating a new, non-existent word on the spot by putting together familiar words in hopes the listener understands the logic. TH: การสร้างคำศัพท์ใหม่ขึ้นมาเองแบบสดๆ โดยนำคำที่คุ้นเคยมาผสมกันโดยหวังว่าผู้ฟังจะเข้าใจครคระหรือความหมายนั้น	EN: Saying "air-ball" because you forgot the word "balloon", or "picture-place" for <i>"art gallery"</i> **. TH: พูดว่า "ลูกบอลอากาศ" เพราะลืมคำว่า "ลูกโป่ง" หรือเรียก "หอศิลป์" ว่า "สถานที่เก็บรูปภาพ"
4. Non-linguistic Means (Mime/Gestures) การใช้ภาษากายและท่าทาง	EN: Using physical gestures, facial expressions, pointing, or imitating sounds to replace the missing words. TH: การใช้ท่าทาง สีหน้า การชี้ หรือการเลียนเสียงต่างๆ เพื่อสื่อความหมายแทนคำพูดที่หายไป	EN: Clapping your hands and pointing to the sky while making a "boom" sound to describe <i>"fireworks"</i> **. TH: การทำท่าตบมือ ชี้ไปบนฟ้า และทำเสียงระเบิด "ตูม" เพื่อพยายามสื่อสารถึงคำว่า "พลุ"
5. Borrowing / Code-Switching การยืมคำ หรือ การสลับภาษา	EN: Using a word from your native language (or another language) right in the middle of a sentence, hoping the listener might know it or figure it out from context. TH: การดึงเอาคำจากภาษาแม่ (หรือภาษาอื่น) มาพูดทับศัพท์กลางประโยค โดยหวังว่าผู้ฟังจะรู้จักคำนั้นหรือเขาได้จากบทบริบท	EN: A tourist in Japan asking, "Where can I buy a bento?" instead of trying to translate it to "lunchbox". TH: คนไทยที่คุยกับชาวต่างชาติแล้วพูดว่า "I want to eat Som Tum" แทนที่จะพยายามแปลว่า "Papaya Salad"

Note. EN = English; TH = Thai. The strategic concepts and definitions presented in this table are synthesised and adapted from Færch & Kasper (1983) and Tarone (1980).

Table 3
Reduction Strategies

Strategy / กลยุทธ์	Definition / คำจำกัดความของการสื่อสาร	Example / ตัวอย่าง
1. Topic Avoidance การหลีกเลี่ยงหัวข้อ	EN: Bypassing or refusing to talk about a specific concept because you know you do not have the vocabulary or linguistic structures to discuss it. TH: การหลบเลี่ยงหรือไม่ยอมพูดถึงหัวข้อใดหัวข้อหนึ่งไปเลยเพราะรู้ว่าไม่มีคำศัพท์หรือโครงสร้างทางภาษาที่เพียงพอจะใช้คุยเรื่องนั้น	EN: Changing the subject when asked about your political views because the vocabulary is too advanced. TH: รีบเปลี่ยนเรื่องคุยทันทีเมื่อมีคนถามถึงมุมมองทางการเมือง เพราะคำศัพท์ในหัวข้อนี้ยากเกินไป
2. Message Abandonment การละทิ้งข้อความกลางคัน	EN: Starting to express an idea but stopping mid-sentence and giving up because it becomes too difficult to continue or finish. TH: เริ่มพูดหรืออธิบายไอเดียไปแล้วแต่หยุดระงับกลางประโยคและยอมแพ้เพราะรู้สึกว่ายากเกินกว่าจะอธิบายต่อไปอีก	EN: Saying, "I was trying to fix my computer by... uh... never mind, I'll just take it to the shop." TH: พูดว่า "ฉันพยายามจะซ่อมคอมพิวเตอร์ด้วยการ... เอ่อ... ช่างมันเถอะ เคียวฉันเอาไปที่ร้านเอง"

Strategy / กลยุทธ์	Definition / คำจำกัดความของการสื่อสาร	Example / ตัวอย่าง
3. Meaning Replacement การเปลี่ยนความหมาย	EN: Substituting your original, complex thought with a much simpler one to make it easier to say, even if it changes your exact intended meaning. TH: การนำไอเดียที่เรียบง่ายกว่ามาแทนความคิดเดิมที่ซับซ้อนเพื่อให้สื่อสารออกไปได้ แม้ว่าจะทำให้ความหมายที่แท้จริงผิดเพี้ยนไปจากเดิมก็ตาม	EN: You want to say "I am feeling extremely overwhelmed with my workload," but you settle for saying, "I am tired." TH: ตั้งใจจะบอกว่า "ฉันรู้สึกแบกรับภาระงานหนักมากจนแทบไม่ไหว" แต่เพื่อความง่ายเลยพูดไปคำว่า "ฉันเหนื่อย"
4. Message Reduction การลดทอนรายละเอียดข้อความ	EN: Expressing the main idea but intentionally leaving out details, nuances, or specific facts to avoid making linguistic errors. TH: การพูดสื่อสารแต่ใจความสำคัญแต่จงใจตัดรายละเอียดเกร็ดเล็กเกร็ดน้อย หรือข้อเท็จจริงเฉพาะเจาะจงออกไปเพื่อป้องกันการพูดผิด	EN: Giving a generic one-sentence summary of your weekend trip instead of telling the detailed, funny story you originally wanted to share. TH: เล่าสรุปทริปเที่ยวสุดสัปดาห์แบบสั้นๆแค่ประโยคเดียวแทนที่จะเล่าเรื่องตลกและรายละเอียดสนุกๆ ตามที่ตั้งใจไว้แต่แรก
5. Form Avoidance การหลีกเลี่ยงรูปแบบ (ไวยากรณ์/คำศัพท์)	EN: Deliberately avoiding a specific grammatical rule (like passive voice) or a hard-to-pronounce word by using a different sentence structure. TH: การจงใจหลีกเลี่ยงกฎไวยากรณ์บางอย่าง (เช่น รูปประโยคถูกกระทำ) หรือคำที่ออกเสียงยาก โดยการแต่งประโยคในรูปแบบอื่นแทน	EN: Saying "The test is hard" instead of "The test is challenging" simply because the word "challenging" is difficult to pronounce. TH: พูดว่า "The test is hard" แทนที่จะใช้คำว่า "The test is challenging" เพียงเพราะคำว่า challenging ออกเสียงให้ถูกต้องได้ยากกว่า

Note. EN = English; TH = Thai. The strategic concepts and definitions presented in this table are synthesised and adapted from Færch & Kasper (1983) and Tarone (1980).

Table 4
Accommodation Strategies

Strategy / กลยุทธ์	Definition / คำจำกัดความของการสื่อสาร	Example / ตัวอย่าง
1. Repetition การกล่าวซ้ำ	EN: Repeating a word, phrase, or sentence exactly as it was originally said to give the listener more time to process the information. TH: การพูดคำ วลี หรือประโยคซ้ำแบบเดิมเป็นๆ เพื่อให้ผู้ฟังมีเวลาในการประมวลผลข้อมูลและทำความเข้าใจมากขึ้น	EN: Speaker A: "The deadline is on Thursday." Speaker B: "Pardon?" Speaker A: "On Thursday. The deadline is on Thursday." TH: ผู้พูด A: "กำหนดส่งคือวันพฤหัสบดีนะ" ผู้พูด B: "อะไรนะครับ?" ผู้พูด A: "วันพฤหัสบดี กำหนดส่งคือวันพฤหัสบดี"
2. Paraphrasing / Rephrasing การลดความ / การเปลี่ยนคำพูด	EN: Explaining the same idea using different words, synonyms, or a simpler sentence structure when the listener does not understand the first attempt. TH: การอธิบายแนวคิดเดิมซ้ำโดยใช้คำศัพท์อื่นคำพ้องความหมาย หรือรูปประโยคที่ง่ายขึ้น เมื่อสังเกตเห็นว่าผู้ฟังไม่เข้าใจประโยคแรก	EN: "We have a monopoly in this market... I mean, we are the only company that sells this product." TH: "บริษัทเราได้ผูกขาดตลาดนี้... ฉันหมายความว่า เราเป็นบริษัทเดียวที่ขายสินค้านี้"
3. Clarification / Explicit Signaling การขอหรือการให้ความกระจ่าง	EN: Actively checking if the listener understands, asking for an explanation, or explicitly spelling out implicit information to prevent misunderstandings. TH: การตรวจสอบให้แน่ใจว่าผู้ฟังเข้าใจ การตั้งคำถามเพื่อขอคำอธิบายหรือการอธิบายข้อมูลที่แบ่งอย่างชัดเจนเพื่อป้องกันความเข้าใจผิด	EN: "Just to be clear, do you mean we should cancel the meeting entirely?" or "By 'ASAP', I mean by 5 PM today." TH: "ขอเช็กให้แน่ใจนะคุณหมายความว่าเราควรยกเลิกการประชุมไปเลยใช่ไหม?" หรือ "ที่บอกว่า 'ด่วนที่สุด' ฉันหมายถึงภายใน 5 โมงเย็นวันนี้นะ"
4. Simplification การทำให้ภาษาให้ง่ายขึ้น	EN: Deliberately adjusting your speech by using simpler vocabulary, speaking more slowly, and avoiding complex cultural idioms that the other person might not know. TH: การตั้งใจปรับการพูดโดยใช้คำศัพท์ที่ง่ายขึ้นพูดให้ช้าลงและหลีกเลี่ยงสำนวนเปรียบเทียบหรือสแลงที่ผู้พูดภาษาอื่นอาจไม่รู้จักรัก	EN: Instead of saying "It costs an arm and a leg," the speaker accommodates by saying, "It is very expensive." TH: แทนที่จะใช้สำนวนว่า "It costs an arm and a leg (มันแพงहुจ)" ผู้พูดปรับตัวโดยการใช้คำตรงๆ ว่า "It is very expensive (มันแพงมาก)"

Strategy / กลยุทธ์	Definition / คำจำกัดความของการสื่อสาร	Example / ตัวอย่าง
5. Self-Repair / Self-Correction การแก้ไขคำพูดของตนเอง	EN: Catching your own mistake, mispronunciation, or potentially confusing word mid-sentence and immediately correcting it before the listener gets confused. TH: การรู้ตัวว่าตนเองพูดผิด ออกเสียงผิด หรือใช้คำที่อาจทำให้สับสนในระหว่างที่กำลังพูด และทำการแก้ไขตัวเองทันทีก่อนที่ผู้ฟังจะงง	EN: "We will meet at the library... sorry, I mean the laboratory, at 10 AM." TH: "เราจะเจอกันที่ห้องสมุด... เอ๊ะ ขอโทษที่ฉันหมายถึงห้องแล็บ, ตอน 10 โมงเช้า"

Note. EN = English; TH = Thai. The strategic concepts and definitions presented in this table are synthesised and adapted from Jenkins (2000) and Seidlhofer (2011).

Table 5
Preventative Strategies

Strategy / กลยุทธ์	Definition / คำจำกัดความของการสื่อสาร	Example / ตัวอย่าง
Explicitation การทำความเข้าใจชัดเจน	EN: Providing more explicit detail, background context, or spelling out implicit information than would normally be necessary, leaving no room for ambiguity. TH: การอธิบายรายละเอียด บริบท หรือข้อมูลที่แฝงอยู่ให้ชัดเจนและตรงไปตรงมามากกว่าปกติ เพื่อไม่ให้เกิดความกำกวมหรือตีความผิด	EN: "The review process for this publication is quite long—by long, I mean it typically takes six to eight months for a decision." TH: "กระบวนการพิจารณาของวารสารนี้ค่อนข้างนาน... ที่บอกว่ายาวนาน ฉันหมายถึงต้องใช้เวลาประมาณ 6 ถึง 8 เดือนกว่าจะตัดสินใจ"
Self-Repetition การกล่าวซ้ำคำพูดตนเอง	EN: Repeating an important word, phrase, or entire point immediately after saying it, which gives the listener's brain extra time to process the information. TH: การพูดซ้ำคำ วลี หรือประเด็นสำคัญทันทีหลังจากเพิ่งพูดจบ เพื่อให้สมองของผู้ฟังมีเวลาประมวลผลข้อมูลมากขึ้น	EN: "The data was collected across different regions in India. Yes, we collected all the data in India." TH: "ข้อมูลถูกเก็บรวบรวมจากหลายภูมิภาคในอินเดีย ใช่ครับ เราเก็บข้อมูลทั้งหมดในอินเดีย"
Self-Paraphrasing การถอดความคำพูดตนเอง	EN: Anticipating that a specific academic term or vocabulary word might be difficult, and immediately rephrasing the sentence using simpler words. TH: การคาดเดาล่วงหน้าว่าคำศัพท์ทางวิชาการหรือคำศัพท์เฉพาะบางคำอาจเข้าใจยากจึงรีบอธิบายประโยคนั้นใหม่ด้วยคำที่ง่ายขึ้นทันที	EN: "We faced several intercultural barriers. In other words, there were many obstacles caused by differences in cultural backgrounds." TH: "เราเผชิญกับอุปสรรคทางวัฒนธรรมระหว่างประเทศหลายอย่าง... พูดอีกอย่างก็คือมีปัญหามากมายที่เกิดจากความแตกต่างของพื้นเพทางวัฒนธรรม"
Comprehension Checks การตรวจสอบความเข้าใจล่วงหน้า	EN: Actively pausing to ask the audience or conversation partner if they are following the point, before moving on to the next complex topic. TH: การหยุดจังหวะเพื่อถามผู้ฟังหรือคู่สนทนาว่าตามทันหรือไม่ ก่อนที่จะเปลี่ยนไปพูดถึงหัวข้อที่ซับซ้อนเรื่องถัดไป	EN: "Does the methodology of this study make sense so far, or should I clarify anything before I show you the results?" TH: "ระเบียบวิธีวิจัยของการศึกษานี้พอจะเข้าใจได้ไหมครับหรืออยากให้ผมอธิบายตรงไหนเพิ่มก่อนที่จะเปิดผลลัพธ์ให้ดู?"
Metadiscoursal Signposting การใช้คำเชื่อมโครงสร้างการพูด	EN: Using clear organizing words (like "firstly," "moving on," "to summarize") to verbally map out the structure of the presentation so the listener never gets lost. TH: การใช้คำเชื่อมหรือคำจัดระเบียบเนื้อหา (เช่น "อย่างแรก", "หัวข้อถัดไป", "สรุปก็คือ") เพื่อบอกโครงสร้างการนำเสนอให้ชัดเจน ทำให้ผู้ฟังไม่หลงประเด็น	EN: "In this presentation, I will first explain the theoretical framework, and then I will move on to the practical applications." TH: "ในการนำเสนอนี้ ผมจะเริ่มอธิบายจากกรอบแนวคิดทางทฤษฎีก่อน จากนั้นผมจะขยับไปพูดถึงการประยุกต์ใช้ในสถานการณ์จริงครับ"

Note. EN = English; TH = Thai. The strategic concepts and definitions presented in this table are synthesised and adapted from Mauranen (2012).

Interview Instructions / คำชี้แจงในการสัมภาษณ์

Purpose: This semi-structured interview aims to explore how individuals navigate linguistic and cultural barriers during intercultural communication. Instructions for

วัตถุประสงค์: แบบสัมภาษณ์กึ่งมีโครงสร้าง (Semi-structured interview) นี้

จัดทำขึ้นเพื่อสำรวจว่าบุคคลมีวิธีการรับมือกับอุปสรรคทางภาษาและวัฒนธรรมอย่างไร ในสถานการณ์การสื่อสารข้ามวัฒนธรรม

"Thank you for participating in this study. The purpose of this interview is to understand your natural experiences with communication barriers in intercultural settings.

Please know that your participation is completely voluntary. There are no right or wrong answers, and we are not evaluating your language proficiency. Your identity will remain strictly confidential, and any data used in the final research will be anonymized. If any question makes you uncomfortable, you can choose not to answer, and you are free to stop the interview at any time without any negative consequences. Do I have your consent to record this audio and proceed?"

“ขอขอบคุณที่สละเวลาเข้าร่วมการศึกษาวีเจียในครั้งนี้ครับวัตถุประสงค์ของการสัมภาษณ์นี้คือเพื่อทำความเข้าใจประสบการณ์ตามธรรมชาติของคุณเมื่อต้องเผชิญกับอุปสรรคในการสื่อสารข้ามวัฒนธรรม”

“ขอเรียนให้ทราบว่า การเข้าร่วมการสัมภาษณ์ในครั้งนี้เป็นไปโดยความสมัครใจอย่างแท้จริง จะไม่มีคำตอบที่ถูกหรือผิด

และเราไม่ได้ทำการประเมินความสามารถทางภาษาของคุณแต่อย่างใด ข้อมูลระบุตัวตนของคุณจะถูกเก็บรักษาเป็นความลับอย่างเคร่งครัด และข้อมูลใดๆ ที่นำไปใช้ในงานวิจัยฉบับสมบูรณ์จะถูกปกปิดตัวตน (Anonymized) หากมีคำถามใดที่ทำให้คุณรู้สึกไม่สบายใจ คุณสามารถเลือกที่จะไม่ตอบได้ และคุณมีสิทธิ์ที่จะขอยุติการสัมภาษณ์ได้ตลอดเวลาโดยจะไม่มีผลกระทบเชิงลบใดๆ ตามมาทั้งสิ้น ทั้งนี้ คุณยินยอมให้ทำการบันทึกเสียงและดำเนินการสัมภาษณ์ต่อไปหรือไม่ครับ?”

Achievement Strategies (กลยุทธ์พยายามสื่อสารให้สำเร็จ)

1. Circumlocution (การอธิบายความ)

EN: When you forget a word, how do you describe the item so the other person understands?

TH: เวลาที่คุณลืมคำศัพท์ คุณอธิบายลักษณะของสิ่งนั้นให้คนอื่นเข้าใจแทนได้อย่างไร?

2. Approximation (การใช้คำที่มีความหมายใกล้เคียง)

EN: If you don't know the exact word, how do you use a similar word to explain what you mean?

TH: ถ้าคุณนึกคำที่ตรงเป๊ะไม่ออก คุณใช้คำที่มีความหมายคล้ายๆ กันมาอธิบายแทนอย่างไร?

3. Word Coinage (การสร้างคำศัพท์ใหม่)

EN: Have you ever made up a new word on the spot by putting simple words together? Can you give an example?

TH: คุณเคยสร้างคำศัพท์ใหม่ขึ้นมาสดๆ โดยเอาคำง่ายๆ มาผสมกันไหม? ลองยกตัวอย่างให้ฟังหน่อย

4. Non-linguistic Means (การใช้ภาษากาย)

EN: How do you use your hands, facial expressions, or body language to help you talk when you cannot find the right words?

TH: คุณใช้มือ สีหน้า หรือท่าทาง ช่วยสื่อสารเวลาที่นึกคำพูดไม่ออกอย่างไร?

5. Borrowing / Code-Switching (การยืมคำ / การสลับภาษา)

EN: Do you ever mix your native language with another language to keep the conversation going smoothly?

TH: คุณเคยผสมภาษาแม่กับภาษาอื่นเวลาพูด เพื่อให้คุยต่อไปได้แบบลื่นไหลไหม?

Reduction Strategies (กลยุทธ์การลดทอนเนื้อหา)

6. Topic Avoidance (การหลีกเลี่ยงหัวข้อ)

EN: Have you ever avoided a topic because you didn't have enough vocabulary to talk about it? Why?

TH: คุณเคยเลี่ยงที่จะคุยบางเรื่อง เพราะไม่รู้คำศัพท์ที่จะใช้พูดถึงมันไหม? ทำไมถึงทำแบบนั้น?

7. Message Abandonment (การทิ้งข้อความกลางคัน)

EN: Have you ever stopped talking in the middle of a sentence because it was too hard to explain? What did you do next?

TH: คุณเคยหยุดพูดกลางคันเพราะรู้สึกว่าเรื่องนั้นอธิบายยากเกินไปไหม? แล้วคุณทำอะไรต่อ?

8. Meaning Replacement (การเปลี่ยนความหมาย)

EN: If a thought is too complex to say, how do you change it to a simpler idea to make it easier to speak?

TH: ถ้าเรื่องที่จะพูดมันซับซ้อนไป คุณมีวิธีเปลี่ยนให้เป็นเรื่องที่ย่ออธิบายง่ายขึ้นอย่างไร?

9. Message Reduction (การลดรายละเอียด)

EN: When you are afraid of making mistakes, how do you keep your story short and leave out the small details?

TH: เวลาที่กลัวจะพูดผิด คุณมีวิธีพูดให้สั้นลงและตัดรายละเอียดเล็กๆ น้อยๆ ออกไปอย่างไร?

10. Form Avoidance (การหลีกเลี่ยงรูปแบบที่ยาก)

EN: Do you ever change your sentence structure to avoid using hard grammar rules or words that are difficult to say?

TH: คุณเคยเปลี่ยนรูปประโยคเพื่อเลี่ยงการใช้ไวยากรณ์ยากๆ หรือคำที่ออกเสียงยากไหม?

Accommodation Strategies (กลยุทธ์การปรับตัวเพื่อให้ผู้ฟังเข้าใจ)

11. Repetition (การพูดซ้ำ)

EN: If the listener doesn't understand you, do you repeat your exact words to give them more time to think?

TH: ถ้าคนฟังตามไม่ทัน คุณใช้วิธีพูดประโยคเดิมซ้ำ เพื่อให้เวลาพวกเขาทำความเข้าใจไหม?

12. Paraphrasing / Rephrasing (การเปลี่ยนคำพูด)

EN: How do you change your words or use a simpler sentence if someone does not understand your first explanation?

TH: ถ้ามีคนไม่เข้าใจสิ่งที่คุณอธิบายตอนแรก คุณมีวิธีเปลี่ยนคำพูดหรือใช้ประโยคที่ง่ายขึ้นอย่างไร?

13. Clarification (การทำให้กระจ่าง)

EN: How do you ask questions to check if people understand you, or to make sure there is no misunderstanding?

TH: คุณตั้งคำถามเพื่อเช็คว่าคนอื่นเข้าใจคุณ หรือป้องกันความเข้าใจผิดอย่างไรบ้าง?

14. Simplification (การทำให้ภาษาเรียบง่าย)

EN: When talking to someone who might not know the language well, how do you make your words simpler and speak slower?

TH: เวลาคุยกับคนที่อาจจะยังไม่เก่งภาษา คุณมีวิธีปรับคำพูดให้ง่ายและพูดให้ช้าลงอย่างไร?

15. Self-Repair (การแก้คำพูดตัวเอง)

EN: What do you do if you say something wrong and need to correct yourself immediately before the listener gets confused?

TH: คุณทำอะไรถ้าพูดผิดแล้วต้องรีบแก้คำพูดตัวเองทันทีก่อนที่คนฟังจะงง?

Preventative Strategies (กลยุทธ์ป้องกันความสับสนล่วงหน้า)

16. Explication (การอธิบายให้ชัดเจน)

EN: How do you give extra, clear details so that people do not get confused about what you mean?

TH: คุณมีวิธีอธิบายรายละเอียดเพิ่มเติมให้ชัดเจน เพื่อไม่ให้คนอื่นสับสนในสิ่งที่คุณสื่ออย่างไร?

17. Self-Repetition (การพูดซ้ำคำตัวเอง)

EN: Do you think saying an important word or phrase twice helps the listener remember it better? Why?

TH: คุณคิดว่าการพูดซ้ำคำสำคัญสองครั้ง ช่วยให้คนฟังจำและเข้าใจได้ดีขึ้นไหม? เพราะอะไร?

18. Self-Paraphrasing (การถอดความคำพูดตัวเอง)

EN: When you use a hard word at work, do you quickly explain it again using easy words?

TH: เวลาที่คุณใช้คำศัพท์ยากๆ ในการทำงาน คุณรีบอธิบายความหมายซ้ำด้วยคำที่ง่ายขึ้นทันทีเลยไหม?

19. Comprehension Checks (การเช็คความเข้าใจ)

EN: How do you pause to ask if everyone is following you before moving on to a harder topic?

TH: ก่อนจะเริ่มพูดเรื่องที่ยากขึ้น คุณมีวิธีหยุดถามคนฟังเพื่อให้แน่ใจว่าทุกคนตามทันอย่างไร?

20. Metadiscoursal Signposting (การบอกโครงสร้างเรื่องที่พูด)

EN: How do you use connecting words like "First," "Next," or "In conclusion" to help people follow your presentation?

TH: คุณใช้คำเชื่อมอย่าง "ข้อแรก", "ต่อไป" หรือ "สรุปคือ" เพื่อช่วยให้คนฟังตามเรื่องที่คุณพรีเซนต์ได้ง่ายขึ้นอย่างไร?