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Abstract

In the globalised world, English is prominently used as a lingua franca, especially when people travel across borders. A great proportion of border-crossing travel takes place in international tourism, and this means that much of the use of English as an international lingua franca (ELF) takes place between tourists and the locals in the countries they are visiting. This is what in this thesis I call “touristic ELF”. Two of the most prominent features of touristic ELF are that (a) interactions tend to be brief (generally not more than a few minutes and often less than one minute), and (b) the main purpose of most touristic interactions is practical, involving the exchange of information, even though interactional elements can also occur.

Within this context, the aim of this study was to investigate how touristic ELF works, especially given that most research in ELF communication revolves around academic or business contexts. The main emphasis of the study was on the ways in which Thai locals and foreign tourists used pragmatic strategies in order to deal with (potential) problems in understanding, and also particularly when non-understanding did arise, until understanding appeared to be achieved. The study also sought to identify the extent to which the use of pragmatic strategies varied according to the nature of communication, transactional or interactional.

Naturally occurring spoken interactions between Thai locals and foreign tourists were collected on Koh Lanta, a southwestern island of Thailand. 86% of 328 recorded touristic encounters in ELF formed a data set whereas 9% were unable to be transcribed because of ambient noise, and 5% were interviews. These touristic encounters were analysed under theoretical perspective of pragmatic strategies in ELF communication. The tools and techniques of Conversation Analysis were chosen and adapted as the analytic approach to look at the ways in which Thai locals and foreign tourists used pragmatic strategies of meaning negotiation in touristic ELF.

The findings of this study indicated that the Thai locals and the foreign tourists used a variety of pragmatic strategies to negotiate meaning and understanding. The five most
common self-initiated strategies, namely 1) simple repetition, 2) key-word repetition, 3) combined repetition, 4) rephrasing and 5) paraphrasing were used to serve various functions. Simple repetition, key-word repetition and rephrasing were frequently used to facilitate the listener a clear hearing. The practices of key-word repetition, combined repetition and rephrasing were employed to enhance explicitness and give prominence of meaning. Additionally, paraphrasing and rephrasing were used to amplify and simplify meanings of utterances.

The Thai locals and the foreign tourists used other-initiated strategies: 1) other-repetition, 2) the practice of using an alternative word/phrase with rising intonation, 3) wh-clarification question, and 4) question repeat and 5) questioning tag to negotiate understanding mutually. Other-repetition was used to show the listener’s acknowledgment. The practice of using an alternative word/phrase with rising intonation, wh-clarification question, and question repeat were employed as clarification requests. In addition, question repeat and questioning tag were used as confirmation checks.

In touristic ELF, these aforementioned pragmatic strategies of meaning negotiation were used across transactional and international conversations, as so to prevent problems of understanding beforehand and to cope with non-understanding when it happened. As ELF communication is context-bounded, the pragmatic strategies used in touristic ELF differ from those used in academic and business ELF in type and frequency. The Thai locals and the foreign tourists opted for the strategies in which they took less time and less effort to negotiate meaning in brief and quick encounters. Due to their different levels of English proficiency, some pragmatic strategies requiring linguistic knowledge were employed to a lesser extent in touristic ELF than in academic and business ELF. To this end, ELF speakers in the context of tourism have shaped the use of pragmatic strategies and the communicative practices in touristic ELF.
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Chapter 1  Introduction

This thesis reports on a study in which I investigated spoken interaction in English used as a lingua franca (ELF) between local Thais and foreign tourists during brief communicative encounters. In the context of tourism, the nature of these encounters was transactional; that is, they primarily involved exchange of information. Interactional talk did however occur, when tourists and local people had an opportunity to chat socially. The emphasis of this study was on the use of pragmatic strategies employed by those speakers of ELF in their efforts towards negotiation of meaning, particularly when problems of understanding arose, and they signalled the presence of non-understanding. This study aimed to gain a better understanding of how ELF was actually used in tourism contexts, and ways in which the pragmatic strategies were employed in negotiation of meaning to achieve shared understanding.

1.1 Background and rationale

The growth of globalisation has accelerated the expansion of English worldwide. Globalisation has also led to greater mobility and interconnectivity. People from a wide range of countries and cultures around the world come into contact, increasingly. Differences in their linguacultural backgrounds result in a need for a shared language for communication in global contexts. English is the language that has gained prominence and dominance over other languages across the world and achieving global status. The use of English has shifted on a global scale, as “a new phenomenon” (Graddol, 2006, p. 11); that is, English is used widely and its use has expanded significantly in international settings in various domains such as academia, business, military and politics, entertainment and media, international travel and tourism, including cyberspace (Crystal, 2003; Galloway & Rose, 2015; Graddol, 2006; Jenkins, 2014; Schneider, 2011). Accordingly, English becomes the language of choice in global communication among people who do not have the same first languages. This phenomenon has given rise to the widespread use of English as a lingua franca (ELF).
Globalisation has enhanced the expansion of ELF. People have a higher demand for English for lingua franca communication. As a result, English is used at varying levels of depth and range, not only by people who have learned it through formal education, but also by those who have restricted access to learning the English language. In this sense, speakers of ELF make use of English in different ways and might have created strategies to make their messages intelligible and to achieve shared understanding subsequently. Given that, making use of ELF in global context then causes diversity and fluidity in ELF communication.

My interest in this study came from my work experience and experience of leisure-purpose travel. Firstly, from my work experience in the past ten years, I used English as a means of communication in my careers when working for international customer services and international cooperation projects based in Thailand. Most of the time, I interacted with customers and colleagues from various countries, mainly from Europe and Asia. I realised that I mostly used English to communicate with non-native English speakers, rather than with native ones. Additionally, this is particularly significant, given that English is the working language of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) (Charter of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, 2008, p. 28) and demand for the use of English in Thailand, one of member states of ASEAN, is increasing.

Secondly, my interest was growing when I experienced teaching English language in higher education. In Thai formal educational system, English has been taught and learned under the English as a foreign language (EFL) paradigm for decades. English Language Teaching (ELT) methodologies have been influenced by Anglo-American teaching models. Accordingly, some Thai students are self-conscious about their Thai accent when speaking English. They often demand native-like fluency, in either in British or American accents (Methitham & Chamcharatsri, 2011) and devalue themselves as non-native speakers (Jindapitak & Teo, 2013). Thailand is often described as being characterised by poor levels of English (First Education, 2013). A number of studies concerning ELT report that English-language teaching and learning in Thailand is ineffective in producing graduates to be able to communicate in English
in the era of globalisation (Boriboon, 2011; Darasawang, 2007; A. Kaur, Young, & Kirkpatrick, 2016; Methitham & Chamcharatsri, 2011; Wongsothorn, Hiranburana, & Chinnawongs, 2002). There is additional evidence that Thai students have little awareness of intercultural communication in global contexts (Baker, 2009; Jeharsae, 2012; A. Kaur et al., 2016; Kongkerd, 2013; Noom-Ura, 2013; Wiriyachitra, 2002).

Due to my work experiences in multinational environments and English language teaching, I have hypothesised that there is a mismatch of English in education and in actual use. That is to say, linguistic knowledge massively acquired in language classrooms is not the mere resource in using English as a means of communication, but pragmatic competences are also essential for exchanging meaning and co-constructing understanding in actual communication. As an English-language teacher, I believe that English learners, who will later be speakers of English, should be equipped with linguistic and pragmatic resources, so that they will be able to exploit their linguistic knowledge and pragmatic and/or communicative competences to handle unpredictable situations in multicultural communication.

Finally, I have a personal interest in leisure travel. Things became apparent to me as I experienced domestic and international travel. Thailand is one of the most well-known tourist destinations in the world; as a result, the average number of foreign visitors arriving in Thailand each year from 2014 to 2018 was approximately twenty-five million. The majority of foreign visitors come from ASEAN countries and East Asia (Ministry of Tourism and Sports, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018). Undoubtedly, English is a default language in the context of international tourism. The language is automatically chosen by foreign tourists to communicate with Thai people. When travelling throughout my country, I was surprised by and admired those Thai people in tourist spots such as in Pattaya, Chiang Mai, Phuket, Krabi and Samui Island etc. when they interacted with foreign tourists in English, despite their smattering of English. It turned out that foreign tourists did more or less understand and had positive attitudes towards English communication during their stay (“Communicating in Thailand,” n.d.; A. Kaur et al., 2016; Suwathikul, 2003). As a backpacker, I travelled in European and Asian countries and realised that English was a common language
used when making contact with local people in those countries or even with other tourists from other countries during stays in hostels. I enjoyed conversations with them, and we put effort into making meaning and making sure that we shared information. All of these situations led me to think that not only professionals in urban areas of international economics, business, or higher education use English, but also the locals and tourists in rural tourist areas.

My enthusiasm was raised by the emergence of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) when I reviewed literature for writing a research proposal to apply for a PhD. I was intrigued by Seidlhofer (2001, 2011), who noted that there is a gap in applied linguistics research between the current use of English in actual communication and the implementation of ELT as well as Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). The pedagogical issues should be reconsidered and developed to be realistic and practical for lingua franca communication, as a consequence. Recently, ELF research has been conducted with a wide range of dimensions prolifically in the domains of academia and business (Jenkins, Baker, & Dewey, 2017; Jenkins, Cogo, & Dewey, 2011). ELF interaction in academic settings e.g. at international conferences, in seminars, courses, group discussions, and casual conversations have been studied with a focus on pragmatic strategies, the process of accommodation, and multilingualism (Björkman, 2011, 2014; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; House, 2002; J. Kaur, 2009, 2011b, 2015, Kirkpatrick, 2007a, 2010a; Lee, 2013; Lichtkoppler, 2007; Mauranen, 2006; Pölzl & Seidlhofer, 2006; Taguchi & Ishihara, 2018). Also, a number of pragmatic ELF studies have been conducted in business settings when ELF is used in telephone conversations and meetings and also in email writing (Ehrenreich, 2009; Evans, 2013; Firth, 1990a, 1990b; Kwan & Dunworth, 2016; Pitzl, 2005; Wolfartsberger, 2011). So far, ELF researchers increasingly pay attention to the pragmatics of ELF. Additionally, ELF has gained momentum in Asia. The Asian Corpus of English was established (Kirkpatrick, 2003, 2010b, 2013), and ELF research in Asia was pioneered by Kirkpatrick as he says:
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The overall objectives will be to investigate whether there is a separate and systematic variety of English that can thus legitimately be termed Lingua Franca English (LFE) or whether speakers use their individual linguistic resources and communicative techniques in order to communicate/negotiate meaning through whatever variety /level of English they have at their disposal (Kirkpatrick, 2003, p. 83).

My research was designed to follow his second point as aforementioned to explore whether and how the Thai local people and foreign tourists “use their linguistic resources and communicative techniques” to exchange meaning in touristic ELF interactions.

I chose the domain of tourism because this domain in fact provides a large portion of lingua franca communication in English. But, ELF communication in the domain of tourism is still under-researched (Guido, 2017; Schneider, 2013, 2016; Van, 2015), particularly in Asia and Thailand. In spite of productive ELF research, there is very little research conducted into pragmatics to reflect the ways in which ordinary people use ELF in tourism contexts. For these reasons, I decided to investigate the actual use of ELF in touristic encounters, focusing on the use of pragmatic strategies during the process of meaning negotiation. What I hope to achieve is documentation of the actual communication of ELF and this empirical study will help to develop a better understanding of ELF communication in the context of tourism.

1.2 Research objectives and research questions

This study was designed to investigate how Thai locals and foreign tourists achieve negotiation of meaning and understanding through pragmatic strategies. This study aimed to contribute to the body of knowledge about the ways in which people communicated via ELF and, in particular, how this took place in tourism contexts. Special emphasis was placed on the ways in which participants signalled the presence of various types of impediments. That is an indication of understanding problems. When problems did arise, this study also sought to show how pragmatic strategies
were employed to solve them. The findings were discussed into 1) pre-empting strategies referring to strategies which serve preventive purposes, without an indication of non-understanding and 2) repairing strategies referring to strategies which serve remedial purposes after the participants had indicated a signal of non-understanding in ELF interactions. Finally, the study also considered the ways in which the pragmatic management of these interactions varied according to the nature of the communication, transactional or interactional. To reach these aims, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What pragmatic strategies do these ELF speakers employ to negotiate meaning and understanding?
   1.1 What strategies are most commonly used for pre-emptive purposes?
   1.2 What strategies are most commonly used for remedial purposes?

2. How does the use of pragmatic strategies vary across transactional and interactional conversations in touristic ELF?

1.3 Context of the study

“Mass tourism is one of the agents of rapid change in many places in the world, and it has fascinating sociolinguistic effects” (Blommaert, 2010, p. 148)

Tourism contributes a great portion of ELF communication. International tourism involves a vast movement of people who come into contact with one another: tourists and the locals in the countries that they are visiting. These are typical ELF situations, where English is overwhelmingly the language of choice among people who do not share their first languages. This phenomenon can be called “touristic ELF”, referring to the use of ELF in tourist-local interactions and tourist-tourist interactions, which are primarily related to exchanging information, providing services, and social talk.

It is worth mentioning the features of touristic ELF.
• It can be assumed that foreign tourists and locals have diverse linguacultural backgrounds.

• It can also be assumed that the participants in these interactions have not necessarily acquired English through formal education. They, therefore, often make use of English in fragments and word-level utterances (Suwathikul, 2003). In exchanging meaning intelligibly and sharing understanding, the locals and the tourists exploit their linguistic resources and use pragmatic strategies to negotiate meaning.

• Touristic ELF encounters are one-offs. Most of the time the individual tourist might come into contact with a local only once, unless the tourists have regular visits and acquaints themselves with the locals.

• Most touristic encounters are dyadic; that is spoken interactions belong to two parties. Mostly only two individuals; one is the local host and the other is the foreign visitor or tourist. At times, there might be more than two individuals participating in the interaction, but they take part as the speaker and the listener one at a time.

• Touristic encounters are purpose-driven interactions. Tourists have an underlying purpose for interacting with local people; similarly, local people set agendas for interacting with tourists. Touristic encounters tend to come to an end straight after the intended purpose is met, so the encounters are brief and direct. In touristic ELF, the nature of most of encounters is transactional, i.e. the exchange of information is the primary focus, although interactional elements, i.e. chatting more socially, also occurred.

• Finally, touristic ELF is used in an informal and friendly manner. Tourists are welcomed and treated by the locals as friends. In this sense, ‘would you...’, ‘could you...’, including polite preliminaries are rarely used in touristic ELF, as opposed to patterns of conversations in hospitality and tourist services
emerge; that is, the language is “formal and commercial-like” (Blue & Harun, 2003, p. 81).

The context of tourism are different from academic and business contexts. In this study, ELF speakers in tourism contexts are the local people having a smattering of English. Conversely, most of ELF speakers in academic contexts are international students, academic staff, and lecturers in international study programs or in higher education whereas the ELF speakers in business settings are personnel working in multi-linguacultural organizations mainly in international business. It can be assumed that they have a higher level of English proficiency, due to their educational backgrounds and experiences of using English. Furthermore, the spoken interactions in academic and business contexts are often polyadic, rather than dyadic conversations because of speech events e.g. group works, seminars, conferences, meetings, video conference calls and telephone conversations. They come into contact to achieve the goal of specific tasks, in this sense they use ELF for goal-oriented interactions. Accordingly, the interactions in academic ELF and business ELF seem to last longer than those brief and direct encounters in touristic ELF.

It seems that differences in the type of ELF speakers in this study, who are Thai locals and foreign tourists, and the different context of ELF use in touristic encounters would influence ways of making use of ELF and pragmatic strategies of meaning negotiation, “settings can affect and shape communication in ELF” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 27).

1.4 Scope of the study

Set only on Koh Lanta or Lanta Islands in southwestern Thailand, this study focused on the use of ELF in local-tourist interactions, excluding tourist-tourist interactions. The participants were the Thai locals and the foreign tourists. The data used for analysis was naturally-occurring spoken interactions. These spoken interactions were authentic to present process of communication when they used English as a language of choice. Accordingly, the conversation analytic approach was adopted in this study as Conversation Analysis (CA) offers available tools to analyse sequences of talk in
spoken interactions. Despite that, this study was not analysed under the complete framework of CA. To answer the research questions, the theoretical perspectives based on pragmatic strategies and negotiation of meaning in ELF pragmatics were developed as the analytic framework of data analysis.

1.5 Definitions of key terms in this study

**English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)**

According to Seidlhofer (2011, p. 7), ELF refers to “any use of English among speakers of different first language for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option”. ELF functions as “a contact language” (Firth, 1996, p. 240) which is “a medium of communication used by people who do not speak the same first language” (Kirkpatrick, 2007b, p. 7). In the setting of my study, ELF is the language of choice spoken by the Thai locals to communicate with foreign tourists.

**Touristic ELF**

This is my own term and it refers to the use of ELF in tourist-local interactions and tourist-tourist interactions, which are primarily related to exchanging information, providing services, and social talks in the context of the tourist industry and international travel.

**Negotiation of meaning**

A process in which speakers and listeners make an effort to produce and exchange meaning by adjusting linguistic forms and using strategies in order to reach a mutual understanding, including working on non-understanding until understanding is shared (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Cogo & House, 2018; Cogo & Pitzl, 2016).

**Pragmatic strategies**

In this study, pragmatic strategies refer to strategic practices and communicative strategies that ELF users employ throughout the process of negotiation of meaning in
order to convey messages and manage interactions. In this sense, the pragmatic strategies are considered as the means to exchange meaning, negotiate meaning, and co-construct understanding until ELF speakers achieve shared understanding (Björkman, 2011, 2014; Cogo, 2010; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Cogo & House, 2018; J. Kaur, 2015).

1.6 Organisation of the thesis

This thesis consists of seven chapters.

Chapter one is the introductory chapter of this study. This chapter presents the background and rationale for this study, the statements of research objectives and research questions. This chapter also includes the context of this study, the scope of this study, the definitions of key terms, and the organisation of the study.

Chapter 2 presents the spread of English across the world. This chapter aims to provide an overview of important factors in the widespread use of English in the era of globalisation and also to introduce the emergence of World Englishes (WE) and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). This chapter also provides an expanded background and context of this study in terms of ELF in ASEAN and ELF in tourism, followed by a discussion of English in Thailand to provide a historical overview, current use of English in Thai contexts, and ELF in tourism in Thailand.

Chapter 3 discusses the studies on ELF pragmatics. This chapter begins with an overview of ELF research regarding linguistic forms and functions in using ELF for communication. The pragmatics of ELF is then discussed in the area of negotiation of meaning, accompanied by a variety of strategic practices and functions.

Chapter 4 details the research methodology of the study. The chapter begins with research aims and research questions. Then, this chapter provides methodological approaches and the analytical framework used in this study before moving on to present procedures of data collection and data analysis.
Chapter 5 presents the findings of this study in detail. This chapter consists of five sections. First is the finding describing the nature of ELF communication in tourism contexts. The second and third sections present findings of the use of pragmatic strategies in transactional segments and interactional segments, respectively. The fourth section presents variants and coinage in touristic ELF, found in this study. The findings are summarised in the last section of this chapter.

Chapter 6 is discussion of the findings of this study in order to answer the research questions. The discussion is based on a comparison of the findings of my study with existing findings of other ELF research into pragmatics. Finally, this chapter includes contribution to ELF research.

Chapter 7 provides the summary of the thesis. This chapter suggests the implications for a) ELF academic community, b) TESOL/ELT community, and c) the local community in the ways how the findings of this study are beneficial to the involved communities. Some suggestions for further research are also provided in this chapter.
Chapter 2   English in a globalised world

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will attempt to conceptualise this study by giving an overview of important factors in the widespread use of English. The discussion will begin with the expansion of English in terms of history and geography. The extensive use of English around the world is a phenomenon of the language resulting in the academic fields of World Englishes (WE) and English as a lingua franca (ELF). This chapter then provides the emergence of WE and ELF. As far as the contexts of this study is concerned, ELF in ASEAN, ELF in tourism and English in Thailand will be discussed in this chapter.

2.2 The spread of English across the world

Today, English is a dominant language of international communication, with an increasing number of speakers. The number of English speakers worldwide, to some extent, indicates the extensive use of the language. Some estimates put the number of speakers between 1.5 and 2 billion. This figure includes those speaking English as their first language and others who speak English as an additional language (Crystal, 2003; Jenkins, 2014; Seargeant, 2012b).

2.2.1 The British Empire

Types of colonisation had an influence on linguistic ecologies and communicative patterns in particular settings (Mufwene, 2001; Schneider, 2011). The power of the British Empire drove the colonial expansion of English in two types of colonisation: settlement and exploitation, and these two types of British colonisation are linked to two patterns of the spread of English: ‘first diaspora’ and ‘second diaspora’ (Jenkins, 2014).
A sizable number of English people moved to new colonial lands from the 16th to the 19th century because of growth of population and a surplus of labour. Additionally, English individuals left their homeland due to their religious dissenters, and a number of enduring convicts and sentenced criminals were deported to new colonies. These phenomena resulted in population relocation and permanent residence in settlement colonies, namely North America, Australia, and New Zealand. English emigrants in these settlement colonies well established their norms and also their policies, cultures, including the English language. The English language was adopted as the vernacular by the coexist populations in the settlement colonies; subsequently, English became the main and official language of education, legislation and every-day life for the majority of the population (Mufwene, 2001; Saraceni, 2015; Schneider, 2011; Seargeant, 2012b).

Between 18th and the 19th centuries, the colonial power of British Empire expanded into Africa and Asia for the purposes of exploiting natural resources, obtaining raw materials, gaining cheap labour, and also trading. In exploitation colonisation, a small number of government representatives e.g. officials and commercial agents were in the colonised territories and set up their communities to achieve control and power over indigenous populations. The British agents trained indigenous ruling-class people to supply the British government with raw materials, natural resources, spices, and slaves. The indigenous elite, in return, worked as part of the British administration and took part in government. In so doing, English was taught to serve as a tool of communication between the British and the indigenous elite; although, the communicative needs in English were restrictive among the British agents and the local elite.

As opposed to English spoken in settlement colonies, English in exploitation colonies was not the vernacular spoken by the majority of populations. In this sense, English was the lexifier which came in contact with indigenous languages, especially after English had been provided through formal education. English was nativized or
indigenized by the British colonisers and the colonised elite, and the norms of using English were influenced by indigenous and colonial cultures to be standard-like for being taught and spoken in school. For this reason, English in exploitation colonies was spoken more and more by educated indigenous people, rather than the British agents. It can be said that indigenized English was established, legitimized and perpetuated by the descendants in such colonised communities through the process of nativization. The phenomena resulted in varieties of indigenized English emerging in the former exploitation colonies e.g. Nigeria, India, Singapore, and Malaysia (Brutt-Griffler, 2002; Mufwene, 2001; Saraceni, 2015; Schneider, 2011).

The collapse of the British Empire occurred in the second half of the 20th century. However, the English language continued to spread to countries that did not experience any pattern of British colonisation. That was because of the impact of another English-speaking nation, the United States of America. Throughout the 20th century, the US gained more military and political power and became the world’s superpower in the latter half of the 20th century, especially after the breakdown of the Soviet Union in 1991.

2.2.2 The American superpower

The American superpower impacted on other countries in terms of political, economic and cultural aspect (Schneider, 2011; Seargeant, 2012a). For example, in politics, the US was the world’s leading nation in international political bodies such as the United Nations, and NATO. Alongside that, the US was the world’s largest economy and the growth of the American population caused the country to be the world’s largest consumer market. As a result, the US dollar was regarded as the most important currency for international business. Later in the 1950s, technologies of modern communication and transportation were invented and developed mainly in the US (Crystal, 2003). This enabled American popular cultures to be transferred to and developed in other countries through media such as Hollywood movies,
American TV serials, and American pop music. As English was the US national language, American English became more and more widely recognised across the world.

Since the late 20th century, globalisation has given rise to the growth of international contacts. People around the world have become more interconnected through modern technologies. For example, it is easier to travel across the world by air transportation. The internet allows people from different parts of the world to be more easily connected. This requires a shared language. English fulfils this role as a “lingua franca” or “a common language” for international communication (Crystal, 2003, p. 11). In this sense, globalisation has accelerated the widespread use of English (Crystal, 2003, 2012; Saraceni, 2015; Schneider, 2011; Seargeant, 2012b, 2012a).

2.3 World Englishes and the ‘Three Circles’ model

In the previous sections, I illustrated the background of the spread of English before a paradigm shift of English studies took place in the second half of the 20th century. This section will briefly provide the history of World Englishes (WE), and fundamental concepts of WE before moving to ELF as the main framework for this present study.

2.3.1 World Englishes: what is it?

English comes into contact with other languages in new locations; as a result, English has adapted and developed to fit in indigenous environments. Accordingly, English in a particular location is slightly different in terms of sounds, vocabulary, structure, the language use, and even the role English plays in the society. In other words, varieties of English emerge. WE is “an umbrella label” covering a wide range of varieties of English that have emerged from the use of English in particular societies (Bolton,
In a similar vein, it refers to “new Englishes” found in Nigeria, Kenya, Hong Kong, Singapore, and Malaysia. The main focus of WE is new distinctive varieties of English, mainly found in post-colonial countries, or the so-called Outer Circle of Kachru’s model (see Section 2.3.2).

Awareness of the existence of other different varieties of English beyond British and American varieties was originally taken into consideration by Kachru (1976, p. 236 cited in Saraceni, 2015, p. 73):

Let us, therefore, appreciate and encourage the Third World varieties of English too. The individuality of the Third World varieties, such as the Indianness of its Indian variety, is contributing to the linguistic mosaic which the speakers of the English language have created in the English speaking world. The attitude toward these varieties ought to be one of appreciation and understanding.

In this period, many influential publications were produced to promote the concept of features of ‘new Englishes’ such as “Kachru’s The Other Tongue (1982), John Pride’s New Englishes (1982), Bailey and Görlach’s English as a World Language (1982) and Platt et al.’s The New Englishes (1984)” (Bolton, 2005; Saraceni, 2015). Those publications focused on “the description of linguistic ‘features’ at the levels of phonetics and phonology, morphology and grammar, and vocabulary” (Bolton, 2005, p. 73). Then in 1985, the journal of ‘World Englishes’ was founded and edited by Kachru and Smith (Kachru, 1992b).

The plural ‘Englishes’ was employed to promote the pluricentric and pluralistic approach to English, and to reflect differentiation within the language. Kachru explained that “This term symbolises the functional and formal variations, divergent socio-linguistic contexts, ranges and varieties of English in variety, and various types of acculturation in parts of the Western and non-Western world” (1992b, p. 2). Consequently, a number of varieties of English and distinct identities, particularly in
the Outer-Circle countries such as Nigerian English, Indian English, Singaporean English and Malaysian English have been explored. Primarily, varieties of English are studied based on the form, function, and use of English and identified based on the user’s native country.

In relation to a perspective of equality within the WE framework, McArthur said that the acronym “WE” represented “a club of equals” (1993, p. 334). That is, Englishes in postcolonial locations were supposed to be recognised and appreciated as equal to English varieties in native-speaking countries. So, English speakers are perceived as “equal partners” (Bolton, 2005, 2008; Kachru, 1997; Saraceni, 2015). Bolton (2005, 2008) explains the wide and narrow senses of WE. In the wide sense, the approach is to describe and analyse characteristics of English in worldwide contexts. It primarily focuses on the emerging roles of English in many aspects e.g. “global English” and “international English” (Bolton, 2008, p. 367). In the narrow sense, WE refers to the studies of new varieties of English e.g. “non-native varieties of English, second language varieties of English, world English(es), new Englishes”, alongside studies of “traditional terms as ESL (English as a Second Language) and EFL (English as a Foreign Language)” (Bolton, 2008, p. 367). In this narrower sense, scholars mainly focus on the linguistic description of English varieties emerging in national or regional areas. Furthermore, Kirkpatrick (2007b, p. 3) clarifies WE as “those indigenous, nativized varieties that have developed around the world and that reflect the cultural and pragmatic norms of their speakers” (p. 3). A number of scholars in Kachru’s school of thought have taken into account research concerning acquisition, sociolinguistics, pedagogy, theoretical and ideological issues.

### 2.3.2 The ‘Three Circles’ model: how does it work?

In 1985, to support the pluricentralism of English, Kachru wanted to show that English played different roles in different parts of the world. Kachru categorised his distinction into three “Circles” based on the types of colonization that each country
had within the British Empire. The ‘Three Circles’ model was developed to represent “the types of spread, the patterns of acquisition and the functional domains in which English is used across cultures and languages” (Kachru, 1985, p. 12).

These three circles, then, bring to English a unique cultural pluralism and a linguistic heterogeneity and diversity which are unrecorded to this extent in human history. With this diffusion, naturally, come scores of problems concerned with codification, standardization, nativization, teaching, and descriptions – and, of course, a multitude of attitudes about recognition of various varieties and subvarieties. (Kachru, 1985, pp. 14–15)
The ‘Inner Circle’ refers to countries that were settled by British people, “traditional bases of English – the region where it is the primary language” (Kachru, 1985, p. 12). In other words, English plays the role of a native language (ENL). The majority of people acquire English as the first language to use for all purposes across the country. This Circle is where more established varieties of English are found as “norm-providing” varieties (Kachru, 1992b, p. 3).
The ‘Outer Circle’ refers to countries that were part of exploitation colonization. English was established through the ‘second diaspora’. English is an additional language used along with local languages. Thus, people acquire English as a second language (ESL). English plays an important role in administration, education, and the media, and is generally used for intra-national purposes. The Outer Circle is where non-native varieties of English or “norm-developing” varieties are found (Kachru, 1992b, p. 3).

The ‘Expanding Circle’ includes the rest of the countries that were not part of the British Empire or did not experience colonial past. Due to the influence of the English-speaking countries, people in the Expanding Circle have a higher demand for using English as the primary foreign language mainly for international purposes. According to Kachru, there are “norm-dependent” varieties in this Circle (1992b, p. 3). In this sense, Thailand is placed into the Expanding Circle.

2.3.3 Criticism of the ‘Three Circles’ Model

The ‘Three Circles’ model is influential and well-recognised because it has the advantage of graphically presenting the pluralism and diversity of English. The model is the most often cited in research with the WE paradigm. It “is adequate enough in that, provided it is not required to account for complex sociolinguistic phenomena, it offers a useful shorthand for classifying contexts of English worldwide” (Bruthiaux, 2003, p. 172). Nonetheless, the public controversy concerning emerging non-native varieties of English was raised by Randolph Quirk in his paper, “Language varieties and standard language” (Quirk, 1990). Quirk disagreed to overvalue non-native varieties of English and to undervalue the importance of Standard English. In general, standards of English refer to institutionalised native-speaker varieties of English, namely British English, American English, and Australian English (Quirk, 1990, p. 6). In his position, standards of English should be the teaching model which was considered as the standard language ideology in countries where English was a foreign language.
He claimed that the native teachers were essential to be the model of correct use of English because they could give learners correction and make judgements whereas non-native teachers of English need to have exposure to the native language for a period of time to be good-performing teachers of English. For this reason, Kachru had responded to Quirk’s deficit linguistics and provided realistics of multilingual societies when English was widespread (Kachru, 1991).

In addition, Bruthiaux (2003) criticises the model that it is not based on how people actually use the English language. As Kachru’s three categories are based on historical and geographical factors, it makes the model insufficient to reflect sociolinguistic descriptions of English. Bruthiaux claims that this model is too broad to simplify the reality of English use across all three Circles. In the Outer Circle, for example, Malaysians are grouped together in the same category, even if some of them use English as a primary language, some of them use it as a second, and other Malaysians use it as a foreign language. In addition, Singapore, where the role of English is generally more important, is categorised in the same Circle as Malaysia. This is just because they share a colonial experience. Furthermore, people in each Expanding-Circle country use English at various levels of depth and range (Bruthiaux, 2003; Kachru, 1992a; Saraceni, 2015). Even though English speakers are in the same location, and are in the same Circle, their level of communicative competence and English proficiency may vary with regard to “proficiency levels and communicative practices in each location” (Bruthiaux, 2003, p. 165).

By and large, the ‘Three Circles’ model may be less appropriate for modern sociolinguistic contexts. Pennycook (2003) comments “The WE paradigm is far too exclusionary to be able to account for many uses of English around the world” (p.521).
2.4 English as a lingua franca

Since the late 20th century, globalisation has enhanced global interconnectivity through modern communications and transportation technologies. When they communicate across national borders, people commonly choose a shared language, which often is not their first or main language. This accelerates the widespread use of the dominant global language, English. Thus, as a medium of global communication, English plays the role of an international lingua franca. This means that an enormous amount of people use English worldwide, approximately 1.5 to 2 billion (Crystal, 2003; Jenkins, 2014; Seargeant, 2012b). Significantly, most of these speakers of English are located in the Expanding Circle.

2.4.1 ELF: what is it?

Firth (1996) gives a primary definition of ELF as a “contact language between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common national culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication” (p.240). House (1999) set the scope of ELF interaction as being “between members of two or more different linguacultures in English, for none of whom English is the mother tongue” (p.74). Jenkins (2009) refers to the context of communication where English is used as “the common language of choice, among speakers who come from different linguacultural backgrounds” (p.200). Another key definition of ELF frequently cited is provided by Seidlhoffer, according to whom ELF is “any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option” (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 7). In light of these definitions, English is used in lingua franca communication between people in contexts where geographical locations or nationality are not relevant as long as those speakers of English have different linguacultural backgrounds (Cogo, 2012; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Jenkins, 2014; Jenkins et al., 2011; Seidlhofer, 2011). It can be seen that the majority
of ELF users are in the Expanding Circle. However, English speakers in the Inner Circle recognised as native speakers of English and those English speakers in the Outer Circle could be ELF users whenever they speak English with others who do not have the same first language. In other words, English comes out automatically when they need the shared language.

These definitions fit within the context of this study. That is, ELF is used as “a contact language” for spoken interactions among Thai local people speaking Thai as their first language and foreign tourists who could be native speakers and non-native speakers of English from various parts of the world. Therefore, native speakers of English are not excluded to provide data for analysis, and they are not distinguished from non-native speakers of English in this study.

**Emergence of ELF**

At the beginning of the 21st century, English plays a big role as the communicative tool in the global contexts, particularly in the Expanding Circle. English is widely used as a lingua franca. The need to study the uses of ELF has been raised to gain a better understanding of ELF “in its own right, and ELF speakers as language users in their own right” (Seidlhofer, 2001, p. 137). The genesis of ELF research is Seidlhofer’s conceptual paper (2001), where she notes the urgency to conduct “systematic research into how English is actually used as a lingua franca” and how this “could serve as a potential basis for formulating a curriculum for the teaching of ELF” (Seidlhofer, 2001, p. 141). She pointed out the conceptual gap between the actual use of English for lingua franca communication and the applied linguistic research focusing on native-speaker varieties of English. English has been developing and changing under the influence of globalisation; consequently, this entails changes in ELT. It was a turning point of the pedagogical reconceptualization of what was necessary to teach English language learners in order for them to be able to utilise
and expand their linguistic and cultural knowledge for lingua franca communication in English.

**Differences between WE and ELF**

Emerging from the global phenomenon of English, WE and ELF paradigms share the idea that English is viewed as pluralistic and de-centralised. On the other hand, there are some differences. The study of WE focuses on distinct varieties of localised English when used for intra- and inter-national communication, particularly in the Outer-Circle countries. The geographical terms of nations are used to express identity and reflect local cultures e.g. Nigerian English, Indian English and Singapore English. ELF research focuses on “the use of globalised EIL (English as an International Language) across all three Kachru’s Circles” (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 4, italics added). That is, the use of ELF for intercultural communication is taken into account. Therefore, geographical locations are irrelevant in ELF research. As Cogo and Dewey (2012, p. 8) clarify:

> WE is concerned with the empirical study of nativized (also often referred to as indigenized or institutionalized) varieties of English in Kachru’s Outer Circle. By contrast, ELF is a term used to describe the use of English in settings where it is spoken as a contact language by speakers of varying linguacultural backgrounds for whom there is not usually another shared language available (their italics).

More precisely, Kirkpatrick (2011) recognises “world Englishes are primarily about the expression of identity and the reflection of local culture(s), while English as a lingua franca is more concerned with communication, although this is not to say, of course, that ELF speakers cannot express identity through ELF” (p. 219).
Controversial issues in ELF

Despite this prolific ELF research, there is some controversy in terms of ELF as a new variety of English in the Expanding Circle and as an alternative model of English teaching. ELF is “an emerging English that exists in its own right and which is being described in its own terms rather than by comparison with ENL” (Jenkins, 2007, p. 2). Jenkins’s statement can be misinterpreted “whether the term ELF refers to a language variety (or set of varieties)” (Saraceni, 2008, p. 24) and “whether the term ‘ELF’ can capture anything distinctive about language form or language use” (Sewell, 2013, p. 5).

Critically, it is an illogical premise that a greater number of English speakers would provide a greater number of the uses of English in NNS-NNS interactions (Maley, 2010; Swan, 2012). Maley (2010) questions the number of “genuine users of English” because “there is no statistical information about the numbers who are real international users rather than learners or consumers of the language” (p. 30-31, his italics). To him, the emergent ELF is a “peripheral” phenomenon of the global use of English. A small number of common features in ELF does not constitute a new variety. Swan (2012) also supports this view, “it is hard to see how lingua franca use will lead to significant language change unless ELF develops beyond its present condition of an “inchoate and disconnected agglomeration of instances of use” (Maley, 2010, p. 31 cited in Swan, 2012, p. 387). ELF research may be seen as attempting to set up “a one-size-fits-all model of English” (Saraceni, 2008, p. 22) in the Expanding Circle. Even if ELF scholars are so doing, Swan opposes this, stating that “ELF cannot, then, sensibly be regarded as a ‘variety’ or group of varieties of English in its own right” (Swan, 2012, p. 387). In response, Jenkins et al. clearly claim, “the fluidity of ELF, along with the hybridity that we referred to earlier, calls into question whether ELF can be considered a language variety or even a group of varieties in the traditional sense of the notion. We would argue that it cannot” (2011, p. 296). I have come to the same conceptual conclusion as other ELF researchers that ELF is not the non-
native variety of English when it is used in the Expanding Circle. Instead, ELF refers to uses of English as a contact language for lingua franca communication.

The other controversy concerns the pedagogical implications of ELF. Research findings in ELF have shown the need to develop ELT to be more suitable for use in lingua franca contexts. It is time to “bring about change in the actual practice of English teaching” (Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, & Pitzl, 2006, p. 23). Jenkins (2007) proposes that ELF could be “a potential provider of norms for English language teaching” (p. xii).

As discussed previously, a number of ELF researchers report non-conformity to ENL norms in ELF forms. Some ELF scholars have raised the issue that the ENL model is not valid for English learners for lingua franca communication (Cogo & Jenkins, 2010). A new alternative model of English is consequently needed for ELF phenomena (Baker, 2011; Canagarajah, 2007; Firth, 2009; Jenkins, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2001; Walker, 2010). However, it is hard to identify “a particular set of linguistic norms” (Ferguson, 2009, p. 129) and to standardise emergent formal characteristics as ELF norms. That is because in fact, ELF serves as a mode of communication which is fluid and flexible in communicative practices. ELF speakers make appropriate use of English "grammar, phonology, lexical range, and pragmatic conventions" according to the English proficiency of those with whom they interact, and ensure mutual intelligibility (Canagarajah, 2007, p. 925). So, what constitutes a successful alternative model of ELF teaching is still somewhat unclear.

It is questionable whether ELF can be seen as an alternative model for teaching English (Dauer, 2005; Maley, 2009, 2010, Saraceni, 2008, 2009; Sewell, 2013; Sowden, 2012). Prodromou (2008) and Maley (2009) suggest that ELF can potentially damage the pedagogy of ELT and English learners’ proficiency. It would be like making “a model of the muddle of variant forms to be found in ELF” if ELF became the model of teaching. As a result, it is risky to send out English language learners “with limited linguistic resources” (Prodromou, 2008, p. 255). Swan (2012) also claims that “its
(ELF) speakers conform to identifiable ELF norms; it is that, like the speakers of all
foreign languages, they do not conform to all NS norms; and this in various and largely
uncodifiable ways” (p. 387). As errors in NS norms are regarded as distinctive or fluid
forms of ELF, Swan (2012) raises the question of “how effectively the ‘deviant’ form
functions in making meaning” (p. 381). This possibly causes English learners’ failure
in NS (native speaker) communication, even though they might be able to achieve
NNS (non-native speaker) communication.

Referring to LFC, Jenkins (2002) provides the core features that are important to
teach English pronunciation for international intelligibility. However, Dauer (2005)
objects that some sounds can be replaced by other sounds e.g. using /f/ instead of
/θ/ (p. 546). She points out some issues of LFC in terms of vowel length, stress and
intonations found in Jenkins’ data with a number of NNS participants. For this reason,
Dauer is not sure that Jenkins’s LFC is generalised enough to be the model of ELF
pronunciation teaching.

Sowden (2012) comments that English language teachers still need standard norms
of English as “reference points” to be sources of English knowledge as well as models
of appropriate English use (p. 92) and as “a benchmark” to evaluate learners’
linguistic practices, rather than to imitate native speakers of English (Kirkpatrick,
2010b, p. 13). Otherwise, without standard norms of English “it is difficult to see how
teachers of ELF could be adequately trained or supplied with appropriate classroom
resources”, says Sowden (2012, p.92). Maley (2009) also raises concerns of “what is
actually learned” and “what teachers do in classroom” (p. 196) in case that ELF is
applied as the new model of ELT. Dynamic uses and linguistic features of ELF lead us
to question which model of English is appropriate for diverse English learners in
different geographical and cultural contexts and whether there would be sufficient
models and teaching materials available for this approach. Maley insists that “neither
ELT publishers nor examination boards can see any profit in killing the goose that lays
the golden eggs, namely a standard variety of English, in a favour of installing a
fledging ugly duckling with dubious public support among learners, teachers or sponsors” (Maley, 2010, p. 35).

With regard to the pedagogical implications, Kirkpatrick has carried out extensive work especially in Asia (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, 2011, 2012b, 2012a). He has proposed that “the Lingua Franca Approach” should be adopted for English language classrooms to meet the learners’ needs for using English in this multilingual region. Kirkpatrick points out that the curriculum of ELT in ASEAN requires more knowledge of Asian cultures to raise English learners’ awareness of cross-cultural communication in English in regional settings rather than in Western settings. The pragmatic norms in the ASEAN context can be provided in the English classroom through regional literatures in English (Kirkpatrick, 2012a, 2014). English language learners should be exposed to other varieties of English. They would consequently have "competence" in English and the "capability" (Widdowson, 2012) to use English for lingua franca interactions.

ELF, a tool of lingua franca communication, is fluid and flexible in communicative practices. As to me, ELF is less likely to be the alternative model of ELT. However, I agree with ELF scholars that awareness of ELF and the pragmatic practices in ELF communication should be introduced and provided during process of English language learning (Kirkpatrick, 2012a, 2014; Seidlhofer, 2009b; N. C. Sifakis et al., 2018; Widdowson, 2012). It is challenging to give English learners who will be ELF users “an explanation of the underlying significance of the forms: to ask what work they do, what functions they are symptomatic of” (Seidlhofer, 2009b, p. 241) and they should be equipped with functional and communicative perspectives of using ELF.
2.4.2 ELF in ASEAN

Interest in ELF research has increased dramatically in parts of Asia, Africa and South America. As far as the context of this present research is concerned, this section specifically looks at EFL research undertaken in Southeast Asia, particularly in ASEAN.

English in ASEAN

The establishment of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has stimulated in the use of ELF in this region. ASEAN not only includes 10 nations in Southeast Asia, but also China, Japan, and Korea, so-called ASEAN+3. ASEAN member states have different mother tongues and cultures and so English is officially used as a common language in ASEAN (Kirkpatrick, 2010b, p. 6; The ASEAN Secretariat, 2013, p. 3). Every ASEAN document is in English and ASEAN events are conducted in English. The situation in ASEAN has promoted the demand for English and also has given rise to the significant role of ELF.

The significant role of ELF in ASEAN consequently leads to interest in exploring ASEAN ELF, alongside European ELF in the European Union. Kirkpatrick is a pioneering scholar who is calling for ELF research in Asia. The purpose is to:

investigate whether there is a separate and systematic variety of English that can thus legitimately be termed Lingua Franca English (LFE) or whether speakers use their individual linguistic resources and communicative techniques in order to communicate/negotiate meaning through whatever variety /level of English they have at their disposal. (Kirkpatrick, 2003, p. 83)

Initially, the following studies were carried out to explore distinctive Asian varieties of English within the WE framework, namely Brunei English (Athirah & Deterding, 2015; Deterding, 2015; Haji-Othman & Mclellan, 2014; Ho & Deterding, 2016; McLellan & Haji-Othman, 2012; Mclellan & Grace, 2016; Sharbawi, 2006), Singapore
English (Alsagoff, 2010b, 2010a; Deterding, 2007; Foley, 2006; Lim, Pakir, & Wee, 2010; Low, 2012; Tan, 2011), Malaysian English (Baskaran, 1987; Hashim & Tan, 2012; Kaur, 2010; Lowenberg, 1991b; McLellan, 2009), and Philippine English (Dayag, 2012; Gonzalez, 2004; Martin, 2014).

Noticeably, the mentioned nations are placed into Kachru’s Outer Circle due to their colonial experience. Brunei, Singapore and Malaysia were the British colonies whereas the Philippines was a colony of the US. In these countries, English is used widely as an official language and as the medium of instruction in schools. In the case of Myanmar, it is somewhat unclear whether the nation should be placed in the Outer or the Expanding Circle. In spite of being a British colony, Myanmar’s "close-door policy" (Kirkpatrick, 2012c, p. 336) decreased the use of English as an institutional medium after independence. The Myanmar government promoted Burmese as the lingua franca used in the country (Fen, 2005; Hashim & Low, 2014; Kirkpatrick, 2012c; Pakir, 2010).

Regarding the other five nations, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam have different colonial past. Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam were the French colonies, and Indonesia was under the colonial rule of the Netherlands. Thailand is the only one ASEAN nation which was not colonised. Thus, these five ASEAN fall within the Expanding Circle. English is mainly used as a lingua franca between the ASEAN countries these days. The demand for English increasing, especially after English is promoted as the official language of ASEAN.

**ASEAN ELF**

The research conducted in Southeast Asia provides regional distinctive varieties of English. In addition, to explore characteristics of ASEAN ELF, Kirkpatrick and his research team collaborated to collect English conversations which naturally occurred in Southeast Asia, especially in the SEAMEO Centre Directors Meeting in 2008. The Asian Corpus of English (ACE) and the corpus of ASEAN ELF were consequently
established (Kirkpatrick, 2010b, 2013, 2016). The users of ASEAN ELF are “English-knowing” bilinguals or multilinguals (Kirkpatrick, 2010b; Pakir, 2010). Despite their different first languages and cultures, they share some linguistic features when using ELF.

I turn now to briefly review common features of ASEAN ELF. To begin with shared phonological ASEAN ELF, consonant clusters as the final sound are often reduced; for example, ‘first’ is pronounced as /fɪərs/ and /t/ is dropped (Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008). Conversely, some of the consonant clusters, particularly voiceless sounds ending with –ed in the past simple are additionally produced as /-ed/ by Thai speakers (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 75). For example, ‘tapped’ is pronounced as /tap-пед/ in place of /təpt/, and the word ‘linked’ is pronounced as /linkd/, instead of [linkt]. Some long vowel sounds e.g. /eː/ and /oː/ and initial aspirations /t/ and /p/ are difficult for some users of ASEAN ELF to pronounce (Deterding & Kirkpatrick, 2006, p. 397; Kirkpatrick, 2010a, pp. 77–78). Users of ELF across ASEAN more or less merge long and short vowel sounds (Baskaran, 2004; Deterding, 2007; Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008). When users of ASEAN ELF utter a multi-syllable word, they lack in reducing vowels (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 78). Furthermore, pronouns and final words are frequently stressed (Deterding & Kirkpatrick, 2006; Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008).

Regarding lexical items, there are many more words describing the same things across varieties of English. Some localised English vocabulary is mixed with the indigenous language and English so that "hybrid words" are frequently found in ELF (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 89). Localised English vocabulary is often used internationally such as ‘satay’ from Malay English (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 86). On the other hand, some of localised lexical items referring to traditional culture are understood only in a specific area such as ‘minor wife’ and ‘make merit’ found when English is used in Thai contexts (Saraceni, 2015; Trakulkasemsuk, 2012) and ‘kiasu’ in Singapore English (Saraceni, 2015, p. 111). In this sense, the use of localised lexis represents cultural values. Furthermore, the same word used in a specific area can have a different
semantic sense. The word ‘crocodile’ in Malay English refers to ‘a womaniser’ (Kirkpatrick, 2007b, p. 124). Using local idioms and localised vocabulary is likely to cause understanding problems for outsiders.

In terms of grammatical features in ASEAN ELF data, users of ELF across ASEAN frequently omit grammatical elements e.g. articles and often insert additional elements e.g. pronouns (Kirkpatrick, 2010a). They leave out an article and commonly use a definite article, instead of using an indefinite one (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 105). Concerning noun pluralisation, ELF users in ASEAN do not mark plurality to plural countable nouns; conversely, uncountable nouns are pluralised. In respect of tense systems, the ASEAN ELF data shows that verbs are not formed into tenses, especially the present or the simple. Instead, ELF users in ASEAN often insert time adverbials in utterances (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 107). They establish the time by using the context. In terms of using modal verbs, the use of ‘would’ in place of ‘will’ is reported as a characteristic found in varieties of Asian English (Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008). However, there are few instances of this found in the ASEAN ELF data. ELF users in ASEAN rarely inverse a subject and a verb in wh-questions. They place an affirmative sentence right after a wh-question word. Like users of ELF in European nations, ELF users in ASEAN produce redundant prepositions as "a general all-purpose preposition" (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 113) for example using ‘about’ with verbs e.g. tell, discuss, and talk.

Despite the use of distinctive linguistic features in ASEAN ELF, there are few occurrences of apparent non-understanding in ELF interactions. A number of studies about ELF interactions in ASEAN report that users of ELF across ASEAN employ strategies to make meaning and reach shared understanding (Deterding, 2013; Jamshidnejad, 2011; J. Kaur, 2009, 2010, 2011b, 2012, 2015, Kirkpatrick, 2007a, 2010a). Like other parts of the world, ELF pragmatic research in ASEAN has been increasingly undertaken. However, little pragmatics research is conducted in Thailand.
This section is mainly discussed emergence of ELF when English is used in the
globalised world and emerging ASEAN ELF in the region of South East Asia. It is
essential to additionally provide an overview of ELF used in the context of
international tourism, which is relevant to the context of this study.

2.4.3 ELF in tourism

Globalised transportation and global travel have facilitated the development of
international tourism. As a result, there has been a significant movement of the
English language into tourism contexts. This can be noticed from the presence of
English use, both in spoken and written discourses in tourism environments to
promote iconic landmarks and local cultures. English is the dominant language in
host-tourist and tourist-tourist spoken interactions. It is also a default language, used
in huge numbers of tourism materials such as inflight magazines, postcards, signage,
guidebooks, blogs, and travelogues (Blommaert, 2010; Blue & Harun, 2003; Cesiri,
2016; Crystal, 2003; Guido, Errico, Iaia, & Amatulli, 2016; Jaworski & Thurlow, 2010;
Jocuns, 2016; Schneider, 2013, 2016; Thurlow & Jaworski, 2010). This phenomenon
has definitely promoted ELF communication in the tourism domain.

ELF plays a highly significant role in tourism contexts. Tourism is “where language and
communication become both commodities and the vehicle of their exchange”
(Jaworski & Thurlow, 2010, p. 260). When people bring ELF into new spaces of
touristic encounters, they possibly play with their linguistic resources to make
meaning and subsequently shape new ways of using ELF in the contexts of tourism.
English is a safe-choice repertoire for stakeholders in the contexts of tourism. The
stakeholders in tourism contexts can be broadly classified into tourists or visitors and
locals or hosts. These two parties mainly encounter one another when asking for and
exchanging information, providing services, buying and selling products and services,
or having phatic talks. The tourist has an underlying purpose and initiates an
interaction with the local, and then the local responds to the tourist’s demands, or
the local sets an agenda to interact with the tourist. The interaction comes to an end straight after the intended purpose of the interaction is met. Given that, tourist-local interactions are frequently “one-offs” (Jaworski & Thurlow, 2010).

Being the dominant language in global tourism, English is used not only to provide information about tourist places but also to persuade tourists to appreciate iconic landmarks and cultures. Language use has an effect on tourists’ satisfaction and attitudes towards tourist destinations. For example, poetic messages are produced together with images in signage and postcards in order to illustrate positive images of tourist areas (Jaworski & Thurlow, 2010; Thurlow & Jaworski, 2010). The use of English in tourism is persuasive in nature (Chiwanga, 2014; Salim, Ibrahim, & Hassan, 2012; Traiger, 2008).

In terms of the “hospitality language” (Blue & Harun, 2003), English is prominently used in hospitality and tourism services, particularly in transactional activities e.g. to give information, provide services, and offer. Accordingly, there is a conversational pattern to the hospitality language. Interlocutors initially greet each other and engage in welcome speech, then possibly conduct small talk before they establish interpersonal conversations dealing with information queries and other requests, check-in and check-out activities, complaints and criticism of staff work. They end the conversation with saying good bye. “Questions will also be followed immediately by another question for identification and clarification purposes; requests are followed by the actions being carried out on the spot, either through verbal response or non-verbal act”, Blue and Harun (2003, p.81). Therefore, the utterances or expressions in some situations are predictable, and the staff can have on-job rehearsals. Their findings show that hotel staff working in Southampton (UK) spoke “formal and commercial-like” English, and frequently used particles or preliminaries of politeness such as ‘would you…’, ‘could you …’, ‘..., please’, including Sir or Mrs with the guest’s last name.
In tourism discourse, there are emerging sociolinguistic effects when English comes into contact with local languages. Cappelli (2013) studied the use of Italian words in the English guidebooks, travel articles and blogs. In her work, languaging is defined as “the use of foreign words to provide local colour or to flatter the pseudo-linguistic abilities of the reader” (Cappelli, 2013, p. 353). She cited Dann’s clarification, “the impressive use of foreign words, but also a manipulation of the vernacular, a special choice of vocabulary, and not just for its own sake” and it is “the use of particular expressions shared by writer and reader, with their occasional poetic treatment”, particularly in written discourse (Dann, 1996, p. 184). More precisely, this linguistic feature is the use of the local language in English texts and speech, typically related to lexical items and grammatical features.

Cappelli (2013) presented that languaging is integrated into the English system in forms of code-switching, lexical borrowing, and code-mixing or language crossing in guidebooks, travelogues, and expat’s blogs. In these tourism materials, code-mixing can be noticed in the form of language crossing which refers to “the use of the language or the linguistic variety of a group of which the speaker cannot legitimately claim membership” (Cappelli, 2013, p. 360). Language crossing is performed through using local words within the English texts; although, those local words are not used by the native speakers of such local language. In this case, syntactic knowledge of the local language is not required in performing language crossing. To illustrate, the use of language crossing in written discourse is noticeable by “pauses, hesitation phenomena, repetition and metalinguistic commentary” (Romainem, 1988 cited in Cappelli, 2013). In addition, some local words are widely recognised in global tourism contexts. Those foreign words are borrowed in case of no other alternative words in English. Lexical borrowing is used in expatriates’ blogs, rather than in guidebooks and travelogues. Code-switching is frequently performed by expatriates in their writing. Unlike the authors of guidebooks and travelogues, expats are more familiar with the structure of two languages and they are better able to understand the shared grammatical structure (Cappelli, 2013).
In a similar vein, Cesiri (2016) analysed the use of local words in Italian in English digital travel guidebooks. The findings showed that languaging was used in digital travel guide books when authors highlight local uniqueness. Italian words were used for particular items e.g. names of streets, tourist destinations, and other items related to culture and traditions to engage potential tourists before their visits (Cesiri, 2016). Using languaging in tourism discourse provides additional meaning as well as local flavour in such meaning, and also minimise gaps of intercultural differences between tourists and hosts.

In the context of international tourism, English is switched to the local language when tourists want to make sense of humour or teasing acts (Jaworski & Thurlow, 2010; Schneider, 2013; Souza, 2016). That is to say, English is used in a friendly and playful manner when tourists had interactional activities with locals during their stay.

It is worth reviewing two Schneider’s studies of using ELF in tourism domains (Schneider, 2013, 2016). He claims that the perspectives of ELF research more or less overlap with those of English for Specific Purposes (Schneider, 2013). That is, ELF and ESP are functional terms, emphasising the practical use of English. He has coined the acronym ELFSP for “just-for-fun” activities (p. 50), and initially explored the use of ELFSP in scuba diving activities. Lexico-grammatical features of ELF are emerging in the diving context, despite not being “strongly generalised” yet. New word compounds e.g. bottom time, dive table, first stage, and to off-gas, including acronyms e.g. BCD, BC, and DCS are internationalised and only used in the context of scuba diving (Schneider, 2013, p. 52). Some lexical items have narrow and specific meanings; for example, the word ‘equalize’ means “deliberately increase inner-ear pressure through Eustachian tubes to balance rising external pressure while descending” (p. 51). In addition, Schneider has examined written ELF discourse about descriptions of dive sites, available on websites. The texts are characterised by the use of the present tense in simple structures. The sentences are frequently made in the structural pattern of noun phrase, “NP is NP/AdjP”. That is, a noun-phrase subject
of the sentence is followed by a primary auxiliary verb and either a noun phrase or an adjective phrase. A huge amount of “complex and specific vocabulary”, especially positive and descriptive adjectives, is used to describe dive sites. As a result, the information about dive sites attracts divers to visit (Schneider, 2013, p. 53).

The development of global tourism has dramatically increased ELF interactions between tourists and locals. Despite that, locals in some tourist areas possibly lack English language skills. They learn English “in whatever form and by whatever means available” only to enable them to do their jobs. Their English is quite far from standard norms of English taught in schools. Consequently, “grassroots Englishes” emerge from “a process of growth of English from the ground” (Schneider, 2016, p. 3).

In spite of undertaking within the framework of World Englishes, Schneider studied how the local people used their limited proficiency in English to get messages across to foreign tourists in the contexts of tourism in India, Indonesia, and Tanzania. His findings revealed fragments of incomplete sentences. Pieces of fragments were repeated, paraphrased, or replaced. The locals created new words when they did not know vocabulary, due to very low level of English proficiency. Despite that, the utterances were, to some extent, understandable for foreign tourists. For example, an Indian local struggled with limited English lexicogrammar when explaining to tourists how to use coconut shells. His utterances were fragmented into phrases and words. In addition, an Indonesian fruit vender exploited her “self-acquired” English (p. 6) and constructed English utterances by directly transferring from her mother tongue. She exploited whatever forms and means of English she could to make meaning and interact with foreign tourists about various topics. The other Indonesia local uttered English with limited syntactic knowledge. His utterances lacked articles or determiners and subject-verb agreement, including other features of using conjunctions and clause connectors (p. 7). However, his utterances were still comprehensible. In Tanzania, the locals did not have a good command of English
because of limited schooling and ineffective English teaching in the country. Despite this, the high demand for English in tourism in Tanzania had driven the local porters to learn English. They practised their English in their jobs when they had contact with foreigners. Syntactically, the verb ‘be’ was missed in forming continuous-tense patterns. Forms of present participles were used after modals in place of infinitives. Word-class conversion, lexical invention, and double prepositions are linguistic features existing in Tanzanian locals’ utterances. Above all, Schneider’s study contributes to the characteristics of emerging grassroots Engishes. It is evident that people make use of English as an “open source” language (Saraceni, 2015, p. 166) for their encounters in the tourism domain.

To this end, this present study aims to shed light on how Thai local people and foreigners make use of their English, as their linguistic resources in the communicative practice of ELF in tourism contexts in Thailand. As far as the context of this study is concerned, the next section will present English in Thailand.

### 2.5 English in Thailand

Thailand is a country located in the centre of the Indochinese peninsula in Southeast Asia, with a population of approximately 66 million people. Thai is the only national language in the country, although some other languages or dialects are spoken among minor groups of the population. For example, Malay is spoken in the southern part of Thailand, and Khmer is spoken by those living in lower north-eastern areas (Baker, 2009, 2012; Nguyen, 2005; Trakulkasemsuk, 2012; Warner, 2006).

English has been taught in schools since 1824. English in Thailand is taught under the framework of English as a foreign language. Even though English has no official role within the country, English is widely used as an additional language in metropolitan and tourist areas e.g. Bangkok, Chiang Mai, Pattaya, Phuket, and is called “metropolitan English” (Chamcharatsri, 2013, p. 22). It is used for international
communication in business, trades, tourism services, and higher education. Recently, English has also been used among Thais as a means of intranational communication (Glass, 2009). The demand for English has increased dramatically in a wider range of different domains within Thailand and, consequently, English proficiency is a basic requirement of professional employment in recent years. Not only in the metropolitan areas, the use of English is also widespread in local contexts. Local people either living near border areas or living in tourist areas have more interactions with foreign visitors, so English is needed as a language for communication in case visitors cannot speak Thai.

In this section, a brief historical background of English and current use of English in Thailand is provided before discussing ELF in tourism in Thailand which is related to the context of this present study.

### 2.5.1 Historical overview

Unlike the establishment of English in postcolonial territories, the English language was brought into Thailand differently because the country never experienced colonialism like its neighbours. Thailand, therefore, is placed in the Expanding Circle. Despite the fact that Thailand had contact with the British for commerce not colonization, when British commercial companies were allowed to trade in the Ayutthaya Era during 1610s-1620s, the importance of English was not recognised (Bennui & Hashim, 2014). English became more crucial in the early 19th century as a tool to secure the independence of Thailand. King Rama III (1824 – 1851) required the royal offspring and noblemen to learn English to communicate with Westerners. Consequently, his son, King Rama IV, had a good command of English. During his reign (1851 – 1868), Rama IV welcomed Westerners to modernize the country and build up a good relationship with European countries.

After visiting leading Western countries, King Rama V (1868 – 1910) opened the country to more Westerners. They were employed to work for the government as
advisors to help the nation to modernise. Meanwhile, missionaries as well as traders were also accepted in Bangkok. During the reign of King Rama V, the national development spread to major regional areas e.g. Chiang Mai in the North, and Phuket and Songkhla in the South. For instance, railway stations were built in Chaing Mai and Had Yai (sub-district of Songkhla). These new transportation services enabled groups of British workers in the forestry trade in northern Thailand and those working in tin mining companies in the South to travel across the country, and far beyond to British Burma and British Malaya (Bennui & Hashim, 2014). This provided more opportunities for local Thai people to interact with British people. Additionally, American missionaries migrated into Thailand and helped to set up western-like schools in Thailand. During the late 1960s, the influx of American military personnel resulted in the spread of English to other rural areas. American military staff were deployed at American military bases in the north-eastern areas of Thailand bordered by Laos and Cambodia during the time of regional conflicts in Southeast Asia. This resulted in the use of English in rural areas and increased interaction between Thai local people and American soldiers. Thai locals had more chances to learn and use English. They were influenced by American language and culture (Baker, 2008; Bennui & Hashim, 2014; Gebhard, 1979; Trakulkasemsuk, 2018). Given that, English had been recognised as a foreign language. The rise of British and American power had an influence on models of English teaching in Thailand. Accordingly, the models of either British English or American English is idealised as the target of native-like proficiency and standard models of English language teaching (ELT) in Thailand (Darasawang & Todd, 2012; Trakulkasemsuk, 2015).

Regarding English language education, English was initially taught in the reign of the King Rama III, though it was restricted only to the Royal family and their relatives, including the noble-class elite. By contrast, ordinary Thai people had little opportunity either to interact with Westerners or to learn English properly. In 1921, English was set into to the Thai national curricula, as a compulsory subject from the fifth year of primary education, equivalent to grade 5, according to the first
Compulsory Education Act. Later in 1960, Thai students were required to study English as a compulsory subject since the fourth year of primary education and continuously in secondary education. At the tertiary level, Thai students still learned English as a compulsory subject. The knowledge of English was promoted for international communication. But, English was revised to be taught as an elective subject, according to the 1978 national curriculum.

To engage with the globalised world, the educational reform occurred in 1999 and; as a result, impacted on the policy of teaching English which was promoted as a means of international communication. The National Education Act of 1999 and the resultant National Education Curriculum of 2002 employed four strands: culture, communication, connection, and community as the cores of English curriculum. The Act of 1999 and the 2002 curriculum has influenced on English language policy and teaching English in Thailand. ELT methodologies e.g. functional-communicative approach and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) are taken to English teaching in order to equip Thai students with English communicative competence. They, therefore, can integrate local knowledge and globalisation and communicate with others from different linguacultural backgrounds through the use of English (Baker & Jarunthawatchai, 2017; Bennui & Hashim, 2014; Darasawang, 2007; Jindapitak & Teo, 2013; Methitham & Chamcharatsri, 2011; Teng & Sinwongsuwat, 2015; Trakulkasemsuk, 2015, 2018; Wiriyachitra, 2002; Wongsothorn et al., 2002).

Nevertheless, Thailand has been ranked as a country with a low level of English proficiency since 2012 (First Education, 2013). This report has raised national concerns and increased the sense of urgency to improve Thai learners’ English language proficiency and equip them with adequate English communicative competence. Recently, the demand for communicative skills in English has gradually increased, especially since English was announced as a working language of ASEAN. In 2013, the Ministry of Education (MOE) issued the National Policy of English Language Teaching for Basic Education. This policy was developed in accordance with
the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). It aims to enhance English Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approaches and improve Thai students’ communication competence and proficiency in English throughout the twelve years of the Basic Education, that is primary and secondary education. After gaining secondary education or equivalent qualifications, Thai students are supposed to be “independent users” at CEFR’s level B1 (Threshold) (Office of the Basic Education Commission, 2013). In addition, Thai graduates are supposed to have a good command of English in their specific field of study and achieve effective English communication in real-life situations (Office of Higher Education Commission, 2013). Before graduation, Thai university students are required to take English proficiency tests to be qualified as “independent users” of B2 level or as “proficient users” of CEFR (Council for Cultural Co-operation Education Committee, 2001, p. 23).

It is likely that the reconsidered policy of English language education in Thailand is a new direction to raise the importance of English and to improve Thai students’ level of proficiency in English. English is perceived as a significant tool to connect with people across the world, to access new knowledge and modern technology, and to obtain better jobs and higher salaries (Chamcharatsri, 2013). Due to globalisation, multilingualism and diversity of cultures in the globalised world, teaching ideology of English in Thailand seems to be shifted to the emphasis on communicative competence and effective communication of English, rather than to achieve native-like competence under the traditional approach of teaching English as a foreign language (Baker & Jarunthawatchai, 2017; Trakulkasemsuk, 2018). In this sense, Thai graduates will be equipped with professional knowledge, and also higher level of English proficiency to gain the advantages of life in this globalisation era.

2.5.2 Current use of English in Thai contexts

In the era of globalisation, English becomes the common language of choice in many Expanding-Circle countries and there is no exception in Thailand. This phenomenon
is also accelerated by the importance of English within ASEAN. As the matter of fact, non-native English speakers outnumber native English speakers. Thais apparently interact with people from non-English speaking countries, rather than those from English speaking ones. English is used as a lingua franca among Thais and non-Thai people and consequently English has grown in a wider range and greater depth in Thai contexts. English is widely used in varying domains e.g. academy, business and trading, tourism, technology, media and entertainment. In term of depth of Thai English users, the majority are educated or middle-class Thais, particularly in metropolitan areas. They use English as a means of inter- and intra-cultural communication at their workplaces and also in social life. English is also used by Thais people living in rural provinces or remote areas where a number of foreigners visit and interacts with Thai locals. Unlike Thais in urban areas, Thai rural people have limited access in learning the English language in formal education and; as a result, Thai locals use English based on their experiences in use, rather than on their slight knowledge of English. This will be most likely that Thai people’s levels of English proficiency are varied, ranging from high-proficient speakers of English to grassroots-English speakers.

Referring to the growth of English in Thailand, a number of evidential studies describe the development of English used in Thai contexts under the framework of WE and ELF. Unique features of English have been observed in Thai media (Masavisut, Sukwiwat, & Wongmontha, 1986; Ngampramuan, 2016), literary works (Watkhaolarm, 2005), email communication (Glass, 2009), and the English online environment (Seargeant, Tagg, & Ngampramuan, 2012; Troyer, 2012) etc. In addition, a number of Thai scholars have investigated perception and awareness of the current use of English from different groups of Thai people e.g. university students (Jindapitak & Teo, 2010; Saengboon, 2015; Snodin & Young, 2015), internet users (Chamcharatsri, 2013), and professional writers (Buripakdi, 2012). According to Trakulkasemsuk’s work (2012), the “first language background, culture, rhetorical
styles, and norms of communication” of the Thai people could have transferred into English and affected their use of English (Trakulkasemsuk, 2012, p. 103).

Thai cultural and social elements have been transferred into the use of English. Regarding lexical imposition, English words or phrases are imposed in relation to sociocultural contexts in Thailand e.g. ‘make merit’ and ‘minor wife’ (Saraceni, 2015; Tan, 2011; Watkhaolarm, 2005). ‘Make merit’ is a Buddhism-related action of doing good to have a better chance of being released from a series of earthly lifetimes. ‘Minor wife’ is coined along with ‘major wife’ to refer to a second or extra unregistered wife. Additionally, loan words with direct translations from Thai to English are applied when elements in Thai contexts cannot be explained in English. In Watkhaolarm’s study (2005), the word ‘satang’ was found as it referred to “Thai currency in those days” (p. 150). Kinship and some social terms in Thai were translated into English and used as titles before people’s names. In fact, this shows good manners, respect, and the politeness of Thai culture. For instance, ‘kamnan’ refers to a “chief of a village” (p. 151); and ‘khun’ is defined as a master or madam and is used as a title to show respect (Watkhaolarm, 2005). Thai kinship and social terms are widely recognised by non-Thai speakers and appear in Grolier’s International Dictionary. For example, ‘phi’ which means “older person” and ‘nong’ that is defined as “younger person” are employed to address someone with social status, even if they do not have a blood relationship. The Dictionary also includes the word ‘acharn’ that means a teacher; and ‘farang’ that refers to a European foreigner with white skin (Trakulkasemsuk, 2012, pp. 103–106).

As this study is to explore the communicative practices of touristic ELF in Thailand, it is worth reviewing the current use of ELF, including English for intercultural communication in tourism in Thailand.
2.5.3 ELF in tourism in Thailand

Approximately 25 million international tourists have visited Thailand every year since 2012. The highest proportion of foreign tourists come from East Asia, followed by Europe, South Asia, Middle East, North America and South America, Oceania, and Africa, respectively (Department of Tourism, 2016). With this in mind, English plays a big role as a lingua franca in tourism in Thailand (Kongkerd, 2013).

In Thailand, many signs in tourist areas are either bilingual or multilingual, containing at least Thai and English. The mixing of Thai and English in signage is noticeable in tourist areas in order to benefit a wider range of international visitors (Huebner, 2006; Jocuns, 2016; Ngampramuan, 2016). Jocuns (2016) examined tourism discourses focusing on “the geosemiotic nature of signage” (p. 219) at heritage sites. His findings show that pieces of English words or texts appear in signage. Translation is a strategy frequently used to make multilingual signs. Thai messages are translated into English and other foreign languages e.g. Chinese, Korean or Japanese. Thai syntax can also be seen in English texts. For example, the Thai word, “prang” is used in the English text, “Merit repair Prang”, instead of using “stupa” in English (Jocuns, 2016, p. 231).

In one recent study, Ngampramuan (2016) investigated the intelligibility of Thai-English signage posted in tourist destinations. According to this study, Thai-English texts on signs have distinctive lexicogrammatical features which share lexicogrammatical patterns with ELF. This study reports that English messages with non-standard grammatical features are more intelligible than those messages with distinctive lexico-semantic features (p. 175). Nevertheless, many factors cause difficulties in understanding Thai-English messages on signs. Obstacles in understanding are due to ambiguity in English messages. That is because English messages are literally translated using online translation software or applications. The software might pick up wrong or inappropriate word choices (p. 223). Non-
understanding can be caused by creative coinage of two words. To illustrate, “ovalcano” is invented as the name for a specific drink by combining the word ‘Ovaltine’, a Swiss-brand drink and ‘volcano’ (Ngampramuan, 2016, p. 176). “Ovalcano” is iced chocolate which is embellished with Ovaltine powder on top of ice to form the drink like the volcano and flavoured with sweet condensed milk or chocolate sauce. Thai words are more or less transliterated into Roman scripts in written discourse; although, transliterated words do not help foreigners understand meaning. Rather, transliteration helps foreigners pronounce Thai words.

Furthermore, Thainess mostly affects foreigners’ understanding. According to Ngampramuan (2016), Thainess refers to “the transfer of religious, cultural and social elements; metaphors or fixed allocations; translations; lexical borrowing reduplication; and hybridization” (p. 3) when Thai people use English in their own ways (Ngampramuan, 2016; Watkhaolarm, 2005). In this sense, Thainess is taken into account as “Thai English” (Buripakdi, 2008; Jocuns, 2016; Ngampramuan, 2016; Trakulkasemsuk, 2012; Watkhaolarm, 2005). Ngampramuan’s findings show that foreigners with experience of visiting Thailand seemingly find understanding Thai English messages on signs simple. Their cultural and experiential backgrounds aid their understanding. Ngampramuan (2016) reports, “the understanding gaps between Thai and international participants were mainly caused by lexico-semantic issues, such as the lack of knowledge of Thai ways of life, as well as the structure of the Thai language” (p. 186).

It is worth mentioning relevant research into communicative strategies used for intercultural communication in the Thai tourism industry, particularly in Phuket (Suwathikul, 2003). Thai professionals in the tourism industry have a pattern of spoken interactions when they meet foreign visitors. They start such interactions with a greeting, followed by self-introduction and end up by saying ‘nice to meet you’ before starting their routine work. These professionals in travel and tourism business are, to some extent, proficient and fluent in English. Their utterances are formal and polite. Indicators or preliminaries of politeness e.g. ‘please’, ‘would you...?’ and ‘could
you...? are inserted in their utterances (p. 85-86). In terms of the use of communicative strategies, hotel and restaurant staff often ask customers to repeat themselves to enable clearer understanding, for example, ‘Could you please repeat again?’ and ‘Excuse me, Sir. Could you speak slowly, please?’ (p. 164). Requests for clarification are also made e.g. ‘What do you mean by ...?’ (p. 164) when they struggle to understand customers’ speech. Staff also employ “echoing” (p. 93) and “checking-back” (p. 88) strategies to confirm whether their understanding is correct. In this context, staff mainly deal with transactional activities, so accuracy of exchanging information and mutual understanding is very important.

By contrast, freelance service providers e.g. street venders, massagers, hairdressers, boat taxi, taxi or tuk-tuk drivers have flexible patterns in interactions, which are less formal. These service providers try to make utterances and communicate with foreign tourists in English, even though they have limited schooling in English. Due to their very-low proficiency in English, these workers speak English in a forthright way without a sense of service or politeness. Their utterances are direct. They only tell customers about their services and prices, but cannot talk about other, unfamiliar topics, ‘when you take them out of the situations, they are confused. They can use English pertaining to their job’ said by an interviewee (Suwathikul, 2003, p. 168).

In terms of the lexico-grammatical features of English found in Suwathikul’s research, these service providers make use of English in word-level utterances. Their utterances are fragmented and include incomplete sentences e.g. ‘Rawai...where?’ (p. 88), ‘Where you go?’ or ‘Where go?’ (p.138) and ‘Have drink. Hello sit down. You look there. You look menu’ (p. 139). The verb, to have is used, instead of “there is/are or there isn’t/aren’t” at the beginning of sentences such as ‘have taxi’, ‘have corals to see’ (p. 191), and ‘no have umbrella for hotel’ (p. 192). In addition, “no have” is obviously used in place of do/does not have e.g. ‘I no have.’, ‘No have people’ (p. 191), and ‘Hotel no have umbrella’ (p. 192). This is because conjugation does not exist in the Thai language system (Ngampramuan, 2016; Suwathikul, 2003). “Little” is often
used in place of “few, a few, a little” e.g. ‘Today have little guest. Have little people’ (p. 191).

Having limited lexical resources, these locals use various strategies to make what they intend to say intelligible. They use body language in line with their utterances to facilitate meaning. Actual items are displayed for meaning clarification. For example, a bottle of fish sauce was shown when a local restaurant owner said, ‘water fish’ (p. 100). Alternative words in the same internal context are also used. To illustrate, a local uttered ‘tree here in Phuket’ to describe the Pará rubber tree (Hevea brasiliensis) which is the local plant. Word repetition is another strategy used to make sense of meaning, e.g. ‘Oil cook here. People cook it’ (p. 100). Thai locals lack linguistic sources in English, so they probably have understanding problems when interacting with foreign tourists. To cope with that, smiling and keeping silent are practical strategies that they use to ignore the problems and to maintain interactions with tourists.

Other relevant research investigated tuk-tuk drivers’ problems and their needs in terms of using English (Wongthon & Sriwanthana, 2007). According to this study, an increasing number of international tourists visiting the heritage sites in Ayutthaya, the ancient capital of Thailand, has led to a higher demand for English amongst tuk-tuk drivers. Tuk-tuk drivers earn more income if they are able to speak English with foreign tourists. But, during their school aged years some drivers are extremely poor and have limited access to proper schooling; subsequently, they have no chance to learn English. In support of Suwathikul’s study (Suwathikul, 2003), this research also shows that tuk-tuk drivers are unable to utter English words in complete sentences. They have difficulties in understanding when tourists use different words or when they hear tourists’ unfamiliar accents, for example. Having a lack of English vocabulary, especially words related to their service, undoubtedly causes them problems with understanding. Nevertheless, the tuk-tuk drivers employ some strategies to cope with difficult situations in understanding English. They use tourism
In terms of the tuk-tuk drivers’ English learning needs, the study reports that speaking and listening skills are most important for them, whereas writing is the skill least necessary for doing their job. Wongthon & Sriwanthana (2007) suggest that tuk-tuk drivers should improve their English language competence and become familiar with English discourse related to their transport services. It would be beneficial if local and regional educational institutions took this into account and provided them with language training and adapted teaching to meet their needs.

In fact, many recent studies of English communication in the Thai tourism industry provide evidential support for Wiriyachitra’s work (2002), that states that Thai workers in the tourism industry have limited proficiency in English. Out of the four communicative skills, the skill of speaking is the most necessary for tourism employees and local workers in tourism services to do their work (Kuosuwan, 2016; Prachanant, 2012; Suwathikul, 2003; Wongthon & Sriwanthana, 2007). Thai professionals and workers use English less effectively in lingua franca interactions with foreign tourists. They use words and expressions inappropriately due to limited resources of vocabulary in tourism contexts. Unfamiliar varieties of English, especially the variety of English accents also cause them difficulties with understanding (Inkaew, 2016; Prachanant, 2012; Wongthon & Sriwanthana, 2007). Some Thai staff lack intercultural communication skills and communication strategies (Inkaew, 2016; Simpson, 2011). This contributes to occurrences of problems in understanding. Foreign tourists probably experience difficulties in English communication with Thais during their stays; as a result, they have a negative attitude towards tourism in Thailand (Traiger, 2008; Wiriyachitra, 2002). Traiger (2008) suggests that staff and
workers using ELF in the context of tourism have guidelines for the applicable use of ELF in tourism and be equipped with communicative competence, together with ways to deal with any problems in using ELF when they interact with a wide range of tourists from diverse linguacultural backgrounds.

The salient features of English used by Thais as a lingua franca in the Thai contexts as discussed above, to some extent reflect that Thai people use their individual linguistic resources available when English is used as the language of choice for communicative interaction. If we view language “as part of social practice” (Saraceni, 2015, p. 118), the crucial concerns when we analyse language are (a) what particular social activity it is used in, (b) who the participants are, and most importantly, (c) what they are doing and how they make use of the language, English, to maintain communicative interaction and achieve mutual intelligibility in such social activities.

2.6 Summary

In this chapter, I have first of all given the background of how English has diffused historically and geographically into many countries across the world. The British Empire initially exported English into the postcolonial countries. English spread to the settlement colonies, namely the US, Australia, and New Zealand between the 16th and the 19th centuries. In the 17th century, the rise of the British Empire further exported English to a great extent into the exploitation colonies in Africa, and East and Southeast Asia. Although British imperial power decreased after the end of World War II, English continuously spread into international contexts because of the American superpower. This English-speaking nation has a great influence on international politics and economics. American popular culture was also transferred to other countries through media. As a result, American English is recognised globally. Later, at the end of the 20th century, globalisation led to the use of English as the common language and subsequently as the prominent language for intercultural communication.
The widespread use of English has resulted in the language being used in different ways and in different locations across the world. The ‘Three-Circle’ model (Kachru, 1985) represents three spheres of English usage: the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and the Expanding Circle. The graphical model presents the pluricentricity of English and moves away from the concept of monolithic English. As a result, two new paradigms of English studies, namely World Englishes (WE) and English as a lingua franca (ELF) emerge from the recent phenomenon of English use in the globalised world. The WE paradigm focuses on new distinctive varieties of English, particularly in the Outer Circle. On the other hand, the study of ELF has been initially acknowledged by Seidlhofer and Jenkin (Jenkins, 1998, 2000; Seidlhofer, 2001). Unlike WE, the study of ELF does not aim to describe and codify a single monolithic variety of English in the Expanding Circle. Instead, the study of ELF focuses on the uses of English as a contact language for lingua franca communication. As this present study is conducted under the framework of ELF, I provided a brief overview of ELF research in ASEAN. Users of ELF across ASEAN share distinctive linguistic features of English and are able to achieve shared understanding. However, there are still a relatively small number of ELF studies focusing on Thailand. To this end, ELF research in Thailand should be paid more attention. Within the perspective of ELF, I, furthermore, discussed the use of ELF in tourism contexts, despite a very small number of ELF research into this area. Sociolinguistic outcomes are emerging when English comes into contact with local languages in the domain of tourism e.g. languaging or language crossing, lexical borrowing, new word compounds and acronyms, and variant structural patterns of sentences (Cappelli, 2013; Cesiri, 2016; Schneider, 2013). Schneider (2016) also introduces grassroots Englishes; that is, English is used by speakers with poor educational background of English; although, they acquire how to strive and manage to communicate in English from their direct experience in use.

Finally, I discussed English use in Thailand. Thailand has never been colonised by the British, and consequently falls within the Expanding Circle. In Thailand, English is
widely used as a lingua franca in varying domains by a great depth of English users, from those with high level of English proficiency to those using grassroots English. Current use of English for intercultural communication, particularly ELF in tourism contexts in Thailand is discussed in this section. Some distinct features of English used in Thai contexts have emerged recently. This presents that Thai people exploit their own linguistic resources in making and exchanging meaning in the communicative practices of ELF.

To explore the communicative practices of touristic ELF, among Thai locals and foreign tourists in Thailand, the next chapter describes the perspective of ELF research into pragmatics. In respect of the ELF context, it is necessary to explore the development of ELF research and pragmatics of ELF. This should lead to a better understanding of the negotiation of meanings through the use of ELF.
Chapter 3  Developments in ELF research

This chapter provides a review of research into ELF as a greater number of ELF research presents the features of ELF and the nature of ELF communication. Pragmatics of ELF will be discussed in detail to provide an overview of functions of using pragmatic strategies, together with strategic practices employed by ELF speakers in negotiation of meaning to pre-empt and repair problems in understanding in ELF communication.

3.1 Overview of ELF research

Turning now to the development of ELF research after Seidlhofer’s call for the description of ELF, one aspect to underline is the importance of empirical data to reflect how ELF plays a “communicative role” (Seidlhofer, 2001, p. 145). In the early years of ELF research, the main concern was “the sociolinguistic description of language forms (phonological, lexical, grammatical, and pragmatic) of English in lingua franca interactions” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 2). ELF researchers were interested in exploring common patterns of English used as a lingua franca across nationalities.

In doing so, “the availability of data” (Seidlhofer, 2001, p. 145) is implemented by “documenting the ELF features/strategies that are common to all ELF speakers and the local features/strategies that characterise distinct ELF varieties” (Cogo, 2008, p. 59). ELF corpora have been established to allow ELF researchers to access datasets available for analysis. A large number of data available in the ELF corpora is spoken discourse that reflects real English in authentic situations in lingua franca communication. That is because spoken interactions are spontaneous and ELF speakers have less time to produce English communication in compliance with ENL norms of standard grammar, “the spoken mode therefore reveals much more about language change in progress” (Mauranen, Hynninen, & Ranta, 2010, p. 185).
So far, ELF research has been carried out in a range of domains. Business domains include international business settings (Evans, 2013; Kankaanranta & Planken, 2010; Pullin, 2010; Tanaka, 2014), business telephone calls (Firth, 1996), and email communication (Kankaanranta, 2006; Louhiala-Salminen & Kankaanranta, 2012). Furthermore, a large amount of ELF research is conducted in the academic domain (Björkman, 2008, 2012, Canagarajah, 2007, 2014; Cogo, 2009; House, 2014; Kaur, 2011a; Low, 2016; Mauranen, 2003a; Mauranen, Hynninen, & Ranta, 2010; Ranta, 2009; Seidlhofer, 2005; Watterson, 2008). Spoken interactions occurring in institutional settings are captured e.g. group discussions, seminars, and international conferences. As a matter of fact, academic communication is the most prominent domain of ELF research.

To document the communicative practices of ELF, three large-scale ELF corpus projects are available: VOICE, ELFA, and ACE. The first two projects are mainly conducted in European settings whereas the other is mainly conducted in Asia. The first corpus of ELF is VOICE, the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English. VOICE provides “audio recording and transcriptions of spoken ELF interactions”. The spoken interactions in ELF were recorded in various domains e.g. "educational, leisure, and professional" and at different types of communicative events e.g. conversations, meetings, conferences, discussions etc. Ideally, the majority of participants had different first languages, and only 7% of the participants spoke English as their first language (Seidlhofer, 2011, pp. 23–24).

Following VOICE, the ELFA (English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings) corpus project was designed and started recording spoken English at the University of Tampere, Finland. In institutional contexts, the authentic spoken discourse was gathered from academic activities in international-degree programmes, commonly conducted in English. This ELFA corpus contributes speech events in seminars, PhD thesis defences, conferences, lectures and panel discussions where participants are
international students and academic professionals, mainly from European countries (Mauranen, 2003; Mauranen et al., 2010).

Moving to Asia, the use of ELF has increased dramatically in this region. Inspired by VOICE, the Asian Corpus of English (ACE) project has been achieved under the influence of English as the working language of ASEAN. This corpus is now accessible at http://corpus.ied.edu.hk/ace/ (Kirkpatrick, 2016). Spoken ELF interactions naturally occurring in Asian multilingual contexts have been collected by a collaborative team across East and Southeast Asia, so ACE participants primarily are Asians with various first languages. In addition, ACE has been established in the same vein as VOICE by adopting the same transcription software. The ACE corpus, therefore, can be compared with the two European corpora (Kirkpatrick, 2010b, 2013, 2016).

Corpus-based research allows descriptive work on the formal features of ELF emerging particularly in Expanding-Circle settings. One of the main findings in corpus-based ELF research is that ELF communication does not follow ENL norms. This is because ELF speakers are multilingual and, as such, modify their linguistic resources and create innovative linguistic forms. As a result, patterns of language use that diverge from ENL forms are perceived as characteristics of ELF, rather than “errors” or a deficiency in the language. Therefore, ENL standard norms are irrelevant as a yardstick to measure the ELF speakers’ English proficiency and correction by the native speakers of English is less necessary in using English for lingua franca communication. Shared understanding through the process of meaning negotiation should be paid, instead (Björkman, 2008; Cogo & Dewey, 2006; Jenkins, 2006, 2011b; Seidlhofer, 2001).

Dewey’s PhD research (2006) initially provides a plausible explanation of underlying functional features in ELF. Forms and functions are related in a way that these emergent ELF forms are motivated by functional incentives. Subsequently, he categorised language shifts into particular types of function as follows:
Exploiting redundancy: Some lexicogrammatical features, as mentioned above, are the result of exploiting redundancy. In ELF, cumbersome elements in lexicogrammar which do not affect semantic value are likely to be excluded in utterances e.g. using a singular verb with the 3rd subject pronoun, dropping the identity of the subject, and omitting objects and complements of transitive verbs. These characteristic formal and functional features enhance the flow of ELF talk, rather than leading to any communicative obstructions.

Enhancing prominence: The function of the definite article is extended to “convey semantic prominence or signal special emphasis” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 101). In other words, the article ‘the’ emphasises important parts of the speech. The article ‘the’ is also used to add prominence, either with abstract and uncountable nouns or with plural nouns, even though they are generic.

Making regularization: The regularisation of anomalous syntactical patterns is another motive which leads to the flexible and variable use of prepositions and collocations in ELF. To give a sense of “topic and theme” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012), these verbs e.g. “discuss” and “mention” are followed with the preposition “about” to regularise the verb as with “talk” and “say”. This function adds more sense of meanings.

Increasing explicitness and clarity: For instance, redundancy is employed to emphasise meanings e.g. return back (Schneider, 2012), and the preposition is added after the verb e.g. discuss about (Dewey, 2006). Furthermore, “repetition, rephrasing, synonymy, and paraphrasing” are employed to make the meaning of expressions clearer and more explicit.

Applying accommodation: Due to the wide range of participants’ linguacultural backgrounds and the diversity of ELF settings, the process of accommodation is remarkable as “the key pragmatic strategy” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 103). The accommodation strategy does not give rise to any language changes, either in terms
of lexicogrammar or semantics. Rather, accommodation is the process that ELF participants employ to exploit their pragmatic resources to negotiate and retain the flow of conversations. In this sense, ELF hearers are tolerant of any non-conforming ENL varieties as long as they do not reduce any semantic value; that is, the utterance is still understandable. Doing so enhances the flow of meanings.

**Reinforcing explicitness and clarity of proposition:** In ELF communication, speakers attempt to optimise explicitness of expression of meaning and minimise ambiguous utterances. Various strategic tools are used to reinforce intended meaning and make it more explicit. Many cases of ELF communication reveal that additional elements e.g. repetition and synonyms are used in ELF utterances when speakers are aware of communicative problems that might have occurred in the previous utterance. In addition, the fronting of a highlighted item and using a named subject together with a subject pronoun are also noticeable in ELF corpora (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Dewey, 2006, 2007).

After all, ELF speakers with diverse linguacultural backgrounds adapt and modify speech patterns at phonological and lexicogrammatical levels. They consequently create “a fluidity of forms” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 77). Indeed, the diversity of ELF speakers and the fluidity of ELF forms characterise ELF interaction. Given the empirical findings in ELF research, it is likely that ELF interaction requires explicitness and clarity throughout the process of communication. ELF speakers are both productive and receptive participants in ELF talk. They are cooperative and collaborative in order to ensure mutual intelligibility.

For this reason, a number of ELF scholars are interested in a “communicative view of ELF” (Seidlhofer, 2009b, p. 241). Their attention to pragmatics is increasing to investigate how ELF speakers actually adapt their English and make use of their linguistic and communicative resources to negotiate meanings and intelligibility in lingua franca interactions (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2011). As well as focusing
on ELF formal features, the direction of ELF research has shifted towards pragmatics and strategies of meaning negotiation.

3.2 Pragmatics of ELF and negotiation of meaning

ELF research demonstrates that ELF speakers make an effort to negotiate meaning and facilitate mutual intelligibility during ongoing spoken interactions. This is a turning point for ELF research into pragmatics to determine “pragmatic motives and functional meanings” (Jenkins et al., 2011, p. 292). As “ELF communication is heavily content-oriented” (Jenkins et al., 2011, p. 293), ELF speakers are concerned “more about meaning than form” (Hülbauer, 2009, p. 333). Thomas (2014) explains, “making meaning is a dynamic process, involving the negotiation of meaning between speaker and hearer, the context of utterance and the meaning potential of the utterance” (p.22). Additionally, Cogo and House (2018) clarify that “the aspect of negotiation meaning” in pragmatic studies of ELF is concentrated on “the strategies used to construct meaning and/or solve non-understanding” (p. 212).

It is worth mentioning significant interactional studies from the early stages of ELF pragmatics, despite intercultural communication between English non-native speakers. Firth (1990) described how English was used by NNSs and how they used English in international settings where the majority of participants were NNSs. In his study, conversations in English were recorded from naturalistic workplaces where participants aimed to sell goods and negotiate with business partners. The findings of conversation analysis led to proposals for an “interactional approach” and demonstrated how NNSs made meanings of English and managed their communication effectively. Firth’s subsequent study (1996) explored a number of strategies that the participants used to achieve the purposes of their conversations in ELF business settings. Significantly, Firth’s research made a point of pragmatic
strategies: (a) “let it pass” used to avoid any situations that could possibly cause communicative problems; (b) “make it normal” applied when the listener pays less attention to the speaker’s non-standard language use; (c) “other-repair” noticed when the listener seemed to focus on the form of English and correct the interlocutor’s utterances, rather than focusing on the content that the speaker conveyed; and (d) “other completions” happening when the listener helped the speaker to finish an utterance when s/he struggled with making sentences (Firth, 1996).

Further key research into ELF interaction was conducted by House (1999) to study on misunderstanding in group discussion among European participants. House claimed that misunderstanding was a fundamental part of intercultural interaction among diverse participants. Misunderstanding was interpreted as ELF participants performing differently, or not appropriately at the moment of ongoing ELF interaction. Communicative inadequacy was one of the main features of ELF talk which gives rise to misunderstanding. With this in mind, she proposed that ELF speakers should have “pragmatic fluency”, alongside competence in English to communicate in ELF contexts:

a) ability to use routinized pragmatic strategies and gambits appropriately

b) ability to initiate and change topics appropriately

c) ability to “carry weight”, giving and taking important turns appropriately

d) ability to carry on uptaking and responding reciprocally during interactions

e) ability to employ other strategies e.g. pauses and back-channels for repairing speech (House, 1996, 2002).

Referring to House’s findings, the participants failed to make meaning understandable mutually. They ignored “local routine disruption” occurring (House,
1999, p. 80) because of a low level of awareness of misunderstanding. The findings represented "self-centeredness" of ELF speakers (p. 84). The participants concentrated on their own thoughts and then threw them into their interlocutors. Conversely, as listeners, they rarely listened to their interlocutors. The participants neglected to give and take turns and lacked “mutual orientation” during interactions (p. 82). They assumed that their interlocutors had understood the meanings in utterances, so they did not pre-empt or avoid any courses of conflict or communicative troubles. The participants failed to collaborate during spoken interactions to achieve mutual understanding. In some situations, the ELF participants could not cope with or react smoothly when encountering difficulties in understanding triggered in the previous turn of talk. Regarding culture irrelevance, House’s findings (1999) reported that the ELF participants were less attached to their L1 identity and linguacultural norms. So, differences in cultures between participants in ELF interactions were not the primary cause of communicative misunderstandings in ELF.

Meierkord (2000) studied “talk-in-interaction” in English among international students in Great Britain. The spoken discourse was analysed by using discourse analysis and conversation analysis approaches. The findings showed some strategies and features of a cooperative and collaborative nature in lingua franca communication. Unlike House’s finding, “co-participation” was found during ongoing conversations. Pauses were oriented to function as transitional markers. In addition, overlapping occasionally happened without disruption during ongoing conversations. Instead of causing failure of turn-taking, the findings showed that overlap served to co-construct utterances. Backchannels and supportive laughter were used when the participant desired to interact with interlocutors. Meierkord reported that the ELF participants would rather talk about safe topics and have a brief conversation; that is, they changed topics of discussion “after less than ten turns”. Interestingly, the finding of Meierkord’s study supported House’s finding in term of cultural
irrelevance. The lingua franca conversations in English did not show “reflections of the participants’ mother tongues’ communicative norms” (Meierkord, 2000, p. 8).

The aforementioned pragmatic studies gave reflections of English intercultural communication which is “overtly consensus-oriented, cooperative, and mutually supportive, and thus fairly robust” (Seidlhofer, 2003, p. 15). In line with those scholars working in this field, Seidlhofer raised the issue that a large database of ELF usage was required in terms of its forms and functions, including the area of ELF pragmatics (Seidlhofer, 2001, 2003).

### 3.2.1 Nature of ELF communication

The pragmatic research in the early stages has led to a large amount of attention being paid to the description of strategies used in ELF communication. The way in which these strategies are studied is in terms of negotiation of meaning and establishment for mutual intelligibility throughout the communicative process in ELF. A number of recent studies about the communicative practices of ELF have documented how ELF speakers make an effort to facilitate the exchange of meaning as well as to retain the conversational flow and smooth it over using pragmatic strategies. The findings subsequently reveal the communicative nature of ELF (Björkman, 2011, 2014; Cogo, 2010; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Deterding, 2013; Honna, 2005; House, 2002; Hülmbauer, 2007; J. Kaur, 2012, 2009, 2011b, Kirkpatrick, 2007a, 2010a; Mauranen, 2006; Pitzl, 2005; Watterson, 2008).

ELF speakers have a wide range of linguistic resources with various localised Englishes and varying degrees of English proficiency. This results in diversity of ELF speakers. They manipulate linguistic resources and more or less transfer their native cultures into ELF usage (Cogo & Dewey, 2006; Kirkpatrick, 2010a; Meierkord, 2002; Pölzl & Seidlhofer, 2006); as a result, language variation and language change has emerged (Cogo & Dewey, 2006; Dewey, 2007). This phenomenon characterises flexibility in ELF
usage, and subsequently fluidity in ELF interactions. Therefore, ELF communication is heterogeneous (Jenkins et al., 2011, p. 305).

On the contrary, ELF communication is “fragile” (Firth, 1996, p. 248; J. Kaur, 2011a, p. 94). “Heightened variability” (Dewey, 2009) of syntactic and semantic properties in using ELF easily causes difficulties and problems in understanding. ELF speakers, however, cannot take it for granted (Cogo, 2010, p. 303) when exchanging meaning and sharing understanding. It is essential for them to work together through “a joint, dynamic, and interactive process” (Cogo & Pitzl, 2016, p. 339). As a two-way process, communication is effective when mutual understanding takes place. ELF speakers actively cooperate with their interlocutors by using pragmatic strategies and interactional elements to exchange meaning, negotiate understanding, collaborate to make conversations flow and get involved in conversations to ensure successful effectiveness in ELF interaction. Therefore, ELF speakers’ cooperation, collaboration and involvement in talk are characteristics required for effective ELF communication (Cogo, 2010; Cogo & Dewey, 2012).

3.2.2 Communicative effectiveness in ELF interactions

Negotiation of shared meaning and mutual understanding is regarded as the aim of effective ELF communication. As far as understanding in concerned, Smith (2009) points out three aspects to negotiate understanding. First, “intelligibility”, refers to the ability to “recognise a word or utterance spoken by another”. Secondly, “comprehensibility” refers to the ability “to ascertain a meaning from another’s word or utterance”. Finally, “interpretability” is the ability “to perceive the intention behind another’s word or utterance” (Smith, 2009, p. 17). A low ability in at least one of these dimensions can result in problems in understanding, mainly non-understanding and misunderstanding.
ELF speakers try to establish mutual intelligibility in ELF communication. In doing so, the crucial process is the negotiation of meaning. They use pragmatic resources, apart from the language to “achieve understanding and negotiate non-understanding” throughout “the communicative practices” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 114). In addition, ELF speakers orient an accommodation process in order to make use of the language suitable for the interlocutor to understand, especially when they encounter communicative problems. To illustrate, ELF speakers in Asia, more or less having shared linguacultural features, code-switch, code-mix, and borrow their interlocutors’ language forms to make meaning in ELF contexts (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, 2010b).

Previous ELF research in pragmatics demonstrates that misunderstanding and miscommunication rarely occur in ELF contexts, despite the use of deviant linguistic forms of English (House, 1999; J. Kaur, 2009; Meierkord, 2000; Seidlhofer, 2003). Non-conformity ENL lexicogrammatical forms or pronunciation features neither disturb ongoing interaction nor cause a great number of misunderstandings (Kirkpatrick, Subhan, & Walkinshaw, 2012, p. 89). This seemingly shows that errors in the SLA perspective are not directly correlated to communicative effectiveness in ELF communication (Hülmbauer, 2007, p. 5). Instead of judging correctness in linguistic forms, understanding of what has been said should be taken into account (Seidlhofer, 2001).

Shared understanding to some extent indicates communicative effectiveness in ELF interaction, but the other side of the coin is that problems in understanding possibly take place during ongoing interaction. In general, mishearing, lexical elements, complex and elliptical utterances, and the context of utterances could contribute to communicative problems (Bremer, 1996; Mauranen, 2006). Problems in understanding can be non-understanding and misunderstanding. Non-understanding happens when listeners cannot make sense of what they have heard, either partial or entire utterances, or when what they have heard is interpreted with a different
meaning to what speakers intended. Non-understanding in the ELF contexts happens when “there is a lack of shared understanding” (Pitzl, 2005, p. 53). In other words, the understanding is incomplete and is not shared between the speaker and the listener. In addition, Mauranen (2006) defines misunderstanding in ELF as “a potential breakdown point in conversation, or at least a kind of communicative turbulence” (p. 128) because ELF speakers have “gaps in the shared language code” (p. 146). In ELF pragmatics, misunderstanding can be defined as “any kind of trouble or difficulty in understanding” (J. Kaur, 2017, p. 28). Nevertheless, there is no clear-cut boundary between non-understanding and misunderstanding, as Bremer (1996) states, “this is not always an ‘absolute’ distinction” (1996, p. 41, her emphasis). To this end, discriminating between non-understanding and misunderstanding depends on how the interlocutor perceives, interprets the utterances, and shows awareness of emerging problems in understanding. That is to say, in some cases listeners do not give any signs of having difficulty in understanding; as a result, speakers do not orient negotiation of meaning and resolution of such understanding problems.

3.2.3 Signals of understanding problems

Signals of understanding problems indicate communicative problems and trigger ELF speakers to respond to such signals. Vasseur, Broeder, & Roberts (1996, p. 77) proposed “a continuum of procedures” model, as shown in Figure 2. The left end shows less explicit symptoms, and more explicit signals of non-understanding are shown at the right end. This model helps to analyse the participants’ “interpretive process” to see how they respond to difficulties in understanding by employing “their perception, knowledge, experience and linguistic resources” (Vasseur et al., 1996, p. 82).
Similarly to Vasseur et al. (1996), Mauranen (2006) studied signals of misunderstanding in ELF interaction. Her study contributes signals of misunderstanding from the explicit signals to the implicit ones. Speakers of ELF produce direct and specific questions e.g. ‘what does ... mean’ to ask for clarification or further explanation (Cogo, 2010; Mauranen, 2006). So, a source of trouble is easily detected and promptly dealt with. In the same vein, Cogo and Dewey (2012) add that speakers of ELF use “explicit statements” such as ‘I don’t understand’ to signal the mismatch of understanding. Some indicators are less explicit, but they are still informative as the source of trouble is indicated, so-called “semi-explicit indicators” (Vasseur et al., 1996; Watterson, 2008). “Repetition of problematic items” produced in an interrogative intonation (Mauranen, 2006, p. 133) is also employed to echo the unclear part of the utterance, also referred to as an echo with rising intonation (Cogo & Dewey, 2012). In the case of using repetition, rising or falling intonation is significant for interpretation (Pickering, 2006; Pickering & Litzenberg, 2011). Moving on to implicit signals, speakers of ELF use “minimal incomprehension signals” (Mauranen, 2006, p. 132). The signal might be detected, but there is no identification
of the source of the problem. Using this kind of indirect and unfocused signal allows the interlocutor to interpret the purpose either as an indicator of confusion or lack of understanding or as a way of gaining more time to think and respond (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Lichtkoppler, 2007; Mauranen, 2006). In addition, direct but unfocused questions e.g. ‘What?’ (Mauranen, 2006, p. 135) and “minimal queries” such as ‘pardon?’, ‘again?’ or ‘eh?’ (Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; Kirkpatrick, 2010a; Pitzl, 2005; Watterson, 2008), are included. ELF speakers might use unfocused "minimal signals" when mishearing the previous utterance (Mauranen, 2006). In terms of the existing signals used in ELF interaction, speakers of ELF do not neglect problems of understanding. Instead, they attempt to remedy these communicative difficulties to achieve meaning-making activities and reach mutual understanding. Apart from exploiting and modifying linguistic resources, it appears that pragmatic resources are also required to negotiate meanings in speeches and ensure mutual intelligibility (Björkman, 2011; Breiteneder, 2009; Cogo, 2010; Cogo & Dewey, 2006; Hülmbauer, 2007; Jenkins, 2011a; Kachru, 1985; Seidlhofer, 2001; Seidlhofer et al., 2006).

There are many factors which contribute to misunderstandings in ELF. Problems in understanding can happen due to mishearing words or phrases (Athirah & Deterding, 2015; J. Kaur, 2011a; Mauranen, 2006), and ‘slips of the tongue’ (J. Kaur, 2011a; Mauranen, 2007) which are related to the performance of ELF speakers. Secondly, misunderstandings can result from language-related factors such as the “ungrammaticalities and disfluencies” (J. Kaur, 2011a, p. 103) of ELF speakers. The third factor is “ambiguity” (J. Kaur, 2011a, p. 105). In some cases, ELF speakers cannot construct utterances explicitly, use ambiguous terms and provide inadequate information, resulting in confusion and incomplete understanding (Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; Pitzl, 2005). As a result, interlocutors need to infer meaning from what they have perceived, and could infer an incorrect meaning. Lack of world knowledge is another factor that can lead to misunderstandings in ELF. ELF speakers who lack general knowledge and have limited linguistic resources will probably fail to provide sufficient information and clarification when negotiating meaning (J. Kaur, 2011a).
Conveying understandable content is more important than using grammatically correct English in ELF communication.

According to Pitzl’s study (2005), a sequence of the understanding problem in negotiation process should be mapped out from where the problem begins until it is resolved. Accordingly, the scoped sequence of repair in this study is mapped out from where the signal of non-understanding occurs until where shared understanding is noticed in touristic encounters. The sequence of repair is the analytic area to explore how ELF speakers negotiate meaning and cope with non-understanding.

### 3.2.4 The analytical model for negotiation of meaning

Non-understanding happens “when the listener realised that s/he cannot make sense of (part of) an utterance” (Bremer, 1996, p. 40). In this respect, Pitzl (2005) adapted the model of “a continuum of procedures” (see Figure 2) to scan any occurrences of non-understanding in ELF spoken interactions as of her data. She also borrowed the model for the negotiation of meaning (T I R RR) proposed by Varonis & Gass (1985, p. 74) as shown in Figure 3 to set the area for analysing how ELF participants cope with non-understanding in her study. The T-IR(R) model indicates the start and finish points of an occurrence of understanding problems.

![Figure 3: Model for the negotiation of meaning](image)
The T-IR(RR) model is divided into “trigger” and “resolution” parts. The trigger refers to a partial or entire previous utterance indicating the hearer’s non-understanding. The trigger indicates a cause of understanding problems which might happen at different levels of understanding, namely at word level (intelligibility), sentence or utterance level (comprehensibility), and at the level of the intention or purpose of the conversation (interpretability) (Deterding, 2013, p. 9; Watterson, 2008, p. 386).

In the resolution part, an indicator refers to non-verbal actions, paralinguistics and utterances functioning as a signal to begin a repair process. The indicator can vary from explicit or direct statements to implicitness e.g. overt question, echoing, request repetition, minimal queries with rising intonation, respectively (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Pitzl, 2005; Watterson, 2008). These are discussed as signals of understanding problems. Inappropriate responses and non-verbal language also serve as indicators (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 119). After the signal is detected, the pragmatic strategy is employed to handle interlocutors’ incomplete understanding. The pragmatic strategy used at this point is regarded as a response designed to repair difficulties with understanding, make meaning, and regain shared understanding. ELF speakers opt for pragmatic strategies for various different functional motives, which will be discussed later in this chapter. Finally, a “reaction” is the last element in this model, however, it is claimed as “a further (optional) utterance” (Watterson, 2008, p. 385). Interlocutors perhaps produce a reaction when they understand and finally get back to the main point of conversation. Reaction, as the signpost, shows that the understanding problem is resolved and understanding occurs again (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Pitzl, 2005; Watterson, 2008).

In ELF interactions, ELF speakers make use of their linguistic and other pragmatic resources to get meaning across. In so doing, pragmatic strategies are key elements that ELF speakers employ to establish shared understanding and achieve their purposes in ELF interactions.
3.3 Pragmatic strategies: functions and strategic practices

An increasing number of ELF studies have been conducted to investigate pragmatic strategies used in various ELF contexts. This section highlights functional motives and pragmatic strategies used in ELF interactions. The discussion of pragmatic strategies is divided into 1) pre-empting strategies referring to strategies serving preventive purposes, without an indication of understanding problems and 2) repairing strategies serving remedial purposes after ELF speakers have realised a signal of non-understanding in ELF interactions.

3.3.1 To pre-empt non-understanding

Pre-empting strategies are used to achieve understanding, avoid potential confusion and minimise problems in understanding before an indicator is signalled in the flow of conversation (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; J. Kaur, 2009). Kaur (2009) describes pre-empting strategies as serving “preventive purposes” to avoid communicative breakdowns and minimise difficulty in understanding. In fact, it is not always that meaning negotiation happens only after an indicator is realised. Even though there might be no evident signals of problems in understanding, ELF speakers anticipate whether a prior utterance might cause misunderstandings. They also need to monitor their interlocutor’s understanding. Bjorkman (2014) says “speakers in ELF settings do pro-active work for communicative effectiveness” (p. 129).

To facilitate clearer hearing

The listener’s hearing and understanding might be impaired during the interaction. If this is the case, it is necessary for the speaker to provide the interlocutor with another chance to hear the utterance, and to clarify the interlocutor’s mishearing (Cogo &
Dewey, 2012, p. 133). If this does not happen, mishearing can cause misunderstandings and mutual understanding cannot be established.

Repetition gives the interlocutor one more chance to hear the utterance more clearly either with or without a request for repetition such as ‘huh?’, ‘ehm’ or ‘sorry’ (J. Kaur, 2010; Kirkpatrick, 2007a, 2010a). In some cases, due to the interlocutor’s silence, ELF speakers interpret that the interlocutors might mishear or hear unclearly. To facilitate clearer hearing, simple repetition, either exact or partial repetition, is commonly employed by the same speaker, regarded as self-initiated repetition. However, exact or partial repetition does not always help the interlocutor with problematic words. ELF speakers need to opt for other practices (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; J. Kaur, 2009, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2010a; Lichtkoppler, 2007).

Repetition of key word (s) is a subtype of repetition used by ELF speakers to allow for clearer hearing. This also helps the speaker to “draw the recipient’s attention to the repeated item” (J. Kaur, 2012, p. 602). Spelling-out repetition is another strategic practice of repetition used to facilitate clearer hearing. ELF speakers spell out the ambiguous or confusing words to disambiguate potential problems in understanding in what have been previously said. Kirkpatrick gave an example that the Vietnamese speaker of ELF spelt out the word, ‘P H O’ when introducing “nam pho”, the Vietnamese food (2010a, pp. 128–129). Van (2015) reported the use of “spelt repetition” in her doctoral research. Vietnamese Front-Office staff spelt out some lexical items particularly proper nouns e.g. ‘T-A-X’, the name of a shopping centre in Ho Chi Mihn City (p. 77). In addition to pre-empt potential non-understanding, Cogo and Pitzl (2016) state that ELF speakers disambiguate confusing pronunciation of contractions by extending such contractions. To illustrate, the contraction, ‘won’t’ in which can be pronounced similarly to the word ‘want’ was produced into ‘will not’ (Cogo & Pitzl, 2016, p. 341). This strategic practice is similar to Kaur’s sound-stretch repetition (2009). Sound stretch is produced to facilitate clearer hearing. According to Kaur’s study (2009), the speaker in one case not only repeated the word
'seventeen’ but also pronounced it more clearly to avoid confusion with the word ‘seventy’ (J. Kaur, 2009, p. 111). Kaur’s data additionally shows that overlap in some way impairs the interlocutor’s clear hearing. Repeating a prior utterance is used as "a way of repairing the possible impairment of a turn component by virtue of its having been in overlap" (Schegloff, 1987 cited in Kaur, 2009, p. 117). Sometimes, speakers of ELF repeat problematic items with a rise in intonation to signal potential trouble in understanding. In turn, the speaker performs a simple repetition or “echoing of repetition” (Watterson, 2008) to allow for clearer hearing.

Repetition are commonly employed in many forms e.g. exact or partial repetition, key-word repetition, spelling-out repetition, and sound-stretch repetition provide interlocutors in ELF interactions with a chance of clearer hearing.

**To repair non-standard linguistic features**

ELF speakers take a proactive approach to exploiting their linguistic resources, and to repairing non-standard linguistic features in ELF interactions. Even though non-standard English do not disturb or cause serious problems in understanding, ELF speakers are to some extent aware of the non-standard variety of their English. They frequently carry out “monologic self-repairing” to prevent misunderstandings (Mauranen, 2006, p. 138).

Mauranen (2006) analysed ELF conversations in the ELFA corpus to investigate signals of misunderstanding and the participants’ responses to these. She commented that ELF speakers rephrased content, lexical or grammatical points with an attempt to show “a high level of language awareness”, rather than to establish understanding in such interaction (p.139-140). She found that non-native speakers in international communication frequently repaired grammatical points in their speech whereas native speakers disregarded them and concentrated on the meaning. In ELF talk, “self-repair practices”, regarded as self-initiated repair (Björkman, 2014; Cogo & House, 2018; Van, 2015) were employed in a way that “the speaker orientated to his
or her own speech as requiring some form of adjustment or modification” (J. Kaur, 2011b, p. 2707). Deterding (2013) additionally reported that users of ASEAN ELF frequently perform self-initiated repairs to avoid misunderstanding in the CMACE corpus. At times, speakers of ELF, taking part as the listener uses “a questioning repeat” to ask the speaker to repair his/her previous utterance (J. Kaur, 2012, p. 609). Alternatively, the practice of questioning repeat can be used to request clarification (J. Kaur, 2010, p. 202).

Pronunciation is the linguistic feature which is frequently repaired in ELF interactions. ELF speakers attempt to articulate a word or to pronounce it correctly immediately after a mispronounced word. According to Deterding’s research, users of ASEAN ELF may sometimes paraphrase immediately after pronouncing a particular word. They are aware that non-standard pronunciation of a prior word might have caused the recipient to become confused, and they hope that paraphrasing provides a clue to help the recipient to understand the meaning. This strategic practice is regarded as “paraphrase with additional explanation” (Deterding, 2013). Deterding gave an example where a participant pronounced the word, ‘vagrant’ as ‘[fʌŋɡræ]’ and explained further, saying ‘meaning travel from one place…’ (Deterding, 2013, p. 133). Nevertheless, ELF speakers hardly ever correct their own pronunciation because to some extent they do not know how to fix their distinctive pronunciation (J. Kaur, 2011b).

Regarding lexicogrammatical points, rephrase and paraphrase are commonly used to solve a lack of linguistic knowledge, with additional explanation. ELF speakers frequently explain things or refer to related lexical items when they lack word choices during ongoing talk. Mauranen (2006) commented that “the explanation seems to function to prevent misunderstanding” (p. 140). Deterding (2013) illustrated that a participant in his study used the word, ‘virgin’ to describe untouched tourist spots. The speaker, however, anticipated that the word ‘virgin’ might have been unclear to the recipient, and possibly the recipient did not know its meaning. For this reason, he
provided more explanation, ‘not much polluted by the tourists’ immediately after the word ‘virgin’ (Deterding, 2013, p. 134) to help the recipient get the main idea.

ELF speakers recall incorrect lexical items or omit to pick up a word when they are struggling with word choices; however, to some extent they are able to repair the problem. For example, one ELF speaker said, ‘I haven’t any’, then after a pause the speaker corrected it to ‘I didn’t have any...’ in the ongoing turn (Jamshidnejad, 2011, p. 3765). Doing so can be regarded “self-correction” where “an incorrect word choice is replaced with the correct one” (J. Kaur, 2011b, p. 2707), similar to “lexical correction” (Kirkpatrick, 2010a). His study reported that users of ASEAN ELF in multiparty talk employed lexical correction because they were aware that using incorrect words or phrases could lead to misunderstanding to other interlocutors.

Lexical replacement is another practice of self-repair (J. Kaur, 2011b). Lexical replacement occurs when ELF speakers can think of the correct lexical item straight after producing the incorrect one and immediately insert it without disrupting the sentence structure of the ongoing turn. Kaur has additionally reported the use of repaired repetition in her following studies (J. Kaur, 2012, 2015). Repaired repetition is the practice of replacing a segment of previous talk with correct lexical items not only to repair inappropriate lexical items but also to enhance clarity of utterances in ELF interactions.

Asking for another person’s help is another strategic practice found in ELF interactions. If the speaker lacks vocabulary, they might ask for help overtly, for example, they might say ‘how can I ... how can I put it in English?’ (Jamshidnejad, 2011, p. 3763). To be proactive and to cooperative in ELF interaction, the listener can initiate strategic practices to offer the speaker “a search for an expression” (Mauranen, 2006, p. 138). The appropriate words are supplied to help the speaker construct the utterance. The speakers of ELF in Deterding’s study (2013) overtly asked their interlocutors questions, e.g. ‘how to say’, ‘what is it’, and ‘what you call’ when they could not find words to complete their utterances (Deterding, 2013, pp. 136–
Co-constructed repairs can happen during ELF talk, especially when ELF speakers are "comfortable with helping strategies" and have the motive to ensure effective communication (Kirkpatrick, 2007a, p. 124). In this sense, Cogo and House (2018) support that co-construction of utterance is another strategy of meaning negotiation to help participants in talk make meaning of what they intended to convey.

Kirkpatrick and a number of regional scholars in South-East Asia carried out an exploration of ELF features and ELF communication in the region. Users of ELF across ASEAN were multi-linguacultural (Deterding & Kirkpatrick, 2006; Kirkpatrick et al., 2012; Michelle, Patkin, & Kirkpatrick, 2014). The studies on ASEAN ELF presented that users of ELF across ASEAN taking parts as the listener helped the speakers to complete utterances by anticipating a possible word when the speaker was struggling to think of a proper lexical item to negotiate meaning. In this sense, they employed “lexical anticipation” to cope with the interlocutors’ restricted language resources. Alternatively, they offered “lexical suggestions” to help the speakers make the right choice of words.

In line with other scholars working on pragmatic strategies, Kwan and Dunworth (2016) carried out research to explore the use of pragmatic features of communication in business settings among employers and employees working for an individual domestic unit in Hong Kong Island. Unlike other aforementioned research, the data in this research was collected using questionnaires and interviews. With regard to the use of repairing, their statistical analysis reported that “error repair” was “the least common” strategy used in their study. This shows that the ELF participants in their research paid much more attention to meaning because “meaning was prioritised over accuracy” (Kwan & Dunworth, 2016, p. 17).
Chapter 3 Developments in ELF research

To make the meaning more explicit

It is vital that ELF speakers make meaning understandable and explicit enough for their interlocutors because the gaps in ELF speakers’ shared knowledge and repertoires have an influence on misunderstanding. ELF speakers have a motive to improve clarity and avoid confusion. They employ various strategic practices in an attempt to “amplify the meaning” (J. Kaur, 2009), “simplify a lexical item” (Björkman, 2014) and “disambiguate a possible non-understanding” (Cogo & Pitzl, 2016). This is especially true when ELF speakers construct localised “unilateral idiomaticity” which is when English lexical items and idioms are used in local and specialised phenomenon and culture in a certain area (Honna, 2005; Kirkpatrick, 2011; Seidlhofer, 2004). The speakers require accommodative and cooperative work to elaborate on meaning and achieve the same understanding (Seidlhofer, 2009a). Prolific ELF research has discovered strategic practices such as such as repetition (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; J. Kaur, 2009, 2012; Lichtkoppler, 2007), reformulations, including rephrasing and paraphrasing (Björkman, 2014; J. Kaur, 2009), and self-repairing (J. Kaur, 2011b; Mauranen, 2012; Tsuchiya & Handford, 2014) are used to increase explicitness in meaning.

Repetition has many types of uses to enhance explicitness in meaning. Lichtkoppler (2007) studied the uses of repetition in terms of forms, functions, and the approach of using this strategy in ELF conversations among Austrian office staff and international students in Austria. The ELF participants in her study not only repeated their utterances, but also slightly altered the utterance with the same information to develop the meaning and make it more understandable. The use of “utterance-developing repetition” was found in Lichtkoppler’s study with two underlying motives: “production-oriented” and “comprehension-oriented”. ELF speakers used the production-oriented utterance-developing repetition when they wanted to “find an expression that he or she is satisfied with” (Lichtkoppler, 2007, p. 53). On the other hand, the comprehension-oriented utterance-developing repetition served to “make
an utterance more intelligible” (p. 54). The latter was more concerned with making meaning explicit. Comprehension-oriented utterance-developing repetition was illustrated by the following examples, ‘you have to move out’, ‘you have to move out totally’ and ‘you have to take your things out of the room’. The key phrase ‘move out’ was repeated a few times in different sentence structures, but the main meaning was the same (Lichtkoppler, 2007, pp. 53–55). “Prominence-providing repetition” is another function of repetition found in Lichtkoppler’s research. That is, ELF speakers repeated a certain word a few times in the flow of a conversation. This kind of repetition gave prominence to utterances to help interlocutors perceive “the deeper sense” of repeated words. For example, a Japanese student asked a German student to print out the document. The Japanese student said the word ‘print’ four times in one talk to emphasise what he had asked for (Lichtkoppler, 2007, p. 55).

In this similar vein, Kaur further determined types and purposes of “resaying in talk” from her dataset. She reported the use of “parallel phrasing” which refers to a “form of repetition with slight variation” (J. Kaur, 2015, p. 248) in ELF interactions. Parallel phrasing is another strategic practice of repetition that ELF speakers used to make meaning more explicit (J. Kaur, 2011b, 2015). To do so, a series of synonymous or antonymous words is formed to reflect the meaning in parallel and emphasise the main point of an interaction. From Kaur’s findings (2012), ‘barrier, impediment, and obstruction’ were produced to show “parallelisms in meaning” within the local context of a conversation. This shows “syntactic parallelism” using synonyms to reinforce meaning (p. 601). Alternatively, both synonym and antonym can be provided as parallel phrasing in the same ongoing talk. For instance, in one case, the word, ‘benefit’ was repeated many times to provide prominent meaning, alongside the phrase, ‘no benefit’ and the repetition of the word ‘disadvantage’ (J. Kaur, 2012, p. 600). Given that, parallel phrasing concerns with rhetorical variation and syntactic similarity to maximise meaning.
Furthermore, Kaur’s studies report the use of combined repetition to clarify meaning and enhance understanding during ELF talk (J. Kaur, 2012, 2015). This strategic practice is similar to repetition with expansion (Cogo, 2010; Cogo & Dewey, 2006, 2012) in a way to elaborate on meaning. ELF speakers attempt to ensure the interlocutor’s intelligibility when expressing culturally-related unilateral idiomaticity. For instance, in Cogo and Dewey’s (2012) work, a Japanese ELF user said ‘don’t step on the stones’. This Japanese speaker was aware that the recipient might not have understood this utterance; therefore, the expression was reformulated with an additional explanation in the following turns (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 131). Additionally, this strategic practice was also used in written ELF communication. Ren (2016) analysed 89 emails written by Chinese graduates and found that one Chinese participant mentioned the Chinese idiomatic term, ‘Karmic tie’. To clarify meaning, an expanded discourse ‘...or a magic connection’ was immediately given to provide local knowledge, related to Chinese culture.

Nevertheless, using repetition in some situations does not help ELF speakers understand meaning explicitly. Due to the interlocutor’s implicit response, ELF speakers must proactively anticipate whether repetition of the prior message is sufficient for understanding. Reformulation is another pragmatic strategy used to raise explicitness in meaning in ELF interactions. ELF speakers can opt for utterance reformulation by rephrasing and paraphrasing to clarify, amplify and simplify meaning (Björkman, 2014; J. Kaur, 2009, 2010, 2015).

The practice of rephrasing is to reformulate the previous utterance with slight variation; the key word or phrase is retained. Kaur (2009) exemplified the strategic practice of rephrasing with a conversation between three participants talking about the reason for suspending their undergraduate studies. The speaker talked about ‘eighty eight crisis in Burma’ and her interlocutor responded with ‘uhhh’. She then rephrased the utterance as ‘democra: democratic crisis in Burma’ in the next turn to amplify the meaning of the phrase “eighty eight crisis” (J. Kaur, 2009, pp. 114–115).
On the other hand, paraphrasing is oriented to modify lexicogrammatical forms and provide concise details. ELF speakers reformulate their previous utterances in an attempt to simplify “terms and concepts or lexicogrammar-related items” to make them easier to understand (Björkman, 2014, p. 130). Paraphrasing is commonly employed to simplify lexical items (Björkman, 2014; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Deterding, 2013; J. Kaur, 2010; Kirkpatrick, 2007b, 2010a). For example, an ELF speaker said ‘it will be double, I mean two times’. In this case, ‘two times’ was produced to simplify the word, ‘double’ (Björkman, 2014, p. 130). In addition, paraphrasing is used to clarify meaning. Referring to Björkman (2014), a group of international students discussed writing a project report. A student, as the speaker in this talk, suggested that the group should write the report with ‘…it’s good quality or poor quality…’, and in his next turn he paraphrased his preceding utterance, saying, ‘we should correct some mistake or improve it…’. He altered the grammatical form of the utterance and also changed the word choices into ‘correct mistake and improve’ for more explicit meaning (Björkman, 2014, p. 131). In short, previous utterances are reformulated by rephrasing or paraphrasing, as explicitness strategies in meaning negotiation (Björkman, 2014; Cogo & House, 2018).

Apart from repairing non-standard linguistic features, self-initiated repairs are the strategic practices employed by ELF speakers to increase explicitness of meaning. A general term in the preceding utterance is replaced with a more specific word. In Kaur’s study (2011b), one speaker of ELF said “…they know – they understand”. To explain, ‘understand’ had a more specific meaning and replaced the word ‘know’. The other example was “…how people – how student”. A word with a broad meaning, ‘people’ was replaced with the word ‘student’ so that the utterance became clearer and more specific (J. Kaur, 2011b, p. 2709).

Clarification is a key element in the disambiguation of problematic items, even where there is no evident signal of a problem with understanding. Having said that, ELF speakers frequently use discourse markers prior to rephrasing or paraphrasing to
indicate a given clarification. These markers e.g. ‘I mean’, ‘in other words’, ‘trying to say’ and ‘what I’m saying is’. are used to alert the recipient to follow. Discourse markers function as “rephrasing markers” in ELF talk (Mauranen, 2007, 2012). Cogo and Pitzl (2016) cited Bjorkman’s (2014) finding, ‘it will be double, I mean two times’ to exemplify. They explained that ‘…I mean…’ functions as the discourse marker, followed by ‘…two times’ as the given clarification to simplify the prior word ‘double’ which seemed ambiguous in the local context of interaction (Björkman, 2014, p. 130; Cogo & Pitzl, 2016, p. 340). In this sense, ‘I mean’ is at times used by ELF speakers to emphasise the meaning they want to convey, with “function of clarification” (Cogo & House, 2018, p. 216).

To this end, increasing clarity and explicitness in ELF interactions should be taken into account, “the more formulations are given to the same sense, the better the chances that the contribution is understood” (Mauranen, 2007, p. 257).

**To check understanding: comprehension checks**

Many studies on ELF pragmatics have found that ELF speakers orient confirmation procedures, namely comprehension checks initiated by the speaker and confirmation checks initiated by the listeners (Björkman, 2014; Jamshidnejad, 2011; J. Kaur, 2010, 2011b; Mauranen, 2006).

ELF speakers, as the speaker in the talk, employ comprehension checks to guard against any potential problems in understanding. The speaker checks if the interlocutor is following his/her talk or not, and monitor whether the interlocutor understands the same meaning as the speaker has intended to convey. Short utterance and longer stretches are constructed to serve this function e.g. ‘understand?’ and ‘you know what I mean…’, respectively (Björkman, 2014). The discourse marker ‘you know’ prior to repetition, paraphrasing and rephrasing (J. Kaur, 2009, p. 115) is found to serve another function. Using ‘you know’ in this sense, the speaker does not mean to elicit an actual answer or explanation from his or her
The discourse marker is used to monitor the recipient’s understanding and provide the recipient with a chance to respond to what they have heard. To respond, the interlocutor either shows alignment or gives a clarification request. Apart from this, ‘you know’ allows the speaker to gain more time to think and make utterances and to continue the interaction (Jamshidnejad, 2011, p. 3766). In addition, overt questions e.g. ‘do you understand me?’, ‘you know what I am saying?’ or ‘do you understand what I mean?’ are also used to check the interlocutor’s comprehension in ELF interactions (Jamshidnejad, 2011; J. Kaur, 2009; Mauranen, 2006).

**To engage alignment along the flow of conversation**

In ELF interaction, the interlocutor should be proactive by showing alignment to support the flow of spoken interaction. When taking part as the listener in ELF talk, ELF users often use repetition, or “Represents” (Edmondson, 1981 cited in Cogo & House, 2018) referring to “echo, mirror, or shadow element” (Cogo & House, 2018, p. 213) to show their engagement in ELF interactions. In other words, they reuse a segment of the previous expression. This practice is regarded as other-repetition to confirm understanding and to show alignment of agreement (Cogo, 2009; Cogo & Dewey, 2006; Cogo & House, 2018; Kalocsai, 2014; Lichtkoppler, 2007). The practice of other-repetition can be initiated, together with minimal responses e.g. ‘yes’, ‘yeah’, ‘ok’, or ‘uh huh’. These minimal responses are used to signal understanding and also give a sign allowing the speaker to progress with the talk (Björkman, 2013, 2014; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Mauranen, 2006). Furthermore, utterance completion and completion overlap can be used to make a flow in ELF talk (Cogo & Dewey, 2012). ELF speakers also perform gestures and non-verbal actions e.g. nodding to engage in the conversation and to encourage the speaker to carry on his or her utterances (Hanamoto, 2016, p. 188).
3.3.2 To repair non-understanding

This subsection deals with repairing strategies in negotiation of meaning in ELF interactions. Schegloff (2000) clarifies repair as “practices for dealing with problems or troubles in speaking, hearing and understanding the talk in conversation” (p.207). The T-IR(RR) model is useful for differentiating whether the strategy is used for pre-empting or remedial purposes. This depends on whether the indicator is detected in the ELF talk or not. Repairing strategies serve as a “response” to the “indicator” in the T-IR(RR) model. After the listener gives a signal of non-understanding (see Section 3.2.3), ELF speakers need to look back to find the trigger or the source of such trouble after detecting the signal. They opt for the strategic practice to solve an existing non-understanding appropriately and effectively. In so doing, ELF speakers need to be sensitive and complete retrospective work.

Repairing strategies could be orientated by the speaker and the listener, regarded as “self-initiated” and “other-initiated” strategies, respectively (Björkman, 2014). Self-initiated strategic practices have been previously reviewed as pre-empting strategies. Despite this, some of them can be also used as repairing strategies in response to the signal of non-understanding. The pragmatic strategies are provided to serve two main functions.

To request clarification

Clarification requests are employed to “request for clarification of meaning when understanding is incomplete” (J. Kaur, 2010, p. 202). The interrogative construction is involved in so doing. Using a direct question is an explicit way of making a request for clarification. For instance, when an abbreviation, ‘IT’ was used in the utterance and the recipient was unsure of its full form, the listener checked on it by asking directly, “did are you referring to the the information technology?” (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 133). Alternatively, a direct wh-question e.g. ‘what do you mean?’ is often...
constructed by the listener to signal a difficulty in understanding (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 124). This direct question triggers the speaker to explain or provide more information.

ELF speakers sometime use a single wh-question word e.g. ‘what?’ (Mauranen, 2006, p. 135) or ‘what’s that?’ (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 134) when the listener fails to get the speaker’s message. Despite that, this practice might not be very explicit in asking for clarification. To make the request more explicit, ELF speakers often combine a single question word with repeating items about which they are unsure, such as ‘ba bead what’s that?’ (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, p. 134) and ‘what? similar: method?’ (Kaur, 2010, p. 202), for example. If the speaker fails to detect these requests, it is likely that the listener use more than one strategy during the ongoing conversation e.g. ‘sorry? … where?’ (Deterding, 2013, p. 141). The minimal query, ‘sorry?’ is used together with the question word, ‘where’ to specify the problematic source.

“An alternative-type question” is another practice found in ELF interaction in cases where the speaker fails in response to “a wh-clarification question” (J. Kaur, 2010). Referring to Kuar’s findings, a listener constructed a wh-question, ‘what kind of law?’ to request clarification, but there was a muted response. Thus, the listener asked again by reformulating the further question, “is the general law or…” (J. Kaur, 2010, p. 203). In this sense, the alternative-type question was used to narrow down the information required.

Question repeat is another practice of clarification request. This practice refers to where a word or a segment of the previous message is repeated with a rising intonation (Björkman, 2014; Dörnyei & Scott, 1997; Jamshidnejad, 2011). Björkman’s work (2014) reported that European ELF speakers in her study used questions or question repeat to ask for explanation or further information to complete their understanding (p. 133). Kirkpatrick added users of ELF across ASEAN asked for clarification by “repeating the unknown term with a questioning intonation” (Kirkpatrick, 2007a, p. 128).
To confirm comprehension

Regarding confirmation procedures, “confirmation checks” initiated by the listener are used to confirm accuracy of the listener’s hearing and understanding. The strategy is similar to a request for confirmation, or a confirmation request in previous studies (Jamshidnejad, 2011; J. Kaur, 2010). The strategic practices are commonly formed into interrogative structures such as direct questions and questioning intonation. Confirmation checks, therefore, also serve as an overt signal of understanding problems.

Mauranen (2006) gave the query, ‘did i understanding right?’ as an example of a direct question. Her research also explored the use of minimal tokens in confirmation procedures. The minimal token, ‘yeah’ was inserted with a rising intonation e.g. ‘...as i think we see in Renata's paper (. ) yeah?’ as confirmation check (Mauranen, 2006, p. 136). ELF speakers, taking part as the listener, insert ‘yeah?’ or ‘right?’ as “a questioning tag” after they have reformulated the previous message to ensure accurate understanding (J. Kaur, 2010; Van, 2015). For example, a speaker of ELF talked about ‘a instrument like computer’, then to confirm the understanding the listener rephrased this into ‘facilities’ and inserted the questioning tag, ‘yeah?’ at the end of his turn (J. Kaur, 2010, p. 201).

In addition, the listener reformulates the prior message to ensure the accuracy of understanding; meanwhile, doing so indicates whether the recipient’s understanding has been matched to the speaker’s or not. Kaur (2010) exemplified this with an extract where the speaker uttered the word, ‘feedback’, though this lexical term was possibly difficult for the recipient to understand. The listener responded to the speaker by paraphrasing in a questioning intonation, ‘our friend will ask you or something?’ Cogo and Dewey (2012) present the idea that “a further expansion on the topic” is another practice used to confirm the listener’s understanding. This means that the listener recall alternative words related to the topic and produce
them with a questioning intonation. Referring to Cogo and Dewey’s work (2012), the speakers of ELF talked about ‘business competition’. The speaker mentioned ‘McDonalds’ in the local context. In response, the listener confirmed his understanding with the word, ‘baker’ in a rising intonation. Cogo and Dewey commented that “a baker was involved in the competition” in some way (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 124). In a similar vein, Deterding (2013) found that users of ASEAN ELF in the CMACE corpus employed an alternative word related to the topic for confirmation checks. One user of ASEAN ELF talked about the ‘rain forest’, but the listener did not understand entirely. For this reason, the listener guessed and inferred what he had heard. In turn, the listener initiated another related word, ‘wind?’ with rising intonation to confirm understanding (Deterding, 2013, p. 140).

ELF speakers employ discourse markers e.g. ‘you mean’ prior to rephrasing and paraphrasing as the practice of confirmation check. To do so, the listener needs interpretability to reformulate what is said into what s/he perceives, and then constructs a request, asking the speaker to verify his/her understanding such as ‘you mean something like that?’ (J. Kaur, 2010, p. 200).

The use of confirmation checks is also found in written communication in ELF. In Ren’s study (2016), analysing pragmatic strategies in ELF emails, a recipient guessed the meaning of a writer’s utterance and made a direct statement, ‘I assume that’s what you mean’ to indicate that his understanding was not complete. The recipient further made a direct request for confirmation, ‘Please kindly check and let me know if there’s any question...’ (p. 8). It needs to be borne in mind that unlike spoken interaction, written communication is not simultaneous, so it is more difficult to notice the signals of understanding problems. Occurrences of non-understanding could be seen in the following replying emails.

It is worth giving sequences of how ELF speakers deal with non-understanding by using a number of pragmatic strategies to negotiate meaning and consequently achieve shared understanding. In Kirkpatrick’s study, a user of ASEAN ELF
pronounced the word, ‘holes’ similarly to the word, ‘horns’. This triggered a difficulty in understanding. The initial speaker spotted the trouble source after the listener performs ‘horns? sorry’ that is regarded as an interrogative repeat. So, the speaker spelt out the word, ‘H-O-L-E’ to facilitate clearer hearing and raise explicitness in utterance. Then, the listener used question repeat, ‘holes?’ to confirm the accurate hearing. Even though the speaker said, ‘yeah’ as a minimal acknowledgment, the listener took his further turn to verify his understanding. The listener repeated ‘holes’ and used the discourse marker ‘oh you mean...’ to indicate the attempt to confirm whether he recalled the right word. During this turn, the word, ‘hole’ was resaid, with expansion ‘in the ground’ to amplify the meaning. Finally, they negotiated a shared understanding after the speaker reacted with ‘yeah’ (Kirkpatrick, 2010a, pp. 132–133).

Given the sequence of meaning negotiation, pre-empting and repairing strategies are used throughout the flow of conversation. In the light of negotiation of meaning, the strategies can be employed after the trouble source occurs and is signalled by the interlocutor so as to solve it; although, the pragmatic strategies can be used without any signs of non-understanding (Cogo & Dewey, 2012). ELF speakers are aware of a potential risk in their interactions. The responsibility for negotiation of understanding either to pre-empt or to repair communicative problems is shared between the speakers and the listener in ELF talk. Particularly when ELF speakers are sensitive to problematic triggers, the sooner the communicative trouble is signalled the better the negotiation of understanding. Collaboration and interactional proactive work occurring at various stages undoubtedly characterises the nature of ELF communication. All things concerned from the previous ELF pragmatic research, these pragmatic strategies are beneficial for ELF speakers to negotiate meaning as well as to establish shared intelligibility in ELF interactions.
3.4 Summary

This chapter provides an overview of the development of ELF research. The initial framework of ELF research was intended to document the linguistic properties of ELF existing in the Expanding Circle. Recently, ELF researchers pay a lot attention to pragmatics in the communicative practices of ELF, mainly in academic and business settings. A huge amount of ELF research indicates the characteristics of ELF communication in terms of the diversity of ELF speakers and the fluidity of ELF uses. ELF speakers try to exchange mutual intelligibility by employing a variety of pragmatic strategies of meaning negotiation (Cogo & Dewey, 2006, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2011).

In this chapter, the purposes of using pragmatic strategies are classified into to pre-empt and repair problems in understanding. ELF speakers use pragmatic strategies in a wide range of forms and functions in negotiation of meaning. Many forms of repetition such as exact or partial repetition (Björkman, 2014; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; J. Kaur, 2009), spelling-out repetition (Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; Kirkpatrick, 2010a; Van, 2015), and repetition with sound stretch (J. Kaur, 2009) are used to facilitate clearer hearing. ELF speakers repair or correct their pronunciation and sentence structures to prevent misunderstanding. Doing so more or less indicates an awareness of their distinctive linguistic features. ELF speakers also employ a variety of repetition and reformulation to enhance explicitness in meaning and clarify utterances such as repetition with expansion (Cogo & Dewey, 2012) or combined repetition (J. Kaur, 2012, 2015), utterance-developing repetition (Lichtkoppler, 2007) or parallel phrasing (J. Kaur, 2012, 2015), rephrasing (Björkman, 2014; J. Kaur, 2009, 2011b, 2015; Van, 2015), and paraphrasing (Björkman, 2014; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; Deterding, 2013; J. Kaur, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2007a; Van, 2015). ELF speakers perform strategies of clarification request to ask for further explanation or more detail to fulfil their understanding (Björkman, 2014; Dörnyei & Scott, 1997; Jamshidnejad, 2011; J. Kaur, 2010, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2007a;
Mauranen, 2006). Additionally, ELF speakers initiate confirmation procedures in using the strategies of comprehension checks (Björkman, 2014; Jamshidnejad, 2011; J. Kaur, 2009, 2010; Mauranen, 2006) and confirmation checks (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; J. Kaur, 2010; Kirkpatrick, 2010a; Mauranen, 2006). The former is to monitor the interlocutor’s understanding whereas the latter is to seek confirmation of accurate understanding, initiated by the interlocutor him/herself.

Regarding as the repairing strategies, these strategies are used as responses to the signals of non-understanding. The interlocutor performs the signal by echoing problematic items with rising intonation, using unfocused questions, and minimal queries (Bremer, Roberts, Vasseur, Simonot, & Broeder, 1996; Mauranen, 2006; Watterson, 2008). In doing so, ELF speakers could request for repetition or clarification. To this end, a variety of pragmatic strategies are used in ELF interactions to exchange and negotiate until the understanding is shared.
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This study is to explore the process of negotiating meaning and achieving shared understanding in touristic ELF. The emphasis was paid on pragmatic strategies employed by Thai local people and foreign tourists. The description of the methodology of this study is a preliminary here. This chapter provides methodological approaches, analytical framework, procedure of data collection and procedure of data analysis. Ethical issues and the limitations of data collection are also addressed.

4.1 Research aims and research questions

Regarding the gap in ELF research, ELF research into pragmatics is prolific in academic and business domains; however, little research has been conducted in the context of tourism, despite numerous ELF interactions in this domain. My aim in this study is to investigate how pragmatic strategies are employed by Thai locals and foreign tourists in touristic encounters and to contribute to a description of communicative practices in touristic ELF. The empirical study answers these following research questions:

1. What pragmatic strategies do these ELF speakers employ to negotiate meaning and understanding?
   1.1 What strategies are most commonly used for pre-emptive purposes?
   1.2 What strategies are most commonly used for remedial purposes?

2. How does the use of pragmatic strategies vary across transactional and interactional conversations in touristic ELF?

Research questions are essential at the initial stage in order to design data collection and analysis. The research questions give a sense of the kind of data that are needed, how to collect the data, where and through which channels such data can be obtained e.g. recordings, observations, interviews etc. This also involves preparing
data for analysis in terms of transcribing and documenting the collected data, and the coding process. Coding is “a way of patterning, classifying, and later reorganizing each datum into emergent categories for further analysis” (Saldaña, 2014, p. 96). The analytical process is about how to obtain evidential answers to those questions (Have, 2004; Saldaña, 2014; Sunderland, 2010).

### 4.2 Methodological approaches

The present study is descriptive within a qualitative research framework. The descriptive findings reflect and present conventions of examining pragmatics strategies in ELF communication, particularly in the context of tourism. Unlike quantitative research dealing with “statistical explanations”, qualitative research contributes verbal explanations and “complex descriptions” (Have, 2004, p. 16). Qualitative research is normally conducted in natural settings to explore “the close study of a limited set of evidence” (Have, 2004). Research materials, or sources of data in qualitative research are taken into account as “part of the reality being studied” (Alasuutari, 1995, p. 63). Qualitative researchers interpret and infer what a set of data actually presents and how to draw conclusions. They work out “from the particular to the general” (Saldaña, 2014, p. 93). Thus, qualitative research involves an inductive or data-driven process (Peräkylä, 2013). Therefore, the qualitative paradigm is suitable for my research.

Qualitative research methodology provides me with methodological approaches to explore ELF pragmatics within tourism contexts. To conduct this present study in the same vein of existing pragmatic ELF research, I combined the conversation analytic approach with the ethnographic framework when collecting data (Cogo & Dewey, 2012). Nevertheless, the study is not analysed under the complete framework of CA. Cogo and Dewey point out that shared understanding can be seen in turn-taking during interactions. That is to say, available tools of CA are opted for analysing data. The theoretical perspective (see Section 3.2) regarding the procedures model of non-
understanding (Vasseur et al., 1996) and the model for meaning negotiation (Varonis & Gass, 1985), together with pragmatics in ELF research (see Section 3.3) are combined to develop an analytical flowchart for data analysis, as discussed in Section 4.3.

4.2.1 Conversation Analysis (CA)

Conversation Analysis (CA) is the study of naturally occurring talk, related to spoken verbal interaction, or talk-in-interaction among participants in social settings. Actual talk which is spontaneous and unexpected provides “naturalistic data” (Liddicoat, 2011, p. 15). People use their knowledge of a language as a means of communication and deploy their linguistic resources e.g. lexis, grammar, and syntax for their interaction. (Peräkylä, 2013, p. 163). All forms of naturally-occurring talk-in-interaction are recoded and transcribed for analysing human spoken interaction (Drew, 2005; Heritage, 1995, 2005; Liddicoat, 2011; Peräkylä, 2013).

Qualitative researchers apply CA to analyse and describe interactional phenomena emerging from conversations, as “practices and patterns of interaction” because CA offers a tool for studying spoken interaction occurring in social settings. CA is the analytical method used to “discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus being on how sequences of actions are generated” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 14). In other words, CA provides a tool to examine the language spoken in natural situations and ways of using language in talk (Have, 2007; Peräkylä, 2013) with the focus on “how one participant understood the other’s prior turn/conduct” and on “what basis they arrived at that understanding” (Drew, 2005, p. 197). CA is adapted in empirical research in ELF interaction “to explain how the interactants understand each other and how the interaction unfolds, but they do not deal with the why question” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 31). The key concern when using CA is “what is in the data” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 31). Schegloff (2007) explains that CA is concerned with “what is said” by
interlocutors in the spoken interaction, and “sequential organization” in terms of turns at talk and organisational sequences (Schegloff, 2007, p. 2). A conversation contains sequences of turns in the talk. The interlocutors interpret what is said in the prior turn and infer what action should or might be taken in their turn to respond to the prior utterances. Talk-in-interaction is an interactive resource providing the organizational orders and sequential responses in talk.

Each turn-taking helps to explore how the participant takes his/her turn to respond to the previous utterance in the prior turn. The sequential organization of talk shows “what happened before” and “what follows next” (Psathas, 1995). The sequences of turns at talk are sequences of moves or actions in interaction which show how the participants accomplish their activity. For this reason, the process of exchanging meanings can be considered in organisational sequences. When the interlocutor responds inappropriately in the following turn, it can be assumed that the participants have problems in understanding or that non-understanding has occurred. The organisation of repair is then taken into account (Have, 2007; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Jefferson, 2004; Liddicoat, 2011; Peräkylä, 2013; Psathas, 1995; Schegloff, 2007).

Nevertheless, in carrying out CA, researchers should take into account variation within the settings and other interactional phenomena. In order to investigate whether the interlocutor “failed to understand or acted as if they failed to understand”, the researcher observes “singular bits of data, each in its embedding context” (Schegloff, 2007, p. 8). Contextual issues in conversations should be considered in ELF pragmatic research into the “ways in which (ELF) talk is conducted” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 33). With this in mind, the context in which ELF is used can shape the pattern of ELF communication. Unlike other sociolinguistic approaches, demographic information or sociolinguistic variables e.g. gender, age, education, social class or participants’ relationship are not taken into account in CA.
This is the main process of CA (Have, 2007; Liddicoat, 2011; Peräkylä, 2013). During the earlier stages of research design, researchers think about the kinds of data needed, either audio recordings or video recordings, or even both if gestures and non-verbal behaviour are the research interests. These matters help the researchers prepare the recording devices and the set-up of devices at research sites. The first step is to make recordings of naturally-occurring talk-in-interaction in the actual social settings. It is a way to “document these interactions” (Liddicoat, 2011, p. 15). It does not matter whether the researchers are absent or present during data recordings because such interactions happen anyway. Then, the collected audio recordings are transferred into textual representation. The transcripts are created. After that, the researchers analyse what is in the data based on the issues of interest. Finally, the findings are reported with the aim of answering research questions.

As my study deals with the communicative practices of ELF in touristic encounters, investigating the use of pragmatic strategies in naturally-occurring talk is more or less similar to CA. I made use of available CA tools as the conversation analytic approach in this study. I attempted to explore the pattern of using pragmatic strategies to pre-empt and repair occurrences of non-understanding in ELF communication; that is how they exchanged meanings and achieved shared understanding throughout the process of spoken interactions in ELF.

With the above matter in mind, I followed Cogo and Dewey’s analytic approach to CA by paying attention to “the sequential succession of turns” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 32). The conversation analytic approach was adapted to look at ways in which the participants uttered through the turn-taking system underlying the organisation of talk. Turn-by-turn sequences in ELF talk were examined to discover signals of non-understanding, responses to these signals, pragmatic strategies adopted, and the effectiveness of using pragmatic strategies. The CA approach was used to contribute an analytic description of the pattern in using pragmatic strategies of pre-empting and repairing problems in understanding in ELF interactions.
4.2.2 Ethnographic perspective

The other methodological approach adapted in my research is the ethnographic perspective. Ethnography provides “on-field methods” (Have, 2004) used on natural research sites. The ethnographic approach is designed to establish what people actually do in natural settings, so researchers spend their lives on the research sites and carry out research routinely (Atkinson, 2001; Blommaert & Dong, 2010; Have, 2004; Kaplan-Weinger & Ullman, 2015; Saville-Troike, 1989). Everything that happens in these natural settings can be considered to be data. Many kinds of techniques e.g. observations, interviews, and document collections are combined to collect data because there might be unexpected situations in natural research settings. Moreover, the ability to interact socially with people in the field gives the researchers background knowledge of the research settings. Local information about such research settings is useful for the researchers as it enables them to select appropriate places to make recordings and allows them to understand such recorded situations more fully. Have (2004) comments, “combining ethnographic fieldwork with the analysis of field recordings has proven to be a very fruitful strategy in ethnomethodological studies of work, in which these two kinds of data are mutually instructive in complex ways”. It is more or less complex in data collection within the ethnographic perspective.

In addition, ELF researchers adapt the ethnographic approach because “the ethnographic element” is beneficial when conducting qualitative research (Seidlhofer et al., 2006, p. 21). In Cogo and Dewey’s work, the emphasis of their empirical research is on “exploring the nature of the ELF phenomenon”. So, “analytic induction” is undertaken “to identify what phenomena it illustrates and what issues it gives rise to, the findings from which analysis can then be transported to other contexts to see how they compare” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 35). The ethnographic features are considered in their research about “investing lingua franca communication”. It is possible that the researchers might play the roles of observers
and participants; as a result, they have access to gain more detail in the situations, “including the surrounding context”.

I consequently combined the ethnographic perspective with the conversation analytic approach in the procedure of data collection. My research is not fully representative of the ethnographic study. Despite that, some ethnographic features were kept in mind when I collected data. The access to data sources, and permission to access these sources were considered before I went to the research site. The consent letters and consent forms were created and approved by the Ethics Committee, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Portsmouth. Doing so enabled me to gain access to the sources of data, and also maintain ethical issues in doing my research. While being on the research site, I presented myself to the Thai participants as the researcher, and as an observer of the foreign tourists at the scenes of making recordings. I was aware of potential unexpected encounters, so the recording devices were always prepared and ready to record face-to-face interactions in any speech event types. Moreover, local information I obtained from the locals helped me routinize data collection while I spent my life in the research field for three months. Implementing data collection is discussed in detail in Section 4.4.3.

4.3 Analytical framework

In my analysis, the theoretical perspective of pragmatics in ELF which I have reviewed in Section 3.2 and 3.3 served as the analytic interests of my research. The analytic flowchart (Figure 4) was developed, together with a glossary of strategic practices in ELF interactions (Table 1) before doing data analysis. To help me analyse the data in a systematic way, the analytical flowchart is like the navigator, navigating me during the process of coding and also providing the analytic area to answer the research questions. The process of data analysis which was carried out using the NVivo platform is discussed in Section 4.5.
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The analytic flowchart for data analysis

Collected face-to-face encounters

A bit of transactional conversation

Types of conversation

A bit of interactional conversation

Transactional segment
(giving or exchanging factual or propositional information)

Interactional segment
(casual conversation for exchanging opinions and attitudes to establish and maintain social relationship)

Signal?
- Minimal query
- Interrogative echo
- Unfocused question
- Inappropriate response
- Explicit statement

Occurrence of understanding problems

No signal of understanding problems

No

Strategy?

No

No use of strategies

Yes

Strategic practices (Strategies)

Let the understanding problem pass

Signal was received?

Yes

Reparing strategies (Response to signals of non-understanding)

Clarification requests (other-)
- Question repeat e.g. “you mean, ...?”
- Single-word question e.g. “What?”
- Wh-clarification question (with specific area needed to be clarified)

Confirmation checks (other-)
- Direct question e.g. “do I understand right?”
- Questioning tag e.g. “right?”, “correct?”
- An alternative word / phrase with a questioning intonation

Signal of solution?

No (possible interpretation)

PRE-EMPTING STRATEGIES
(Response without non-understanding)

Repetition (self-/other-)
- Combined repetition
- Key-word repetition
- Parallel phrasing / Utterance-developing repetition
- Simple-repetition
- Sound-stretch repetition
- Spelling-out repetition

Reformulation (self-/other-)
- Paraphrasing
- Paraphrasing with expansion
- Rephrasing

Linguistic repairs (self-/other-)
- Co-constructed repair
- Lexical anticipation
- Lexical suggestion
- Lexicogrammatical repair
- Pronunciation repair

The problem is not dealt
Table 1: Glossary of strategic practices in ELF interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic practices</th>
<th>Definition/ Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A direct question (confirmation check)</td>
<td>An overt question e.g. 'did I understand, right?' is used as a confirmation check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-constructed repair (linguistic repair)</td>
<td>The practice of lexicogrammatical repair is performed by the third party in the multi-party talk to help other interlocutors make meaning and constructing utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined repetition (repetition)</td>
<td>A word or phrase is repeated, together with using a synonym, further information, or additional explanation, similar to Cogo and Dewey’s repetition with expansion. (TS 11-TS 15, TS 71-TS 74, IS 1-TS 2, IS 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructed (overt) question (comprehension check)</td>
<td>A direct or constructed question is used by a speaker to ensure that his/her listener understands what has been said e.g. 'understand?', 'do you know what I mean?', including using 'okay?'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit statement (signal of non-understanding)</td>
<td>The direct statement is uttered by a recipient to indicate the mismatch in understanding e.g. 'I don’t understand'. (TS 60, TS 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate response (signal of non-understanding)</td>
<td>The response in the following turn does not match what was said or asked in the previous turn, so it is assumed that there is a mismatch in understanding. (TS 61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic practices</td>
<td>Definition/Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative echo (signal of non-understanding)</td>
<td>A listener repeats a speaker's utterance or a problematic item in the previous turn with a rising intonation when s/he encounters a difficulty in intelligibility or comprehensibility. (TS 62, TS 74, TS 79, TS 89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key-word repetition (repetition)</td>
<td>It is a practice of repeating a particular or important word or phrase to provide a listener an emphasis of meaning, and to give the narrow sense of meaning in the ongoing talk. (TS 7-TS 10, TS 67-TS 70, IS 5, IS 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical anticipation (linguistic repair)</td>
<td>It is a strategic practice that a listener anticipates a possible word to help a speaker complete his/her utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical replacement (linguistic repair)</td>
<td>An incorrect word or phrase in the previous utterance is replaced by the correct one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical suggestion (linguistic repair)</td>
<td>A word or phrase is suggested or offered in order to provide word choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic practices</td>
<td>Definition/ Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexicogrammatical repair</td>
<td>A non-standard lexicogrammatical feature is replaced or repaired, either self-repair or other-repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal query</td>
<td>A minimal query e.g. ‘pardon?’, ‘sorry?’, or ‘huh?’ is used to ask for another chance of clearer hearing. (TS 53-TS 57, TS 62-TS 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-repetition</td>
<td>A word or phrase in the previous turn is repeated (with a falling intonation) by a listener in the following turn. This kind of repetition can show alignment and to confirm correct hearing. (TS 27-TS 31, TS 75-TS 79, IS 7, IS 8, IS 18, IS 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel phrasing</td>
<td>It is a practice of repeating oneself with slight change of previous utterance for rhetorical effect (Kaur, 2015) or a series of synonymous or antonymous words (Kaur, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrasing</td>
<td>A previous utterance is reformulated by using different words with similar meaning. (TS 16-TS20, TS 63-TS 66, IS 3, IS 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase with expansion</td>
<td>A previous utterance is paraphrased with additional explanation of related lexical items in the same context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation repair</td>
<td>A correct or better pronunciation is produced to repair the prior mispronounced word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic practices</td>
<td>Definition/ Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question repeat</td>
<td>A word or a segment of a previous utterance is repeated with a rising intonation by a listener to request clarification (after the listener more or less recognises the local context of talk). (TS 32-TS 37, TS 80-TS 84, IS 11, IS12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning tag</td>
<td>The practice of using a token e.g. 'right?', 'yeah?', or 'correct?' as questioning tag with a rising intonation after reformulated or repeated utterance to confirm understanding. (TS 44-TS 47, TS 93-TS 96, IS 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rephrasing</td>
<td>A previous utterance is reformulated in a different sentence with slight variation of utterances; the key word or phrase is remained. (TS 21-TS 23, TS 58-TS 62, IS 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self repetition</td>
<td>It is a strategic practice that a speaker simply repeats a part or the whole of his/her own previous utterance to provide a listener with another chance of hearing. (TS 1-TS 6, TS 53-TS 57, IS 6, IS 13, IS 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-word question</td>
<td>A wh-question word e.g. ‘what?’ or ‘which?’ is used to request clarification without a specific area of understanding problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound-stretch repetition</td>
<td>A word or phrase is repeated in which the sound is pronounced with a stronger and clearer stress and pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic practices</td>
<td>Definition/ Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling-out repetition (repetition)</td>
<td>A word is repeated in which a speaker spells out the word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using an alternative word/phrase with a rising intonation (confirmation check)</td>
<td>The practice of using an alternative word which is the other word in the same local context of talk is used with a rising intonation. (TS 38-TS 43, TS 89-TS 92, IS 9, IS 10, IS 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using discourse markers (confirmation check)</td>
<td>A discourse marker e.g. ‘you mean?’ or ‘right?’ is used to check the listener’s accuracy in understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using, ‘you know?’ (comprehension check)</td>
<td>A speaker uses a discourse marker e.g. ‘you know?’ after his/her utterance to check or monitor a recipient’s understanding. (TS 24-TS 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfocused question (signal of non-understanding)</td>
<td>A question word is uttered when a listener does not pay attention to listen, without any focus in listening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterance-developing repetition (repetition)</td>
<td>It is a practice of repetition that a speaker develops his/her utterance for a few times for a deeper sense of meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-clarification question (clarification request)</td>
<td>A wh-question with a specific area of the previous utterance is used by a listener of talk to seek clarification or addition explanation. (TS 48-TS 52, TS 85-TS 88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Procedure of data collection

4.4.1 Research site and scenes

The touristic encounters in my data occurred on a tropical island in Thailand. Lanta Island, also called Koh Lanta, is located in the Andaman Sea on Thailand’s Southwestern Coast. Koh Lanta District is an administrative area within Krabi Province, approximately 884 km from Bangkok. Koh Lanta is comprised of three main islands and other small islands. Two of the main islands are identified as Lanta Noi and Lanta Yai. The latter is the main research site where I made audio recordings of face-to-face interactions between locals and foreign tourists (Marchand, 2006; Ukrit, Arunotai, & Doungchan, 2011).

Figure 5: Koh Lanta
Koh Lanta is accessible by boat from Krabi, Phuket, Phi Phi Island, Lipe Island in Trang, and many other islands nearby. Tourists can also visit Koh Lanta by minivan, public transportation from mainland Krabi. Car-ferry services are also provided, passing from mainland Krabi to Koh Lanta Noi, and reaching Koh Lanta Yai. In 2016, a bridge was constructed between Koh Lanta Noi and Koh Lanta Yai, allowing visitors and locals to travel more easily than in the past.

Koh Lanta was chosen as the research site, due to tourism development on the island. Government and provincial administration policies have increased economic growth in the tourism industry. A huge number of foreign travellers, mainly from western countries visit. Some foreigners live on the island like residents, working as expats and having their own communities, such as the Swedish people (Ukrit et al., 2011). As Koh Lanta is open to global tourism, local people have started up small and medium-sized businesses in the tourism industry. Obviously, there is a stronger demand for ELF on Koh Lanta. Speech events in touristic encounters are significant to shed light on the nature of ELF in the context of tourism.

In sociolinguistics, social settings are considered as the context for talk which has an influence on communication. The social interaction in the particular context also shapes the participants’ actions to achieve their goals. In this sense, Cogo and Dewey comment, “setting can affect and shape communication in ELF”, (2012, p. 27). With the sociolinguistic matter in mind, Johnstone (2000) recommends working with something familiar. Patkin (2016) points out that “familiarity was helpful when identifying unique use of language, vocabulary and pronunciation” (p. 341). Familiarity in the setting is the reason why I chose Koh Lanta to conduct my research. For the last ten years, I have visited Koh Lanta regularly, so that I am acquainted with people and places on the island. Having friends in business there helped me access data sources. Furthermore, I was introduced to other locals owning cafés, hostels, and tour and travel agents, including yoga and Thai cooking instructors. Phatic
conversations with the locals gave me ideas about where else I could make audio recordings of face-to-face interactions between locals and tourists.

The collected data includes all types of speech events: transactional and interactional activities in various settings. Audio recordings took place in various places, namely information booking counters, piers, hostels, tourist spots, a souvenir shop, a diving shop, and some leisure-activity classes. I chose to carry out data collection in the high season between December 2015 and February 2016. It was a challenge to record naturally-occurring spoken interactions in a limited time frame.

### 4.4.2 Participants

The participants in this study were Thai locals and foreign tourists, regarded as ELF speakers using English for lingua franca communication in their own right. To investigate the use of pragmatic strategies in touristic ELF interactions, the key concern was how the participants achieved mutual understanding as a communicative outcome. For this reason, the participants’ demographic information was not collected. Their background information in terms of native countries, their first languages, educational background and level of English proficiency was not taken into account in this study. The findings resulted from analysis of collected naturally-occurring ELF spoken interactions.

There were 55 local Thai participants in this study. Despite excluding the participants’ personal information, some background information about local Thai participants was obtained through personal conversations with them. 27% of Thai participants were graduates, but there was only one participant who had majored in Business English. 35% of them did not have a university degree. I did not have a chance to obtain personal information about 38% of the Thai participants but 62% gave me their background information during personal conversations. The majority of them were not well-educated. Some of them had not learned English formally at school. They
acquired English on their own because of the high demand for using English on Koh Lanta. They gained knowledge of English from their experience. For example, a Thai local participant, working as a bartender, learned English from his customers. One local tour guide left school to work as a boatman. At that time, he could not even speak English, but now he is the local tour guide. He said that he learned English from his senior boatman. Accordingly, it can be assumed that some participants used their English at grass-root level for work-related purposes.

Foreign tourists were also participants in this study. Tourists visit Thailand from East Asia, Europe, South Asia, Middle East, North America and South America, Oceania, and Africa, respectively (Department of Tourism, 2016). Based on their physical appearance, westerners constitute the largest group of foreign tourists (Ukrit et al., 2011). In this study, no attempt was made to identify the nationality of the participants because their identity was not taken into account for data analysis. Nevertheless, some of these foreign tourists were native speakers of English as they informed where they were from during touristic interactions. Native speakers of English were not distinguished from non-native speakers of English. These foreign tourists were counted as the participants of this study. Despite that, it was difficult to count the number of foreign tourists participating in touristic encounters, especially when they were in a group. Only their genders were identified, for further research in future.

Psathas (1995) notes that “protection of right to privacy are assured, and individual participants many be anonymised and not identified”. The identification of participants was anonymised in the transcribing process. Alphabetical and numeral codes were created to de-identify the participant in transcripts. The upper case ‘TH’ stood for Thai whereas ‘F’ was for foreigners. The lower case ‘f’ was for female, and ‘m’ was for male. To illustrate, TH01f identified a local Thai female, numbered one. F001m identified a foreign tourist male, numbered one.
4.4.3 Data collection

The data collection was planned to take place over three months because I was unable to leave the UK for longer than three months, due to the restrictions of a Tier 4 student visa. I went to Thailand and was on the research site between December 2015 and February 2016 after having obtained the approval of the ethical review with Ethics Committee reference: 15/16:07 (Appendix 1). In the first week, I met some of my friends and acquaintances to inform them of the general purpose of this study. That is, I observed how Thai locals used English to communicate with foreigners, but I did not tell them any details of the research aims or research questions. Then, I asked their permission to collect spoken interactions which naturally happened in their places of work. During the first two weeks of collecting data, I mainly collected the touristic encounters in ELF around Sala Dan Pier because the Pier is the main entrance to Koh Lanta. A number of hostels, cafes, restaurants, booking kiosks, and souvenir shops are located on Sala Dan Street.

I adapted the ethnographic approach to plan my routine work for the rest of the time. The on-field methods allowed me to select where to collect spoken interactions and to establish the best times to observe the maximum number of touristic encounters. The Sala Dan Pier was packed with tourists in the morning, especially from 10:00 – 12:00 due to the boat timetable. Tourists checked in for boat departures at the Pier. In addition, tourists who had just arrived on Koh Lanta asked for information at tour & ticket kiosks. There were not many boat services after noon. The Sala Dan Pier was fairly quiet in the afternoon, after 14:00. For this reason, I switched to collecting spoken interactions at the nearby hostel when it was busy with check-ins and check-outs. I sometimes spent the afternoons recording touristic encounters at cafes.

After being present at the Pier for a while, I became “the familiar strange(r)” (Saldaña, 2014, p. 35). I was introduced as a PhD student to other Thai locals who were taxi and took-took drivers. This allowed me to have casual conversations with them and tell
them briefly about my study. I therefore asked their permission to make recordings when they interacted with foreigners. I also asked them to have noticeable signs on their vehicles in order to inform passengers that conversations in English were recorded for educational purposes and the passengers had the right to withdraw from this study. However, some taxi drivers refused to participate at first because they were reluctant to have their actions recorded and felt embarrassed about their English. After I had told them that the focus of this study was not on linguistic correction, they agreed to take part in the study. They expressed their willingness for their recorded conversations to be used for data analysis in this research. Consequently, I made audio recordings of these locals providing transportation services when there were not many speech activities at the Pier or the booking kiosks.

In the area of Sala Dan, I went to a scuba dive shop where I had previously been a customer for years. Having spoken with the owner, I asked him for permission to record the interactions between Thai staff, foreign dive masters, and foreign divers. The owner allowed me to make recordings at the dive shop and also on board boats during diving trips.

I attempted to record touristic encounters in ELF at as many different locations as possible because the venue where ELF interactions take place is identified as “an important contextual factor” (Pölzl & Seidlhofer, 2006, p. 155) which impacts on ELF phenomenon. In the first week of January 2016, I expanded the research area by making new contacts with other local business owners such as dive shops, tour and travel agencies, and other café owners recommended by my friends. I went to collect spoken interactions in ELF in Lanta Old Town, located in the east of the island. Close to Lanta Old Town, Yee Peng is a strong community where the villagers organise small-scale travelling services. They provide many types of tours such as one-day or half-day trips to other small islands nearby, kayaking trips and walking tours in the mangrove forest. The speech activities here provided me with audio recordings when I joined many of the organized trips. On the other side of the island, there are many hotels
and resorts where the guests’ privacy is preserved. As a result, I could only make recordings of touristic encounters at one hostel in Long Beach. Some booking agencies were available during the night, so I could record spoken interactions between Thais and tourists at Sala Dan Night Market. To record touristic encounters, I spent the mornings around the Sala Dan area, and went to either the Old Town or Long Beach in the afternoon, then I went back to the Night Market in Sala Dan after dinner. Despite that, data collection was unexpected, complex and difficult. I sometimes made few recordings even though I was at the research locations for hours.

### 4.4.4 Recording

Audio recording was the primary method used for collecting naturally-occurring ELF spoken interactions. The core data consists of authentic encounters which occurred naturally between Thai locals and non-Thai tourists. The use of uttered pragmatic strategies was the focus of this study, excluding gestures and non-verbal behaviour. I, therefore, preferred audio recording to video-recording because audio recording was less intrusive than video recording. It was also easier to set up and handle the audio recorder than the digital visual recording device in the research settings. An Olympus VP-10 digital voice recorder was used as the main recording device. This device has a built-in microphone, so I did not need to carry a separate microphone when making recordings. The low-cut filter and noise-cancel function of this device also provides clear recording. With its speaker, I could play recordings back straight after making them to check the sound quality in particular scenes to make sure that “the recording is clear enough” (Liddicoat, 2011, p. 21). The device is also convenient to turn on for recording with one touch.

Mondada recommends, “recordings must be done in one shot, with no interruptions” (2013, p. 43). The encounters in tourism were recorded continuously without any interruption. During the first few days of collecting data, I learned that encounters between locals and tourists sometime happened unexpectedly, and the nature of
encounters was often quick and brief. Therefore, the recording device was set up ready to record face-to-face interactions at any time. While making audio recordings, I also made field notes to better serve the purpose of gathering qualitative data (Blommaert & Dong, 2010). The field notes consisted of supplementary information about recorded encounters, including information about participants, scenes, purposes and brief details. The notes helped me recognise the situated interactions but could not be analysed. Noted details were used to classify data, to give details of each encounter in terms of anonymised identification of participants, places of speech activities, speech acts (either conversations or interviews), brief descriptions of situations, and length of encounter. The data classification was carried out when I initially scanned the data and checked for the sound quality of recordings.

Having said that, one of the limitations of this data collection was when the touristic encounters occurred in a noisy environment. It would have been much better to have a separate microphone, and to have placed it close to the participants in order to enhance the quality of the audio recordings. But, it was hard to do this in this research. I used a recording device with a built-in microphone, so that some background noise could not be filtered out. Unclear audio recordings caused difficulties with transcription, so they were unusable in data analysis.

Goodwin’s suggestion of using a tape for data recording is still valid; that is, researchers “ALWAYS work from copies not originals” (Goodwin, 1993, p. 196, his emphasis). The original conversational data in MP3 format were transferred and saved in my personal external drive. I also stored copies on my own laptop where a password is required for access. Thinking of the system of data documenting, and creating a data set, I used NVivo, a computer assisted qualitative data analysis software, as a working platform. I stored my conversational data, played the recordings repeatedly on demand and transcribed recordings to transfer into textual representation, so that I could code research interests on data, and analysed it in one place.
In total, I recorded 328 encounters. 5% of the collected encounters were interviews which were gained accidentally. On the other hand, 9% were unusable recordings, due to poor quality of sound recording, noisy background, and difficulty in hearing to transcribe. Interviews and unusable recordings were discarded. Only 86% of collected touristic encounters, totalling approximately eight hours and fifty-six minutes, formed a data set. I used MicroWave Application to amplify the audio signals and boost the volume on recordings. Then, these amplified digital audio files were imported to Nvivo.

4.4.5 Transcription

Transcription allows textual representation of the recordings of naturally occurring spoken interactions to be made available for analysis (Have, 2007; Liddicoat, 2011; Seedhouse, 2004). Transcription conventions are ways of using signs and punctuations to make audio recordings visible to analyse how people use language in social interaction pragmatically. The transcribed conversations are tagged to present “what was said and how it was said”, ready to be examined, “analytic consideration” (Have, 2007, p. 32). Basic concepts of transcription involve orthography, speech timing and placement related to overlaps, pauses, and silences, including other interactional features e.g. laughter, cut-off sounds or words (Jefferson, 2004, p. 180). Thus, some concepts of transcription were selected in relation to the focus of this present study.

To investigate ELF in touristic encounters, transcriptions were formatted using selected mark-up and spelling conventions in VOICE and ACE corpora (Appendix 2). The audio data was transferred into orthographic transcripts where the actual words were reproduced (VOICE, 2007b). Some mark-up conventions (VOICE, 2007a) are in addition to those in the CA approach (Bailey, 2008; Hepburn & Boilden, 2013; Jefferson, 2004; O’Connell & Kowal, 2009). The transcription conventions were marked manually. For example, the <pvc></pvc> tag is used to represent
pronunciation variations and coinage. There was no translation or transcription when languages other than Thai and English, were spoken. Instead, the utterances in a participant’s first language were indicated as the speaker’s L1 with the \(<\text{L1}>\)/\(<\text{L1}>\) tag. Where code-switching was used, I transliterated into the Roman alphabet and indicated this with the \(<\text{Lth}>\)/\(<\text{Lth}>\) tag. Some specific markers related to pragmatic strategies were opted in transcription. Falling intonation was marked with a full stop, “.” while a question mark “?” was used for rising intonation. A full stop in parentheses, (.) was used to mark a brief pause in utterances. Overlaps in interactions were marked with numbered tags in angle brackets, \(<1>\ xxx \</1>\). The tag \(<\text{spel}>\)/\(<\text{spel}>\) indicated spelling out. Apart from the abbreviations of TH and F anonymising the participants, TS, IS and U were used to shorten transactional segment, interactional segment, and utterance, respectively.

4.5 Procedure of data analysis

NVivo is a computer-assisted software for qualitative data analysis developed by Qualitative Solutions and Research International (QSR). NVivo11 is used as a management system for data documenting, and coding. It is also a tool used to conduct analysis. After installing NVivo for Mac (Version 11), I created this research project in NVivo. The amplified audio files, as the core data of this study, were imported into the Internals folder of Sources. As NVivo contains a transcription function, I transcribed the audio files within the software. The transcripts without transcription conventions were then available for coding in the NVivo platform.

It is vital that researchers learn its lingo to be able to operate NVivo for qualitative data analysis. Nodes are tags of ideas about the data, emerging ideas, and ideas of relationship in the data. Nodes are created “to mark relevant concepts and topics … that can be searched and anlayzed” (Walsh, 2003, p. 253). Referring to the analytic flowchart, factors that I investigated to answer my research questions were created as “nodes”. Coding at Nodes is the next step with the aim of categorising and linking
data to the ideas. Richards (1999) says that “if you code data in NVivo, Nodes are where coding is stored and explored” (p. 53). Within the conversation analytic approach, it is said that “coding functions as a way of patterning, classifying and later reorganising each datum into emergent categories for further analysis (Saldaña, 2014, p. 96). Accordingly, I used NVivo to label the data, and sort distinctive findings, as shown in Figure 6. NVivo provides an analysis utility as queries with different types, namely Text Search, Word Frequency, Coding, Matrix Coding, and Coding Comparison. In this study, I mainly ran “Matrix Coding” queries to explore relationships within the data. The function of annotations was used when the spoken data showed interesting issues. I used this function to note my opinions during the analysis.

![Operating in the NVivo platform](image)

**Figure 6: Operating in the NVivo platform**

I adapted CA procedures to analyse naturally-occurring encounters in ELF (Jamshidnejad, 2011; J. Kaur, 2010; Liddicoat, 2011; Pitzl, 2005; Seedhouse, 2004).
The initial stage to identify unmotivated phenomena of ELF interactions was indicated by the first diamond in the analytic flowchart. At this stage, I uncovered the speech event types. The collected encounters were categorized into types of communication which are transactional or interactional conversations to be addressed for the second research question. Transactional conversations deals with exchanging information as the major purpose of such interactions whereas interactional conversations or phatic talks aims to socialise and establish a social relationship among interlocutors (Brown & Yule, 1983). Despite that, there is not a clear-cut boundary between the nature of communication. Some touristic encounters in my data set had a mix of transactional and interactional talk. To analyse data, these touristic encounters were categorized into transational or interactional segments, based on the primary purpose of each talk. In case that transactional and interactional talk was mixed within the encounter, such encounter was divided into a small bit having only one type of communication. In this sense, a segment refers to a unit of a small bit of such encounter. In total, there were 257 transactional segments and 176 interactional segments from 328 touristic encounters.

At the second stage, I used CA procedures for the micro-analysis to explore strategy usage in ELF talk, regarded as examined phenomena in this study. Using CA, the researchers are supported to consider “aspects of the sequential connection between the prior turn and its prior sequence” (Watterson, 2008, p. 401). I, therefore, looked at sequences of turns in the talk to explore the practices of using pragmatic strategies in close detail (Cutting, 2008; Sidnell, 2013; Watterson, 2008).

Sequences of turns to be examined were divided into three positions as indicated by the grey diamonds in the analytic flowchart. The first position was the turn where instances of signals of non-understanding were located in talk. I kept in mind that signals of non-understanding had two pragmatic functions; to express mishearing or a mismatch to understand the prior utterances. If participants gave any of signals of non-understanding e.g. echoing, explicit questions, inappropriate responses, minimal
queries or overt questions, it indicated that incomplete understanding had potentially occurred. The pragmatic strategies used in the following turn were considered to be repairing strategies, “post trouble-source” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 120). On the other hand, some strategies were used without any signals of non-understanding. In other words, the strategies which ELF speakers employed to pre-empt non-understanding beforehand were considered as pre-empting strategies, “pre-realizations” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 127). I then examined the second position of the macro analysis. The second position was the following turn where the pragmatic strategy was employed. The strategy used in this turn was regarded as the response to the signals of non-understanding in the previous turn. At this point of analysis, it is worth noting that some strategies can have pre-empting and repairing functions in achieving mutual understanding in ELF talk. There might be many turns in between the second and the third positions. To estimate effectiveness of strategy usage in ELF talk, the analysis was also conducted in the third position where there is a signal of solution. The indication of shared understanding could be explicit acknowledgement or the participant’s responses showing to some extent satisfaction with his/her interlocutor. If there were no indications of shared understanding obviously taking place in the ELF interaction, the interlocutor’s reaction was open to interpretation.

As discussed above, the procedures were involved in coding at Nodes in NVivo. After finishing the process of coding, I ran the “Matrix Coding” queries. To do so, I identified particular phenomena in my study and then sorted out sets of Nodes related to other sets of Nodes. The results were shown in the form of table. It is advantageous to use NVivo for data analysis because NVivo provides counting functions. As a result, the numerical findings were available to support the descriptive findings. Quantitative findings were evidential for frequency of using pragmatic strategies. Finally, I applied the thematic approach, based on the functional motives to choose instances of strategy usage to be discussed in the chapter of findings.
4.6 Ethical issues and limitations of the study

Researchers have to consider practical, ethical and legal issues when collecting and analysing data. Gaining consent is about having permission to access research settings and data sources. It includes permission to use the collected data for research purposes, which might be reported in publications (Have, 2007). In terms of ethical issues, I bore in mind the need to have the participants’ consent. All the Thai participants were informed about my research when we had personal conversations, and I informed them prior to making recordings.

Some of the foreign tourists consented verbally to me recording their interactions with Thai locals. Nevertheless, it was difficult to obtain the oral consent from them before they began face-to-face interactions. ELF encounters in tourism happened relatively quickly at some places e.g. booking kiosks, hostels, and cafés. There was no chance to obtain oral consent. In addition, tourists’ comfort during their stays or their trips was taken into account because it should be insured that “no harm and minimal discomfort come to anyone” (Saldaña, 2014, p. 25). The best solution that I could find was to have the signpost and set up the audio device noticeably at the research scenes. The participants in my study had the right to withdraw their participation in this study at any time, then the recordings were deleted. Fortunately, there were no withdrawals.

Although this study has accomplished its aims, some limitations are unavoidable. Firstly, scoped as research into the pragmatics of ELF, the focus of this study is only on negotiation of meaning and how ELF speakers employ strategies to negotiate meaning and understanding, and how they solve problems in understanding. The use of interactional elements, discourse markers, idiomatic expressions and multilingualism (Cogo & House, 2018) was excluded in this study.
Secondly, time constraints affected data collection. Data collection was carried out over the course of three months, during the course of high season. I could not travel to collect data in many tourist islands nationwide. Therefore, the investigation of ELF communication in this study was focused only on the particular tourist island, Koh Lanta in Thailand. It could be criticised as a small-scale research area. Time limits also meant that I had fewer opportunities to make contact with local people and this resulted in a small number of Thai locals participating in this study. Another limitation of my study was the small size of the data set, totalling approximately eight hours and fifty-six minutes. This happened because of the features of touristic encounters; they are brief even though I recorded the naturally-occurring spoken interactions between Thai locals and foreign tourists as much as I could in various venues on a daily basis.

Finally, some limitations relate to data analysis. Audio-recordings were the only data in this study; that is, the verbal utterances were only analysed using the conversation analytic approach. Underlying functions in the pragmatic strategies were interpreted by the research from the contexts and situational surroundings. If video recording had been used, emerging non-verbal behaviour would be helpful in doing so, but it was difficult to set up the camera in various venues. In addition, retrospective interviews could reduce the possibilities of misinterpreting the underlying functions, but it was not possible to conduct retrospective interviews in this study. In touristic ELF, brief and purpose-driven interactions restricted retrospective interviews; moreover, asking the tourists for in-depth interviews might disturb tourists’ leisure and subsequently causes ethical issues. All things concerned, it seems that the findings of my study cannot be generalised as the use of touristic ELF.

### 4.7 Summary

The study was designed within the framework of qualitative research. The available tools of the conversation analytic approach were adapted to suit data collection and data analysis of naturally-occurring touristic encounters. The pragmatic strategies and
their functions were analysed based on sequences of turns in talk within the CA approach and the relevant theoretical perspective in pragmatics in ELF. NVivo was used as the working platform; that is, the data was documented, coded, and analysed in one place. Ethical considerations and limitations of this study were discussed.
Chapter 5  Findings

As this study is to explore the use of pragmatic strategies during the process of meaning negotiation in touristic ELF, the findings are presented in this chapter. The first section describes the nature of communication in touristic ELF and an overview of the frequencies of pragmatic strategies in this study. The use of pragmatic strategies for pre-empting and repairing non-understanding in transactional encounters is described in greater detail in the second section. The third section describes the pragmatic strategies used to pre-empt and repair non-understanding in interactional encounters. The detailed discussion of these two sections is explored with examples of transcribed data.

5.1 The nature of ELF communication in tourism contexts

The data set was formed using 269 (86%) out of 328 recorded touristic encounters whereas other 59 encounters were interviews (5%) and unusable recordings (9%) due to ambient noise. In the dataset, these encounters were divided into transactional and interactional segments, depending on the primary focus of encounters: to exchange information or to chat socially. As the matter of fact, some touristic encounters possibly contain two types of communication; that is, phatic talk can be inserted into transactional conversations. To distinguish phatic talk from transactional conversations, the touristic encounter was extracted into parts. Each part of encounter has only one type of communication either transactional or interactional. In this sense, one segment refers to a unit of an extracted part. The duration of the touristic encounters ranged from four seconds to 13:30 minutes, totalling approximately eight hours and fifty-six minutes. These touristic encounters were brief and spontaneous. The pie chart (Figure 7) reveals the proportion of transactional and interactional segments in this study as 78% and 28%, respectively.
The nature of most of these touristic encounters was transactional; that is, the exchange of information was the primary focus. The Thai locals and the foreign tourists used ELF in an attempt to give and gain accurate information. Transactional segments were found in the communicative practices of ELF asking for information about places of interest, tour packages, accommodation, transportation, and other services. This included reservation services and selling-buying activities. Apart from transactional segments, some casual interactions also occurred among Thai locals and foreign tourists. The interactional segments occurred when they had phatic talk, chatting socially in order to have social contacts and build up their relationships e.g. when hostel hosts socialised with their guests during their stays and when tour guides entertained their customers during their trips. In this sense, interactional segments were unrelated to the transactional purposes. They were not relevant to any tourist information. Figure 8 draws a comparison between the use of pragmatic strategies of meaning negotiation in transactional and interactional segments.
5.2 Pragmatic strategies in transactional segments

This section describes the frequencies of pragmatic strategies which were most commonly used in transactional segments. The coding process and the frequencies of pragmatic strategies in the data set were based on the findings provided by NVivo. The pragmatic strategies were classified into self-initiated and other-initiated strategies, depending on whether the speaker or the listener initiated the strategic practice in negotiation meaning. Self-initiated strategies were the strategic practices initiated by the speaker him-/herself whereas the latter are the strategic practices initiated by the listener.

Figure 9 illustrates the frequencies of self-initiated strategies used to pre-empt and repair non-understanding in transactional segments. Overall, the five most frequently-used strategic practices to guard against non-understanding were the same as those used to repair non-understanding. However, a higher frequency of self-
initiated strategies occurred when problems in understanding did arise. As a means of repair, self-(simple) repetition, at 31%, was the most frequently used practice, followed, in order, by rephrasing (20%), key-word repetition (16%) as well as paraphrasing (16%), and combined repetition (7%). On the other hand, to pre-empt non-understanding, the most frequently used strategic practices were self-repetition and key-word repetition, at 16%, followed by rephrasing (13%), and combined repetition (12%) as well as paraphrasing (12%).

![Pie charts showing frequencies of self-initiated strategies for repairing and pre-empting non-understanding in transactional segments.](image)

**Figure 9:** The frequencies of self-initiated strategies used for pre-empting and repairing non-understanding in transactional segments

By comparison, a higher frequency of self-initiated strategies occurred for **repairing** than pre-empting non-understanding. Self-repetition was the most commonly used strategic practice for pre-empting and repairing. **Self-(simple) repetition** is the strategic practice by which the speaker simply repeats either part of or the whole of his/her previous utterances. In this investigation, the frequency of self-repetition for repairing non-understanding (31%) was nearly double that for pre-empting, at 16%.

The next strategic practice was key-word repetition. **Key-word repetition** is the strategic practice in which the speaker repeats a particular or important word or phrase to emphasise and narrow a sense of meaning. Interestingly, the frequency of key-word repetition for pre-empting and repairing non-understanding was equal, at 16%. To guard against non-understanding, key-word repetition was the first most
commonly used to, along with self-repetition whereas this strategic practice was the third most often used practice for repairing non-understanding.

In this data set, the speaker seemed to reformulate his/her previous utterance to develop the utterance and improve explicitness in meaning, in response to the presence of various types of obstacles in understanding. By doing so, the speaker initiated rephrasing and paraphrasing. **Rephrasing** is the strategic practice related to a structural amendment; that is, the speaker slightly changes their way of speaking in terms of sentence structures, but still retains the key word or phrase in the utterance. **Paraphrasing** is the other practice of reformulation, regarding a lexical amendment. **Paraphrasing** is the practice in which the speaker uses different words or phrases with similar meanings but arranges in a slightly different way. The findings showed that the frequency of rephrasing and paraphrasing in response to signals of non-understanding was at 20% and 16%, but these two practices were used less than for pre-empting non-understanding, at 13% and 12%, respectively.

The last strategic practice commonly used in transactional segments was combined repetition. **Combined repetition** is the practice initiated by the speaker in which s/he repeat a word or a phrase of their previous utterance and also use a synonym or provide additional explanation in order to make meaning explicit. Unlike the four strategic practices mentioned earlier, combined repetition was the only strategic practice used for pre-empting (12%) more often than for repairing non-understanding (7%). This finding provided evidence that the speaker was highly aware of potential ambiguity and cautious to avoid any confusion by using combined repetition beforehand.

The interesting point here is that more than a quarter of the participants initiated other strategic practices for pre-empting non-understanding: (a) using discourse markers, ‘you know’ or ‘okay’ with a rising intonation, marked with ‘?’; (b) constructing an overt question for comprehension check; and (c) repairing his/her own non-standard lexicogrammatical features to avoid any confusion, at 9%, 7%, and
6%, respectively. By contrast, the participants used other strategic practices, at only 10% in sequence of repairing when problems in understanding arose.

The investigation also explored the functions of using self-initiated strategies in transactional segments (Figure 10). Most of the time the speaker performed self-repetition to facilitate another opportunity for the listener to hear the previous utterance either with or without the presence of any signals of non-understanding.

Like self-repetition, rephrasing and key-word repetition were used to facilitate a clearer hearing for the listener. Regarding explicitness in meaning, the participants in this study frequently opted for key-word repetition, combined repetition, and rephrasing to clarify and emphasise meaning; in addition, paraphrasing was significantly used to make the meaning easier for the listener to understand or to simplify meaning.

![Functions of using self-initiated strategies in transactional segments](image)

Figure 10: Functions of using self-initiated strategies in transactional segments

Turning now to pragmatic strategies initiated by the listener, Figure 11 illustrates the proportion of other-initiated strategic practices most frequently used in transactional segments. Other-(simple) repetition, question repeat, using an alternative word or phrase, wh-clarification question, and questioning tag were other-initiated strategic
practices which the listener most often used in negotiation of meaning to achieve shared understanding.

The most significant practices in the other-initiated strategies were other-repetition and question repeat, which together accounted for about half of the frequencies of the pre-empting and repairing strategies. Other-repetition was the first most often used practice initiated by the listener in transactional segments. **Other-repetition** is the practice in which the listener repeats the speaker’s previous utterance exactly or partly in the following turn with a falling intonation. In this data set, it can be seen that the higher frequency of other-repetition occurred for pre-empting, at 41%, rather than for repairing non-understanding, at 32%. The listener used this strategic practice to show acknowledgement and engage alignment with the speaker’s previous turn.

The second most frequently used practice was question repeat. **Question repeat** is the strategic practice in which the listener repeats a word or a segment of the speaker’s previous utterance with a rising intonation, particularly regarded as a clarification request. The frequency of question repeat in response to signals of non-understanding (36%) was over double the frequency of its use for pre-empting non-understanding (16%).

Figure 11: The frequencies of other-initiated strategies used for pre-empting and repairing non-understanding in transactional segments
The other three strategic practices, namely using an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation, wh-clarification question, and questioning tag were in the minority; that is, the frequency of each was less than a fifth of the whole. The listener initiated the practice of using an alternative term in the same local context of talk with a rising intonation as a pre-empting strategy more frequently, at 14%, than as a means of repair, at 12% to ensure an accurate understanding.

The next most commonly used other-initiated practice was wh-clarification question; that is, the listener constructs a wh-question about a specific area of the speaker’s previous utterance in order to seek clarification or further explanation. The higher frequency of wh-clarification question occurred when a problem in understanding arose (14%) rather than before it happened (5%), as a practice of clarification request.

Out of these five other-initiated strategies, the practice of using questioning tag was the least commonly used in transactional segments. A questioning tag e.g. ‘right?’, ‘yeah?’, or ‘correct?’ was inserted after the repeated or reformulated utterance to confirm the listener’s understanding. Doing so was regarded as a confirmation check. The findings showed the listener initiated the practice of using questioning tag for repairing non-understanding (11%) more frequently than for pre-empting the problems (7%).

The use of these other-initiated strategies more or less depended on the functions of using each strategic practice in negotiation of meaning. Regarding the functions of using other-initiated strategic practices (Figure 12), other-repetition was significantly used to show acknowledgement and engage alignment along the flow of interactions.

Question repeat, using an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation, and questioning tag were mainly used to confirm the listener’s comprehension as confirmation checks. In cases when further explanation was needed, the listener preferred using question repeat, followed by questioning tag, and also using an alternative term for clarification requests.
Those aforementioned strategic practices were also used as means of repair after the presence of obstacles in understanding in the prior turn. Speakers of ELF signal a wide range of signals of non-understanding, as explored in Section 3.2.3.

Figure 13 shows the signals of non-understanding in transactional segments. Minimal query e.g. ‘huh?’, ‘sorry?’, and ‘pardon?’ had the highest frequency of a signal of non-understanding, at 47%. An interrogative echo and an inappropriate response were frequently used to signal incomplete understanding, at 24%, and 9%, respectively. A very small number of other signals of non-understanding were used e.g. an explicit statement of non-understanding and misunderstanding, an unfocused question, and silence. After the listener signalled problems in understanding, the pragmatic strategies were used in repairing sequences until they exchanged the meaning effectively and achieved shared understanding or at least received satisfied responses.
This statistical analysis presented the frequency of pragmatic strategies used for pre-empting and repairing non-understanding in transactional segments of touristic ELF. Next, the use of pragmatic strategies, particularly in transactional segments of touristic ELF is described. Sequences of turn in transactional segments are explored, including how the pragmatic strategies are actually used in negotiation of meaning. The below examples are taken from the transcribed data set. An arrow (→) is used to indicate the utterance in which the strategic practice is the focus of the description.

### 5.2.1 Self-initiated strategies to pre-empt problems of understanding

This subsection provides evidence of how self-initiated strategies were used in transactional segments to pre-empt problems in understanding beforehand.

#### 1) Self-repetition

Self-repetition was the most frequently and commonly used strategic practice employed by the speaker to facilitate another opportunity of hearing for his/her listener. In TS 1 below, a Thai taxi driver (TH17f) asked a passenger (F114f) whether...
she had reserved her room at the place to which she was travelling. TH17f initiated an exact repetition of her previous utterance in the same turn to provide F114f, the listener, with a second hearing.

**TS 1 (105)**

[1] TH17f→ you have booking already? **you have booking already?**

[2] F114f oh yeah i’m meeting my cousin. my cousin is over there

TS 2 took place at a coffee shop where a customer (F315m) asked an owner (TH41f) if he could get some beer. F315, as the speaker, exactly repeated his previous utterance in the same turn in line 1 to ensure that TH41f heard his utterance clearly enough.

**TS 2 (320)**

[1] F315m→ you have beer. **you have beer?**

[2] TH41f yeah i have

Self-repetition was commonly used after the speaker did not receive a spontaneous response, indicated by a slight silence (.) which was less than three seconds. The encounter of TS 3 happened at a hostel when two foreign tourists (F319f and F320m) wanted to leave their rucksacks there while they were looking for a room at other places. Before doing so, F319f asked a hostel owner (TH1f) about the closing time of the hostel (line 1). To F319f, TH1f seemed not to have heard F319f’s initial utterance, so F319f repeated her utterance in the same turn (line 1). As a result, TH1f answered the question in the following turn (line 2).

**TS 3 (323)**

[1] F319f→ what time do you close here (.) **what time do you close**
[2] TH1f don't don't sure sometime late in the night

Self-repetition was used to emphasise and make meaning explicit, as in TS 4 below.

TS 4 (077)

[1] TH15m good afternoon phi phi island you (wait) luggage on

[2] → the pier. staff take your luggage you. staff take.

[3] F79m oh <L1> {waiting at the pier}

[4] TH15m→ three people you wait luggage on the pier. staff take

[5] → you luggage. staff take your luggage

[6] F79m yeah

This encounter took place at a pier when the boat was nearly ready for boarding. A member of boat staff, TH15m, partially repeated his utterance, ‘staff take’ in the same turn (line 2). He also repeated his previous utterance in lines 4 and 5 to make sure that passengers were waiting right there at the pier while the other boat staff were transferring luggage onto the speedboat. TH15m’s utterances presented a lexicogrammatical variant in the way that he transferred the norms of the Thai language into how he made use of English. Despite that, a passenger (F79m) understood TH15m’s utterances, and so responded with, ‘yeah’ (line 6).

Self-repetition was also used to confirm shared understanding between participants. TS 5 and TS 6 provide the example of self-repletion, together with other-repetition initiated by the listener when they understood mutually.

TS 5 took place at a boat check-in kiosk when a passenger (F56m) checked in before boarding and asked for the arrival time in Phuket. A boat-service staff member (TH10m) answered the question and then partially repeated, ‘two’ (line 2) to provide
F56m with another opportunity for hearing in the same turn. This partial repetition overlapped with F56m’s other-repetition, ‘two hours’ (line 3) showing listenership. Due to this overlapping, TH10m repeated ‘two hour’ (line 4) again to facilitate F56m rehearing the key information. Repeated utterances in lines 3 and 4 were taken into account as evidence of shared understanding.

**TS 5 (056)**

1. F56m er wh- what time we arrive in phuket?
2. TH10m ah phuket two hour. <2> two
3. F56m in two </2> hours
4. TH10m two hour

TS 6 is the other sample of using self-repetition to confirm the shared understanding in this study.

**TS 6 (424)**

1. TH2f [place] i have transfer pick up from there
2. F417f okay
3. TH2f but from there about seven fifteen
4. F417f fifteen
5. TH2f → seven fifteen about
6. F417f → seven fifteen okay

In TS 6, a booking agent (TH2f) made an appointment for a shuttle service included in a boat transportation service which a foreign tourist (F417f) had already purchased to go to another nearby island. TH2f said the shuttle driver would arrive at her
accommodation at seven fifteen (line 3). To show acknowledgement in the prior turn, F417f partially repeated, ‘fifteen’ with a falling tone (line 4). TH2f initiated self-repetition in line 5 for a clearer utterance. In response, F417f initiated other-repetition (line 6) to confirm the shared understanding. The mutual understanding was evidenced by the turns from lines 4 to 6.

2) Key-word repetition

Key-word repetition was most frequently used for pre-empting non-understanding in transactional sections, apart from self-repetition. This practice was quite similar to self-repetition as illustrated earlier. Despite that, emphasis on important information and a narrow sense of meaning was the primary function of this practice. In doing so, the speaker rather chose to repeat only an important word or phrase.

TS 7 is the segment between two foreign tourists (F338m and F339f) and a community tour agent who was in charge of providing information and selling tour packages organised by the local community (TH48f). In this context, giving important information was essential to persuade tourists to buy tour packages. The key information in this transactional segment is in lines 5 to 7.

TS 7 (335)

[1] TH48f with the boat one hour trip

[2] F338m yeah

[3] TH48f or you want to need ah: go by yourself by kayaking

[4] F338m mm hmm

[5] TH48f because i recommend you first you come for the lucky

[6] time now the high tide . was in the mangrove not same
[7] → as every day. because **you come for the lucky time**

{Irrelevant turns are extracted}

[28] F338m we take a look. thank you

[29] TH48f ah: because cannot inside because inside for the walking you buy ticket twenty baht for person first.

[30] → because the same like this because **only the high tide**

[31] TH48f now you can see near the beach. and then you back

[32] → because inside same like this now because **the high tide**

[33] → **tide** i recommend this for you because **high tide** only good for the trip with the boat or you rent the kayaking. for low tide because good for the walking

[34] → but you cannot see (filler) crab mudskipper now

{Irrelevant turns are extracted}

[44] F339f okay

[45] Fs <L1>

[46] TH48f→ **water** in mangrove not same as every day na

[47] F338m yeah

[48] TH48f→ but now you come **for lucky time** we have time only

[49] → one hour they starting now. you can take to around
Within the flow of this encounter, TH48f particularly repeated phrases ‘for (the) lucky time’ and ‘the high tide’, her selling points, a number of times. The key phrase, ‘the high tide’ was repeated three times in TH48f’s turn (lines 31, 33, and 34) to inform the tourists about the activities that they could do while visiting the mangrove forest during the high tide. In line 46, TH48f used ‘water’ to narrow a sense of meaning of her selling point, ‘high tide’. Again, she initiated key-word repetition, ‘high tide’ (line 50), followed by a comparison with what tourists could do during ‘the low tide’ in the same turn, in spite of using an improper conjunction, ‘but’ (line 50).

In TS 7, the other key information, ‘the lucky time’, was another of TH48f’s selling points to persuade these tourists to visit this tourist spot at the perfect time during the high tide of that day. TH48f firstly said, ‘the lucky time’ in line 5, and then she initiated key-word repetition in the same turn (line 7). To emphasise the right time to visit the mangrove forest, TH48f used key-word repetition, ‘the lucky time’ again in line 48 after informing the tourists about what they would enjoy during the high tide in her previous turns.

TS 8 illustrates the use of key-word repetition for emphasising meaning. It took place at the hostel when a foreign tourist (F35f) was looking for a toilet. She seemed to ask to use a toilet in the hostel after finding out that the public toilet was out of order. TH1f directed the tourist to the coffee shop where she could do her business because
the tourist did not stay at the hostel and the toilet was exclusively for the hostel guests (line 6). In the same turn, TH1f repeated key information, ‘at the coffee shop’ in line 7 to facilitate a clearer hearing for F35f, and to emphasise this information.

TS 8 (032)

[1] F35f is it toilet (x)?
[2] TH1f toilet they have at the pier
[3] F35f but it’s close
[4] TH1f <1> for public toilet
[5] F35f {noisy and they were speaking at the same time} </1>
[6] TH1f the coffee shop they have toilet service five baht .
[7] → at the coffee shop

In TS 9, the local taxi driver (TH17f) whose car and tuk-tuk were used for the taxi service clarified the differences between the tuk-tuk taxi and the car taxi to the tourists. She initiated key-word repetition, ‘tuk-tuk’ many times, with various functions in this segment. In particular, ‘tuk-tuk’ was repeated a few more times (lines 4, 5, and 6), instead of using the subject pronoun in her utterance. Still in this turn, TH17f repeated ‘tuk-tuk’ to gain a bit more time for negotiating meaning (line 7). Again in line 10, the practice of repeating ‘tuk-tuk’, analysed as key-word repetition was initiated to narrow the sense of explaining the fare.

TS 9 (106)

[1] TH17f start lanta fifty baht per person . start for the price taxi
[2] tuk-tuk or car the same
[3] F116f we can take tuk-tuk

[4] TH17f yeah same thing i have two taxi i have one car and one tuk-tuk


[6] TH17f→ tuk-tuk erh tuk-tuk you know ae: tuk-tuk small
[7] → one ae tuk-tuk can go only one one way you know
[8] → and then no more people but tuk-tuk private you
[9] → know about one fifty about the tuk-tuk

Another sample of using key-word repetition is in TS 10. After a foreign tourist (F131m) asked the taxi driver (TH17f) for a discount on the fare (line 1), TH17f refused by telling him how far it was to get to his destination (line 2). Following F131m’s minimal response, ‘yeah’ (line 3), TH17f repeated herself, ‘six kilometre’ (line 4) as the key information twice in this turn to emphasise the distance that was pretty far. She could not give him a discount, as a result.

TS 10 (114)

[1] F131m sixty? one twenty for two
[2] TH17f no no from here six kilometre
[3] F131m yeah
[4] TH17f→ six kilometre from here to there six kilometre
3) Combined repetition

Repetition together with additional explanation improves on explicitness in meaning, and is regarded as combined repetition (J. Kaur, 2015), similarly to repetition with expansion (Cogo & Dewey, 2012). The following transactional segments illustrate the use of combined repetition initiated by the speaker to give the listener additional information.

TS 11 is the segment between a Thai local guide (TH55m) and a group of tourists when the local guide described the landscape of a small island where they had briefly stopped. TH55m showed the tourists where Koh Lanta and Koh Lanta Noi were located (lines 5 and 6). Following F415m’s response in the form of other-key-word repetition (line 7), TH55m provided further explanation of the definition of ‘yai’ in Thai which means ‘big’ in English (lines 8 and 9). In response, F416f repeated ‘lanta yai’ after a minimal token (line 10). In the next turn, TH55m initiated combined repetition with a structural-omitted utterance into, ‘lanta yai big’ (line 11). Furthermore, as originally mentioned with regard to ‘lanta noi’ (line 5), TH55m initiated combined repetition again in line 13. He repeated ‘lanta noi’, and combined this with ‘small’ which is the definition of ‘noi’ in English.

TS 11 (420)

[1] TH55m ahhh you can see but this area when the high tide

[2] <Lth> ni </Lth> . when the high tide <Lth> ni </Lth> .

[3] you can see only tree . but the like that beach stay in

[4] the water . but this island stay in the middle from the

[5] koh lanta . but then you can see the <2> lanta noi . this

[6] is a lanta noi
TS 12 illustrates the use of combined repetition when the booking agent (TH2f) informed her customers (F49m and F50f) about the course of time from Koh Lanta to Krabi, the nearby province (line 3). In F49m’s response (line 4), TH2f seemed to be aware of a mismatch in understanding. To avoid misunderstanding, she initiated combined repetition (lines 6 and 7). She deliberately explained that it would take two hours from Koh Lanta to Ao Nang, as the first stop and then it took twenty to thirty minutes from Ao Nang to Krabi, the destination.
Combined repetition was used to improve clarity and to guard against problems in understanding, as in TS 13 below.

TS 13 (068)

[1] F72m er: to pa tong beach
[2] TH2f pa tong beach
[3] F72m <Lth> mɯːä räj {when} <Lth>?  
[4] TH2f one o’clock (...)  
[5] F72m and it’s full now? eleven thirty ah?  
[7] F72m <1> one-
[8] TH2f→ we don’t </1> have eleven thirty . they have  
[9] → one o’clock

A tourist (F72m) asked the booking agent (TH2f) for the departure time to Patong Beach in line 3 where he initiated code-switching into Thai. However, F72m’s response, mentioning the other departure time at eleven thirty (line 5), caused TH2f’s awareness of a mismatch in understanding. TH2f, therefore, initiated an exact repetition herself (line 6), and also further clarified for F72m that there was no boat service to Patong Beach at eleven thirty in lines 8 and 9.

Accuracy in exchanging information and having a shared understanding is essential in the context of tourism. Due to a means of clarification and explicitness in meaning,
combined repetition frequently occurred at the information and booking counters. In TS14, a tourist (F45m) wanted to book transportation to Koh Rok, the nearby island. Two options were offered for the journey. The tourists could buy a one-day tour to Koh Rok, including a meal and refreshments. Alternatively, the tourists could just buy the round-trip boat ticket from Koh Lanta to Koh Rok, in this case they could stay overnight on Koh Rok.

TS 14 (043)

[1] TH2f yes you mean like a one day tour or just go there
[2] and sleep
[3] F45m no no
[4] TH2f→ **one day tour . go and back one day tour** that one
[5] they charge you one thousand two hundred baht
[6] per person
[7] F45m one?
[8] TH2f one thousand two hundred baht
[9] F46f okay

Before making a booking, the booking agent (TH2f) needed to be certain about what the tourist, F45m really wanted (lines 1 and 2). Following F45’s response in the form of a negative minimal response (line 3), TH2f initiated combined repetition to explain the characteristics of the one-day tour. She, in turn, repeated the key word, ‘**one day tour**’ to narrow the sense, followed by an additional explanation, ‘**go and back one day tour**’ (line 4) before informing the tourist the price of this package. F45m initiated an interrogative echo (line 7) to ask for another chance of hearing in the following
turn. TH2f responded to this signal of non-understanding by using self-repetition (line 8). F46f’s acknowledgement response, ‘okay’ (line 9) was coded as the satisfied solution after negotiation of meaning.

TS 15 is the transactional segment between the scuba dive leader (F199m) and the boatmen (TH26m and TH27m). F199m explained that he had noticed some boats getting into the dive site area (line 1). To ask for more detail, TH26m uttered an alternative word, ‘speedboat’, followed by a questioning tag, ‘huh?’ (line 2). F199m specified that he saw the long-tail boat (line 3). Following TH26m’s response in line 4, F199m seemed to understand that TH26m might have seen a speedboat getting into the dive site area above from the boat. F199m showed alignment that there might have been both kinds of boats (line 5), and F199m rephrased his previous utterance in line 7. Then, TH27m took part in line 9, asking if F199m had seen the long tail boat. At this point, F199m responded by initiating combined repetition to explain that he saw the long-tail boat while he was diving under the sea (line 11). Following TH26m’s response in the form of self-repetition to ensure his notice (line 12), F199m repeated the key words, ‘speedboat’ and ‘long tail’ (line 13) for the mutual understanding. Interestingly, TS 15 illustrates the use of utterance-developing repetition, rarely found in this data set. Within the flow of this encounter, F199m developed his utterances a few times (lines 5, 7, and 13) for a deeper sense of meaning.

TS 15 (170)

[1] F199m there are boats inside (there) boat go inside

[2] TH26m speedboat huh?

[3] F199m no long tail boat

[4] TH26m speedboat yeah

[5] F199m long tail speedboat both
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[6] TH26m speedboat

[7] F199m i think both

[8] TH26m speedboat yeah

[9] TH27m long tail boat huh?

[10] TH26m i think somebody-

[11] F199m→ look up the depth down long tail boat inside (...)

[12] TH26m speed boat go inside i think some-

[13] F199m speedboat inside and long tail

[14] TH26m i think somebody picture already

4) Paraphrasing

As discussed in 5.2, the frequency of using paraphrasing was equal to using combined repetition in transactional segments. Despite that, paraphrasing was mostly used for simplification of meaning. TS 16 and TS 17 are examples of paraphrasing when the speaker attempted to make his/her utterances easier to understand by changing the word used.

TS 16 is between a tourist (F14m) and the hostel owner (TH1f) when F14m popped in to see the bar zone inside the hostel and wonders when the bar closed that night. Instead of answering his question right away, TH1f used a discourse marker, ‘you mean’ (line 3), regarded as a confirmation check, to confirm her understanding. Despite F14m’s affirmative minimal response (line 4), she rather clarified what was served than answered him about when the bar was closed (line 5). F14m consequently changed ‘what till what time’ into ‘when’ to simplify meaning, and changed the word, ‘open’ in his original question to ‘close’ to make it more explicit. F14m paraphrased
his utterance into, ‘when when do you close tonight’ and in doing so he used ‘when’ to narrow a sense of meaning in lines 6 and 7. Accordingly, TH1f gave him the answer in the next turn (line 8).

**TS 16 (012)**

[1] F14m till till what time are you open today . to eight pm nine

[2] TH1f you mean the bar?

[3] F14m yeah

[4] TH1f we have like the drink for sale sir

[5] F14m→ yeah and **what till what time** ah **when when do you**

[6] close tonight

[7] TH1f tonight we will close quite early ten thirty

TS 17 is another segment exemplifying the use of paraphrasing to simplify meaning. This segment is between a member of boat staff (TH27m) and a diver (F209m). TH27m informed F209m about the dive site for the next descent (line 1). In response, F209m refused the next dive and said that he would rather stay on-board (line 2). Following TH27m’s response in making noise, F209m was clearly unsure if TH27m understood his utterance. In the next turn, F209m initiated paraphrasing into ‘no diving’ (line 4). This utterance was shorter and easier to understand.

**TS 17 (178)**

[1] TH27m next dive we go hin bida {name of a dive site} yeah

[2] F209m okay i’m i’m gonna gonna stay on the boat
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[3] TH27m ow:: (making noise)

[4] F209m → no diving

In TS 18 below, the segment is between a hostel guest (F7f) and the hostel owner (TH1f). F7f wanted to extend her stay at this hostel, so she asked about availability (line 1). In the same turn, she paraphrased her previous utterance into, ‘like one more night and two more night’ (line 2) to make the meaning more explicit, ‘a little bit longer’.

TS 18 (007)

[1] F7f can i stay a little bit longer er here at the hostel

[2] → like one more night or two more night

[3] TH1f stay more night because after new year it's not busy

[4] F7f ah perfect

TS 19 provides evidence of paraphrasing used to emphasise a key point within the talk. This segment is between a foreign tourist (F412f) and the Thai local guide (TH55m) while they were visiting the sea cave.

TS 19 (416)

[1] F412f → where is it the: entrance? like where do we go one

[2] → kilometre where? like where is the pond?

[3] TH55m ah ha

[4] F412f where?

The local guide had described the features of the cave and informed the group of tourists that there was a pond further inside the upper-level cave. However, it took
nearly four hours to climb up to the upper level of the cave and took more time to walk further to the pond. F412f seemed not to understand completely T55m’s previous utterances, so she initiated a clarification request by constructing an overt question, ‘where is it the: entrance’ (line 1). To simplify the meaning, she amended the words, ‘entrance’ by reprising segments of phrases in TH55m’s previous utterances e.g. ‘one kilometre’ and ‘the pond’ to give the specific area where she needed clarification, and still retained the key word, ‘where’ when asking for clarification within the same turn (lines 1 and 2). Following TH55m’s response in the form of a minimal response (line 3), F412f initiated key-word repetition in the next turn to emphasise her clarification request.

Another example of paraphrasing to confirm mutual understanding is evidenced in TS 20. This transactional segment is between the local guide (TH55m) and another tourist (F410f).

TS 20 (421)

[1] TH55m this is ah . this boat this is <pvc> ɓɔː (\textit{(brought)}) </pvc>

[2] this boat this this <pvc> ɓɔː </pvc> from the this boat

[3] from the <pvc> 'mʊz.lɪm {muslim} </pvc> people you know

[4] F410f the muslim

[5] TH55m <pvc> 'mʊz.lɪm {muslim} </pvc> people you know

[6] <pvc> 'mʊz.lɪm {muslim} </pvc> people

[7] F410f → yeah yeah the religion

TH55m attempted to describe the historical characteristics of the long-tail boat (lines 1 to 3). The antecedents of Muslim people, and the island dwellers, well-known as the Moken used to go fishing in the long-tail boats. In fact, these days the boats are used
more widely in the tourism industry, rather than for fishing. After informing the tourist of this with his limited English, he used a discourse marker, ‘you know’ (line 3) for a comprehension check in the same turn. This kind of discourse marker was used by the speaker to monitor the listener’s understanding. In response, F410f initiated other-repetition (line 4) to show alignment. Despite that, TH55m initiated the strategy of a comprehension check, using ‘you know’ again, together with key-word repetition, ‘Muslim’ in the following turn (lines 5 and 6) to ensure that the tourist understood what had been said. In line 7, paraphrasing was used by F410f by changing the word ‘Muslim’ into ‘the religion’, a lexical amendment to show understanding at this point, alongside prior an affirmative minimal response, ‘yeah yeah’.

5) Rephrasing

Rephrasing, the practice reformulation strategy related to linguistic competence, was used by the speaker frequently to clarify or emphasise the meaning as well as to facilitate a clear rehearing for the listener. The speaker used rephrasing with less awareness of linguistic use, different from self-lexicogrammatical repair. Instead, rephrasing was used to improve on explicitness in meaning. The following transactional segments (TS 21-23) illustrate how the participants in this study used rephrasing in negotiation of meaning.

TS 21 is the segment between a foreign customer (F238f) and a Thai café owner (TH12m). F238f ordered iced mocha (line 1). However, F238f’s utterance did not indicate how many glasses of coffee she wanted. Following TH12m’s response in the form of a clarification request (line 2), F238f rephrased her previous utterance by retaining only key words, ‘iced mocha’ and adding, ‘two’ to make her order more explicit. Line 4 where TH12m partially repeated F238f’s utterance in Thai shows the shared understanding.
TS 21 (212)

[1] F238f       i want to have iced mocha
[2] TH12m       okay one two? one?
[3] F238f→      for two iced mocha
[4] TH12m       <Lth> {two} </Lth>

Rephrasing was used to raise explicitness in meaning, as in TS 22. This transactional segment took place when a Thai local (TH43f) asked for a tourist’s passport as a deposit on renting a motorbike (line 1). In response, F304m seemed to refuse. TH43f reformulated her previous utterance in the following turn. She shortened the utterance by retaining the key word, ‘passport’, followed by, ‘not not a copy’ (line 3) to make it explicit that the original passport was only required.

TS 22 (310)

[1] TH43f       excuse me can i need one passport please
[2] F304m       or just a copy?
[3] TH43f→      only passport not not copy

TS 23 is between a local gatekeeper at the community fair (TH42m) and a few tourists (F282f, F283m and F284m). At the fair, it was free entrance except for that night as there was a concert. TH42m informed the tourists that they needed to buy tickets before entry (line 1). F282f responded in the form of other-repetition (line 2). In the following turn, TH42m said, ‘tomorrow tomorrow’ (line 3) with an attempt to tell the couple that they could come back in the following day as it would be free entry. Within the flow of this encounter, TH42m initiated self-repetition (line 5) as well as rephrasing (line 7). In line 7, TH42m reformulated his previous utterances in lines 1 and 3 by retaining the key contents and amending to, ‘tomorrow come today have
ticket entry’ to make it clearer. Despite a variant of grammatical structure, his utterance was understandable for the tourists as indicated by other-repetition in lines 2 and 6.

TS 23 (288)

1. TH42m have ticket tonight
2. F282f oh ticket
3. TH42m tomorrow. tomorrow
4. F282f okay
5. TH42m→ tomorrow
6. F283m tomorrow
7. TH42m→ yeah tomorrow come today have ticket <4> entry
8. F284m yes </4>

6) Using ‘you know?’ and ‘okay’?

In this investigation, it is worth noticing the use of discourse markers e.g. ‘you know?’ and ‘okay?’ which were initiated by the speaker to monitor the listener’s understanding. In this sense, using discourse markers was regarded as the strategy for comprehension checks.

TS 24 is the segment when the local guide (TH55m) attempted to describe a tourist spot to a group of tourists. Within this turn, he used, ‘you know’ (line 2) to ensure that the tourists knew the lava stone. He carried on his utterance in lines 3 to 5 with an attempt to describe the fact that the fossils of sea animals e.g. sea snails or shells could be seen in the lava stone; meanwhile, he also pointed out the lava stone. TH55m
rephrased his utterance (lines 6 to 8), followed by using, ‘you know’ to monitor the listeners’ understanding of his talk in line 8. In response, one tourist, F407f asked for clarification by using a signal-word question, ‘in what?’ (line 9). F407’s utterance overlapped with TH55m’s utterance (line 10) when he constructed an overt question, ‘understand?’, regarded as the strategic practice of a comprehension check. In TH55m’s turn, he spontaneously responded to F407’s question with the specific answer, ‘oyster’. F407f used a minimal response, ‘oy- yeah’ in the following turn (line 11) which indicated a satisfied response in this investigation. It could not be ascertained whether the participants understood TH55m’s explanation.

TS 24 (420)

[1] TH55m this island they have special they have the- but this

[2] → stone this is come from the lava stone. you know lava

[3] stone ahh this is come from lava stone. but you can

[4] see but normally on the on the stone. or somewhere

[5] you see they have snail. or shell. they have to stay in

[6] like that right? you see? or you see there? they have

[7] the stone then they have the snail or shell stay in the

[8] → stone you know?

[9] F407f <1> in what?

[10] TH55m→ understand? </1> er oyster

The other sample is in TS 25 between another local guide (TH53), and a group of tourists during a kayaking tour. After TH53m arranged the kayaks for his customers, some of the tourists eagerly paddled the kayaks into the open sea. TH53m needed to slow them down (line 1), and emphasised this by reformulating his utterance into a comparison with, ‘the olympic kayaking’ in line 2. In his turn, the word, ‘okay’ with a rising intonation was used as a comprehension check to ensure the tourists’ understanding. Following F388f’s response in the form of using an affirmative minimal response, ‘yeah’ (line 3), TH53m emphasised the meaning with the word, ‘slowly’ (line 4) and initiated self-repetition (line 6). It was obvious that they achieved shared understanding, as indicated by F389m’s response in line 5.

TS 25 (387)

[1] TH53m okay ‘cuse me . everybody this is the kayaking tour .

[2] → not the olympic kayaking okay?

[3] F388f yeah

[4] TH53m slowly

[5] F389m no problem

[6] TH53m slowly

Regarding comprehension checks, the discourse marker ‘okay?’ was used more often than ‘you know’. Here was another use of ‘okay’ that the speaker initiated to ensure the listener’s understanding. TS 26 involved the taxi driver (TH17f) who asked her passenger (F114f) to wait nearby her taxi while she looked for other passengers to share the journey (line 1). In this turn, TH17f ended her utterance with ‘okay’ with a rising intonation to ensure the tourist’s understanding. The mutual understanding was indicated by F114f’s response in line 3.
In touristic ELF, self-repetition, key-word repetition, self-combined repetition, paraphrasing, and rephrasing initiated by the speaker were the most commonly used for pre-empting non-understanding in transaction segments. These strategic practices were mainly used to facilitate clearer hearing for the listener, to clarify and emphasise meaning, and also to simplify meaning during the process of meaning negotiation.

### 5.2.2 Other-initiated strategies to pre-empt problems of understanding

Turning now to the use of other-initiated strategies, this section provides the actual use of strategic practices in which the listener initiated to pre-empt problems of understanding.

#### 1) Other-repetition

In ELF talk, the listener is interactive to show listenership, acknowledgement or alignment, and to confirm shared understanding by repeating the speaker’s previous utterance either partially or exactly with a falling intonation.

TS 27 is the segment between the hostel owner (TH1f) and her guest (F1m). TH1f asked F1m for any ideas to celebrate the night before the New Year’s Eve, so she gave her the idea that she would cook Thai food and invited the guests to have dinner together (line 1). F1m initiated other-repetition, ‘thai dinner’ (line 2) to show listenership. TH1f further explained that she would also take the guests to the beach...
party at Klong Kong Beach. Again, F1m initiated other-repetition, ‘klong kong’, followed by an affirmative response (line 5) to show alignment.

TS 27 (002)

[1] TH1f    if they like er (.) we have some thai dinner here

[2] F1m→    thai dinner

[3] TH1f    or everyone have dinner ready and after that go party

[4]        at klong kong beach

[5] F1m→    klong kong okay yep yep

TS 28 is the segment between the booking agent (TH2f) and a foreigner (F38m) when he asked for the fares of boat services.

TS 28 (036)

[1] TH2f    <Lth> sa wee de ka <Lth>

[2] F38m    how much to krabi

[3] TH2f→   krabi two hundred fifty baht

[4] F38m    and how (x) to ao nang ao nang

[5] TH2f→   ao nang in the morning four hundred baht

[6]        in the afternoon five hundred baht

[7] F38m    er how's rai ley?

[8] TH2f    same four hundred and five hundred baht

[9] F38m→   four and five
As the listener, TH2f partially repeated F38m’s utterance using only the key terms which were ‘krabi’ in line 3 and ‘ao nang’ in line 5 to acknowledge what she had heard before giving the response to previous information queries. On the other hand, F38m, as the listener in the prior turn, repeated a part of TH2f’s previous utterance, ‘four and five’ in the next turn (line 9) to show his acknowledgement.

TS 29 is between a foreign passenger (F56m) and the boat-service staff (TH10m). F56m, as the speaker, asked TH10m about the arrival time in Phuket (line 1). In response, TH10m repeated the key term, ‘phuket’ in F56m’s previous utterance to ensure what he had heard before answering, ‘two hour’ in line 2. In the following turn, F56m initiated other-repetition, ‘in two hour’ in line 3 which overlapped with TH10m’s response (line 2) unexpectedly. Due to the overlapping talk, TH10m initiated key-word repetition for clarity (line 4).

TS 29 (056)

[1] F56m er wh- what time we arrive in phuket?
[2] TH10m→ ah phuket two hour. <2> two
[3] F56m→ in two </2> hour
[4] TH10m two hour
[5] F56m ah:

TS 30 is between the taxi driver (TH17f) and a foreign tourist (F113m). TH17f asked F113m whether he wanted to rent the motorbike (line 1). F113m asked about the rent, followed by other-repetition, ‘motorbike’ (line 2) to show alignment in the prior turn. In the following turn, TH17f repeated ‘motorbike’ (line 3) and gave F113m the
answers. The practice of other-repetition, ‘two hundred fifty baht’ initiated by F113m was to show acknowledgement in line 5.

TS 30 (104)

[1] TH17f you want to rent motorbike?


[3] TH17f motorbike for one day two hundred fifty baht

[4] for automatic

[5] F113m→ two hundred fifty baht

The transactional segment in TS 31 is between the local guide (TH54m) and a tourist (F398m). As F398m had bought a kayaking tour and boat trip package, TH54m informed that kayaking would be approximately one kilometre around the mangrove forest (lines 1 and 2). Following F398m’s response, ‘okay’, TH54m initiated ‘okay?’ with a rising intonation to monitor the listener’s understanding (line 4). F398m and TH54m had shared understanding, to some extent, as seen in lines 5 and 6 where they both used ‘okay’ to show alignment. Other-repetition was used in lines 7 and 8. F398m repeated TH54’s original utterance (line 1) to confirm the mutual understanding.

TS 31 (403)

[[1] TH54m start kayaking around the mangrove about

[2] one kilometre

[3] F398m okay

[4] TH54m okay?

[5] F398m okay
2) Question repeat

The practice of exactly or partially repeating the speaker’s previous utterance with a rising intonation is regarded as question repeat, the strategy of meaning negotiation. In this study, question repeat was used particularly when the listener more or less recognised the local context of talk, but s/he had not understood completely yet. This strategic practice was used by the listener as a confirmation check more often than a clarification request.

TS 32 provides the use of question repeat as a confirmation check. This segment is between the local guide (TH46m) and a tourist (F351f) when the local guide divided the customers into two groups for a half-day tour and a one-day tour for which they needed to get on different boats. Following F351’s response, ‘one day’ (line 2), TH46m initiated other-repetition in line 3 to confirm his understanding, and then pointed out the right boat for her. To ensure her understanding, F351f initiated question repeat, ‘this one?’ (line 4) in the following turn.

TS 32 (376)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TH46m</td>
<td>‘cuse me half day or one day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F351f</td>
<td>ah one day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TH46m</td>
<td>one day this one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F351f</td>
<td>this one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TH46m</td>
<td>ah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TS 33 is another example of question repeat used for a confirmation check. The segment is between the boatman (TH27m) and the dive leader (F204m) when briefing the ascent and descent points of the next dive (lines 1 and 2). TH27m attempted to explain that the captain planned to drop the divers off near the wall side of the island and to collect them somewhere around the headland. In the following turn, F204m initiated question repeat, ‘in the wall?’ in line 3. TH27m used an affirmative minimal response. ‘yep’ to confirm F204m’s understanding (line 4).

TS 33 (092)

[1] TH27m yeah ah fun dive jump in the wall and pick up <1> in
[2] F204m the sharp yeah
[3] F204m→ in the wall? </1>
[4] TH27m yep

TS 34 is between a taxi driver (TH5f) and a couple of foreign tourists (F42m and F43f) when they wanted to know how to get to Tiger Cave, in the south of the island. TH5f recommended them to take a taxi (line 1). F42m asked about the fare in the following turn. Following TH5f’s response in line 3, F42m repeated TH5f’s utterance with a rising intonation. In this case, he initiated question repeat to ensure his understanding.

TS 34 (040)

[1] TH5f you need to take a taxi
[2] F42m i don’t know how much could that be
[3] TH5f five hundred baht for two
[4] F42m→ five hundred baht for two?
[5] TH5f yes
Moving on to TS 35 to TS 37, these segments provide the use of question repeat for clarification requests.

TS 35 is the segment between the booking agent (TH13f) and a tourist (F331m) when F331 was unsure about the difference between taking a long-tail boat trip and a speedboat one. F331m asked his question (line 1), and TH13f answered, ‘time’ in the following turn (line 2). Following TH13f’s response with a word, without any further detail, F331m initiated the practice of question repeat, ‘time?’ in line 3 to indicate TH13f that he needed more explanation. In response, TH13f explained that travelling by speedboat was faster than the long-tail boat, and consequently the tourists spent more time relaxing on the island (lines 4 to 7).

TS 35 (330)

[1] F331m is that much different between er (speed boat)
[2] TH13f time
[3] F331m→ time?
[4] TH13f different time because speedboat is er thirty minute to
[5] four island this take one hour . double time . you have
[6] one hour extra by speedboat . the long tail they come
[7] back

TS 36 is the segment between the hostel owner (TH1f) and a couple of tourists (F27m and F28m) while they were checking in. F28m asked about the adventure activities on Koh Lanta, and to respond, TH1f informed him that these kinds of activities, e.g. parachuting, jet skiing and banana boating, were not allowed on the island (line 1). In the following turn, the practice of question repeat, ‘not allow?’ was initiated by F28m (line 2); that is, he was likely to ensure his understanding or ask for more explanation.
In this sense, TH1f further informed the tourists that a friendly-environment and eco-tourism were promoted on Koh Lanta (line 3). F28m initiated the practice of using an alternative phrase with a rising intonation in the following turn (line 4). TH1f took the next turn to additionally inform the tourists that no extreme or adventure sports were available (lines 5 and 6); consequently, tourists were able to enjoy swimming, snorkelling or kayaking along the beach safely.

TS 36 (025)

[1] TH1f koh lanta no have they not allow
[2] F28m→ not allow?
[3] TH1f because they keep nature er tourism here
[4] F28m→ so that natural?
[5] TH1f they are not allow any extreme sport like er jet ski
[6] banana boat parachute

TS 37 is between a tourist (F53m) and the booking agent (TH2f). F53m questioned TH2f how often the bus departed to Krabi Airport (line 1). Following TH2f’s response (line 3), F53m initiated other-repetition, ‘one hour’ (line 4) to show his acknowledgement. TH2f further explained that the last trip departed at four o’clock in the next turn. In line 6, F53m initiated question repeat by reprising only, ‘four’ with a rising intonation. At this point, F53m possibly used this practice as a repetition request or maybe a comprehension check. TH2f initiated self-repetition (line 7) in the following turn.

TS 37 (049)

[1] F53m okay the (day) and do you have a bus that leaves
3) Using an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation

To pre-empt non-understanding in transactional segments, the listener frequently used an alternative term, which can be a word or phrase in the same context of talk with a rising intonation. From the data set, the practice of using an alternative word/phrase with a rising intonation were employed to ask for clarification and to ensure accurate understanding. Functions of using this practice were interpreted from the context and the situation of such encounters.

TS 38 is between a tourist (F21m) asking the hostel owner (TH1f) how to go to Lanta Old Town (line 1). Various kinds of transportation e.g. taxi, tuk-tuk, and motorbike, were provided from Sala Dan Pier to go to Lanta Old Town. In this case, clarification was needed for TH1f to answer to F21m’s demand. As the motorbike rental service was offered at the hostel, TH1f used, ‘motorbike’ (line 2) which was regarded as the alternative term in this local contact of talk to clarify what kind of transportation F21m wanted.

TS 38 (017)

[1] F21m (how) to take to get er old town
TS 39 is between the booking agent (TH2f) and a foreign tourist (F53m) when he wanted to book the transportation service to Krabi Airport. To estimate the departure time from Koh Lanta, TH2f needed the flight or boarding time (line 1). Following F53m’s response, ‘it’s at eight’ (line 2), TH1f initiated other-repetition to show alignment (line 3). Nevertheless, alternative terms for time, ‘at night’ and ‘pm’ were used in line 5 because TH2f needed F53m’s clarification and to ensure her understanding. In response, F53m repeated ‘at night’, followed by an affirmative response ‘yeah’ (line 6). F53m, in turn, offered the fare, ‘it’s three hundred’. TH2f, therefore, repeated F53m’s utterance for confirmation in the following turn.

TS 39 (049)

[1] TH2f what time your flight?
[2] F53m it’s at eight
[3] TH2f eight o'clock
[4] F53m eight o'clock so we need there
[5] TH2f→ at night eh? pm?
[6] F53m at night yeah . it's three hundred
[7] TH2f three hundred

TS 40 is another example of using an alternative term to ensure accurate understanding and seemingly ask for further detail in the way to completely understand. This segment is between the boat-service manager (TH11m) and his
customer (F142f) at the pier. F142f was going to Phuket and wondered how to travel to Phuket Airport (line 1). In the following turn, TH11m explained that she could take a private minivan from Ratsada Pier to the airport. However, the word, ‘minivan’ in TH11m’s utterances was ambiguous. F142f consequently initiated an alternative term, ‘real car’ in line 9 to make herself clear in meaning and pre-empt misunderstanding. In the following turn, TH11m responded in the form of a positive minimal response, ‘ah’, followed by self-initiated key-word repetition, ‘minivan’. Following F142f’s response in the form of other-repetition (line 11), TH11m seemed to be aware of ambiguity in meaning. He, therefore, initiated lexicogrammatical repair by amending the word, ‘minivan’ into ‘minibus’ (line 12) to develop meaning. He further explained in his following turn that ‘a sedan’, a five-seat car taxi, was not enough for her family, including their luggage (line 14).

TS 40 (124)

[1] F142f from ah the pier to the airport
[2] TH11m i think you should to go with the minivan. minivan
[3] private for nine hundred baht. this only private from
[4] ratsada pier have for (tour). nine hundred baht if you
[5] booking there when you arriving there they will show
[6] your name and bring you direct. nai yang right?
[7] F142f how much
[8] TH11m nine- nine hundred
[9] F142f→ nine hundred. is it. is it a real: car?
[10] TH11m ah minivan
TS 41 to 43 illustrate the practice of using an alternative word for a confirmation check.

TS 41 is between the booking agent (TH2f) and a foreign tourist (F72m) when F72m wanted to buy the boat ticket to Patong beach in Phuket. TH2f informed F72m that the boat departed from Koh Lanta to Phi Phi Island for the boat transfer and then went further to Phuket (line 1). F72m used an alternative phrase, ‘go directly’ (line 2) to ensure his understanding in the following turn. TH2f further explained that the passengers had to transfer to the other boat from Phi Phi to Phuket (line 3). However, TH2f’s response seemed to cause F72m to be unsure of the degree of understanding, as seen in line 4. TH2f were possibly aware of F72m’s mismatched understanding, so TH2f further explained F72m (lines 5 and 6). In other words, it was a one-stop boat trip from Koh Lanta to Phuket. F72m’s affirmative response (line 7) showed his understanding, to some extent.

TS 41 (068)

[1] TH2f yes. from here to phi phi and then phi phi to phuket

[2] F72m→ yes it **go directly**?

[3] TH2f change the boat in phi phi
[4] F72m yes but it's not er:
[5] TH2f just a few minute for change the boat for five or ten minute
[6] [7] F72m yeah yeah yeah

TS 42 is the segment between the local guide (TH46m) and a tourist when the local guide talked about the oyster shells on the cave wall. TH46m informed that the shells were very sharp (line 1 to 2). Following F368m’s response token, ‘yes’, TH46m initiated self-initiated key-word repetition, ‘dangerous’ to emphasise meaning (line 4). In this sense, F368m used an analogy, ‘like the knife’, regarded as the alternative term to confirm his understanding in line 5.

TS 42 (368)

[1] TH46m hello sir . hello (...) hello not not touch and
[2] the dangerous and the hand yeah
[3] F368m yes
[4] TH46m dangerous
[5] F368m→ like the knife yes
[6] TH46m yeah yeah

Another sample of using an alternative word with a rising intonation for a confirmation check, is seen in TS 43. The segment is between the local guide (TH53m) and a tourist (F393f) when they were visiting the cave inside. TH53m attempted to explain to the group of tourists that the stalactites were formed by the water dropping from the roof of the cave (lines 1 to 4). In the following turn, F393m initiated an alternative word, ‘minerals minerals’ with a rising intonation to confirm her
understanding in line 5. In response, TH53m produced an affirmative response, ‘yes yes’ (line 6).

TS 43 (393)

[1] TH53m but not not long time for <pvc> has{high} </pvc>

[2] about one hour and then low again (.) this is stalactite

[3] from from the water . you can see every time have

[4] water . go down . down

[5] F393f→ minerals minerals?

[6] TH53m yes yes

4) Questioning tag

In touristic ELF, a questioning tag e.g. ‘right?’ , ‘correct’, or a minimal token e.g. ‘yeah?’ , ‘okay?’ , ‘huh?’ were inserted with a rising intonation after the listener had repeated or reformulated the speaker’s previous utterance. This strategic practice was particularly to ensure the listener’s accurate understanding.

TS 44 is between the hostel owner (TH1f) and her guest (F66m) when he wanted to rent two motorbikes. While he was filling in the rental form, TH1f clarified the registration numbers of two rental motorbikes. That is, one was number ‘three three three’ and the other was ‘seven two nine’. In spite of using an acknowledgement marker, ‘okay’ (line 4), F66m initiated the practice of using a questioning tag, ‘right?’ after his paraphrased utterance in line 6 in order to ensure his understanding.

TS 44 (059)

[1] TH1f okay <Lth> kah </Lth> they are honda click i
[2] <Lth> na ka </Lth> number of the: motorbike

[3] three three three seven two nine

[4] F66m okay

[5] TH1f yes

[6] F66m→ but we have we have two motorbike right?

[7] TH1f yes this one and this one

TS 45 is between the local guide (TH46m) and a group of tourists. This segment occurred when they arrived an island during a long-tail boat trip. TH46m asked all tourists to wait on the beach while the staff arranged kayaks for all of them to go on a kayaking tour (lines 1 and 2). In response, F350f showed her acknowledgement with ‘okay’ (line 3). On the other hand, F351f repeated TH46m’s previous utterance, ‘walk on the beach’ and also inserted ‘right?’ to confirm her understanding in line 4.

TS 45 (350)

[1] TH46m excuse me sir you can wait on the beach wait

[2] the kayaking they coming

[3] F350f okay

[4] F351f→ walk on the beach right?

[5] TH46m yeah

The participants in this study used ‘right?’ and ‘huh?’ as questioning tags quite frequently. TS 46 and TS 47 provide the use of ‘huh?’ for a confirmation check.

TS 46 occurred at the pier between a foreign tourist (F148f) and another member of boat-service staff (TH19f). While waiting for the boat, F148m asked TH19f whether he
had enough time for his lunch (line 1). In the following turn, TH19f partially repeated the key words in F148m’s utterance, ‘*have lunch*’, followed by ‘*huh?’*, a questioning tag which was inserted to confirm her understanding and seemingly gain time to respond in line 2. F148m took the next turn to inform TH19f that he might have come back within thirty minutes (line 3). In response, TH19f replied that the boat would be ready for boarding in ten minutes, so F148m could not have lunch unfortunately.

TS 46 (131) using ‘*huh?’*

1. F148m  
   can go meat . have lunch?

2. TH19f  
   have lunch huh?

3. F148m  
   come back late thirty

4. TH19f  
   no no sir difficult boat about ten minute waiting ready

The other sample can be seen in TS 47 between the taxi driver (TH17f) and a couple of tourists (F119m and F120f). At the pier, a lot of taxi drivers waited for potential passengers. They normally asked tourists where they were going, as seen in line 1. In response, F119m replied, ‘*er that’s olay*’. This can be interpreted that F119m might have been embarrassed to say he was looking for a toilet. Instead, he used this phrase in the sense of don’t worry. Alternatively, he might have used this phrase to minimise the threat to TH17f’s offer. But, TH17f noticed F119m was looking for something and she was happy to help, as seen in the following turn. Following F119m’s response, ‘*bathroom*’ (line 4), TH17f repeated ‘*bathroom*’, followed by a questioning tag, ‘*huh?’* in line 5. As F120f confirmed TH17f’s understanding in the following turn, TH17f showed them the way to the public toilet. This segment also exemplified question repeat initiated by F120f in line 8 as a confirmation check.

TS 47 (108)

1. TH17f  
   hello where you going
[2] F119m er that's okay
[3] TH17f what you looking
[4] F119m bathroom
[5] TH17f→ @ bathroom huh?
[6] F120f he really needs a bathroom
[7] TH17f this this way <Lth>
[8] F120f this way? thank you so much

5) *Wh-clarification question*

The participants of this study used the practice of *wh-clarification question* as a clarification request in touristic ELF. Taking part as the listener, they narrowed the specific area of the speaker’s previous utterance to ask for further information or additional explanation. Doing so was to prevent potential ambiguity and problems in understanding beforehand.

TS 48 is between a foreigner (F30m) wanting to book the transportation service to Krabi Airport and the hostel owner (TH1f) providing this service at her hostel. F30m asked for the other choice to go to the airport (line 1), in turn, he initiated the practice of using a questioning tag, ‘huh?’. In response, TH1f informed him of the departure times for the boat transfer services (line 2). In the following turn, F30m initiated a *wh-clarification question*, ‘*how long*’, followed by an alternative word within the same local context, ‘*an hour?*’ to specify the detail he needed to know in line 3.

TS 48 (027)

[1] F30m the other option is boat huh?
[2] TH1f boat eight or eleven thirty

[3] F30m⇒ and the boat is how long? an hour?

[4] TH1f ferry boat two hours to krabi pier and then

[5] connect by er taxi from the pier another forty minutes

TS 49 is between the owner of a coffee shop (TH41f) and her foreign friend (F281f). In this segment, F281f planned to visit Bangkok since she was eager for creativity to make art crafts. So, she asked TH41f where to go and where to stay in Bangkok. TH41f recommended F281f to visit Asiatique, the antique warehouse transformed into a touristy evening market in Bangkok (lines 1 to 3). In the following turn, F281f initiated the practice of wh-clarification questions, asking for more detail, ‘what is Asiatique?’ in line 4. In response, TH41f informed her that it was like a shopping centre.

TS 49 (286)

[1] TH41f you have to go <Lth> niː dun di {also this}

[2] </Lth> Asiatique . Asiatique you can go by . it’s also


[4] F281f ⇒ what is Asiatique?

[5] TH41f ah like a shopping mall


TS 50 took place when the local guide (TH46m) explained the landscape of a cave to a group of tourists. They visited the cave at the right time during the course of low tide, so they could walk on the beach inside the cave (lines 1 to 4). Following F370’s response in the form of an acknowledgement marker, ‘okay’ (line 5), TH46m further explained that the beach was flooded during the course of high tide. Accordingly,
F370m initiated a wh-clarification question, *'how high is the water'* in line 10 about the sea level of high tide.

**TS 50 (368)**

[1] TH46m okay now ni for you good luck . in here the can see on

[2] TH46m the beach . sometime and the morning

[3] <Lth> ŋan {there} </Lth> have the high tide not see

[4] TH46m in the beach

[5] F370m okay

[6] TH46m cannot stop in here not see in the beach and

[7] TH46m the water full

[8] F370m okay

[9] TH46m yeah

[10] F370m→ how high is the water?

[11] TH46m <Lth> nia {here} </Lth> {pointing at the cave wall}

[12] F371f oh yeah

[13] TH46m about here . for you today ah good luck . you can see

[14] TH46m on the beach

TS 51 is between a foreign passenger (F64m) and a member of boat-service staff (TH10m) at the pier. F64m initially asked TH10m whether he had to transfer to another boat (line 1). F64m, in turn, used a questioning tag, *'right?'* in his query.
Before giving F64m an answer, TH10m initiated a wh- clarification question, ‘where are you going?’ to ask about his trip in line 2. Following F64m’s response, ‘phuket’ (line 3), T10m gave the answer (lines 4 to 5).

TS 51 (058)

[1] F64m change here, right?

[2] TH10m → where are you going?

[3] F64m phuket

[4] F10m phuket okay change the boat confirm ticket already.

[5] stand by the pier

TS 52 is further evidence of using a wh-clarification question initiated by the listener in this data set. The segment is between a tourist customer (F218m) at the coffee shop and a barista (TH30f). TF218m ordered one hot latte and one iced latte. In this case, TH30f wanted to know how sweet he wanted for the ice latte (line 4). Due to the ambiguity of sweetness, F218f initiated the practice of a wh-clarification question, ‘how sweet it is’ to ask for clarity in line 5.

TS 52 (191)

[1] F218m one ah one latte hot

[2] TH30f hot latte

[3] F218m one iced latte

[4] TH30f ice latte sweet or not sweet

[5] F218m → er how sweet it is? it's very sweet or-

[6] TH30f depend on you
This subsection exemplifies other-initiated strategies, namely other-repetition, question repeat, the practice of using an alternative word/phrase with a rising intonation, questioning tag, and wh-clarification initiated by the listener to pre-empt problems in understanding. The next two subsections describe how the speaker and the listener initiated the strategic practices as a means of repair when problems of understanding arose in transactional segments.

5.2.3 **Self-initiated strategies to repair problems of understanding**

This subsection illustrates the ways in which the speaker initiated strategic practices in sequences of repair after signalling the presence of problems in understanding in transactional segments.

1) **Self-repetition**

Apart from pre-empting non-understanding, self-repetition was most frequently used in response to the listener’s signals non-understanding.

TS 53 is the transactional segment between the booking agent (TH2f) and a foreigner (F53m) when F53m wanted to book a transportation service from his accommodation to Krabi Airport. To find out the departure time of the minivan, TH2f needed to know the boarding time at the airport and then figured out when the tourist should have been present at the check-in counter at the airport. TH2f informed F53m that he should check in at the airport around seven o’clock (line 1). F53m seemed not to have heard it clearly and signalled with a minimal query, ‘sorry?’ (line 2). TH2f, therefore, initiated self-repetition in line 3 to facilitate F53m a clear rehearing. They both
mutually understood. It indicated by F53m’s affirmative response in the following turn.

TS 53 (049)

[1] TH2f check in about seven o’clock na

[2] F53m→ sorry?

[3] TH2f→ check in about seven o’clock

[4] F53m okay yes yes yes

TS 54 took place on the ferry from Phi Phi Island to Koh Lanta. This segment is between a booking agent (TH16f) and the passenger (F102m). In line 1, TH16f asked F102m whether he had booked accommodation on Koh Lanta yet in order that she could sell him a room for his stay. In the following turn, F102m signalled the trouble in understanding with a minimal query, ‘huh?’ (line 2). So, TH16f facilitated another chance of rehearing for F102m by repeating her previous utterance exactly in line 3.

TS 54 (090)

[1] TH16f where are you stay on koh lanta?

[2] F102m→ huh?

[3] TH16f→ where are you stay on koh lanta?

TS 55 is between the taxi driver (TH17f) and a group of foreign tourists about the fare.

TS 55 (139)

[1] TH17f two- four people hundred fifty baht

[2] F154f pardon?
[3] TH17f → **two people hundred fifty** (the tourists collected
money altogether and paid the driver)

TH17f informed the tourists how much the fare was in line 1. The segment of ‘two-four people’ was likely the trigger in understanding. F154m signalled with a minimal query, ‘pardon’ (line 2) to ask for another chance of hearing. In the following turn, TH17f initiated self-repetition to make her previous utterance clearer. TH17f, in turn, corrected information in line 1; that is, the fare was a hundred and fifty baht for two, not four people.

TS 56 happened at the boat check-in kiosk. While checking in the passenger, the boat-service manager (TH11m) requested the customer’s payment in line 1. In his turn, he used a discourse marker, ‘right?’ to confirm his understanding. Following F22m’s response, ‘okay’, TH11m made sure if there were five adult passengers and one child in this group in line 3. The tourist might have not paid attention in listening, so he signalled in the form of a minimal query, ‘huh?’ (line 5) to ask TH11m for repeating what he had said. TH11m, therefore, exactly repeated his previous utterance (line 6) in the following turn. F228m’s response (line 7) indicated the shared understanding.

TS 56 (208)

[1] TH11m  okay and you have to pay here for seven thousand five
[2]        hundred right?
[3] F228m  okay
[4] TH11m  five adult one kid
[5] F228m→  huh?
[6] TH11m→  **five adult one kid**
TS 57 is between the café owner (TH41f) and a foreigner (F300f). After F300f had ordered an iced cappuccino for take-away, TH41f asked her to have a seat while waiting for the coffee (line 6). However, F300f seemed not to have heard clearly, and signalled with a minimal query, ‘huh?’ (line 7). TH41f, therefore, initiated self-repetition, ‘have a seat first’ (line 9). In the next turn, F300f confirmed her understanding with an affirmative response, ‘yes’.

2) Rephrasing

This discussion illustrates the use of rephrasing in repairing sequences in transactional segments in transactional segments.
TS 58 happened after the hostel owner (TH1f) had taken a potential guest (F104f) to view the bedroom inside the hostel before checking in. Due to the age of this couple of tourists, TH1f wanted to make sure that they could stay in the hostel in a shared bedroom. TH1f asked F104f whether she still wanted to stay here or not in line 1. F104f seemed not to have heard and signalled with a minimal query, ‘huh?’ (line 2). TH1f, therefore, reformulated her previous utterance into the complete sentence, ‘would you like to check in?’ in line 3. In the next turn, F104f’s response indicated that she understood the message to some extent. F104f, in turn, initiated self-lexicogrammatical repair as she was aware of using the appropriate word, ‘show’ in this context, so she corrected herself with the word ‘tell’ (line 4).

TS 58 (096)

[1] TH1f okay check in?
[2] F104f→ huh?
[3] TH1f→ would you like to check in?
[4] F104f i’ll show him i’ll tell him first
[5] TH1f okay okay

The next sample is in TS 59 when the local guide (TH46m) asked a tourist (F369f) about time. F369f answered, ‘ten to twelve’ (line 2). To confirm his understanding, TH46m reformulated F369f’s utterance into, ‘twelve o’clock ten minute na’ (line 3) in the following turn. At this point, it is obvious that TH46m misunderstood. F369f, therefore, initiates rephrasing. She slightly changed the sentence structure into, ‘ten minutes to twelve o’clock’ (line 4) to make it explicit.

TS 59 (371)

[1] TH46m what time what time . twelve
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[2]  F369f  ten to twelve

[3]  TH46m→  twelve o’clock ten minute na

[4]  F369f→  ten minutes to twelve o’clock

TS 60 is between the taxi driver (TH17f) and a group of tourists. After TH17f dropped off these passengers, one of them asked if she was leaving them in line 1. The contraction, ‘gonna’ likely triggered Th17f to understand. Following TH17f’s response with a negative token, ‘no’, F126m echoed TH17f’s response. TH17f seemed to be aware of her misunderstanding, so she signalled with an explicit statement, ‘what what you say?’ (line 4). F126m, therefore, rephrased by changing the contraction into the complete form, ‘are you leaving now?’ (line 5) in the next turn. In response, TH17f told F126m that she would park her taxi first and come back to help them find the accommodation.

TS 60 (110)

[1]  F126m  are you gonna leave now

[2]  TH17f  no

[3]  F126m  no?


[5]  F126m→  are you leaving now?

[6]  TH17f  no no i- i have parking er i have (parking) and then

[7]  i come back

The next example is at the coffee shop. TS 61 is between a foreign customer (F279m) and the barista (TH30f). F279m was interested in the wooden small stool and asked TH30f what kind of wood was used to make the stool (line 1). TH30f’s response, ‘it’s
for a chair for a baby' indicated misunderstanding, as it showed an inappropriate response (line 2). F279m, therefore, initiated rephrasing by slightly amending the structure of his previous utterance into, ‘what what’s the wood?’ (line 3). The key term, ‘wood’ was still retained in the reformulated utterance. In the following turn, TH30f attempted to answer his query. She, in turn, explained that the origin of the wood was northern Thailand, but she could not remember what it was called (lines 4 to 6).

TS 61 (274)

[1] F279m what wood is it?
[2] TH30f→ it’s for a chair for a baby
[3] F279m→ what what’s the wood?
[4] TH30f erm: <Lth> (it was planted in the north) </Lth> ah

[5] in the north of thailand <Lth> nah </Lth> . i don’t know

[6] what's what the-
[7] F279m the name?
[8] TH30f yes . i cannot remember @

TS 62 is the segment between the taxi driver (TH7f) and two tourists (F54m and F55m). While these two tourists were looking for their accommodation in the brochure, TH7f asked how things are going.

TS 62 (050)

[1] TH7f you have many place choice huh?
[2] F55m→ pardon?
[3] TH7f $\rightarrow$ they have- you have how many place you have now

[4] F55m $\rightarrow$ how many?

[5] F54m how many <3> prices you have

[6] TH7f $\rightarrow$ how many place </3> you looking

[7] F55m oh just this one . how many prices

[8] TH7f just only (x) this

[9] F55m yeah yeah

[10] F54m $\rightarrow$ no i don’t know what she said how many to that is that how many rooms or this?

[11] TH7f $\rightarrow$ your idea your idea how many idea . place for the place how many

[12] F54m ah:

[13] F55m $\rightarrow$ how many?

[14] F54m ideas

[15] TH7f idea

TH7f initiated a question in line 1, but F55m seemed not to pay attention or maybe hear it unclearly. F55m signalled with a minimal query, ‘pardon?’ (line 1). In the following turn, TH7f initiated rephrasing. In so doing, she retained the key term, ‘place’, emits a word, ‘choice’, and also added ‘you have now’ (line 3) to give the sense of meaning of how many places they had in mind so far. TH7f’s rephrasing was likely not sufficient to repair non-understanding at the first effort. F55m still signalled with...
an interrogative echo (line 4). Moreover, it is likely that TH7f’s pronunciation might be the trigger, as seen in line 5 where F54m repeated what he had heard, ‘how many prices you have’. TH7f rephrased her utterance again in line 6. However, up to this turn the tourists had not understood TH7f’s message completely yet, as F54m initiated an explicit statement (lines 10 to 11) to indicate his non-understanding. In the following turn, TH7f made another effort to negotiate meaning by amending the word choice. She amended to use the word, ‘idea’ and repeated it twice to give a narrow sense of meaning. She still used the word, ‘place’ and ‘how many’ to retain the meaning in her original question. This is taken into account as paraphrasing (lines 12 and 13). It is likely that F54m more or less understood the meaning and responds with a minimal response, ‘ah’ in the following turn. On the other hand, F55m indicated his incomplete understanding by using an interrogative echo, ‘how many?’ (line 16). So, F54m helped F55m understand in line 16, by repeating TH7f’s word, ‘ideas’ (line 17).

3) Paraphrasing

This subsection provides evidence of paraphrasing used as a means of repair in negotiation of meaning.

TS 63 is the segment between a tourist (F383m) and the local guide (TH53m) after the guide had explained the landscape inside the cave. The tourist intended to know more about whether visitors could climb up to the upper level because there was a climbing trail.

TS 63 (391)

[1] F383m → we not we are not allow-

[2] TH53m → huh?

[3] F383m → can we go up?
F383m had the query in line 1. TH53m seemed not to have heard and signals a minimal query, ‘*huh?*’ (line 2) as a repetition request. F383m, therefore, initiated paraphrasing. In doing so, F383m changed words to simplify meaning, ‘*can we go up?*’ in the following turn (line 3). In response, TH53m told him that tourists could climb only half way up as far as the tyre-made climbing trail and the rope were available.

The next exemplified segment (TS 64) between the community tour agent (TH48f) and a tourist (F342f) occurred when she and her husband visited the mangrove forest at Yee Peng Community. These two tourists were interested in a kayaking tour around the mangrove. TH48f asked how many people would do the kayaking tour (line 1). F342f answered, ‘*my husband and me*’ instead of informing him of the number. Despite that, TH48f gave a signal, ‘*huh*’ asking for repetition in the following turn. In response to the signal, F342f initiated paraphrasing, ‘*just two*’ in line 4 to make it explicit and easy for TH48f to understand. At this point, a lexical amendment was used to provide the concise answer.

TS 64 (342)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TH48f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F342f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TH48f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F342f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TH48f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TS 65 is the segment between a tourist (F387f) and the local guide (TH53m) when visiting inside the cave. F387f asked TH53m whether people here took the faeces of
the bats for selling (line 1). TH53m seemed not to understand F387f’s utterance and signalled with a minimal query, ‘again please’ (line 2) for a repetition request in the following turn. The non-understanding here was more or less caused by the unfamiliar topic and vocabulary. In sequence of repairing, F387f retained only the key term, ‘the bats’ (line 4) to give the focus of the talk. Following TH53m’s acknowledgement marker, ‘okay’, F387f carried on the next turn with ‘they poo’ (line 6) to narrow a sense of meaning. At this point, it can be seen that F387f made an effort to simplify the meaning for TH53m. Following TH53m’s minimal response, F387f initiated paraphrasing in lines 8 and 9 by changing ‘faeces’ in the original utterance into ‘the poo’, and the words ‘farm lands’ were amended into ‘the field’. F387f’s put her effort to negotiate meaning. She separated the key terms into a number of turns (lines 4 and 6) in order to help TH53m ascertain the meaning. Nevertheless, she ended her paraphrased utterance with ‘no’, which could be the leading answer for TH53m in the next turn.

TS 65 (396)

[1] F387f have they ever used the faeces for ah: to take out

[2] faeces to use on the farms farm lands?

[3] TH53m → again please

[4] F387f → the bats

[5] TH53m yes

[6] F387f → they poo

[7] TH53m er hum

[8] F387f → yeah have they ever used the bat poo out on the

[9] fields . no
TS 66 is between the local guide (TH53m) and a group of tourists when they stopped on a small island during a kayaking tour. TH53m explained that normally tourists were able to go snorkelling, but on that day, they could not, due to the strong wind (lines 1 to 3). The tourists seemed to understand with a response in the form of a minimal response. TH53m further explained that the wind brought the sea mud up to the sea surface (lines 5 and 7) in the following turn. The trigger more or less was a variant of TH53m’s pronunciation which was tagged in `<pvc> mʌtʃ {mud} </pvc>`. F392m’s response in the form of an interrogative echo, ‘*how much?*’ (line 8) indicated the non-understanding. Due to TH53m’s limited English, he was not able to initiate self-pronunciation repair. Instead, he attempted to give more detail in the following turn (lines 9 to 14). In doing so, TH53m used other alternative words e.g. ‘*sands*’ (line 9) and ‘*in the bottom*’ (line 10), regarded as the lexical amendment. In this sense, he used paraphrasing to negotiate the meaning that the wind and the strong waves blew the mud, so the sea water was not clear enough for snorkelling.

**TS 66 (401)**

[1] TH53m but normally `<pvc> ˈsnɔːklɪŋ {snorkelling} </pvc>`

[2] but today cannot do `<pvc> ˈsnɔːklɪŋ {snorkelling} </pvc>`

[3] `<pvc> because have the (.) wave windy </pvc>`

[4] Fs ahhh

[5] TH53m they take the `<pvc> mʌtʃ {mud} </pvc>` the

[6] `<pvc> mʌtʃ {mud} </pvc>` you know

[7] `<pvc> mʌtʃ {mud} </pvc>`

[8] F392m→ how much?
TH53m→ <pvc> mʌtʃ {mud} </pvc> this is the sand. this is sand

but normally around here. in the bottom has the

<ppc> mʌtʃ {mud} </ppc> land. when have the wave.

the wave take the <pvc> mʌtʃ {mud} </pvc> come

under water. but water not clear not see anything.

only swimming

4) Key-word repetition

In response to the listener’s signals of non-understanding, the speaker in ELF talk initiated the practice of repeating only the key terms to facilitate rehearing for the listener and emphasise meaning.

TS 67 is between the local guide (TH46m) and the tourist (F370m) once more when TH46m called all tourists to get back on the long-tail boat to leave for Koh Lanta (line 1). F370m seemed not have heard clearly and signalled with a minimal query, ‘eh’ (line 2). In the following turn, TH56m repeated the key phrase ‘go back in the boat’ in sequence of repairing. Despite that, F370m was unsure what he had heard and again signalled the problem with an interrogative echo, ‘in the boat?’ (line 4). In response, TH46m repeated the key term, ‘go to the boat’ (line 5). At this point, the problem in understanding had not been repaired effectively. F370m used an alternative word with a rising intonation, ‘monkey?’ (line 6) in the next turn to ask for confirmation of his understanding. In this sense, F370m attempted to check his understanding whether the next stop was to sightsee monkeys that inhabit the mangrove forest. That is because this activity is included in the day tour package. TH46m initiated key-word repetition again and also repeated ‘go’ a number of times in the following turn.
Responding to F370m’s signal, TH46m gave a negative response, ‘no monkey’ in the same turn.

TS 67 (373)

[1] TH46m  hello. hey hey we go back in the boat

[2] F370m→  eh?

[3] TH46m→  go back in the boat

[4] F370m  in the boat?

[5] TH46m→  go to the boat

[6] F370m  monkey?

[7] TH46m→  go to the boat. no monkey go go go to the boat yeah

[8] F370m  okay the boat

TS 68 is between a tourist (F327f) and the booking agent (TH13f) when F327f and her partner were booking the boat transfer to Krabi. To complete the reservation form, TH13f asked them to write down their names. In this regard, F327f asked TH13f if she needed the passports or not (line 1). Following TH13f’s response in the form of a minimal query, ‘huh?’, F327f initiated key-word repetition by reprising ‘passport’, the key term twice in the following turn.

TS 68 (328)

[1] F327f  you need passport?

[2] TH13f→  huh?

[3] F327f→  passport passport
[4] TH13f  no no that's okay <Lth> {there is no need for passport}

[5] </Lth> (...) tomorrow seven ten between seven twenty

[6] pick up

[7] F328m    seven seven twenty

TS 69 is between the local guide (TH53m) and tourists (F391m, F386m, and F392m) during their visit to the cave. TH53m explained that cavemen lived here and collected birds’ nests (line 1). TH53m, in turn, used the discourse marker, ‘you know’ with the key-word repetition for a comprehension check. As a matter of fact, it is the swiftlet’s nest which is made of its saliva. F391m seemed unsure what he had heard. He signalled with an interrogative echo, ‘birth?’ by repeating the problematic item in the next turn. In response, TH53m initiated key-word repetition (line 3). In the following turn, F386m, another tourist, repeated the word again to show acknowledgement. Following TH53m’s positive response, F392m used an alternative phrase, ‘bird bird nest soup’ (line 6) to confirm his understanding.

TS 69 (392)

[1] TH53m   yeah but they live for birds nest . you know birds nest?

[2] F391m→ birth?

[3] TH53m→ bird nest

[4] F386m   bird nest

[5] TH53m   yes

[6] F392m   bird bird nest soup

Another sample is TS 70. The segment is between the hostel owner (TH1f) and the guest (F104f). TH1f explained that her place was a kind of hostel, similarly the
dormitory. Her pronunciation more or less triggered a problem in understanding, as seen in the next turn where F104f signalled with a minimal query, ‘hah?’ (line 3). In response, TH1f repeated the key term, ‘dorm’, together with its formal form, ‘dormitory’ in line 4. Despite that, F104f constructed an overt question in the next turn. At this point, TH1f’s key-word repetition seemed insufficient in meaning negotiation as she seemed unable to deal with F104f’s understanding. TH1f, therefore, decided to take F104f to view the place first before checking in (lines 5 and 6).

5) Combined repetition

Combined repetition was used as a means of repair, particularly when the listener signalled that s/he required further explanation or information to complete his/her understanding.
TS 71 is between the local guide (TH46m) and a tourist F340m while walking through the mangrove forest. TH46m initiated the conversation (line 1) and pointed out the mudskipper to F340m and his child. F340m responded in the form of a minimal query, ‘huh?’ (line 2) asking for repetition. In the following turn, TH46m initiated self-combined repetition. In this turn, he repeated the word, ‘mudskipper’ as tagged with <pvc>, due to his pronunciation. TH46m, in turn, further explained that it was a fish walking on mud when the tide is low (lines 4 to 6). In fact, the mudskipper has fins which work as legs, so they can survive in swamps during the course of low tide.

TS 71 (337)

[1] TH46m yeah yeah the <pvc> mʌd kɪ:p pɑr (mudskipper) </pvc>

[2] fish

[3] F340m→ huh?

[4] TH46m→ and the <pvc> mʌd kɪ:p pɑr </pvc> ni the low tide

[5] they can’t see <pvc> mʌd kɪ:p pɑr </pvc> fish and

[6] walking fish

TS 72 is between the local guide (TH53m) and a tourist (F390f) and a group of tourists when the guide pointed out the mark of high sea level on the cave wall. In the following turn, F390f responded in the form of a minimal query, ‘hum?’ (line 2). In sequence of repair, TH53m initiated self-combined repetition. He repeated ‘only one day to up here’ (line 3), followed by more detail (lines 4 to 5). He attempted to inform the tourists that the sea level could only rise that high on one night which was the Loy Kratong Festival in Thailand. However, in fact Loy Kratong is not the Thai New Year’s Day, but it is a traditional festival, celebrated on the full-moon night of the 12th lunar month.
TS 72 (393)

[1] TH53m have only one day have high up there

[2] F390f→ hum?

[3] TH53m→ have . in here only one day to up here . for the


[5] TH53m→ like a new year for thai people

[6] F388f→ okay

TS 73 is between the hostel owner (TH1f) and a guest (F245f) who wanted to know the best option to leave Kon Lanta. TH1f replied that people took more time than usual when they travelled by the minivan during the New Year holiday. F245f signalled the non-understanding by echoing ‘wait’, followed by a single question word, ‘what?’ to request repetition (line 3). In the following turn, TH1f initiated key-word repetition, ‘minivan’ (line 4). In spite of F245f’s minimal response (line 5), TH1f initiated combined repetition in line 6 in sequence of repair. TH1f, in turn, repeated ‘minivan’ and further explained that the minivan was transferred from Koh Lanta to the Krabi mainland by ferry. That was the reason why it took more time, due to a lot of cars and only two ferries in service.

TS 73 (215)

[1] TH1f by van take quite long time like have to wait long time

[2] F245f→ three hour three and a half hour


[4] TH1f→ minivan
TS 74 is the last segment discussed here to exemplify the use of self-initiated strategies for repairing problems in understanding. This segment happened at the hostel when the hostel guests (F11m and F12f) asked the owner (TH1f) where they should visit in Lanta Old Town, the other side of Koh Lanta. This segment is between F11m and F12f as they used English as a lingua franca because they were from different countries. F12f wanted to know whether there were any beaches on the other side of the island (line 3). F11m replied in the sense that there were some beaches, but they were small and there was the mangrove forest. At this point, ‘mangrove’ was the trigger of F12f’s problem in understanding as she signalled with an interrogative echo (line 5). In the following turn, F11m initiated self-combined repetition. F11m, in turn, repeated ‘mangrove’, followed by his explanation, ‘like kinda watery trees’ (line 6).

TS 74 (009)

[1] F11m yeah yeah it's interesting to go that in that side i never

[2] 

[3] F12f so there are beaches?

[4] F11m there are but there small mangrove forest

[5] F12f→ mangrove?

[6] F11m→ mangrove like kinda watery trees
5.2.4 Other-initiated strategies to repair problems of understanding

Turning now to other-initiated strategies as repairing strategies, this section describes the transcribed data is to provide the samples of using other-initiated strategies, by the listener after s/he gave a signal of non-understanding earlier. But, the speaker’s response in the prior turn was not effective enough to complete his/her comprehension. The findings describe the ways both parties: the speaker and the listener worked together to exchange meaning and negotiate understanding until understanding was shared.

1) Other-repetition

Like pre-emptive purposes, other-repetition was the most frequently used for remedial purposes. However, it was particularly used to give a signal of solution in using the pragmatic strategies within the ELF talk. In this sense, it was obvious that the speaker and the listener achieved mutual understanding.

TS 75 is between a foreign tourist (F52m) looking for a book shop and the booking agent (TH2f). After F52m asked TH2f whether there were any bookshops near the pier (line 1), TH2f initiated other-repetition to confirm her hearing in the next turn. Following F52m’s response in the form of an affirmative response, ‘yeah’ (line 3), TH2f told him the name of the bookshop, ‘CATFISH’ with stressed sound, followed by a piece of information, ‘around the corner’ (line 4). Due to F52m’s minimal response, ‘er’, TH2f seemed to be aware of potential non-understanding. TH2f, therefore, further informed the tourist that the bookshop is on the right-hand side, followed by key-word repetition, ‘CATFISH’ (line 6). However, F52m had not completely understood as he signalled with an inappropriate response, ‘catbook?’ (line 7). In response to the presence of non-understanding, TH2f initiated key-word repetition
with sound stretch, ‘CATFISH’ (line 8). In the next turn, F52m initiated other-repetition, ‘catfish’ (line 9) to show his accurate acknowledgement.

TS 75 (048)

[1] F52m er is there any bookshop
[2] TH2f bookshop
[3] F52m yeah
[4] TH2f CATFISH around the corner
[5] F52m er
[6] TH2f on your right side CATFISH
[7] F52m→ catbook?
[8] TH2f CATFISH
[9] F52m→ catfish
[10] TH2f yes

TS 76 is between the booking agent (TH2f) and a foreign customer (F108f) asking for the boat transfer service to Phuket. The signal of the potential problem in understanding is in line 3 when F108f initiated an interrogative echo, ‘one thirty?’ as a repetition request. Following TH2f’s response in the form of self-repetition to facilitate another chance of rehearing (line 4), F108f used other-repetition, ‘twelve thirty’ in line 5 to show acknowledgement of the provided information.

TS 76 (100)

[1] TH2f speed boat they have twelve thirty and one
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[2]  o’clock <Lth> kha <Lth>

[3]  F108f→  one thirty?

[4]  TH2f  twelve thirty


TS 77 is between a tourist (F214f) and another booking agent (TH13f) when F214f and her friends made a booking for a trip to Koh Lipe, another nearby island. In this segment, the sign of misinterpretation was indicated by ‘tomorrow’ in line 2; that is, TH13f understood that these tourists would go to Koh Lipe the following day. F214f clarified in the next turn that they wanted to go on Thursday. As the listener, TH13f initiated other-repetition (line 4) to show acknowledgement and confirm her accurate understanding. Following F214f’s response with more detail of the trip (line 5), TH13f again repeated a part of F214f’s previous utterance, ‘go home on sunday’ (line 6) to confirm her understanding before making the reservation for them.

TS 77 (186)

[1]  F214f  we want to go er to go lipe

[2]  TH13f→  tomorrow lipe

[3]  F214f  no no thursday

[4]  TH13f→  thursday <1> also

[5]  F214f  thursday </1> and the we want to go home on sunday

[6]  TH13f→  go home on sunday

TS 78 is between a boat passenger (F233f) and the boat-service manager (TH11m). F233f asked TH11m whether the boat trip was a direct or a one-stop journey (line 1). TH11m seemed not to have heard and responds with a form of silence. (line 2). Due
to TH11m’s silence, F233f said ‘hello’ to call for his attention, followed by rephrasing in the next turn. F233f, in turn, reformulated her previous utterance to be clearer. She did not only repeat her utterance (line 3), but also added concise words, ‘go straight’ to emphasise meaning in line 4. Following TH11m’s response, ‘er direct’ (line 5), F233f, as the listener, initiated other-repetition, ‘direct to Phuket’ to confirm her understanding in line 6. TH11m gave further detail about this boat journey (lines 7 and 8) and F233f confirmed her understanding by using an acknowledgement response, ‘ah okay’, followed by other-paraphrase, ‘no change no change’ (line 9). F233m and TH11m were collaborating to improve clarity and mutual understanding in this segment.

TS 78 (210)

[1] F233f ehm the boat goes to phi phi first? then phuket?

[2] TH11m → silence

[3] F233f hello . boat goes to phi phi then phuket?

[4] or go straight to phuket

[5] TH11m er direct

[6] F233f → direct to phuket

[7] TH11m yeah same boat but stop at the phi phi

[8] <1> just a moment

[9] F234m ah okay </1> no change no change

TS 79 is between a Chinese customer (F271f) and two members of waiting staff (TH35m and TH36m). This segment is interesting evidence of the use of repairing strategies. The practices of self-repetition and other-repetition were likely insufficient
to repair the non-understanding at the first effort. Despite that, the participants in this encounter additionally exploited non-linguistic resource to negotiate understanding.

TS 79 (265)

[1] F271f hello b five <pvc> waɪc {rice} </pvc> two

[2] TH35m→ wine?


[4] TH36m→ white wine white wine

[5] F271f yeah yeah two

[6] TH36m white wine two {TH36m followed F271f to her dining table and he now recognised that F271f wanted more rice, not white wine} <Lth> { no no no it's not white wine @ rice rice she wanted more rice} </Lth>

[7] TH36m rice rice yeah

[8] F271f rice

[9] TH36m some rice

F271f asked for one more rice at the table no. B5 (line 1) her accent triggered TH35m to understand the message. F271f’s word, ‘rice’ seemed to have been heard by TH35m as ‘wine’; therefore, TH35m initiated an interrogative echo in line 2 to indicate the presence of problem in understanding. In response, F271f used a minimal query, ‘huh’ and initiated self-repetition, ‘rice’ in the same turn to facilitate rehearing for the waiting staff (line 3). Due to the non-standard pronunciation of the ‘r’ sound, F271’s
self-repetition was not sufficient to repair the mismatched understanding. In addition, it is possible that F271’s ‘be five’ in her initial utterance could have been recognised by TH36m as a brand of white wine, so he repeated ‘white wine white wine’ (line 4). However, F271f seemed not to detect the presence of a misunderstanding as she used an affirmative response, ‘yeah yeah two’ in the following turn. Yet, the misunderstanding still existed in line 6 where TH36m initiated other-repetition to confirm his understanding. Despite that, TH36m followed F271f to her dining table, and then discovered that F271f had not ordered wine because there were no wine glasses on the table. Besides, her family was still having food. Suddenly, T36m shouted to TH35m, the other staff that she wanted some rice, not wine.

2) Question repeat

The practice of question repeat initiated by the listener was frequently used to ensure understanding when the listener more or less recognised the local context of talk, but s/he had not understood completely yet.

TS 80 is between the taxi driver (TH17f) and two tourists (F153f and F154f). TH17f offered the tourists a good deal on the fare (line 1). In the following turn, F153f used an affirmative response, ‘yeah okay’. On the other hand, F154f did not understand TH17f’s utterance yet and she signalled with an overt question, ‘what did she say?’ (line 3) to ask for repetition. In response, TH17f initiated self-repetition, ‘three hundred together’ (line 4) to facilitate another chance of hearing for them. F154f, therefore, used question repeat, ‘three hundred?’ in line 5 as a confirmation check.

TS 80 (134)

[1] TH17f i give you discount for three hundred together

[2] F153f yeah okay

[3] F154f→ what did she say?
TS 81 is another exemplified segment between a taxi driver (TH17f) and a group of foreign tourists (F155m and F157f) when the tourists asked for the fare. The signal of non-understanding was indicated in the form of a minimal response, ‘huh’ (line 2) after TH17f asked how many tourists would travel together. In repairing sequence, TH17f initiated self-repetition (line 3) to facilitate rehearing. Following F155m’s response, ‘two’, TH17f told them the fare which cost two hundred baht for two people. TH17f also initiated paraphrasing (line 7) to explicate meaning in the utterance. F157f, therefore, used question repeat, ‘two hundred for two?’ in line 8 to ensure what she had heard. In response, TH17f used ‘okay?’ as a comprehension check and asked for agreement. The affirmative response, ‘okay’ (line 10) showed mutual understanding and effectiveness in repairing non-understanding in this segment.
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[7] TH17f  for two for two . one hundred baht for person

[8] F157f→ two hundred for two? {noisy}

[9] TH17f  okay?

[10] F157f  okay

TS 82 is the segment between the booking agent (TH13f) and a foreign tourist (F330m) wanting to book a four-island day trip. He was unclear about the differences between taking a speedboat and a long-tail boat, as TH13f attempted to explain (lines 1 to 3). The potential problem was indicated by a minimal query, ‘huh’ (line 4). TH13 responded in the following turn by giving only key terms, ‘buffet lunch same’ (line 5) for explanation. That is to say, these two kinds of boat trip provided a buffet lunch for the customers. Following F331m’s response in the form of a minimal query, ‘huh?’ (line 6), TH13f initiated self-repetition (line 7). F330m, in the next turn, used the practice of question repeat, ‘buffet? same?’ to ensure his understanding in line 8. Despite having TH13f’s confirmation (line 9), F330m used question repeat, ‘the same?’ again in line 10 as a confirmation check. In response, TH13f refused his understanding and explained in lines 11 and 12; that is, tourists would have gone by the long-tail boat if tour packages of long-tail boat and speed boat had been the same.

TS 82 (330)

[1] TH13f  time pick up in the morning and then deliver to

[2]  arrive time and speed boat (.) pick up also morning (...)

[3]  long tail is not bad

[4] F331m→ huh?

[5] TH13f  buffet lunch same
TS 83 provides another simple of using question repeat as a clarification request when the listener was unclear about meaning. As the tourists (F54m and F55m) were looking for a room during their stay on Koh Lanta, TH7f recommended the hostel which was another type of accommodation available. In the segment, instead of using ‘hostel’, TH7f used the word, ‘dorm’ (line 1) where her pronunciation more or less established a problem in understanding for the tourists. Therefore, F54m indicated the problem by using an interrogative echo, ‘they have’ in line 2. In response, TH7f used key-word repetition (line 3). F54m initiated question repeat, ‘dorm’ in line 4 to ask for explanation. TH7f seemed to realise that the word ‘dorm’ could be the trouble source in understanding. Therefore, TH7f shifted to use a word, ‘hostel’, followed by a bit of explanation in the following turn (line 5). TH7f, in turn, constructed an overt question, ‘do you understand me?’ as a comprehension check. F55m repeated ‘hostel’ to show his acknowledgement.

TS 83 (050)

[1] TH7f they have <pvc> dəʊm {dorm} </pvc> also in here

[2] F54m→ they have?
TH7f <pvc> dorm {dorm} </pvc>

F54m→ dorm?

TH7f hostel for ten bed for one room. do you understand me?

F55m hostel

TS 84 is the segment between the foreign tourists (F214f and F215f) and the booking agent (TH3f) after they had agreed about the booking to Koh Lipe and TH13f had filled in the reservation form. In the segment, TH13f asked for the room number (line 2). Following F214f’s response in the form of an unfocused question, ‘what?’ in line 3, TH13f initiated self-repetition to facilitate them a rehearing in the following turn. TH13f seemed to have heard F214f’s response (line 5) unclearly and signalled with the practice of question repeat, ‘eight?’ (line 6) to ask for clarification. F214f, in the next turn, repeated her utterance by splitting into ‘eight yes’ where an affirmative response, ‘yes’ was used, followed by ‘one’ to improve clarity in line 7.

TS 84 (186)

F215f we are [place]

TH13f room number?

F214f→ what?

TH13f room number?

F214f eight one

TH13f→ eight?

F214f eight yes
3) **Wh-clarification question**

In addition, the listener initiated a wh-clarification question to repair problems in understanding. The listener frequently initiated this practice, as a clarification request when further explanation or more detail was needed to enhance his/her understanding.

TS 85 is between the taxi driver (TH17f) and one of her passengers (F121m). This segment happened during a transfer when she tried to sort out where F121m’s accommodation was located. She asked F121m to tell her the phone number on his reservation form. In fact, this reservation was arranged by a third party and no contact number for the accommodation was provided. In line 1, TH17f asked for the contact number on the reservation form in his travelling backpack. F121m used an interrogative echo, ‘*bag*?’ (line 2) to indicate the potential non-understanding in the following turn. TH17f again tried to ask for the contact number in the next turn, by repeating the phrases ‘*your bag your bag*’ and ‘*what number*?’ (line 3). F121m seemed not to understand TH17f’s utterance. He, therefore, constructed the wh-clarification question, ‘*what do you want. how do I find number?*’ to ask for clarification of what TH17f actually wanted and how could can find the telephone number (line 4). TH17m seemed not to be able to provide a clear response. Instead, she said ‘*zero two*’ (line 5) with an attempt to hint to F121m where to find the contact number, starting with zero two, which was the area code of the phone number.

TS 85 (109)

[1] TH17f number number your bag your bag

[2] F121m→ bag?

[3] TH17f your bag your bag one second . you you what number?
These two segments (TS 86 and TS 87) provided the actual use of a wh-clarification question imitated by the listener when they needed more explicit detail to complete their understanding.

TS86 is between the local guide (TH46m) and one of tourists (F351f) during the course of the boat trip. When arriving at the first stop, TH46m asked all tourists to wait on the beach. Meanwhile, the boatmen and himself prepared kayaks for the tourists to go kayaking.

TS 86 (350)

[1] TH46m wait the kayaking
[3] TH46m <Lth> nia {this one} </Lth> kayak
[4] F351f which's kayaking?
[5] TH46m kayak
[6] F351f <L1>
[7] TH46m okay you can we go on the beach
[8] F351f how long what time?
[9] TH46m in the kayaking about the one hour
[10] F351f one hour
[11] TH46m yeah
F351f seemed not to understand what kayaking was, so she initiated an interrogative echo, ‘kayaking?’ (line 2). In response, TH46m performed code-switching in Thai, and points at the kayak. Yet, the non-understanding was not solved, as seen by F351d’s response in line 4. F351f, in turn, initiated a wh-clarification question, ‘which’s kayaking?’ in order to ask for more detail. TH46m responded in the form of self-repetition (line 5). At this point, it could be interpreted that F351f more or less understood TH46m’s message. Following F351f’s utterance spoken in her first language, TH46m asked her to walk to the beach and waited for the kayak over there (line 7). In the next turn, F351f initiated wh-clarification again, ‘how long what time?’ (line 8) to specify the area of more detail she needs. After TH46m replied that it would take around one hour for a kayaking tour, F351f initiated other-repetition, ‘one hour’ (line 10) to show her acknowledgement. Following TH46m’s affirmative response, ‘yeah’ (line 11), F351 initiated other-rephrasing to ensure her understanding in line 12, which signalled the mismatch of non-understanding. Accordingly, TH46m tried to make his message clear in the following turn. That is, the tourist walked up to the beach and waited there for five minutes (line 13). In the next turn, F351f acknowledged TH46m’s message by using other-repetition. This turn was coded as a satisfied solution in this investigation.

TS 87 is the segment between another tourist (F365f) and the local guide (TH46m). During the course of a boat trip, the tourists went on a kayaking tour to visit the sea cave, as the first stop. When they were going to leave the cave, F356f asked TH46m whether she had to take the same kayak or not (lines 1 and 2). TH46m seemed to have heard unclearly and signalled with a minimal query, ‘huh’ in line 3. In the following turn, F365f initiated rephrasing (line 4). But, it was likely that her effort to facilitate
rehearing was not sufficient to repair the problem, as indicated in the next turn (lines 5 and 6). TH46m’s utterance failed to elicit an appropriate response and caused misunderstanding. F365f, therefore, initiated a wh-clarification question, ‘which kayak?’ in line 7 to ask him to point out which one she should have taken. TH46m responded ‘after you’ (line 8), instead of ‘up to you’. In his sense of meaning, the tourists could get on any kayak. F365f’s utterance, ‘don’t matter don’t matter’ (line 9) showed acknowledgement and confirmed her understanding in this segment.

TS 87 (363)

[1] F365f can we just grab one or we have to stick to the one
[2] TH46m that we got into or-
[3] TH46m huh?
[4] F365f we just grab one doesn’t matter which one or-
[5] TH46m together <Lth> l̄j <Lth> we go from the kayak
[6] TH46m you can go wait me over there
[7] F365f→ yeah yeah which kayak?
[8] TH46m after you <Lth> l̄j <Lth> you er
[9] F365f don’t matter don’t matter

TS 88 is further evidence of using a wh-clarification question as a means of repair. This segment was between the local guide (TH54m) and a couple of tourists (F397f and F398m). TH54m informed both tourists to go kayaking for sightseeing around the mangrove forest (lines 1 and 2). F397f seemed not to have understood TH54m’s message, and used the practice of a wh-clarification question, ‘where we what?’ to ask for further explanation (line 3). In the following turn, TH54m initiated a partial
repetition, ‘start kayaking’, but it was likely not enough to make the tourists understand. Therefore, F398m signalled with an incomplete utterance, ‘i don’t’ (line 5). TH54m’s response, ‘1b’ (line 6) in the next turn did not solve the problem. As a matter of fact, ‘1b’ was the type of tour package which this couple had bought. In the next turn, F398m repeated ‘1b’ to emphasise the specific area, followed by a wh-clarification question, ‘what is that?’ to ask for further clarification in line 7. To cope with the presence of non-understanding, TH54m did not explain what 1b exactly was. Instead, he repeated his initial utterance (lines 8 and 9). At this point, the non-understanding was more or less repaired, due to F398m’s response in the form of an acknowledgement response, ‘okay’ (line 10).

TS 88 (403)

[1] TH54m okay the: no no you start kayaking around

[2] TH54m on the mangrove about one kilometre

[3] F397f→ where we what?

[4] TH54m start kayaking

[5] F398m→ i don’t-

[6] TH54m 1b

[7] F398m→ 1b what is that?

[8] TH54m start kayaking around the mangrove about

[9] one kilometre

[10] F398m okay
4) Using an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation

Here is evidence of using an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation as a repairing means when the listener had incomplete understanding in transactional segments.

TS 89 is when a foreign tourist (F118f) was looking for a good restaurant for her lunch, and asked the taxi driver (TH17f) in line 1. In this case, ‘good lunch’ was tagged with <pvc></pvc> because of coinage. TH17f seemed not to have heard and signalled with a minimal query, ‘huh?’ (line 2). F188f initiated key-word repetition in the following turn. F188f’s repetition was likely not sufficient to achieve understanding because TH17f initiated an interrogative echo (line 4) to signal the presence of the non-understanding. TH17f’s variation on pronunciation more or less caused F188f an obstacle in understanding. F188f’s reply failed to elicit an appropriate response (line 5). However, TH17f did not give up and she made another effort in the following turn. In line 6, TH17f used an alternative word, ‘eat’ together with a questioning tag, ‘yeah?’ to ensure her understanding. In the following turn, F188f asked for more detail, for example whether there were restaurants only at the pier, instead of responding to TH17f’s confirmation check. Following TH17f’s answer, F118f said ‘thank you’ which was regarded as a satisfied response.

TS 89 (107)

[1] F118f where is <pvc> good lunch <pvc>?

[2] TH17f→ huh?

[3] F118f good lunch

[4] TH17f→ <pvc> goo-tɕʰ </pvc> lunch?
TS 90 is the segment between the local guide (TH46m) and a tourist (F340m) when they stopped at the mangrove forest. TH46m explained to the tourists about the monkeys living in the mangrove and that sometimes the monkeys ate fish (line 1). Following F340m’s response in the form of a minimal query, ‘huh?’, TH46m further explained, ‘they take out of the water’ (line 3). At this point, F340m could, to some extent, interpret and perceive TH46m’s meaning, as he produced a minimal response, ‘ah ha’ (line 4). TH46m went on telling the story of the monkey (lines 5 and 6). F340m, therefore, used an alternative word in the same context of this talk, ‘fruit’ in line 7. F340m, in turn, used the alternative word, ‘fruit’ with a rising intonation to ensure his hearing or understanding as he may not have heard the word ‘food’ in line 6 clearly. Alternatively, he possibly used this practice to ask for more detail about whether the monkey ate fruit in the mangrove. After responding with ‘no’, TH46m clarified that the monkeys had some fruits which were actually fed to them by tourists, and some sea animals in their habitat (lines 8 and 9).
they can eating (x) the fish . many food for the monkey
in the mangrove many food
F340m→ fruit
no banana no ae watermelon no mango have have
the . snail oyster fish crab

TS 91 is the segment between a couple of Chinese tourists who had never experienced kayaking (F351f and F373m) and the local guide (TH46m). F351f and her husband were struggling with paddling the kayak during the kayaking tour to visit many natural places nearby such as sea caves and beaches.

maybe your ship can . can tie together with my ship
yeah yeah yeah
tie together (.) yeah yeah and the rope together
yeah of course
and the baby we go the: kayak from the: man
and you go with me on the kayak i help for you okay?
do you understand?
okay my my baby?
mmm . we go with the man
with the man?
[11] TH46m yeah

[12] F351f→ the thailand man or our man?

[13] TH46m <Lth> nan nan {that that} <Lth> friend my friend

[14] you <Lth> ŋan </Lth>

F351f asked TH46m to bind her kayak together with TH46m’s kayak. Following TH46m’s response in the form of a minimal response, ‘yeah yeah yeah’ (line 2), F351m initiated self-repetition (line 3 to 4) to emphasise her meaning. In lines 5-7, TH46m attempted to explain F351f that her son would get on another kayak and he would go with other two Thai tourists who had helped her family paddle from the island to the beach whereas F351f and her husband would take the same kayak with TH46m, the local guide for their safety since this family had never experienced kayaking. So far, a problem of understanding still existed (lines 1-7) due to TH46m’s non-standard English and the gap of English knowledge between TH46m and F351f. Nevertheless, they put their effort in exchanging meaning. To clarify F351f’s understanding, she initiated question repeat, ‘okay my my baby?’ (line 8) that she referred to her own son. But, TH46m’s response (line 9) was neither clear nor effective enough to achieve the shared meaning. And then again, F351f initiated question repeat, ‘with the man?’ in line 10 for asking clarification. Following TH46m’s response in the form of a minimal response, F351f still made an effort by using the alternative term, ‘the thailand man or our man?’ in line 12 to give him a narrow sense of her meaning and to confirm her understanding. TH46m’s response, ‘friend my friend’ was to explicate the meaning of the Thai man, who would help her family during the kayaking tour.

TS 92 is another sample of using an alternative term in the same context of talk to ask for clarification. The segment is between a tourist (F412f) and the local guide (TH55m). When they were visiting the sea cave, TH55m showed the group of tourists the bats hanging from the ceiling of a cave. In the segment F412f asked TH55m whether he had seen the bats. TH55m seemed not to have heard F412f’s utterance
clearly and signalled with ‘huh?’ (line 2). In the following turn, F412f initiated self-repetition to facilitate rehearing for TH55m. Instead of replying to F412f’s question, TH55m questioned F412f in return (line 4). F412f initiated the practice of using an alternative term, ‘like dots?’ with a rising intonation (line 5) to ask for clarification. TH55m, therefore, explained more in line 6.

TS 92 (416)

[1] F412f   do you see them?
[2] TH55m→ huh?
[3] F412f   do you see them?
[4] TH55m   ah you can see?
[5] F412f→ like dots?
[6] TH55m   small you see small black colour
[7] F412f   mm maybe

5) Questioning tag

Moving on to the last strategic practice used as a means of repair, the listener inserted a questioning tag to ensure his/her understanding after the problem in understanding arises. In this investigation, ‘right?’ and ‘huh?’ were questioning tags the most frequently used.

TS 93 is between a member of boat-service staff (TH19f) and one of her passengers (F265m). The segment happened when F265m missed his transportation to Krabi because the boat was delayed from Phuket to Koh Lanta. In this case, TH19f attempted to help F265m check the transfer service and she needed more detail by asking F265m what type of transportation he had booked and whether he booked for
the minivan to Krabi (line 1). Following F265m’s response with silence, TH19f initiated key-word repetition (line 4). In response, F265m clarified that he booked the private car taxi with his friends. TH19f seemed not be sure of his clarified detail, though. She signalled with confirmation checks, as seen in line 7. In turn, TH19f used a discourse, ‘*you mean*’, and also inserted a questioning tag, ‘*right?*’, followed by the practice of key-word repetition, ‘*car*’ and inserting ‘*right?*’ again to ensure her accurate comprehension. F265m took the next turn to explain his difficult situation with the transfer to Krabi and to ask for the responsibility from the boat service company.

**TS 93 (256)**

[1] TH19f {TH19f went to the office and checked for the detail
to help this customer.} minivan or something?

[2] F265m {silence}

[3] TH19f minivan?

[4] F265m mm okay i booked normal car with (friends) condition

[5] but i-

[6] TH19f→ maybe er mini mini you mean mini van right? car right?

[7] F265m yeah but i don't know i (already) my er lost my transfer

[8] i paid for it and: you know but (they won’t) give

[9] my money back

[10] The use of ‘*right?*’ can be seen in TS94. This segment is between the local guide (TH46m) and one of his tourists (F369f). They were taking a rest on the beach where fruits and drinks were provided for the tourists. TH46m spotted a few monkeys on the cliff watching their fruits, so he told F369f to look at the monkeys (line 1). However,
F369f seemed not to have heard clearly and used a minimal query, ‘huh?’ (line 2) as a repetition request. TH46m’s additional information in the next turn triggered the problem in understanding. As the listener, F369f used an alternative term in this context, ‘monkeys’ with a rising intonation to ensure her understanding. Following TH46m’s response in the form of a minimal response (line 5), F369f initiated rephrasing to explicate her meaning and to ensure understanding of TH46m’s utterance. F369f’s utterance, in this turn, could be interpreted that she wanted to know if they were heading off to see monkeys in the mangrove forest. In response, TH46m explained that they would do so on the way back to Koh Lanta. In the next turn, F369f seemed not to completely understand TH46m’s utterance because she rephrased her utterance, and inserted a questioning tag, ‘right?’ in line 8 as a confirmation check. Up to this turn, F369f developed her utterances within the flow of talk, regarded as utterance-developing repetition (lines 4, 6, 8 and 9). TH46m responded in the form of a minimal response, ‘yeah yeah yeah’ which was overlapped with F369f’s utterance in the prior turn, followed by more detail (line 10). At last, F369f was satisfied in understanding, indicated by an acknowledgement response in the following turn.

TS 94 (371)

[1] TH46m monkey look(.) for the food

[2] F369f→ huh?

[3] TH46m look watermelon pineapple

[4] F369f monkeys?

[5] TH46m yeah

[6] F369f go to the monkey?

[7] TH46m we go back in the mangrove about ae: one o’clock
TS 95 is the segment between two tourists (F54m and F55m), a local receptionist (TH8m), and the taxi driver (TH7f) when they were looking for a place to stay. F54m asked TH54m whether this accommodation was listed on Agoda, the well-known website for booking accommodation and other travelling services. TH8m seemed not to have heard F54m’s utterance clearly, and signalled with a minimal query, ‘huh?’ as a repetition request (line 2). Following F54m’s response in the form of key-word repetition, TH8m inserted a questioning tag, ‘huh?’ after he had repeated, ‘agoda’ to confirm his hearing and understanding in line 4. In response, F54m told TH8m that this place cost one thousand five hundred on the Agoda website. In the next turn, TH8m repeated F54m’s utterance, followed by inserting the question tag, ‘huh?’ in line 6 as a confirmation check. F54m confirmed TH8m’s understanding by a minimal response. As F54m found out that the room price mentioned by TH8m was different from the price on Agoda, TH7f took the next turn (line 8) to clarify for the tourists that TH8m would check with the owner.
[4] TH8m→ *agoda huh?*

[5] F54m yeah this one thousand five hundred

[6] TH8m→ *one thousand five hundred huh?*

[7] F54m yeah yeah

[8] TH7f he check he check to the boss first

[9] F55m okay

TS 96 is the segment between the tourists (F54m and F55m) and the taxi driver (TH7f). F54m asked about the gypsy restaurant which TH7f had never heard of. They put effort into meaning negotiation to find out where the gypsy restaurant was. In line 2, TH7f used an alternative term, *another side* to ask for clarification, and also inserted a questioning tag, *mai?*, the Thai question word in her utterance. Interestingly, this presented hybridity noticed in the communicative practices of ELF. F54m seemed not to understand clearly that the restaurant was on another side of the island (line 3). In the following turn, TH7f denied that the restaurant was on the other side of Koh Lanta, and she guessed the restaurant might have been located on Lanta Noi, the other smaller island. She inserted a questioning tag, *huh?* into her utterance (line 4). F55m repeated TH7f’s utterance with a rising intonation, regarded as question repeat to ensure understanding, and he, in turn, showed acknowledgement ‘*okay*’. TH7f seemed to be aware of a misunderstanding and she made it clear that she did not know where the gypsy restaurant was (line 6).

**TS 96 (050)**

[1] F54m gypsy restaurant

[2] TH7f *ar another side <Lth> mai? </Lth>*

[3] F54m another side maybe
As discussed above, Section 5.2 exemplifies the actual use of self-initiated and other-initiated strategies to negotiate meaning and repairing non-understanding in transactional segments. The next section provides more evidence of using these strategies in interactional segments when the participants had phatic talk.

### 5.3 Pragmatic strategies in interactional segments

In touristic ELF, interactional elements also occurred when the participants had social chats. The phatic talk at times took place in between exchanges of information. The interactional segments were linked to the primary purpose of building up social interaction. Figures 14 illustrates the frequencies of self-initiated strategies used to pre-empt and repair non-understanding in interactional segments. Regarding the pre-empting strategies, self-combined repetition, at 29% was the most frequently used practice, followed, in order, by paraphrasing (23%), key-word repetition (17%) and self-repetition 8%. On the other hand, the frequency of self-repetition (60%) was nearly double that as a means of repair. Self-combined repetition (16%), key-word repetition (8%), and rephrasing (8%) were also used to repair non-understanding in interactional segments.
Like the functions of using these strategic practices in transactional segments, Figure 15 presents that the speaker significantly used self-repetition in response to the listener’s repetition request asking to hear the previous utterance one more time. To respond to signals of non-understanding, combined repetition and key-word repetition were commonly initiated to clarify and emphasise meaning. In addition, self-combined repetition, key-word repetition, and paraphrasing were used to simplify meaning in interactional segments.
Moving on to pragmatic strategies used by the listener, Figure 16 presents the proportion of three strategic practices most often used for pre-empting and repairing non-understanding in interactional segments.

The listener most frequently initiated other-repetition to guard against the presence of problems in understanding, at 46%, followed by using an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation, at 16% and using question repeat, at 10%. On the other hand, the listener initiated only three strategic practices as a means of repair in interactional segments, namely other-repetition (60%), using an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation (20%), and question repeat (20%).

The functions of using other-initiated strategies are shown in Figure 17. The listener initiated other-repetition the most frequently to show alignment or acknowledgement of the speaker’s previous utterance. The listener initiated the practice of using an alternative term with a rising intonation mostly to ask for further information or explanation, and also to ensure his/her understanding. The listener also used question repeat, and a single-word question, ‘what?’ without a specific area to ask for explanation. The listener initiated the practices of question repeat, using an alternative term with a rising intonation, and questioning tag to ensure his/her understanding.
Figure 17: Functions of using other-initiated strategies in interactional segments

As a means of repair, strategic practices were used in response to the signal of non-understanding which was initiated by the listener in the prior turn. In interactional segments, the listener indicated the presence of obstacles in understanding by using a minimal query (Figure 18). Like in transactional segments, the minimal query had the highest frequency of a signal of non-understanding in interactional segments, at 64%. The listener’s inappropriate response also indicated the mismatch in understanding, at 11%. The other two indicators of non-understanding found in interactional segments were interrogative echo, the practice of echoing a problematic item with a rising intonation, and unfocused question in which the listener initiated a single question word when s/he had not paid attention in listening or heard the utterance clearly.
The transcribed data below illustrates how the self-initiated and other-initiated strategies were actually used to pre-empt and repair problems of understanding in interactional segments. Likewise, the arrow (→) is used to indicate where the focused pointed of the discussion is.

5.3.1 **Self-initiated strategies to pre-empt problems of understanding**

This section provides evidence of how the speaker used self-initiated strategic practice without the presence of problems in understanding. The proportion of interactional segments in this study was less than the proportion of transactional segments; as a result, the number of exemplified segments here is less than for interactional segments.

1) **Combined repetition**

Combined repetition was used by the speaker when s/he provided more detail or further explanation to his/her own previous utterance.

IS 1 is between the local guide (TH53m) and a foreign tourist (F386m). TH53m started the phatic talk with the tourist when they were on a kayaking tour (line 1). F386m’s
response was provided in the next turn. Following TH53m’s response in the form of other-repetition to show his acknowledgement, F386m initiated combined repetition to provide more detail after he repeats, ‘iraq’ in line 4.

IS 1 (385)

[1] TH53m  excuse me where you from?
[2] F386m  iraq
[3] TH53m  iraq
[4] F386m→  iraq but i was grown in canada and i live in china

The other sample is a segment of phatic talk when the hostel owner (TH34m) socialised with his guests at the bar. IS 2 is the segment when TH34m told them the story of fighting when he was a young gangster while studying in Bangkok. TH34m talked about seniors in college (lines 1 and 2). Following F249m’s response in the form of a minimal response, ‘yeah’, TH34m initiated combined repetition in the following turn. He attempted to explain that his seniors were built with strength and power. They led the juniors in college and treated them like followers. Accordingly, F252m used an alternative phrase, ‘he likes a boss’ (line 9) to show his alignment with TH34m’s previous utterances. TH34m continued his story about his experience of fighting (lines 13 and 14). TH34m explained that his schoolmates and he had various kinds of weapons, and due to fighting one of his mates was shot. In the following turn, F250m initiates ‘oh?’ (line 15) to show his surprise on what he had heard, and he further initiated question repeat, ‘with the gun?’ (line 17). Combined repetition was used in the following turn (line 18). TH34m repeated F250m’s utterance, ‘with the gun’ and he also added a bit piece of detail to clarify that it was a pen gun. In fact, the pen gun is a kind of firearm which is modified from an ink pen. It is used by Thai teenage gangsters. Here, TH34m repeated the word ‘pen’ maybe because he wanted to gain more time to make his utterance.
you know when a new people come, there are big big big man in the school

they are bigger than you he like a brother build they tell you everything what to do

yeah and they go with you and they go in front you

stand back

he likes a boss

yeah that’s true. that’s same like that but long time ago now still have but not like before

yeah

before we have gun we have everything. my friend got shoot on the month

oh?

yeah

with the gun?

with the gun, pen pen gun
2) Paraphrasing

Paraphrasing was often used to simplify the meaning of the utterance. The strategic practice was mainly concerned with lexical amendment. The samples of using paraphrasing are provided in IS 3 and IS 4.

IS 3 is a segment of phatic talk between the hostel owner (TH1f) and her guest (F5f) when TH1f asked F5f about the party she went to the night before. TH1f recommended F5f to go to Klong Dao Beach if F5f preferred to watch the fireworks (line 1). In the next turn, F5f initiated a question about where the beach was to complete her understanding. F5f, in turn, also paraphrased her question into ‘is the other name of the beach?’ Seemingly, she was slightly unsure if the fireworks were at Klong Dao Beach or at another beach. While TH1f took a bit of time to respond (line 5), F5f again initiated paraphrasing in lines 6 and 7 with an awareness of TH1f’s non-understanding. F5f slightly changed the words in her question, from ‘where’ (line 3) to ‘is the other name of the beach?’ (line 4) and ‘what the name of the beach?’ (lines 6 and 7).

IS 3 (004)

[1] TH1f but another beach is klong dao beach if prefer more
[2] F5f fireworks yeah okay okay and where is that?
[3] → is the other name of the beach?
[4] TH1f the:
[5] F5f the one with the fireworks what the name of the <3>
[6] beach?
[7]
The other sample is seen in IS 4. This segment is between the local guide (Th53m) and a tourist (F383m) as F383m curiously looked at TH53m smoking a local cigarette, which was rolled with a piece of nipa palm leaf. TH53m answered F383m in Thai, ‘bäj ŏk’ (line 1); that is, a piece of nipa palm leaf. Following F383m’s response, TH53m initiated paraphrasing in a way to put the Thai words into English in line 3. In the next turn, F383m showed his acknowledgement by repeating ‘not the paper’ (line 4).

IS 4 (402)

[1] TH53m yes? <Lth> bäj ŏk {nipa palm leaf} </Lth>
[2] F383m so much better
[3] TH53m → ae: leave from the palm tree . not the paper
[4] F383m not the paper

3) Key-word repetition

In interaction segments, key-word repetition was used to emphasise the sense of meaning, as seen in IS 5. This interaction took place at the hostel after a foreign tourist (F246m) had rented a motorbike and looked around the hostel. He was interested in buying a hand-made notebook as a souvenir for his girlfriend. He explained that his girlfriend was a professional writer (lines 1 to 4). He added that his girlfriend kept writing ‘all the time all the time all the time’ (line 8) to emphasise the sense of meaning in his previous turn.

IS 5 (218)

[1] F246m i like this one {humming} it’s for my girl friend .
because my girlfriend she writes books you know? but

professor. she she makes books write. print and then

sell it

TH-R oh

but a lot not

she will like it

yeah: she write all the time all the time all the time.

she not watch television

4) Self – Repetition

Here is the sample of using self-repetition to prevent non-understanding beforehand in interational segments.

IS 6 is the segment between the taxi driver (TH17f) and a passenger (F163m). TH17f started the conversation on the way to take F163m to her taxi (line 1). TH17f asked F163m how long he would stay (line 3). TH17f, in turn, initiated self-repetition to facilitate rehearing for F163m. Following F163m’s response, she repeated F163m’s utterance to show her acknowledgement. Despite inserting ‘huh’ (line 5), she did not seek for confirmation of her understanding.

IS 6 (143)

[1] TH17f holiday?

[2] F163m yes

[3] TH17f→ how many day you live(. how many day you live
5.3.2 Other-initiated strategies to pre-empt problems of understanding

This subsection presents the common strategic practices used by the listener to pre-empt problems in understanding, without signals of non-understanding in phatic talk.

1) Other – Repetition

The listener particularly uses other-repetition to show listenership and alignment. To some extent, the use of other-repetition encourages the speaker to carry on conversations.

IS 7 took place when the boatman (TH27m) socialised with the diver (F205m) after the dive. TH27m asked F205m whether he had seen the blacktip shark during the dive (line 1). Following F205m’s response, TH27m initiated other-repetition, ‘no shark’ (line 3) in the next turn to show his listenership. F205m carried on the talk by telling TH27m that he had seen barracuda. Other-repetition, ‘er big barracuda’ (line 5) was initiated by TH27m to show his alignment and also emphasise the sense of meaning that the barracuda here were pretty big. In response, the word, ‘big’ was repeated by F205m as he said, ‘really big’ to show his agreement with TH27m.

IS 7 (174)

[1] TH27m and you see blacktip already?

[2] F205m no shark

[3] TH27m→ no shark hah oh:
The other sample of using other-repetition is seen in IS 8 between the hostel owner (TH1f) and the tourist (F246m). This segment is when they were talking about TH1f’s Vespa classic scooter, parked in front of the hostel. TH1f told F246m that she did not have its register book. F246m’s response in the form of other-paraphrasing (line 2) indicated shared understanding. TH1f maximised the understanding by using a specific word, ‘register book’ (line 3). To show acknowledgement, F246m repeated the word, ‘register book’, followed by an affirmative token, ‘yes’ (line 4). In the following turn, TH1f rephrased her original utterance to emphasise the meaning. In response, F246m initiated an overt affirmative sentence, ‘ah i understanding’ explicitly showing the shared understanding.

IS 8 (219)

[1] TH1f this one no book anymore
[2] F246m ah you don’t have the paper
[5] TH1f but this one no anymore
[6] F246m ah i understand
2) Using an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation

In this investigation, the listener used an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation in order to ask for further information and to ensure his/her understanding, as exemplified in IS 9 and IS 10.

IS 9 is the segment between the tourist (F252m) and the hostel owner (TH34m). They were still talking about the experience of fighting. TH34m told his hostel guests when the gangsters were arrested at the fighting scene (line 4). F250m asked for clarification in the following turn, ‘hit you?’ Following TH34m’s response, F250m initiated the practice of using an alternative word, ‘oh with the baton?’ (line 7) to ask for more detail. In response, TH34m initially used a minimal token, ‘yeah’ to show his understanding in F250m’s utterance, before answering that the police used their fists, instead of batons.

**IS 9 (239)**

1. F252m  oh . so the police came on
2. TH34m  but they tie
3. F250m  they tie everybody now
4. TH34m  they tie everybody and they hit
5. F250m  hit you?
6. TH34m  they hit everybody
7. F250m→  **oh with the baton?**
8. TH34m  yeah no their fist
IS 10 is between a foreign tourist (F244f) and the hostel owner (TH1f) when F244f wanted to book the ferry to Krabi. After making the booking, TH1f oriented phatic talk by asking about her four-island trip. F244f told TH1f that the water was not clear enough and she could not go to the last stop due to the big waves (line 1). In the following turn, TH1f used an alternative word in the same local context of the talk, ‘oh windy’ (line 3) to ensure her understanding.

IS 10 (215)

[1] F244f last trip we couldn’t go the last place because the
[2] wave goes to big
[3] TH1f→ oh windy
[4] F244f yes so we erm we had to stop the last place but it was
[5] so good

3) Question repeat

The practice of question repeat was initiated by the listener when s/he repeated the previous utterance partially or exactly with a rising intonation. In this investigation, question repeat was used as a confirmation check more often than as a clarification request.

IS 11 is another segment showing question repeat used as a confirmation check. TH34m continuously told his story of fighting when he was in college to the guests (lines 1 to 4). That is, the college gangsters in Bangkok fought to spread the reputation of their college. They threatened other students from different colleges by forcefully taking off their college uniform such as shirts or belts. The guests used a minimal response, ‘yeah yeah’ within the flow of talk. In line 9, F253m initiated question repeat, ‘you fight for t-shirt?’ to ensure his understanding in TH34m’s story. In
response, TH34m used a minimal response, ‘yeah’, followed by the practice of repeating the phrase, ‘that shirt’, despite it being an incomplete sentence (line 10).

IS 11 (237)

[1] TH34m first they come with almost five people and after that
[2] TH34m one fight at one people . everyone give up but one guy
[3] TH34m never give up because you know if you take my shirt out or my belt out . it's very proud in the school @
[4] Fs yeah yeah
[5] TH34m it's like a hero sometime like that kinda stupid . i just fight for protection @ that that that what i do
[6] F249m yeah
[7] F253m→ you fight for t-shirt?
[8] TH34m yeah that shirt that’s why they-

The other sample of using question repeat is seen in IS 12 between a couple of tourists (F258m and F259f) and a yoga instructor (TH31f). After the yoga class was dismissed, the tourists had a chat with the instructor about F258m’s surgery and TH31f shared her experience with them. TH31f told them that she once had had orthognathic surgery when she was a teenager. F259f asked for more detail in line 1. TH31f responded in the form of repeating ‘in bangkok’. TH31f, in turn, tried to figure out when she had that surgery as she said, ‘forty one . seventeen’ (line 3). F259f seemed not to be sure and then signalled for a clarification request. F259f initiated question repeat, ‘seventeen?’ (line 4) which overlapped with TH31f’s additional detail, ‘seventeen years old’, as tagged with <8> </8> (lines 4 and 5).
IS 12 (249)

[1] F259f no we can't see . how many years ago? in in Bangkok

[2] <7> you did the operation

[3] TH31f in bangkok </7> (x) forty one . seven teen

[4] F259f→ <8> seventeen?

[5] TH31f seventeen </8> years old

5.3.3 Self-initiated strategies to repair problems of understanding

This section provides the evidence when the speaker used self-initiated strategies in sequences of repair after detecting the listener’s signals of non-understanding.

1) Self - Repetition

Significantly, self-repetition was the effective resolution which the most commonly used in response to the listener’s signal of non-understanding. That is, the speaker facilitated another opportunity for the listener to hear the previous utterance after detecting the signal of the presence of problems.

IS 13 is the evidential segment between a couple of foreigners (F121m and F122f) and the taxi driver (TH17f). TH17f made sure that her passengers were fine and comfortable in her taxi on the way to their destination. F122f asked TH17f to turn on the music if she had it (line 1). Following TH17f’s response in the form of a minimal query, ‘huh?’ (line 2), F122f initiated self-repetition in the following turn. However, F122f seemed to give up on negotiating meaning by saying, ‘anyway’. Again, TH17f responded in the form of a minimal query, ‘huh?’ asking for repetition. In the next
turn, TH122f asked her partner to help in this situation. It can be assumed that TH17f had difficulty listening to and understanding the unfamiliar accents of English. TH17f made an effort to carry on the conversation and satisfy her customers. She switched the topic asking where they were from (line 8). After having the answer, TH17f made an excuse that she had poor English in line 10. F122f made another effort by rephrasing to simplify her utterance, ‘do you have music?’ (line 11). The word, ‘music’ was a problematic item as TH17f responded in the form of echoing the first syllable, ‘mi-’ (line 12). At this point in line 13, F121m took the next turn to collaborate with F122f as he initiated sound-stretch repetition which was rarely noticed in this investigation. TH17f consequently ascertained the word, ‘music’, followed by an acknowledgement response, ‘okay’ in line 14. Moreover, lines 16 to 18 show variant forms of English used by Thai people, which will be discussed later in Section 5.4.

IS 13 (109)

[1] F122f have you got any music?

[2] TH17f→ huh?

[3] F122f→ have you got any music? . anyway

[4] TH17f→ huh?

[5] F122f→ you speak honey

[6] TH17f ah you <ipa> rv: </ipa> me?

[7] F122f honey

[8] TH17f where you from

[9] F122f england

[10] TH17f england ruh i’m little bit english
[11] F122f→ **do you have music?**

[12] TH17f mi-

[13] F121m→ */ˈmjuː.zɪk/*

[14] TH17f MU-SIC okay

[15] F121m {humming and whistle}

[16] TH17f i’m sorry (.) one moment i have little bit ah erm

[17] <pvc> music english </pvc> and i have many <pvc>

[18] music thai </pvc>

The other segment (IS 14) illustrates self-repetition used by the speaker in response to the presence of non-understanding. This interactional segment is between the boatman (TH26m) and a diver (F210m). While F210m were looking at photos on-screen of his underwater camera, TH26m asked F210m whether those photos were taken on that day (line 1). Following F210m’s response in the form of an affirmative response, ‘yes’, with the practice of repeating ‘today’, TH26m carried on this talk (line 3) in a way to make a connection to photo-taking. F210m seemed not to have heard clearly and signals with a minimal query, ‘huh?’ (line 5). TH26m, therefore, initiated self-repetition in the following turn (line 6). In response, F210m showed his alignment (line 7).

IS 14 (179)

[1] TH26m today eh?

[2] F210m yes today {he looked at the photo taken underwater

[3] on his camera}
2) Combined repetition

Combined repetition was used commonly by the speaker in sequence of repair. Doing so was intended to clarify meaning or provide more detail to his/her previous utterance.

IS 15 is between the local guide (TH46m) and the tourist (F369f). TH46m socialised with F369f during their snack stop on the beach by asking where she was from. F369f responded that she was from Holland (line 2). In the following turns, TH46m tried to carry on the conversation by talking about a number of Dutch footballers. F369f explained that she was not into this kind of sport (line 6). Despite that, TH46m still mentioned the third footballer (line 7). Following F369f’s response in the form of a minimal query, ‘*huh?*’, TH46m repeated the name, followed by more detail, ‘*the goal the safe for the football*’ (lines 9 and 10). At this point, TH46m, as the speaker, initiated the combined repetition to give a bit more detail to his previous utterance; that is, he played as a goalkeeper.

IS 15 (371)

[1] TH46m   where do you come from
[2] F369f   holland
[3] TH46m   holland . you know [footballer1 ]
3) Key-word repetition

This interactional segment exemplifies the speaker’s use of key-word repetition as a means of repair. IS 16 is between the taxi driver (TH17f) and a passenger (F164m) while they were walking to the taxi. TH17f started phatic talk by asking F164m whether it was his first time on Koh Lanta. TH17f, in the same turn, initiated key-word repetition, ‘first time’ (line 1) after a shortened pause. She also provided an alternative phrase, ‘many time’ (line 2) to narrow the sense of meaning in the listener’s answer. Despite that, F164m responded in the form of ‘er:’ which to some extent signals uncertainty in his understanding. TH17f, therefore, initiated key-word repetition, ‘first time?’ to facilitate rehearing for F164m (line 4). In the next turn, F164m responded in the form of repetition, ‘first time here’ (line 5).

IS 16 (144)

[1] TH17f you come here first time? . first time or

[2] F164m→ many time here?

[3] F164m→ er:

[4] TH17f→ first time?
4) Rephrasing

To repair problems in understanding, the speaker used rephrasing in equal proportion with key-word repetition.

Here is the use of rephrasing as a means of repair, as exemplified in IS 17. This segment is between the hostel owner (TH1f) and a guest (F224m) who was staying for a long time. While they were having dinner together, TH1f asked F224m whether he could make pizza for them next time when he returned. TH1f, in turn, performed code-mixing as she used Thai words, ‘dai mai’ in her utterance in English. At this point, it shows hybridity, a linguistic feature in using ELF. Following F224m’s response in the form of a minimal query, ‘huh?’ (line 2), TH17 rephrased her previous utterance by omitting the Thai words, and reprised ‘pizza’ (line 3). F244m refused by telling her that making pizza was ‘too hard’.

IS 17 (200)

[1] TH1f  &lt;Lth&gt; pizza dai mai {can you make pizza?} &lt;/Lth&gt;

[2] F224m→  huh?

[3] TH1f→  pizza

[4] F224m  yeah pizza too hard
5.3.4 Other-initiated strategies to repair problems of understanding

Moving on to the last subsection, only three strategic practices of other-initiated strategies were used by the listener in sequence of repair found in this study. The samples of strategic practices of other-repetition, using an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation and question repeat are discussed in the way that the listener used these practices during the process of repairing non-understanding in interactional segments.

1) Other – Repetition

The findings of this investigation show that the listener mostly used other-repetition to show his/her acknowledgment and alignment within the flow of talk, especially after his/her problem of understanding had been repaired by the speaker in the prior turn.

IS 18 is the interactional segment when a customer (F257m) socialised with the bartender (TH35m). While they were talking about football, F257m asked TH35m whether he was a supporter of Bayern München football team (line 1). Following TH35m’s response in the form of a minimal query, ‘huh?’ (line 2), F257m initiated self-repetition to facilitate rehearing for TH35m in the next turn. After TH35m had answered, F257m initiated other-repetition, ‘every time’ (line 5) to show his acknowledgement.

IS 18 (244)

[1] F257m are you munich supporter er?

[2] TH35m→ huh?
The other sample is seen in IS 19. This segment is between the local guide (TH54m) and a foreign tourist (F405m). TH54m started phatic talk with this elder tourist as he called him, ‘papa’ (line 1). F405m seemed not to have heard TH54m’s utterance clearly and then signalled with an unfocused question, ‘what?’ (line 2). TH54m, therefore, initiated self-repetition as a means of repair to facilitate rehearing in line 3. After hearing F405m’s answer in the following turn, TH54m used other-repetition, ‘three week huh ohh’ (line 5) to show his acknowledgement.

IS 19 (407)

[1] TH54m how long time in koh lanta . hah papa?

[2] F405m→ what?

[3] TH54m how long time in koh lanta

[4] F405m er: three weeks

[5] TH54m→ three week huh ohh

2) Using an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation

During the process of meaning negotiation, the listener used an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation in sequences of repair.
IS 20 provides the sample of using an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation, together with other practices. The segment is between the hostel owner (TH1f) and a group of her guests. TH1f planned to take her guests to enjoy the party together on the night before the New Year’s Eve. She asked whether they had a plan for that night yet. In this case, the word, ‘countdown’ in line 1 possibly caused non-understanding because that night was not the New Year’s Eve. The presence of the problem in understanding was signalled in the form of ‘sorry?’ by F7f in the next turn. In response to the minimal query, TH1f initiated self-repetition in line 3. But the exact repetition was likely not sufficient to repair the non-understanding when F7f used an interrogative echo, ‘countdown?’ to indicate the problematic term in the next turn. At this point, F8m, another guest, used ‘with the firework?’ (line 5) as an alternative phrase in this local context of talk to ensure understanding. TH1f responded with an affirmative response, ‘yes’, followed by her invitation to take her guests to the party in the following turn (lines 6 and 7). Furthermore, in line 10 TH1f also rephrased her original utterance to make it explicit; that is, the party was similar to a big celebration of New Year’s Eve. F8m also used an alternative phrase, ‘on the fire rope’ (line 14) to ensure his understanding after TH1f mentioned ‘special fire show’ in the prior turn (line 12).

IS 20 (006)

[1] TH1f where you going for countdown party tonight?

[2] F7f→ sorry?

[3] TH1f where you going for countdown party tonight?

[4] F7f→ countdown?

[5] F8m→ with a firework?

[6] TH1f yes come with us i’m thinking to ah take our guests to
3) Question repeat

In this investigation, question repeat was another common strategic practice that the listener used as a means of repairing to complete his/her existing mismatched understanding in interactional segments.

IS 21 is the segment between a tourist (F409f) and the local guide (TH55m). F409f wondered where TH55m learned English (line 1). Following TH55m’s response in the form of a minimal query, ‘huh?’ (line 2) as a repetition request, F409f initiated self-repetition in the following turn to facilitate rehearing for TH55m. In response, TH55m answered F409f that he learned English from the tourists. In the following turn, F409f initiated question repeat, ‘with the tourists?’ (line 5) as a clarification request. F409f, in turn, also initiated an alternative phrase, ‘you don’t have in the school?’ with a rising intonation to ask for further clarification. In the next turn, TH55m repeated the word, ‘have’ and added more detail (lines 8 and 9) in this turn where it was considered as self-combined repetition. F409f took the next turn by initiating question repeat, ‘in
school you learned that?” in line 10 to ensure her understanding. TH55m used a minimal response to confirm F409f’s understanding.

IS 21 (421)

[1] F409f where did you learn english?
[2] TH55m→ huh?
[3] F409f where did you learn english?
[4] TH55m with the tourist
[5] F409f→ with the tourists? so you don’t have in the school?
[6] TH55m have
[7] F409f→ you have in school?
[8] TH55m have chicken dog like that one two three four five six
[9] <1> seven eight nine ten
[10] F409f in schools </1> you learned that?
[11] TH55m er ahhh

Section 5.3 discusses the evidential use of self-initiated and other-initiated strategies in interactional segments when the Thai locals and the tourists had social interactions. The exemplified segments provide the actual use of pragmatic strategies of negotiation of meaning in touristic ELF.
5.4 Summary

This chapter discusses the findings of the use of pragmatic strategies in the communicative practices of touristic ELF. The pragmatic strategies were investigated in transactional and interactional types of communication. The strategic practices initiated by the Thai locals and the foreign tourists when taking part as either the speaker or the listener to exchanging meaning and negotiate understanding with or without the presence of any signals of non-understanding.

In transactional segments, the five strategic practices initiated by the speaker, namely self-repetition, key-word repetition, combined repetition, rephrasing and paraphrasing were most frequently used as self-initiated strategies to guard against non-understanding. These strategic practices were also used as means of repairing when problems in understanding arose. On the other hand, the listener commonly used other-repetition to show acknowledgement. Other strategic practices, namely question repeat, using an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation, wh-clarification question, and questioning tag were used to complete his/her understanding.

Regarding interactional segments, combined repetition, paraphrasing, key-word repetition, and self-repetition were the most often used by the speaker him/herself for pre-empting non-understanding. However, self-repetition was the effective practice used in response to the listener’s signal of non-understanding. On the other hand, the listener frequently initiated other-repetition, using an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation, and question repeat in negotiation of meaning when having phatic talk.

The findings suggest that speakers of ELF in this study had attempted to exchange and negotiate meaning in order to achieve shared understanding as they used a wide range of pragmatic strategies in doing so. The next chapter will discuss the findings of
this study to answer research questions, in relation to other ELF studies on pragmatic strategies.
Chapter 6  Discussion

The previous chapter described the findings of this study with an attempt to reveal the communicative practices of ELF and the use of the pragmatic strategies in touristic ELF. It is evident that ELF is used in touristic encounters in relation to nature of communication and practical purposes e.g. exchanging information, providing services, including having phatic talk. This chapter to answer the research questions, based on a comparison of the findings of my study with existing findings of other ELF research into pragmatics. Contribution to ELF research, particularly to outline characteristics of touristic ELF will then be discussed in the next section of this chapter.

6.1 Research questions

6.1.1 What strategies do these ELF speakers employ to negotiate meaning and understanding?

The conventions of using pragmatic strategies, described in Sections 5.2 and 5.3, are further evidence of the fact that ELF speakers employ the pragmatic strategies in negotiation of meaning in lingua franca situations (Björkman, 2014; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; J. Kaur, 2009, 2010, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2010a; Muraunen, 2006), and that encounters in touristic ELF are no exception.

A wide range of pragmatic strategies were used in touristic ELF before any overt non-understanding had occurred and also after any impediments of non-understanding had been signalled. It appeared that to achieve shared understanding the Thai locals and the tourists were proactive about negotiation of meaning, in a way to convey understandable messages across and guard against any sources of troubles in understanding beforehand. When problems in understanding arose, they were interactive to exploit their individual resources in respond to the interlocutor’s signals of non-understanding, rather than to adopt the let-it-pass strategy.
1. What strategies are most commonly used for pre-emptive purposes?

Repetition and reformulation are common phenomena in ELF communication, including in touristic ELF. However, repetition and reformulation in touristic ELF were employed in different types of strategic practices and motive functions in use. My findings indicated that the Thai locals often initiated simple repetition, key-word repetition, and rephrasing to facilitate the foreign tourists another chance of hearing, and to guard against mishearing. These practices were used when the Thai locals were aware of their non-standard English or their low levels of English proficiency. They attempted to produce utterances which were understandable and deliverable to the tourists. In other academic contexts, Cogo and Pitzl (2016) have suggested that repetition is the common strategy used to enhance clarity and increase explicitness, in accordance with Björkman’s study; that is, repetition is categorised as the explicitness strategy used in academic ELF encounters (Björkman, 2014).

To give explicitness in meaning and guard against tourists’ misunderstanding, my findings showed that the Thai locals were proactive in the way that they clarified meaning by using combined repetition and key-word repetition. The locals used combined repetition to give further explanations when they repeated their utterances, and often repeated key words to draw the tourists’ attention and emphasise the provided information. In my data, these two strategic practices of repetition were used to clarify meaning, emphasise meaning, and simplify meaning for giving prominence and enhancing explicitness in their utterances.

Furthermore, the Thai locals rephrased their own utterances to emphasise the important information for the tourists, despite non-standard usage of English. As far as intelligibility and comprehensibility is concerned, paraphrasing was used to simplify meaning. The Thai locals and foreigners slightly amended lexical items or used alternative words to negotiate mutual understanding during the course of the exchange of information. My findings show that rephrasing and paraphrasing,
strategic practices of reformulation, were commonly used to disambiguate utterances and improve clarity in touristic ELF, consistent with the findings in academic ELF (Björkman, 2014; Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; J. Kaur, 2009, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2007a).

As discussed above, repetition and reformulation are regarded as self-initiated or speaker-initiated strategies, in which the speaker makes an effort towards exchanges of meaning, in line with other research (Björkman, 2014; Deterding, 2013; Kirkpatrick, 2007a, 2010a). On the other hand, other-initiated repetition with a falling intonation was frequently used the foreign tourists, on the part of the listener. They did so to show listenership, acknowledgement or alignment of understanding. Subsequently, other-repetition was used to confirm shared understanding in touristic ELF, in accordance with other ELF studies (Cogo, 2009; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Kalocsai, 2014; Lichtkoppler, 2007). Having said that, the use of repetition and reformation in touristic ELF further supports the growing evidence of pragmatic strategies in ELF communication.

Regarding other-initiated strategies, the foreign tourists reflected an attempt on the part of the listener to prevent misunderstanding beforehand in touristic ELF. The tourists were more or less aware of their incomplete understanding but did not overtly signal the presence of impediments. In this sense, they used pragmatic strategies for clarification requests and confirmation checks to fulfil their understanding, and to pre-empt misunderstanding. In spite of being reviewed as repairing strategies (Section 3.3.2), clarification requests and confirmation checks can be used as pre-empting strategies without explicit signs of existing problems of understanding, consistent with the findings by Cogo and Dewey (2012) and Van (2015). This shows that both parties: the Thai locals and the foreign tourist were cooperative and interactive to exchange meaning, negotiate understanding and finally achieved shared understanding in talk.

The findings provide evidence that the strategic **practices of clarification requests and confirmation checks** were used interchangeably to ask for further explanation,
clarification and to ensure accurate understanding. The tourists very often used the practice of using an alternative term, either a word or phrase related to the context of talk, with rising intonation to request more detail. Though, the finding of using this practice shows that the Thai locals seemed not to pay much attention to a rising intonation when using this practice. The statistical evidence from my study suggests that the practice of using an alternative word or phrase with rising intonation was used to ask for clarification slightly more often than to seek for confirmation of accurate understanding, in contrast with the ELF studies of Cogo and Dewey (2012) and Deterding (2013) in academic ELF. Wh-clarification question was the other practice used for clarification requests in touristic ELF. The tourists asked for further explanation in the form of a wh-word question, especially when they asked for touristic information in transactional encounters. The present finding is similar to those from other studies in academic contexts (Björkman, 2014; J. Kaur, 2010; Kirkpatrick, 2007a); that is, the wh-clarification question, considered as the practice of clarification requests, is commonly used to request further explanation and clarification.

Clarification requests used in touristic ELF to some extent are different from those used in academic and business ELF in types of practices. Clarification requests, mainly in academic ELF, are employed in various forms e.g. a single-wh question word, a wh-clarification question, an alternative question, and a direct question (Björkman, 2014; Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; Jamshidnejad, 2011; J. Kaur, 2010, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2007a; Van, 2015). Repetition and reformulation are employed with rising intonation to seek for clarification and further explanation (J. Kaur, 2015; Van, 2015). Björkman (2014) supports the view that “a question repeat is the repetition of a word or a segment with question intonation” (p. 133), used for requesting clarification.

Moving on to confirmation checks, my findings present that on the part of the listener the tourists frequently opted for question repeat when receiving information provided by the locals whereas the locals used questioning tag to ensure accurate
understanding. It is noticeable that the tourists and the locals chose the strategic practices which took less time and less effort in making use of their English in the negotiation of meaning. Possibly, this is because the nature of touristic ELF is quick and brief to meet intended purposes of such an encounter. This finding of my study is similar to Van’s findings revealing that the Vietnamese Front Office staff repeated the guest’s query with a rising intonation, before giving a response to their guests. Alternatively, she reported that the staff repeated the guest’s utterance, followed by “a tag-ending such as ‘yeah/right?’” (Van, 2015, p. 213). On the contrary, ELF speakers in academic contexts often seek for confirmation in their understanding and to ensure shared understanding by using various strategic practices e.g. direct question (Mauranen, 2006), repeated or reformulated utterance with rising intonation (Björkman, 2014; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; J. Kaur, 2010; Kirkpatrick, 2007a; Lichtkoppler, 2007), questioning repeat (J. Kaur, 2010), questioning tag (J. Kaur, 2010), and using a discourse marker, “you mean” (J. Kaur, 2010) to ensure accurate hearing and understanding in academic ELF.

Comprehension checks are the self-initiated pragmatic strategy used by the speaker for preventive purposes. Comprehension checks were occasionally used in touristic ELF, as described in Section 5.2.1. The Thai locals opted for using ‘you know?’ and ‘okay?’ with rising intonation to monitor and check whether the tourists understood what they had said. There is little evidence of an overt and direct question or long-stretched interrogative sentences in touristic ELF. As illustrated in TS 24 and TS 91 in Section 5.2.1 (6), the Thai locals to a lesser extent used shortened utterances, ‘understand?’ and ‘do you understand?’. The practices of comprehension checks used in touristic ELF are slightly different from those in academic ELF (Björkman, 2014; J. Kaur, 2009). For instance, overt questions e.g. “do you understand me?” (J. Kaur, 2009, p. 112) and “you know what I mean” (Björkman, 2014, p. 131) were used to check for understanding in academic ELF. In addition to Kaur’s study, the discourse marker ‘you know’ is used to monitor the interlocutor’s understanding.
There is some evidence in this study to suggest that ELF speakers’ levels of English proficiency have an influence on their individual linguistic resources, as a result, they exploit their own resources to initiate a wider range of strategic practices to serve varying functions to negotiate meaning and achieve shared understanding.

Furthermore, the findings provide evidence that pragmatic strategies, even those regarded as pre-empting strategies, were used interchangeably for repairing non-understanding, as already described in Sections 5.2 and 5.3. That depended on the presence of impediments in understanding. Both types of pragmatic strategies can be considered as “negotiation strategies” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 120). That is, the strategies are used to exchange meaning, negotiate intended meaning and solve problems of understanding, until shared understanding is achieved (Cogo & House, 2018). The use of pragmatic strategies of meaning negotiation in sequences of repair is discussed to answer the following research question.

As far as the forms and functions of the pragmatic strategies are concerned, it is difficult to disentangle functions from the use of pragmatic strategies. Underlying functions of using a particular strategic practice therefore need to be interpreted with caution by the researcher who presented in the setting of touristic ELF encounters. The underlying motive could be sensed from the context of interactions. It is important to bear in mind that the functions interpreted could possibly be different from the actual motives of the ELF participants. Unlike some studies in academic and business settings, it was less possible to conduct retrospective interviews in this context because the nature of touristic ELF encounters is brief and one-off. Additionally, doing so might disturb tourists’ leisure and subsequently causes ethical issues.

2. **What strategies are most commonly used for remedial purposes?**

In accordance with Pitzl’s (2005) and Watterson’s (2008) studies, the first step of examining the use of repairing strategies in this study was to locate sequences of
repair. The sequence began when the signal of non-understanding was addressed, then exchanges of meaning were carried on and the mismatched understanding was dealt with, until the problem in understanding was resolved. At this point, shared understanding was interpreted from the ELF participants’ utterances showing somewhat satisfactory exchanges of meaning or achievement of shared understanding. Varonis & Gass’s (1985) model for the negotiation of meaning was adopted for the analytical framework in my study (Section 4.3). The signals of non-understanding in this study are similar to the “indicator” (I) whereas the repairing strategies could be equivalent to the “responses” (R). In this sense, pragmatic strategies used in response to the signal of non-understanding in sequences of repair were then considered as the repairing strategies. Following the conversation analytic approach, the signals of non-understanding and the use of pragmatic strategies were examined only from what the Thai locals and the foreign tourists verbally addressed in the recorded data. Underlying functions could be discovered from the contexts and situational surroundings of touristic ELF encounters and interpreted by the researcher in the course of encounters. This study would have been more convincing if the recorded data had been triangulated with retrospective interviews from the participants.

My findings provide evidence that in ELF touristic the locals and the tourists made an effort to achieve successful exchanges of meaning, particularly when they signalled the presence of various types of impediments in on-going talk. Once any type of impediment e.g. unclear hearing, mishearing, incomplete understanding and misunderstanding occurs in ELF interactions and subsequently affects ELF speakers’ intelligibility, ELF speakers indicate this with the signals of non-understanding e.g. explicit statements, echoes of problematic items with rising intonation, unfocused questions, and minimal queries, including inappropriate responses (Bremer et al., 1996; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; Kirkpatrick, 2010a; Mauranen, 2006; Pitzl, 2005; Watterson, 2008).
The findings indicate that minimal queries were most commonly initiated to signal problems, followed by interrogative echoes, unfocused questions and inappropriate responses in touristic ELF. There is little evidence of the use of explicit statements or overt questions to signal mismatched understanding in this study. The findings support the existing findings in ELF pragmatics research. ELF speakers neither attempt to neglect potential trouble sources nor avoid problems in understanding. Among the plausible explanations for existing findings in ELF is that the minimal queries are used as “open class repair initiators” (Watterson, 2008, p. 390) in sequences of repair to negotiate meaning.

In touristic ELF, the Thai locals or the foreign tourists frequently used minimal queries e.g. ‘huh?’, ‘sorry?’ and ‘pardon?’ when they seemingly had problems with unclear hearing and mishearing, or sometimes when they did not pay attention. The minimal queries were explicit enough to indicate the presence of problems in understanding, in spite of being less specific in the problematic areas. It was effective to trigger the speakers of ELF to resolve such problems. After the minimal query had been signalled, simple repetition was the most frequently used strategy to respond to a request for repetition in touristic ELF. This finding supports the view that minimal queries could function as repetition requests, consistent with Kirkpatrick’s findings (2010a, p. 130). In response to minimal queries, my findings provide evidence that rephrasing was, at times, used to facilitate hearing and clarify the utterances when the locals and the tourists were exchanging tourist information. On the other hand, in phatic talk combined repetition was used to facilitate rehearing as well as to give further explanation or more detail when the Thai locals and the foreign tourists were engaged. In this sense, minimal queries functioned as clarification requests to complete mismatched understanding, which is in line with existing ELF studies (Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; Pitzl, 2005; Van, 2015). In touristic ELF, minimal queries were used for repetition requests and clarifications requests.
To signal non-understanding more specifically, ELF speakers echo or reprise only problematic items with rising intonation, so-called interrogative echoes which adopted from Cogo and Dewey’s (2012) and Mauranen’s (2006) perspectives. Interrogative echoes commonly signalled problems in understanding in touristic ELF when the Thai locals and the foreign tourists required clarification to clear up their mismatched understanding and ensure that the meaning was understood. It is evident that the Thai locals and the foreign tourists were aware of existing non-understanding; that is, they were sensitive to the signals of non-understanding and proactive in coping with the problems by using pragmatic strategies immediately in the following turn of talk. To illustrate, the tourists had signalled in a form of interrogative echo. After detecting the signal with the specific problematic item, the Thai locals, on the part of the initial speaker, opted for common strategic practices e.g. key-word repetition, combined-repetition, and rephrasing to enhance clarity and give prominence in meaning in the sequence of repair. In addition, my findings reveal that the interrogative echo was occasionally used together with the unfocused question e.g. ‘what?’. It could be assumed that the participants could hear a part of the utterance but could not yet ascertain meaning to fulfil their understanding. This phenomenon happened especially in interactional chats in touristic ELF, in which topics were varying and were not related to tourist information.

Furthermore, inappropriate response was the other signal of non-understanding noticed in touristic ELF. This finding supports Cogo and Dewey’s work (2012, p. 119) which explains that the inappropriate response in on-going talk explicitly indicates existing misunderstanding, and obviously conveys failure of interpretability in ELF communication. Instead of avoiding misunderstanding, the Thai locals and the tourists made an effort to negotiate meaning and interacted in order to get across the actual content, until shared understanding was achieved. It is in the same way that Kirkpatrick has reported that users of ELF across ASEAN employ the “don’t give up strategy” (2010a, p. 128).
In the sequence of repair, pragmatic strategies used to respond to the signals of non-understanding are regarded as repairing strategies. To clear up existing problems in understanding, the Thai locals and the foreign tourists, on the part of the speaker used self-initiated repetition and reformulation, namely simple repetition, combined repetition, key-word repetition, rephrasing and paraphrasing. These five most frequently-used strategic practices for remedial purposes were opted to manage non-understanding in sequences of repair to negotiate meaning in touristic ELF.

This finding supports the idea that ELF speakers are cooperative and collaborative in order to establish shared understanding (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Cogo & House, 2018; Cogo & Pitzl, 2016). The Thai locals and the foreign tourists were interactive to develop exchanges of meaning and negotiation understanding. The non-understanding sometimes was not cleared up successfully at the first attempt; therefore, two or more pragmatic strategies might have been used in the sequence of repair. When self-initiated strategies were not effective enough to negotiate meaning and get across the message, the locals and the tourists on the part of the listener could take another chance to use other-initiated strategies in the following turn to negotiate understanding. In this case, clarification requests and confirmation checks were commonly used as repairing strategies.

In terms of clarification requests, the findings show that the foreign tourists often used an alternative word or phrase with rising intonation to ask for further explanation, consistent with findings by Cogo and Dewey (2012) and Deterding (2013). In doing so, they recalled alternative words or phrases related to the topic of talk and produced them with a questioning intonation. These alternative terms could indicate the specific detail needed to maximise understanding. As far as the underlying function is concerned, the practice of using an alternative word or phrase with rising intonation in this study is similar to the paraphrasing with a rising intonation reported by Björkman (2014) and reformulation with rising intonation reported by Van (2015). Alternatively, the foreign tourists employed wh-clarification
questions to ask for clarification to fulfil their understanding. The statistical findings show that the tourists often used wh-clarification questions only in transactional conversations, not in international talk. The use of wh-clarification questions found in touristic ELF is consistent with the existing findings in academic settings (Deterding, 2013; J. Kaur, 2010).

In touristic ELF, the Thai locals and the foreign tourists engaged themselves in confirmation procedures to ensure that they achieved mutual understanding. On the part of the listener they initiated confirmation checks; on the other hand, on the part of the speaker they employed comprehension checks. In so doing, the locals and the tourists were aware of the accuracy of their understanding. After the non-understanding was somehow clarified in the sequence of repair, the locals and the tourists who were on the part of the listener consequently sought confirmation of their understanding. The practices of question repeat and questioning tag were the most commonly used as confirmation checks. The finding revealed that the foreign tourists opted for question repeat whereas the Thai locals used questioning tag to ensure accurate understanding. This finding supports previous ELF research, even in different contexts (Björkman, 2014; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; J. Kaur, 2010; Lichtkoppler, 2007; Van, 2015), which reports that the use of confirmation checks is common in negotiation of meaning in ELF interaction.

With reference to confirmation procedures, in touristic ELF comprehension checks were rarely used as a repairing strategy. Instead, the discourse markers e.g. ‘you know?’ and ‘okay?’ were often used as a pre-empting strategy in order to monitor and ensure the listener’s understanding, as discussed earlier (see Section 5.2.1).

The plausible explanations for these findings reflect that the Thai locals and the foreign tourists, considered to be ELF speakers, put effort into using a variety of the pragmatic strategies to negotiate meaning and achieve mutual understanding. In relation to the nature of touristic ELF, the Thai locals took the part of the speaker more often than the listener, so they often used self-initiated pragmatic strategies. On the
other hand, the tourists took the part of the listener more often than the speaker, thereby often using other-initiated strategies. They engaged themselves actively in using pragmatic strategies in sequences of negotiation of meaning for pre-empting and repairing understanding problems. More importantly, the findings of this study have shaded a light on the process of meaning negotiation in touristic ELF, as shown in Figure 19. This provides understanding of the nature of EFL communication in the context of tourism and highlight a wide range of common pragmatic strategies in touristic ELF.
Figure 19: Process of negotiation of meaning in touristic ELF
6.1.2 How does the use of pragmatic strategies vary across transactional and interactional conversations in touristic ELF?

Little recent ELF research into pragmatics has reported any correlation between the use of pragmatic strategies in transactional and interactional conversations. The nature of collected spoken interactions in ELF apparently are transactional conversations e.g. group work, seminars and group discussions (Björkman, 2014; House, 1999; J. Kaur, 2010, 2011b, Kirkpatrick, 2007a, 2010a; Watterson, 2008), business meetings (Firth, 1990b; Pitzl, 2005), service encounters at students’ accommodation (Lichtkoppler, 2007) and at hotels (Van, 2015); although some are interactional conversations e.g. social talk, in which topics involve personal interests, and are not related to work or studies (Cogo, 2009; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; J. Kaur, 2009).

In my study, the nature of most of the touristic encounters was transactional; although interactional segments such as social chats or interactional talk also occurred or were inserted in transactional conversations. The Thai locals and the foreign tourists used a variety of pragmatic strategies across transactional and international conversations in touristic encounters. The exchange of tourism information was the primary focus of transactional conversations. It happened regularly, and topics were predictable. The Thai locals were familiar with words or phrases relating to such routine information. On the other hand, the locals and the tourists chatted socially, regarded as the primary purpose of interactional talk. In doing so, the topics could be varied e.g. personal interests which were not related to tourist information. Talking about unfamiliar topics, the locals and the tourists might be struggling to ascertain words and meaning, including to make use of their limited linguistic resources. This reflects the fact that the primary focus of conversations
affected the varying uses of pragmatic strategies in transactional and interactional conversations in touristic ELF.

As described in Section 5.1, the Thai locals and the foreign tourists used pragmatic strategies to pre-empt problems of understanding beforehand in interactional conversations (69%) slightly more often than in transactional conversations (63%). But, they used pragmatic strategies when problems in understanding did arise and were signalled explicitly in transactional conversations (32%) more than interactional conversations (24%). The Thai locals and the foreign tourists used the pragmatic strategies for pre-emptive purposes in interactional conversations slightly more often than in transactional information. Possibly that is because they might have been unfamiliar with topics of talk which were not related to tourist information or routine information. The Thai locals and the foreign tourists did not give a sign of problems in understanding straight away, even though they had difficulties in intelligibility and comprehensibility in interactional encounters. Instead, the locals and the tourists could wait to let the context of talk help them suggest meanings. Alternatively, they used pre-empting strategies to develop the mismatched understanding and guard against any potential misunderstand beforehand. Otherwise, they adopted the let-it-pass strategy in case the meaning or contents of talk was ignorable.

On the contrary, in transactional conversations accuracy of information provided e.g. prices, schedules, and locations, and accurate understanding were vital when the Thai locals and the foreign tourists exchanged the information. They were proactive to ensure accurate information received and were sensitive to signalling the presence of non-understanding explicitly when their understanding was not fully complete or was still mismatched. Therefore, repairing strategies were used in response to signals of non-understanding in transactional conversations more often than in interactional conversations.

To guard against any potential problems beforehand, the Thai locals and the foreign tourists, on the part of the speaker, used simple repetition and rephrasing more often
in transactional conversations than in interactional talk. Doing so improved and emphasised the clarity of the utterance. Key-word repetition was used to provide prominence in meaning in transactional and interactional conversations at the same level of frequency. In contrast, the Thai locals and the foreign tourists used combined repetition and paraphrasing in interactional conversations to a greater extent than in transactional conversations. Giving an explanation or more detail and making meaning easier to understanding were pre-emptive ways to clarify meaning and enhance clarity in utterances. On the other hand, the locals and the tourists, on the part of the listener, used simple repetition to show alignment and acknowledgement in interactional talk, slightly more frequently than in transactional conversations. This happened possibly because they tried to engage their interlocutor, as the speaker, to carry on conversations. Question repeat and questioning tag, functioning as confirmation checks were used in transactional conversations more often than in interactional talk. Remarkably, questioning tag e.g. ‘yeah?’ or ‘right?’ was the practice used by the Thai locals more than the foreign tourists. They opted for this practice because they took less time and effort to make use of their English. Using an alternative word or phrase with a rising intonation was another strategic practice which could be used to ensure accurate understanding and to ask for clarification. In touristic ELF, this practice was used for pre-empting non-understanding in interactional talk slightly more often than in transactional conversations. Wh-clarification questions, the other strategy of clarification requests, were used in transactional conversations at a level equivalent to interactional talk.

Moving on to pragmatic strategies for remedial purposes, the Thai locals and tourists put effort into the successful negotiation of meaning and understanding through the use of pragmatic strategies when they signalled the presence of problems of understanding. They worked together to cope with non-understanding until the understanding was shared. In this case, either the locals or the tourists, on the part of the speaker who created a trouble source, used self-initiated strategies immediately in the next turn after the listener’s signal of non-understanding. Simple repetition was
the easiest strategy in response to the presence of problems, and to some extent it was effective enough at the first attempt. Simple repetition was used in interactional talk to a greater extent than in transactional conversations. The findings present that the locals, as the speaker, used simple repetition when they attempted to construct their utterances with their limited English whereas simple repetition was often used by the tourists, as the listener, to show listenership and encourage the locals to carry on the talk. The Thai locals and the foreign tourists opted for key-word repetition, rephrasing, and paraphrasing in response to the signal of problems in transactional conversations, but to a lesser extent in interactional talk while combined repetition was used as a repairing strategy more frequently in interactional talk. In this sense, clarification might have been needed to fulfil understanding, due to unfamiliar topics in interactional talk.

At times, the use of repairing at the first attempt was not effective enough to achieve shared understanding. That is, understanding was still mismatched. The locals and the tourists, on the part of the listener, further used other-initiated strategies in response to the continued presence of non-understanding. The practices of question repeat and wh-clarification questions were used for clarification requests; in addition, the practice of using an alternative word or phrase with rising intonation and the questioning tag functioned as confirmation checks, commonly used in transactional conversations. However, in interactional talk the Thai locals and the foreign tourists only used question repeat and the practice of using an alternative word or phrase with rising intonation in negotiation of meaning.

The findings of this study provide contribution to ELF research and the body of knowledge about touristic ELF, as discussed in the following section.
6.2 Contribution to ELF research

The findings from my study make an additional contribution to ELF research, particularly in the domain of tourism which is under-researched. Among the plausible explanations for these findings is that the Thai locals and the foreign tourists were proactive and interactive in conveying understandable messages and achieving mutual understanding in touristic ELF, similarly to ELF speakers in academic and business settings. Repetition and reformulation are common phenomena in ELF interaction in academic and business domains, and additionally in the tourism domain. Clarification requests, comprehension checks and confirmation checks are common strategies to negotiate meaning and achieve understanding in touristic ELF, similarly to those studies of pragmatics in ELF carried out mostly in academic contexts (Björkman, 2014; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; Deterding, 2013; House, 1999; Jamshidnejad, 2011; J. Kaur, 2009, 2010, 2015, Kirkpatrick, 2010a, 2007a; Mauranen, 2006) as discussed earlier in this chapter.

Nevertheless, differences in the type of ELF user and the context of ELF use in different settings results in different ways of making use of ELF and pragmatic strategies for negotiation of meaning and shared understanding, “settings can affect and shape communication in ELF” (Cogo & Dewey, 2012, p. 27).

Regarding the different types of ELF speakers, the participants in this study belonged to one of two parties; Thai locals or foreign tourists (see Section 4.4.2). Even though the Thai locals had experienced studying English as a compulsory subject in school, to some extent they actually acquired English in their own way from available sources e.g. learning from tourists or senior locals working in similar jobs or services. Having said that, the Thai locals had a low level of English language competence. Due to their smattering of English, some Thai locals made use of English in fragments and word-level utterances. Consequently, non-standard usage of English was found in this study (see Section 5.4). The use of grassroots English is evident in touristic ELF, consistent
with findings by Schneider (2016). More importantly, my findings provide the evidence that the Thai locals were able to negotiate meaning and communicate with the foreign tourists effectively. Having the low level of proficiency in English and exploiting limited linguistic resources, the Thai locals used other techniques, or pragmatic strategies in this sense to make meaning and achieve shared understanding in touristic ELF.

The types of ELF speakers in touristic ELF are different from those in academic and business settings. Most of them are students and lecturers in international study programs or in higher education, English-language teachers or staff in academies, including personnel in international business. To a great extent, they have experienced learning English and using the language in intercultural communication. They possibly have expansive linguistic resources. Thus, it could be assumed that ELF speakers in academic and business domains have a higher level of English proficiency than those in the tourism contexts of this study.

Moving on to differences of the contexts of using ELF, the findings indicate that touristic ELF encounters were mostly dyadic between two parties. One was the Thai local and the other was the foreign tourist. At times, there might have been more than one tourist participating in one spoken interaction, but they took the role as either the speaker or the listen one at a time. In touristic ELF, the individual tourist might have come into contact with the local unexpectedly, and most of the time they met only once, unless the tourist regularly visited and acquainted themselves with the particular local. However, most of the time the Thai locals and the foreign tourists rarely developed familiarity or interpersonal relationships. In addition, touristic encounters were driven by their practical purposes e.g. exchanging tourism information, asking for places and directions, providing services and having social chats. The encounters came to an end straight after their intended purpose was met or satisfied. In the data set, the length of the shortest encounter was four seconds when the tourist asked for the toilet at the café, whereas the longest encounter took
13:33 minutes, when the Thai local had phatic talks with his guests at the hostel. The average length of touristic encounters in the data set was 1:56 minutes. As a result, the touristic encounters in this study were brief and direct. My findings also show that exchanges of information in touristic ELF were routine. The Thai locals were familiar with such information in English. Touristic ELF was used in an informal and friendly manner. There is very little evidence of using ‘would you…’, ‘could you…’, including less polite preliminaries, in this study. By contrast, Blue and Harun (2003) comment that the language in hospitality and tourist services is “formal and commercial-like” (p. 81). The nature of ELF communication in the context of tourism characterises touristic ELF into a) dyadic spoken interactions, b) one-off interactions, c) purpose-driven interactions, d) brief and direct touristic encounters, and e) informal and friendly interactions. Given that, these are drawn from the findings of my study, although it is small in scale.

As opposed to touristic ELF, the contexts of ELF use in academic and business domains are different. Firstly, speech events in academic ELF are group works, seminars, consultations, conferences, and lectures (House, 2014; Kalocsai, 2014; Lichtkoppler, 2007; Mauranen, 2012; Mauranen et al., 2010) whereas those in business ELF are mainly telephone conversations and meetings (Kankaanranta & Louhiala-Salminen, 2010, 2017; Kankaanranta & Planken, 2010; Pitzl, 2005; Santner-Wolfartsberger, 2015; Wolfartsberger, 2011). These speech events give rise to multi-party conversations, rather than dyadic ones. In these two domains, ELF is used among the multi-participants aiming to reach shared understanding and subsequently achieve the goal of such a speech event, so it can be considered that ELF is used for goal-oriented interactions. In so doing, ELF spoken interactions seem to be long-winded and contain extended sequences of meaning negotiation. Additionally, ELF speakers in academic and business settings to some extent have shared educational and professional backgrounds, also a shared knowledge in their disciplines, regarded as the community of practice. In terms of interpersonal relationships, they are
acquainted; as a result, familiarity and rapport can be created in these contexts (Kankaanranta & Louhiala-Salminen, 2010, 2017, Mauranen, 2003, 2012).

In touristic ELF, pragmatic strategies in use are context-bound as contextual factors have shaped the description of the use of strategic practices in negotiation of meaning (J. Kaur, 2018; Toomaneejinda & Harding, 2018). Due to different types of ELF speakers and different settings in tourism, the present findings indicate some differences in using linguistic and pragmatic resources in touristic ELF. The Thai locals and the foreign tourists did not only exploit their linguistic resources, but that they had pragmatic competence to some extent in using strategies to negotiate meaning and achieving shared understanding. The Thai locals and the foreign tourists chose the strategic practices which took less effort in making use of their limited English and less time to negotiate meaning in brief encounters. Some pragmatic strategies requiring linguistic knowledge were used in touristic ELF to a lesser extent than in other contexts of ELF use; for example, parallel phrasing (J. Kaur, 2012, 2015), or Lichtkoppler's utterance developing repetition (Lichtkoppler, 2007), spelling-out repetition (Cogo & Pitzl, 2016; Kirkpatrick, 2010a), including overt and direct questions for clarification requests (Björkman, 2014; Cogo & Dewey, 2012; J. Kaur, 2010).

The existing findings of ELF studies have shown that sound-stretch repetition (J. Kaur, 2009) and spelling-out repetition (Cogo & Pitzl, 2016) are used to give another chance of hearing, considered as pre-empting strategies, but there was very little evidence of sound-stretch repetition and spelling-out repetition in my findings. However, these two subtypes of repetition were occasionally used as repairing strategies in touristic ELF. The Thai locals, for example, stretched sounds of important information e.g. prices or names of places, to make it clearer for the tourists after the tourists had signalled the presence of non-understanding. Tourists might be unfamiliar with the names of places in Thai and English, and this, in combination with the Thai accent, possibly resulted in mishearing and subsequently inappropriate responses. According
to Kaur's work, “some variation in pronunciation and accent” has an effect on clarity and intelligibility in utterances (2011a, p. 101).

ELF speakers in academic settings exploit their expansive linguistic resources to initiate pragmatic strategies e.g. rephrasing and paraphrasing (Deterding, 2013; Mauranen, 2006), repaired repetition (J. Kaur, 2012, 2015), reformulation repetition (Murata, 1995), lexical or word replacement (Björkman, 2014; J. Kaur, 2011b, 2015), lexical suggestion and lexical anticipation (Kirkpatrick, 2007a, 2010a), and co-constructed repairs (Cogo & House, 2018; Deterding, 2013). These strategies function as phonological and lexicogrammatical repairs to prevent any possible non-understanding triggered by distinctive phonological and lexicogrammatical features as well as to improve comprehensibility in negotiation of meaning. On the other hand, there is little evidence that the Thai locals and the foreign tourists attempted to repair distinctive linguistic features or employed the aforementioned strategies in touristic ELF. That is because doing so required knowledge of standard English and language competency. Unlike ELF speakers in academic and business settings, a number of the Thai locals in this study had the lower level of English proficiency or used “grassroots English” (Schneider, 2016). They had limited knowledge of correct forms and standard usage of English, thereby they were unable to exploit their linguistic resources to correct and repair their own utterances or those of the tourists. However, non-standard English usage by Thai locals did not disturb or cause serious misunderstandings in touristic ELF. In fact, they tried alternative ways to help them get utterances across to the tourists and achieve shared understanding.

The findings were examined from a small data set; thereby, the findings of this present research cannot be generalised to represent touristic ELF. Despite that, this research has been conducted with the pioneering aim of broadening insight into ELF used in the domain of tourism, which constitutes a large portion of ELF communication.
6.3 Summary

This chapter discusses the findings to answer the research questions and to provide contribution to ELF research. The Thai locals and the foreign tourists, regarded as the ELF speakers commonly used self-initiated strategies of repetition and reformulation and other-initiated strategies of clarification requests and confirmation checks for both pre-emptive and remedial purposes in touristic ELF, consistent with the existing findings of pragmatic ELF research in academic and business domains.

But, there were some differences in terms of the strategic practices or the subtypes of strategies used in touristic ELF. The ELF speakers, taking part of the speaker used simple repetition, key-word repetition, and rephrasing to facilitate clearer hearing. To make the meaning more explicit, the ELF speakers employed key-word repetition, combined repetition, and rephrasing to enhance clarity in utterances. Key-word repetition and rephrasing were at times used to emphasise meaning and give prominence of information. In addition, paraphrasing was used remarkably to simplify meaning of the messages. On the other hand, other-initiated strategies were used by the Thai locals and the foreign tourists, taking part of the listeners. They commonly opted for the practices of using an alternative word or phrase with rising intonation, wh-clarification question, and occasionally question repeat as the strategies of clarification request. To ensure their accuracy of understanding, an alternative word or phrase with rising intonation, question repeat, and questioning tag were used as the strategies of confirmation checks.

My findings are evidential that different types of ELF speakers and different contexts for ELF use have shaped the communicative practices and the uses of pragmatic strategies in touristic ELF. As opposed to the use of strategies in academic and business settings, there is little evidence of the strategies of linguistic repairs, and other strategies requiring linguistic knowledge e.g. spelling-out repetition, repaired repetition, and suggestion and lexical anticipation in touristic ELF. As the nature of
most of these touristic encounters was transactional, the features of touristic ELF were purpose-driven interactions, also brief and direct encounter. Alongside of making use of their individual linguistic resources, the Thai locals and the tourists opted for the strategic practices, in other words their techniques in which they took less time and less effort to initiate during the process of negotiation of meaning. In spite of being drawn from a small-scaled data set, the features of touristic ELF and the use of pragmatic strategies found in this study cannot be generalised to represent the overall contexts of tourism. But, it is hoped that this empirical research can maximise the body of knowledge about the nature of ELF communication in tourism, another under-researched domain.
Chapter 7  Conclusion

7.1 The summary of the thesis

This thesis presents the study that investigates spoken interactions in English between Thai locals and foreign tourists during communicative encounters. This phenomenon can be called “touristic ELF” which refers to ELF used in tourist-local interactions and tourist-touristic interactions. In this context, the nature of most of touristic encounters in ELF was transactional e.g. exchange of tourism information, although, interactional elements also occurred when they had phatic talk at times. The study focused on the use of pragmatic strategies when the participants put their efforts towards the process of negotiation of meaning. The main emphasis was on the ways in which the participants used the strategies to guard against potential problems in understanding, and also particularly when non-understanding did happen, until mutual understanding was achieved. The study also sought to identify particular features of ELF use, including the pragmatic practices in these spoken interactions, which were shaped by the types of ELF speakers and the contexts of ELF use. Accordingly, it is hoped that this study will contribute to the body of knowledge about ways in which people communicate via ELF and, in particular, how they make use of their individual linguistic resources of English and pragmatic competence in touristic ELF.

In so doing, naturally occurring spoken interactions between Thai locals and foreign tourists were collected on Koh Lanta, located in southwestern Thailand. Nevertheless, this research is based on a very limited data set as discussed in Section 4.4. There will be many more types of speech acts in touristic ELF interactions than those described in this thesis. For example, a tour guide or a receptionist who is likely to have very high levels of English proficiency are able to extemporise touristic ELF while discussing specific features of tourist attractions or while dealing with complaints raised by foreign customers or hotel guests. To analyse the data, the conversation analytic
approach was adapted because Conversation Analysis offered appropriate tools to investigate what happened in sequences of spoken interactions (see Section 4.2). In addition, existing findings of research into the pragmatics of ELF, mainly in academic and business settings, were taken as reference to create the analytical framework (see Section 4.3). The actual data analysis was carried out using the NVivo platform.

The findings of this study revealed that repetition and reformulation are the most commonly strategies used by those taking part as the speaker, whereas clarification requests and confirmation checks are the most common strategies used by those taking part as the listener. In touristic ELF, simple repetition, key-word repetition, and rephrasing were used as the strategic practices to facilitate hearing for the listeners. Key-word repetition, combined repetition, and rephrasing were commonly used to enhance clarity. Key-word repetition and rephrasing were also used to place emphasis on meaning and prominence of information. Paraphrasing was used to simplify meaning in order to make the utterance easier to understand and rephrasing was also used at times for this function. These aforementioned practices were regarded as self-initiated strategies. The Thai locals and the foreign tourists were proactive and interactive in the process of negotiation of meaning in the way they also used other-initiated strategies. Taking part as the listener, they used clarification requests and confirmation checks. In touristic ELF, wh-clarification questions and the practice of using an alternative word or phrase with rising intonation were very common to ask for further explanation or clarification of what they had heard. There is some evidence that the practice of using an alternative word or phrase with rising intonation was used to ensure accurate understanding as well. The Thai locals and the foreign tourists alternatively used question repeat or questioning tag to seek confirmation of their understanding. Once the accuracy of understanding was confirmed, the listener obviously used other-repetition as a response to show their acknowledgement. Given that, the pragmatic strategies were used beforehand to guard against any potential problems in understanding.
Furthermore, the Thai locals and the foreign tourists were interactive in their use of pragmatic strategies to repair non-understanding. When problems did arise, the listener signalled the presence of problems in understanding. The common signals of understanding found in touristic ELF were minimal query, interrogative echo, unfocused question, and inappropriate response. It can be seen that the Thai locals and the foreign tourists were sensitive and responsive to detecting the signal and interpreting its function either as a repetition request or a clarification request and, as a consequence, they were able to choose the self-initiated pragmatic strategies to repair such problems. At times, their effort at the first attempt to repair existing non-understanding was not effective enough. So, as the listeners, the Thai locals and the tourists took another chance in the following turn by using other-initiated strategies to somehow fulfil their understanding. Doing so reflects that they both worked collaboratively in exchange of meaning and negotiation of understanding.

According to the nature of communication, transactional or interactional, the primary purpose of touristic encounters affected the varying uses of pragmatic strategies in touristic ELF. The exchange of information was the primary focus in transactional conversations whereas the locals and the tourists socially chatted in interactional talk. The nature of the touristic encounters was mostly transactional. The pragmatic strategies were used for remedial purposes in transactional conversations more often than in interactional talk. That is because accuracy of tourism information in transactional conversations was essential and misunderstanding could have negative consequences. The tourists were proactive to signal spontaneously in case of incomplete understanding. This triggered the locals to use common self-initiated strategies, namely simple repetition, rephrasing, key-word repetition, paraphrasing and combined repetition in response to the signal of non-understanding. In case of ineffective repair, other-initiated strategies were used by the listeners, either clarification requests or confirmation checks, until they finally achieved a shared understanding.
On the other hand, in interactional talk the pragmatic strategies were used for pre-emptive purposes, slightly more frequently than in transactional conversations. The Thai locals, in particular might have struggled to make use of their smattering of English to socially chat with the tourists because of the diverse range of unfamiliar topics, unrelated to tourism information. Their low proficiency in English possibly causes difficulties in negotiation of meaning in ELF. However, when chatting socially, the tourists could wait and allow the context of talk to reveal the intended meaning. Rather than give a signal of problems in understanding, the tourists were interactive and used other-initiated strategies in order to encourage the locals to carry on the talk. Remarkably, the use of rephrasing, paraphrasing, and wh-clarification questions were used to a lesser extent in interactional talk.

Accordingly, my findings confirm that the use of pragmatic strategies is context-bounded. The different types of ELF speakers and the context of ELF use has shaped the communicative practices of touristic ELF. The ELF speakers in this study have different levels of English proficiency. The Thai locals have low proficiency; therefore, their limited resources of English restricted types or strategic practices of meaning negotiation. The features of touristic ELF are a) brief and direct, b) purpose-driven interactions, c) one-off interactions, d) dyadic spoken interactions, and e) informal and friendly interactions. This gave rise to the use of pragmatic strategies in touristic ELF in the way that the Thai locals and the tourists preferred opting for the strategic practices which did not require much linguistic knowledge of English, and which also took less time and less effort for meaning negotiation.

7.2 Implications

As a member of the ELF academic community, I investigated how speakers of ELF; that is; Thai locals and foreign tourists use ELF during brief and spontaneous encounters in the context of tourism and how they make use of their individual linguistic resources, including pragmatic strategies in particular to exchange and negotiate meaning in
touristic ELF. The findings of my study have drawn implications for the ELF academic community, the TESOL/ELT community and also the local community where I collected these naturally-occurring touristic ELF encounters.

### 7.2.1 Implications for the ELF academic community

“We should make reference to what people actually do with the language they have learnt, how they actually communicate in English as an additional language”

(Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 187)

ELF research has been conducted prolifically for decades so that it has continuously shed light on the nature of ELF communication and the communicative practices of ELF. In particular, interest in the pragmatics of ELF is growing to provide pragmatic understanding. A great amount of recent ELF work explains the ways in which ELF speakers make use of ELF in constructing and negotiating meaning and managing their ELF interactions when they encounter obstacles in understanding or when they do not understand their interlocutor’s utterances completely.

This study has provided implications for the ELF academic community so as to obtain a better understanding of ELF in use and new knowledge about “touristic ELF”, referring to the use of ELF in touristic encounters. My findings reflect the communicative practices and the use of pragmatic strategies in touristic ELF. The communicative practices of touristic ELF are bound within the context. Brief and spontaneous encounters in tourism do not provide ELF speakers with much time to elaborate their utterances in English and to opt for pragmatic strategies which require time and linguistic knowledge in use. Contextual factors: diversity of ELF speakers and settings of ELF use have an influence on language use and the use of strategies of negotiation of meaning in touristic ELF.

All ELF speakers have different levels of English proficiency. This study shows that the Thai locals and the foreign tourists exploited their individual linguistic resources of
English to communicate among others. They were aware of the interlocutors’ intelligibility. Apart from linguistic resources, the Thai locals and the foreign tourists also exploited pragmatic resources, using a variety of pragmatic strategies to manage ELF interactions to achieve mutual understanding among them. They put their effort to produce and exchange meaning with others whose English is either better or worse than their own proficiency of English.

In doing so, the Thai locals and the foreign tourists used pragmatic strategies to prevent problems in understanding beforehand and also to cope with non-understanding when it did happen. This demonstrates that the Thai locals and the foreign tourists were proactive and interactive in their negotiation of meaning, like other speakers of ELF in academic and business contexts. Repetition, reformation, clarification requests, comprehension checks and confirmation checks are common strategies in meaning negotiation. However, the use of pragmatic strategies in touristic ELF was different in type and frequency. Simple repetition, key-word repetition and combined repetition are the practices of repetition that were most commonly used in this study. Unlike in academic contexts, the practices of spelling-out repetition, sound-stretch repetition, repairing repetition and parallel phrasing were used to a lesser extent in touristic ELF encounters. So were pragmatic strategies for linguistic repairs. The ELF speakers in this study only opted for using “you know”, a discourse marker to check and monitor their interlocutor’s intelligibility. In case of incomplete or mismatched understanding, the speakers of ELF preferred using words or phrases with rising intonation, wh-clarification questions, and at times question repeat to ask for clarification. Question repeat was also used to confirm their accurate understanding, in the same way as the practice of using a questioning tag. The communicative practices and the use of pragmatic strategies in touristic ELF subsequently reflects fluidity and flexibility in ELF communication. It can be seen that ELF speakers with different levels of English proficiency is a key characteristic of ELF communication.
Touristic ELF can be explored more as it is still under researched. To ELF researchers, the domain of tourism provides a vast amount of ELF interactions in both spoken and written discourse, which can be explored in other aspects of pragmatics. Alternatively, a focus on the use of other linguistic and non-linguistic resources in touristic ELF is also worth investigating. My study, in addition, provides the implications for a methodological approach. The analytical flowchart of data analysis could be beneficial to develop as the tool to investigate the use of pragmatic strategies in further ELF studies. The model of the process of negotiation of meaning in touristic ELF proposed in this study shows the nature of ELF communication. The process of meaning negotiation might be further studied in other different types of ELF speakers and in different settings. Access to a wider range of ELF interactions would provide more opportunities to practice ELF for English learners and users and it is beneficial to develop the pedagogical implications of ELT.

7.2.2 Implications for the TESOL/ELT community

A considerable amount of attention in ELF research has been paid to the pedagogic implications of the conceptual gap between the actual use of English in lingua franca communication and English language learning/teaching. Reconsideration of the implications of ELT and the English curriculum has been raised by ELF scholars. Interestingly, Kirkpatrick has proposed guidelines about how to put “the Lingua Franca Approach” into classroom practices in the context of ASEAN (Kirkpatrick, 2012b, 2012a, 2014). It is worthy briefly mentioning “the Lingua Franca Approach”. The English curriculum should teach students effective use of English in lingua franca communication, “mutual intelligibility”, together with intercultural competence. Students should be able to acquire knowledge of the cultures of the nations in ASEAN rather than just Anglophone cultures. Additionally, students are supposed to have the opportunities to use their English competence in actual lingua franca contexts, particularly in ASEAN. It will be beneficial to students in some way to be more confident in making use of their English. According to the shift in the language learning
goal in ELT for the use of ELF, “nativelikeness” is discarded, so is the native speaker teacher of English. Rather, the local or non-native speaker teachers of English should be promoted. As a matter of fact, it is essential to raise awareness of the paradigm of ELF in pre-service teacher education and in-service teacher development (Dewey & Patsko, 2017; N. C. Sifakis et al., 2018). Finally, the assessment should be related to the student’s English proficiency in terms of “functional proficiency” in ELF contexts, how students make use of their English to negotiate meaning and get messages across in lingua franca talk, to perform and achieve linguistic tasks (Kirkpatrick, 2014, p. 24). This guideline for assessment is in line with Canagarajah (2007, 2014) as he raised the idea of changing the pedagogical paradigm for teaching English as an International Language (EIL). “Performance and pragmatics” should be the criteria, focusing on “one’s strategies of negotiation, situated performance, communicative repertoire, and language awareness” (Canagarajah, 2007, p. 936).

In addition, the concept of “ELF-aware teacher learning and development” is raised by Sikafis and Bayyurt. It refers to “the process of engaging with ELF research and developing one’s own understanding of the ways in which it can be integrated in one’s classroom context” (N. Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2018, p. 459). That is to say, English language teachers learn about ELF, and further adopt the perspective of ELF in their implementations for their English-language classroom. To do so, teachers should know the local features of teaching situations and learning/classroom contexts, including the social and institutional features in order to create and develop learning activities, related to ELF. Sikafis and Bayyurt propose three phrases of ELF-aware teacher education. Firstly, teachers realise the new role of English in the globalised world and acknowledge the research paradigms of EIL, WE and ELF in phrase A, ‘Exposure’. In phrase B, teachers have ‘Critical awareness’ in terms of the global spread of English, the implications for teaching and learning contexts. They should realise how to integrate the perspective of ELF into classroom activities. To this end, teachers integrate their understanding of ELF with learners’ features and needs in learning English language in phrase C, ‘Action Plan’. Teachers should “decide
whether/to what extent ELF is relevant to their learners in their context” (Jenkins, 2012, p. 492) to design instructional activities, including implementation and evaluation of each activity.

Moving on to ELT in Thailand, a mismatch between the implications of ELT and the application of ELF still exists. As discussed in Section 2.6, English is identified as a foreign language in national education and; as a result, the implications of ELT adhere closely to either British English or American English regarded as the Standard English model for decades. On the contrary, in the Thai context, English is actually used as a lingua franca to communicate with non-native English speakers, rather than native ones. To date, a number of ELF researchers in Thailand have been convinced and proposed reconsideration of English language policy and the implications of ELT in Thailand (Baker & Jarunthawatchai, 2017; Boonsuk, Ambele, & Buddharat, 2018; Trakulkasemsuk, 2015, 2018). It should be borne in mind that students learning the English language today will be ELF speakers in the future. As such, the goals of teaching and learning English should be shifted to intelligibility and communicative effectiveness in ELF. It is essential for English-language students to learn how to make use of English to negotiate meaning and communicate with other ELF speakers due to their different levels of English proficiency and diverse linguacultural background. Students should be equipped with propositional and procedural knowledge. In other words, they should acquire linguistic competence of English and pragmatic competence so extensive that they can exploit their individual resources for negotiation of forms and meaning effectively in lingua franca communication, even in the presence of non-understanding. In this sense, they are supposed to use their linguistic and pragmatic resources to manage their communication with others who have either better or worse English. This is likely to be one of the major skills of ELF communication.

Under the framework of ELF, the study benefits the development of ELT in Thailand to some extent. The findings of my study show that Thai locals, as ELF speakers could
achieve mutual intelligibility, despite their low level of English proficiency. It points out that they also used their techniques to exchange meaning and communicate with the tourists effectively. This study has contributed to the body of knowledge about the process of meaning negation via ELF in tourism contexts, in particular. As far as the implications for ELT in Thailand are concerned, the findings of this study could be further developed as the contents of an English language curriculum, including materials for ELT in ELF contexts.

Despite the paradigm shift into ELF, it does not mean that the Anglophone’s models or Standard forms of English are completely discarded in ELT. Phonological and lexicogrammatical knowledge of English is the core content needed in order to construct and build up a student’s linguistic resources in basic education. In Thailand, English is prescribed as one of the foreign languages when teaching English in ELF contexts. At this level, English language teachers possibly introduce varieties of Standard English gradually and insert cultural knowledge of Thai national and local cultures in English in order to value the students’ identities, and additionally the cultural background of the nations in ASEAN. In doing so, the spoken interactions in touristic ELF could be designed as linguistic tasks to encourage students to share their experiences when travelling and using English with non-Thai people and developed as guidelines for English use in lingua franca to equip students with a wide range of contextualised situations of using English.

Moving on to ELT in higher education in Thailand, undergraduates are expected to have a “working knowledge of English”; that is the communicative competence to make use of English in different contexts; improve their levels of English proficiency; and pass “one of the international standardized tests”. At this level, students have been more or less equipped with extensive linguistic knowledge. Teachers therefore, should provide students with pragmatic knowledge e.g. the use of pragmatic strategies in the process of negotiation of meaning, the language use in a wide range of communicative contexts and a great depth of English use in lingua franca
communication. The findings of my study illustrate how the locals used pragmatic strategies to negotiate meaning effectively in actual situations, especially how they handled occurrences of non-understanding, despite restricted resources. In this regard, pragmatic knowledge should be integrated into general English courses to enhance communicative competence in ELF contexts.

The findings of my study could be developed as pragmatic content and authentic samples of the process of negotiation of meaning in ELF. The naturally-occurring spoken interactions found in this study could be exploited to present diversity and fluidity of lexicogrammatical and phonological forms of English in lingua franca communication, to raise students’ language awareness. Teachers could use these spoken interactions in touristic ELF to design linguistic tasks in which students could use their English to develop utterances, in terms of language use and explicitness of meaning suitably in different contexts. This practice would help to equip students with rhetorical sensitivity and creativity. Most importantly, the pragmatic content of negotiation strategies should be included in teaching practice. The findings can be used to design learning materials from which students can acquire forms and functions, including the use of pragmatic strategies. Students can picture how to prevent problems in understanding beforehand and how to repair non-understanding when it arises through actual ELF communication in a wide range of contextualised situations. In so doing, the classroom can be created as a community of practice where students have opportunities to put their linguistic knowledge, professional knowledge, and pragmatic knowledge together in practice through classroom activities. Furthermore, teaching practice should increase the students’ awareness of ELF e.g. varieties of English, diversity and fluidity of linguistic forms in English and the nature of ELF communication, particularly pragmatic methods of ELF use in authentic scenarios, found in this study. Given that, the findings of this study will benefit ELT in higher education for general English courses, and specifically for English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and English for Tourism and Hospitality courses.
7.2.3 Implications for the local community

It would be beneficial to the locals working in tourism to broaden their horizons in terms of appropriate language use and pragmatic techniques which they can put into practice. That is because communication in English affects tourists’ impressions and attitudes (Traiger, 2008). Tourists are satisfied with and impressed by services and subsequently have positive attitudes towards the local people and tourism industry. ELF is demanded as a medium for touristic encounters to meet the tourist’s purpose of interaction. In this sense, the local people are not expected to have a high level of proficiency in English. Instead, their English is intelligible and functional enough in exchanging meaning and minimising communicative breakdowns in touristic ELF.

Wongthon & Sriwanthana (2007) recommended that tuk-tuk drivers in tourist spots should “have a general knowledge of grammar” (p. 445) to improve their linguistic resources of English. In addition, Prachanant (2012) explored the needs and the problems of practitioners experiencing the use of English in the tourism industry. The employees in tourism companies needed to improve English language skills, particularly speaking and listening skills because they had difficulties with unfamiliar tourist accents, inability to use proper expressions in the contexts of talk, and inadequate knowledge of vocabulary and grammar.

The findings of this study are evident that the Thai locals could make use of their English, even with limited linguistic resources. Having said that, the Thai locals would have more opportunities to earn income in their business if their linguistic resources were expanded and; as a subsequent, they could use their English comprehensible to sell their products or services and satisfy the tourists.

The Thai locals would acquire more communicative skills in English. Rather than teaching them with the standard forms of English, the focus of training courses should be on the ability to make use of English effectively in touristic ELF; that is, how to maximise explicitness in meaning and minimise non-understanding, and subsequently
achieve the shared understanding. Accordingly, the findings in this study are beneficial for English-language teachers and/or training facilitators who provide intensive training courses of English in the local community.

Naturally-occurring spoken interactions in touristic ELF such as those I collected for my study can be used as the guideline for language use in order to provide contextualised situations of ELF use. Teachers and/or facilitators of English language training exploit the findings and authentic scenarios in touristic ELF to design and deliver the right contents to meet the locals’ needs. Utterances of touristic ELF in this study can be developed into useful expressions in particular jobs and services, including settings of using ELF for interactions with tourists. In so doing, the useful expressions should be short and easy that the locals will be able to memorize them and put them into practice. Additionally, teachers and/or training facilitators can use these spoken interactions in touristic ELF as the materials for practicing listening skills. This will help them be familiar with a wide range of situations in varying English accents. How English is made in use in particular situations should be additionally explained for the locals. This would be beneficial to help the locals build up their individual linguistic resources and develop their speaking and listening skills.

More importantly, these spoken interactions in touristic ELF exemplify the process of negotiation of meaning. Teachers and/or facilitators of English language training can develop these spoken interactions as the models for role-play activities in order to enhance the local’s pragmatic competence in ELF communication. Teachers and/or facilitators take a role as a foreigner and allow the locals to put themselves in the real role depending on their jobs, for example. Doing so provides the Thai locals more opportunities for practicing the use pragmatic strategies commonly used in touristic ELF, namely repetition, reformulation, clarification requests and comprehension checks. Over all, the activities should be designed and delivered to the locals in order that they can picture the real scenario of using English and pragmatic strategic as the techniques in making and exchanging meaning with the tourists.
Moreover, portable ready-to-use materials might be the alternative solution. These kinds of materials can be produced as supplements to the training course. Pocket-size guidebooks or leaflets with visual images, useful expressions, and relevant vocabulary would be helpful for the locals to learn English at any time convenient to them. The contents of the guidebooks should be designed with a focus on the actual use of touristic ELF, similarly to the contents in training courses. It would be more beneficial if the guidebooks and the leaflets could be published in a series, according to the purposes of ELF use in particular venues and circumstances in touristic ELF, e.g. exchanges of localised tourism information, tour and booking services, transportation services, and the sale of products and services. With regard to useful expressions and vocabulary, phonology written in Thai would be provided for the locals to learn how to pronounce appropriately and understandably, or alternatively produced together with an audio CD for practicing listening skills.

It should be advantageous for stakeholders engaged in the tourism industry, not only for those on Koh Lanta, but also others in rural tourist spots. Local administration would be the significant organisations to set up training courses of English and to contribute some budget towards educational development for the local people in tourism industry. According to the 20 years national strategy framework (2017-2036), the framework aims to set out directions and strategies to strengthen the nation, having “security, prosperity, and sustainability” in the next 20 years. Human capital development is the foundation of the country development. Thai people should acquire skills, knowledge and capability needed for a quality of life; subsequently, they are supposed to have decent jobs and lifelong well-being (Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board, 2017). To this end, local administration, social institutions, and communities should cooperatively take part in developing and strengthening people’s capacity in the communities. In my opinion, the national and local administration working together with local institutions are supposed to promote training courses and educational materials for English language learning and deliver them to population in the community so as to improve their individual linguistic and
pragmatic competence, including performance when using English in lingua franca communication. The local people have access to skill training and enhance their income. In return, this can enhance the growth of tourism industry in the local community and earn a reputation of Thailand’s tourist destination.

7.3 Further research

The findings of this study have provided contributions to ELF research, including implications beneficial to the local community and the implementation of ELT in ELF contexts. Nevertheless, the findings cannot be generalised to touristic ELF, or even the whole phenomenon of ELF use in Thailand’s tourism. This section will suggest further research in ELF because there is still a lack of empirical data in touristic ELF.

To contribute to ELF research in the domain of tourism and to provide more insight into touristic ELF, more research needs to be carried out into the varying communicative situations of touristic ELF, such as the use of pragmatic strategies in tourist-tourist interactions, the use of ELF in hospitality and tourism services, or other aspects of the pragmatics of ELF e.g. interactional elements and multilingualism in the tourism domain. It is worth exploring the process of negotiation of meaning in different settings, whether ELF speakers in different countries or regions make use of their English and pragmatic competence in different contexts of ELF use. In so doing, the researcher should allocate more time to collect naturally-occurring spoken interactions to establish a richer and more reliable data set.

The majority of ELF data has so far been based on spoken interactions. However, ELF is widely used in written communication. For example, tourists email local agencies to exchange information or the agencies in different countries work collaboratively to organise trips for their customers. So, further research into ELF should investigate how meaning is constructed and negotiated through email communication. This can provide a much greater understanding of what actually happens in ELF.
communication in the contexts of tourism, in particular. Further research could generate a better understanding of the nature of touristic ELF.
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Appendix 2: Selected VOICE transcription conventions

?        rising intonation
.
( )      falling intonation
( . )    pause in speech (less than 3 seconds)
( . . )   pause in speech (longer than 3 seconds)
:        lengthened sounds
-        word fragments, a part of the word is missing
@        laughter or laugh-er-like sounds
(x)      words cannot identified or intelligible utterances
<1> </1> the overlaps are marked with numbered tags
<pvc> </pvc> variations on the phonological and lexicogrammatical levels,
 including coinages
< L1 > </ L1 >  Non-English speech, assumed as the first language of tourists.
<Lth> </Lth> Utterances in Thai, transliterated into the Roman alphabet
<spel> </spel> spelling-out words
[ ]      anonymization of names of places and persons
{ ... }  contextual information, including Thai utterances, translated into
           English
WORD     Words written in capital letters give prominence
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