

E-ISSN: 2476-9606

Abstract Proceedings International Scholars Conference

Volume 7 Issue 1, October 2019, pp. 1518-1538



<https://doi.org/10.35974/isc.v7i1.992>



Thai Students' Motivation To Speak English Outside The Classroom at Asia-Pacific International University

Suwannee Lansri¹, Josephine Katenga²

Faculty of Education, Asia Pacific International University, Thailand

suwannee@apiu.edu

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were to explore the factors that motivated and those that discouraged students from speaking English outside of the classroom at Asia-Pacific International University, Mauk Lek Campus. The university offers undergraduate programs in both English and Thai medium. The majority of Thai students who were enrolled in both programs notably lived in the University dormitories, which exposed them to students from 32 different countries, yet were still hesitant to speak English.

Using the convenience sampling method, 197 students were selected to participate in this study. A descriptive quantitative method and a self-administered questionnaire were used to collect the data.

The findings reveal that motivation for speaking English outside the classroom was mainly for instrumental motivational reasons ($M=4.17$, $SD=0.59$), followed by integrative motivational reasons ($M=3.74$, $SD=0.67$). Less clear reasons were intrinsic motivation ($M=3.41$, $SD=0.75$) and extrinsic motivation ($M=3.32$, $SD=0.82$) motivations. The study also reported that factors such as inadequate vocabulary to speak effectively, insufficient knowledge of English grammar, and inability to speak English fluently and continuously, were perceived as hindering them from speaking English outside the classroom. Lastly, the study found statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level in instrumental motivation, intrinsic motivation, and extrinsic motivation when compared with gender, faculty, class status, program of study, and period of learning.

The recommendations for future research threefold: to study learning approaches to a variety of vocabularies which would enhance students' communication outside of the classroom; to study participants from other nationalities; and to use a larger sample using other types of sampling and data collection methods.

Keywords: Speaking English, Speaking English Outside The Classroom, Motivation, Demotivating.

INTRODUCTION

English has become a means for international communication due to globalization. It is used as a medium of communication in many countries within the Association of Southeast Asia Nations (ASEAN). However, Thailand has a low proficiency score of 48.54 that translates to

64th rank among 88 countries surveyed in the EF English Proficiency Index in; 2018. Students learning English as a second language find it difficult to speak outside of the classroom because they are not able to express themselves accurately and often students lack confidence and do not want to make mistakes (Nuttawat, 2008; Shvidko, 2012). Research however indicates that students who are motivated are able to speak English outside of the classroom (Choomthong & Chaichompoo, 2015).

English is taught as a second language in many of the southeast Asian countries. In 2015, the ASEAN community established a powerful single market system under the ASEAN Economics Community (AEC) and chose English as the official language. As a result, the Thai government has advocated developing greater fluency in the English language amongst Thai students. This would make the nation economically competitive not only within the AEC community but also worldwide. Therefore, the Ministry of Education (2015) directed that the English language implemented under the 2008 Basic Education Core Curriculum should be a mandatory subject for all students, from grades 1 to 12.

The learning area for foreign languages is aimed at enabling learners to acquire a favorable attitude towards foreign languages, the ability to use foreign languages for communicating in various situations, seeking knowledge, engaging in a livelihood and pursuing further education at higher levels. (The Basic Education Core Curriculum, 2008, p. 252)

This policy emphasized a framework for English learning standard, time for learning, and communication. The government also launched the “Thailand English Speaking Year” program in 2016. Nevertheless, Thai students’ English proficiency has remained virtually unchanged (The National Institute of Educational Testing Service, 2015). The English score in 2015 for Thai students on the Ordinary National Educational Test (O-NET) was 28.43 out of 100, and in 2017, the score was 28.31.

The problem comes from the learning process itself. Thai teachers and learners lack the vocabulary and have low pronunciation and intonation ability (Harmer, 1995, 2007). Large-class sizes also hamper students’ efforts to English. The fact that Thailand had never been colonized also influenced Thais perception of foreign languages. Thais are less interested in foreign cultures and languages (Richards & Renandya, 2002). Learning a foreign language is not only a matter of learning the subject, but also how to engage in learning about the culture itself, where motivation plays a key role in the process (Gardner, 2007). Against this background It was interesting to find what motivates or demotivates students to speak English outside of the classroom.

Asia-Pacific International University uses both English and Thai languages as mediums of instruction in its undergraduate programs. This exposure potentially helps students to use the English language. Many students hesitate to speak English even though they have foreign instructors who use English as a medium of instruction. The majority of the students prefer to speak their dialects outside of the classroom. This study aimed to explore the factors that affect Thai students' motivation to speak English outside of the classroom at this private university located in Muak Lek District, Saraburi Province, Thailand.

There were two purposes for this study: a) to determine the factors that motivate or discourage students from speaking English outside of the classroom; b) to find out whether the following variables, gender, program of study, faculty, class status, or period of learning English have a statistically significant influence on motivation and demotivation factors in speaking English outside of the classroom.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Motivation is important for succeeding in learning a second language. According to Gardner (2006), motivation is a multidimensional concept related to behavior, which consists of desire and effort in achieving the goal of learning a language. It is a dynamic process that drives a person's initiative (Harmer, 2007), actions, or performance of actions. Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination Theory, and Gardner's Motivation Theory are motivation theories that explain why students fail to speak English outside of the classroom.

The Self-Determination Theory by Deci and Ryan (1985) indicates that external and internal factors influence one's desire to learn. This theory distinguishes two motivation types: intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation is described as self-driven motivation to gain internal rewards. This type of motivation is associated with positive experiences, as the individual is not pressured to achieve. He has the autonomy to control what happens. This motivation exists inside the individual. His motivation is not influenced by external pressures.

The extrinsic motivation is one's desire for acknowledgement and for avoiding punishment. It is not merely for self-satisfaction but because the individual has no autonomy over his actions. This type of motivation can be associated with both negative and positive experiences. In the classroom context, students take part in class activities because they look for rewards such as good grades. This motivation usually occurs for a limited period and does not continue in some cases after the individual receives either the rewards or punishment.

Gardner's Motivation Theory (1985) has two different orientations: 1) integration motivation and 2) instrumental motivation. Based on Gardner (1985), integrative motivation is one's attitude towards members of the target language. According to Baker (1998), students with high integrative motivation have more exposure to the target language and are more persistent in learning the language. Although the success of learning the language through integrative motivation is higher, this motivation may not be appropriate for all language-learning circumstances, because the learner may not have the opportunity to interact with native speakers.

Instrumental motivation, on the other hand, is doing an act, which is stimulated by utilitarian purposes such as getting a better job and salary (Gardner, 1985). External awards such as community recognition, prestige, and money are the driving forces. Learners are more task-oriented, prefer to avoid routines and punishment, and they are more profit-minded. Learners believe that mastering the second language will help them have a bright future.

Concerning demotivation in speaking English, Gardner (1985) stated that one's attitude determines the success or failure in language acquisition, as it might hinder one's motivation to learn. What hinders students' motivation may come from factors, such as classroom atmosphere, public humiliation, devastating test results, and conflict with peers. Lopez and Tun (2017) stated that students fail to speak English because they lack confidence and have the fear of being ridiculed. Students can also be demotivated because they have limited access to English-speaking environments. Various studies revealed that the majority of Thai students found that speaking was problematic compared to listening, writing, reading, and grammar (Juhana, 2012; Romwapee, 2012) because they lacked the vocabulary and grammar.

METHODS

This study was conducted at Asia-Pacific International University, Muak Lek Campus, located in Muak Lek District, Saraburi Province, Thailand. The sample comprised of 197 Thai students enrolled in the International and Thai programs in the second semester of the 2018-2019 Academic Year. The sample was a mixture of freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior students. A convenience sampling method was used to collect data from students who completed a Likert scale that measured their opinions. The questionnaire was adapted from Chongpensuklert (2011). The questionnaire comprised of three parts: demographics, motivation factors, and demotivating factors.

Descriptive methods were used to analyze student demographics, and to explore factors that affected students' motivation and demotivation to speak English. The analysis also included a t-test, F-test, and Scheffe's method procedure to identify the statistical differences

RESULTS

Demographic Characteristics of Participants

The data analysis indicates that females represented 67.5% of the sample study, while 32.5% were male. Participants who were between 20 to 23 years old accounted for 65.5% of the total, followed by 31% aged between 17-19 years old, and 3.6% above 23 years old. A majority of the students representing 73.1% were studying in the Thai program, and only 26.9% were from the International program. Moreover, most participants came from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities (37.6%), followed by Faculty of Nursing (34.5%), Faculty of Business Administration (11.7%), Faculty of Education (7.1%), Faculty Religious Studies (4.6%), and Faculty of Science (3.6%). The smallest numbers of participant came from the Faculty of Information Technology (1%). In addition, freshmen represent a majority of the study sample (40.1%), followed by sophomores (37.1%). The remainder consisted of 13.7% who were juniors, and 9.1% who were seniors. Of all the students who partook in this study, 40.6% of participants had learned English for less than 12 years, 32% had learned English for between 12 to 14 years, and 27.4% had studied English for more than 14 years.

Preliminary Data Analysis

There were two stages in analyzing the quantitative data. The first stage checked for errors, and the Cronbach's alpha was used to analyze questionnaire item's reliability in order to choose items to omit or reconstruct. The second stage analyzed the differences among variables by using descriptive statistics (means, frequencies, standard deviations, t-test, and p-value).

Factors Motivating Students to Speak English Outside of the Classroom

There are 31 items related to factors motivating students to speak English outside the classroom. These factors were divided into four areas Extrinsic, Intrinsic, Instrumental and Integrative.

Table 1. **Extrinsic Motivation Item Means and Standard Deviations** (n=197)

Statements	M	SD
Answering questions in class.	3.46	1.04
Join speaking activities in class.	3.41	1.01
Taking a speaking exam.	3.39	0.91
Asking and answering questions in English.	3.34	0.92
Doing oral presentation in English.	3.25	0.99
Talking to foreigners.	3.22	1.00
Chatting English in social media (e.g., messenger, line, etc.).	3.16	1.10

Table 1 summarizes extrinsic reasons for speaking English. With the highest mean of 3.46 (SD=1.05) for ‘answering questions in class’ and the lowest mean of 3.16 (SD=1.10) for “chatting English in social media”, it appears that most students are neutral about extrinsic reasons for speaking English outside the classroom.

Table 2. **Intrinsic Motivation Item Means and Standard Deviations** (n=197)

Statements	M	SD
I like to listen to and sing English songs.	3.98	0.93
I like to study the English language	3.85	0.96
I love to watch English movies.	3.65	0.98
I like to speak English with foreigners.	3.35	1.09
I like to read English books aloud.	3.33	1.06
I like to read English books (e.g., Novels/fictions).	2.93	1.05
I like to write English stories.	2.81	1.16

Intrinsic motivation for speaking English outside the classroom is reported in Table 4. Intrinsic reasons for speaking English are mainly defined by listening and singing English songs (M=3.98, SD=0.94), studying the English language (M=3.85, SD=0.96) and watching English movies (M=3.65, SD=0.98). Participants were neutral about writing English stories (M=2.81, SD=1.17) as a reason for learning English.

Table 3. Instrumental Motivation Item Means and Standard Deviations (n=197)

Statements	M	SD
The ability to speak English allows one to meet and talk to people in other countries.	4.54	0.68
To travel or survive abroad, one should be able to speak English.	4.53	0.68
To pursue higher education, one should be able to speak English.	4.45	0.74
Being able to speak English increases the chance of getting a better job.	4.45	0.75
Ability in speaking English assists a person's achievement and improvement.	4.22	0.87
Ability in speaking English helps increase a person's confidence.	4.20	0.85
Society respects a person who can speak English.	3.98	0.88
To be westernized, you must be able to speak English.	3.93	0.92
The new generation should be able to speak English.	3.84	0.91
A person who can speak English is an educated person.	3.55	0.98

Table 3 reports item level statistics for instrumental motivation. The majority of the participants agreed with the statement, “the ability to speak English allows one to meet and talk to people in other countries” (M = 4.54, SD = 0.681), followed by “to travel or survive abroad, one should be able to speak English” (M = 4.53, SD = 0.689). Two items had the same mean score: “being able to speak English increases the chance of getting a better job” (M = 4.45, SD = 0.751), and “to pursue higher education, one should be able to speak English” (M = 4.45, SD = 0.745). Other instrumental reasons for speaking English included “the new generation should be able to speak English” (M = 3.84, SD = 0.917), and “a person who can speak English is the educated person” (M = 3.55, SD = 0.981).

Table 4. Integrative Motivation Item Means and Standard Deviations (n=197)

Statements	M	SD
English is very useful when going abroad and traveling.	4.48	0.83
English is very important for future careers.	4.35	0.83
I would like to pursue a Master's degree overseas.	4.14	1.03
I would like to work in an international organization.	3.79	1.13
English is very useful for higher education.	3.78	1.02
I am influenced by English environment, making international friends.	3.47	1.15
My parents use English at home and at work.	2.15	1.423

Item statistics for integrative motivation are reported in Table 6. The majority of the participants agreed, “English is very useful when going abroad and traveling” ($M=4.48$, $SD=0.83$), “English is very important for future careers” ($M=4.35$, $SD=0.84$), and “I would like to pursue a Master’s degree overseas” ($M=4.14$, $SD=1.04$). However, participants disagreed that their parents use English at home and at work ($M=2.15$, $SD=1.42$).

Factors Demotivating Students to Speak English Outside of the Classroom

Table 5: **Demotivation Item Means and Standard Deviations** (n=197)

Statements	M	SD
I do not know enough vocabulary words to speak effectively.	3.73	1.08
I do not have enough grammar knowledge to speak effectively.	3.50	1.06
I cannot speak English fluently.	3.50	1.16
I cannot speak English continuously.	3.46	1.18
I feel nervous about making mistakes.	3.32	1.18
I do not know how to stress words correctly.	3.29	1.06
I cannot pronounce words and consonants correctly.	3.27	1.07
I cannot speak with intonation like a native speaker.	3.21	1.16
I feel shy and lack confidence in speaking English.	3.07	1.22
I do not want to lose face in front of my peers.	2.65	1.24

Table 5 reports on the perceived obstacles to speaking English outside the classroom. These obstacles include inadequate vocabulary to speak effectively ($M=3.73$, $SD=1.09$), “can’t speak English fluently” ($M=3.50$, $SD=1.16$), insufficient knowledge of English grammar ($M=3.50$, $SD=1.06$), and not being to speak English continuously ($M=3.46$, $SD=1.18$). Less of an obstacle is not wanting “to lose face in front of my peers” ($M=2.65$, $SD=1.25$).

Differences between Variables toward Motivation to Speak English Outside the Classroom

Statistical parameters such as mean, standard deviation, t-test, and p-value were utilized to find differences between gender, program of study, class status, faculty, and period of learning English on motivation variables and demotivation factors.

Table 6. Gender Differences on Motivation and Demotivation variables.

Group Statistics								
Variables	Gender	N	M	SD	t	df	p	ES(d)
Extrinsic Motivation	1 Male	63	3.50	0.75	2.116	193	0.036	0.32
	2 Female	132	3.24	0.84				
Intrinsic Motivation	1 Male	63	3.65	0.66	3.034	193	0.003	0.46
	2 Female	132	3.31	0.77				
Instrumental Motivation	1 Male	63	4.00	0.62	-2.749	193	0.007	0.42
	2 Female	132	4.25	0.56				
Integrative Motivation	1 Male	63	3.84	0.74	1.480	193	0.141	0.23
	2 Female	132	3.69	0.63				
Demotivation Speaking English	to1 Male	63	3.24	0.84	-0.604	193	0.546	0.09
	2 Female	132	3.32	0.85				

Gender effects on motivation and obstacles to speaking English outside the classroom are reported in Table 6. There are statistically significant gender differences in instrumental motivation ($t=-2.749$, $df=193$, $p=0.007$, $ES(d)=0.42$), intrinsic motivation ($t=3.034$, $df=193$, $p=0.003$, $ES(d)=0.46$), and extrinsic motivation ($t=2.116$, $df=193$, $p=0.036$, $ES(d)=0.32$). Females ($M=4.25$, $SD=0.56$) had significantly higher instrumental motivation than males ($M=4.00$, $SD=0.62$). However, females ($M=3.31$, $SD=0.77$) have significantly lower intrinsic motivation than males ($M=3.65$, $SD=0.66$). Females ($M=3.24$, $SD=0.84$) also have lower extrinsic motivation than males ($M=3.50$, $SD=0.75$). No gender differences were found for integrative motivation and demotivation (obstacles to speaking English).

Table 7. Program Differences on Motivation and Demotivation Variables

Variables	Program	N	M	SD	t	df	p	ES(d)
Extrinsic Motivation	International	52	3.60	0.81	2.886	188	0.004	0.47
	Thai	138	3.22	0.81				
Intrinsic Motivation	International	52	3.66	0.71	2.619	188	0.010	0.43
	Thai	138	3.35	0.73				
Instrumental Motivation	International	52	4.09	0.56	-1.257	188	0.210	0.20
	Thai	138	4.21	0.57				
Integrative Motivation	International	52	3.91	0.69	2.095	188	0.038	0.34
	Thai	138	3.69	0.64				
Demotivation Speaking English	toInternational	52	3.00	0.87	-3.020	188	0.003	0.49
	Thai	138	3.41	0.80				

Program differences on motivation variables are reported on Table 7. Statistically significant program of study differences were found for all five factors: extrinsic motivation ($t = -2.886$, $df = 188$, $p = 0.004$, $ES(d) = 0.47$), intrinsic motivation ($t = 2.619$, $df = 188$, $p = 0.010$, $ES(d) = 0.43$), integrative motivation ($t = 2.095$, $df = 188$, $p = 0.038$, $ES(d) = 0.34$), instrumental motivation ($t = -1.257$, $df = 188$, $p = 0.0210$, $ES(d) = 0.20$), and demotivation ($t = -3.020$, $df = 188$, $p = 0.003$, $ES(d) = 0.49$). Students in the International program ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 0.81$) had significantly higher extrinsic motivation than those in the Thai program ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 0.81$). In addition, International program students ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 0.71$) had higher significantly higher intrinsic motivation than did Thai program students ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 0.73$). Besides that, International program ($M = 3.91$, $SD = 0.69$) students had significantly higher integrative motivation than did their Thai program counterparts ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 0.64$). However, Thai program students ($M = 3.41$, $SD = 0.80$) had significantly higher demotivation than did International program students ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 0.71$).

Table 8. Year of Study Differences on Motivation and Demotivation Variables

		N	M	SD	F	$\overline{df1, df2 p}$		η^2
Extrinsic Motivation	Freshman	79	3.20	0.79	3.64	3, 192	0.001	0.08
	Sophomore	73	3.20	0.76				
	Junior	26	3.54	0.81				
	Senior	18	3.97	0.88				
Intrinsic Motivation	Freshman	79	3.43	0.69	1.30	3, 192	0.275	0.02
	Sophomore	73	3.29	0.76				
	Junior	26	3.60	0.86				
	Senior	18	3.52	0.78				
Instrumental Motivation	Freshman	79	4.24	0.46	4.86	3, 192	0.003	0.07
	Sophomore	73	4.25	0.55				
	Junior	26	3.80	0.79				
	Senior	18	4.02	0.71				
Integrative Motivation	Freshman	79	3.84	0.58	2.76	3, 192	0.044	0.04
	Sophomore	73	3.66	0.66				
	Junior	26	3.47	0.84				
	Senior	18	3.92	0.71				
Demotivation Speaking English	Freshman	79	3.38	0.79	3.69	3, 192	0.001	0.08
	Sophomore	73	3.47	0.79				
	Junior	26	2.80	0.93				
	Senior	18	2.97	0.87				

Year of Study descriptive statistics and results of one-way analysis of variance are reported in Table 8. There are significant class differences for instrumental motivation ($F_{(3,192)}=4.86$,

$p=0.003$, $\eta^2 =0.07$), integrative motivation ($F_{(3,192)}=2.76$, $p=0.044$, $\eta^2 =0.02$), extrinsic motivation $F_{(3,192)}=3.64$, $p=0.001$, $\eta^2 =0.08$) and obstacles to speaking English ($F_{(3,192)}=3.69$, $p=0.001$, $\eta^2 =0.08$).

Table 9. Post-Hoc Multiple Comparison for Year of Study (Least Significant Differences)

Variables	Class Status	M	Sophomore	Junior	Senior
Extrinsic	Freshman	3.20			***
	Sophomore	3.20			***
	Junior	3.54			
	Senior	3.97			
Instrumental	Freshman	4.24		***	
	Sophomore	4.25		***	
	Junior	3.80			
	Senior	4.02			
Integrative Motivation	Freshman	3.84		*	
	Sophomore	3.66			
	Junior	3.47			*
	Senior	3.92			
Demotivation to Speak English	Freshman	3.38		**	
	Sophomore	3.47		***	*
	Junior	2.80			
	Senior	2.97			

Less than 10% of the variations in these motivation variables can be accounted for by post-hoc multiple comparisons. A procedure using the least significant differences (LSD) indicated that juniors ($M=3.80$) have lower instrumental motivation than did freshman ($M=4.24$) or sophomores ($M=4.25$). Freshman ($M=3.84$) also have higher integrative motivation than had juniors ($M=3.47$), and seniors ($M=3.92$), but not with sophomores ($M=3.66$). Freshman ($M=3.20$) and sophomores ($M=3.20$) have lower extrinsic motivation than did seniors ($M=3.97$) but not with juniors ($M=3.54$). Obstacles to speaking English are higher among freshman ($M=3.38$) and sophomores ($M=3.47$) than juniors ($M=2.80$) and seniors ($M=2.97$).

Table 10. Faculty Differences on Motivation and Demotivation Variables

Variable	Faculty	N	M	SD	F	df1, df2	p	η^2
Extrinsic Motivation	Arts & Humanities	74	3.67	0.75	7.66	5, 191	<0.001	0.17
	Business Administration	23	3.28	0.97				
	Education	14	3.16	0.46				
	Science & IT	9	3.65	0.47				
	Nursing	68	2.92	0.71				
Intrinsic Motivation	Arts & Humanities	74	3.61	0.74	4.12	5, 191	0.001	0.10
	Business Administration	23	3.52	0.76				
	Education	14	3.70	0.57				
	Science & IT	9	3.56	0.55				
	Nursing	68	3.11	0.72				
Instrumental Motivation	Arts & Humanities	74	4.04	0.65	3.29	5, 191	0.007	0.08
	Business Administration	23	3.98	0.69				
	Education	14	4.19	0.47				
	Science & IT	9	3.96	0.57				
	Nursing	68	4.37	0.45				
Integrative Motivation	Arts & Humanities	74	3.87	0.67	1.92	5, 191	0.094	0.05
	Business Administration	23	3.57	0.89				
	Education	14	3.82	0.60				
	Science & IT	9	3.87	0.48				
	Nursing	68	3.59	0.60				
Extrinsic Motivation	Arts & Humanities	74	3.67	0.75	7.66	5, 191	<0.001	0.17
	Business Administration	23	3.28	0.97				
	Education	14	3.16	0.46				
	Science & IT	9	3.65	0.47				
	Nursing	68	2.92	0.71				
Obstacles to Speaking English	Arts & Humanities	74	3.20	0.90	1.58	5, 191	0.169	0.04
	Business Administration	23	3.00	0.97				
	Education	14	3.28	0.54				
	Science & IT	9	3.46	0.74				
	Nursing	68	3.49	0.77				
	Religious Studies	9	3.31	0.90				

Differences among Faculties are reported on Table 10. There are statistically significant Faculty differences in instrumental motivation ($F_{(5,191)} = 3.29$, $p = 0.007$, $\eta^2 = 0.08$), intrinsic motivation ($F_{(5,191)} = 4.21$, $p = 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.10$), and extrinsic motivation ($F_{(5,191)} = 7.66$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.17$).

Table 11. Post-Hoc Multiple Comparisons for Faculty (Least Significant Differences)

Variable	Faculty	M	Bus Ad	Educ	SC/IT	Nurs	Rel
Extrinsic Motivation	Arts & Humanities	3.67	*	*		***	
	Business Administration	3.28				*	
	Education	3.16					
	Science & IT	3.65				**	
	Nursing	2.92					
Intrinsic Motivation	Arts & Humanities	3.61				*	
	Business Administration	3.52				***	
	Education	3.70				*	
	Science & IT	3.56				**	
	Nursing	3.11					
Instrumental Motivation	Arts & Humanities	4.04				*	
	Business Administration	3.98				***	
	Education	4.19				**	
	Science & IT	3.96				*	
	Nursing	4.37					
	Religious Studies	4.37					

Pairwise comparison procedure results using least significant differences (LSD) are reported in Table 11. Compared to other Faculties, the Faculty of Nursing (M=4.37) was higher in instrumental motivation, while lower in intrinsic motivation (M=3.11) and extrinsic motivation (M=2.92). The Faculty of Arts and Humanities (M=3.67) was higher than Business Administration (M=3.28) and Education (M=3.16) in extrinsic motivation.

Table 12. Period of Learning English Differences on Motivation and Demotivation Variables

Variable	Years	N	M	SD	F	df1, df2	p	η^2
Extrinsic Motivation	< 12 years	80	3.21	0.88	2.81	2, 194	0.062	0.03
	12-14 years	63	3.27	0.62				
	> 14 years	54	3.54	0.90				
	Total	197	3.32	0.82				
Intrinsic Motivation	< 12 years	80	3.29	0.76	1.98	2, 194	0.141	0.02
	12-14 years	63	3.47	0.72				
	> 14 years	54	3.54	0.74				
	Total	197	3.41	0.75				
Instrumental Motivation	< 12 years	80	4.01	0.67	5.06	2, 194	0.007	0.05
	12-14 years	63	4.26	0.49				
	> 14 years	54	4.29	0.51				
	Total	197	4.17	0.59				
Integrative Motivation	< 12 years	80	3.65	0.75	4.24	2, 194	0.016	0.04
	12-14 years	63	3.66	0.61				
	> 14 years	54	3.96	0.58				
	Total	197	3.74	0.67				
Obstacles to Speaking English	< 12 years	80	3.23	0.86	4.82	2, 194	0.009	0.05
	12-14 yrs	63	3.56	0.73				
	> 14 yrs	54	3.10	0.90				
	Total	197	3.30	0.85				

Table 12 summarizes the results for motivational differences by period of studying English. There were significant differences in instrumental motivation ($F_{(2,194)} = 5.06$, $p=0.007$, $\eta^2 = 0.05$), integrative motivation ($F_{(2,194)} = 4.24$, $p = 0.016$, $\eta^2 = 0.04$), and obstacles to speaking English ($F_{(2,194)} = 4.82$, $p = 0.009$, $\eta^2 = 0.05$).

Table 13. Post-Hoc Multiple Comparisons for Period of Learning English (Least Significant Differences)

Variable	Years	M	12-14	>14
Instrumental Motivation	< 12 years	4.01	**	**
	12-14 years	4.26		
	> 14 years	4.29		
Integrative Motivation	< 12 years	3.65		**
	12-14 years	3.66		*
	> 14 years	3.96		
Demotivation to Speaking English	< 12 years	3.23	*	
	12-14 years	3.56		**
	> 14 years	3.10		

The results of a post-hoc multiple comparison procedure using least significant differences (LSD) are reported on Table 13. Participants who had learned English for 12-14 years ($M=4.26$) and over 14 years ($M=4.29$) had higher instrumental motivation than those who had learned the language for less than 12 years ($M=4.01$). Those who had learned English for over 14 years ($M=3.96$) had higher integrative motivation than those who reported less than 12 years ($M=3.65$) or those who had learned it for 12-14 years ($M=3.66$). Obstacles were lower for those who had learned English over 14 years ($M=3.10$) than those who had learned it for less than 12 years ($M=3.23$), and those who had learned it for 12-14 years ($M=3.56$).

DISCUSSION

The major results of the study are organized and summarized according to the research questions.

Demographic Characteristics Of Participants

The study revealed that the majority of participants were enrolled in the Thai programs (73.1%), and most of them were female students (67.5%). The participants' ages were between 20-23 years old (65.5%); the smallest group was above 23 years old (3.6%). The largest group were studying English majors (37.6%), followed by Nursing (34.5%). Freshmen (40.6%) and sophomore students (37.1%) dominated the participants in this study. The data also showed that most participants had studied English for less than 12 years (40.6%), followed by between 12-14 years (32%), and followed by those had studied English more than 14 years (27.4%).

Factors that motivating Thai student to Speak English outside the Classroom

Research Question 1

What motivation and demotivation factors affect Thai students English speaking outside the classroom?

The findings revealed that motivation for speaking English outside the classroom was mainly for instrumental reasons ($M=4.17$, $SD=0.59$), followed by integrative reasons ($M=3.74$, $SD=0.67$). Less clear reasons were intrinsic ($M=3.41$, $SD=.75$), and extrinsic ($M=3.32$, $SD=0.82$) motivations. The results are in agreement with findings from the study conducted by Arnold (2000), who stated that the benefit of learning English is to get external rewards. The findings also parallel the findings which reveal that students had higher instrumental

motivation to speak English (Choomthong & Chaichompoo, 2015; Ghanea et al., 2011). This finding indicates that students realize the significance of the English language for accessing a better life.

The study also showed two dominant instrumental reasons that motivated students to speak English. Speaking English allows students to meet and speak to foreigners and be able to survive abroad; and speaking English increases chances of getting a better job, or pursuing higher education.

Respondents also acknowledged that the integrative reasons to speak English were similar to the instrumental reasons. People who speak English travel abroad, have better careers, and can pursue a Master's degree overseas. However, a majority of the students disagreed that having parents who use English at home or at work is the reason for them to speak English.

Regarding intrinsic reasons, the findings showed that student studied English to watch English movies, to listen and sing English songs. The respondents were neutral about writing English stories as a reason for learning English. However, the highest mean of 3.46 (SD=1.05) were for 'answering questions in class,' and the lowest mean of 3.16 (SD=1.10) was for "chatting in English in social media." It appears that most students are neutral about extrinsic reasons for speaking English outside the classroom.

Factors Demotivating Thai students to Speak English Outside of the Classroom

The findings also revealed that inadequate vocabulary, insufficient knowledge of English grammar, and lack of ability to speak English fluently hinders students from speaking English outside the classroom. Romwapee (2012) and Nuttawat (2008), also found that Thai students' ability to speak fluent English results from lack of grammatical structure, and practice in pronouncing words.

Differences between Gender, Program of Study, Class Status, Faculty and Period of Learning English toward Motivation Variables

Research Question 2

Is there a statistically significant difference between motivation and demotivation factors in speaking English outside the classroom in terms of demographic variables?

Gender Differences on Motivation Variables

There are statistically significant gender differences in instrumental motivation, intrinsic motivation, and extrinsic motivation. Females had significantly higher instrumental

motivation than males. A similar study in Spain revealed that female students also scored significantly higher than males in integrative motivation towards learning the English language (Amengual-Pizarro, 2017). One reason why more females in this study had instrumental motivation could be the possibility of getting better city jobs after training. Many of the female respondents were nursing students who would complete their studies at the Bangkok campus where they are many foreign patients.

Program Differences in Motivation Variables

Statistically significant program of study differences were found in extrinsic motivation, intrinsic motivation, integrative motivation, instrumental motivation and demotivation. Students in the International program have significantly higher extrinsic motivation than those enrolled in the Thai program. In addition, International program students had significantly higher intrinsic and integrative motivations than Thai students. However, Thai program students had significantly higher instrumental motivation and demotivation than the International program students. These findings are supported by Thongmark (2012) who revealed that Thaksin University's students who learned through English medium were motivated instrumental to speak English than other Faculties in the university.

Year of Study Differences on Motivation Variables

There were significant class differences for instrumental motivation, integrative motivation, extrinsic motivation, and obstacles to speaking English. Less than 10% of the variations in these motivation variables could be accounted for by post-hoc multiple comparison procedure using least significant differences (LSD), indicating that juniors had lower instrumental motivation than freshmen or sophomores. However, freshmen had higher integrative motivation than juniors and seniors, but not sophomores. Moreover, this present study revealed that freshmen and sophomores had lower extrinsic motivation than seniors, but not juniors. Obstacles to speaking English were higher among freshmen and sophomores than among juniors and seniors.

These findings were almost similar to the results of Jindathai (2015), who reported that there were statistically significant differences in types of motivation to speak English among freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors at the 0.05 level. Freshmen had higher instrumental integrative motivation compared to sophomores and juniors, but not seniors.

However, freshmen and juniors had slightly lower intrinsic motivation than seniors and sophomores.

Faculty Differences on Motivation Variables

There were statistically significant Faculty differences in instrumental motivation, intrinsic motivation, and extrinsic motivation. Based on pairwise comparison procedure, it was found that the Faculty of Nursing was higher on instrumental motivation, but lower on intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. The Faculty of Arts and Humanities was higher on extrinsic motivation than Business Administration or Education. This supported the study of Pengnate (2014) on low-graded students' motivation and behavior in English learning at the Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology, which revealed that there were statistically significant differences in intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and English learning behavior at the 0.05 level among students from the Automotive Engineering and Business Information majors. In additions, Degang (2010) explained that Thai students in the Faculty of Business English of Assumption University were slightly more interactively motivated to speak English than students from other Faculties.

Motivational Differences by Period of Studying English

The analysis also showed that respondents who have learned English for over 12-14 years and have higher instrumental motivation than those who learned the language for less than 12 years. Those who have learned English for over 14 years have higher integrative motivation than those who reported learning for less than 12 years or 12-14 years. Obstacles are lower for those who have learned English for over 14 years than for those who have learned for less than 12 years or from 12-14 years. These research findings correspond to the study of Prakongchat (2007) which stated that students with more than eight years of language learning experience were more motivated in language learning than those who had less than 8 years of experience

Conclusion

The study revealed that motivation for speaking English outside the classroom is mainly for instrumental and integrative reasons. Respondents agreed that being able to speak English would lead to traveling abroad, interaction with foreigners, and obtain a better career. The study also reported that inadequate vocabulary to speak effectively, insufficient knowledge of English grammar, and inability to speak English fluently and continuously were perceived as

hindering students from speaking English outside the classroom. Less clear reasons are intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. Lastly, the study showed that there are statistically significant gender, faculty, class status, program of study and period of learning English differences in instrumental motivation, intrinsic motivation, and extrinsic motivation at the 0.05 level. All these findings could be credited to the fact that students realized the significance of the English language as a mean for accessing a better life. The findings of this study provide a useful parameter for the institutions to develop better strategies to improve student English speaking ability and eliminate factors that are detrimental to courses. Teachers who are seriously interested in ensuring students learn the language can use both the negative and positive findings to develop ways of helping students to speak the language outside of the classroom. Besides, teachers can develop strategies that help students to increase their motivation and overcome their attitudes towards speaking English.

REFERENCES

- Amengual-Pizzaro, M. (2017). Engineering students' motivational variables towards English and the learning of the English language. *Revista de Lenguas para Fines Especificos* 23(1), 31-44.
- Arnold, J. (2000). *Affect in language learning*. Beijing, China: Foreign Language and Research Press.
- Baker, M. C. (1988). *A theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Chongpensuklert, S. (2011). *A case study of Thai students in the International Program at International College, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University*. (Unpublished Thesis). Thammasat University, Language Institute, English for Careers, Thailand.
- Choomthong, D. & Chaichompoo, C. (2015). English language learning motivation of Thai undergraduate students in the globalized era. *Suranee J. Soc. Sci.* 9(2), 23 – 45.
- Deci, E. L., & Richard, M. R. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self Determination in Human Behavior*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Degang, M. (2010). *Motivation toward English language learning of the second year undergraduate Thai students majoring in Business English at an English-medium university*. (Unpublished Thesis). Bangkok: Graduate School, Srinakharinwirot University.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

- Ghanea, M., Pisheh, H.R.Z. and Ghanea, M. H. (2011). The relationship between learners 'motivation (integrative and instrumental) and English proficiency among Iranian EFL learners. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 59, 458-464.
- Harmer, J. (1995). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 4th ed. London: Longman,
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Longman.
- Jindathai, S. (2015). Factors Affecting English Speaking Problems among Engineering Students at Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology. The 3rd National Interdisciplinary Academic Conference (TNIAC 2015).
- Juhana (2012). Psychological Factors That Hinder Students from Speaking in English Class. *Journal of Education and Practice*. 3 (12), 100-110.
- López, M. G., & Tun, M. B. (2017). Motivating and demotivating factors for students with low emotional intelligence to participate in speaking activities. *Teachers' Professional Development*, 19(2), 151-163. doi: <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v19n2.60652>
- Ministry of Education (2015). *Thailand's ASEAN community educational preparation*. Retrieved from <http://www.en.moe.go.th/enMoe2017/> on February 12, 2019.
- Nuttawat, P. (2008). *A survey of needs and problems in learning to speak English of the third year Tourism Industry students at Surathani Rajabhat University*. (Unpublished Thesis). Thammasat University, Language Institute, English for Careers, Thailand.
- Pengnate, W. (2014). Motivation, Attitude and English Learning Behaviors of the low-graded Students. *TNI Journal of Business Administration and Languages*. 2(1), 39 – 43.
- Prakongchat, N. (2007). *Relationship of Variables, and Usage in English Language learning Strategies of Thai Frist Year Students in Public Universities*. (Unpublished Thesis). Doctoral Dissertation of Arts in English language studies, Graduate School, Suranaree University of Technology.
- Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W.A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: an anthology of current practice*. New York: Cambridge
- Romwapee, W. (2012). *Junior High School Students' English Pronunciation Development through Reading-aloud Dominoes*. (Unpublished Thesis). Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Khon Kaen University.
- Shvidko, E. V. (2012). *Students' perspectives on language use outside the classroom in an intensive English program*. (Unpublished masters' thesis). Brigham Young University, Utah.
- The National Institution of Educational Testing Service (Public Organization). (2015) *Ordinary National Educational Test (O-NET)*. Retrieved from <http://www.niets.or.th/en/catalog/view/2211> on February 22, 2019.

Thongmark, S. (2012). *A study of Thaksin University Student's Motivation in English Language Learning*. (Unpublished Thesis). Faculty of Education, Thaksin University