CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter reports the results of the study. It comprises the analysis of the collected data and findings. The three research questions formulated in Chapter I serve as the framework for the presentation of the findings. Each answer is based on the data collected from the Phitsanulok hotel staff in five hotels through the questionnaires, and the interview questionnaires. All the data obtained were later computed and analyzed.

Description of the Subjects of the Study

The Questionnaire

The number of responses received in the study was 82, out of 99, representing 82.9 percent of the target population. Table 5 shows the number of the hotel staff in each category:

Table 5 The Number of Responses for the Questionnaire

Subjects	Target Subjects	Returned Questionnaires	
Managers/Supervisors	16	16	(100%)
Receptionists	13	13	(100%)
Cashiers	11	11	(100%)
Operators	7	7	(100%)
Waiters	52	35	(67.3%)
Total	**99**	**82**	**(82.8%)**

The Interview Questionnaire

The number of responses for the interview questionnaire was 21. And the table below represents the number of the hotel staff in each category:

Table 6 The Number of Responses for the Interview Questionnaire

Subjects	Number of Interviewees
Managers/Supervisors	7
Receptionists	4
Cashiers	4
Operators	3
Waiters	3
Total	21

Part I of the questionnaire asked the respondents to identify their general background. Detailed information is presented in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7 Distribution of Respondents by General Background for the Questionnaire

Positions / General Background	Managers/ Supervisors		Receptionists		Cashiers		Operators		Waiters	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Gender										
- Male	9	56.25	5	38.46	2	18.18	1	14.28	11	31.42
- Female	7	43.75	8	61.54	9	81.81	6	85.71	24	68.57
Age										
- 18-25	3	18.75	8	61.53	6	54.54	5	71.42	20	57.14
- 26-35	9	56.25	5	38.46	5	45.45	2	28.57	15	42.85
- 36-45	3	18.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- 46 Up	1	6.25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 7 (continued)

Positions / General Background	Managers/ Supervisors		Receptionists		Cashiers		Operators		Waiters	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Experience										
- 1-5	13	81.25	13	100.0	11	100.0	6	85.71	34	97.14
- 6-10	2	12.50	-	-	-	-	1	14.28	1	2.85
- 10 Up	1	6.25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Educational Attainment										
- M	2	12.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	14.28
- V	4	25.00	3	23.07	1	9.09	2	28.57	9	25.71
- B	8	50.00	9	69.23	10	90.90	5	71.42	21	60.00
- M.A	2	12.50	1	7.69	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	16	100.0	13	100.0	11	100.0	7	100.0	35	100.0

M = Matthayom 6, V = Vocational, B = Bachelor's degree, M.A = Master's degree, F = Frequency

The Questionnaire

With regard to the distribution of respondents by gender and age, most of the hotel staff were female. The data presented in this table reveals that there were 54 female respondents while 28 male respondents. From the results, most of the respondents were aged 18 to 25.

From the analysis of data, the distribution of respondents by hotel working experience indicates that the majority of the respondents had experience working in hotels between 1 to 5 years.

With reference to the distribution of respondents by educational attainment, the largest segment of the hotel staff held a bachelor's degree, followed by the vocational, Matthayom 6, and a master's degree.

Table 8 Distribution of Respondents by General Background for the Interview Questionnaire

Positions / General Background	Managers/ Supervisors		Receptionists		Cashiers		Operators		Waiters	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Gender										
- Male	3	42.86	2	50.00	-	-	-	-	1	33.33
- Female	4	57.14	2	50.00	4	100.0	3	100.0	2	66.67
Age										
- Less than 17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	50.00
- 18-25	1	14.29	4	100.0	3	75.00	3	100.0	1	50.00
- 26-35	5	71.42	-	-	1	25.00	-	-	-	-
- 36-45	1	14.29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Experience										
- 1-5	6	85.71	4	100.0	4	100.0	3	100.0	3	100.0
- 10 Up	1	14.29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Educational Attainment										
- M	2	28.57	-	-	1	25.00	-	-	-	-
- V	1	14.29	1	25.00	-	-	-	-	3	100.0
- B	3	42.85	3	75.00	3	75.00	3	100.0	-	-
- M.A	1	14.29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	7	100.0	4	100.0	4	100.0	3	100.0	3	100.0

M = Matthayom 6, V = Vocational, B = Bachelor's degree, M.A = Master's degree, F = Frequency

The Interview Questionnaire

A distribution of respondents by gender and age shows that female hotel staff outnumbered males. In this study, there were 15 female and 6 male respondents. From the data obtained, the age of the most hotel staff was between 18 to 25.

With reference to the distribution of respondents by hotel working experience, most of the respondents had experience in hotel work ranging between 1 to 5 years. A detailed distribution of respondents by level of education, the largest segment of the respondents attained their bachelor's degree, followed by the vocational, Matthayom 6, and a master's degree.

The data from the questionnaires and the interview questionnaires will now be considered in relation to the research question listed in Chapter I (p.6). The data are presented in Tables 9-33.

Research Question One

To what extent are the staff of the hotels in Phitsanulok proficient in communicating with their guests in English?

- as perceived by themselves
- as evaluated by the researcher

Part II of the questionnaire, and the interview questionnaire, items 1 to 54, asked the hotel staff to indicate their level of proficiency in communicating with their guests in English.

Their level of proficiency in communicating with their guests in English were rated and a mean score derived from this scale was interpreted in the following ranges.

The Questionnaire

1.1 Criteria for hotel staff's perception of their own level of proficiency in communicating with their guests in English

Use English with very high proficiency	=	5
Use English with high proficiency	=	4
Use English with moderate proficiency	=	3

Use English with low proficiency = 2

Use English with very low proficiency = 1

Mean scores derived from this scale were then defined on the following ranges:

Use English with very high proficiency = 5.00-4.50

Use English with high proficiency = 4.49-3.50

Use English with moderate proficiency = 3.49-2.50

Use English with low proficiency = 2.49-1.50

Use English with very low proficiency = 1.49-1.00

The data obtained were analyzed, tabulated, and the results were presented in Tables 9-11.

Finding One

The Hotel Staff's Perception of their Own Level of Proficiency in Communicating with their Guests in English

The first of the language functions was the main functions for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 9.

Table 9 Mean Ratings of the Hotel Staff's Perception of their Own Level of Proficiency in Communicating with their Guests in English, Most Particularly in the Main Functions

Functions	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.
1. saying you do not know/showing a limitation of knowledge	4.02	0.75
2. asking about remembering	3.78	0.86
3. saying something is correct/incorrect	3.68	0.99
4. saying you are not sure	3.70	0.94
5. saying what you hope will happen	3.93	0.86
6. saying you are looking forward to something	3.82	0.70

Table 9 (continued)

Functions	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.
7. asking how someone feels after something happens	3.87	0.87
8. asking about preference	3.63	0.98
9. giving your opinion	3.78	0.94
10. giving reasons	3.50	0.96
11. offering to do something for someone	3.68	1.05
12. asking for permission	3.80	0.91
13. giving permission	3.67	0.98
14. refusing permission	3.66	0.93
15. saying someone is obliged to do something	3.66	0.96
16. saying someone need not to do something	3.60	0.87
17. telling someone how to do something	3.56	0.93
18. advising someone to do something	3.85	0.92
19. suggesting	3.59	0.96
21. persuading	3.62	0.94
22. saying you are willing to do something	3.68	0.93
23. refusing to do something	3.84	0.99

N = 82

Table 9 showed the hotel staff's perception of their own level of proficiency in communicating with their guests in English. In the first factor, the main functions, the mean level of the hotel staff's perception on their practical use of English indicated that they considered themselves as those who used language with high proficiency in every function; there was no function from the above table that was under 3.50. The function they perceived that they used the best was related to 'saying you do not know/showing a limitation of knowledge (F1)' (mean = 4.02) while the function 'giving reasons (F10)' (mean = 3.50) was the least used.

The second of the language functions was the social formulas for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 10.

Table 10 Mean Ratings of the Hotel Staff's Perception of their Own Level of Proficiency in Communicating with their Guests in English, Most Particularly in the Social Formulas

Functions	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.
24. starting a conversation with a stranger	4.23	0.86
25. introducing someone	3.88	0.84
26. answering an introduction	4.29	0.73
27. attracting someone's attention	3.73	0.97
28. greeting someone	4.26	0.95
29. asking how someone is	3.73	1.07
30. giving someone your general good wishes	3.94	1.02
31. inviting someone	3.83	0.87
32. accepting an invitation	3.79	0.94
33. offering something	3.76	0.90
34. declining an offer of something	3.80	0.87
35. giving something to someone	3.84	0.92
36. thanking	4.04	0.94
37. responding to thanks	4.04	0.95
38. complimenting	3.90	1.05
39. congratulating	3.80	1.04
40. responding to compliments or congratulations	4.10	0.91
41. saying sorry	3.93	1.00
42. accepting an apology	3.98	0.86
43. showing sympathy	3.73	1.03
44. leaving someone politely for a short time	3.82	1.00

Table 10 (continued)

Functions	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.
45. ending a conversation	3.80	0.97
46. saying goodbye	4.09	0.95

N = 82

According to Table 10, the hotel staff perceived that they had proficiency in the 4.49-3.50 mean level. It can be seen that they thought that they used all the functions with high proficiency. The function of 'answering an introduction (F26)' (mean = 4.29) got the highest scale. The functions on 'attracting someone's attention (F27)' (mean = 3.73), 'asking how someone is (F29)' (mean = 3.73), and 'showing sympathy (F43)' (mean = 3.73) were also the ones they considered that they used the least.

The third of the language functions was making communication work for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 11.

Table 11 Mean Ratings of the Hotel Staff's Perception of their Own Level of Proficiency in Communicating with their Guests in English, Most Particularly in Making Communication Work

Functions	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.
47. asking someone to say something again	3.94	0.92
48. checking that you have understood	3.83	0.95
49. saying something again	3.82	1.00
50. saying something in another way	3.73	0.97
51. giving an example	3.85	1.00
52. showing you are listening	3.80	1.05
53. giving yourself time to think	4.00	0.83
54. changing the subject	3.82	0.98

N = 82

Next to the social formulas, making communication work was also presented in this table. The hotel staff perceived that they could use all of the English language functions with high proficiency. From their perception, the function 'giving yourself time to think (F53)' (mean = 4.00) got the highest scale, while the function 'saying something in another way (F50)' got the lowest scale (mean = 3.73).

The Hotel Staff's Level of Proficiency in Communicating with their Guests in English as Evaluated by the Researcher Using the PET Assessment Criteria: Accuracy and Appropriacy of Language and Task Achievement

1.2 Criteria for the evaluation by the researcher based on the PET Assessment Criteria:

1.2.1 Accuracy and Appropriacy of Language:

Generally effective in the use of structure, vocabulary and paraphrase at this level (use English with very high proficiency) = 5

Meaning is conveyed despite noticeable structural inaccuracies, lack of vocabulary and ineffective paraphrase (use English with high proficiency) = 4

Meaning is occasionally obscured by structural inaccuracies and/or limited vocabulary and inability to paraphrase (use English with moderate proficiency = 3

Frequently incomprehensible because of limited vocabulary and numerous structural errors (use English with low proficiency) = 2

Virtually incomprehensible because of insufficient vocabulary and gross errors (use English with very low proficiency) = 1

Mean scores derived from this scale were then defined on the following ranges:

Generally effective in the use of structure, vocabulary and paraphrase at this level (use English with very high proficiency) = 5.00-4.50

Meaning is conveyed despite noticeable structural inaccuracies, lack of vocabulary and ineffective paraphrase (use English with high proficiency) = 4.49-3.50

Meaning is occasionally obscured by structural inaccuracies and/or limited vocabulary and inability to paraphrase (use English with moderate proficiency = 3.49-2.50

Frequently incomprehensible because of limited vocabulary and numerous structural errors (use English with low proficiency) = 2.49-1.50

Virtually incomprehensible because of insufficient vocabulary and gross errors (use English with very low proficiency) = 1.49-1.00

1.2.2 Task Achievement:

Tasks are dealt with fully and effectively (use English with very high proficiency) = 5

Tasks are dealt with adequately (use English with high proficiency) = 4

Limited ability to deal with tasks (use English with moderate proficiency) = 3

Ineffective handling of tasks (use English with low proficiency) = 2

Unable to deal with tasks (use English with very low proficiency) = 1

Mean scores derived from this scale were interpreted as follows:

Tasks are dealt with fully and effectively (use English with very high proficiency) = 5.00-4.50

Tasks are dealt with adequately (use English with high proficiency) = 4.49-4.50

Limited ability to deal with tasks (use English with moderate proficiency) = 3.49-2.50

Ineffective handling of tasks (use English with low proficiency) = 2.49-1.50

Unable to deal with tasks (use English with very low proficiency) = 1.49-1.00

The mean scores of the hotel staff's level of proficiency in communicating with their guests in English was calculated and the results were presented in Tables 12-14.

The first of the language functions was the main functions for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 12.

Table 12 Assessment of the Hotel Staff's Level of Proficiency in Communicating with their Guests in English, Most Particularly in the Main Functions Found in the Questionnaire

Functions	Accuracy and Appropriacy of Language		Task Achievement	
	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.
F1	4.23	0.91	4.22	0.92
F2	3.46	0.86	4.20	0.95
F3	3.72	0.81	4.21	0.93
F4	3.76	0.79	4.02	0.75
F5	3.88	0.73	4.38	0.60
F6	3.85	0.67	4.45	0.65
F7	4.07	0.83	4.16	0.62
F8	3.94	0.65	4.21	0.66
F9	3.56	0.89	4.05	0.90
F10	3.13	0.64	3.96	0.94
F11	3.16	1.06	3.95	1.38
F12	3.23	0.48	3.91	0.63
F13	3.46	0.91	4.06	1.15
F14	3.28	0.61	3.78	0.59
F15	3.41	0.96	3.78	1.07
F16	3.56	0.57	4.32	0.91
F17	3.63	0.73	4.38	1.00
F18	3.48	0.53	3.73	0.57
F19	3.16	0.78	3.32	0.87
F20	3.40	0.58	3.95	0.70

Table 12 (continued)

Functions	Accuracy and Appropriacy of Language		Task Achievement	
	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.
F21	3.70	0.46	3.98	0.16
F22	2.85	0.69	3.13	0.84
F23	4.17	0.72	4.56	0.67

N = 82

As illustrated by Table 12, for accuracy and appropriacy of language, the hotel staff were able to convey the intended meaning despite noticeable structural inaccuracies, lack of vocabulary and ineffective paraphrase in twelve functions. Those functions were: 'saying you do not know/showing a limitation of knowledge (F1)' (mean = 4.23), 'refusing to do something (F23)' (mean = 4.17), 'asking how someone feels after something happen (F7)' (mean = 4.07), 'asking about preference (F8)' (mean = 3.94), 'saying what you hope will happen (F5)' (mean = 3.88), 'saying you are looking forward to something (F6)' (mean = 3.85), 'saying you are not sure (F4)' (mean = 3.76), 'saying something is correct/not correct (F3)' (mean = 3.72), 'persuading (F21)' (mean = 3.70), 'telling someone how to do something (F17)' (mean = 3.63), 'giving your opinion (F9)' (mean = 3.56), and 'saying someone need not to do something (F16)' (mean = 3.56).

Moreover, they occasionally obscured their meaning through structural inaccuracies and/or limited vocabulary and inability to paraphrase in the functions of 'advising someone to do something (F18)' (mean = 3.48), 'asking about remembering (F2)' (mean = 3.46), 'giving permission (F13)' (mean = 3.46), 'saying someone is obliged to do something (F15)' (mean = 3.41), 'requesting (F20)' (mean = 3.40), 'refusing permission (F14)' (mean = 3.28), 'asking for permission (F12)' (mean = 3.23), 'offering to do something for someone (F11)' (mean = 3.16), 'suggesting (F19)' (mean = 3.16), 'giving reasons (F10)' (mean = 3.13), and 'saying you are willing to do something (F22)' (mean = 2.85).

For task achievement, in the main functions, their tasks were dealt with fully and effectively in the function of 'refusing to do something (F23)' (mean = 4.56). Their tasks were dealt with adequately in twenty functions. These functions were: 'saying you are looking forward to something (F6)' (mean = 4.45), 'saying what you hope will happen (F5)' (mean = 4.38), 'telling someone how to do something (F17)' (mean = 4.38), 'saying someone need not to do something (F16)' (mean 4.32), 'saying you do not know/showing a limitation of knowledge (F1)' (mean = 4.22), 'saying something is correct/not correct (F3)' (mean = 4.21), 'asking about preference (F8)' (mean = 4.21), 'asking about remembering (F2)' (mean = 4.20), 'asking how someone feels after something happens (F7)' (mean = 4.16), 'giving permission (F13)' (mean = 4.06), 'giving your opinions (F9)' (mean = 4.05), 'saying you are not sure (F4)' (mean = 4.02), 'persuading (F21)' (mean = 3.98), 'giving reasons (F10)' (mean = 3.96), 'offering to do something for someone (F11)' (mean = 3.95), 'requesting (F20)' (mean = 3.95), 'asking for permission (F12)' (mean = 3.91), 'refusing permission (F14)' (mean = 3.78), 'saying someone is obliged to do something (F15)' (mean = 3.78), and 'advising someone to do something (F18)' (mean = 3.73). In the functions of 'suggesting (F19)' (mean = 3.32), and 'saying you are willing to do something (F22)' (mean = 3.13), they had limited ability to deal with such tasks.

The second of the language functions was the social formulas for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 13.

Table 13 Assessment of the Hotel Staff's Level of Proficiency in Communicating with their Guests in English, Most Particularly in the Social Formulas Found in the Questionnaire

Functions	Accuracy and Appropriacy of Language		Task Achievement	
	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.
F24	4.49	0.55	4.93	0.26

Table 13 (continued)

Functions	Accuracy and Appropriacy of Language		Task Achievement	
	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.
F25	3.98	0.80	4.62	0.56
F26	4.89	0.31	4.89	0.31
F27	3.07	0.72	3.34	0.80
F28	4.72	0.50	5.00	0.00
F29	3.80	1.44	4.09	1.53
F30	4.67	0.52	4.95	0.22
F31	3.20	0.58	3.70	0.56
F32	3.66	0.50	4.32	0.49
F33	3.13	1.05	3.83	1.41
F34	4.50	0.59	4.46	0.63
F35	3.67	0.47	4.35	0.67
F36	4.59	0.54	4.91	0.28
F37	4.45	0.80	4.76	0.75
F38	3.80	1.02	4.16	1.09
F39	3.66	0.80	4.12	0.53
F40	3.88	0.67	4.49	0.77
F41	3.80	0.48	4.76	0.43
F42	4.46	0.72	4.77	0.42
F43	3.39	0.64	3.72	0.91
F44	3.16	0.53	3.65	0.57
F45	3.15	0.74	3.50	0.67
F46	4.85	0.36	5.00	0.00

N = 82

Table 13 showed that, in the social formulas, the hotel staff used English with very high proficiency. The grammatical structures, vocabulary and paraphrase used were very good, most particularly in the functions of 'answering an introduction

(F26)' (mean = 4.89), 'saying goodbye (F46)' (mean = 4.85), 'greeting someone (F28)' (mean = 4.72), 'giving someone your general good wishes (F30)' (mean = 4.67), and 'thanking (F36)' (mean = 4.59), 'declining an offer of something (F34)' (mean = 4.50).

The functions such as: 'starting a conversation with a stranger (F24)' (mean = 4.49), 'accepting an apology (F42)' (mean = 4.46), 'responding to thanks (F37)' (mean = 4.45), 'introducing someone (F25)' (mean = 3.98), 'responding to compliments or congratulations (F40)' (mean = 3.88), 'asking how someone is (F29)' (mean = 3.80), 'complimenting (F38)' (mean = 3.80), 'saying sorry (F41)' (mean = 3.80), 'giving something to someone (F35)' (mean = 3.67), 'accepting an invitation (F32)' (mean = 3.66), 'congratulating (F39)' (mean = 3.66) showed the staff could still convey meaning despite noticeable structural inaccuracies, lack of vocabulary and ineffective paraphrase in eleven functions. Moreover, they occasionally obscured meaning by structural inaccuracies and/or limited vocabulary and inability to paraphrase in the functions of 'showing sympathy (F43)' (mean = 3.39), 'inviting someone (F31)' (mean = 3.20), 'leaving someone politely for a short time (F44)' (mean = 3.16), 'ending a conversation (F45)' (mean = 3.15), 'offering something (F33)' (mean = 3.13), and 'attracting someone's attention (F27)' (mean = 3.07).

For task achievement, in the social formulas, they were able to deal with their tasks fully and effectively in the function of 'greeting someone (F28)' (mean = 5.00), 'saying goodbye (F46)' (mean = 5.00), 'giving someone your general good wishes (F30)' (mean = 4.95), 'starting a conversation with a stranger (F24)' (mean = 4.93), 'thanking (F36)' (mean = 4.91), 'answering an introduction (F26)' (mean = 4.89), 'accepting an apology (F42)' (mean = 4.77), 'responding to thanks (F37)' (mean = 4.76), 'saying sorry (F41)' (mean = 3.76), and 'introducing someone (F25)' (mean = 4.62).

In the functions of 'responding to compliments or congratulations (F40)' (mean = 4.49), 'declining an offer of something (F34)' (mean = 4.46), 'giving something to someone (F35)' (mean = 4.35), 'accepting an invitation (F32)' (mean = 4.32), 'complimenting (F38)' (mean = 4.16), 'congratulating (F39)'

(mean = 4.12), 'asking how someone is (F29)' (mean = 4.09), 'offering something (F33)' (mean = 3.83), 'showing sympathy (F43)' (mean = 3.72), 'inviting someone (F31)' (mean = 3.70), 'leaving someone politely for a short time (F44)' (mean = 3.65), 'ending a conversation (F45)' (mean = 3.50), it was indicated that they could deal with such tasks adequately. In the function of 'attracting someone's attention (F27)' (mean = 3.34), they had limited ability to deal with these tasks.

The third of the language functions was making communication work for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 14.

Table 14 Assessment of the Hotel Staff's Level of Proficiency in Communicating with their Guests in English, Most Particularly in Making Communication Work Found in the Questionnaire

Functions	Accuracy and Appropriacy of Language		Task Achievement	
	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.
F47	3.82	0.72	4.38	0.62
F48	3.41	0.54	4.05	0.68
F49	3.30	0.76	3.80	1.07
F50	3.29	0.48	3.48	0.50
F51	3.71	0.62	4.54	0.65
F52	3.17	0.97	3.59	1.14
F53	3.68	0.63	4.28	0.67
F54	3.54	0.69	4.24	0.94

N = 82

Table 14 showed that, in making communication work, they were able to convey the intended meaning despite noticeable structural inaccuracies, lack of vocabulary and ineffective paraphrase in four functions. Those functions were: 'asking someone to say something again (F47)' (mean = 3.82), 'giving an example (F51)' (mean = 3.71), 'giving yourself time to think (F53)' (mean = 3.68), and 'changing the subject (F54)' (mean = 3.54). Moreover, they occasionally obscured

their intended meaning through their structural inaccuracies and/or limited vocabulary and inability to paraphrase in the functions of 'checking that you have understood (F48)' (mean = 3.41), 'saying something again (F49)' (mean = 3.30), 'saying something in another way (F50)' (mean = 3.29), and 'showing you are listening (F52)' (mean = 3.17).

For task achievement, in making communication work, their tasks were dealt with fully and effectively in the function of 'giving an example (F51)' (mean = 4.54). In the functions of 'asking someone to say something again (F47)' (mean = 4.38), 'giving yourself time to think (F53)' (mean = 4.28), and 'changing the subject (F54)' (mean = 4.24), 'checking that you have understood (F48)' (mean = 4.05), 'saying something again (F49)' (mean = 3.80), and 'showing you are listening (F52)' (mean = 3.59), the hotel staff dealt with their tasks adequately. And the only one function that the hotel staff had limited ability to deal with their task was the function of 'saying something in another way (F50)' (mean = 3.48).

The Interview Questionnaire

The Hotel Staff's Level of Proficiency in Communicating with their Guests in English as Evaluated by the Researcher Using the PET Assessment Criteria: Fluency, Accuracy and Appropriacy of Language, Pronunciation, and Task Achievement

1.3 Criteria for the evaluation by the researcher based on the PET Assessment Criteria:

1.3.1 Fluency

Able to sustain flow of language appropriate to the tasks with occasional hesitation to search for language (use English with very high proficiency)	=	5

Noticeable hesitations such as to strain the listener or impede communication (use English with high proficiency) = 4

Hesitation often demands patience of the listener (use English with moderate proficiency) = 3

Speech is very disconnected and difficult to follow (use English with low proficiency) = 2

No connected speech (use English with very low proficiency) = 1

Mean scores derived from this scale were then defined on the following ranges:

Able to sustain flow of language appropriate to the tasks with occasional hesitation to search for language (use English with very high proficiency) = 5.00-4.50

Noticeable hesitations such as to strain the listener or impede communication (use English with high proficiency) = 4.49-3.50

Hesitation often demands patience of the listener (use English with moderate proficiency) = 3.49-2.50

Speech is very disconnected and difficult to follow (use English with low proficiency) = 2.49-1.50

No connected speech (use English with very low proficiency) = 1.49-1.00

1.3.2 Accuracy and Appropriacy of Language:

Generally effective in the use of structure, vocabulary and paraphrase at this level (use English with very high proficiency) = 5

Meaning is conveyed despite noticeable structural inaccuracies, lack of vocabulary and ineffective paraphrase (use English with high proficiency) = 4

Meaning is occasionally obscured by structural inaccuracies and/or limited vocabulary and inability to paraphrase (use English with moderate proficiency = 3

Frequently incomprehensible because of limited vocabulary and numerous structural errors (use English with low proficiency) = 2

Virtually incomprehensible because of insufficient vocabulary and gross errors (use English with very low proficiency) = 1

Mean scores derived from this scale were then defined on the following ranges:

Generally effective in the use of structure, vocabulary and paraphrase at this level (use English with very high proficiency)	=	5.00-4.50
Meaning is conveyed despite noticeable structural inaccuracies, lack of vocabulary and ineffective paraphrase (use English with high proficiency)	=	4.49-3.50
Meaning is occasionally obscured by structural inaccuracies and/or limited vocabulary and inability to paraphrase (use English with moderate proficiency	=	3.49-2.50
Frequently incomprehensible because of limited vocabulary and numerous structural errors (use English with low proficiency)	=	2.49-1.50
Virtually incomprehensible because of insufficient vocabulary and gross errors (use English with very low proficiency)	=	1.49-1.00

1.3.3 Pronunciation

Generally easy to understand despite L1 accent (use English with very high proficiency)	=	5

L1 interference occasionally causes difficulty in understanding (use English with high proficiency) = 4

L1 interference frequently causes difficulty in understanding (use English with moderate proficiency) = 3

Frequently impossible to understand (use English with low proficiency) = 2

Virtually unintelligible (use English with very low proficiency) = 1

Mean scores derived from this scale were then defined on the following ranges:

Generally easy to understand despite L1 accent (use English with very high proficiency) = 5.00-4.50

L1 interference occasionally causes difficulty in understanding (use English with high proficiency) = 4.49-3.50

L1 interference frequently causes difficulty in understanding (use English with moderate proficiency) = 3.49-2.50

Frequently impossible to understand (use English with low proficiency) = 2.49-1.50

Virtually unintelligible (use English with very low proficiency) = 1.49-1.00

1.3.4 Task Achievement:

Tasks are dealt with fully and effectively (use English with very high proficiency) = 5

Tasks are dealt with adequately (use English with high proficiency) = 4

Limited ability to deal with tasks (use English with moderate proficiency) = 3

Ineffective handling of tasks (use English with low proficiency) = 2

Unable to deal with tasks (use English with very low proficiency) = 1

Mean scores derived from this scale were then defined on the following ranges:

Tasks are dealt with fully and effectively (use English with very high proficiency) = 5.00-4.50

Tasks are dealt with adequately (use English with high proficiency) = 4.49-4.50

Limited ability to deal with tasks (use English with moderate proficiency) = 3.49-2.50

Ineffective handling of tasks (use English with low proficiency) = 2.49-1.50

Unable to deal with tasks (use English with very low proficiency) = 1.49-1.00

Their level of proficiency in communicating with their guests in English was calculated and the results were presented in Tables 15-17.

The first of the language functions was the main functions for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 15.

Table 15 Assessment of the Hotel Staff's Level of Proficiency in Communicating with their Guests in English, Most Particularly in the Main Functions Found in the Interview Questionnaire

Function	Fluency		Accuracy and Appropriacy of Language		Pronunciation		Task Achievement	
	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.
F1	3.05	1.20	3.00	1.14	3.05	1.07	3.05	1.16
F2	2.90	0.94	2.81	0.68	2.95	0.74	3.00	1.00
F3	3.19	0.93	2.81	0.81	3.14	0.79	2.95	0.97
F4	3.38	1.07	3.14	1.11	3.10	1.09	3.48	1.25
F5	3.57	1.25	3.52	1.36	3.57	1.08	4.14	1.24
F6	3.52	1.08	3.05	0.86	3.14	1.11	3.71	1.35
F7	3.10	1.14	2.90	1.00	3.19	1.17	3.38	1.40
F8	3.57	1.21	3.57	1.12	3.38	0.80	3.86	0.96
F9	3.33	1.02	3.33	1.02	3.19	0.75	3.76	0.70
F10	3.19	0.87	3.05	0.74	3.43	0.60	3.67	1.06
F11	3.76	1.26	3.86	1.28	3.76	1.09	4.33	0.91
F12	3.57	1.12	3.33	1.20	3.48	0.93	3.67	1.32
F13	3.38	0.86	3.33	0.97	3.52	0.68	3.67	0.80
F14	3.24	1.00	3.10	1.18	3.33	0.91	3.52	1.08
F15	3.19	1.08	3.33	1.02	3.19	0.87	2.90	0.89
F16	3.62	0.97	3.48	1.12	3.67	0.91	3.71	0.78
F17	3.52	0.93	3.38	0.97	3.57	0.87	3.57	1.03
F18	4.00	1.26	3.43	1.03	3.95	0.74	4.05	0.86
F19	3.57	1.12	3.76	1.26	3.62	0.97	3.86	1.31
F20	3.33	1.06	3.43	1.25	3.57	1.03	3.67	1.02
F21	3.33	0.97	3.52	1.12	3.38	0.67	3.62	1.07
F22	3.67	1.02	3.52	1.08	3.67	0.91	3.86	0.91
F23	3.90	1.22	3.52	1.25	3.52	1.17	4.05	0.97

N = 21

As can be seen from Table 15, for fluency in the main functions, the hotel staff noticeably hesitated such as to strain the listener or impede communication in the eleven functions. Those functions were: 'advising someone to do something (F18)' (mean = 4.00), 'refusing to do something (F23)' (mean = 3.90), 'offering to do something for someone (F11)' (mean = 3.76), 'saying you are willing to do something (F22)' (mean = 3.67), 'saying someone need not to do something (F16)' (mean = 3.62), 'saying what you hope will happen (F5)' (mean = 3.57), 'asking about preference (F8)' (mean = 3.57), 'asking for permission (F12)' (mean =3.57), 'suggesting (F19)' (mean = 3.57), 'saying you are looking forward to something (F6)' (mean = 3.52), and 'telling someone how to do something (F17)' (mean = 3.52).

In addition, they often showed hesitation in the functions of 'saying you are not sure (F4)' (mean = 3.38), 'giving permission (F13)' (mean = 3.38), 'giving your opinion (F9)' (mean = 3.33), 'requesting (F20)' (mean = 3.33), 'persuading (F21)' (mean = 3.33), 'refusing permission (F14)' (mean = 3.24), 'saying something is correct/not correct (F3)' (mean = 3.19), 'giving reasons (F10)' (mean = 3.19), 'saying someone is obliged to do something (F15)' (mean = 3.19), 'asking how someone feels after something happens (F7)' (mean = 3.10), 'saying you do not know/showing a limitation of knowledge (F1)' (mean = 3.05), and 'asking about remembering (F2)' (mean = 2.90).

For accuracy and appropriacy of language in the main functions, they were able to convey the intended meaning despite noticeable structural inaccuracies, lack of vocabulary and ineffective paraphrase in the functions of 'offering to do something for someone (F11)' (mean = 3.86), 'suggesting (F19)' (mean = 3.76), 'asking about preference (F8)' (mean = 3.57), 'saying what you hope will happen (F5)' (mean = 3.52), 'persuading (F21)' (mean = 3.52), 'saying you are willing to do something (F22)' (mean = 3.52), and 'refusing to do something (F23)' (mean = 3.52).

In the functions of 'saying someone need not to do something (F16)' (mean = 3.48), 'advising someone to do something (F18)' (mean = 3.43), 'requesting (F20)' (mean = 3.43), 'telling someone how to do something (F17)' (mean = 3.38), 'giving your opinion (F9)' (mean = 3.33), 'asking for permission (F12)' (mean =3.33), 'giving permission (F13)' (mean = 3.33), 'saying someone is obliged to do something (F15)' (mean = 3.33), 'saying you are not sure (F4)' (mean = 3.14),

'refusing permission (F14)' (mean = 3.10), 'saying you are looking forward to something (F6)' (mean = 3.05), 'giving reasons (F10)' (mean = 3.05), 'saying you do not know/showing a limitation of knowledge (F1)' (mean = 3.00), 'asking how someone feels after something happens (F7)' (mean = 2.90), 'asking about remembering (F2)' (mean = 2.81), and 'saying something is correct/not correct (F3)' (mean = 2.81), they occasionally obscured their intended meaning through their structural inaccuracies and/or limited vocabulary and inability to paraphrase.

With reference to the pronunciation in the main functions, L1 interference occasionally caused difficulty in understanding in the functions of 'advising someone to do something (F18)' (mean = 3.95), 'offering to do something for someone (F11)' (mean = 3.76), 'saying someone need not to do something (F16)' (mean = 3.67), 'saying you are willing to do something (F22)' (mean = 3.67), 'suggesting (F19)' (mean = 3.62), 'saying what you hope will happen (F5)' (mean = 3.57), 'telling someone how to do something (F17)' (mean = 3.57), 'requesting (F20)' (mean = 3.57), 'giving permission (F13)' (mean = 3.52), and 'refusing to do something (F23)' (mean = 3.52).

Moreover, L1 interference frequently caused difficulty in understanding in the functions of 'asking for permission (F12)' (mean =3.48), 'giving reasons (F10)' (mean = 3.43), 'asking about preference (F8)' (mean = 3.38), 'persuading (F21)' (mean = 3.38), 'refusing permission (F14)' (mean = 3.33), 'asking how someone feels after something happens (F7) (mean = 3.19), 'giving your opinion (F9)' (mean = 3.19), 'saying someone is obliged to do something (F15)' (mean = 3.19), 'saying something is correct/not correct (F3)' (mean = 3.14), 'saying you are looking forward to something (F6)' (mean = 3.14), 'saying you are not sure (F4)' (mean = 3.10), 'saying you do not know/showing a limitation of knowledge (F1)' (mean = 3.05), and 'asking about remembering (F2)' (mean = 2.95).

With regard to the task achievement in the main functions, their tasks were dealt with adequately in the functions of 'offering to do something for someone (F11)' (mean = 4.33), 'saying what you hope will happen (F5)' (mean = 4.14), 'advising someone to do something (F18)' (mean = 4.05), 'refusing to do something (F23)' (mean = 4.05), 'asking about preference (F8)' (mean = 3.86), 'suggesting (F19)' (mean = 3.86), 'saying you are willing to do something (F22)' (mean = 3.86),

'giving your opinion (F9)' (mean = 3.76), 'saying you are looking forward to something (F6)' (mean = 3.71), 'saying someone need not to do something (F16)' (mean = 3.71), 'giving reasons (F10)' (mean = 3.67), 'asking for permission (F12)' (mean =3.67), 'giving permission (F13)' (mean = 3.67), 'requesting (F20)' (mean = 3.67), 'persuading (F21)' (mean = 3.62), 'telling someone how to do something (F17)' (mean = 3.57), and 'refusing permission (F14)' (mean = 3.52).

The functions which were related to 'saying you are not sure (F4)' (mean = 3.48), 'asking how someone feels after something happens (F7) (mean = 3.38), 'saying you do not know/showing a limitation of knowledge (F1)' (mean = 3.05), 'asking about remembering (F2)' (mean = 3.00), 'saying something is correct/not correct (F3)' (mean = 2.95), and 'saying someone is obliged to do something (F15)' (mean = 2.90), they had limited ability to deal with such tasks.

The second of the language functions was the social formulas for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 16.

Table 16 Assessment of the Hotel Staff's Level of Proficiency in Communicating with their Guests in English, Most Particularly in the Social Formulas Found in the Interview Questionnaire

Function	Fluency		Accuracy and Appropriacy of Language		Pronunciation		Task Achievement	
	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.
F24	4.33	1.28	4.29	1.19	4.62	0.92	4.67	0.80
F25	3.95	1.16	4.05	1.20	4.14	1.01	4.52	0.93
F26	4.43	1.21	4.29	1.19	4.71	0.72	4.57	0.98
F27	3.71	1.10	3.81	1.03	3.90	0.83	4.33	0.91
F28	4.43	1.21	4.33	1.20	4.67	0.80	4.76	0.77
F29	3.57	0.98	3.62	1.07	3.81	0.75	4.19	0.81
F30	4.29	1.23	4.19	1.29	4.43	0.81	4.57	0.93
F31	3.57	0.87	3.57	0.98	3.81	0.68	4.14	1.20

Table 16 (continued)

Function	Fluency		Accuracy and Appropriacy of Language		Pronunciation		Task Achievement	
	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.
F32	3.81	1.08	3.76	1.09	4.00	0.89	4.33	0.80
F33	3.76	1.14	3.57	1.12	3.90	0.77	4.14	0.79
F34	3.67	1.15	3.81	1.17	3.67	0.86	4.14	1.42
F35	3.29	1.19	3.00	1.10	3.19	0.98	3.90	1.22
F36	4.24	1.18	4.29	1.23	4.48	0.87	4.43	0.98
F37	4.19	1.25	4.19	1.25	4.57	0.75	4.43	0.93
F38	3.81	1.12	3.86	1.01	3.76	0.70	4.38	0.92
F39	3.90	1.18	3.43	0.93	3.67	0.66	4.14	0.96
F40	3.67	1.15	3.52	1.08	3.71	0.72	3.86	0.91
F41	4.05	1.16	3.62	1.02	4.10	0.83	4.38	0.80
F42	4.29	1.27	4.24	1.26	4.38	0.92	4.57	0.87
F43	4.19	1.17	4.05	1.12	4.29	0.78	4.48	0.98
F44	3.86	1.24	3.43	0.98	3.67	0.80	4.05	0.86
F45	3.90	1.18	3.76	1.22	3.81	0.81	4.33	0.86
F46	3.90	1.58	3.76	1.55	4.14	1.35	4.10	1.37

N = 21

As illustrated by Table 16, for fluency in the social formulas, the hotel staff noticeably hesitated such as to strain the listener or impede communication in twenty-two functions. Those functions were: 'answering an introduction (F26)' (mean = 4.43), 'greeting someone (F28)' (mean = 4.43), 'starting a conversation with a stranger (F24)' (mean = 4.33), 'giving someone your general good wishes (F30)' (mean = 4.29), 'accepting an apology (F42)' (mean = 4.29), 'thanking (F36)' (mean = 4.24), 'responding to thanks (F37)' (mean = 4.19), 'showing sympathy (F43)' (mean = 4.19), 'saying sorry (F41)' (mean = 4.05), 'introducing someone (F25)' (mean = 3.95), 'congratulating (F39)' (mean = 3.90), 'ending a conversation

(F45)' (mean = 3.90), 'saying goodbye (F46)' (mean = 3.90), 'leaving someone politely for a short time (F44)' (mean = 3.86), ' accepting an invitation (F32)' (mean = 3.81), 'complimenting (F38)' (mean = 3.81), 'offering something (F33)' (mean = 3.76), 'attracting someone's attention (F27)' (mean = 3.71), ' declining an offer of something (F34)' (mean = 3.67), 'responding to compliments or congratulations (F40)' (mean = 3.67), 'asking how someone is (F29)' (mean = 3.57), and 'inviting someone (F31)' (mean = 3.57).

Furthermore, they often showed hesitation in the function of 'giving something to someone (F35)' (mean = 3.29).

With reference to the accuracy and appropriacy of language, they occasionally obscured their intended meaning through their structural inaccuracies and/or limited vocabulary and inability to paraphrase in all of the functions except for three functions. And the three functions were related to the functions of 'congratulating (F39)' (mean = 3.43), 'leaving someone politely for a short time (F44)' (mean = 3.43), and 'giving something to someone (F35)' (mean = 3.00). They occasionally obscured their meaning through their structural inaccuracies and/or limited vocabulary and inability to paraphrase in these functions.

For pronunciation in the social formulas, their pronunciations were generally easy to understand despite L1 accent in the four functions. These functions were related to 'answering an introduction (F26)' (mean = 4.71), 'greeting someone (F28)' (mean = 4.67), 'starting a conversation with a stranger (F24)' (mean = 4.62), and 'responding to thanks (F37)' (mean = 4.57).

Moreover, L1 interference occasionally caused difficulty in understanding in the functions of 'thanking (F36)' (mean = 4.48), 'giving someone your general good wishes (F30)' (mean = 4.43), 'accepting an apology (F42)' (mean = 4.38), 'showing sympathy (F43)' (mean = 4.29), 'introducing someone (F25)' (mean = 4.14), 'saying goodbye (F46)' (mean = 4.14), 'saying sorry (F41)' (mean = 4.10), 'accepting an invitation (F32)' (mean = 4.00), 'attracting someone's attention (F27)' (mean = 3.90), 'offering something (F33)' (mean = 3.90), 'asking how someone is (F29)' (mean = 3.81), 'inviting someone (F31)' (mean = 3.81), 'ending a conversation (F45)' (mean = 3.81), 'complimenting (F38)' (mean = 3.76), 'responding to compliments or congratulations (F40)' (mean = 3.71), 'declining an offer of

something (F34)' (mean = 3.67), 'congratulating (F39)' (mean = 3.67), and 'leaving someone politely for a short time (F44)' (mean = 3.67).

For the function of 'giving something to someone (F35)' (mean = 3.19), L1 interference frequently caused difficulty in understanding.

For task achievement, in the social formulas, their tasks were dealt with fully and effectively in the functions of 'greeting someone (F28)' (mean = 4.76), 'starting a conversation with a stranger (F24)' (mean = 4.67), 'answering an introduction (F26)' (mean = 4.57), 'giving someone your general good wishes (F30)' (mean = 4.57), and 'accepting an apology (F42)' (mean = 4.57), and 'introducing someone (F25)' (mean = 4.52).

In the functions of 'showing sympathy (F43)' (mean = 4.48), 'thanking (F36)' (mean = 4.43), 'responding to thanks (F37)' (mean = 4.43), 'complimenting (F38)' (mean = 4.38), 'saying sorry (F41)' (mean 4.38), 'attracting someone's attention (F27)' (mean = 4.33), 'accepting an invitation (F32)' (mean = 4.33), 'ending a conversation (F45)' (mean = 4.33), 'asking how someone is (F29)' (mean = 4.19), 'inviting someone (F31)' (mean = 4.14), 'offering something (F33)' (mean = 4.14), 'declining an offer of something (F34)' (mean = 4.14), 'congratulating (F39)' (mean = 4.14), 'saying goodbye (F46)' (mean = 4.10), 'leaving someone politely for a short time (F44)' (mean = 4.05), 'giving something to someone (F35)' (mean = 3.90), and 'responding to compliments or congratulations (F40)' (mean = 3.86), their tasks were dealt with adequately.

The third of the language functions was making communication work for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 17.

Table 17 Assessment of the Hotel Staff's Level of Proficiency in Communicating with their Guests in English Most Particularly in Making Communication Work Found in the Interview Questionnaire

Function	Fluency		Accuracy and Appropriacy of Language		Pronunciation		Task Achievement	
	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.	$\bar{\chi}$	S.D.
F47	3.71	1.06	3.62	0.92	3.86	0.73	4.10	0.83
F48	3.52	0.87	3.71	1.06	3.81	0.68	4.10	0.83
F49	2.81	1.25	2.48	0.98	2.95	1.12	3.10	1.22
F50	3.10	1.26	3.05	1.07	3.48	1.03	3.67	0.97
F51	4.10	1.37	4.19	1.25	4.29	0.96	4.52	0.87
F52	3.14	1.49	2.81	1.33	3.52	1.36	3.24	1.37
F53	3.86	1.35	3.90	1.18	4.10	1.14	4.14	1.06
F54	3.62	1.47	3.52	1.44	3.76	1.22	4.00	1.38

N = 21

Table 17 showed that, for fluency in making communication work, the hotel staff noticeably hesitated such as to strain the listener or impede communication in the functions of 'giving an example (F51)' (mean = 4.10), 'giving yourself time to think (F53)' (mean = 3.86), 'asking someone to say something again (F47)' (mean = 3.71), 'changing the subject (F54)' (mean = 3.62), and 'checking that you have understood (F48)' (mean = 3.52). In the functions of 'showing you are listening (F52)' (mean = 3.14), 'saying something in another way (F50)' (mean = 3.10), and 'saying something again (F49)' (mean = 2.81), they often showed hesitations.

For accuracy and appropriacy of language in making communication work, the functions such as: 'giving an example (F51)' (mean = 4.19), 'giving yourself time to think (F53)' (mean = 3.90), 'checking that you have understood (F48)' (mean = 3.71), 'asking someone to say something again (F47)' (mean = 3.62), and 'changing the subject (F54)' (mean = 3.52), showed the staff could still convey meaning despite noticeable structural inaccuracies, lack of vocabulary and ineffective paraphrase in these functions.

In the functions of 'saying something in another way (F50)' (mean = 3.05), 'showing you are listening (F52)' (mean = 2.81), and 'saying something again (F49)' (mean = 2.81), they occasionally obscured by structural inaccuracies and/or limited vocabulary and inability to paraphrase.

For pronunciation, in making communication work, L1 interference occasionally caused difficulty in understanding in the functions of 'giving an example (F51)', (mean = 4.29), 'giving yourself time to think (F53)' (mean = 4.10), 'asking someone to say something again (F47)' (mean = 3.86), 'checking that you have understood (F48)' (mean = 3.81), 'changing the subject (F54)' (mean = 3.76), and 'showing you are listening (F52)' (mean = 3.52).

There were two functions 'saying something in another way (F50)' (mean = 3.48), and 'saying something again (F49)' (mean = 2.95), which L1 interference frequently caused difficulty in understanding.

With regard to task achievement, in making communication work, they were able to deal with their task fully and effectively in only one function 'giving an example (F51)' (mean = 4.52). In the functions of 'giving yourself time to think (F53)' (mean = 4.14), 'asking someone to say something again (F47)' (mean = 4.10), 'checking that you have understood (F48)' (mean = 4.10), 'changing the subject (F54)' (mean = 4.00), and 'saying something in another way (F50)' (mean = 3.67), it was indicated that they could deal with such tasks adequately. In the functions of 'showing you are listening (F52)' (mean = 3.24), and 'saying something again (F49)' (mean = 3.10), they had limited ability to deal with these tasks.

Research Question Two

What level of English language do most of the hotel staff use to communicate with their guests?

Items 1 to 54 were designed to extract information on the hotel staff's level type of English language used in communicating with their guests. As mentioned earlier, Blundell, Higgens, and Middlemiss (1982) suggested that there were two levels of English language use, namely: formal and neutral levels. This part of the study sought to determine whether the staff in Phitsanulok hotels used the formal

level type of English or the neutral one. All answers from the questionnaire and the interview questionnaire were used to calculate the level type of English language used. The frequency and percentage were used to provide the answers to this research question.

The information obtained was used to identify the level type of English language. The results of the analysis were presented in Tables 18-25.

The Questionnaire

The frequency and percentage were used to answer this research question. As illustrated in Tables 18-25, it was interesting to note that the majority of the hotel staff used the neutral level of English language to communicate with their guests.

An analysis of the two English language levels in each function could be seen in Tables 18-25 and the responses to the second research question could be summarized as follows:

Finding Two

English Language Level of the Hotel Staff Used in Communicating with their Guests

The Questionnaire

The first of the language functions was the main functions for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 18.

Table 18 Frequency Distribution and Percentage of the Two Levels of English Language Use in the Main Functions Found in the Questionnaire

Function	Formal language		Neutral language	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
F1	7	8.5	75	91.5
F2	2	2.4	80	97.6

Table 18 (continued)

Function	Formal language		Neutral language	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
F3	5	6.1	77	93.9
F4	5	6.1	77	93.9
F5	1	1.2	81	98.8
F6	4	4.9	78	95.1
F7	-	-	82	100.0
F8	5	6.1	77	93.9
F9	16	19.5	66	80.5
F10	8	9.8	74	90.2
F11	22	26.8	60	73.2
F12	14	17.1	68	82.9
F13	9	11.0	73	89.0
F14	5	6.1	77	93.9
F15	3	3.7	79	96.3
F16	3	3.7	79	96.3
F17	1	1.2	81	98.8
F18	10	12.2	72	87.8
F19	15	18.3	67	81.7
F20	6	7.3	76	92.7
F21	10	12.2	72	87.8
F22	8	9.8	74	90.2
F23	4	4.9	78	95.1
Overall	163	8.65	1,723	91.35

N = 82

Table 18 showed the two English language levels: formal, and neutral---used by the hotel staff to express the main functions. It could be seen that the hotel staff preferred to use the neutral English language. The highest percentage was for the functions of 'asking how someone feels after something happens (F7)' at 100 percent. Moreover, there were fifteen functions for which they used the neutral language more

frequently. These functions were: 'saying what you hope will happen (F5)', 'telling someone how to do something (F17)' at 98.8 percent, 'asking about remembering (F2)' at 97.6 percent, 'saying someone is obliged to do something (F15)', 'saying someone need not to do something (F16)' at 96.3 percent, 'saying you are looking forward to something (F6)', 'refusing to do something (F23)' at 95.1 percent, 'saying something is correct/not correct (F3)', 'saying you are not sure (F4)', 'asking about preference (F8)', 'refusing permission (F14)' at 93.9 percent, 'requesting (F20)' at 92.7 percent, 'saying you do not know/showing a limitation of knowledge (F1)' at 91.5 percent, 'giving reasons (F10)', and 'saying you are willing to do something (F22)' at 90.2 percent. And the lowest percentage was for the function of 'offering to do something for someone (F11)' at 73.2 percent.

The second of the language functions was the social formulas for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 19.

Table 19 Frequency Distribution and Percentage of the Two Levels of English Language Use in the Social Formulas Found in the Questionnaire

Function	Formal language		Neutral language	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
F24	52	63.4	30	36.6
F25	34	41.5	48	58.5
F26	81	98.8	1	1.2
F27	8	9.8	74	90.2
F28	75	91.5	7	8.5
F29	17	20.7	65	79.3
F30	1	1.2	81	98.8
F31	5	6.1	77	93.9
F32	1	1.2	81	98.8
F33	-	-	82	100.0
F34	-	-	82	100.0

Table 19 (continued)

Function	Formal language		Neutral language	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
F35	3	3.7	79	96.3
F36	1	1.2	81	98.8
F37	-	-	82	100.0
F38	-	-	82	100.0
F39	-	-	82	100.0
F40	3	3.7	79	96.3
F41	7	8.5	75	91.5
F42	4	4.9	78	95.1
F43	1	1.2	81	98.8
F44	3	3.7	79	96.3
F45	7	8.5	75	91.5
F46	1	1.2	81	98.8
Overall	304	16.12	1,582	83.88

N = 82

For the social formulas, the results were the following:

The hotel staff also used the neutral English language to communicate with the foreigners. Five of the twenty-three functions got 100 percent in the use of the neutral level of English. Those functions are: 'offering something (F33)', 'declining an offer of something (F34)', 'responding to thanks (F37)', 'complimenting (F38)', and 'congratulating (F39)'. They also used the neutral language more frequently in the functions of 'giving someone your general good wishes (F30)', 'accepting an invitation (F32)', 'thanking (F36)', 'showing sympathy (F43)', 'saying goodbye (F46)' at 98.8 percent, 'giving something to someone (F35)', 'responding to compliments or congratulations (F40)', 'leaving someone politely for a short time (F44)' at 96.3 percent, 'accepting an apology (F42)' at 95.1 percent, 'inviting someone (F31)' at 93.9 percent, 'saying sorry (F41)', 'ending a conversation (F45)' at 91.5 percent, and 'attracting someone's attention (F27)' at 90.2 percent. The function

that they used the least was the function of 'introducing someone' (F25) at 58.5 percent.

However, in the functions of 'starting a conversation with a stranger (F24)', 'answering an introduction (F26)', and 'greeting someone (F28)', the hotel staff preferred to use the English language at the formal level. The highest function that the hotel staff used was 'answering an introduction (F26)' at 98.8 percent while the function of 'starting a conversation with a stranger (F24)' received the lowest rating at 63.4 percent.

The third of the language functions was making communication work for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 20.

Table 20 Frequency Distribution and Percentage of the Two Levels of English Language Use in Making Communication Work Found in the Questionnaire

Function	Formal language		Neutral language	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
F47	7	8.5	75	91.5
F48	7	8.5	75	91.5
F49	3	3.7	79	96.3
F50	1	1.2	81	98.8
F51	6	7.3	76	92.7
F52	4	4.9	78	95.1
F53	8	9.8	74	90.2
F54	10	12.2	72	87.8
Overall	46	7.01	610	92.99

N = 82

According to Table 20, the hotel staff used the neutral English language in eight functions, and the function of 'saying something in another way (F50)' had the highest percentage of 98.8 percent. They also used the neutral English language more frequently in the functions of 'saying something again (F49)' (96.3 percent), 'showing you are listening (F52)' (95.1 percent), 'giving an example (F51)' (92.7 percent),

'asking someone to say something again (F47)', 'checking that you have understood (F48)' (91.5 percent), 'giving yourself time to think (F53)' (90.2 percent), and 'changing the subject (F54)' (87.8 percent).

From the results of the data analysis, English language levels could be ranked from the highest to the lowest of percentages as seen in Table 21.

Table 21 Ranking of the Hotel Staff's Level of English Language Use in Communicating with their Guests Found in the Questionnaire

Part	Neutral language		Formal language	
	F	%	F	%
Part I	1,723	91.35	163	8.65
Part II	1,582	83.88	304	16.12
Part III	610	92.99	46	7.01
Overall	3,915	89.41	513	10.59

N = 82

F = Frequency, % = Percent

Table 21 showed the ranking of hotel staff's level of English language in communicating with their guests. It could be seen that, on average, the highest English language level they used was in the neutral level at 89.41 percent. The formal level, on the other hand, was seldom used as indicated in percentage at 10.59 percent.

The Interview Questionnaire

Data obtained from the interview questionnaire revealed that the majority of the hotel staff used the neutral level of English language to communicate with their guests.

An analysis of the two English language levels in each function can be seen in Tables 22, 23, and 24. Moreover, in Table 25, the ranking of the hotel staff's level of English language in communicating with their guests is also presented, and the responses to this research question can be summarized as follows:

The first of the language functions was the main functions for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 22.

Table 22 Frequency Distribution and Percentage of the Two Levels of English Language Use in the Main Functions Found in the Interview Questionnaire

Function	Formal language		Neutral language	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
F1	2	9.5	19	90.5
F2	-	-	21	100.0
F3	-	-	21	100.0
F4	2	9.5	19	90.5
F5	2	9.5	19	90.5
F6	-	-	21	100.0
F7	-	-	21	100.0
F8	-	-	21	100.0
F9	1	4.8	20	95.2
F10	1	4.8	20	95.2
F11	6	28.6	15	71.4
F12	6	28.6	15	71.4
F13	-	-	21	100.0
F14	2	9.5	19	90.5
F15	1	4.8	20	95.2
F16	-	-	21	100.0
F17	-	-	21	100.0
F18	4	19.0	17	81.0
F19	7	33.3	14	66.7
F20	4	19.0	17	81.0
F21	3	14.3	18	85.7

Table 22 (continued)

Function	Formal language		Neutral language	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
F22	-	-	21	100.0
F23	-	-	21	100.0
Overall	1.78	8.50	19.22	91.50

N = 21

According to Table 22, the hotel staff also used the neutral English language to communicate with their guests. Ten of the twenty-three functions got 100 percent in the use of the neutral level of English. Those functions were: 'asking about remembering (F2)', 'saying something is correct/not correct (F3)', 'saying you are looking forward to something (F6)', 'asking how someone feels after something happens (F7)', 'asking about preference (F8)', 'giving permission (F13)', 'saying someone need not to do something (F16)', 'telling someone how to do something (F17)', 'saying you are willing to do something (F22)', and 'refusing to do something (F23)'. They also used the neutral language more frequently in the functions of 'giving your opinion (F9)', 'giving reasons (F10)', 'saying someone is obliged to do something (F15)' at 95.1 percent, 'saying you do not know/showing a limitation of knowledge (F1)', 'saying you are not sure (F4)', 'saying what you hope will happen (F5)', 'refusing permission (F14)' at 90.5 percent. The function that they used the least was the function of 'suggesting (F19)' at 66.7 percent.

The second of the language functions was the social formulas for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 23.

Table 23 Frequency Distribution and Percentage of the Two Levels of English Language Use in the Social Formulas Found in the Interview Questionnaire

Function	Formal language		Neutral language	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
F24	2	9.5	19	90.5
F25	3	14.3	18	85.7
F26	21	100.0	-	-
F27	-	-	21	100.0
F28	18	85.7	3	14.3
F29	2	9.5	19	90.5
F30	-	-	21	100.0
F31	3	14.3	18	85.7
F32	-	-	21	100.0
F33	1	4.8	20	95.2
F34	1	4.8	20	95.2
F35	-	-	21	100.0
F36	-	-	21	100.0
F37	-	-	21	100.0
F38	-	-	21	100.0
F39	-	-	21	100.0
F40	2	9.5	19	90.5
F41	-	-	21	100.0
F42	1	4.8	20	95.2
F43	-	-	21	100.0
F44	-	-	21	100.0
F45	8	38.1	13	61.9
F46	3	14.3	18	85.7
Overall	2.83	13.46	18.17	86.54

N = 21

For the social formulas, the results were the following:

The hotel staff preferred to use the neutral English language in twenty-one functions. The highest percentage was for the functions of 'attracting someone's attention (F27)', 'giving someone your general good wishes (F30)', 'accepting an invitation (F32)', giving something to someone (F35)', 'thanking (f36)', 'responding to thanks (F37)', 'complimenting (F38)', 'congratulating (F39)', 'saying sorry (F41)', 'showing sympathy (F43)', and 'leaving someone politely for a short time (F44)'. Furthermore, there were ten functions for which they used the neutral language more frequently. Those functions were related to the functions of 'offering something (F33)', 'declining an offer of something (F34)', 'accepting an apology (F42)' at 95.2 percent, 'starting a conversation with a stranger (F24)', 'asking how someone is (F29)', 'responding to compliments or congratulations (F40)' at 90.5 percent, 'introducing someone (F25)', 'inviting someone (F31)', 'saying goodbye (F46)' at 85.7 percent, and 'ending a conversation (F45)' at 61.9 percent.

On the other hand, the hotel staff preferred to use the English language at the formal level in two functions. And these two functions were: 'answering an introduction (F26)' at 100 percent, and 'greeting someone (F28)' at 85.7 percent.

The third of the language functions was making communication work for which the results of the analysis can be seen in Table 24.

Table 24 Frequency Distribution and Percentage of the Two Levels of English Language Use in Making Communication Work Found in the Interview Questionnaire

Function	Formal language		Neutral language	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
F47	-	-	21	100.0
F48	1	4.8	20	95.2
F49	-	-	21	100.0
F50	1	4.8	20	95.2

Table 24 (continued)

Function	Formal language		Neutral language	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
F51	1	4.8	20	95.2
F52	-	-	21	100.0
F53	-	-	21	100.0
F54	1	4.8	20	95.2
Overall	0.50	2.40	20.50	97.60

N = 21

According to Table 24, the hotel staff used the neutral English language in every function in making communication work. The functions of 'asking someone to say something again (F47)', 'saying something again (F49)', 'showing you are listening (F52)', and 'giving yourself time to think (F53)' got the 100 percent in the use of the neutral level of English. In addition, there were four functions which got 95.2 percent. These functions were: 'checking that you have understood (F48)', 'saying something in another way (F50)', 'giving an example (F51)', and 'changing the subject (F54)'.

From the result of the data analysis of English language levels of the hotel staff in communicating with their guests in the interview questionnaire, English language levels can be ranked from the highest to the lowest as seen in Table 25.

Table 25 Ranking of Hotel Staff's Level of English Language Use in Communicating with their Guests Found in the Interview Questionnaire

Part	Neutral language		Formal language	
	F	%	F	%
Part I	442	91.50	41	1.78
Part II	418	86.54	65	2.83
Part III	164	97.60	4	2.40
Overall	1,024	91.88	110	2.34

N = 21

F = Frequency, % = Percent

Table 25 showed the ranking of the hotel staff's level of English language in communicating with their guests. It could be seen that, on average, the highest English language level they used was in the neutral level at 91.88 percent. The formal level, on the other hand, was seldom used as indicated in percentage at 2.34 percent

Research Question Three

What do the hotel staff perceive to be the most important language skill they need to work on?

In Part III, the first item of the questionnaires asked the hotel staff from five Phitsanulok hotels to indicate what the hotel staff perceived to be their most needed English language skills in their careers and work lives. The weighted scores were used to calculate answers to the third research question.

Four alternative English language skills were listed in item 1 of the questionnaire. The hotel staff were asked to rank what language skills they perceived to be the most important language skill they needed to work on. For the most required English skill of each hotel staff's choice, a weight of 4 was designed. The second ranked skill of the hotel staff was given a weight of 3 and so on, as shown below:

Rank	Weighted Scores
1	4
2	3
3	2
4	1

Tables 26-27 set out the total weighted scores which were defined as the summation of weighted scores received from each of the four skills in English.

Finding Three

The Most Needed Language Skill to Be Used in the Hotel Staff's Career and Work Life According to their Own Perceptions

The Questionnaire

The hotel staff's perceived needs for English language skill could be summarized as follows:

The respondents were asked to rate the English skills they needed the most in their jobs.

Table 26 Ranking of the Most Needed Language Skill to Be Used in the Hotel Staff's Career and Work Life According to their Own Perceptions as Found in the Questionnaire

English Skills	Weighted Scores	Rank
Speaking	164	1
Listening	123	2
Reading	76	3
Writing	46	4

N = 82

Table 26 showed what the hotel staff perceived to be the most needed language skill to be used in their career and work life. The results indicated that

speaking ranked at the top of the list. Next came listening, reading, and writing respectively.

The Interview Questionnaire

The respondents were asked to rate the English skills they needed the most in their jobs.

Table 27 Ranking of the Most Needed Language Skill to Be Used in the Hotel Staff's Career and Work Life According to their Own Perceptions as Found in the Interview Questionnaire

English Skills	Weighted Scores	Rank
Speaking	40	1
Listening	27	2
Reading	24	3
Writing	12	4

N = 21

Table 27 showed what the hotel staff perceived to be the most needed language skill to be used in their career and work life. The results indicated that speaking ranked at the top of the list. Next came listening, reading, and writing respectively.