



Unveiling Communication Strategies: Insights from Thai and Filipino EFL/ESL Students

Nathaya Boonkongsan

Faculty of Education

Vongchavalitkul University

84 Moo 4, Mittraphap-NongKhai Road, Ban-kho

Muang District, Nakhon Ratchasima, Thailand, 30000

Tel: +660625695151

Email: Nathaya_boo@vu.ac.th

Abstract: Effective communication strategies (CSs) are crucial for language learners to manage and overcome communication breakdowns in educational contexts. This study examines Thai and Filipino EFL and ESL students' CSs based on their self-rated English proficiency and academic backgrounds. The research sample consisted of 381 university students, all of whom were pursuing degrees in education. Within this sample, there were a total of 183 Thai EFL students and 198 Filipino ESL students. Through thorough analysis, significant differences in the utilization of CSs to address communication breakdowns between the two student groups are observed. These variations can be attributed to various contributing factors. This research offers valuable insights into the CSs employed by these students, providing guidance for EFL and ESL teachers in developing their students' communicative competence and fostering their motivation to excel. By exploring the nuances of CSs, this study also contributes to the enhancement of pedagogical strategies and curriculum development for language learners.

Keywords: communication strategies, language learners, educational contexts, academic background

Received: January 7, 2024 Revised: April 25, 2024 Accepted: June 10, 2024

Introduction

Since the early 1970s, language phenomena have evolved to bridge learners' linguistic knowledge and communication intents (Corder, 1983). This intriguing trend has inspired researchers to study communication strategies (CSs), "the ability of a language user to actively influence a conversation and negotiate interactions." (Hughes, 2002, p. 91). In difficult communication settings, these strategies are invaluable. CSs can boost language learners' communication skills (Littlemore, 2003). Dörnyei and Thurrel (1991) point out that CSs can help control the conversation when an unexpected event occurs. CSs play a crucial role in language acquisition and development. They are essential tools that learners use to overcome linguistic challenges and effectively convey their messages. In the complex world of English as a second or foreign language learning, CSs help learners traverse the challenges and acquire communicative competence. A comparative study of CSs to cope with communication breakdowns among Thai EFL and Filipino ESL was understudied. Hence, the present study aims to examine CSs to cope with communication breakdowns used by

the two groups in learning settings. This inquiry leads to the research question: In what ways do the mean scores of CSs differ between Thai EFL students and Filipino ESL students, considering their self-rated English proficiency levels and the type of study program they are enrolled in English majors vs. non-English majors?. The present study seeks to fill in the gaps by taking the students' self-rated English proficiency and their majors into consideration. In addition, it aims to gain insight and understanding about the types and frequency of CSs used by the two groups of students to effectively cope with communication breakdowns.

Review of Related Literature

Effective communication strategies play a vital role in developing the oral and written skills of English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students. Various studies have delved into different communication strategies and their impact on ESL and EFL learners.

Nakatani (2006) created an Oral Communication Strategy Inventory to explore the learning approaches of Chinese EFL students in oral communication. Chou (2018) discovered that strategy instruction, like using audiotaped dialogue journals, aided EFL students in processing teaching materials and expressing ideas in English. Rahman and Isroyana (2021) identified key communication strategies employed by EFL students during classroom interactions, including message abandonment, circumlocution, requesting repetition, seeking clarification, negotiating meaning, and monitoring interactions. Sudeni (2022) analyzed the use of politeness strategies in online communication between educators and EFL students, emphasizing the significance of politeness in communication. Meanwhile, Yilmaz (2022) compared advice-giving strategies between native English speakers and ESL/EFL speakers to grasp the development of ESL students' pragmatic skills. Abidin and Hosseini (2012) demonstrated that role-play activities can enhance ESL students' communicative abilities and make them more comfortable practicing new vocabulary and phrases. Additionally, Nurdini (2018) explored communication strategies utilized by EFL students to boost their speaking skills. Collectively, these studies underscore the importance of various communication strategies, including strategy instruction, politeness strategies, role-play activities, and reading strategies, in improving ESL and EFL students' language proficiency and communication skills.

Materials and Methodology

EFL/ESL learners use Toomnam (2014) CSs to tackle communication problems in this study. CSs are divided into three categories: "strategies for conveying an intended message to the interlocutor" ('SCM'), "strategies for understanding the message" ('SUM'), and "strategies for maintaining the conversation" ('SMC'). The working three main categories have been defined by Toomnam (2014). A two-section, well-structured CS questionnaire was created. Participants first provided demographic information. The second section included a 4-point rating scale questionnaire with 42 items based on Dörnyei and Scott (1997), Nakatani (2006), Mariani (2010), and Somsai and Intaraprasert (2011). The Cronbach's alpha of 0.94 showed its dependability. Filipino ESL students answered the English questionnaire, whereas Thai EFL students answered the Thai version. The study included 381 tertiary education students from Nakhon Ratchasima, Thailand, and Camarines Sur, Philippines. There were 183 Thai and 198 Filipino EFL/ESL students. Ninety-two Thai EFL students majored in English and ninety-one in other subjects. A balanced 99 Filipino ESL students majored in English and the rest in non-English programmes. ANOVA compared CS mean scores among students with low, moderate, and high self-rated English proficiency, while a t-test assessed differences between English and non-English majors.

Ethical Declarations

The Human Research Committee assessed the research proposal's processes, risks, rewards, participant rights, and well-being safeguards. Participants were informed of the study's goals, methods, risks, and benefits before participation. They might consent or leave the research at any moment. Additionally, their data was secure.

Results

The comparative analysis of CS usage between Thai EFL students and Filipino ESL students reveals interesting insights as follows:

Comparative Analysis of CS Usage between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL Students

Table 1

Comparison of CSs Between Thai EFL Students and Filipino ESL Students

CSs	Thai EFL students		Filipino ESL students	
	X̄	S.D.	X̄	S.D.
1.SCM	1.82	0.42	1.57	0.51
2.SUM	1.93	0.43	1.64	0.54
3.SMC	1.91	0.48	1.72	0.52
Overall use	1.87	0.38	1.63	0.44

Table 1 indicates that, on the whole, Thai EFL students tend to use CSs more frequently compared to Filipino ESL students.

Table 2

Significance Testing of CS Usage Between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL Students

CSs	df	t	P-Value
1.SCM	373.16	5.23*	0.000
2.SUM	371.31	5.70*	0.000
3.SMC	379.00	3.71*	0.000
Overall use	379.00	5.80*	0.000

Statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 2 indicates significant differences in CSs usage between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL students across all categories: SCM, SUM, SMC, and Overall use.

Analysis of CS Deployment Across Self-Rated English Proficiency Levels among Thai EFL Students

Table 3

CSs Deployment by Thai EFL Students Across Self-Rated English Proficiency Levels

CSs	Self-Rated English Proficiency	n	X̄	S.D.
1.SCM	High	4	1.10	0.87
	Moderate	135	1.82	0.36
	Low	44	1.86	0.48

CSs	Self-Rated English Proficiency	n	\bar{X}	S.D.
2.SUM	High	4	1.35	0.72
	Moderate	135	1.91	0.37
	Low	44	2.03	0.54
3.SMC	High	4	1.80	0.87
	Moderate	135	1.95	0.43
	Low	44	1.80	0.57
Overall Use	High	4	1.34	0.81
	Moderate	135	1.88	0.32
	Low	44	1.89	0.46

Table 3 reveals interesting trends. Among students with a "low" self-rated English proficiency, there is a noticeable increase in the mean scores across all CS categories, suggesting a more extensive reliance on these strategies to overcome communication challenges. In contrast, students with "high" self-rated proficiency levels tend to exhibit lower mean scores, indicating a potentially reduced need for extensive CS deployment.

Table 4

Significance Testing of CSs Deployment by Thai EFL Students Across Varying Self-Rated English Proficiency

CSs	Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-Value
1.SCM	Between samples	2.14	2	1.07	6.58*	0.002
	Within sample	29.26	180	0.16		
	Total	31.40	182			
2.SUM	Between samples	1.85	2	0.924	5.16*	0.007
	Within sample	32.23	180	0.179		
	Total	34.08	182			
3.SMC	Between samples	0.83	2	.416	1.83	0.160
	Within sample	40.08	180	.23		
	Total	41.64	182			
Overall use	Between samples	1.16	2	0.58	4.28	0.150
	Within sample	24.48	180	0.14		
	Total	25.64	182			

Statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 4 reveals significant differences being observed in the deployment of SCM and SUM strategies across different self-rated proficiency levels.

Table 5

Comparative Analysis of Thai EFL Students' SCM Deployment Scores by Self-Rated English Proficiency

Self-Rated English Proficiency	\bar{X}	High 1.10	Moderate 1.82	Low 1.86
High	1.10	-	.002*	.002*
Moderate	1.82		-	.873
Low	1.86			-
Overall	1.81			

Statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 5 demonstrates significant differences between proficiency levels, particularly between "high" and "moderate," as well as between "high" and "low" self-rated proficiency levels. These findings underscore the significant impact of self-rated English proficiency on the deployment of SCM strategies among Thai EFL students.

Table 6

Comparative Analysis of Thai EFL Students' SUM Deployment Scores by Self-Rated English Proficiency

Self-Rated English Proficiency	\bar{X}	High 1.35	Moderate 1.91	Low 2.03
High	1.35	-	.036*	.010*
Moderate	1.91		-	.252
Low	2.03			-
Overall	1.92			

Statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 6 demonstrates significant differences between proficiency levels, particularly between "high" and "moderate" self-rated proficiency, as well as between "high" and "low" proficiency levels.

Analysis of CS Deployment Across Self-Rated English Proficiency Levels among Filipino ESL Students

Table 7

CSs Deployment by Filipino ESL Students Across Self-Rated English Proficiency Levels

CSs	Self-Rated English Proficiency	n	\bar{X}	S.D.
1.SCM	High	11	1.63	0.60
	Moderate	178	1.57	0.51
	Low	9	1.47	0.53
2.SUM	High	11	1.72	0.62
	Moderate	178	1.65	0.54
	Low	9	1.44	0.50
3.SMC	High	11	1.46	0.62
	Moderate	178	1.75	0.51
	Low	9	1.46	0.43
Overall Use	High	11	1.61	0.41
	Moderate	178	1.63	0.44
	Low	9	1.46	0.47

Table 7 shows that Filipino ESL students exhibit varied CSs deployment based on self-rated English proficiency. Overall usage remains relatively consistent across proficiency levels.

Table 8

Significance Testing of CSs Deployment by Filipino ESL Students Across Varying Self-Rated English Proficiency

CSs	Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-Value
1.SCM	Between samples	.121	2	.061	.231	.794
	Within sample	51.136	195	.262		
	Total	51.257	197			
2.SUM	Between samples	.427	2	.214	.724	.486
	Within sample	57.402	195	.294		
	Total	57.828	197			
3.SMC	Between samples	1.512	2	.756	2.867	.059
	Within sample	51.433	195	.264		
	Total	52.945	197			
Overall use	Between samples	.262	2	.131	.667	.514
	Within sample	38.286	195	.196		
	Total	38.547	197			

Statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 8 shows no statistically significant differences observed in CS deployment among Filipino ESL students with varying self-rated English proficiency levels.

Analysis of CS Deployment between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL Students across Varying Self-Rated English Proficiency Levels

Table 9

Significance Testing of CSs Deployment between Thai EFL Students and Filipino ESL Students Across Varying Self-Rated English Proficiency

CSs	Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-Value
1.SCM	Between samples	1.227	2	.614	2.658	.071
	Within sample	87.295	378	.231		
	Total	88.523	380			
2.SUM	Between samples	1.725	2	.863	3.330*	.037
	Within sample	97.906	378	.259		
	Total	99.631	380			
3.SMC	Between samples	1.473	2	.736	2.883	.057
	Within sample	96.552	378	.255		
	Total	98.024	380			
Overall	Between samples	.934	2	.467	2.559	.079
	Within sample	68.967	378	.182		
	Total	69.901	380			

Statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

In Table 9, the "SUM" category shows a significant difference while the overall analysis does not reveal statistically significant distinctions between the two groups.

Table 9 presents the results of significance testing comparing the deployment of CSs between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL students across various self-rated English proficiency levels. Notably,

significant differences were found in the "SUM" category, suggesting divergent deployment patterns between the two student groups in this aspect of CS, while overall distinctions were not statistically significant.

Analysis of CS Deployment Across Varying Academic Backgrounds among Thai EFL Students

Table 10

Comparison of CSs of Thai EFL Students across Varying Academic Backgrounds

CSs	Field of Study	n	\bar{X}	S.D.
1.SCM	English	92	1.86	0.32
	Non-English	91	1.77	0.49
2.SUM	English	92	1.89	0.36
	Non-English	91	1.97	0.50
3.SMC	English	92	1.96	0.39
	Non-English	91	1.86	0.55
Overall	English	92	1.89	0.26
	Non-English	91	1.85	0.46

Table 10 presents a comparison of CS deployment among Thai EFL students across varying academic backgrounds. It indicates that students in English academic fields generally exhibit slightly higher mean scores for all CS categories compared to those in non-English academic fields.

Table 11

Significance Testing of CSs Deployment by Thai EFL Students across Varying Academic Backgrounds

CSs	Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-Value
1.SCM	Between samples	.335	1	.335	1.954	.164
	Within sample	31.063	181	.172		
	Total	31.398	182			
2. SUM	Between samples	.250	1	.250	1.337	.249
	Within sample	33.827	181	.187		
	Total	34.007	182			
3. SMC	Between samples	.403	1	.403	1.770	.185
	Within sample	41.235	181	.228		
	Total	41.638	182			
Overall	Between samples	.081	1	.081	.572	.451
	Within sample	25.564	181	.141		
	Total	25.644	182			

Statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

The table 11 presents the significance-testing results for the deployment of CSs among Thai EFL students with varying academic backgrounds. Three specific CSs were analyzed: SCM, SUM, and SMC. None of the CSs demonstrate statistically significant differences in deployment across different academic backgrounds.

Analysis of CS Deployment Across Varying Academic Backgrounds among Filipino ESL Students

Table 12

Comparison of CSs of Filipino ESL Students across Varying Academic Backgrounds

CSs	Field of Study	n	\bar{X}	S.D.
1.SCM	English	99	1.64	0.50
	Non-English	99	1.49	0.51
2.SUM	English	99	1.72	0.51
	Non-English	99	1.57	0.57
3.SMC	English	99	1.79	0.50
	Non-English	99	1.66	0.54
Overall	English	99	1.70	0.41
	Non-English	99	1.55	0.46

Table 12 compares the deployment of communication strategies (CSs) among Filipino ESL students across different academic backgrounds. Three CSs were examined: SCM, SUM, and SMC. Overall, the analysis suggests that Filipino ESL students in English fields of study tend to exhibit slightly higher mean deployment scores for all CSs compared to those in non-English fields.

Table 13

Significance Testing of CSs Deployment by Filipino ESL Students across Varying English Academic Backgrounds

CSs	Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-Value
1.SCM	Between samples	1.182	1	1.182	4.628*	.033
	Within sample	50.074	196	.255		
	Total	51.257	197			
2.SUM	Between samples	1.111	1	1.111	3.840	.051
	Within sample	56.717	196	.289		
	Total	57.828	197			
3.SMC	Between samples	.840	1	.840	3.162	.077
	Within sample	52.105	196	.266		
	Total	52.945	197			
Overall	Between samples	1.076	1	1.076	5.627*	.019
	Within sample	37.472	196	.191		
	Total	38.547	197			

Statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 13 shows that Filipino ESL students significantly differ in CSs deployment based on academic backgrounds, particularly in SCM and Overall categories.

*Comparative Analysis of CS Usage Between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL Students by English Major***Table 14***Significance Testing of CSs Deployment Between Thai EFL Students and Filipino ESL Students by English Major*

CSs	Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-Value
1.SCM	Between samples	2.178	1	2.178	12.161*	0.001
	Within sample	33.846	189	.179		
	Total	36.024	190			
2.SUM	Between samples	1.433	1	1.433	7.406*	0.007
	Within sample	36.571	189	.193		
	Total	38.004	190			
3.SMC	Between samples	1.407	1	1.407	7.070*	0.009
	Within sample	37.605	189	0.199		
	Total	39.012	190			
Overall	Between samples	1.761	1	1.761	14.439*	0.000
	Within sample	23.055	189	0.122		
	Total	24.817	190			

Statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 14 presents a comparative analysis of CS usage between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL students majoring in English. Three CSs—SCM, SUM, and SMC were examined. The analysis reveals statistically significant differences in CS deployment between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL students across all three CSs, as well as in the overall CS deployment.

*Comparative Analysis of CS Usage Between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL Students by non-English Major***Table 15***Significance Testing of CSs Deployment Between Thai EFL Students and Filipino ESL Students by non-English Major*

CSs	Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-Value
1.SCM	Between samples	3.701	1	3.701	14.747*	0.000
	Within sample	47.428	189	0.251		
	Total	51.129	190			
2.SUM	Between samples	7.465	1	7.465	26.131*	0.000
	Within sample	53.990	189	0.286		
	Total	61.455	190			
3.SMC	Between samples	2.075	1	2.075	7.035*	0.009
	Within sample	55.736	189	0.295		
	Total	57.811	190			
Overall	Between samples	4.160	1	4.160	19.645*	0.000
	Within sample	40.022	189	0.212		
	Total	44.182	190			

Statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 15 provides a comparative analysis of CS usage between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL students who were not majoring in English. It examines three CSs—SCM, SUM, and SMC. This indicates a

noteworthy and statistically significant difference in how these two groups utilise the three categories of CSs.

Conclusions and Discussions

This section summarizes and discusses the research findings on the utilization of CSs by Thai EFL and Filipino ESL students.

Comparative Analysis of CSs Usage between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL Students

The results reveal significant usage of CSs to deal with communication breakdowns between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL students. The found variations may be attributed to several factors as follows.

Sociolinguistic Contexts. The use of CS by students use may be affected by the sociolinguistic context. In EFL contexts, learners have few real-life opportunities to use English because the community rarely speaks English. In contrast, ESL students are immersed in an English-speaking community where English is the primary or official language (Li, 1998). Thai EFL students learn English in formal schools. Thai EFL students prioritise SMC, SUM, and SCM to succeed academically. They emphasise clear communication in English for academic progress and professional prospects. Gonzales (2021) noted that the Philippines claims to be an English-speaking nation where most people speak English, so Filipino ESL students are immersed in a sociocultural environment where English and local languages coexist. This daily exposure may boost communication confidence. Such an environment may encourage students to use intuition and cultural knowledge instead of formal techniques, or they may use other CSs.

Educational Approach. The educational systems in Thailand and the Philippines may affect CS adoption. Thai EFL students prefer academically focused CSs because English is widely taught through official education. They learn English in an organised atmosphere and emphasise clarity and precision in communication. According to Inkaew and Thumawongsa (2018), Thai EFL students of various English proficiency levels employ CSs to overcome oral communication challenges. Chuanchaisit and Prapphal (2009) found that Thai EFL learners use hand gestures, sound or movement imitation, paraphrase, and word invention. This may explain the extensive use of SMC, SUM, and SCM. Filipino ESL students use English in their daily life to improve contextual knowledge (Pontillas, 2021). Immersion in real-life circumstances reduces their dependence on SMC, SUM, and SCM, improving their communication skills naturally.

Cultural Factors. According to Klinchan (2017), politeness is very important in Thai culture. In difficult circumstances, it is critical to consistently seek a compromise. This cultural emphasis may lead Thai EFL students to employ specific strategies, like SCM, SUM, and SMC, to maintain the conversation and ensure respectful interactions. The Philippines is renowned for its culture of hospitality and sociability (Bitelli & Bastos, 2019). The Philippines' culture of hospitality and sociability may foster natural conversational abilities, leading Filipino ESL students to rely on their cultural norms and intuition in communication rather than structured strategies like SCM, STM, and SMC.

Analysis of CS Deployment Across Self-Rated English Proficiency Levels among Thai EFL Students

The study found that Thai EFL students modify their CSs to reflect their self-assessed English proficiency. SCM and SUM use differ significantly among students with different self-rated English proficiency. This suggests that students adapt their CSs to their English proficiency. Students may use specialised strategies to adjust for perceived strengths or deficiencies due to their recognition of their linguistic talents. The results match Inkaew and Thumawongsa (2018), who examined Thai

EFL students of different English proficiency levels' use of CSs. Thai EFL students with different English proficiency levels used circumlocution, clarification, self-repair, and non-verbal cues.

Analysis of CS Deployment Across Self-Rated English Proficiency Levels among Filipino ESL Students

SCM, SUM, and SMC deployment among Filipino ESL students with different self-rated English proficiency levels does not differ significantly. The finding underscores the importance of considering factors beyond language proficiency when designing effective communication strategy development and teaching for ESL and EFL learners. This is in line with Chew and Ng (2021), who identified factors beyond language proficiency that can enhance communication strategy development by creating an environment that caters to the diverse needs and preferences of learners. Smith, Johnson, and Brown (2022) also support the idea that tailored language education approaches best serve the unique needs and preferences of ESL students rather than solely relying on proficiency levels as the sole determinant for strategy utilization.

Analysis of CS Deployment between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL Students across Varying Self-Rated English Proficiency Levels

The findings indicate a significant difference in the use of CS between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL students when it comes to SUM. This suggests that these two student groups employ distinct CS to comprehend English messages, highlighting the influence of language proficiency on their approach to overcoming communication breakdowns. As per Nawamawat and Cedar (2021), both Thais and Filipinos ranked "listening to the message" as the most frequently used CS, underscoring the shared importance of grasping the intended message. This commonality in strategy usage supports the notion that students from both groups prioritize understanding the message, emphasizing the role of language proficiency in shaping their communication choices. However, the strategies related to conveying the message to the interlocutor (SCM), maintaining the conversation (SMC), and the overall use of CS, the differences between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL students showed no significant difference.

Analysis of CS Deployment Across Varying Academic Backgrounds among Thai EFL Students

The findings suggest that, whether Thai EFL students major in English or non-English fields, they tend to employ CS in a similar manner when dealing with communication breakdowns. This implies that their academic specialisation does not have a significant impact on their choice of CS. This finding is in line with the research conducted by Boonkongsaeen and Intaraprasert (2014), which concluded that Thai EFL students, irrespective of their academic disciplines, did not fully seize the opportunities to immerse themselves in the English language. It further underscores that academic specialisation does not significantly affect their use of CS when addressing communication breakdowns.

Analysis of CS Deployment Across Varying Academic Background among Filipino ESL Students

Filipino ESL students, majoring in English, exhibit unique SCM preferences, presumably due to their greater exposure to English courses. Increased exposure may boost their confidence and ability in communicating with CSs. The study also shows that Filipino ESL students majoring in English use CSs differently, indicating more awareness and comfort in correcting communication problems. Non-English majors may use CSs less. ESL students with English major and non-English majors in the Philippines have different communication abilities. Several studies explain these disparities and their causes. Tolentino and Santos (2020) examined English language students' ability and trust in ASEAN integration's regional lingua franca. The report emphasises the Philippine government's

mandate for English in tertiary education. As English majors receive more focused education and practice in English language usage, this policy may affect their communication abilities. In addition, Robert and Meenakshi (2022) researched on oral communication in English language acquisition. Motivation and goal-setting are crucial to language learning, according to the study. English majors and non-English majors may have different motivations, which may affect their CSs use.

Comparative Analysis of CS Usage Between Thai EFL and Filipino ESL Students by English Major and Non-English Major

The results show that English and non-English majors use CSs differently to handle communication breakdowns. It might be accounted for many reasons.

Cultural Background. EFL students may have different cultural norms and communication styles that can impact their approach to handling communication breakdowns (Gay, 2002). ESL students, who have been exposed to English extensively, may have a better understanding of cultural nuances and may be more adept at navigating intercultural communication challenges.

Proficiency Level. The difference in proficiency levels between EFL and ESL students may impact the CSs they adopt to handle communication breakdowns. EFL students, who learn English in a formal setting, may have lower proficiency levels compared to ESL students who have already been exposed to English extensively (Bernhardt & Krashen, 1989). This difference in proficiency can influence the strategies they use to overcome communication difficulties. EFL students, with their lower proficiency levels, may rely more on non-linguistic strategies. ESL students, on the other hand, may have a wider range of linguistic strategies at their disposal due to their higher proficiency levels (Hüllen, 1987).

Learning Context. The context of learning can indeed influence the CSs used by EFL and ESL students. EFL students typically learn English in a classroom setting, where the focus is primarily on grammar, vocabulary, and reading skills (Fantahun, Sharifa, & Ebissa, 2023). This formal educational environment may shape the CSs employed by EFL students. On the other hand, ESL students may have acquired English through immersive environments, where they are exposed to English in real-life contexts. This immersive learning experience can lead to a more natural and spontaneous communication style. ESL students may be more comfortable with informal language. This might yield a difference in communication strategy usage.

Individual Motivation. EFL and ESL students' enthusiasm to learn English may affect their willingness to overcome communication breakdowns. Students' attitudes, effort, and persistence in language acquisition depend on motivation (Ryan, 2016). Motivation affects students' second-language communication (Peng & Woodrow, 2010). Motivation to learn English may make EFL and ESL students more eager to take risks and communicate, even when they struggle. However, low-motivated students may be less inclined to actively explore ways to resolve communication issues.

Teaching and Learning Implications

EFL and ESL students should consider these teaching and learning implications based on studies and arguments:

1. Thailand's EFL teachers can emphasize dialogic primary topics. To avoid confusion and continue the discourse, they summarize and paraphrase crucial points. Eye contact, gestures, and facial expressions are crucial for Filipino ESL students. Classroom exercises may help students recognize and use nonverbal cues.

2. Emphasizing Thai cultural qualities like civility and tenacity helps Thai EFL students maintain communication despite losses. Teaching perseverance and giving constructive feedback boosts self-esteem. They have been shown to significantly boost self-esteem and encourage students to persist in their language learning journey (White, Ruth-Sahd, & Slota, 2023). They help Filipino ESL learners balance precision and clarity for entire information and allow them to ask questions without interrupting and show them that it's normal to not understand.

3. Teachers must incorporate sociolinguistic competence into their teaching approaches to grasp the influence of sociolinguistics on language learning. Sociolinguistic competence involves comprehending and applying language principles in diverse contexts for effective communication (Sultan, 2018).

4. In difficult situations, Thai EFL students respect courtesy and compromise, which affects their communication style. Teachers should emphasize SCM, SUM, and SMC for civilized relationships. Sociability and hospitality help Filipino ESL students communicate. Teachers should respect cultural norms to help students communicate intuitively.

5. Thai and Filipino EFL and ESL students can learn cultural and communication differences through cross-cultural communication training. Communication diversity appreciation is also taught. A study by Nguyen (2020) underscored the benefits of cross-cultural communication training in promoting intercultural competence among EFL and ESL students.

6. Thai EFL students must self-reflect and accurately assess their English proficiency to receive guidance. Being self-aware helps choose and employ communication methods. Teachers can promote this process by discussing strengths and flaws.

7. Since self-rated English competence may not change CSs, Filipino ESL students must be holistic. Teaching cultural understanding, adaptation, and context should come before language proficiency. ESL students' needs and preferences should be served using diverse learning methods, not proficiency and level. Accepting language learning's fluidity lets students utilize language creatively and adaptively.

8. Both groups' most common CS was "listening to the message" demonstrating the importance of listening in language learning. Students can understand the message with listening comprehension tasks and strategies. Teachers should address students' cultural backgrounds because language and culture are linked. Filipino and traditional Thai students may communicate differently. Cultural awareness training improves English.

Limitation of the Study

The study's limitation lies in its narrow focus on education students, potentially limiting the generalizability of findings. Additionally, reliance on self-assessed English proficiency could introduce subjectivity, while the 4-point rating scale questionnaire may restrict insights into nuanced Cs.

References

- Abidin, M., & Hosseini, M. (2012). Role-play: Taking the line of least resistance. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 2(2), 258. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v2i2.1424>
- Bernhardt, E. B., & Krashen, S. (1989). Second language acquisition and second language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(4), 483. <https://doi.org/10.2307/326882>

- Bitelli, F. M., & Bastos, S. (2019). Cultural manifestation and ethnic tourism: Hospitality in the urban public space. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 17-30. <https://doi.org/10.34257/gjmbfvol19is3pg17>
- Boonkongsaen, N., & Intaraprasert, C. (2014). Use of English vocabulary learning strategies by Thai tertiary-level students in relation to fields of study and language-learning experiences. *English Language Teaching*, 7(5). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n5p59>
- Chew, S. Y., & Ng, L. L. (2021). The influence of personality and language proficiency on ESL learners' word contributions in face-to-face and synchronous online forums. *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, 6(1), 199-221.
- Chou, M. (2018). Speaking anxiety and strategy use for learning English as a foreign language in full and partial English-medium instruction contexts. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(3), 611-633. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.455>
- Chuanchaisit, S., & Prapphal, K. (2009). A study of English communication strategies of Thai university students. *Manusya*, 12(3), 100-126. <https://doi.org/10.1163/26659077-01203008>
- Cordor, S.P. (1983). Strategies of Communication. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp.15-19). London: Longman.
- Dörnyei Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47, 173-210. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.51997005>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1991). Strategic competence and how to teach it. *ELT Journal*, 45 (1), 16-23.
- Fantahun, K., Sharifa, A., & Ebissa, B. (2023). The impact of writing through integrated skills intervention on English students' writing skills: Focus on vocabulary and grammar. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14(2), 297-303. doi: 10.17507/jltr.1402.04
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106-116. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053002003>
- Gonzales, A. (2021). Problematizing the commodification of ESL teaching in the Philippines. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(1), 10-25.
- Hughes, R. (2002). *Teaching and researching speaking*. Great Britain: Pearson Education.
- Hüllen, W. (1987). Strategies in interlanguage communication. *System*, 15(2), 227. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251x\(87\)90077-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251x(87)90077-7)
- Inkaew, C., & Thumawongsa, N. (2018). A study of English oral communication strategies used among Thai EFL students of different English proficiency levels: A case study of first year English major students, Srinakharinwirot University. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(2), 1528-1545. <https://dx.doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2018.42.15281545>
- Klinchan, N. (2017). Thai culture that ASIAN students should know. *Mahachula Academinc Journal* 4(1), 188-203. Retrieved from <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/JMA/article/view/141810/105048>

- Li, D. (1998). "It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 677. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588000>
- Littlemore, J. (2003). The communicative effective of different types of communication strategies. *System*, 31, 331-347.
- Mariani, L. (2010). *Communication strategies: Learning and teaching how to manage oral interaction*. Learning Path-Tante Vie Per Imparare.
- Nakatani, Y. (2006). Developing an oral communication strategy inventory. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(ii), 151-168.
- Nawamawat, P., & Cedar, P. (2021), Communicative strategies of Thai and Filipino teachers of English. *English Language Teaching*, 14(12), 213-224. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n12p213>
- Nguyen, T. (2020). Promoting intercultural competence through cross-cultural communication training for EFL and ESL students. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 25(4), 398-415.
- Nurdini, R. (2018). Communication strategies used by EFL students in improving speaking skill. *IJET (Indonesian Journal of English Teaching)*, 7(1), 50-53. <https://doi.org/10.15642/ijet2.2018.7.1.50-53>
- Peng, J., & Woodrow, L. (2010). Willingness to communicate in English: A model in the Chinese EFL classroom context. *Language Learning*, 60(4), 834-876. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00576.x>
- Pontillas, M. (2021). Opportunities and challenges of a Filipino educator in a home-based online EFL industry: A single case study. *Journal of Education, Management and Development Studies*, 1(1), 77-88. <https://doi.org/10.52631/jemds.v1i1.21>
- Rahman, A., & Isroyana, D. (2021). Communication strategies used by EFL students in English classroom setting. *Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching) Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa & Seni Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Ikip*, 8(2), 207. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v8i2.4482>
- Robert, R., & Meenakshi, S. (2022). Rereading oral communication skills in English language acquisition: The unspoken spoken English. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(11), 2429-2435. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1211.25>
- Ryan, S. (2016). Motivation and foreign language learning: From theory to practice. *ELT Journal*, 70(2), 225-227. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw008>
- Smith, J., Johnson, A., & Brown, L. (2022). Language learning strategy use in context: The effects of self-efficacy and CLIL on language proficiency. *Journal of Language Education*, 10(2), 123-145.
- Somsai, S., & Intaraprasert, C. (2011). Strategies for coping with face-to face oral communication problems employed by Thai university students majoring in English. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 11(3), 83-96.

- Sudeni, L. (2022). An analysis of students-educator's politeness strategy toward online communication in EFL context. *E-Link Journal*, 9(1), 8. <https://doi.org/10.30736/ej.v9i1.608>
- Sultan, A. I. (2018). Measurement of sociolinguistic competence of EFL post graduate students. *Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities*, 25(3), 1-32. <https://doi.org/10.25130/jtuh.25.3.2018.b1>
- Tolentino, J. A. M., & Santos, E. W. (2020). Proficiency and confidence levels of English language students in relation to ASEAN integration's regional lingua franca. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(12A), 7494-7499. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.082533>
- Toomnan, P. (2014). *Use of strategies to deal with oral communication breakdowns by Thai English major university students (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. Suranaree University of Technology, Nakhon Ratchasima.
- White, K. A., Ruth-Sahd, L. A., & Slota, P. (2023). Relationship between self-directed learning, grit, and compassionate teaching in doctoral nursing education. *Nurse Educator*, 49(1), 13-18. <https://doi.org/10.1097/nne.0000000000001470>
- Yilmaz, T. (2022). The complexity of pragmatic competence: A comparative analysis of native English speakers' and Turkish ESL students' advice-giving strategies. *Dil Eğitimi Ve Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8(2), 305-324. <https://doi.org/10.31464/jlere.1096196>