FAMILY COMMUNICATION PATTERNS AND ENGLISH COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS: AN INVESTIGATION OF THAI UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Watthana Suksiripkonchai

This Independent Study Manuscript Presented to The Graduate School of Bangkok University In Partial Fulfillment Of the Requirements for the Degree Master of Communication Arts



© 2017 Watthana Suksiripakonchai All Rights Reserved

.

This Independent Study has been approved by the Graduate School **Bangkok University**

Title: FAMILY COMMUNICATION PATTERNS AND ENGLISH COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS: AN INVESTIGATION OF THAI UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Author: Mr. Watthana Suksiripakonchai

Independent Study Committee:

Advisor



(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Boonlert Supadhiloke)

Field Specialist

(Asst. Prof. Dr. Pacharaporn Kesaprakorn)



Suksiripakonchai, W. Master of Communication Arts, September 2017, Graduate School, Bangkok University.

Family Communication Patterns and English Communicative Skills: An Investigation of Thai University Students. (69 pp.)

ABSTRACT

Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Boonlert Supadhiloke, Ph.D.

Family is an important institution of a society. It is said that the way an individual behaves is influenced by the characteristics of his or her family. Family communication patterns can be seen as representation of the characteristics of a specific family. Family communication patterns are often mistakenly thought as facilitation to communication rather Chaffee, McLeod & Wackman (1973) stated they were actually constraints. Previous studies have indicated that family communication patterns influence success and failure of students in terms of academic achievement. This quantitative research aimed to study the family communication patterns in the Thai context and how they influence Thai university students' English communicative skills. The total number of 331 participants was used as group sampling. Revised Family Communication Patterns (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990) and modified English Communicative Skills Questionnaires based on Sanaa (2013) were used as the research instruments and distributed to the participants online. It was found that the consensual family communication pattern (47.7%) best represented the type of the family communication pattern of the participants. The laissez-faire type amounted to 27.8% and the protective type 24.1%. The pluralistic type was not identified among the participants. Statistical analysis through Kruskal Willis Test indicated there were significant differences in the level of English communicative skills of the participants among the three family communication patterns – consensual, laissez-faire and protective (p-value = 0.00). The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to find differences between groups and the results were .00 (consensual and laissez-faire), 0.2 (consensual and protective) and .00 (laissez-faire and protective).

Keywords: English communicative skills, Family communication patterns, English language teaching, Thai family, Thai university students

OUN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my appreciation to my advisor, Associate Professor Dr. Boonlert Supadhiloke for his useful advice and support throughout the duration of this Independent Study.

I would also like to thank a field specialist, Assistant Professor Dr. Pacharaporn Kesaprakorn, for her comments during the final proposal.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background of the study	1
1.2 Objectives of the study	2
A ANALAS IN	2
1.4 Significance of the study	
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Theoretical framework	
2.1.1 Family Communication Patterns Theory	1
2.1.2 Application of the theory for this research2.2 Thai family characteristics	6
2.2 Thai family characteristics	9
2.3 Communicative learning approach	
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Population of the research	
3.2 Participant	
	14
3.3 Research instrumentation	

v

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY (Continued)	Page
3.4 Data collection procedure	16
3.5 Data analysis procedure	16
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	
4.1 Reliability of the instruments	19
4.2 Family communication patterns and analysis	19
4.3 Test of normaility	23
4.4 Evaluation of differences	
4.5 Test of differences (Kruskal-Willis test)	27
4.6 Test of differences (Mann-Whitney U test)	29
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION	
5.1 Summary of the research	
5.2 Discussion	
5.2.1 Thai family communication patterns	
5.2.2 Family communication patterns and English communicative skills	
5.3 Conclusion	
5.4 Recommendation for future research	40
BIBLIOGRAPHIY	42
APPENDICES	
BIODATA	69
LICENSE AGREEMENT	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Gender	17
Table 2: Age	
Table 3: Reliability Statistics (Family Communication Patterns Questionnaire)	19
Table 4: Reliability Statitis (English Communicative Skills Questionnaire)	19
Table 5: Family Communication Patterns	22
Table 5: Family Communication Patterns Table 6: Test of Normality	
Table 7: Mean and Median of English Communicative Skills	
Table 8: Descriptive Statitis (Consensual, Laissez-fair and Protective)	
Table 9: Ranks (Consensual, Laissez-faire and Protective)	
Table 10: Test Statistics ^{a,b} (Consensual, Laissez-faire and Protective)	29
Table 11: Ranks between Consensual and Laissez-faire Families	
Table 12: Test Statistics ^{a,b} between Consensual and Laissez-faire Families	
Table 13: Ranks between Consensual and Protective Families	
Table 14: Test Statistics ^{a,b} between Consensual and Protective Families	
Table 15: Ranks between Laissez-faire and Protective Familieis	
Table 16: Test Statistics ^{a,b} between Laissez-faire and Protective Families	

Page

LIST OF FIGURES

viii

Figure 1: Concept of Application of the Theory for This Research	. 8
Figure 2: Family Communication Patterns	22
Figure 3: Distribution of Consensual Family Communication Pattern	25
Figure 4: Distribution of Laissez-Faire Family Communication Pattern	25
Figure 5: Distribution of Protective Family Communication Pattern	26



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This first chapter of the research serves as an introduction of the study. It will provide the background. The objectives, the research questions and the definitions of key terms used in the study will also be identified. Further, the significance of the study will be explained.

NK U

1.1 Background of the study

Family plays an important role as a fundamental institution agent in a society. It is considered a social system and the earliest institution of the society (Rousta, Bayat & Nia, 2014). In fact, family is believed to be one of the main parameters that directly influences the functioning of a society (Mazaheri, 2008). Education is another important aspect that drives the efficient functioning of the society. Turkkahraman (2012) stated that society and education complement each other especially in terms of communication in the society, and that without education the society is affected starting from the family institution. Therefore, it can be inferred that the concepts related to society, family, education and communication are intertwined.

Regardless of different upbringing styles, an individual is raised in a family. Charoenthaweesub & Hale (2011) supported this statement by claiming that every human being holds some kind of membership in a family. To better understand how a family functions in a society as a means to supplement human communication, one possible way to do so is through the study of family communication patterns. This is because family serves as an inception point where a person learns how to communicate since childhood. In other words, the way people learn to communicate are influenced by their family communication patterns (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). Whilst this may be a phenomenon that occurs at home, it links to what may take place at educational institutions as proven by scholars in the relevant field (Ullrich & Kreppner, 1997; Jowkar, Kohoulat & Zakeri, 2011).

1.2 Objectives of the study

Based on this preliminary revision of the significance of family, especially family communication patterns and their role in communication studies as well as the related field of education, this study aims to examine the family communication patters in Thailand. This is because studies on Thai family communication patterns are limited (Charoenthawweesub, 2011). The current study will also examine how Thai communication patterns influence English communicative skills of Thai university students given they are connected. The objectives of this research are outlined as follows:

- 1. To examine family communication patterns among by Thai university students; and,
- 2. To examine how family communication patterns influence English communicative skills of Thai university students.

1.3 Research questions

According to the objectives of the research above, the research questions of this current research are listed below:

- 1. What are the family communication patterns among Thai university students?
- 2. How do family communication patterns influence English communicative skills of Thai university students?

1.4 Significance of the study

This research is of a unique characteristic. It is communication research that provides additional attributes to supplement its relative field of educational research. There have been studies that examine the relationship between family communication patterns and academic achievement (Ullrich & Kreppner, 1997; Jowkar, Kohoulat & Zakeri, 2011). However, to the researcher's knowledge, there has not been any study that looks to find the relationship between family communication patterns and language learning skills (for the purpose of this study – English communicative skills) especially in the Thai context. As a consequence, this study will be beneficial to both communication researchers and education researchers in the field of English language teaching. It may be a preliminary set of literature review for future researchers, which will allow them to better understand how family communication patterns can have an impact upon language learning. It will also be beneficial to family communication scholars in Thailand in terms of additional empirical data.

1.5 Definitions of terms

 Family communication pattern refers to the patterns of communication found in a Thai family.
 English communicative skill refers to the characteristics of communication skills according to the principle of communicative language teaching as expected by a student when speaking English in and outside the classroom such as being talkative, participating in oral expressions, speaking English outside the classroom.

This introductory chapter has covered the background of the research. Further, the chapter has listed out the objectives, the research questions and the definitions of key terms of the research. The significance of the study has also been identified. The following chapter will discuss in details the review of relevant literature of the research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This second chapter serves as a review on relevant literature of the study. It will begin with the theoretical framework of the study – Family Communication Patterns Theory. Justification of the theoretical framework will also be explained in the chapter. Other relevant literature includes Thai family characteristics and communicative learning approach.

2.1 Theoretical framework

2.1.1 Family Communication Patterns Theory

Family Communication Patterns Theory is the conceptual product of Chaffee, McLeod, & Wackman (1973) with the attempt to explain, through stable and predictable patterns, how members in a family communicate with one another. The foundation of this theory is based on the Co-orientation Theory, a cognitive theory, which suggests that "two or more persons focusing on and evaluating the same object in their social and material environment" (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002, p. 52). Essentially, this means that cognition and perception of a person may be influenced by cognition or perception of another person in the same group. In other words, their focus and evaluation of a given object are shared through a degree of agreement. This is because "[W]ithout a sufficient degree of agreement as to what the situation is all about, it is not possible to begin to formulate a perception of how the other party sees the issue" (Ajieh & Uzokwe, 2014, p. 220). However, Chaffee, McLeod, & Wackman (1973) elaborated on the fact that members of a family may not always share the same agreement in a given social setting. In fact, family members often hold different ideas about something particularly in this age of globalisation as a result of easy access to media and other resources that may have an influential impact upon how an individual may focus and evaluate something. Therefore, Family Communication Patterns Theory introduces an alternative model of communication in which its founders claimed that, according to Family Communication Patterns, there existed two dimensions of family communication patterns namely social-oriented and concept-oriented patterns (Chaffee, McLeod, & Wackman, 1973).

The social-oriented pattern refers to the authoritative and controlling nature of communication on the part of parents. This means children are subject to the authority of their parents, maintenance of harmonious relationships, and avoidance of conflicts with their parents as well as other people. In contradiction to the first type, the concept-oriented pattern focuses on the promotion of being independent in the ideas, beliefs and feelings on the part of children. In other words, parents in this type of family communication patterns tend to deviate from the traditional authoritative and controlling style (Chaffee, McLeod, & Wackman, 1973).

Family communication patterns are further sub-divided into four types: protective, pluralistic, laissez-faire and consensual (Chaffee, McLeod, & Wackman, 1973). According to the explanation by the founding theorists, the family communication of the protective type contains characteristics of being low on concept-orientation whereas high on social-orientation. This first type is the most traditional pattern. Children in this type of family are expected to strictly obey their parents' instructions without challenging their parents' authority. The pluralistic type is in reverse. It is low on social-orientation and high on concept-orientation, which means children in this type of family are free to express their ideas, beliefs and feelings. As for the laissez-faire type, it is both social-orientedly and concept-orientedly low. This type of family seems to care neither the nature of being authoritative and controlling parents nor being progressive and liberal children. This is totally opposite to the consensual type in which the social-oriented and conceptoriented patterns are both high. For this last type of family communication patterns, while parents may be strict in their authority, they seem to be open to discussions initiated by their children at the same time. Charoenthaweesub & Hale (2011) reported that this type of family communication pattern best represented the situation in Thailand.

The original ideas of family communication patterns have been criticised due to their limited framework around socialisation; therefore, the ideas were advanced by Richie and Fitzpatrick (1990), who perceived the socio-orientation as conformity orientation (measured by parents' control) and the concept-orientation as conversation orientation (measured by communication control).

2.1.2 Application of the theory for this research

According to the Family Communication Patterns Theory, based on the cultural value in Thailand, the research assumes that the family communication patterns of Thai family fall under the social-oriented category/conformity orientation. If this is the case, children in the Thai families should be limited to how they can express their own ideas, beliefs and feelings. Rather, they are expected to defer their parents and seniors in which it is detrimental to the children in terms of self-confidence and independent skills. In this type of families, it should be difficult for children to learn new knowledge by themselves. This is because they lack the confidence to initiate discussions and the ability to acquire active learning skills. Some scholars (Ullrich & Kreppner, 1997; Jowkar, Kohoulat & Zakeri, 2011) studied how family communication patterns are connected with academic achievements. The study by Ullrich & Kreppner (1997), which examined the quality of family communication and academic achievement in early adolescence found that relaxed family communication patterns created positive impact upon children. A more recent study of Jowkar, Kohoulat & Zakeri (2011) who studied family communication patterns and academic resilience of 606 school students and found that family communication patterns had significant impact upon students' academic resilience.

When it comes to the factor associated with language, communication apprehension, which is an "individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey, 1977, p. 78) plays an important role in how a person learns language. According to McCroskey (1977) people who experience communication apprehension were found to be negatively affected academically. To link family communication patterns with second or foreign language learning, it was found by Richmond, Beatty & Dyba (1982) that people who were affected by communication apprehension in their first language, were also affected by communication apprehension in their second or foreign language learning. Therefore, it could be assumed that Thai children who experience strict social-orientation/conformity orientation family communication patterns may not display characteristics of English communicative skills. The following figure illustrates the concept of the application of the theory for this research.

COUNE

7



Figure 1: Concept of Application of the Theory for This Research

Based on the theoretical framework of this research that family communication patterns of a specific family type affect English communicative skills, the following hypotheses are put forward:

H1: Students from consensual families have significantly higher scores on English communicative skills than those from protective families:

H2: Students from consensual families have significantly higher scores on English communicative skills than those from laissez-faire families;

H3: Students from pluralistic families have significantly higher scores on English

communicative skills than those from protective families; and,

H4: Students from pluralistic families have significantly higher scores on English communicative skills than those from laissez-faire families.

2.2 Thai family characteristics

Thailand is part of Asia; therefore, the Thai culture is part of an Asian culture. Pongsapich (1990) stated that in a Thai family, males were dominant and juniors had to defer to their seniors. This is confirmed by Hofstede (1991) who stated that Thai families were high context in nature. To elaborate on this, children are expected to obey commands of their parents. This means when they communicate with their parents, they are not supposed to question their parents. They are expected to accept and follow their parents' teaching. This notion is supported by the National Child and Youth Development Plan during 2002 to 2011, which encouraged the moral and ethical values on teenagers to lead their lives (National Youth Bureau, 2002). Taking moral and ethical values into consideration, it would be fair to assume that traditional thinking is still firmly embedded in the Thai society.

Further support may be found in the analysis on Thai families by Pinyuchon & Gray (1997) who agreed that religious beliefs and societal values played significant roles in Thai families. As a result of this policy together with the supporting reasons mentioned in here, it can be construed that not only at the family level do Thai families give importance to hierarchy, conformity, and high distance power, but this is also reflective at the national level. Therefore, in accordance with the present literature review, it would be fair to conclude that Thai families belong to the social-oriented category/conformity orientation. Nevertheless, it does not mean that Thai families do not promote any concepts related to individual belief and self-confidence. As claimed by Charoenthaweesub & Hale (2011), Thai family communication patterns conform to those characteristics of the consensual patterns. This means that despite possessing authoritative

and controlling nature, Thai family communication patterns demonstrate some leniency towards individual beliefs, ideas, and feelings.

2.3 Communicative learning approach

Throughout the history of English language teaching, a number of teaching approaches have existed in parallel with various learning approaches. Chomsky (1965) initiated the grammar-translation approach to teaching English. The Chomskian approach dominated English language teaching up to the late 1960s (Richards, 2006). The framework is subject to criticisms due to its main weakness in which the focus of it is majorly on syntax with minimum attention to the communicative side of language learning. Towards the beginning of 1970s, "[R]ather than simply specifying the grammar and vocabulary learners needed to master, it was argued that a syllabus should identify the following aspects of language use in order to be able to develop the learner's communicative competence" (Richards, 2006, p. 9). The aspects included purposes, setting, role, communicative events, language functions, notions, discourse and rhetorical skills, variety, grammatical content, and lexical content. As a result of this, the communicative language teaching emerged.

In a communicative teaching class, in order to successfully learn, learners are required to make real communication, experiment and look for information by themselves (Richards, 2006) in addition to what is provided to them by the teachers. This is a combination of deductive learning as well as inductive learning. To enunciate this point, in language learning, the learners learn deductively by receiving language rules provided to them in class. However, in communicative language learning, after being exposed to the language rules, the learners have to search for more information to experiment and expand their knowledge further (Richards, 206). Similar to the environment at home for the parents, the communicative approach requires that the

teachers open up to errors made by learners in order to allow the learners to acquire their communicative competence. This way builds up self-confidence in the learners and encourages them to actively seek out for knowledge and try to learn by themselves.

The trend of English language teaching in Thailand is also in line with the communicative language teaching. In fact communicative language teaching has been the required method by the Thai Ministry of Education since the education reform in 1990 (Darasawang, 2007). Saengboon (2002, p. 37) confirmed this by explaining that "[C]ommunicative Language Teaching in Thailand will have the goal of producing reasonably fluent communicative skills appropriate to the local setting". The statement clearly indicates that communicative teaching has been established in Thailand. Confirmation may be found in the statement by Punthumasen (2007) who reported that communicative teaching had been incorporated into Thai English curriculum since 1996. However, Saengboon (2002, p. 37) also suggested that "towards this goal, the teacher will retain conventional authority in the classroom while conducting activities that encourage interactions among students". This latter statement somehow contradicts a modern approach to teaching as well as the communicative teaching approach in which the focus is placed upon the learners not the teachers. According to Collins & O'Brien (2003, p. 343):

This learning model places the student (learner) in the center of the learning process. The instructor provides students with opportunities to learn independently and from one another and coaches them in the skills they need to do so effectively. The SCI approach includes such techniques as substituting active learning experiences for lectures, assigning open-ended problems and problems requiring critical or creative thinking that

cannot be solved by following text examples, involving students in simulations and role plays, and using self-paced and/or cooperative (team-based) learning
Since a contradiction exists between what it should be and how it is practiced in Thailand, it may be the reason why communicative teaching is problematic in Thailand. This is because
communicative teaching poses "several problems as is evidenced in the results of the English language evaluation of our students as a whole" (Punthumasen, 2007, p. 2). As Khamkhien
(2010) reported that performance of Thai students in English was low in the ASEAN countries.

It is not only the teachers who play a role in rendering success of English communicative skills in their students, but also the students themselves who must explore the understanding and advantages of communicative language teaching. These include being active in the classroom as well as out-of-classroom experiences, being collaborative, and being collaborative in the classroom (Sanna, 2013). This is because English communicative skills are built upon both linguistic and social factors (Hedge, 2000; Brown, 2007). Most relevant to this study is being able to use the language appropriately in a given social setting (Hedge, 2000). The rationale behind this lies in the fact that students learn sociolinguistic competence through family communication patterns and from experience they gain from school. Further, based on inductive learning which forms an essential component in English communicative skills, students should also demonstrate strategic competence. This means the students can maintain effective communication in an authentic situation (Canale & Swain, 1980). Family communication patterns especially from consensual and pluralistic families should demonstrate highly in their English communicative skills. The opposite should occur in the protective families.

Throughout this chapter, the theoretical framework based on the Family Communication Patterns Theory has been discussed. The relevant literature including the Thai family characteristics and the communicative learning approach have also been analysed in support of the concept found in this research. The third chapter will provide a discussion on the research methodology of the research.



CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research employed the quantitative approach, and applied the survey research method. The theoretical framework of the research was based on the Family Communication Pattern Theory by Chaffee, McLeod & Wackman (1973). This part of the research presents the population, participants, research instruments, data collection procedure, and data analysis of the research.

3.1 Population of the research

According to the Higher Education Information website, as of 30 November 2016, there are 1,933,310 Thai students studying at the tertiary level in Thailand (Higher Education Information, 2016).

3.2 Participant

The participants of the research were set at 400 Thai university students at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels studying English and English education majors at Srinakharinwirot University. This is in line with Gay (1996) who stated that when the population size is beyond a certain point, usually more than 5,000 people, the sample size of 400 people is adequate. The technique for the sampling group selection is convenience sampling.

3.3 Research instrumentation

There were two research instruments for this research. The first was adopted from the Revised Family Pattern Questionnaire developed by Ritchie and Fitzpatrick (1990). The role questionnaire was to identify family communication patterns as perceived by participants. It was a 26-item questionnaire. Based on this questionnaire 15 items (Questions 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24 and 26) were used to assess the conversation-orientation whereas the other 11 items (Questions 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 18, 20, 23, and 25) were used to assess the conformity-orientation. The 7-point Likert type scale was the format of the questionnaire – 1: Strongly Disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Somewhat Disagree, 4 Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5: Somewhat Agree, 6: Agree, and 7: Strongly Agree. The Cronbach's alpha of the original questionnaire was 0.75 (M = 50.71, S.D. = 9.05) for the conversation family patterns, and 0.87 (M = 31.80, S.D. = 8.02) for the conformity patterns.

The second research instrument was the English Communicative Skills Questionnaire adapted from Sanaa (2013). The modification was made to better suit the Thai communicative learning environment. The purpose of this questionnaire was to examine the English communicative skills of the participants. It was a 20-item questionnaire consisting of two parts – likelihood of English communicative skills and non-communicative skills. Twelve items (Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19) assessed the likelihood of English communicative skills on the part of students. The other eight items (Questions 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14 and 20) assessed the likelihood of non-communicative skills on the part of students. The 7point Likert type scale was the format of the questionnaire – 1: Strongly Disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Somewhat Disagree, 4 Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5: Somewhat Agree, 6: Agree, and 7: Strongly Agree. The content validity of the modified questionnaires was checked by three experts through the use of Index of Congruence (IOC) (Payne, 2003).

3.4 Data collection procedure

The data collection procedure of the research was as follows:

1. The researcher distributed the questionnaires to 400 Thai university students in Bangkok through an online channel. The participants were between 19-25 years of age.

2. The participants were allowed one week for respondents to complete the questionnaires.

3. After collecting all of the completed questionnaires, the research used SPSS to analyse the data.

3.5 Data analysis procedure

The questionnaires that were used in this research produced the data for the research in the form of interval data. Two sets of the interval data were used in order to support or reject hypotheses as well as to respond to the research questions of the study.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was set to be conducted to test all of the hypotheses of the research.

Throughout this chapter, the fundamental concept of the research methodology used in the research has been explained. This includes the technique of selecting group sampling, the construct of the research instruments together with how they were tested in terms of reliability. The statistical analysis of the research has also been explained in this chapter. The fourth chapter will discuss the research findings of this study.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter discusses the results of the research. It demonstrates the statistical analysis calculated by SPSS based on the raw data collected using the Family Communication Patterns and the English Communicative Learning Skills Questionnaires. Hypotheses and Research Questions are also dealt with in this chapter.

The researcher distributed 400 Family Communication Patterns together with the English Communicative Skills Questionnaires to the participants in this research. Out of the 400 questionnaires, 331 were completed and returned to the researcher within one week. Out of the 331 participants, 121 participants (36%) were male and 210 participants (62.5%) were female. Table 1 below provides frequency of the gender of the participants in this research.

		B B	la la	4	(ma
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative
					Percent
	Male	121	36.0	36.6	36.6
Valid	Female	210	62.5	63.4	100.0
	Total	331	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.5		
Total		336	100.0		

Table 1: Gender

The age range of the participants in this research was between 19 to 25 years of age. Out of the 311 participants, 79 participants (23.5%) were 19 years old, 77 participants (22.9%) were 20 years old, 61 participants (18.2%) were 21 years old, 47 participants (14%) were 22 years old, 29 participants (8.6%) were 23 years old, 16 participants (4.8%) were 24 years old, and 22 participants (6.5%) were 25 years old. Table 2 below provides the frequency of the age range of the participants in this research.

Table 2:	Age	active and the first of the fir	O	KU,	ND.	No. of Concession, Name
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative	The second
<i>a</i> .					Percent	p \
	19	79	23.5	23.9	23.9	(\mathcal{O})
	20	77	22.9	23.3	47.1	Anterination of the second
	21	61	18.2	18.4	65.6	12mmstrati
Valid	22	47	14.0	14.2	79.8	And Carling
	23	29	8.6	8.8	88.5	@ /
	24	16	4.8	4.8	93.4	V
	25	22	6.5	6.6	100.0	Contraction of the second
	Total	331	98.5	100.0		
Missing	System	5	1.5			
Total		336	100.0			

4.1 Reliability of the instruments

To ensure that the research instruments of this research were reliable, the researcher administered the reliability test for both of the research instruments. The Family Communication Patterns Questionnaire rendered the Cronbach alpha's value of 0.93. The English Communicative Skills Questionnaire rendered the Cronbah alpha's value of 0.77. According to Nunnally & Bernstein (1994) as well as Tavakok & Dennick (2011), the acceptable level of Chronbach's alpha value was between 0.70 and 0.95. Therefore, both research instruments in this research met the acceptable level of reliability test.

Table 3: Reliability Statistics (Family Communication Patterns Questionnaire)

101 (Shr. 10
N of Items
26

Table 4: Reliability Statistics (English Communicative Skills Questionnaire)

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.778	20

4.2 Family communication patterns and analysis

As stated in chapter 3, Questions 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24 and 26 in the Family Communication Patterns Questionnaire assessed the conversation orientation (Richie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). The 7-point Likert scale was used in the questionnaire. The median score of this orientation was 5. Therefore, the researcher set up the score range as follows: 1 to 4 = low conversation orientation

5 to 7 = high conversation orientation

Similar to the conversation orientation, Questions 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 18, 20, 23, and 25 in the Family Communication Patterns Questionnaire assessed the conformity orientation. The median score of this orientation was 4. Therefore, the researcher set up the score range as follows:

1 to 3 =low conformity orientation

4 to 7 = high conformity orientation

To further categorise the two orientations into family communication pattern types of Chaffee, McLeod, & Wackman, (1973), the following criteria suggested by the modified concept of family communication patterns by Richie & Fitzpatrick (1990) were applied:

VIL

- 1. High conversation orientation + High conformity orientation = Consensual family
- 2. High conversation orientation + Low conformity orientation = Pluralistic family
- 3. Low conversation orientation + High conformity orientation = Protective family
- 4. Low conversation orientation + Low conformity orientation = Laissez-faire family

After the data obtained from the participants had been applied against the above criteria, it was found that consensual family type ranked first (158 out of 331 participants). This means 47% of the participants came from the families who communication patterns were high in the conversation orientation as well as in the conformity orientation. Laissez-faire family type

ranked second (92 out of 331 participants). In other words, 27.4% of the participants were raised in the families that were high neither in the conversation nor the conformity orientations. The protective family type ranked third (81 out of 331 participants), which can be interested that 24.1% of the participants belonged to the families where high conformity orientation and low conversation orientation were found in their family communication patterns. Interestingly, the pluralistic family type did not fit into the description as proposed by Chaffee, McLeod & Wackman (1973) according to the data of the participants in this research. This means out of the 331 participants in this research, none of them came from a family who communication patterns were high in the conversation orientation and low in the conformity orientation. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 (Students from pluralistic families have significantly higher scores on English communicative skills than those from protective families) and Hypothesis 4 (Students from pluralistic families have significantly higher scores on English communicative skills than those from laissez-faire families) 4 were automatically rejected.

However, it was possible to form Hypothesis 5, which compared the differences between the English communicative skills between the participants from the laissez-faire families and the ones from the protective families. Since the laissez-faire families were low on both conversation and conformity orientations, in theory, the members of these families should score low on English communicative skills. In addition, with the pressure from the parents in protective families who want to see their children do well academically, members of these families should score higher than the laissez-faire members despite being low in conversation orientation. Therefore, the final hypothesis was formed as follow: H5: Students from protective families have significantly higher scores on English communicative skills than those from laissez-faire families.

	1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 -	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative
					Percent
	Consensual	158	47.0	47.7	47.7
Valid	Laissez-Faire	92	27.4	27.8	75.5
, una	Protective	81	24.1	24.5	100.0
	Total	331	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.5		
Total		336	100.0		



.



Figure 2: Family Communication Patterns

4.3 Test of normaility

All of the Hypotheses in the research aimed to examine the differences between the scores of English communicative skills among different groups of family types. In general, ANOVA would be an appropriate statistical tool for the Hypotheses. In order to ensure that ANOVA was the appropriate statistical tool, it was necessary to test that the data from all types of family communication patterns were normally distributed. Thus, the tests of normality were administered.

Originally, Shapiro & Wilk (1965) recommended this test of normality for a sample size of not more than 50. Therefore, the researcher referred to the significance value calculated in the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The significance value of the consensual and the protective family types were 0.20 and 0.20 respectively. This indicated that the normal distribution hypothesis was rejected. Despite the significance value of the laissez-faire family type, it was not possible to accept the normal distribution hypothesis because the other two sets of data were not normally distributed. Even when referring to the significance values calculated by the Shapiro-Wilk test, the same conclusion was drawn that the data in the consensual (significance value = 0.654) and the protective (significnace value = 0.58) family types were not normally distributed. Again, the laissez-faire family type was the only one with the significance value less than 0.05 (0.01). However, the same alnalysis goes with the that of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. That is, it would not be possible to accept the normal distribution analysis unless all of the data sets to be used in ANOVA were normally distributed.

According to the above statistical analysis, it was concluded that ANOVA could not be used in the current research. Moore, McCabe & Craig (2016) suggest that when the distribution of data is not normal, non-parametic tests are to be administered. As a consequence, for this research, Kruskal Wallis Test (for three or more variables) was used among the three groups and Mann-Whitney U Test (for one or two variables) was used to find the differences between each group (Green & Salkind, 2008).

Table 6: Test of Normality

	Family Communication	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-W		
Patterns		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
	Consensual	.061	158	.200*	.993	158	.654
Score	Laissez-Faire	.126	92	.001	.963	92	.010
	Protective	.052	81	.200*	.987	81	.588

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Figure 3, Figure 4 and Figure 5 demonstrate distribution of the data from the three types of family communication patterns and English communicative skills of the participants in the research. According to Figure 3, it is clear that the curve of the distributed data was not in the shape of a normal bell shape. On the contrary, Figure 4 shows a more recognisable bell shape. This means it represents normal distribution of the data. The last one, Figure 5, does not depict the bell shape. This means that the data of the protective family communication pattern failed to meet the assumption of normal distribution.



Figure 4: Distribution of Laissez-Faire Family Communication Pattern



Figure 5: Distribution of Protective Family Communication Pattern

4.4 Evaluation of differences

Table 7 provides descritive statistics on mean and median for the family communication patterns of the three family types (consensual, lessez-faire and protective) found in this research against the score on English communicative skills. Out of the 331 participants, 158 participants in the consensual family received the highest mean score of 94.24 and S.D. = 13.78 (median = 94). The 81 participants in the protective families were in the middle rank with the mean score of 89.86, S.D. = 12.08 (median = 89). As for the 92 participants from the laissez-faire families, the mean score was 84.13, S.D. = 17.01 (median = 82) making it the least mean score out of the three family types.
Family Communication	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Median
Patterns				
Consensual	94.2468	158	13.78344	94.0000
Laissez-Faire	84.1304	92	17.01080	82.0000
Protective	89.8642	81	12.08072	89.0000
Total	90.3625	331	14.95574	90.0000

Table 7: Mean and Median of English Communicative Skills

4.5 Test of differences (Kruskal-Willis test)

In order to test the differences among the three family communication pattern types (consensual, laissez-faire and protective), the Kruskal Wallis test was administered. The family communication patterns served as the independent variable whereas the English communicative skills served as the dependant variable (this applied to the rest of the test after this section). Table 8 provides descriptive statistics of the test. Out of the 331 participants, the mean score of the English communicative skills for all of the family types was 90.36 (the total score in the English Communicative Skills Questionnaire was 140). The maximum score was 137 whereas the minmum score was 35. The Standard Deviation of the score was 14.95.

Table 9 provides scores on English communicative skills of each family type. The consensual families received the mean rank of 190.74 (median = 94.00), which was the highest rank comapred the the other two family types. The protective families rendered the mean rank of 163.52 (median = 89.00. For the laissez-faire families, they had the mean rank of 125.70 (median = 82.00) making it the lowest score rank holder compared to all of the family types.

Table 10 provides the statistics derived by the Kruskal Willis test. The results indicated a significance differentce on the scores of English communicative skills in the participants of the three family types (consensual, laissez-faire and protective). In this case, $X^2 (2, N = 331) = 26.94$, p = 0.00. These results were for the overall test. The Mann-Whitney U test had to also be administered to evaluate pairwise differences between each group.

Table 8: Descriptive Statitis (Consensual, Laissez-fair and Protective)

		12	andra The		Allen.	
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Score		331	90.3625	14.95574	35.00	137.00
Family	Communication					
Patterns	5	331	1.77	.819	1	3
			Va s			Contraction of the second s
Fable 9	e: Ranks (Consens	ual, Laisse	z-faire and	Protective)	Beau	
	Family Communic	4.	1.3.7			
	,	ation	Ν	Mean Rank		
	Patterns	ation	N	Mean Rank		
			N 158	Mean Rank 190.74		
Saara	Patterns				06}	
Score	Patterns Consensual		158	190.74		

Table 10: Test Statistics^{a,b} (Consensual, Laissez-faire and Protective)

	Score
Chi-Square	26.949
df	2
Median	90.0000
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Kruskal Willis Test

b. Grouping Variable: Family

Communication Patterns

4.6 Test of differences (Mann-Whitney U test)

To evaluate the differences of scores on English communicative skills, Mann-Whitney U test was administered on three separate times as follows:

A.

A: Consensual vs laissez-faire families

The first time was between the consensual and laissez-faire families. The second was between the consensual and protective families. The last time was for between the laissez-faire and the protective families.

According to Table 11, for the 158 participants in the consensual family type, the mean rank of the English communicative skills score was 149.91 (median = 94, which was much higher than the mean rank of the 95.61 (median = 82) produced by 92 participants in the laissez-faire family type.

Table 12 provides the statistical analysis calculated by the Mann-Whitney U test. The statistics indicated that participants of the consensual family type scored significantly higher on

English communicative skills than the participants from the laissez-faire family type (Mann-Whitney U = 4518 (Z = -4.98), $n_1 = 158$, $n_2 = 92$, p = 0.00). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was supported.

	Family Communication Patterns	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
	Consensual	158	142.91	22579.00
Score	Laissez-Faire	92	95.61	8796.00
	Total	250		

Table 11: Ranks between Consensual and Laissez-faire Families

Table 12: Test Statistics^{a,b} between Consensual and Laissez-faire Families

		A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
	Score	
Mann-Whitney U	4518.000	
Wilcoxon W	8796.000	
Z	-4.989	
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	1. 400 mm
a. Grouping Variable: Fa	mily	NOFOL
Communication Patterns		VL/L/L

B: Consensual vs protective families

According to Table 13, 159 participants from the consensual families produced a mean rank score of 127.33 (median = 94) on English communicative skills, which was higher than the mean score rank of 105.70 (median = 89) produced by the participants in the protective families.

The Mann-Whitney U statistics in Table 14 indicated that the scores on English communicative skills of the participants from the consensual families were significantly higher than the scores of the participants from the protective families (Mann-Whitney U value = 5240 (Z = -2.29), $n_1 = 158$, $n_2 = 81$, p = 0.02). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

Table 13: Ranks between Consensual and Protective Families

	Family Communication	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
	Patterns			
	Consensual	158	127.33	20118.50
Score	Protective	81	105.70	8561.50
	Total	239		

Table 14: Test	Statistics ^{a,b}	between (Consensual	and	Protective Families	

	Score
Mann-Whitney U	5240.500
Wilcoxon W	8561.500
Z	-2.291
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.022

a. Grouping Variable: Family

Communication Patterns

C: Laissez-faire vs protective families

According to Table 15, 92 participants from the laissez-faire families had the mean rank of 76.59 (median = 82), which was lower than the mean rank of 98.83 (median = 89) produced by the 81 participants from the protective families.

The statistics calculated by the Mann-Whitney U test in Table 16 indicated that the scores on English communicative skills of the participants from the protective families were significantly higher than the scores produced by the participants from the laissez-faire families (Mann-Whitney U value = 2768 (Z = -2.91), $n_1 = 92$, $n_2 = 81$, p = .00). Therefore, Hypothesis 5 was supported.

	Family Communication Patterns	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
	Laissez-Faire	92	76.59	7046.00
Score	Protective	81	98.83	8005.00
	Total	173		

Table 15: Ranks between Laissez-faire and Protective Familieis

Table 16: Test Statistics^{a,b} between Laissez-faire and Protective Families

12	183A	
	Score	
Mann-Whitney U	2768.000	
Wilcoxon W	7046.000	AL STATE
Z	-2.916	VDED :-
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	Real Processing and the second se

a. Grouping Variable: Family

Communication Patterns

Throughout this chapter, the statistical analysis on the family communication patterns of the three family types has been discussed. The scores on English communicative skills have also been statistically analysed against the communication patterns of the three family types. Because the pluralistic families were not identified by the research group samples, therefore, Hypotheses 3 and 4 were rejected. However, the rest of the Hypotheses were supported. The final chapter of the research deals with discussions and interpretation of the statistical findings. It also concludes the findings of this research.



CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This chapter is the final chapter of the research. It begins with the summary of the research. The focus of the chapter will be on the discussion with regard to the findings of the research. This serves as answers and explanation to the research questions of the study. Recommendation for future research will also be provided in this chapter.

5.1 Summary of the research

This quantitative research studied the family communication patterns in the Thai context based on the original conceptual model of Family Communication Patterns by Chaffee, McLeod & Wackman (1973). The aim of the research was to find the differences among the family communication patterns in Thailand in relation to their English communicative skills. The theoretical framework of the research was based on the assumption that certain types of family communication patters (high in communication such as pluralistic families) should demonstrate better English communication skills than other types (low in communication such as conformity families). The convenience sampling technique was applied to select the group sampling for the research. Two sets of questionnaires were used as the research instruments – 1) Revised Family Communication Patterns Questionnaire (Ritchie and Fitzpatrick, 1990) and 2) modified English Communicative Skills Questionnaire (Sanaa, 2013). The Krusakl-Willis test was administered to find the differences between individual groups of family communication

patterns. While Chapter 4 provides the statistical findings of the research, the following part of this research discusses the implications of the research findings.

5.2 Discussion

5.2.1 Thai family communication patterns

This initial part of the discussion deals with the family communication patterns found in this research. Essentially, it answers the first research question – What are the family communication patterns among Thai university students?

The first point to make here is the comparison between the original proposal on family types of Chaffee, McLeod & Wackman (1973) and the family types that were identified in the findings of the research. The original concept proposes that there are four types of family based on their communication patterns – consensual, pluralistic, protective and laissez-faire. However, the findings of the research showed that only three types of family communication patterns had been identified – consensual (47%), protective (24.1%) and laissez-faire (27.4%). The pluralistic family type, based on the findings of this research, had not been identified by the participants.

In response to the first research question, it was found that the majority of the participants (47%) were identified as members from the consensual type. This means the participants were encouraged to express their ideas as family members while at the same time being under strict control of their parents. Interestingly, the findings were in line a previous study conducted by Charoenthaweesub & Hale (2011). In their study on Thai family communication patterns, it was found that the consensual type was the family communication patterns among Thai adolescents. Consequently, the findings in Charoenthaweesub & Hale (2011) as well as the current study agreed with the family communication patterns as proposed by other scholars including Hofstede (1991); Pinyuchon & Gray (1997); and Pongsapich (1990).

To sum up, the findings of the current research revealed the consensual characteristic of Thai families. This means that the traditional aspect of being highly social oriented of Thai families continues to play a role. Children are still expected to adhere to their parents' belief and instruction. Further, parents remain the model for their children to follow. Yet; the more progressive trait of being liberal and candid on the part of the parents has been integrated into Thai families. In other words, Thai parents do grant permission for their children to express ideas and opinions to the degree that they are willing to hear belief that is against their own. This direction towards Thai family communication patterns proposes a sound argument to support the findings of this research. As a result of globalisation, it is undeniably difficulty to avoid change. Nevertheless, the identity of being Thai is also subject to uneasy alteration. Thus, Thai families, at this current time and as identified by the majority of the participants in this research, are best presented as possessing the consensual family communication pattern.

Based on the analysis above, it is reasonable to accept the findings whereby the pluralistic type of family communication patterns had not been identified by the participants. This is because the characteristic of this family communication pattern is against the intrinsic trait of being Thai family that is being highly social oriented. Despite the change the world of communication has experienced, it is not possible to deny the root of being Thai family – highly social oriented in terms of how members in a family communicate.

To discuss the pluralistic type, the participants in this research did not identify themselves being part of the pluralistic type because this type of family communication would be too contradictory to the cultural dimensions of Thai society. In a highly educated family, it is possible for Thai parents to allow their children to express ideas and opinions in the household; however, it would be highly unlikely that parents in this type of family would ignore social orientation or conformity in the family. In other words, consensual, laissez-faire and protective family communication patterns each exhibits relevant characteristics of Thai families, but pluralistic type does not. Therefore, this would be the best explanation for the non-existence of the pluralistic type of communication in this current research.

5.2.2 Family communication patterns and English communicative skills

This part of the chapter discusses the second research question - How do family

communication patterns influence English communicative skills of Thai university students? When referring to the English Communicative Skills Questionnaire, there were 20 questions with a 7-point Likert scale for each question. This equated to the total score of 140, the more score a participant demonstrated, the better likelihood of English communicative skills the participant tended to have. It was clear from the statistics that participants from the consensual family type demonstrated the best skills of English communication (mean = 94.24, median = 94). This is because it is the only family communication pattern that promotes the conversation orientation whereas the laissez-faire and protective family communication patterns are employed by parents of the families that do not encourage children to express ideas and opinions. The mean score of the protective type was 89.86 (median = 89) whereas it was 84.13 (median = 82) for the laissez-faire type. Despite being low in conversation orientation for both of these types, members of the families possessing the protective family communication pattern would be under pressure by their parents to achieve a certain academic achievement. This means even though the children are not encouraged to express their ideas and opinions in their families because they are expected to listen to and follow their parents' instruction (especially being competent in English), it would not be surprising that these children perform better at English than members of the laissez-faire type. A rationale behind this is because in the families possessing the laissezfaire communication pattern members of such families would be subject no little to no expectations from their parents to become good at English. Therefore, a certain type of family communication patterns especially the plays a role in success of academic goal, specific to this current research is English communicative skills. The results of the research accord with previous findings of other studies such as Ullrich & Kreppner (1997), Jowkar, Kohoulat & Zakeri, 2011)

To relate family communication patterns with the success of English communication skills on the part of students, it is useful to look at the role of communication apprehension. Based on McCroskey (1977), people who are afraid of using language to communicate suffer low academic achievement. It is clear from the findings of this research that members of families possessing low conversation orientation such as the protective and laissez-faire types received lower scores on English communication skills than the consensual type. Parents of students in the protective and laissez-faire type of families would be strict when it comes to communication within their families. A corollary of these behavioural communication patterns create communication apprehension on the family members, which means their English communicative skills would be negatively affected (see Beatty & Dyba, 1982). This means students in these families would be reluctant to express their ideas and belief because they fear that what they impart might not be as it is expected by their parents. Because Thai students perform lowly in English (see Khamkhien, 2010) and if the phenomena such as these continue to occur, it will always be detrimental to the students' English communicative skills. What happens at home normally influences how students behave in the classroom. Thus, it would be fair to conclude that students who experience communication apprehension because of the nature in their family communication patterns perform unsatisfactory in English communication skills. External to the

fear from the family, which plays a contributing role may be attitudes towards approximating native pronunciation. Suksiripakonchai (2015) and Suksiripakonchai (2013) suggested that native speaker pronunciation models were preferred among Thai students. Usually, students are often afraid of the speaking skills because of this reason. The more pressure the students receive from the non-conversation oriented style of upbringing, the more unlikely the students will achieve competent English communicative skills. This is because students' speaking approach would be more deductive rather than inductive. In other words, without being given information about what to say, the students will less likely to produce utterances or initiate a conversation. Basically, this would be against the principles of communicative learning (see Richards, 2006).

Contrary to the above discussion, members from families that support ideas and opinions perform better academically. In this research the pluralistic type of family communication patterns was not found; consequently, consensual type was the only communication pattern with high conversation orientation. Because parents of the consensual type encourage their children to speak up and share ideas and opinions at home, this will influence the children's language performance in the classroom. Since they are able to express themselves at home without communication apprehension, the students would unlikely show any communication apprehension in the classroom either. The consequence of this is the students being able to speak or be willing to speak in class both with the teachers and their peers. Essentially, these behaviours meet the goal of communicative English skills (Collins & O'Brien, 2003; Richards, 2006). Also, this is expected by the current policy of Thai education (Punthumasen, 2007; Saengboon, 2002).

5.3 Conclusion

It can be seen that family communication patterns that promote conversation orientation influence the likelihood of success in English communicative skills in Thai university students. Therefore, the conclusion can be drawn that it is beneficial for scholars and educators to study and understand the nature of family communication patterns in the Thai context so that they can better prepare themselves when teaching English. This is because of the significance of the current approach to teaching and learning English across the globe that emphasise communicative skills. Although it may not be possible for scholars and educators to change the communicative behaviours of people at home, by understanding family communication patterns scholars and educators may ensure that 1) students who perform competently in their English communicative skills can be pushed further for greater success, and 2) students who may suffer from low English communicative skills because of detrimental family communication patterns may not be disadvantaged academically.

To expand the Family Communication Theory, researchers will have to take into account that the original family communication ideas were based more towards western cultural dimensions. As apparent in this research, the original concepts failed to cover some aspects of Thai society – no one in the current research identified themselves as part of the pluralistic type. Therefore, family communication patterns could be further revised in the future to complete this gap.

5.4 Recommendation for future research

The current research findings were based on a group sampling of 331 Thai university students and only three types of family communication patterns were identified. Future researchers may look decide to sample a different group of participants in order to find out whether the pluralistic type of family communication pattern can be identified or not. This is because people from different socio-economic groups may possess varying family communication patterns. The current research intended to use statistical analysis to examine the significance level among different groups; therefore, a certain number of participants (around 400) were selected. However, future researchers may employ a different method using a much large scale of sample size if the significance level is not of interest to them. Other variables that were not studied in this research may also be of interest to future researchers including age and gender.

Various organisations can apply the findings of this research in to understand communicative competence of their employees. In this current study, the focus was upon students. Thus, education institutions can make best use of this research to further improve pedagogy of English language teaching. For other types of organisations, a human resources department would most likely benefit from the current research findings. This is because it can employ results and recommendation found in this current research to develop or improve training for its personnel particularly training related to communication skills and competence.

VDE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ajieh, P. C., & Uzokwe, U. N. (2014). Effective Application of the Coorientation Communication Model in Disseminating Agricultural Information: A Review. Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology, 3(3), 217-223.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). *Theoretical Bases of Communication Approaches*. UK: Cambridge University.
- Chaffee, S.H., McLeod, J.M., & Wackman, D.B. (1973). Family communication patterns and adolescent political participation. In J. Dennis (Ed.), *Socialization to politics* (pp. 349-364). NY: Wiley.
- Charoenthaweesub, M. & Hale, C. (2011, May-June). Thai Family Communication Patterns: Parent-Adolescent Communication and the Well-Being of Thai Families. Paper presented at the First International Conference on Interdisciplinary Research and Development, Thailand. Retrieved from http://www.inrit2013.com/inrit2011/Proceedings2011/02_84_16E_Mathurada%20Charoe

nttp://www.inrit2013.com/inrit2011/Proceedings2011/02_84_16E_Mathurada%20Charoe nthaweesub_[6].pdf.

- Chomsky, N. (965). Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. NY: MIT Press.
- Collins, J.W., 3rd, & O'Brien, N.P. (Eds). (2003). *Greenwood Dictionary of Education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Darasawang, P. (2007). English in Southeast Asia. UK: Cambridge Scholars.

Gay, L.R. (1996). Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. Beverly Hill, CA: Sage.

- Green, S.B. & Salkind, N.J. (2008). Using SPSS for Window and Macintosh: Analysing and understanding data (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Higher Education Information. (2016, November 30) Information on Educational Statistics. Retrieved from
 - http://www.info.mua.go.th/information/show_all_statdata_table.php?data_show=2Jowkar , B., Kohoulat, N., & Zakeri, H. (2011). Family Communication Patterns and Academic Resilience. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29*, 87-90.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). Cultures and organizations. London, UK: McGraw-Hill Book.
- Jowkar, B., Kohoulat, N., & Zakeri, H. (2011). Family Communication Patterns and Academic Resilience. Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29, 87-90.
- Koerner, A.F., & Fitzpatrick, M.A. (2002). Toward a theory of family communication. *Communication Theory*, *12*, 70-91.
- Khamkhien, A. (2010). Thai Learner' English Pronunciation Competence: Lesson Learned from Word Stress Assignment. *Journal of Language and Research*, 1(6), 754-764.
- Mazaheri, M. A. (2008). Examining the effect of parental control over education and social communicative behaviors of students. Family Research Institute: Final Research Project Report for the Ministry of Science, Research and Technology.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. *Human Communication Research*, *4*, 78-96.
- Moore, D.S., McCabe, G.P., & Craig, B.A. (2016). *Introduction to the Practice of Statistics* (9th ed). USA: W.H. Freeman.

National Youth Bureau. (2002). National Youth Policy and National Child and Youth Development Plan (2002-2011). Bangkok: National Youth Bureau, The Prime Minister's Office. (in Thai).

Nunnally, J. & Bernstein, L. (1994). Psychometric theory. NY: McGraw-Hill Higher, INC.

- Payne, D. A. (2003). *Applied Educational Assessment* (2nd ed.). Canada: Nelson Thomson Learning.
- Pinyuchon, M. & Gray, L.A. (1997). Understanding Thai Families: A Cultural Context for Therepists Using Structural Approach. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 19(2), 209-228.
- Pongsapich, A. (1999, May). Changing Family Patterns and Gender Roles in Asia. Paper presented at Regional Workshop, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand. Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0008/000865/086520EB.pdf.
- Punthumasen, P. (2007, December). International Program for Teacher Education: An
 Approach to Tackling Problems of English Education in Thailand. Paper presented at the 11th UNESCO-APEID International Conference Reinventing Higher Education: Toward Participatory and Sustainable Development, Bangkok, Thailand. Retrieved from http://www.unescobkk.org/fileadmin/user_upload/apeid/Conference/11thConference/pap ers/3C3_Pattanida_Punthumasen.pdf

Richards, J. C. (2006). Communicative Language Teaching Today. NY: Cambridge University.

- Ritchie, L. D. & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1990). Family communication patterns: Measuring intrapersonal perceptions of interpersonal relationships. *Communication Research*, 17, 523-544.
- Richmond, V. P., Beatty, M. J., & Dyba, P. (1985). Shyness and popularity: Children's views. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 49, 116-125.

- Rousta, Z., Bayat, D. E., & Nia, A. A. (2014). A comparison of family communication patterns and time management between two groups of students with either academic success or failure. *Journal of Novel Applied Sciences*, *3*(8), 908-914.
- Sanaa, M. (2013). Developing the Students' Speaking Skill through Communicative Learning
 Teaching. Case study: Second year LMD Students of English at Mohamed Khieder
 Biskra University. (Master Degree's thesis, Mohamed Khieder University of Biskra,
 Algeria) Retrieved from

http://dspace.univ-biskra.dz:8080/jspui/bitstream/123456789/4740/1/SE%20143.pdf.

- Shapiro, S. S. & Wlk, M. B. (1965). An Analysis of Variance Test for Normality (Complete Samples). *Biometrika*, 52(3/4), 591-611.
- Suksiripakonchai, W. (2015). English as Lingua Franca and Its Status in Thailand: Implications for Teaching English Pronunciation. *Journal of Asian Critical Education*, *3*, 5-11.
- Suksiripakonchai, W. (2013). Thai Students' Attitudes Towards Native/Non-native Speakers of English. Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, Burapha University, 21(35), 25-46.
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. International Journal of Medical Education, 2, 53-55.
- Turkkahraman, M. (2012). The role of education in the societal development. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World, 2*(4), 38-41.
- Ullrich, M. & Kreppner, K. (1997, April). The Quality of Family Communication and Academic Achievement in Early Adolescence. Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of SRCD, Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED409994.



Appendix 1 Family Communication Patterns Questionnaire

Your gender

- ⊖ Male
- O Female O Other

Your age

- 19
 20
 21

- 22○ 23

23 24 25 Pleas tick the level of agreement most suitable for your family

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewh at Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewh at Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. In our family we often talk	AN				C	11	
about topics like politics and		P Alexand			h, will	A MARK	
religion where some people	NICE STORAGE					The second	
disagree with others.		V William			्र विद्या		
2. When anything really	A Contraction			and the second	litter	met all	
important is involved, my	No.			and the second se	Ped	and h	
parents expect me to obey	A.			alle.		/	
without questions.							
3. My parents often say						Ø	
something like "Every member			16 an		17	A.	
of the family should have some					WY.	(1 ⁸⁴	
say in family decisions".				A O			
4. In our home, my parents	C/A	I marries	Show Read		CONTRACTOR .		
usually have the last word.	11		Jan V		SELLECTION .		
5. My parents often ask my	The second s	Margall	Barret Barrer	- ALESSAN DESTRUCTION			
opinion when the family is		TRANSFER PROVIDENCE	International Contraction and	- Aller -			
talking about something.							
6. My parents feel that it is							
important to be the boss.							
7. My parents encourage me to							
challenge their ideas and							
beliefs.							
8. My parents sometimes							
become irritated with my views							
if they are different from their							
own.							
9. My parents often say							

		1		1		1	
something like, "You should							
always look at both sides of an							
issue."							
10. If my parents don't approve							
of it, they don't want to know							
about it.							
11. I usually tell my parents							
what I am thinking about things.							
12. I can tell my parents about							
almost anything.							
13. When I am at home, I am							-
expected to obey my parents'							
rules.		STATISTICS STATISTICS	THE REPORT OF THE PARTY OF THE	later.			
14. In our family, we often talk	Stratter and State	8		-oggine			
about our feelings and	and the second	Man .		I m	Calaton.		
emotions.		W ar	-stanto di	V/B	aller a		
15. My parents often say things	t danger			- 4 J			
like "You'll know better when					ALL N	and a second	
you grow up."					1-100	1	
16. My parents and I often have					The second secon	W.	
long, relaxed conversations				AND NO.	T I		
		Providence of			Nal	All Internet	
about nothing in particular.					And House	and the second s	
17. I really enjoy talking with my		No. Wall			195	305235151	
parents, even when we	17.00					1	
disagree.	A State				(m)	NEW	
18. My parents often say things	And a state						
like, "My ideas are right and you			1999		atilita		
should not question them."			and y				
19. My parents encourage me			and the second s		P	All and a second	
to express my feelings.		Constant of Constant	pr-		CV	A. C.	
20. My parents often say things				Part	C/	Star - Carlos	
like, "A child should not argue	1 in			AL	and the second second		
with adults."	$\cup \mathbb{N}$	1 march	Manual Manual	1 1 -	and a state of the		
21. My parents tend to be very	L I			di di	S. State		
open about their emotions.		All averagely.	Benerit 100	TELLINES LAURL			
22. We often talk as a family		- Andread Barrister (1920)	EPARTON AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AN				
about things we have done							
during the day.							
23. My parents often say things							
like, "There are some things							
that just shouldn't be talked							
about."							
24. In our family, we often talk							
about our plans and hopes for							
the future.							
25. My parents often say things							
like, "You should give in on							

arguments rather than risk	
making people mad."	
26. My parents like to hear my	
opinion, even when I don't	
agree.	



	Appendix 1
English	Communicative Learning Questionnaire

Please tick the level of agreement most suitable for your character

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewh at Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewh at Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. When choosing to learn							
language, was English your first							
choice?							
2. My level of English is very							
good.							
3. I always want to improve my		C SURANGER CONTROLOGY	A MANGARANGARANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA AN	States			
English communicative skills.	ALL STREET	s. /	IIA	A COLORISON IN COLORISON INCLUENTE INC	5		
4. I am a talkative person.	1 miles	Margar.	UN	V M E	California I.		
5. I am scared to make mistakes		30-		V / /	18 m		
when speaking.	annika.			Alexan			
6. I always want to share my					(A	No.	
ideas with people. 🥖 🔛					- Failed	N.	
7. I am shy to express myself.	, dana an			MANDA.	1	A A	
8. My teacher makes me feel	ANN	4		Cardina .		X	
uncomfortable in the		Str. Alexander			in with	accessed \$	
classroom.	autor -	1000	MILLENDARD		W.		
9. My classmate makes me feel		A Westigen					
uncomfortable in the					100	mannel	
classroom.	A Carl		\sim	and the second			
10. Different oral activities used				r		1	
by my teacher in the classroom							
make me feel uncomfortable.					d'an	All and a second	
11. I prefer group work.		1 and	Ser.		NV	1	
12. I prefer individual work.	Y			and the second	C)	S.	
13. I prefer pair work. 🔪 🕍	1 im			A			
14. I prefer to be silent in the	VA	1 1000	And Long		a little and		
classroom.	1	V []])		1	ENGRA-		
15. I am comfortable asking	AND DESCRIPTION OF THE OWNER	and Wall Down	Storeston	SCH ISSEE			
questions in the classroom.		ALTERNAL STREET, STREE	INTERNAL CONTRACTOR				
16. I enjoy role play activities in							
the classroom.							
17. I enjoy discussion activities							
in the classroom.							
18. I feel confident speaking in							
front of the classroom.							
19. I always practice speaking							
English outside the classroom.							
20. Outside the classroom, I							
prefer to be alone.							

Appendix 2	
Data from Family Communication Patterns (Questionnaire

Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 1 0	Q 1 1	Q 1 2	Q 1 3	Q 1 4	Q 1 5	Q 1 6	Q 1 7	Q 1 8	Q 1 9	Q 2 0	Q 2 1	Q 2 2	Q 2 3	Q 2 4	Q 2 5	Q 2 6
3	7	6	6	5	4	1	3	6	6	3	4	6	7	7	7	4	4	7	7	5	2	6	6	6	5
1	1	1	1	1	2	7	7	7	6	6	6	7	6	6	7	6	6	6	6	7	7	6	7	4	4
1	3	1	6	7	2	4	5	7	5	3	2	1	1	5	7	4	1	6	5	6	7	7	5	4	7
2	2	2	5	6	5	5	6	5	4	6	4	3	3	7	5	5	1	5	6	2	4	4	3	3	4
2	5	2	2	7	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	7	5	5	3	4	1	6	4	4	5	4	3	2	6
2	4	4	3	7	4	4	3	5	3	4	4	3	2	5	5	4	2	4	5	5	6	2	4	2	6
5	5	6	2	7	5	7	6	7	2	6	5	/5	7	6	6	5	5	6	4	6	6	5	7	6	6
1	3	2	5	2	2	2	7	4	7	3	2	4	1	3	2	1	4	⁵³¹ 1055	6	1	2	4	2	3	1
5	2	7	5	7	4	4	ser 9	7	2	7	6	3	4	5	6	7	3	6	4	5	6	4	7	3	6
6	6	6	5	7	1	7	5	7	3	7	6	4	7	5	7	5	2	7	5	6	6	4	7	5	6
5	3	3	4	7	1/	5	2	1	1	6	2	1	2	1	4	6	1	4	2	5	5	2	5	3	7
3	2	3	2	3	3		2	3	3	2	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	3	2	4	3	2	5	4	6	2	4	3	3	3	5	4	2	2	4	5	1	6	3	7	4	4
5	2	4	2	6	3	4	2	7	3	4	5	4	4	5	6	4	5	5	5	6	5	4	5	6	5
3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	3	1 🙀	3	2	3	2	3	3
3	5	5	4	7	5	3	4	5	4	5	5	4	6	5	5	5	4	5	5	6	6	6	7	5	5
6	6	5	1	7	3	2	2	3	1	7	6	1	5	6	-7	7	1	6	2	7	5	1	6	3	7
2	3	1	4	5	4	4	5	6	5	6	4	4	6	4	7	4	5	3	5	6	5	5	6	3	4
4	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	7	4	6	6	6	5	7	7	7	1	6	3	5	3	5	6	5	5
5	4	5	3	5	4	3	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	6	5	5	5	4
2	3	4	5	6	6	6	3	6	3	5	6	5	5	5	6	4	2	6	2	5	4	3	6	5	5
4	2	6	6	2	5	2	4	2	4	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	6	4	6	2	1	2	1	6	3
2	5	5	5	6	4	7	6	7	4	3	4	4	5	6	6	5	7)	6	5	5	6	5	5	4	5
1	1	3	4	4	4	5	3	Cal Iness	4	1/	V	4	3	5	1)	5	6	5	7	3	1	3	1	1	2
4	1	3	4	4	2	5	2	6	2	4	4	3	3	5	5	4	1	4	3	5	3	1	4	2	4
4	5	4	2	6	3	3	3	3	4	2	2	4	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
2	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	3	2	3	2	3	3	1	2	2
	1	1	4	1	7	6	6	1			6	6	5	7	5		7		7	1	2	3	5	4	1
3	1		3		4	5	3	3	1	4	4	3	3	2	7	6	1	4	3	4	3	2	6	4	5
3	2	2	2	5	1	3	2	7	1	5	6	2	2	1	2	2	1	6	4	4	4	2	3	5	6
4	1	6	6		2	5	3	1	4	7	6	4	6	5	6	5	2	6	2	6	6	5	7	6	5
3	4	2	3		2	4	6	7	4	5	4	5	5	3	3	3	3	3	5	4	4	3	5	4	3
2	2	6	6			6	6		3	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	7	6	5	6	6	6	6
3	1	5	2			7			2	7	7	2	7	4		7		7	2	7	5	2	7	4	7
3	2	6	5	6	5	4	5	7	2	5	6	2	5	4	4	6	1	6	1	7	7	1	7	7	7

5	3	3	5	6	4	5	2	6	3	6	6	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	6	5	6	5	6	6	6
3	3	2	3	5	3	5	5	5	4	3	2	2	1	4	2	3	2	1	1	3	2	3	3	3	2
7	2	7	5	7	2	7	3	7	2	6	7	5	7	7	7	7	1	7	1	7	7	3	7	2	7
2	5	6	1	2	2	2	7	5	3	2	3	1	2	7	3	2	3	4	5	4	2	3	2	3	2
6	2	6	2	6	1	5	5	5	5	6	6	3	5	6	6	6	2	5	3	5	6	2	6	5	5
6	6	4	6	6	3	2	1	5	1	5	6	4	5	5	6	7	1	5	1	2	7	1	7	4	6
2	4	3	4	3	1	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	6	2	4	2	4	1	6	7	4	4	4	5	3	6	4	2	5	4	7	4	3	5	6	4	4
2	2	6	6	5	2	3	2	6	4	3	6	5	4	5	3	4	2	6	2	3	2	2	4	1	3
5	7	6	5	5	4	4	4	5	3	5	5	4	5	5	6	5	3	4	3	6	6	6	6	4	5
5	2	4	2	6	2	3	5	3	3	5	5	4	4	6	100 Tang	6	2	4	2	3	7	2	5	4	4
3	2	1	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	1000 CON	3	1	3	2	2	4	2	2
5	5	6	3	6	4	6	5	2	2	6	6	5	1	-7	4	5	2 2	3	2	2	5	5	7	4	4
3	3	5	6	6	3	4	3	-5	3	6	5	4	4	5	6	6	2	5	2	5	5	2	5	4	4
3	3	1	1	3	3	2	3	3	3	1	1	3	2	3	2	1	1	2	3	3	1	2	2	1	2
1	6	3	5	6	6	1	2	4	2	2	6	5	4	2	3	1	6	5	7	6	5	5	2	4	3
1	5	4	5	5	2	4	5	6	6	2	2	5	3	6	2	3	2	5	4	4	3	2	5	4	4
5	4	4	5	4	2	4	2	5	3	2	2	6	6	6	4	7	5	6	4	5	3	6	7	7	4
6	7	4	5	6	5	3	4	6	6	7	5	5	5	6	5	6	5	6	795	6	5	3	6	6	5
4	1	7	1	7	1	7	2	7	1	7	7	1	7	1	7	7	1	7	1 %	7	7	1	7	1	7
5	5	6	4	6	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	6	4	5	6	3	6	3	5	5	4	5	3	5
3	1	1	3	6	1	1	1	1	1	5	6	3	3	7	7	5	1	3	5	6	4	2	5	1	1
2	2	4	2	7	2	3	6	2	2	6	5	3	1	2	4	5	1	3	5	2	1	5	3	4	3
6	3	6	5	6	5	6	5	7	3	6	6	5	6	5	6	4	1	6	4	6	6	5	6	4	5
2	1	2	2	2	1	1	20	1	2	1	3	2	2	1	2	2	1	1/500	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
1	4	4	5	3	7	6	5	6	6	5	7	5	4	7	6	5	4	5	3	3	5	4	4	4	2
3	6	4	5	6	6	5	6	4	6	4	2	5	5	6	6	6	(4)	3	6	3	6	5	7	3	3
5	5	5	4	6	4	4	5	6	5	5	7	6	6	-7 1	The second secon	6	5)	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	5
2	2	5	5	6	2	2	2	6	6	4	6	4	5	6	4	6	3	6	3	6	4	2	4	6	6
1	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	lead and	1 201300	2	1	1	1 WARANTERCOM	anlass	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1
6	1	1	2	4	1	4	4	3	2	6	7	2	3	1	6	5	2	5	1	2	1	1	3	5	5
3	4	2	2	4	2	3	2	2	1	5	4	4	7	6	6	5	2	2	1	3	3	2	4	3	5
4	2	4	5	4	2	2	3	4	2	7	6	3	6	6	7	5	2	5	3	5	6	4	6	3	7
4	7	6	6	5	6	6	5	6	7	5	5	5	5	7	5	5	7	5	7	5	6	5	6	6	5
4	2	6	3 5	7	2	4	2	4	2	7	7	5	7	6	7	6	1	6	1	5	7	2	5	1	7
3	2	2	5	6	5	5	3	7	4	7	7	5	6	7	5	6	2	7	6	7	6	6	6	6	7
6	2	6	6 5	6	4	4	4	6	3	6	5	6	5	7	6	4	2	6	1	3	5	4	4	6	6
4	4	6	5	7	2	2	1	6	5	7	6	6	5	3	6	6	3	7	6	3	3	2	6	4	7
4	2	6	2	7	2	4	3	6	2	6	6	4	3	5	4	5	1	6	2	4	6	4	6	5	5
3	4	3	5	7	4	3	4	4	1	7	7	7	7	1	7	7	4	4	7	5	7	7	7	4	5

2	1	4	6	6 4	3	3	2	7	2	6	5	5	6	6	6	6	1	5	4	6	5	4	7	5	6
3	2	4	- 5	7	2	3	3	5	3	5	6	4	5	4	5	3	1	7	1	6	5	1	3	1	4
2	6	3	6	5	6	2	6	5	6	5	5	6	2	6	2	1	6	1	7	2	2	7	7	1	7
2	6	3	6	5	6	2	6	5	6	5	5	6	2	6	2	1	6	1	7	2	2	7	7	1	7
2	6	3	6	5	6	2	6	5	6	5	5	6	2	6	2	1	6	1	7	2	2	7	7	1	7
7	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	6	5	5	4	4	4	7	6	6	6	7	6	6	6	6	6	4
4	5	4	3	6	3	6	4	4	3	6	5	5	3	3	6	6	2	5	5	3	4	3	6	4	4
3	6	7	2	5	1	5	6	5	3	4	5	6	2	2	7	4	7	7	1	6	4	1	7	1	7
5	1	6	4	7	4	2	2	4	1	6	4	4	4	6	6	6	2	4	2	6	6	4	6	4	6
5	3	6	4	6	2	7	4	5	4	6	5	5	6	5	6	4	3	5	5	3	5	5	6	5	5
3	4	3	1	1	3	3	3	2	3	3	gan 3 an	2	1	and the second sec	Bissar Bu	1	1	1	4	2	2	2	2	2	1
3	3	3	2	5	2	2	4	3	3	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	2	4	3	3	4
5	6	4	6	6	6	5	5	4	4	6	4	5	6	- 5	6	6	4	6	4	4	6	5	6	6	6
5	4	5	5	6	5	4	4	4	4	3	6	5	5	6	6	5	4 5	6	5	5	6	5	7	5	6
5	6	5	6	5	5	4	5	6	6	6	5	5	5	6	5	5	4	5	4	5	6	5	6	6	5
4	2	4	4	5	3	2	6	5	3	2	4	6	2	2	4	2	2	2	5	5	2	2	6	2	3
2	1	3	2	4	2	3	2	2	2	7	6	2	3	3	2	4	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2
4	4	4	4	5	3	5	4 ۲	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
6	6	6	5	6	6	5		6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
4	2	6	4	6	4	4	2	6	5	6	6	6	4	6	5	4	1	6	2 🕫	5	6	2	7	4	4
2	2	1	2	2	2 4	2 5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
4	4	4	3	6			5	3	4	6	6	4	6	5	6	4	4	5	3	5	4	4	6	4	6
2	4	5	6	5	1	3	1	4	4	2	2	4	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	5	4	3	5	4	4
2	2	6	2	5	6	6	4	5	5	7	7	3	7	7	7	6	6	6	5	7	7	6	6	6	5
2	2 2	2	2	2	2	2	2 5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2gray	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
5 2	2	3 2	5	6	5	4	- 19	- -	3	6	7	6	7	6	6	5	5	3	4	4	6	2	6	5	5
2	2	2	3 1	6 1	7 1	5	6	5	6	3	3	4	4	5	6	5	6	5	7	6	6	5	7	7	2
1	5	5	6	1	4	2	100	1				1 Marines			2	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	3	4	4	4 5	4	3 5	3 4	з 6	3	5	0	3	4		2	3	1	3	2	5	5	3	5	3	5
5	5	5	5	5	6		4 6	5	4	C C	0 7	4	4	5	and the second	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5
2	2	2	2	2	2	6 2	2	2	2	6 2			6		6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
6	6	5	3	1	7	6	2 5	2 6	2	2 5	2 2	2 3	2 2	2 6	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	2	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	2	3	2	0 3	6 3	5	5	5	7	6	6	7	6	6	4
6	6	7	5	5	5	6	5	5	4	5	5	3 4	3 4	5 6		3 7	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3
5	5	, 5	7	7	5	6	5	6	5	7	7	4 7	4 7	5	6 7		1	2	3	4	6	5	6	5	6
2		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2	2	2		7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	4	5
6		6	4	1	4	6	5	6	5		2 5	2	2	2 5	2 5	2 3	2 4	2 4	2 1	2 2	2	2	2	2	2
6		5	5	6	4	6	3	5	5		7	5	4 6	6	5 6	5 6	4 5		2	2	2 2	2 1	1	2 1	2
		5	5	6	4	6			5		7	5	6	6	6	6	5		2	5	2	5	3 7		3
	-	2	2	2		5	5	0	U	,	,	5	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	9	1	5	7

6	5	5	5	6	4	6	3	5	5	7	7	5	6	6	6	6	5	6	2	5	;	6	5	7	F	7
5	5	5	5	6	5	5	5	5	6	7	7	5	3	6	3	3	3	4	5	4		_	3	7 6	5 4	7
5	4	6	6	6	2	6	4	4	5	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	2	2	2	3			1	2	4	5 2
2	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	6	6	5	3	3	5	6	5	5	5	5	6	4			4	4	5	4
5	2	7	1	7	2	7	3	7	2	7	7	3	7	7	7	7	1	3	2	3				7	3	4
1	3	4	7	7	2	5	4	1	4	5	7	3 4	4	3	5	5	1	3	3	3				7	1	7
4	4	5	6	6	5	5	4	4	4	5	6	3 4	4	6	6	7	5	4	2	4		50 A R	_	, 4	4	5
4	4	6	5	6	2	3	4	4	3	7	7	2 6	3	6	6	7	5	3	6	3				6	4	6
4	3	6	5	6	3	2	2	5	2	7	7	5 8	5	6	5	5	2	5	3	4	3			3	3	3
2	3	3	3	3	5	2	5	3	5	3	3 (5 3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	2			5	5	3
5	6	4	6	3	6	6	3	7	7	5	6 4	4 5	5	6	4	5	7	6	5	3	1	7		7	4	5
4	4	5	6	6	5	5	4	4	4 ²⁰⁰⁰	5	6 3	3 4		3	6	7	5	4	2	4	5	2		1	4	5
4	4	5	6	6	5	5	4	4	4	5	6 3	3 4	No. of Concession, Name	5 /	6	7	5	4	2	4	5			ŀ	4	5
1	3	4	2		4	Ser		6	7 ^{- 1}	7	65	5 5	6	5	5	5	5 5	6	7	6	6	5	Ę	5	5	4
3	2		2		A	£.	1	1%:		1 :	33	3 3		I	1	1	2	A.	3	100	3	2	1		3	1
6	2				G	10	-11.3		26	5 4	4 3	5	3	3	5	5	2	5	5	5	2	5	5	;	5	4
3	3			J			27-		4 3		2 1	1	7	MUCE	3	1	2	2	2	1	3	2	2		2	1
6	5			. iii		and the		1	56		6 6	6	6	; ;	5	5	2	6	6	6	6	5	7		4	7
3	5 1			6	53		4	7 4	and the second second	Automation of the local diversion of the loca	20020	6	6	•	3	7	5	5	6	5	6	5	6		6	6
4 2				留				6 4		Attel	Carlos	6	7	(5	5	6	6	5 👳	5	5	6	7	į	7	7
4		62 55		6 4	North State	55		3 2	- WH			4	5	7	7	7	5	5	3	5	7	3	6	ć	3	6
3		2 2	6 	6 5 1 0		7 6		55		Table in		6	7	5	5	7	6	5	5	6	5	5	6	6	6	6
		55		1		33				A	SHIER.	6	6	5	r.,	6	5	6	4	5	6	4	6	6	3	6
		54		8						7	10 M	4	5	4			5	7	5	6	7	6	7	7	,	7
100	46			1		- ADDREY	8 8	5 7	6	7		6	6	7			6	5	7	6	7	2	7	2	?	5
1	1 4				R	6	8	4	5	6	1	3	6	7			WA.	6	7	6	7	5	7	5	;	4
4 (5 7					1	4	aller 1	4	6	1	6	1	6			18	6	4	6	4	2	4	1		2
2	1 1		6		6	5	7	2	1	3	4	4	4	4	199	1		5	5	5	4	4	5	5	i i	5
2 5	5 5	6	7		7	4	7	- all line	7	7	5	2	7	3	7		SECU		5	2	2	1	2	1		4
2 1	7	4	7	4	3	1			7	7			1	7	NE FE	19an			7	7	7	6	7	4		7
5 2	2 6	5	6					3	5	3	3	2	7	5	3					7	7	5	7	7		7
1 1	1	2	6	5	7			2	7	5	4	3	4	6	5					3	1	1	5	5		3
56	7	6	7	7	7		6	2	3	4	7	3	1	4	3					2	3	2	7	5		7
32			2		2				3	3	2	2	3	3	2						6	4	6	3		5
2 3	1	2	3	1	2	7	4	7	4	1	4	2	5	1	1						2	3	2	2		3
25	2	5	2	4	2	6	6	6	2	2	3	2	4	5	2						2 2	4	5	4	1	
75	4	4	5	4	6	7	7	2	7	7	7	7	7	7	7						2 7	4 2	4	3	2	
54	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	, 5	5						4	2 5	7	5	4	
1 7	4	5	4	6	2	6	5	6	3	2	5	2	6	3	1						4 5	5 3	5 2	5 4	5	
													37.2			r	0	-	•	,	5	5	2	4	3	

6	3	1	1	2	1	7	6	7	3	7	7	2	7	5	7	7	1	7	1	7	7	1	7	7	1
5	4	5	4	5	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	6	4	3	5	5	1	2	7	5	5	5	7
4	3	2	4	6	1	1	2	2	3	7	7	6	7	7	7	6	2	2	3	4	3	2	7	5	7
5	5	6	6	5	6	7	4	5	6	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	4
1	2	4	1	5	3	6	4	4	3	3	2	4	2	5	6	3	1	6	2	3	4	2	2	3	6
4	3	6	3	6	1	4	4	5	3	4	3	4	5	6	5	5	3	7	3	5	5	4	5	2	4
1	1	1	2	6	1	5	5	7	2	5	2	6	2	6	6	3	3	4	6	6	1	1	7	1	7
6	1	1	7	1	1	5	5	6	1	7	7	5	7	5	7	5	1	5	2	7	7	5	7	4	5
2	7	4	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	5	4	5	3	3	4
5	4	4	3	5	2	3	2	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	1	3
1	4	2	7	2	3	2	3	7	5	2	3	4	3	2	3	4	4	3	7	4	3	4	3	3	2
2	5	7	3	2	2	7	7	7	7 20	2	1	4	1	7	1	1	5	1	7	1	5	1	6	1	3
3	3	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	in the	2	1	2	1940	1	2	1	2	1	2	1
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	<5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2 5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
3	2	2	4	2	1	2	4	2	4	4	5	4	2	5	4	1	2	2	1	2	5	2	2	4	2
3	3	2	4	3	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	6	5	6	5	5	4	5
2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
6	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
2	2	7	2	6	6	6	2	2	1	7	7	2	6	6	6	7	7	7	4	6	6	7	7	7	7
4	6	4	4	4	7	4	7	4	6	5	4	4	3	4	4	2	7	3	7 🦻	6	5	5	6	5	2
2	5	4	5	6	14	5	5	7	6	5	5	5	5	6	7	5	5	5	4	4	6	6	7	6	6
3	2	2	2	6	6	5	4	4	5	6	5	5	6	5	7	6	4	5	2	4	6	4	6	6	6
1	5	3	6	1	7	2	6	6	6	2	2	6	1	6	2	2	4	2	7	2	2	6	6	6	2
2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	2
3	2	1	1	6	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	4	3	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5
3	1	1	1	7	4	3	7	6	6	4	4	5	5	7	4	4	2	2	3	1	2	3	3	5	4
2	5	4	7	5	7	4	4	5	7	1	4	7	4	5	4	1	(7)	2	7	2	4	3	4	2	2
1	7	7	7	1	1	1	7	1	7	1)	1	3	1	7	-1	1	1)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	2	3	2	6	3	5	1	5	5	6	2	3	6	-4	7	6	2	7	3	5	7	5	7	4	6
1	1	7	5	6	5	7	1	7	6	5	6	6	6	1	6	5	ALL	6	5	6	5	5	5	5	7
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2		3	1	2	3	2	1	3	3	2	1	1	2	2
2	6	6	5	5	3	2	5	6	6	2	1	6	1	4	4	4	2	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	3
3	5	5	5	6	7	4	4	7	3	7	5	2	1	7	1	3	2	6	1	2	2	6	3	4	4
2	2	2	3	1	4	4	4	5	3	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	3	2	3	2	1	2	1	3	3
5	6	6	6	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	3	2	3	1	6	5	2	7	5	6	6	2	5	4	6
2	2	3	2	4	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	3
5	4	6	5	6	2	4	5	5	4	2	1	6	1	6	5	5	3	1	6	1	3	3	4	4	4
3	4	4	6	5	3	2	6	4	4	5	3	4	3	5	4	4	3	3	7	5	4	5	4	4	4
3	3	4	4	6	5	4	3	5	6	5	5	4	3	5	5	4	2	6	5	4	2	2	5	6	6
7	5	5	3	5	5	4	4	5	3	6	3	5	6	3	4	4	3	5	5	5	6	2	5	4	3

3	1	3	2	6	1	6	5	5	1	2	1	1	1	3	5	3	1	6	1	3	3	3	3	2	7
1	1	3	3	5	1	2	2	4	1	5	5	4	2	2	4	3	4	4	2	6	4	4	5	4	5
2	1	4	5	6	3	4	2	6	2	6	6	2	4	2	5	6	1	5	1	5	5	3	4	5	6
3	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2
3	4	2	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	7	7	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	6
4	3	5	5	5	2	6	4	4	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
4	1	4	4	3	1	2	3	4	1	1	5	2	1	5	2	4	1	4	4	2	1	1	4	2	3
6	7	7	6	5	4	4	4	6	4	2	2	2	3	4	4	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	4	6	3
5	3	6	4	6	5	4	3	5	4	4	2	2	4	4	5	5	2	5	2	5	3	3	6	1	2
4	2	3	2	5	2	4	5	4	4	3	2	3	5	4	6	6	4	6	1	5	5	3	7	4	4
4	3	7	6	7	5	7	4	4	5	6	5	4	5	7	7.	5	5	5	7	6	6	6	6	4	5
2	6	6	5	5	4	2	6	7	ano 1 tos	2	2	5	2	6	5	2	2	6	5	6	1	6	7	6	2
5	6	3	7	7	7	2	7	7	7	1	1	7	1	7	1	1	6	100	7	1	1	7	7	1	1
2	2	1	2	5	4	2	1	~7	1	4	5	2	5	3	7	3	1	5	2	6	5	6	6	5	6
1	1	7	1	6	1	6	2	6	⊳ 1́	7	7	2	7	2	7	7	1	7	1	6	6	2	6	6	7
4	5	7	5	6	4	7	4	6	5	6	6	5	6	5	6	6	4	5	5	6	5	5	6	5	3
5	4	5	4	5	1	1-1-	2	1	1	2	1	7	5	5	7	7	7	7	1	5	5	5	5	5	1
3	4	3	6	6	4	3	__ 6	6	4	7	7	1	4	5	7	5	6	3	1	2	7	5	7	5	4
2	4	2	4	2	6	4	6	6	6	2	2	4	2	7	2	2	6	4	6	2	2	2	2	4	2
4	5	4	3	5	4	3	3	5	3	5	6	5	4	4	4	5	2	4	5 🖗	4	5	1	4	3	5
1	3	2	2	3	10	2 6	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	2	4	3	3	4
6	1	1	1	2	2	6	2	1	1	3	3	1	6	2	4	5	2	5	1	5	5	2	3	3	4
7	5	6	5	7	1	2	2	1	1	4	2	2	4	7	7	7	5	4	6	4	5	5	7	6	3
2	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	4	5	4	2	3	3	5	4	3	2	3	4	4	4	4	6	5	5
5	7	5	3	5	4	3	6	4	3	2	2	5	2	5	2	1	3	100	5	2	1	3	5	4	2
1	6	5	7	6	4	3	5	5	6	5	5	6	2	1	2	4	2	5	1	4	4	1	4	1	4
2	6	1	6	3	6	5	2	6	/1	5	6	2	5	6	7	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	7	5	7
5	5	5	5	6	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	5	4	4	6	5	3	5	4	5	4	4	5	3	2	5	4	2	3	1	4	5	5	6	4	5
1	5	5	3	5	6	6	6	4	3	Times	6	5	3	6	5	2	2	5	7	4	2	2	5	4	6
5	6	4	4	7	4	4	3	4	3	5	6	5	5	6	5	6	1	7	3	5	5	3	6	5	6
5	2	6	1	7	1	3	4	4	5	2	1	2	1	1	7	6	1	7	6	2	4	2	7	2	7
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
7	2	7	4	6	2	4	2	7	2	7	6	2	7	4	7	5	1	3	2	4	4	4	6	4	5
2	7	5	5	3	4	1	6	7	6	4	6	7	4	7	3	1	2	4	7	5	7	5	6	7	3
3	4	3	5	3	2	2	1	7	4	6	5	6	6	7	6	5	3	2	7	3	3	5	2	4	3
3	3	6	2	6	6	6	4	5	3	5	6	6	6	4	6	5	1	5	4	3	6	3	3	4	3
3	2	3	6	5	5	5	6	7	3	4	5	5	5	7	6	5	5	6	6	4	3	2	6	3	7
2	5	5	4	6	3	2	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	1	3	3	3	3	5	3	4	6	3	5	4
1	7	1	7	1	7	1	7	1	7	1	1	7	1	7	1	1	7	1	7	1	1	1	7	7	1

6	5	2	7	7	5	7	5	7	5	7	7	5	7	5	7	7	5	7	6	7	7	6	7	5	7
5	5	3	6	7	6	7	5	6	5	4	5	6	5	7	5	4	5	5	7	4	4	5	4	4	6
3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
5	6	5	4	6	5	4	4	5	3	6	4	4	5	7	5	3	3	4	6	5	5	4	6	5	5
4	6	3	3	6	2	3	2	4	3	4	4	3	4	6	6	6	5	7	6	6	5	6	5	5	5
4	5	2	3	3	2	3	4	4	2	4	2	3	3	4	3	2	3	2	3	3	4	2	4	5	4
1	3	2	2	6	2	4	4	6	2	6	6	5	5	4	4	3	3	5	3	5	5	2	6	4	4
4	5	5	5	6	4	5	3	6	4	4	7	5	3	3	5	6	3	5	4	4	5	3	4	4	5
6	1	7	1	6	1	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
3	5	5	1	6	1	5	3	6	2	7	7	2	6	6	6	5	5	7	5	7	6	3	7	5	6
6	5	4	4	6	5	6	6	6	4	6	6	6	5	5	6	5	5	5	6	6	6	3	7	6	4
6	6	6	7	6	7	6	6	6	6	6	7	6	7	6	6	6	6	6	7	6	6	6	7	7	7
3	5	4	4	7	3	6	3	6	6	6	6	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	7	5	5	5	5	5	6
1	3	2	2	3	1	1	3	~1L	3	2	1	3	2	2	2	3	1	2	3	1	1	3	1	3	1
4	2	2	3	3	2	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	2	2	1	2	2
6	7	5	4	5	5	7	7	6	6	7	5	6	7	7	7	7	5	6	6	4	7	6	6	6	7
5	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4
3	2	3	4	5	3	3	4	5	3	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	2	4	5	5	4	2	2	4	5
1	1	7	4	7	4	4	4	6	1	7	7	1	7	4	7	7	1	1	1	4	7	1	5	4	7
6	5	5	4	4	5	3	6	4	5	5	6	5	5	5	5	6	7	4	7 🖗	5	4	5	5	6	6
2	7	4	4	6	6	5	4	5	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	4	6	4	5	5	3	6	4	4
5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	6	6	6	6
5	4	2	2	3	2	2	3	4	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3
6	3	6	5	6	4	5	5	6	5	6	5	5	5	6	5	6	5	5	5	6	6	6	5	6	5
3	2	1	3	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	2	3	3	1	1	3	1	3	1
7	5	5	6	5	6	6	6	6	4	6	6	6	7	6	5	5	3	5	5	5	6	5	6	6	5
4	2	6	5	6	4	4	4	6	3	5	5	4	5	4		6	4	5	4	4	6	3	6	4	6
3	3	3	1	4	2	4	4	4	3	7	5	5	3	-5	4	4	3	5	2	3	2	4	2	2	6
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.05	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
4	5	4	6	5	6	6	6	4	5	2	2	5	3	3	5	4	5	4	4	4	6	5	6	6	5
5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	6	6	6	5	6	6	6	5	6	6	5	7	7	5	7
4	5	6	5	6	5	6	6	7	5	6	5	7	6	7	5	6	4	6	5	5	5	6	6	7	7
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
1	5	5	4	6	4	4	6	5	5	6	6	4	5	6	6	6	4	6	5	4	6	6	5	5	5
4	6	4	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	6	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
3	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	3	2	3	4	6	4	4	5	4	5	4	3	4	4	4	4
3	4	3	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	6	5	6	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	5	5	6	5
5	6	5	6	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	5	3	4	4	3	3	4

1	1	2	2	2 1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2
4	4	4	4	4 3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
6	1	7	6	5 7	6	6	6	7	6	7	7	7	6	1	3	4	2	4	4	6	6	5	7	6	7
6	6	6	6	5 5	5	6	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	5	6	5	5	6	5	6	6	6	5	5	6
3	3	2	2	6	4	6	4	4	5	5	4	3	4	5	5	5	3	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	5
6	2	5	4	. 3	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	6	6	5	4	3	3	6	3	4	3	3	4	4
5	4	4	3	4	2	3	4	6	4	3	4	5	4	2	3	4	3	4	5	3	6	3	4	1	4
6	5	5	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3
3	3	3	2	2	1	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	3
2	5	6	5	7	5	6	5	7	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	6	3	6	6	5	6	6	6
1	6	6	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
1	4	3	3	3	4	3	2	2	7	3	1	3	3	3 5	3	4	2	3	3	3	2	3	4	4	3
3	5	6	5	7	5	7	2	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	1	5	5	5	5	3	2	2	6
2	2	1	1	6	1	3	2	6	2	7	6	2	7	1	6	6	1	6	2	5	3	1	3	5	6
2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	3	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1
4	4	4	3	6	5	5	3	4	2	3	6	5	5	5	6	6	4	5	4	5	5	3	6	6	7
3	3	4	4	4	3	5	5	6	4	3	2	5	3	5	2	3	2	4	4	2	2	3	2	2	3
5	4	4	6	3	2	7	_{دو} 4	5	3	6	5	7	_1	2	4	5	5	3	2	5	4	4	7	5	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	2	5	3	4	3	2	4	5	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	2	2
1	1	1	1	1	12		1	1	1	/1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	្ត1	1	1	1	1
6	1	7	7	7	6	7	4	7	5	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	6	7	7	6	6	6	7	6	5
7	5	7	7	7	6	6	4	7	3	7	7	7	7	7	6	3	1	7	5	7	7	6	6	7	7
5	5	2	3	2	4	2	6	2	3	2	2	5	2	6	3	2	5	2	6	6	2	5	3	2	2
4	4	2	5	2	7	3	Tel	5	5	5	5	4	1	6	5	5	7	2	7	2	2	6	3	6	2
5	5	5	5	7	5	5	6	Tous .	7	7	7	5	7	6	6	6	7	4	5	3	4	4	6	5	2
6	6	6	5	6	6	6	2	2	2	7	5	7	6	5	6	7	4	6	1	3	4	3	7	5	7
5	6	6	6	7	5	6	5	7	4	6	5	6	6	_7	-7	6	5	7	7	5	5	6	7	5	7
4	5 6	6 6	4 4	6	3	6 7	3	1402	2	5	5	7	6	-5	6	6	1	6	1	4	4	3	7	4	3
2	1	1	4	6 1	2 1	, 1	4 1	4	6	6	7	6	1	1	6	4.5.4	4	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
4	4	6	2	6	6	7	ו 5	1	1	1			Portano E		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	3	4	2	2	3	2	2	6 3	1 1	3 3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	2	4	4	4	4	4
4		7	5	4	6	2 5	4	4	6	3	6 4	7 5	6 4	2 7	6	6	5	4	6	5	5	5	4	4	3
2	2	6	2	6	2	6	2	4	2	5					6	4	5	4	6	4	5	4	6	5	4
6		7	6	6	6	6	2 5	4 6	2 5	5 5	5 5	4 5	4 5	3 5	5	6	2	6 5	2	6	4	4	6	4	6
5		6	6	6	5	6	5	4	5	5	5 6	5 6	5 7	5 6	5	5	5	5	5	6 5	6	5	6 6	7	7
5		4	5	6	7	5	5	4	4	5	4	6	7 5	6 4	6 5	6 5	6 4	6 5	5	5	6	6 6	6 5	6	6
5		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4 5	5	5	4 5	5 5	5 5	4 5	5 5	5 5	4 5	6 5	6 5	5	6 5	5
5		4	5	6	2	2	4		4	6	6	6	5 6	5 6	5 6	5 6	5 6	5 6	5 4	5 6	5 6	5	5	5	5
5			5		-	-	7	U	т	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	6	6	6	6	6

2	2	2	2	7	1	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
2	3	6	7	6	4	4	2	6	4	5	6	5	6	6	6	4	1	5	1	6	6	2	7	2	6
2	3	3	4	2	4	4	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3
2	3	3	2	6	6	6	4	6	2	6	6	2	6	6	3	2	1	1	3	1	2	2	6	2	6
3	5	3	2	3	5	5	6	6	4	3	2	4	5	7	5	4	1	6	7	6	6	2	7	6	6
4	1	5	5	1	3	4	5	6	1	1	3	2	1	6	4	2	3	4	2	3	2	1	3	2	3
1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	1	3	2	2	3	1	2	2	1	1	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	1	2
4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
3	5	6	6	4	2	5	2	7	4	2	2	4	2	3	2	1	4	2	6	6	6	6	3	6	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	¹³⁸⁰ 1 ³⁸⁸	2	2	ensil ser	1	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	2
5	5	5	6	6	6	3	6	6	4	6	5	5	5	7	5	3	3	4	6	5	5	4	5	4	5
6	2	4	5	2	6	2	5	7	2	6	6	6	6	7	5	11	1	12	7	3	5	6	7	5	7
2	5	5	4	5	1	6	6	6	4	2	2	2	2	7	7	1	1	2	7	2	3	3	2	7	2
5	5	4	6	5	4	6	2	5	4	5	5	6	6	6	5	5	1	5	1	6	6	5	7	6	6
5	5	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	4	6	7	5	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	7	6	5	6	5	7
					A.	hani	USIEUR					100	-	2	-	-	5	Allor	Fall	. 14	0	0	0	5	'

A BED 1901

Appendix 3 Data from English Communicative Learning Questionnaire

Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10	Q 11	Q 12	Q 13	Q 14	Q 15	Q 16	Q 17	Q 18	Q 19	Q 20
7	7	7	7	4	4	2	4	1	2	5	7	5	6	6	7	4	6	7	4
7	7	7	7	4	4	6	4	4	4	4	3	6	4	3	4	3	5	6	4
7	5	7	7	7	6	7	1	1	2	5	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	5	3
6	5	7	6	4	7	2	4	4	3	5	4	5	3	4	5	6	5	2	3
4	5	7	5	6	6	5	4	4	4	3	5	4	2	5	6	5	2	4	3
7	5	7	4	4	4	3	5	2	5	5	aca 4 anam	6	4	4	7	7	4	5	3
6	3	6	5	7	4	6	5	5	5	4	6	5	6	6	3	6	2	5	6
7	4	7	3	2	6	2	3	2	2	2	5	6	2	5	5	6	6	6	3
6	5	7	7	4	7	1	and a second	1	1	4	4	4	1-	3	7	7	7	6	1
7	6	7	6	5	6	3	3	2	2	3	4	4	1	7	7	7	7	6	1
6	4	7	4	2	6	2	3	2	2	6	4	5	1	5	5	5	5	7	3
3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
7	5	7	4	2	6	2	3	1	2	4	4	4	2	2	6	5	4	5	2
7	4	6	7	5.00	6	5	5	4	5	6	4	5	6	3 🛛	6	6	5	4	1
1	2	1	3	2	1	4	3	5	4	4	2	3	3	3	4.00	2	2	2	4
7	5	7	7	5	7	2	4	4	4	6	5	6	1	7	6	7	7	7	4
7	5	7	6	1	7	1	3	2	1	7	3	6	1	6	7	6	3	7	1
7	6	6	6	2	5	5	1	1	2	1	6	4	6	7	6	6	5	5	4
7	5	7	6	5	7	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	3	4 🌘	6	6	5	6	2
7	6	5	5	5	5	6	4	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	5	4	3	5	4
6	5	6	4	5	5	5	2	5	2	2	5	2	3	3	6	6	5	5	2
1	4	7	7	6	6	5	2	2	2	4	4	4	1	6	7	7	5	4	1
7	5	7	7	4	7	5	5	4	5	1	-7	4	6	5	5	3	5	7	3
1	1	1	3	4	1 -	4	6	2	7	1	1	1 1	7	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	3	5	3	5	3	5	4	2	3	4	5	5	2	3	3	4	3	5	3
7	5	7	7	7	7	7	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	4
2	2	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	1	7	1	1	3	3	7
6	5	7	5	7	7	7	2	2	4	4	2	6	5	3	6	6	2	4	2
6	4	7	4	5	4	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	3
7	6	7	7	1	7	1	1	1	1	3	4	5	1	7	7	7	7	6	2
7	5	7	7	6	7	5	5	1	4	5	6	6	1	5	7	6	5	6	4
2	3	3	2	3	2	4	3	3	3	2	4	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	3
6	2	5	4	4	5	3	1	1	2	6	6	6	2	6	6	3	5	5	6
7	6	7	7	2	6	3	5	7	1	3	7	5	7	5	6	5	6	5	6
7	5	7	4	2	6	2	1	1	1	2	5	5	3	7	7	7	6	7	4

7	4	7	4	2	5	3	2	2	2	2	6	5	2	5	6	6	5	3	3
5	2	7	6	5	5	5	4	4	4	2	7	3	2	5	4	5	4	4	3
2	2	7	5	5	7	1	1	1	1	4	7	4	1	7	7	7	6	7	4
6	5	7	7	3	7	1	2	2	3	5	5	5	3	7	6	6	7	7	6
4	5	6	4	2	6	5	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	5	6	6	4	5	5
7	4	7	4	2	4	6	1	5	3	5	4	7	2	6	7	3	4	6	3
2	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	1	3	3	3	3	4	3
6	4	7	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	6	6	5	5	2
6	4	5	2	5	2	7	5	3	2	6	1	1	6	2	2	2	4	2	3
7	4	7	6	3	6	2	2	2	2	4	5	6	2	7	7	7	6	7	3
7	5	7	6	2	5	2	2	2	2	4	1000000 6 100	6	3	5	4	5	5	5	5
6	6	7	5	6	5	5	4	3	3	5	3	y 4	4	5	5	5	2	4	1
7	5	7	2	4	6	5	3	1	3	6	6	6	5	7 100	5	5	4	5	3
6	5	7	5	4	6	3	2	2	2	4	4	4	2	6	6	6	5	6	2
3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	K 1	1	2	3	1	2
3	4	7	3	4	4	6	4	3	5	3	4	2	7	4)1	3	4	4	5
7	4	6	3	7	5	6	5	6	5	6	2	5	6	4	5	4	3	2	4
7	5	7	4	7	6	6	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4 (5	5	5	4	4
6	4	7	5	Antis April	6	6	7	4	3	2	7	5	6	3	7	6	7	5	3
7	4	7	7	1	7	1	6	1	1	7	4	7	1	7	7.00	7	7	7	1
7	7	7	5	6	6	6	4	4	5	5	6	6	4	5	5	6	5	5	4
7	4	7	5	andound 5	7	6	5	2	1	5	6	3	5	3	5	5	5	6	1
7	5	7	5	5	6	6	5	2	2	7	2	6	1	6	7	7	6	5	4
7	6	7	7	6	7	3	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	6	5
1	2	2	1	3	1 par	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1
7	2	5	4	6	7 Common	-5	1	1	1	1	7	1	4	3	1,5	7	3	4	5
7	4	7	6	7	5	5	5	5	5	7	4	70	2	6	7	7	2	3	1
6 7	5	7	5	3	5	5	/³/∖	5	6	3	-7	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	4
2	6 2	7	4	7	7	3	1/	2	1)	1	7	1	5	6	7	7	5	4	3
2	2	1	1	2	2	2	Surger Street in	2	2	2	1	STREET BELLER	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
5	3	5 7	7	4	6	1	1			4		5	1	7	2	6	3	4	1
7	3	7	6 4	6	6	2	2	4	5	1	6	1	2	2	2	4	3	5	7
7	5	7		6 5	4	6	5	2	2	6	5	6	6	3	6	5	5	5	3
7	5	6	6	5	6	6	5	4	4	6	5	5	4	5	5	6	4	5	2
4	4	7	6 5	5	7	4	3	4	4	6	7	7	1	6	6	7	5	4	4
7	4	7	5 5	5	3	4	1	1	2	4	6	5	6	6	5	3	4	5	6
7	4	7	5 7	6	5	6	2	2	2	2	7	6	4	6	6	5	6	6	1
7	2 5	7	7 5	2 4	7 5	2	7	7	1	6	2	6	2	7	7	7	6	2	1
7	4	7	5 4	4 5	5	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	3	6	4	4	6	6	3
,	-	1	4	0	5	5	4	4	1	7	1	7	1	7	7	7	4	1	4

7	F	7	c	F	F	2	0	0	0	0	0	0		_	F	-	0	~	
	5	7	6	5	5	3	2	2	3	2	6	2	4	5	5	5	6	6	4
7	5	7	4	3	3	4	3	3	2	2	6	2	4	4	6	6	6	5	5
7	5	6	6	6	6	5	1	1	1	3	3	3	1	3	4	4	3	3	1
6	4	7	5	4	4	5	1	5	2	4	3	3	6	4	7	6	4	7	4
5	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
7	4	7	7	6	5	7	5	5	6	6	5	6	7	4	4	4	4	6	4
4	2	5	2	6	6	6	5	7	4	5	7	5	4	3	5	4	3	6	2
7	5	7	7	3	6	5	1	1	1	3	5	5	1	7	7	7	5	6	3
7	4	6	7	4	6	2	1	1	1	4	4	6	6	2	7	7	6	7	2
6	5	7	4	5	6	3	4	3	3	1	7	5	2	6	5	6	7	6	2
1	3	1	1	3	2	3	1	3	3	3	Sense Sense	3	1	3	2	2	2	1	2
5	2	7	5	5	4	5	2	2	2	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	3	2	1
5	3	6	4	5	5	5	(4)	4	4	6	5	2	5	5	5	6	5	4	3
7	5	7	6	7	6	6	3	5	3	4	6	4	2	5	5	6	6	5	4
6	5	7	6	2	6	2	5	5	5	4	4	6	4	5	6	7	5	4	4
6	6	7	2	6	4	4	2	6	2	1	6	6	4	6	4	2	4	6	4
7	5	7	3	1	6	1	1	2	1	3	6	7	2	7	2	5	7	7	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	2	6	4	Test	5	5	6	2	6	5	5	5	5	2	2	2	2	5	2
7	5	7	5	5	6	5	3	2	3	5	3	3	2	3		6	5	5	2
3	3	1	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
6	4	7	4	2	5	2	1	1	1	4	4	4	7	5	5	5	4	5	7
6	3	7	6	3	5	6	2	1	1	2	2	5	1	4	4	4	4	2	6
7	4	7	5	2	4	2	2	2	1	2	3	4	4	5 (6	6	6	5	6
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
6	5	5	3	7	5	6	2	2	3	5	5	6	5	6	4	4	2	2	4
5	4	5	5	4	5	3	2	2	4	5	4	4 🌔	5	3	6	3	3	4	2
1	2	1	1	2	1	2	À M	1	1	1	and the second	1	1	1,50%	1	1	1	1	1
7	4	7	4	7	4	7	4	7	5	4	4	6	6	3	3	3	1	2	3
7	5	7	6	6	5	6	4	5	4	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	4	6	3
5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	5	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
7	4	7	7	7	7	6	6	6	6	3	3	3	2	3	4	3	4	6	2
1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
6	5	7	5	7	7	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	5	5	4	4	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	4	1
6	6	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	6
7	5	6	5	5	6	5	4	4	4	2	6	5	7	7	7	7	6	6	6
6	5	7	7	6	6	5	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	, 5	5	, 5	6	5	5
6	5	7	7	6	6	5	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	5	5
U	U		,	U	U	5				5	5	5	5	5	5	5	U	5	5

6	5	7	7	6	6	5	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	5	5
6	2	4	5	7	6	4	4	6	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	5
7	5	7	7	2	7	1	1	1	2	5	4	5	4	6	6	6	6	6	1
6	5	6	5	5	6	2	2	2	2	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	6
7	5	7	5	5	7	5	3	3	4	3	7	5	5	4	4	4	5	7	5
7	4	7	3	2	4	4	5	5	6	4	4	2	7	7	7	5	6	7	7
7	4	5	5	5	6	4	1	1	2	4	4	4	4	6	6	6	5	5	3
5	4	4	4	5	6	6	6	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
6	4	6	4	4	5	5	3	4	3	3	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4
7	4	7	3	5	4	3	3	3	2	2	5	5	4	3	6	6	2	4	2
7	5	7	6	5	6	5	5	6	4	5	6	5	3	7	6	6	3	5	3
7	4	5	5	5	6	4.55	1	1/	2	4	4	4	the state of the s	6	6	6	5	5	3
7	4	5	5	5	6	4	(1)	1	2	4	4	4	4	6	6	6	5	5	3
7	5	7	6	7	7 •	7	3	7	1	3	6	5	5	6	7	7	2	6	2
3	2	2	3	2	(mail 4)	3	2	2	2	3	3	1	3	×1	1	1	2	2	3
6	2	7	6	1	6	1	1	1	1	6	6	6	1	6	6	7	7	3	1
1	3	1	1	7	1	1	7	7	7	2	7	5	7	1	2	2	1	1	7
7	5	6	7	4	୍ 7	2	1	1	1	3	7	1	1	6	J7	6	6	6	1
7	5	7	5	-Ten		2	1	V1/2	5	7	3	5	6	þ 7	5	6	6	7	2
6	2	7	4	6	6	7	3	3	4	4	7	3	3	2	9181 4 2019	4	2	2	1
7	5	7	6	4	5	2	2	3	4	5	4	6	2	6	5	5	6	6	4
5	2	7	2	7	6	7	7	6	6	6	2	6	4	6	5	5	1	5	3
7	7	7	Z	1	7	1	1 🕅	1	1	6	1	7	1	7	7	7	5	7	1
6	6	6	7	6	6	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5
3	6	7	1 \	6	6	6	2	2	2	4	5	5	6	3	2	2	1	5	1
1	2	1	1	1	Marr	2	2	2	1 3	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2
7	5	7	6	4	7	al de	- 1	1	1	5	5	5		5	7	6	5	7	1
6 6	5 4	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	5	6	5	6	6	6
7	4 6	7 7	5 5	6 7	7	3	4	2	1	7	7	7 🎽	Turne I unsel	5	3	7	5	5	1
7	5	7	5 1	7 4	5	6	sa5.	5	6	3	7	6	5	3	3	5	3	5	4
7	2	7	5	4 6	7	3	1			7		7	7	7	4	7	7	5	4
7	5	7	3	5	5	6	6	5	3	6	3	6	4	3	3	3	1	6	1
7	6	7	6	5 4	6 4	6	3	2	2	2	6	3	4	5	6	6	6	2	5
3	3	3	3	4 3	4 3	3	3	4	2	4	4	4	5	3	3	4	4	5	2
7	7	7	7	1	3 7	3 1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
6	3	6	5	4	6	1 3	1	1	1	4	6	5	5	7	4	7	7	7	4
7	6	7	3	4 7	6 5	3 5		3	3	3	5	5	4	5	5	4	2	3	4
6	6	6	6	6	5 6	5 6		4	1	4	5	3	2	1	3	3	7	7	6
7	5	7	6	6	6 4			6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
	0	,	0	0	4	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	4	5	6

7	5	7	6	5	7	1	1	3	1	1	7	5	1	1	3	7	6	6	4
5	4	7	5	7	7	5	1	3	1	5	5	5	4	7	7	7	7	7	5
5	6	7	4	1	6	1	4	4	4	4	6	6	2	7	7	7	7	7	7
1	2	1	3	3	1	2	1	2	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
7	7	7	4	2	6	4	2	1	3	2	6	4	5	5	4	7	7	6	5
7	5	6	2	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	4	7	7
6	5	7	5	4	4	5	4	6	1	5	4	5	2	2	6	4	4	6	1
7	5	7	7	5	7	3	3	3	1	5	6	6	3	4	7	7	5	7	5
2	3	4	5	6	7	6	5	4	4	5	4	6	5	6	4	6	5	7	7
5	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	1
1	3	2	2	6	2	7	7	6	6	7	Gitter Distance	5	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
6	4	7	7	3	7	3	1 annual	1/	2	7	2	6	2	7	5	7	6	7	1
2	1	2	1	2	2	2	(1)	1	1	2	1	2 5	1	2	1	2	2	2	2
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5-	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	5	7	5	6	6	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	6	4	4	4	4	4
1	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	1	3	3	2	33	3	1	2	2
2	4	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7/	7	6	7	7
3	2	7	5	6	6	4	7	7	7	7	1	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	5
7	6	6	5	5	6	5	5	5	4	3	6	6	4	4	100 4 mm	4	3	6	4
7	5	7	7	5 6	7	3	3	1	1	3	6	5	4	6	7	7	6	5	5
3	6	7	6		7	3	1	1	4	6	6	6	5	6	6	6	7	6	2
1	6	7	5	7	3	6	4	2	2	2	6	6	3	5	2	5	2	2	2
1	1	1	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	1	1	Ś	3	3	3	3	1	2
5	5	5	4	5	5	5	6	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	4	6	1
7	5	7	2	4	7	The second	4	7	3	1	6	7	7	2	2	6	7	7	5
7	6	7	4	3	3	3	2	3	5	6	5	6	X	6	7	4	3	5	6
5	6	7	7	6	7	7	$/ \Lambda$	5	5	7	-3	5	1	5	7	7	7	7	6
6	5	6	4	5	5	6	5	4	5	5	6	3	2	3	3	5	3	3	7
7	6	7	5	6	5	5	Rando Calendar	5	1	7	3	anti anno	2	5	7	5	2	5	3
1	3	1	3	1	2	2	1	3	anne f an an		1	2	3	3	1	2	2	3	3
7	6	7	3	6	6	6	5	5	6	2	6	2	3	5	6	6	5	6	7
7	5	7	4	5	5	2	1	4	2	3	5	5	4	5	3	6	4	2	4
7	6	7	6	7	5	6	6	5	5	6	6	7	4	5	6	5	2	3	4
6	5	6	4	5	7	6	1	1	1	4	4	4	5	6	5	4	3	4	2
6	5	6	2	6	6	3	2	6	3	2	6	6	2	2	2	6	2	2	2
5	5	7	6	7	7	1	4	2	5	1	7	6	1	6	6	6	5	4	1
5	6	6	5	3	6	4	5	3	5	4	5	5	3	4	3	3	6	5	4
7	6	6	5	2	5	3	1	2	2	2	6	5	7	6	7	5	4	7	4
3	6	6	5	3	6	5	5	7	4	3	2	5	3	6	1	6	2	6	6

7	3	6	3	5	5	2	1	1	2	F	F	C	2	0	~	0	-	-	0
6	5	7	5	5	6	3 7	4	2	2	5	5	6	3	6	5	6	5	5	6
7	5	7	2	4					4	3	7	5	4	5	5	6	7	6	5
2	2	2	2	2	4	4	2	2	3	4	5	4	5	4	2	3	4	2	4
2	4	4	2	2	2 4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2
						4	4	5	5	5	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
6	4	6	6	4	6	3	4	3	3	5	2	5	6	6	6	6	3	3	3
2	5	7	5	7	6	5	5	4	4	4	4	7	3	4	6	5	5	4	5
3	1	5	5	6	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	2	2	2	5	3	1	2
7	5	6	3	5	6	5	2	1	3	4	6	5	3	6	2	6	3	3	5
5	2	7	2	6	2	6	5	4	4	2	7	2	4	4	2	6	4	1	4
7	5	7	7	7	7	7	4	4	5	5	STREET GOING	7 Balansana	7	5	5	5	5	4	1
5	6	7	7	3	2	6	2	2	7	2	6	5	1992: 7	1	1	6	5	2	7
7	5	7	3	7	7. seco	5		1	s 1	~7	6	6	1	7	7	7	3	7	5
2	4	7	5	7	6	5	6	6	4	1	7	1	7	4	3	5	2	5	7
6	7	7	7	1	7	2	2	2	1	2	6	7	3	6	1	6	2	7	5
6	4	4	3	/1	7	1	1	1	1	7	5	7	2	6	6	7	4	6	1
4	1	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	3	5	5	6	7	7	3	7	5	1	3
6	4	7	7	2	6	2	2	2	2	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	5	4	3
7	5	6	4	3.00	3	4	5	120	4	4	4	4	1	5	5	5	4	4	3
6	4	7	5	5	5	6	5	4	4	3	5	5	4	5	10085000	5	4	5	4
2	1	4	2	5	4	5	1	5	4	6	4	5	4	3	4	4	3	2	4
7	4	7	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	3	5	5	2	2	2	2	4
7	6	6	5	1	7	1	1	1	1	3	7	7	7	7	4	6	7	7	2
6	5	6	4	7	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	3	4 (5	4	3	3	4
7	5	7	6	2	5	2	3	2	2	3	6	4	3	2	3	4	5	6	2
7	4	7	5	5	5	4	4	2	2	5	7	6	6	4	4	4	3	2	4
7	4	5	5	7	4	5	4	2	3	4	4	4 (7	4	1	4	4	4	1
7	5	6	5	6	6	6	3	4	3	6	6	6	4	5	6	6	5	5	6
7	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	5	5 5	7	5	6	5	6	7	7	3	5	5
7	5	7	6	6	6	5	6	3	5	2	6	6	5	3	1	3	2	7	1
7	6	7	5	4	5	1	3	and the second	3	4	5	7	1	7	6	5	4	6	3
7	3	4	3	4	2	6	4	4	3	6	6	5	1	7	6	6	2	4	1
1	2	2	2	4	2	4	5	5	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
7	3	7	7	5	6	5	5	5	4	4	7	7	5	1	1	1	1	4	3
7	5	6	1	5	4	7	4	4	5	2	6	7	7	5	1	4	2	2	6
7	7	7	7	2	7	2	3	1	1	6	5	6	1	7	7	7	6	7	3
6	6	6	7	3	5	3	4	2	3	4	6	7	6	5	3	4	3	5	4
7	6	7	3	6	5	6	3	3	3	5	4	4	5	3	5	5	4	4	4
7	6	5	6	3	6	1	1	1	1	4	5	6	3	6	6	4	5	6	4
7	5	7	4	3	7	4	4	7	1	1	7	1	4	4	7	3	5	7	7
												100	28	1994	£9	NOT	11055	805	89

6	6	6	3	7	7	5	5	3	2	4	4	4	4	2	4	6	5	4	1
6	6	7	4	4	5	4	3	5	3	5	6	6	3	3	7	6	4	6	4
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	5	7	6	5	6	4	3	3	3	5	4	6	2	6	5	6	5	6	4
2	2	1	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	2	1	2
6	5	6	4	5	6	5	5	5	2	3	4	4	2	3	5	5	3	4	3
7	6	7	5	2	6	5	5	5	5	5	6	5	2	6	6	6	5	5	2
7	4	7	3	6	4	6	2	2	2	4	5	5	3	4	6	4	2	4	4
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
6	5	7	3	6	5	6	5	3	3	2	6	6	5	3	6	4	2	5	1
6	5	7	5	5	6	4	4	3	5	5	6	6	2	4	5	5	4	5	2
6	6	6	6	7	6	6	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3
7	5	7	6	2	6	6	2	5	2	6	4	6	2	5	5	5	5	6	3
1	2	3	2	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	3	2	1
3	3	3	3	3	14	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1,00	1	1	1	1	2	2
3	4	4	4	5	4	5	7	4	7	7	6	7	7	7	6	6	6	5	5
5	5	6	5	5	6	5	5	5	6	5	5	6	6	5	5	5	5	6	6
5	5	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	4	4
7	3	5	2	-grading	5	5	5	5	2	3	3	3	5	6	4	4	3	6	5
3	3	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	5
7	1	5	4	2	7	2	1	1	3	4	6	7	5	4	5	6	6	6	4
5	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	1	2	1	1	3 (2	2	3	2	2
3	4	4	4	5	4	3	3	4	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	4
1	3	1	1	3	1,00	3	3	2	3	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	3	3	1
6	5	7	7	5	6	6	4	3	4	4	4	4 🌔	4	5	5	5	5	7	6
6	6	6	6	5	6	5	4	4	4	6	4	6	4	5	5	5	5	5	1
7	5	7	6	4	5	3	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	3	6	5
5	5	6	6	4	6	4	3	4	3	4	6	4	4	5	3	5	5	5	5
7	5	7	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	5	6	5	5	3	4	4	6	5	4
7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
6	4	6	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
6	5	5	6	5	6	5	5	6	6	5	5	5	6	5	5	6	5	5	5
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
6	5	5	6	3	6	5	4	4	4	6	2	3	3	4	1	2	2	6	4
5	4	7	4	4	5	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4
4	4	5	4	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	5	3	5	5
7	5	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	5
2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2
														12700	1.000.000	101	_		_

2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	2
5	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
7	6	7	6	2	6	2	3	7	5	6	5	4	7	7	6	6	7	5	6
5	5	6	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	5	6	5	5	5	4	4	4	4
3	4	6	6	4	6	4	4	4	4	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	2
6	5	6	3	5	5	4	3	2	3	5	5	5	2	6	6	5	5	4	6
7	5	6	4	4	6	5	1	2	2	4	4	4	2	4	3	4	4	6	2
2	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	1	1	2	1
3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3
7	6	7	6	7	5	7	5	5	5	6	7	6	6	7	5	5	5	5	6
6	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
7	6	7	7	4	6	2	2	2/	3	3	7	6	5	7	7	7	7	7	7
7	5	7	1	5	7	2	1	1	5 1		3	6	5	6	6	5	5	6	3
7	3	5	6	7 🥖	6	7	5	3	2	7	3	4	4	1	4	4	1	5	1
1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1.00	$\langle \gamma \rangle$	2	1	1	1	2
6	4	6	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	3	5	6	4	3	5	5	3	5	3
5	4	7	3	6	5	6	3	3	3	6	3	6	5	6	5	5	4	3	2
7	2	6	4	5	5	2	5	6	5	6	4	4	4	3	7	7	5	5	6
6	5	6	5	6	4	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
3	5	3	6	6	5	7	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
7	4	5	5	6	6	5	1	1	1	6	5	4	6	6	7	7	7	6	7
7	4	5	5	7	5	5	3	1	1	6	4	5	1	7	7	7	7	7	1
5	3	7	3	6	4	7	6	6	7	6	5	6	5	3 (3	2	5	2	1
6	4	6	5	7	6	7	6	7	6	1	6	5	7	2	2	2	2	2	7
7	5	7	5	5	5	5	5	1	5	7	5	7	7	4	6	6	4	7	4
7	2	7	6	2	7	1	3	3	2	3	6	6		6	7	6	6	5	1
6	5	7	2	4	4	5	3 A	4	6	7	5	6	7	6	7	7	5	6	6
6	4	7	3	5	6	3	2	2	3	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	2	5	6
6	5	7	5	7	6	6	3	3	4	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	3	5	1
1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	EER 1055	1.000 1 .0000	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
3	2	7	7	6	6	2	2	2	2	5	2	4	1	6	7	6	2	4	5
7	2	2	2	2	7	1	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2
7	4	5	2	3	3	5	2	2	4	6	3	5	6	2	4	4	3	4	5
6	4	5	4	6	4	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	6	6	6	4	4	1
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	7
5	5	5	6	5	6	3	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	, 5	6	, 5
4	1	7	4	3	6	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	5	6	5	5	6
7	4	7	4	5	5	6	3	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	3
					U U	Ū	Ũ	0	•	0	U	0	0	0	0	5	5	U	5

4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	6	7	6	2	6	3	3	4	3	5	5	6	2	6	6	6	6	6	2
3	4	3	4	4	3	4	5	4	3	4	4	4	2	3	2	4	3	2	4
7	5	7	7	1	6	1	2	2	2	7	3	3	2	7	7	7	5	5	5
7	4	7	5	6	5	2	5	5	5	6	5	6	2	6	6	7	5	6	2
7	5	4	4	6	6	5	3	2	2	4	5	6	7	2	5	5	4	4	2
7	5	3	7	6	6	7	1	2	2	4	4	4	4	6	6	7	6	6	5
2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2
5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
7	5	6	6	5	5	3	5	3	5	2	5	5	6	3	4	5	5	7	3
1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	and states	1	A LOCAL	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
7	6	7	5	5	5	5	1	2	1	3	5	6	5	6	5	5	5	6	2
6	5	7	5	7	6	6	6	7	5	4	5	6	2	5	2	3	1	6	6
6	5	5	3	5	4	6	2	3	2	2	6	2	6	3	1	3	2	6	5
6	5	6	1	5	/5	6	3	2	3	4	4	5	6	2	4	6	5	5	5
6	4	7	6	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	5

BANK AND IN IST

BIODATA

Name + Surname:

Bangkok 10250

Watthana Suksiripakonchai

Address: Email:

erskine_21@hotmail.com

Educational Background:

Work Experience:

Srinakharinwirot University

LL.B., LL.M. and Ph.D. (ELT)



Bangkok University

License Agreement of Dissertation/Thesis/ Report of Senior Project

Day 19 Month February Year 2018

Mr. / Mrs. / Ms Watthance Suksi ripakanchai now living at Protesa Ville \$? 38 Soi Street Pattanakan District Sugar-Lung Sub-district Sugar Lugar Bangkok Province Postal Code (0250 being a Bangkok University student, student ID 759 0300 90 Degree level Master □ Bachelor □ Doctorate Program MCA - GC Department _____ School <u>Graduate School</u> hereafter referred to as "the licensor"

Bangkok University 119 Rama 4 Road, Klong-Toey, Bangkok 10110 hereafter referred to as "the licensee"

Both parties have agreed on the following terms and conditions:

1. The licensor certifies that he/she is the author and possesses the exclusive rights of dissertation/thesis/report of senior project entitled

Family Communication Patterns and English Communicative Skills: An Investigation of Thai University Students

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for Master of Communication And of Bangkok University (hereafter referred to as "dissertation/thesis/ report of senior project").

2. The licensor grants to the licensee an indefinite and royalty free license of his/her dissertation/thesis/report of senior project to reproduce, adapt, distribute, rent out the original or copy of the manuscript.

3. In case of any dispute in the copyright of the dissertation/thesis/report of senior project between the licensor and others, or between the licensee and others, or any other inconveniences in regard to the copyright that prevent the licensee from reproducing, adapting or distributing the manuscript, the licensor agrees to indemnify the licensee against any damage incurred.

This agreement is prepared in duplicate identical wording for two copies. Both parties have read and fully understand its contents and agree to comply with the above terms and conditions. Each party shall retain one signed copy of the agreement.



¥.-