1. Introduction

This paper explores the impact of classmates’ linguistic diversity on Thai students’ classroom participation in an MSc Marketing programme in a British university. Linguistically diverse classroom settings in this study are the result of the growing number of international students in British universities (Turner, 2006). Studies regarding diversity in UK higher education seem to be limited to students’ cultural diversity and sensitivity without much emphasis on the linguistic diversity that vitally impacts on and shapes classroom teaching and learning (Etherington, 2006; Gill, 2007; Trahar, 2007). Ippolito (2007), however, argues that although intercultural awareness raising and reflective practice fosters intercultural learning, there is a complex interplay between power relations and the interconnectedness of home and international students’ classroom experience. These issues could be derived from linguistic inequalities and misunderstandings of classroom contribution, and thus international students are discouraged by group members not to take part in oral presentation in order to avoid a bad grade (Ippolito, 2007). It is evident that linguistic inequalities and negative attitudes towards international students’ spoken English can undermine and distort classroom practices. This study, therefore, examines Thai students’ classroom experiences and attitudes towards linguistic diversity and legitimacy, and inequality in classroom practices. These issues are manifested in semi-structured interviews, which can reveal their “voices” and make explicit their past, present, and future circumstances and difficulties in order to raise awareness of justice, social inclusion, and tolerance of diversity in UK higher education.
2. Literature review

This section discusses the theoretical and analytical frameworks of this study. The theoretical framework draws upon two interrelated concepts, which are, *multilingual classroom ecologies* (Creese and Martin, 2003) and *identities in multilingual contexts* (Pavlenko and Blackledge, 2004). Creese and Martin’s (2003) multilingual classroom ecological approach investigates relationships of languages, their speakers and classroom settings in which these speakers of given languages exist, and acknowledges particular geographical, socio-cultural and economic circumstances, and the wider linguistic environment. It is also important to include ideology as a concern of language use and practices in multilingual classroom environments (Creese and Martin, 2003). Woolard (1998) defines ideologies as ideas, beliefs, values, or practices leading to the struggle to acquire or maintain power, which is always the tool, property, or practice of dominant social groups. Consequently, the powerful “others” have the control to oppress those with less power and access. Language, therefore, reflects the “truth” of the more dominant group and hides the “truth” of the less dominant group, which could be done through political power in the forms of laws, speeches, and debates (Wareing, 1999).

Ideologies can include political, economic, and linguistic concerns, but it seems crucial for this study to focus on “linguistic ideology”, which is defined by Blackledge (2008), as the values, practices and beliefs of speakers about language use (p.29). Godley et al. (2007) argue that linguistic ideologies are not explicitly expressed by teachers or students, but rather implicitly demonstrated through patterns of classroom participation, specific word choices, or teachers’ reactions to particular students (p.104). Creese and Martin’s (2003) approach is, therefore, relevant for this study as it not only investigates the relationships between speakers of different languages, but also uncovers ideologies that underpin a particular language which is commonly used and considered more “legitimate” than other languages existing in a certain multilingual classroom (p.4). Martin-Jones and Heller (1996) view a “legitimate” language as the social construction of language values and practices, which occur in the institutional and interactional contexts, and particularly in multilingual educational settings. Heller and Martin-Jones (2001) further explain that the concept of “legitimate” language concerns “what ways of using language, what kinds of language practices, are valued and considered good, normal, appropriate, or correct in the framework of ideological orientations connected to social, economic, and political interests” (p.2). Communicative practices in multilingual educational settings can thus be perceived as complex and
illuminating, because they not only inform relationships between interaction, institutions, and community, but also differences and inequalities between interlocutors (Heller and Martin-Jones, 2001, p.5).

To gain a comprehensive understanding of Thai students’ “voices" in their MSc Marketing classrooms, Pavlenko and Blackledge’s (2004) work is discussed. They claim that linguistic minority speakers in multilingual contexts are likely to encounter a conflict between their identities, linguistic ideologies, and power relations, and that leads to struggles to claim their rights of linguistic legitimacy imposed by particular individuals or groups in certain spatial-temporal circumstances. As a result, individuals and groups who experience transnational migration and diasporas are likely to encounter tensions between their fragmented, decentred, and shifting identities and their desire for meaning and coherence, and thus identity narratives are essential for them to relieve these tensions, reconstruct the connection between past, present, and future, and create coherence (Pavlenko and Blackledge, 2004, p.18). Cortazzi (1993) notes that narratives are oral accounts of personal experiences, which can inform the tellers’ representation. Clandinin et al. (2006) state that a person’s stories are strongly influenced by the lived and told narratives in which he or she is embedded, and that implies languages can shape social, cultural, and institutional narratives, which, in turn, can shape an individual person. Kearney (2003) views narrative as a way of reconstructing and reinscribing the identities of those who are second generation immigrants, economic immigrants, or asylum seekers, and thus their narratives can reveal a complex process by which individuals cope with diverse social and linguistic influences to produce a critical, dynamic, and yet coherent sense of self. Clough (2002) claims that narrative reveals a deeper view of life in familiar contexts, which means “it can make the familiar strange, and the strange familiar” (p.8). Phillion et al. (2005) thus suggest that personal narratives should be read and understood in terms of the historical, geographical, socio-political, cultural contexts of investigation, and thus readers should “look beyond stereotypes, the familiar, and what they take for granted in order to recognise the complexity of multicultural lives” (p.2). In this study, Thai students’ narratives are manifested in semi-structured interviews as this research tool effectively offers them opportunities to talk about their life experience. It is thus possible to hear and understand their “voices" and make “visible” their past, present, and future circumstances and difficulties which is important if we are to promote academic and social integration for international students in UK higher education.
The analytical framework of this study draws upon “positioning theory” (Davies and Harré, 1990) that views “position” as the dynamic aspect of human interactions and to replace static, formal and ritualistic aspects of “role” (p.44). Davies and Harré (1990) state that individuals emerge from the processes of social interaction, which are constructed through the various discursive practices in which they participate and their identities are shifting, depending upon the positions made available within their own and others’ discursive practices (p.46). The notion of “positioning” can, therefore, be viewed as the constitution of speakers and hearers in particular ways as they engage in conversation through different discursive practices that are simultaneous resources through which both parties can negotiate new positions created in talk and through talk (Davies and Harré, 1990, p.62). Davies and Harré (1990) distinguish two aspects of positioning, which are interactive and reflexive: the former assumes that an individual positions others whereas the latter is the process of positioning oneself (p.48). In various communicative situations, an individual may attempt to position their interlocutors in a particular way (interactive positioning), and yet, the positioned other might not want to be positioned as such and not only rejects that position but also tries to position him/herself in a more desirable way (reflexive positioning) (Davies and Harré, 1990). When speakers position themselves and others in interactions, they are also influenced by political and moral commitments, their identities and attitudes towards their interlocutors, and cumulative experiences, which are all implicated in their utterances (Davies and Harré, 1990).

The theoretical and analytical frameworks in this study can unravel and alleviate the issues of inequality and disintegration of communicative practices caused by existing unequal power relations and language ideologies in multilingual classrooms. This study is important because it can not only enhance appropriate pedagogies and learning environments for international students representing linguistic minority students, but can also promote better social inclusion and fairness for them in British university settings.

3. Research methodology

3.1 Case study as a research approach

A qualitative case study approach is employed in this study because it investigates a particular unit, i.e. a group of Thai students, which strives for depth of understanding regarding what it means for them to be in particular classroom settings, what their lives are like, what is going on in their lives, and what matters to them. Cohen et al. (2000)
point out that “case” is an object of interest, such as, a person, a classroom, or programme, or school, which is assumed to be a complex system that cannot entirely be easily understood. Denscombe (2003) defines case study as a focus of a single or a few instances of a particular phenomenon, which examines an in-depth understanding of events, relationships, experiences, or processes happening in that specific situation. Yin (1993) mentions case study as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context. By exploring the experiences of a group of Thai students in depth, this study aims for “concrete and complex illustrations” (Wolcott, 1994, p. 364) of the individual cases. It also attempts to identify some general trends and significant patterns among research participants. It is important for case study researchers to take various educational factors into account and understand their links because relationships and processes within educational settings tend to be interrelated.

3.2 Research participants and site

This study explores seven Thai students, five females (Pekky, Oudy, Julie, Pinkie, Pook) and two males (Sharp and Petch), aged 22-26 from diverse academic backgrounds and with varying amounts of work experience. The research site in this study took place in an MSc Marketing programme at the Management Centre of the University. During the first term (October – December 2005), they had to register for the core modules, namely, Foundation of Knowledge, Principles of Marketing, Consumer Behaviours, and Marketing Theory. During the second term (January – March 2006), they had to enrol on two core modules, which were Product, Policy and Innovation and Brand and Communication. They also had to enrol on two optional modules from a variety of subjects, such as, Human Resource Management, Consumption and Culture, or International Marketing. All classes took place in a lecture theatre that could house nearly 150 students. There were approximately 93 students, whose average age was twenty-four from the 15 nationality groups shown in the bar graph below (Figure 1):
3.3 Data collection

Data were collected from October 2005 – April 2006. The three research tools were semi-structured interviews, English-speaking logs, and classroom observations. A series of semi-structured interviews aimed to find out the participants’ attitudes towards their classroom participation and that of others. The semi-structured interview schedule (see Appendix 1) was underpinned by the theoretical and analytical frameworks which aimed to understand Thai participants’ perceptions of their spoken English and that of their tutors and classmates, and how these perceptions impacted upon their positioning in whole-class and group discussions. Samples of interview questions included “What do you think about your English abilities?”, “What opportunities do you have to use English?”, “What did you think about your classmates’ participation?”, “What did you think about your tutors’ instruction?” A semi-structured interview allowed me to have a specific agenda to follow and to select relevant topics and themes to pursue in advance. Keats (2000) points out that additional information can be obtained by probing the initial responses which gives richness to the data in order to reveal more about the interviewees’ opinions and reasoning. I was able to improvise follow-up questions and to explore meanings and areas of interest as they arose. The interviews were conducted and tape-recorded in locations chosen by the participants and lasted about an hour. They were conducted in Thai or English or both depending on the preferences of the participants.

Some of the interview questions were, however, based on information gained from the English speaking logs (see Appendix 2) and classroom observation field notes (see Appendix 3). The participants were provided with log sheets, which allowed them to record their
class participation when I was unable to observe them inside and outside the MSc Marketing classroom. These logs were used to prompt interview questions in order to gain more information on different speaking opportunities. Another major part of the data collection derives from classroom observations in the MSc Marketing classes. Classroom observations were conducted once a week and that provided valuable insights for my analysis because I could see their actual participation besides their logs. Classroom observation field notes were used to develop interview questions and gain their reflections during the interviews. All the interviews were transcribed/translated by the researcher. Interview transcripts were returned to the participants for verification in order to improve the validity and reliability of this study. The findings of this study are mainly based on the participants’ interview transcripts reveal their attitudes of linguistic diversity in the MSc Marketing classrooms, and this will be presented in the next section.

4. Findings and discussion

This section highlights the importance of classroom contexts and practices which play significant roles in constructing Thai students’ attitudes towards their classmates’ linguistic diversity. This concept of Creese and Martin’s (2003) “multilingual classroom ecologies” is useful in this study because it helps to examine particular classroom environments where linguistic diversity exists, and how that can affect relationships and interactions between these Thai students and other language users in British university classrooms. According to Martin-Jones and Heller (1996), linguistic “legitimacy” should be viewed as socially constructed and situated within institutional and interactive contexts because it involves how language users in those settings value a certain language. Pavlenko and Blackledge’s work (2004) is helpful in assessing how Thai students value particular classmates’ varieties of spoken English, and how they position themselves and their peers as a result.

Petch feels comfortable when communicating with Chinese classmates because he believes they share similar levels of competence in English:

It depends on the level of my interlocutors. I don’t feel uncomfortable talking to Chinese students. They can’t notice my errors.

(Petch, English translation, 21/12/05)
This extract illustrates Davies and Harré’s (1990) “interactive positioning” as Petch positions himself and his Chinese classmates as having an “equal position” because they do not seem to notice his linguistic errors. This extract reveals that he is relatively concerned about his linguistic errors when communicating with others, and thus this perceived “equal” position Petch has, of course, the opportunity to familiarise himself with the proficiency level of Chinese students during the pre-sessional course.

For Pekky, communication with Greek students is problematic in her group discussions:

But the thing is some of them are from Greece. I found it difficult to understand and listen to them. I mean accent and pronunciation of them. It’s quite difficult to get some words that I am not used to. I try to listen carefully. If I don’t get some words, I just asked them to say it again. And also they find it difficult from us as well. From Asian people who talk in English. They also sometimes cannot understand.

(Pekky, Original in English, 03/04/06)

Pekky perceives her language competence and the Greek students’ language competence as equal as both parties have to develop sensitivity and accommodate each other to accomplish successful communication.

Pinkie develops an interesting communicative strategy with the Chinese students in her group by unanimously using their first language to discuss with their respective Thai or Chinese friends first and then using English for a group discussion:

Sarah and Niki spoke in Chinese and I spoke in Thai with other Thai friends. After that, we spoke in English to share our ideas.

(Pinkie, English translation, 05/04/06)

With reference to Creese and Martin’s (2003) multilingual classroom ecologies, it is interesting to note that there are three languages, e.g. Chinese, Thai and English, used in Pinkie’s group discussion. She perceives discussing issues in one’s first language and sharing ideas in English more productive for both parties because they feel more comfortable about expressing their ideas. This strategy not only values one’s first language but also creates a “multilingual space” where they find a middle ground to support a more effective and productive discussion.
Oudy’s perceptions of her spoken English in contrast are rather negative because she believes that European students speak English more fluently than her.

As I told you before, in my mind there is a conflict about good and bad things. If I can answer, oh yes, I can. I’m not sure if my answer is good or not. Maybe because my English is not quite good to answer the question or maybe because other students, most students come European countries or maybe they speak English fluently. Or I think too much, maybe that’s why I didn’t answer the questions.

(Oudy, Original in English, 04/04/06)

Oudy struggles to negotiate her classroom participation because she positions herself as “inferior” to European students because of her English proficiency and this discourages her from taking part in class discussions. This extract also shows the interrelationship between psychological and sociological aspects of Oudy’s language use because although she wishes to answer lecturers, she is concerned whether other students, especially European students, will understand her spoken English. As a result, she chooses not to take part in discussions. Oudy’s decision to engage in class discussion is not simply about being able to say things but also about being perceived by other students as a “legitimate” speaker.

Julie believes that Chinese students will understand her but Europeans may not:

When lecturers asked me, I wanted to give another opinion. But I didn't dare answer them because I was not sure if other students would understand me. Chinese students might understand me, but European students might not.

(Julie, English translation, 04/01/06)

This extract reveals that Julie is a sensitive and considerate student as she is concerned that her response may confuse her fellow classmates, and thus she decides not to answer because she does not want to be positioned as a “trouble maker” within the class. She, however, believes that Chinese students share similar levels of proficiency in English and may feel “culturally closer” to this group as they are from East Asian countries.

At times when there is more than one Thai student in the same group, they unintentionally discuss things in Thai even though there is another overseas student in the group, as Sharp regrettably states:
I didn’t intend to speak Thai in front of him because when I discussed the topic, I discussed it in Thai. If I were him, I would feel bad though because I wouldn’t understand what they said. I think if there are overseas students in a group, I should speak in English. Otherwise I feel that I alienate them.

(Sharp, English translation, 06/04/06)

Sharp agrees that it is important to use English as a medium of communication to enable other overseas students to participate. His awareness of using English as a common language within a group avoids alienation, and thus he positions himself as an “unbiased” and “non-discriminatory” person who considers other overseas students equal.

The findings reveal how linguistic ideologies crucially impact upon the perceived linguistic “legitimacy” of speakers of English when Thai students evaluate their and classmates’ spoken English, and this determines Thai students’ positioning with their interlocutors differently within the classroom contexts discussed. Positioning oneself and others as “legitimate” speakers of English is thus socially constructed within particular interactive settings as Thai students find themselves more comfortable speaking in English with their Chinese counterparts than with their European ones. The findings also point out that Thai students are keen to position themselves at the same level as their Chinese classmates due to their similar English language proficiency levels, familiarity and friendship. Thai students, on the contrary, seem to position themselves as “linguistically inferior” to their European counterparts, and this discourages them from participating in class and group discussions. As a result, Thai students in this study may face challenges when speaking English in classrooms because they may think they have not acquired “standard” English varieties and, therefore, consider themselves as members of the “outgroup”, and speakers of “standard” English as members of the “ingroup”. There is a need for negotiation and accommodation from both parties to even out this disparity and create a more reciprocal relationship for effective communication.

5. Pedagogical implication of the study

The findings of this study suggest that there is a need for home and international students to develop positive attitudes and awareness towards multilingualism and varieties of English in UK higher education because it can allow them to recognise benefits of interacting with people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. To problematise the legitimacy of English in classroom
contexts in this study, it is important to consider the impact of language ideology. The way English and its varieties are perceived as “legitimate” by Thai students in multilingual classroom settings must be carefully evaluated since the value attached to English may be influenced by the ideologies of certain powerful groups, such as the Language Unit, postgraduate departments, University policy makers or the British government.

McKay’s (2002) comprehensive approach to English as an International Language (EIL) pedagogy is applicable for teaching speaking and listening skills to prepare international students to be able to participate effectively in their postgraduate study. McKay’s (2002) model provides fundamental understanding of EIL and appropriate teaching goals. EIL pedagogy can enable language tutors to re-evaluate their current teaching practices, pay attention to multilingualism in postgraduate classrooms and employ practical and relevant teaching approaches that can enable international students to “fit in” more appropriately and be able to take up desirable subject positions when interacting with their tutors and peers from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds during their postgraduate study. McKay (2002) points out that what happens in a particular classroom is influenced by socio-cultural and political factors that exist in the wider community (p.129).

McKay (2002) notes that EIL teaching and learning has to take English varieties into account, and thus students should be taught to acknowledge that all varieties of English are adequate, valid and appropriate for particular communicative demands in order to promote the equality of speakers (p.126). Davies and Harré (1990) note that speakers’ attitudes towards interlocutors are implicated in interactions; hence Thai students’ attitudes towards their spoken English with a Thai accent compared with other students’ varieties of English play a significant role in their discursive practices in the multilingual classrooms, and reveal how language ideologies affect interactions in contexts of language diversity. In this study, it is evident that there are various situations when Thai students express both positive and negative attitudes towards their own and others’ spoken English, and that leads to different reactions in particular communicative contexts. The findings suggest that English is not the only language used within multilingual classrooms; Chinese is another major language that the Thai students encounter within classrooms and at the main campus. Some Thai students are open to possible opportunities to make friends with students from other countries. Pinkie, for instance, is able to develop a communicative strategy that enables the use of Thai with her Thai team mates, and
allows her Chinese counterparts to use Chinese to discuss a difficult topic, before using English for mutual intelligibility.

Thai students should also recognise the opportunities they have when interacting with other students from outside the classroom, and that can allow them to be exposed to varieties of English, familiarise themselves with linguistic and cultural diversity in their social contexts, and improve their English proficiency. Oudy, for instance, notices that living with her overseas housemates in student accommodation not only provides her with opportunities to socialise with them, but also to gain a better understanding of their cultures:

About my speaking, I can improve because I try to speak English with my flatmates from China and Cyprus. From Cyprus, just only sometimes because she always stay with her friends and stay in her room. So I have a chance to talk to my flatmate from China. I always spend times with my Taiwanese friends. Sometimes I go out and have a party with my friends from Greece. I can improve my English language but also I can learn about their culture as well.

(Oudy, Original in English, 04/04/06)

Multilingualism in academic and social settings in the UK should be acknowledged as a valuable resource for every student who can reap this benefit in their future careers. Petch, for example, realises that this year in the UK offers him such a tremendous advantage that he would have never found in Thailand:

At least if I want to work in England, I know what Chinese, Greek, Taiwanese, and British are like and what they think. I know more than before. I'll never know this in Thailand. One day, I think this experience will be useful.

(Petch, English translation, 21/12/05)

This study suggests that being optimistic about multilingualism in UK higher education would allow Thai students to acquire a comparative advantage in terms of understanding other people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and that helps to widen their world views regarding the way they perceive themselves and others. International students should thus be viewed as valuable resources that provide an additional dimension to the academic and cultural life of a university (Russel, 2005). Academic staff and lecturers, therefore, must ensure that they meet the needs and expectations of international students in terms of academic achievement because international students have to adjust to British academic conventions.
regarding classroom participation and performance in their new learning environment (Ryan, 2000; Ryan and Carroll, 2005).

6. Conclusions

This study examines the impact of classmates’ linguistic diversity on Thai students’ classroom participation in an MSc Marketing programme in a British university. Drawing upon Creese and Martin’s (2003) multilingual classroom ecologies and Pavlenko and Blackledge’s (2004) identities in multilingual settings as the theoretical framework and Davies and Harre’s (1990) positioning theory as the analytical framework, the findings suggest that Thai students react differently towards their classmates’ linguistic diversity in the postgraduate classroom. Some Thai students accommodate and embrace their classmates’ first languages, such as, Chinese and Greek, and varieties of English by adopting listening and speaking skills to improve intelligibility. Some Thai students, however, find their spoken English “illegitimate” and are hesitant to participate in class and group discussions, and thus they position themselves as “inferior” to the competent speakers including European students. This study suggests that it is imperative for Thai students to develop optimistic attitudes towards multilingualism and varieties of spoken English inside and outside the classroom, and, as a result, their classroom participation can be enhanced. Direct experience in social interactions can derive from individual agency which not only allows them to recognise the appropriateness of interaction in terms of situated contexts, interlocutors, and time, but also changes their attitudes towards their language use by allowing them to achieve communicative purposes. Language tutors should, therefore, encourage students to meet other people in order to gain direct social, interactive experience, and this could help them to become more participative in class. Students’ “real-life” learning experiences should enable them to develop open-mindedness of linguistic and cultural diversity, and create a more inclusive and tolerant British higher education.
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Appendix 1: Interview schedule

Interview No. 1 (Beginning of MSc Marketing class)

1. How was the result of your English exams?
2. How did the course help you with your English skills?
3. What do you think about your English now?
4. What opportunities do you have to speak English?
5. What courses will you take in Term 1?
6. What is your expectation and fear about Term 1?
7. How will you prepare for Term 1?
8. What do you think about classroom participation at a postgraduate level?

Interview No. 2 (conducted at the end of Term1 December 2005)

1. What are your general impressions of term 1?
2. What did you enjoy about the course?
3. What difficulties did you have? How did you deal with it?
4. How was your class discussion and participation in course X?
5. What did you think about other classmates’ participation?
6. Do you have any comments about your lecturers?
7. What kind of academic skills do you improve and need to improve?
8. What do you think about your English abilities?
9. What opportunities do you have to use English?
10. How is your typical day?
11. What do you expect for Term 2?
12. What courses will you take?

Interview No. 3 (conducted at the end of Term 2 April 2006)

1. What are your general impressions of term 2?
2. What did you enjoy about the course?
3. What difficulties did you have? How did you deal with it?
4. How was your class discussion and participation in course X?
5. What did you think about other classmates’ participation?
6. Do you have any comments about your lecturers?
7. What kind of academic skills do you improve and need to improve?
8. What do you think about your English abilities?
9. What opportunities do you have to use English?
10. What do you think about your academic life at the University?
11. What will you suggest for new Thai students who will come next year?
12. What kind of supports will be useful for international students?
13. What are your future plans?
14. What do you think about being part of this project?

Appendix 2: English Speaking Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>English Speaking Encounters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct. Mon. 17</td>
<td>My classroom</td>
<td>I asked my friend: <em>What have you read? Journals?</em> Do you understand it or not? <em>In the evening, I have dinner with my flatmate, I asked her that: Why do you cook the same dish everyday?</em> Are you boring?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. Tue. 18</td>
<td>My flat</td>
<td>I talked with my flatmates about dinner and her class. I asked Vikki my friend from France about Marketing. I asked her that: Do you understand the questions of Marketing? and How can you find this journal? Tomorrow, do you want to go to the university with me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. Wed. 19</td>
<td>My classroom</td>
<td>I can understand about assignment. I asked my friend: What about teachers'olland. How can I write about my assignment? I want to be the 5th floor of that building. I asked him: Can I get not enough? I asked my flatmate: Do you go back to your country in this Christmas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. Thu. 20</td>
<td>My classroom</td>
<td>I discuss about reading assignment in my group at the university. I asked my friend: <em>Can you explain the questions?</em> What? <em>Why do you think that?</em> I spoke the literature, I asked my friend: Did you find the 5th floor quickly? My friend told me that: She can't find it. Is about him: What can you think? It's hard another holiday?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. Fri. 21</td>
<td>My classroom</td>
<td>I went to my classroom in the afternoon. And I asked my friend: <em>When you start your assignment?</em> Are you understand the room? In the evening, my flatmates know my love. I asked my friend: Did you have dinner? What time? Do you want to eat? I asked: Would you: tomorrow, what time does you start apathy? Is it possible if I want to make a plan to go a party?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. Sat. 22</td>
<td>My flat</td>
<td>I stayed in my flat. I have a party with my flatmates. My friend invited her friend to join together. I make a new friend. I asked him: <em>What's your name?</em> and: Are you studying? <em>I talked with someone about this Christmas. I asked her: Which will you go on this Christmas?</em> She told me that she will go to her home.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Oct. Sun. 23 | My flat        | I talked with Bonnie about her boyfriend. I asked her: *Do you have some problems?* You can tell me. She told me that: her boyfriend called her many times. Would you do have dinner today? *
Appendix 3: Classroom observation field notes

[Handwritten notes on the page]