



Writing Development among Learners of Thai as a Foreign Language

Sasiwimol Klayklueng

(clssk@nus.edu.sg)

National University of Singapore, Singapore

Adisorn Prathoomthin

(adisorn.pra@crru.ac.th)

Chiang Rai Rajabhat University, Thailand

Abstract

Writing skills are significantly assessed in academic contexts as part of the curriculum requirement and assessment of foreign or second language proficiency. Hence, much of language class time is devoted to the teaching of writing and written assignments. It is assumed that learners' L2 writing develops over time in response to instruction, teacher feedback and practice. The present study investigated the writing development among learners of Thai as a foreign language at a university in Singapore over the period of a 13-week semester. Discourse measures of accuracy, fluency and grammatical complexity were employed to assess the language use. In addition, the overall quality of writing was explored through analytic scoring. The study found that students' writing statistically improved after a 13-week language course. The findings in relation to the students' language proficiency and writing instruction were discussed.

1 Introduction and literature review

There are a number of studies on second language writing development. The majority of research studies in this area have focused on the domain of English as a second or foreign language (Matsuda & Silva, 2010). It is believed that focused instruction and pedagogical activities are important factors for learners to develop advanced L2 writing skills (Benevento & Storch, 2011; Dekeyser, 2007; Hyland, 2003).

Support for this area of research can be found in Storch (2009), as well as Storch and Tapper (2009). Both papers looked at international ESL students in Australia over a semester. Specifically, the participants met the minimum threshold requirements for university entrance and required formal ESL support. Storch (2009) examined students who did not look for formal ESL support, while Storch and Tapper (2009) investigated students who were enrolled in an EAP course. The bases of analysis for both studies were language use, quality of content and organization of written scripts. Conclusively, both studies found improvement in overall quality of writing, alongside coherent content and structure. However, only Storch and Tapper (2009) revealed that writing progresses in the forms of accuracy, syntactic complexity, and use of academic vocabulary. It is believed that instruction and feedback that the students received on their writing in the EAP course was attributed to some aspects of L2 writing development.

When looking at the range of measures used to assess writing development in ESL tertiary contexts (Sasaki, 2007, 2009, 2011; Shaw & Liu, 1998; Storch & Tapper, 2009), findings varied according to the measures employed. Sasaki's studies compared the L2 writing development of study abroad and at-home participants using a composition rating scale. Conclusively, students who participated in 1.5 to 11 months of study abroad and who were provided with general ESL and writing instruction, proved to have significant improvement in their L2 writing scores. On the contrary, their at-home counterparts did not show progress.

Other studies using band scores and discourse measures to assess writing development with revealed mixed results include Shaw and Liu (1998). Their investigation of international students enrolled in an EAP course in a UK university showed improvements in terms of register, from more spoken forms to written forms. Conversely, there was insignificant progress in productive linguistic resources and accuracy. Reportedly, the lack of progress in accuracy was a result of the tools of measurement (i.e. count of errors per T-unit).

Mixed results were similarly observed in Tsang and Wong (2000), whose study investigated the effects of pedagogical activity (i.e. explicit correction of errors, construction of sentences in class, and frequent reading input) on sentence correction and writing development of undergraduate TESL students over a period of 14 weeks. The findings showed no significant enhancement at sentence-level production. Contrarily, there was significant improvement in word count (a measure of fluency), average T-unit length and the number of T-units per sentence (measures of complexity).

Research studies set out to investigate writing development over a relatively long period include Knoch, Rouhshad and Storch (2014). Suggesting that perhaps accuracy, fluency, and complexity take a longer period of time to develop, they carried out a longitudinal study of more than a year on ESL students enrolled in an English-medium university. The rater-based scores and discourse measures were instrumented. The results revealed that the students' writing in terms of fluency improved, whereas accuracy, syntactic and lexical complexity did not show any improvement over a year of study. Likewise, the global scores of writing did not show any change over time.

In the same vein of longitudinal research, similar results were found in Benevento and Storch (2011). In their investigation of writing development among secondary school learners of French as a second language, there were no significant improvements in accuracy and certain frequent errors persisted. Interestingly, they found that the participants' ability to creatively use prefabricated chunks learned in class improved significantly over time.

It is evident that the research findings on the impact of instruction on foreign or second language writing development are inconclusive. It is argued that the length of instruction and instructional contexts could attribute to learners' writing development.

2 The study

2.1 Writing instructional approach

The current study was conducted on a pre-intermediate course of Thai as a foreign language at a Singapore university. In this course, writing was primarily seen as a means to elicit and improve students' linguistic knowledge, with attention focused on the appropriate use of vocabulary, syntax and cohesive devices.

Learning to write involved reading and understanding a (modeled) reading text; being familiarized with and practice vocabulary and sentence structures; drafting and composing; and revising. In the early stage, when a reading text (with a relevant topic) was introduced by the teacher and discussed in class, the students learned and practiced useful grammar and vocabulary, which they were expected to use in the follow-up writing assignment. In addition to grammar and vocabulary, text organization was emphasized so that students could learn how to present their topics and ideas appropriately. Due to time constraints, not all writing processes and activities took place in the classroom setting. Students would do brainstorming and drafting in class, and meet outside the classroom to compose and revise their essays before submission. While some pieces of writing

were done in pairs, or small groups, some were produced individually, depending on the topic and task complexity. For instance, a letter to a friend would be a piece of individual work, while a brochure to introduce tourist attractions in Singapore was completed in groups of three. While the students were brainstorming and drafting an essay in the classroom, the teacher acted as a facilitator, walking around and answering questions related to vocabulary and grammar.

When the corrected essays were returned to students in the following session, the teacher discussed the organization, problematic grammar and vocabulary found in the essays. Written feedback from the teacher on grammar, vocabulary, cohesive devices as well as ideas and content, was recorded clearly on each piece of writing. When familiar grammar and vocabulary were used wrongly, including spelling, the teacher would circle or underline them, enabling the students to notice and correct the mistakes. Errors pertaining to complex sentence structures and low-frequency vocabulary were explicitly corrected; the teacher wrote the correct answers and appropriate usage for the particular points. After receiving their checked and commented assignments, students seemed highly encouraged to revise and re-submit their essays. This helped to enhance the correct and appropriate usage of grammar, vocabulary and spelling, although no additional marks were accorded to resubmissions.

Eight pieces of essay assignments were submitted in the semester; each piece was approximately 1-2 pages in length, produced either individually, in pairs, or in groups of three. As discussed above, only the first submission was graded in each case; the re-submission was optional (though highly encouraged) for improving the students' linguistic knowledge, grammar, vocabulary and cohesive devices.

The marking criteria were clearly communicated to students before the tests. Grammar, vocabulary, spelling, cohesive devices, text organization, content and ideas were the main criteria when marking students' essay writings. Written feedback was provided explicitly in the form of corrections on students' compositions.

2.2 Research questions

Although there have been studies examining foreign and second language writing development at the university level, empirical research on improvements over a relatively short period of 10-14 weeks of instruction has revealed mixed results in terms of measures and analytic scores (Knoch et al., 2014). The present study sought to contribute to the writing development research by investigating the writing development of learners of Thai as a foreign language at a university in Singapore, quantitatively measuring in particular the development of accuracy, fluency, grammatical complexity in the students' writing.

Specifically, the present study set out to answer the following research questions:

1. Does the writing proficiency of undergraduate learners of Thai as a foreign language at a Singapore university improve through the writing instruction they receive over a period of 13 weeks?
2. Specifically, what aspects of writing (accuracy, fluency, grammatical complexity and the overall quality of writing) develop over the course of the 13-week instruction?

3 Methodology

3.1 Participants

20 pre-intermediate learners of Thai as a foreign language at a university in Singapore were invited to participate in the study over a 13-week semester of the university. The participants' age ranges between 18 and 22, and they are of Chinese ethnic background, speaking both English and Mandarin Chinese at home and having attended English-medium schools.

Thai language courses are offered by the language centre of this university as elective modules to undergraduate and postgraduate students across faculties. Prior to being enrolled in the pre-intermediate Thai course (Thai 3), the students had completed the Beginners 1 and 2 courses (Thai

1 & Thai 2) in the previous semesters. Each course consists of six contact hours weekly over a 13-week semester. The six contact hours are divided into three two-hour sessions, with two sessions engaging students in listening and speaking activities, while the third focuses on reading and writing practice.

Students at each level of proficiency learn how to read and write Thai through selected topics based on various genres, that is, narrative, expository and argumentative texts. Writing activities are aimed at building and enhancing students' linguistic knowledge of the target language as well as their Thai writing skills.

3.2 Instruments

3.2.1 Discourse measures of accuracy, fluency and grammatical complexity

Following the previous studies (Benevento & Storch, 2011; Knoch et al., 2014; Polio, 1997; Storch, 1999, 2005, 2009; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2009), all the 20 participants' essays were coded for T-units and clauses, and analyzed through the measures of accuracy, fluency and grammatical complexity.

The measure of accuracy was examined via the percentage of error-free clauses and the percentage of error-free T-units. The measure of fluency was measured via the average number of T-units per text. Grammatical complexity was measured via the number of clauses per T-unit (C/T-unit).

To answer research question 1, the researchers (the author and co-author) hand-coded all the written scripts and performed a statistical analysis. Polio's (1997) guidelines on what constitutes a T-unit, a clause, and error were employed and adjusted to suit the distinctive specifications of the Thai language. Prior to the current study, the researchers piloted the guidelines (Polio, 1997) on the essays of a previous cohort of pre-intermediate level of Thai as a foreign language at the same university. The reliability of inter- and intra-rating was not reported. Examples of the coding of T-units and clauses are provided in Appendix 2.

Table 1. Discourse measures

Category	Measures
Accuracy	Error-free Clauses (EFC) Error-free T-units (EFT)
Fluency	Number of T-units
Grammatical Complexity	Clauses per T-units

3.2.2 Analytic scoring

To complement the quantitative data analysis as above, analytic scoring was carried out to rate various aspects of the participants' writing (Weigle, 2002). A widely used scale originally developed by Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel, and Hughey (1981) and adapted by Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1992) was employed. A pilot study to assess the validity and reliability of the scoring criteria was conducted. A different cohort of the learners of Thai as a foreign language at the same university was invited to participate in the pilot study. The scale consists of five components, namely, *Content*, *Organization*, *Grammar*, *Vocabulary* and *Mechanics of Writing*. (See Appendix 1 for a complete description of the five components and their respective bands or rating criteria).

3.3 Procedures

3.3.1 Tasks: Test and retest design

Two narrative writing tasks were conducted over one semester, with the first task in Week 1 and the other in Week 13. The participants were given 40 minutes to write an essay of approximately 200–300 words on a given topic. The first essay was entitled *My memorable holiday* and the other essay was on *My favorite festival*. It is noted that even though the topics chosen for the writing tasks were not piloted, they were relevant to the topics and readings learned in this course. The researchers had a discussion session with the teacher and viewed the course curriculum before the study was conducted.

3.3.2 Rating and coding

The author and an experienced teacher who taught the pre-intermediate course during the period of study rated the participants' essays to analyze the overall quality of writing using the analytic scoring (see Appendix 1). Prior to the study, the scoring scale, marking criteria and rubrics were discussed among the raters and piloted on a different cohort of pre-intermediate learners of Thai at the same university. Nevertheless, the assessment of the raters' scoring reliability was not performed.

3.4 Data coding and analysis

3.4.1 Comparing discourse measures

To analyze the data, the participants' essays (Task 1 = Time 1, and Task 2 = Time 2) were collected and analyzed quantitatively. The quantitative analysis measured accuracy, fluency, and grammatical complexity. T-units and clauses were coded and analyzed according to the coding agreements (adapted from Polio, 1997). The discourse measures were adapted from previous studies (Benevento & Storch, 2011; Knoch et al., 2014; Polio, 1997; Storch, 1999, 2005, 2009; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2009).

Having completed the coding, the means and standard deviations for the measures of accuracy, fluency and grammatical complexity were calculated. Subsequently, a statistical analysis using a paired sample t-test was conducted to establish the difference between Task 1 and Task 2 essays.

3.4.2 Analytic essay scores

The adapted analytic scoring in Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1992) was employed to rate the essays. The overall quality of writing was rated in terms of content, organization, grammar, vocabulary and mechanics of writing on a 0–100 point scale, and adjusted to 20 marks. In turn, the means and standard deviations, as well as a paired samples t-test were performed to establish the statistical significance of any difference between Task 1 and Task 2 scores.

4 Results

4.1 Analytic essay scores

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of analytic essay scores for all participants. The differences in mean scores between Task 1 and Task 2 were statistically significant.

Table 2. Comparing means of essay scores between Task 1 and Task 2 (n = 20)

	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Marks: T1	14.65	1.40	12.00	17.50
Marks: T2	17.00	1.02	14.60	19.00

Notes: T1 = Task 1; T2 = Task 2

Table 3 presents the paired sample t-test results of mean scores between Task 1 and Task 2. As shown, the essay scores improved from Task 1 to Task 2. Two-tailed t-tests revealed that the differences were statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Table 3. Paired sample t-test results for essay scores between Task 1 and Task 2

Category	Measures	Mean T1	SD	Mean T2	SD	<i>t</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
Overall quality	Essay scores	14.65	1.40	17.00	1.02	9.66	.000

Notes: $df = 19$; $n = 20$; * = $p < .05$

4.2 Discourse measures

Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics for the discourse measures. As the table shows, there were significant differences in mean scores between Task 1 and Task 2 in the measures of accuracy, fluency and grammatical complexity.

Table 4. Comparing means of discourse measures between Task 1 and Task 2 (n = 20)

	Mean	SD	Min	Max
EFT_T1	.44	.23	.01	.75
EFT_T2	.67	.18	.14	.89
EFC_T1	.70	.22	.15	.95
EFC_T2	.85	.06	.70	.94
T_T1	8.85	2.56	3.00	15.00
T_T2	11.60	2.82	7.00	19.00
CPT_T1	2.24	.36	1.67	3.00
CPT_T2	2.96	.39	1.89	3.86

Notes: EFT = Error free T-units; EFC = Error free Clauses; T = T- units; CPT = Clauses per T- unit

Table 5 presents the inferential statistics for the discourse measures. As the table shows, there was statistically significant improvement of accuracy between Task 1 and Task 2. Likewise, fluency, measured by the number of T-units, between Task 1 and Task 2 also shows statistical improvement. For grammatical complexity, there was also statistically significant improvement found between the two tasks.

Table 5. Paired sample t-test results for discourse measures: Task 1 and Task 2

Category	Measures	Mean T1	SD	Mean T2	SD	<i>t</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
Accuracy	Error-free T-units (EFT)	.44	.23	.67	.18	3.871	.001
	Error-free Clauses (EFC)	.70	.22	.85	.06	3.222	.004
Fluency	No. T-units (T)	8.85	2.56	11.60	2.82	3.205	.005
Grammatical complexity	Clauses per T-units (C/T)	2.24	.36	2.96	.39	6.592	.000

Notes: $df = 19$; $n = 20$; * = $p < .05$

5 Discussion

The current study investigated Thai as a foreign language writing development of university students after a 13-week Thai elective module in a non-target language environment. The results of the study showed that the students' writing indeed developed in all aspects of measures employed, the discourse measures of accuracy, fluency and grammatical complexity, and the analytic scoring. This is inconsistent with the findings of Shaw & Liu's (1998) study, which documented that there was no significant improvement in terms of accuracy and grammatical complexity after 10–14 weeks of an EAP course for international students in a UK university. This inconsistency could perhaps be explained in terms of the measures employed. In Shaw and Liu (1998), grammatical complexity was measured via the increased use of nominalization, reduction of clauses to prepositional or participial phrases and increased subordination or changes in the pattern of subordination. However, in the current study, only the number of clauses per T-units was used to measure grammatical complexity. A range of measures to assess writing development could reveal varied findings depending on the measures used (Sasaki, 2007, 2009, 2011; Shaw & Liu, 1998; Storch & Tapper, 2009).

Fluency, among other measures, showed statistically significant improvement between Task 1 and Task 2. The finding in relation to fluency development is consistent with some previous research (see e.g. Tsang & Wong, 2000). Nevertheless, it is noted that the measure of fluency in Tsang and Wong (2000) involved the word count, while the current study's measure of fluency was the number of T-units.

In terms of the overall quality of Task 1 and Task 2, the results suggested that there was a statistically significant improvement from essay 1 to essay 2. The essay rating scale was employed to assess the students' writing. It is noted that even though each component of the marking criteria was not explicitly illustrated, the heavy component of scores fell on content, grammar, organization, and vocabulary respectively (refer to Appendix 1). The improvement in the essay scores between Task 1 and Task 2 appeared to be consistent with the findings of discourse measures, whereby accuracy and grammatical complexity significantly improved over the period of study.

The study shows that writing instruction, writing practice and teacher feedback could prove beneficial to learners' writing development. In the current study, the essay topics chosen for Task 1 and Task 2 were relevant to the syllabus and content introduced in the classroom setting. In other words, the students at this level of proficiency were expected to produce writing related to selected topics of interest. In addition, as discussed above, the students were required to submit their written assignments weekly for the teacher to provide both oral and written corrective feedback for each student's essay. It is noted that the teacher feedback covered grammar, organization, content and spelling. As elaborated above, the writing instructional approach and teacher feedback could be the reasons that the learners' writing improved significantly.

The current study was not without its limitations. It is noted that the range of discourse measures could be more varied. A clearer picture of development in terms of fluency and grammatical complexity could have been revealed, if more measures of each category had been employed. To exemplify this point, in Storch (2009), fluency was measured via the number of words, number of T-units, and words per T-units. As for the measure of grammatical complexity, the number of clauses per T-unit and the dependent clauses per clause were counted. Furthermore, the inter-rater and intra-rater reliability of the scoring was not controlled.

6 Conclusion

The study provides an insight to the domain of writing development among learners of Thai as a foreign language. It is found that, over a 13-week period of studying Thai as a foreign language in an environment where the target language is not used outside the classroom, learners' writing could be significantly developed in the aspects of accuracy, fluency, grammatical complexity as well as with regard to the overall quality of their essays. It is believed that the syllabus, writing instruction, practice and teacher corrective feedback could have contributed to the students' writ-

ing performance. As it is assumed that L2 writing improves over time in response to classroom instruction activities and practice, future studies may carry out longitudinal research with more varied criteria and features of discourse measures with a stronger focus on qualitative analysis. Interview sessions with learners could provide invaluable insights into their learning styles and perceptions with regard to an informed writing development. It is hoped that with more triangulating approaches, future studies will produce more conclusive results.

References

- Benevento, C., & Storch, N. (2011). Investigating writing development in secondary school learners of French. *Assessing Writing*, *16*, 97–110.
- Dekeyser, R.M. (2007). Introduction: Situating the concept of practice. In R. M. Dekeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language* (pp. 1–18). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *1*, 255–276.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, H., Zinkgraf, S., Wormuth, D., Hartfiel, V., & Hughey, J. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Knoch, U., Rouhshad, A., & Storch, N. (2014). Does the writing of undergraduate ESL students develop after one year of study in a English-medium university? *Assessing Writing*, *21*, 1–17.
- Matsuda, P. K., & Silva, T. (2010). Writing. In S. Norbert (Ed.), *Applied linguistics* (pp. 232–246). London: Hodder Education.
- Polio, C. G. (1997). Measures of linguistic accuracy in second language writing research. *Language Learning*, *47*, 101–143.
- Sasaki, M. (2007). Effects of study-abroad experiences on EFL writers: A multiple data analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*, 602–620.
- Sasaki, M. (2009). Changes in EFL students' writing over 3.5 years: A socio-cognitive account. In R. M. Manchon (Ed.), *Learning, teaching and researching writing in foreign language contexts* (pp. 49–76). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sasaki, M. (2011). Effects of varying lengths of study-abroad experiences on Japanese EFL students' L2 writing ability and motivation: A longitudinal study. *TESOL Quarterly*, *45*(1), 81–105.
- Shaw, P., & Liu, E. (1998). What develops in the development of second-language writing? *Applied Linguistics*, *19*(2), 225–254.
- Storch, N. (1999). Are two heads better than one? Pair work and grammatical accuracy. *System*, *27*, 363–374.
- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *14*, 153–173.
- Storch, N. (2009). The impact of studying in a second language (L2) medium university on the development of L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *18*(2), 103–118.
- Storch, N., & Tapper, J. (2009). The impact of an EAP course on postgraduate writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *8*(3), 207–223.
- Tsang, W., & Wong, M. (2000). Giving grammar the place it deserves in process writing. *Prospect*, *15*(1), 34–45.
- Weigle, S. R. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wigglesworth, G., & Storch, N. (2009). Pair versus individual writing: Effects on fluency, complexity and accuracy. *Language Testing*, *26*, 445–466.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Essay Rating Scale (Jacobs et al., 1981; adapted by Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992)

Score criteria	
Content	
27–30	Excellent to very good: knowledgeable; substantive, through development of thesis; relevant to topic assigned
22–26	Good to average: some knowledge of subject; adequate range; limited thematic development; mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail
17–21	Fair to poor: limited knowledge of subject; minimal substance; poor thematic development
13–16	Very poor: shows little or no knowledge of subject; inadequate quantity; not relevant, or not enough to rate
Organization	
18–20	Excellent to very good: fluent expression; clear statement of ideas; solid support; clear organization; logical and cohesive sequencing
14–17	Good to average: adequate fluency; main ideas clear, but loosely organized; supporting material limited; sequencing logical but incomplete
10–13	Fair to poor: low fluency; ideas not well connected; logical sequencing and development lacking
7–9	Very poor: ideas not communicated; organization lacking, or not enough to rate
Grammar	
22–25	Excellent to very good: accurate use of relatively complex structures; few errors in agreement, number, tense, word order, articles, pronouns, prepositions
18–21	Good to average: simple constructions used effectively; some problems in use of complex constructions; errors in agreement, number, tense, word order, articles, pronouns, prepositions
11–17	Fair to poor: significant defects in use of complex constructions; frequent errors in agreement, number, tense, negation, word order, articles, pronouns, prepositions; fragments and deletions; lack of accuracy interferes with meaning
5–10	Very poor: no mastery of simple sentence construction; text dominated by errors; does not communicate, or not enough to rate
Vocabulary	
18–20	Excellent to very good: complex range; accurate word/idiom; master of word forms; appropriate register
14–17	Good to average: adequate range; errors of word/idiom choice; effective transmission of meaning
10–13	Fair to poor: limited range; frequent word/idiom errors; inadequate choice, usage; meaning not effectively communicated
7–9	Very poor: translation-based errors; little knowledge of target language vocabulary, or not enough to rate
Mechanics	
5	Excellent to very good: masters conventions of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraph indentation, etc.
4	Good to average: occasional errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraph indentation, etc., which do not interfere with meaning
3	Fair to poor: frequent spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing errors; meaning disrupted by formal problems
2	Very poor: no mastery of conventions due to frequency of mechanical errors, or not enough to rate

Appendix 2**Examples of coding agreements for T-unit and clause coding** (modified from Polio, 1997)

- 1) สิงคโปร์มีสถานที่น่าท่องเที่ยวและน่าสนใจหลายแห่ง
‘Singapore has many tourist attractions and interesting places.’
= 1 T-unit (1 clause)
- 2) เรามีเรียนทุกเช้าและพบเพื่อนคนไทยตอนบ่าย
‘We got a lesson every morning and met our Thai friends in the afternoon.’
= 1 T-unit (2 clauses)
- 3) ก่อนที่ดิฉันจะไปเมืองไทย/ ดิฉันไม่สนิทกับพวกเขา
‘Before I went to Thailand, I was not close to them.’
= 1 T-unit (2 clauses)
- 4) ผมคิดว่า/ จังหวัดสุโขทัยน่าสนใจมาก
‘I think that Sukhothai province is very interesting.’
= 1 T-unit (2 clauses)
- 5) การเรียนที่นั่นไม่เครียดเลย/ และเราก็ได้ฝึกใช้ภาษาไทยทุกวัน
‘Studying there was not stressful at all and we got to practice Thai every day.’
= 2 T-units (2 clauses)