

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

In the study "Needs and Problems of Officials Working in the Department of Fisheries in Using English Language for Communication at Work", two hundred copies of the questionnaire were distributed to DOF officials working in Bangkok and other provinces. However, there were 166 officials or 83% who completed and returned the questionnaires to the researcher.

This chapter reports the results of the study based on the data gained from the 166 respondents. Summary tables are used to present the results and support the discussion. The results are separated into two parts according to the questionnaire.

4.1 RESPONDENTS' PERSONAL INFORMATION

Table 1. Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	60	36.1
Female	106	63.9
Total	166	100.0

It is shown in Table 1 that most of the respondents (63.9%) were female while 36.1% of them were male.

Table 2. Age

Age Ranges (years)	Frequency	Percentage
Not over 30 years	51	30.7
31 – 35	37	22.3
36 – 40	39	23.5
Over 45 years	39	23.5
Total	166	100.0

Table 2 shows that the respondents' ages ranged from not over 30 years old to over 45 years old. Most of them (30.7%) were younger than 30 years old. There were

two of them (23.5%) who were between 36-40 years old and older than 45 years old. The minority group was those who were 31-35 years old (22.3%).

Table 3. Level of Education

Level of Education	Frequency	Percentage
Under Bachelor Degree	20	12.0
Graduate (Bachelor Degree)	96	57.8
Postgraduate (Master Degree)	50	30.1
Total	166	100.0

Table 3 shows that of the 166 respondents, most of them (57.8%) held a Bachelor Degree and 30.1% of them had Master Degree. The minority group was those who had an education lower than Bachelor's degree (12.0%).

Table 4. Educational Institutes/Universities of the Respondents

Educational Institutes/Universities	Frequency	Percentage
Domestic	159	95.8
Foreign	7	4.2
Total	166	100.0

Table 4 indicates that the majority of the respondents (95.8%) studied in Thailand, whereas the rest of them (4.2%) graduated from universities in foreign countries.

Table 5. The Rank of the Respondents' Position

Rank of Position	Frequency	Percentage
Temporary Fisheries Staff	74	44.6
Operating Fisheries Biologist	38	22.9
Professional Fisheries Biologist	41	24.7
Senior Fisheries Biologist	13	7.8
Total	166	100.0

Table 5 indicates that of the 166 respondents, 44.6% of them were temporary fisheries staff, whereas 24.7% and 22.9% of them were Professional Fisheries Biologists and Operating Fisheries Biologists, respectively. The minority group was those who were Senior Fisheries Biologists (7.8%).

Table 6. The Respondents' Service Period in the Department of Fisheries

Service Period in DOF (Years)	Frequency	Percentage
Less than a year	7	4.2
1 – 5 years	66	39.8
6 – 10 years	22	13.3
11 – 15 years	31	18.7
16 – 20 years	17	10.2
21 – 25 years	9	5.4
26 – 30 years	6	3.6
Over 30 years	8	4.8
Total	166	100.0

From Table 6, the majority of the respondents (39.8%) had served the Department of Fisheries for 1-5 years. 18.7% and 13.3% of them had worked for 11-15 years and 6-10 years, respectively. In fact, the minority groups were those who had worked for over 30 years, less than a year and 26-30 years, respectively (4.8%, 4.2%, 3.6%)

Table 7. Frequency of Working on Fisheries International Affairs per Year

Frequency of Working on International Affairs per Year	Frequency	Percentage
1 – 4 times	41	24.7
5 – 8 times	14	8.4
9 – 12 times	6	3.6
13 – 16 times	3	1.8
More than 16 times	15	9.0
None	87	52.4
Total	166	100.0

As shown in Table 7, of the 166 respondents, the majority (52.4%) had never worked on international affairs. 24.7%, 9.0% and 8.4% of them had worked on international affairs 1-4 times, more than 16 times and 5-8 times per year, respectively. The minority groups were those who had worked on international affairs 9-12 times per year (3.6%) and 13-16 times per year (1.8%), respectively.

Table 8. Frequency of Working on International Affairs in Thailand per Year

Frequency of Working on International Affairs in Thailand per Year	Frequency	Percentage
1 – 4 times	52	31.3
5 – 8 times	17	10.2
9 – 12 times	6	3.6
13 – 16 times	2	1.2
More than 16 times	13	7.8
None	76	45.8
Total	166	100.0

According to Table 8, of the 166 respondents, the majority (45.8%) had never worked on international assignments in Thailand. 31.3%, 10.6% and 7.8% of them had worked on assignments related to international affairs in Thailand 1-4 times, 5-8 times and more than 16 times per year, respectively. The minority groups were those who had worked on international affairs 9-12 times per year (3.6%) and 13-16 times per year (1.2%), respectively.

Table 9. Frequency of Working in Foreign Countries per Year

Frequency of Working on International Affairs in Foreign Countries per Year	Frequency	Percentage
1 – 4 times	26	15.7
5 – 8 times	1	0.6
9 – 12 times	1	0.6
13 – 16 times	0	0.0
More than 16 times	3	1.8
None	135	81.3
Total	166	100.0

Table 9 shows that of the 166 respondents, 81.3% of them had never worked in foreign countries at all. 15.7% of them had worked in foreign countries 1-4 times per year and 1.8% of them had worked in foreign countries more than 16 times per year. There were two minority groups consisting of those who had worked in foreign countries 5-8 times and 9-12 times per year (0.6%), whereas none of the respondents had worked in foreign countries 13-16 times per year.

Table 10. Frequency of Working with the Foreigners in Thailand per Year

Frequency of Working with the Foreigners in Thailand per Year	Frequency	Percentage
1 – 4 times	48	28.9
5 – 8 times	6	3.6
9 – 12 times	1	0.6
13 – 16 times	1	0.6
More than 16 times	8	4.8
None	102	61.4
Total	166	100.0

Table 10 indicates that the majority of all 166 respondents (61.4%) had never worked with foreigners in Thailand while 28.9% of them had worked with foreigners in Thailand 1-4 times per year. 4.8% and 3.6% of them had worked with foreigners in

Thailand more than 16 times and 5-8 times, per year respectively. There were two minority groups consisting of those who had worked with foreigners in Thailand 9-12 times and 13-16 times per year (0.6%).

Table 11. Frequency of Working with Foreigners in Foreign Countries

Frequency of Coordinating and Visiting the Foreigner in the Foreign Countries	Frequency	Percentage
1 – 4 times	28	16.9
5 – 8 times	1	0.6
9 – 12 times	2	1.2
13 – 16 times	0	0.0
More than 16 times	2	1.2
None	133	80.1
Total	166	100.0

Table 11 shows that the majority of all 166 respondents (80.1%) had never worked with foreigners in foreign countries. 16.9% of them had worked with foreigners in foreign countries 1-4 times per year. There were two groups (1.2%) who had worked with the foreigners in foreign countries 9-12 times and more than 16 times per year. The minority group (0.6%) was those who had worked with foreigners in foreign countries 5-8 times per year while none of the respondents had worked with foreigners in foreign countries 13-16 times per year.

4.2 OPINIONS ON THE NEEDS AND PROBLEMS OF ENGLISH COMMUNICATION AT WORK

Table 12. Level of Needs and Problems of English Communication in Listening Skills

Activities

Needs				Listening Skill Activities	Problems			
Mean	SD	Rank	Level of Needs		Mean	SD	Rank	Level of Problems
3.28	1.23	1	Moderate	1. Listening to general conversation	3.22	1.12	8	Moderate
3.15	1.33	4	Moderate	2. Listening to and following work instructions including project implementation in fisheries and related fields	3.48	1.14	4	High
3.24	1.38	2	Moderate	3. Listening to academic and/or technical presentations in fisheries and related fields	3.55	1.14	2	High
3.11	1.43	5	Moderate	4. Listening to discussions during international meetings and/or seminars in fisheries and related fields	3.53	1.24	3	High
2.81	1.3	9	Moderate	5. Listening to announcements, suggestions and warnings abroad	3.1	1.18	9	Moderate
3.2	1.29	3	Moderate	6. Listening to conversations with different foreign accents	3.63	1.16	1	High
2.92	1.23	8	Moderate	7. Listening to audio visual media regarding fisheries and related fields	3.31	1.08	6	Moderate
3.07	1.34	6	Moderate	8. Listening to face-to-face conversation with foreigners.	3.44	1.15	5	High
2.95	1.33	7	Moderate	9. Listening to non face-to-face conversation via telephone and/or answering machine etc.	3.25	1.19	7	Moderate

Table 12 shows that the three most significant activities in listening skills that DOF officials needed to communicate in English language were listening to general conversation (mean score = 3.28), listening to academic and technical presentations in the fisheries field (mean score = 3.24), and listening to conversations with different foreign accents (mean score = 3.20). All of these three most significant activities contributed to a moderate level of needs in listening skills.

The three least significant ones were listening to non face-to-face conversation via telephone and answering machine etc. (mean score = 2.95), listening to audio visual media in the fisheries content (mean score = 2.92), and listening to

announcements, suggestions and warnings in foreign countries (mean score = 2.81). All of these three least significant activities were moderate.

The three most problematic activities in listening skills that DOF officials encountered when communicating in English language were listening to conversations with different foreign accents (mean score = 3.63), listening to academic and technical presentations in the fisheries field (mean score = 3.55), and listening to discussions during fisheries international meetings and seminars (mean score = 3.53). The level of these three most problematic activities was high.

The three least problematic activities were listening to non face-to-face conversation via telephone and answering machine etc. (mean score = 3.25), listening to general conversation (mean score = 3.22), and listening to announcements, suggestions and warnings in the foreign countries (mean score = 3.10). The level of these three least problematic activities was moderate.

Table 13. Level of Needs and Problems of English Communication in Speaking Skills Activities

Needs				Speaking Skill Activities	Problems			
Mean	SD	Rank	Level of Needs		Mean	SD	Rank	Level of Problems
2.94	1.27	3	Moderate	1. Greeting and daily communication	3.08	1.14	8	Moderate
2.88	1.31	6	Moderate	2. Conversing in non face-to-face communication, e.g. telephone conversation	3.31	1.12	7	Moderate
3.01	1.41	1	Moderate	3. Conversing in face-to-face communication	3.39	1.22	6	Moderate
2.86	1.45	7	Moderate	4. Giving work instructions including project implementation in fisheries and related fields	3.45	1.18	5	High
2.93	1.46	5	Moderate	5. Giving academic and/or technical presentations in fisheries and related fields and others	3.51	1.24	4	High
2.96	1.48	2	Moderate	6. Asking for information or clarification during international meetings and/or seminars in fisheries and related fields and others	3.55	1.24	2	High
2.94	1.54	3	Moderate	7. Giving opinions and speaking in international meetings and/or seminars in fisheries and related fields	3.6	1.3	1	High
2.69	1.56	8	Moderate	8. Lecturing in international training	3.53	1.44	3	High
2.57	1.3	9	Low	9. Asking for directions and other information abroad	3.02	1.29	9	Moderate

According to Table 13, the three most significant activities in speaking skills that DOF officials needed to communicate in English language were conversing in face-to-face communication (mean score = 3.01), asking for information and clarification during international fisheries meetings and seminars (mean score = 2.96), However, there were two activities, greeting and daily communication including speaking in international meetings and/or seminar in fisheries, represented by the same mean score (mean score = 2.94). These four mentioned activities were all moderate.

The three least significant ones were giving work instructions including project implementations in the fisheries field (mean score = 2.86), lecturing in international training (mean score = 2.69), and asking for directions and other

information in foreign countries (mean score = 2.57). The level of needs in these three activities was moderate, moderate and low respectively.

The three most problematic activities in speaking skills that DOF officials encountered when communicating in English language were giving opinions and speaking in international fisheries meetings and seminars (mean score = 3.60), asking for information and clarification during those international meetings and seminars (mean score = 3.55), and lecturing in international training (mean score = 3.53). All of these three most problematic activities contributed to a high level in speaking skills.

The three least problematic activities were conversing in non face-to-face communication such as conversation on telephone (mean score = 3.31), greeting in daily communication (mean score = 3.08) and asking for directions and other information in foreign countries (mean score = 3.02). These three least problematic activities were all moderate.

Table 14. Level of Needs and Problems of English Communication in Reading Skills Activities

Needs				Reading Skill Activities	Problems			
Mean	SD	Rank	Level of Needs		Mean	SD	Rank	Level of Problems
3.07	1.17	3	Moderate	1. Reading newspapers, magazines, journals and other print media	3.12	1.04	5	Moderate
2.9	1.14	7	Moderate	2. Reading news, declarations, and official materials issued by international organizations e.g. meeting invitations and/or exposition manuals	3.05	1.04	6	Moderate
2.78	1.16	8	Moderate	3. Reading application forms for international training courses and/or international meetings/seminars	2.99	1.1	8	Moderate
3.13	1.21	2	Moderate	4. Reading E – mail and information on fisheries or related fields available on the internet	3	1.11	7	Moderate
3.04	1.31	4	Moderate	5. Reading work instructions, project implementations, and other documents, e.g. Terms of References (TOR) and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding fisheries and related fields	3.27	1.09	2	Moderate
3.02	1.37	5	Moderate	6. Reading documents from international meetings/seminars	3.23	1.15	4	Moderate
3	1.39	6	Moderate	7. Reading official correspondence, agreements and contracts	3.4	1.21	1	Moderate
3.16	1.37	1	Moderate	8. Reading technical articles and/or technical papers/reports	3.25	1.11	3	Moderate
2.66	1.21	9	Moderate	9. Reading general information, maps, and directions abroad	2.87	1.15	9	Moderate

Table 14 shows that the three most significant activities in reading skills that DOF officials needed to use English language were reading technical articles, papers and reports in the fisheries field (mean score = 3.16), reading E-mail and fisheries information available on the internet (mean score = 3.13), and reading newspapers, magazines, journals and other printed media (mean score = 3.07). These three most significant activities were all moderate.

The three least significant activities that DOF officials needed to use English language were reading news, declarations, and official materials issued by international organizations such as meeting invitation letters and exposition manuals (mean score = 2.90), reading application forms for international training courses, meetings and seminars (mean score = 2.78), and reading general information, maps, and directions in foreign countries (mean score = 2.66). These three least significant activities were all moderate.

The three most problematic activities in reading skills that DOF officials encountered were reading official correspondence, agreements and contracts (mean score = 3.40), reading work instructions, project implementations, and other documents such as Terms of Reference and Memorandum of Understanding (mean score = 3.27), and reading technical fisheries articles, papers, and reports (mean score = 3.25). All of these three most problematic activities contributed to a moderate level in reading skills.

The three least problematic activities were reading E-mail and fisheries information available on the Internet (mean score = 3.00), reading application forms for international training courses, meetings, and seminars (mean score = 2.99), and reading general information, maps, and directions in foreign countries (mean score = 2.87). All of these three least problematic activities were moderate.

Table 15. Level of Needs and Problems of English Communication in Writing Skills Activities

Needs				Writing Skill Activities	Problems			
Mean	SD	Rank	Level of Needs		Mean	SD	Rank	Level of Problems
3.18	1.2	1	Moderate	1. Writing CV or resume	3.15	1.08	8	Moderate
3.06	1.45	3	Moderate	2. Writing project proposal	3.63	1.2	3	High
3.1	1.28	2	Moderate	3. Writing correspondence via E-mail	3.22	1.16	7	Moderate
2.94	1.3	5	Moderate	4. Filling in application forms to participate in international meetings/ seminars	3.05	1.21	9	Moderate
2.83	1.36	7	Moderate	5. Writing documents for meetings and/or writing handouts for presentations e.g. agenda and schedule	3.45	1.23	5	High
2.75	1.39	9	Moderate	6. Writing evaluation forms for training courses/ meetings/ seminars/ projects	3.36	1.24	6	Moderate
2.81	1.53	8	Moderate	7. Taking notes to record international meetings/ seminars and writing the minutes of meetings	3.6	1.29	4	High
2.92	1.49	6	Moderate	8. Writing official correspondence, agreements and contracts	3.69	1.26	2	High
3.02	1.53	4	Moderate	9. Writing technical articles and/or technical papers/reports	3.73	1.23	1	High
2.73	1.4	10	Moderate	10. Writing news and/ or information for dissemination	2.73	1.4	10	Moderate

Table 15 indicates that the three most significant activities that DOF officials needed to use English language were writing CVs or resumes (mean score = 3.18), writing correspondence via E-mail (mean score = 3.10), and writing project proposals (mean score = 3.06). These three most significant activities contributed to a moderate level of needs in writing skills.

The three least significant activities which the officials needed to use English language for were taking notes to record international meetings, seminars, and writing the minutes of meetings (mean score = 2.81); writing evaluation forms for training courses, meetings, seminars, and projects (mean score = 2.75); and writing news and information for dissemination (mean score = 2.73). These three least significant activities were all moderate.

The three most problematic activities that DOF officials encountered when writing in English language were writing technical articles, papers, and reports (mean score = 3.73); writing official correspondence, agreements, and contracts (mean score = 3.69); and writing project proposals (mean score = 3.63). All of the three most problematic activities contributed to a high level in writing skills.

The three least problematic activities were writing CVs or resumes (mean score = 3.15), filling in application forms to participate in international meetings and seminars (mean score = 3.05), and writing news and information for dissemination (mean score = 2.73). All of three least problematic activities contributed to a moderate level in writing skill.

Table 16. Level of Needs of English Communication at Work in Four Skills

English skills	Mean	SD	Rank	Level of Needs
Listening	3.43	1.35	1	High
Speaking	3.34	1.42	3	Moderate
Reading	3.36	1.28	2	Moderate
Writing	3.23	1.32	4	Moderate

From Table 16, the most significant skill that DOF officials needed to communicate in English language was listening skills (mean score = 3.43) which contributed to a high level of need in English communication. The level of needs in reading, speaking, and writing skills were moderate which were rated as 3.36, 3.34, and 3.23, respectively.

Table 17. Level of Problems of English Communication at Work in Four Skills

English Skills	Mean	SD	Rank	Level of Problems
Listening	3.66	1.17	2	High
Speaking	3.72	1.16	1	High
Reading	3.25	1.13	4	Moderate
Writing	3.64	1.18	3	High

Table 17 shows that the most problematic skill that DOF officials encountered when communicating in English language was speaking skills which was rated as 3.72. It contributed to a high level of problem. It was followed by listening, writing, and reading skills which were rated as 3.66, 3.64, and 3.25, respectively. The level of problems in writing and speaking skills were high, whereas the level of problems in reading skills was moderate.

Table 18. The Level of the Respondents' English Proficiency in Each of Four Skills

Level of English Proficiency	Skills							
	Listening		Speaking		Reading		Writing	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Excellent	0	0.00	1	0.60	1	0.60	1	0.60
Good	12	7.23	7	4.22	23	13.86	8	4.82
Intermediate	57	34.34	49	29.52	59	35.54	46	27.71
Fair	97	58.43	109	65.66	83	50.00	111	66.87
Total	166	100	166	100	166	100	166	100

Table 18 shows that in listening skills, most of the respondents (58.43%) had fair English proficiency while 34.34% of them had intermediate English proficiency. The minority group (7.23%) had good proficiency in English. But, none of the respondents had excellent English proficiency.

Regarding speaking skills, most of the respondents (65.66%) had fair English proficiency. 29.52% of them had intermediate English proficiency in speaking skills. The minority groups were those who had good and excellent proficiency, which accounted for 4.22% and 0.60%, respectively.

In terms of reading skills, the majority groups were those who had fair and intermediate English proficiency accounted for 50% and 35.54%, respectively. The minority groups were those who had good and excellent proficiency in English reading skills that accounted for 13.86% and 0.60%, respectively.

For writing skills, most of the respondents (66.87%) had fair English proficiency. 27.71% of them had intermediate English proficiency in writing skills.

The minority groups were those who had good and excellent proficiency in English writing skills which accounted for 4.82% and 0.60%, respectively.

Table 19. The Skill that the Respondents' Mostly Wanted to be Improved

Skills Mostly Wanted to Be Improved	Frequency	Percentage
Listening	58	34.9
Speaking	64	38.6
Reading	31	18.7
Writing	13	7.8
Total	166	100.0

From Table 19, most of the respondents (64%) would mostly like to improve their speaking skills. 58%, 31%, and 13% of them would like to improve their listening, reading, and writing skills, respectively.

Table 20. The Respondents' Opinion That They Encountered Problems in English Communication at Work

Do you think you have problems in English Communication at Work	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	107	64.46
No	59	35.54
Total	166	100.0

Table 20 shows that of the 166 respondents, only 35.54% of them did not encounter any difficulty in English communication at work, whereas 64.46% of them had problems when they communicated in English at work.

Table 21. The Respondents' Experience in English Language Training

Experience in English Language Training (%)	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	48	28.92
No	118	71.08
Total	166	100.0

According to Table 21, of the 166 respondents, only 28.92% of them had experience in English language training and additional courses while 71.08% of them had never been trained for English language improvement.

The findings of the study will be summarized and discussed in the next chapter.