Chapter 8
An Analysis of Teaching Methodologies and Learning Assessment

8.1 Introduction

Chapter 6 and 7 discuss the philosophies, ideologies and theories underpinning the ESB curriculum overarching goals, content standards and benchmarks. This chapter covers two major analyses. The first is an analysis of the suggested teaching and learning management (STLM) or teaching methodologies that include mainly a description of English language teaching and learning principles (DTLP), and the list of approaches and methods (LAM). The second is a suggested learning assessment method.

This chapter raises several questions. What pedagogical suggestions as well as language teaching and learning methods that support the achievement of ESB goals are available for teachers? How should language teaching be structured to facilitate learning that was defined in the educational goals? Which methodology or methodologies are teachers being directed towards? What are the evaluation methods, guided by curriculum policy, that enable teachers to evaluate students? Are the suggestions theoretically and philosophically coherent with the ESB curriculum overarching goals and the curriculum content or not?
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The first part of this chapter presents an analysis of the pedagogical approaches underpinning STLM set against the ESB curriculum overarching goals, content standards and benchmarks. This section begins by revisiting national educational key policy related to teaching and learning management. Then both coherent and non coherent principles underlying STML are revealed and discussed. Some examples in the “Manual for English language learning area”, the data from the planning of teacher development and training programs are also discussed. They add a more broadly based analysis of the curriculum document. They are factors that should be taken into account in the planning of an EFL curriculum so that there is better coherence with the ESB curriculum.

The second part analyses suggested learning assessment methods. The analysis is similar to the analysis of the STLM learning assessment suggested in the curriculum document. The analysis is made against the ESB curriculum overarching goals, content standards and teaching methodologies in terms of coherent underlying principles among curriculum elements.

### 8.2 Setting the Scene

As mentioned in previous chapters, the strong movement of Thai education in this reform period has been the progressive view of education, despite traditional thinking being embedded in some elements of the ESB curriculum's overarching goals. According to the progressive movement, the role of teachers is as facilitators, and learners are active participants within and beyond the classroom environment. Within this view, learners are empowered to take charge of their own learning, incorporating their own needs at all times and acknowledging that learning is for their life time or part of life long learning. This process of teaching and learning allows learners to construct knowledge based on their own interest with the guidance of teachers, and to cooperatively negotiate meaning of the world through self-reflection and with peers and teachers. This process is based on the belief that providing learning opportunities in this way gives learners more freedom to draw upon their own intrinsic values and attitudes toward education rather than being oppressed by education (Charlesworth, 1988).
The key policy of Thai education in this reform period has been the development of "Knowledge, Learning Process and Affectivity" (KPA). In the ESB curriculum, the expanded details of the "Learning Process" were discussed intensively in DTLP and the STLM in the ESB curriculum manual. ESB curriculum working committees called the description of the teaching and learning principles section - "Learning process".

It is worth revisiting the key "Learning Process" elements in the National Education Act 1999 (NEA 1999) in order that the “learning process” described in the ESB curriculum is analysed against the national “Learning Process”.

Section 24 of the NEA 1999, states that educational institutions and agencies should organize the learning process with concern for the following issues: (the bold stress key elements of the “learning process” are those of the researcher)

1) Provide substance and arrange activities in line with the learners' interests and aptitudes, bearing in mind individual differences
2) Provide training in thinking process, management, how to face various situations and application of knowledge for obviating and solving problems
3) Organize activities for learners to draw from authentic experience; drill in practical work for complete mastery; enable learners to think critically and acquire the reading habit and continuous thirst for knowledge.
4) Achieve, in all subjects, a balanced integration of subject matter, integrity, values and desirable attributes
5) Enable instructors to create the ambiance, environment, instructional media, and facilities for learners to learn and be all-round persons, able to benefit from research as part of the learning process. In so doing, both learners and teachers may learn together from different types of teaching-learning media and other sources of knowledge.
6) Enable individuals to learn at all times and in all places. Co-operation with parents, guardians, and all parties concerned in the community shall be sought to develop jointly the learners in accord with their potentiality. (National Education Act of 1999)

These statements have to be discussed with teacher trainers, curriculum planners, and teachers and serve as a reference for materials developers, teacher trainers, and teachers (Developer A, B and C). Furthermore, the values listed below, which are taken from the NEA 1999, should be promoted. Students should be assisted in developing these values through discussion and modelling as part of the learning and teaching processes within the school environment (National Education Act of 1999).
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1) A pursuit of knowledge and a commitment to the achievement of potential
2) Self acceptance and respect of self
3) Respect and concern for others and their rights
4) Social and civic responsibility
5) Environmental responsibility. (National Education Act of 1999, pp. 7-8)

The following sections discuss the STLM and suggested learning assessment as well as the ESB curriculum overarching goals against these statements.

8.3 Characteristics of STLM (Suggested teaching and learning management)

The STLM was developed after the curriculum goals, content standards and curriculum had already been formulated. Similar to what happened in the case of the curriculum content, the advisory committees allowed curriculum working committees to freely develop STLM because it dealt with the specific area of ELT (Developer A). The government officers of DCID (Department of Curriculum and Instruction Development) had the major role in devising the STLM as well as the suggested learning assessment. They had a major role in organizing the curriculum draft, editing the final draft, disseminating, producing the curriculum manual, providing training programs and teacher development with a consultant and assistance from university lecturers. Within this process, the working committees changed personnel, resulting in different committees under the control of DCID. Some sections of the STLM, especially the curriculum manuals were devised by different parties. Therefore, philosophies and theories underlying STLM and the additional support document were influenced vastly by government officers; some of whom were involved at both the basic principle drafting stage and the editorial stage while some were not.

The curriculum working committees did not concern themselves much with the development of teaching methods because they believed that school teachers would do anything as long as they could help learners achieve the standards (Developer A, Officers C and D). As described in previous chapters, the Thai EFL curriculum should not be perceived as a list of objectives to be followed; rather, it is a framework for schools to develop their own curriculum, that is, a “School-based curriculum” (SBC).
Principally, teachers have full responsibility for organization of learning as well as development of classroom assessment. Teachers become decision makers in the process of selection of well-suited teaching methodologies, learning assessment and appropriate classroom environments (Trainers A and B). They have freedom to design classroom practices, which are not strictly controlled by the central department. Therefore, STLM does not provide a set of compulsory and specific teaching methods. STLM described the principles behind the teaching methodologies and learning process in order that school teachers and curriculum stakeholders mutually understand the concept of ELT (Developers A, Officers C and D). Therefore, at this stage, teachers have full responsibility for and freedom in self development and in self directed studies about which teaching methods can provide learning environments for learners to become competent language learners and good Thai citizens (Officers C, D, Trainers A, B, C and D).

Two sections are devoted to STLM in the ESB curriculum: a description of teaching and learning principles and a list of approaches and methods. The next sections discuss first the description of teaching and learning principles and later the list of approaches and methods.

### 8.3.1 The Description of Teaching and Learning Principles (DTLP)

DTLP is a one page broad description of English language teaching and learning principles. The curriculum working committees had taken into account the statement about 'Learning Process' in the NEA 1999 and stated this explicitly in the DTLP. The following extract shows the influence of the NEA 1999 (the researcher's underlining):

(A) Foreign language teaching and learning management principles are influenced by different philosophers, psychologists and linguists at different period of time. These groups of people have cooperatively identified various foreign language teaching and learning approaches. The most updated approach is teaching language for communicative purposes (Communicative approach) whose main characteristic is the "learner-centred" approach.

(B) Teaching and learning language principles under the communicative approach emphasise "learning process" that include practising and using language in the real situation according to language communicative functions
(C) Thus, the management of the learning process should aim to give the most opportunities to students to practise language as well as to have skills for searching for knowledge from different and various learning sources. 

(D) In the provision of teaching and learning activities, teachers should choose to use different “Learning Strategies” that are suitable for the age and proficiency level of learners in order for learners to have their own “Learning Styles”.

(E) There is no conclusion on which method is the best because each method has its strengths and weaknesses. Thus, teachers have to study the development of theories of learning and teaching for the decision making basis, understand the reason and know the importance of change. Teachers should apply teaching methods that are suitable for learners and foreign language teaching and learning goals in each level. This will help teaching to be more effective.

(F) Learners know the differences among peers and become the most effective learners according to their abilities. 

(Translated from the ESB curriculum, Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, (2002a))

According to the statement, Thai English language teachers are required to have a variety of knowledge and put in a great deal of study in order to come to grips with the ELT (Extracts (A) and (E)). Compared with previous practice where teachers only followed the instruction in textbooks provided by the central government, teaching and learning with the ESB curriculum disregards “textbook-based learning” (Developer B). Choices of instruction options, including classroom materials, should always be made with reference to expected outcomes as articulated in the curriculum. Therefore, school teachers are expected to be able to teach, searching for learning resources and be familiar with updated approaches to foreign language teaching and learning in order to help learners achieved the educational goals (Officers C and D).

As explained by Officer C:

“Teachers are required to know a variety of activities and methods. No one particular method will fit with English language teaching. The teacher needs to be ready and have more knowledge to decide which is the most appropriate method to encourage students and to give students the lesson. To know what students need, ex: to be able to understand order and request, teachers need to think which method or which activity to help students achieve this objective. You might need to have technology tool or anything.” (Officer C)

The most important principle that ELT teachers have to master is Communicative Language teaching (CLT), which is the basic approach to ELT that the Thai curriculum working committee stressed. They explained that the Communicative
approach, which was introduced after the previous curriculum in 1996, is still the most suitable method.

"A...language teaching method has been changed since 2533 (1990), they use communicative approach, which means we don't need to change. Teachers can do anything but they need to know what are the objectives and expected learning outcomes." (Officer D)

"Communicative Approach is a very long run approach that we have been introducing for a long time and that is the best approach to teaching and learning management for this ESB curriculum" (Officer A)

The working committees commented that CLT had been developed for a long time; teachers had become familiar with this approach and now all teachers should be familiar with the approach. The questionnaires from school teachers supported this claim of CLT familiarity, with 14 out of 20 stating that the Communication Strand is the easiest strand because they are familiar with teaching for communication. However, because of the textbooks-based teaching and learning that they were used to and the complaints about the lack of communicative competence among school graduates, the meaning underlying CLT is worth exploring and is discussed further in this chapter (section 8.4.1).

8.3.2 List of Approaches and Methods (LAM)

LAM is presented in the Table 8.1 below. It is a summary of suggested various approaches and methods that the working committees believed were relevant to ELT in the new curriculum. LAM accentuates teaching and learning approaches and methods that are coherent with the ESB curriculum’s overarching goals and Thai educational philosophies. For example, learners are at the centre of the classroom and the development of the learning process. They are involved in cooperative learning, a whole language approach, and integrated learning that is set out in Table 8.1. This is the LAM, as translated from Thai language by the researcher.
Table 8.1: A summary of the important substance of various approaches in ELT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning management approaches</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Teaching Methods</th>
<th>Assessment and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner-Centred</td>
<td>Have knowledge and ability in language and learning process</td>
<td>Language skill, and learning skill</td>
<td>Self learning, learners involvement and have practice</td>
<td>Authentic assessments and variety of methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Communication</td>
<td>All 4 communicative skills</td>
<td>Language in daily life, meaningful</td>
<td>Language for communication</td>
<td>Communicative skill, emphasis on fluency and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>learning, integrated skills practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>correctness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Specific Purposes</td>
<td>Specific working skill and content</td>
<td>Academic content and specific working content</td>
<td>Language for communication, Task-based learning</td>
<td>Content and specific skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated approach</td>
<td>Linkage between the learning content and real life, self construct</td>
<td>Knowledge and skills of relative subjects</td>
<td>The relationship of knowledge and skill from</td>
<td>Learner’s cooperation, group work, learning results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>different subjects, and able to use them for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>problem solving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative learning</td>
<td>Promote communicative skill and social skills</td>
<td>Content-free, choose any content</td>
<td>Emphasis on group work, structure, order and various</td>
<td>Self – assessment, peer assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content-Based Instruction</td>
<td>Language for communication, and language for learning tool</td>
<td>Link or integrate with other subject matters in</td>
<td>Integrate all 4 language skills</td>
<td>Language skill and subject matter content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole language approach</td>
<td>Integrate language skill with other subject matter content</td>
<td>Content that is meaningful to learners</td>
<td>Learners participate in planning and in discussion</td>
<td>Participation of learners and learning result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based learning</td>
<td>Self construct knowledge, and link constructed knowledge with real</td>
<td>Various activities in real situation, searching</td>
<td>Real practice in activities and cooperatively do</td>
<td>Working planning, responsibility of assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>life</td>
<td>for knowledge and systematically collect the</td>
<td>research</td>
<td>result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-based learning</td>
<td>Practically do the given task perfectly according to specified</td>
<td>The task is the main by focusing on the content</td>
<td>Language for communication</td>
<td>Language ability, the achievement of tasks and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>objectives</td>
<td>or language skill in order to have expected</td>
<td></td>
<td>achievement of purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivism</td>
<td>Searching for knowledge by oneself and exchanging knowledge with</td>
<td>Various content that is surrounding oneself</td>
<td>Using various strategies to create opportunities</td>
<td>Assigned tasks according to learner’s differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one another</td>
<td></td>
<td>for learners to express their opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Mat/formal</td>
<td>The development of left and right</td>
<td>The content from various subjects</td>
<td>Emphasis on the new knowledge</td>
<td>Self evaluation and peer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.2.1 An indiscriminate tendency to adopt Western theories

As can be seen from the table, the list was influenced by numerous major national and international developments in ELT such as Burns (2003) who listed the international trends such as: theoretical and practical developments in communicative language teaching (Nunan 1988; Johnson 1989; Tudor 1996; van Lier 1996), Task-based learning (Nunan 1989, Skehan 1996; Ellis), Learner styles and strategies (Willing 1989, Oxford 1990). These methods shared basic principles of progressive education that are based on Dewey's "problem solving as a method of instruction" (Gutek, 2004, p.74), process-based, interdisciplinary, and tested in action. The methods assume the provision of a learning environment in which learners are active participants in the classroom, and encourage learners self construction of knowledge rather than imposing knowledge from outside. However, TPR (Total Physical Response), on the other hand, is a traditional method that promotes drill practice. In other words, the methods were categorised in the learner-centeredness perspective and social reconstruction perspective, except that TPR originated in the early movement of social-economic efficiency perspectives (see 2.20.2.1). The LAM indicates the tendency for indiscriminate adoption of Western learning theories and foreign language teaching and learning theories into Thai which will be discussed in the organisation of LAM section.

The organisation of LAM

The list contains learning theories and an exhaustive list of approaches to ELT, teaching methods and techniques that are important fundamentals of good language teaching practice. Learning theories generally expresses the fundamental thinking about teaching and learning; they are a broad set of ideas of how one views learners, learning, subject matter, classroom environment, etc. Richards (1990) states that the word 'approach' indicates which assumptions and beliefs about language and language learning are specified. He also suggests that teachers can improve the quality
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of language teaching by referring to general principles and theories concerning how languages are learned, how knowledge of language is represented, and so different approaches result in different methods. They are all connected and based on one another.

The table shows that learning theories, approaches and methods were not presented in a coherent and connected way. It was organised in an arbitrary fashion rather than presented in a way that teachers with less background in language teaching and general learning theories could see a correlation between them. There is no clear representation of the status of each of these approaches and methods and how they are arranged, whether alphabetically, chronologically, in importance, based on principles or philosophies, and so on. Why, for example, from the list, did “learner-centred” come first and “constructivism” come almost at the end? As can be seen from the table, constructivism was placed almost at the end of the list where it was assumed to be the umbrella learning theory of language teaching and learning. In addition, “constructivism” is the basic learning theory of the NEA 1999 and ESB curriculum overarching goals; it should be made clear in the DTLP rather than be included in the table.

This table can be interpreted in many ways. The most dangerous interpretation is decision making that is based on one teaching method or selection of one set of values over another. For example, “constructivism” is a newly developed learning theory that teachers have not experienced before. By putting “constructivism” in the table means that teachers may regard it as one of the choices to be easily disregarded because of its complicated nature. In addition, there could be the risk of viewing constructivism as equivalent to TPR where the former is to do with learning theories and the latter is about teaching methods. The former views the negotiation of meaning as important in learning. After all, another view of the imposition of knowledge is the method to be used.

In addition, in confronting the separation and the order of “learner-centred” and “task-based learning” in this way, teachers may have the perception that those two are different and are not related which is not the case (Ellis, 1997; Nunan, 2000; Richards,
Another example is the whole language approach. It is theoretically based on constructivism and neo-constructivism that emphasises learners as the centre of learning and the organization of learning allows learners to integrate subject matter and life skills (Edelsky, 1993; Schwarzer, 2001, 2003). Within this approach, project-based learning, task-based learning and cooperative learning are preferred teaching methodologies (Edelsky, 1993; Schwarzer, 2001, 2003). Because they are separately introduced in the table, it can be interpreted that task-based learning may not require cooperative learning or integrated learning or, indeed, are not related to the whole language approach.

Teachers may choose a method/an approach they find comfortable or they may not be able to choose because they may find that some approaches are not relevant to language learning. This circumstance may be especially true of primary language teachers who do not have a language teaching background. TPR may be the most popular method and its choice may stop teachers adopting other methods. There is evidence of TPR’s popularity as a method: at the English Expo in 2005, where the Minister and Secretary of Education were proud of the methods of TPR and stated that this was a sign of a positive change in a learner-centred approach to language learning. TPR despite requiring learners to be active, stresses physical over intellectual and moral involvement; it is not a learner-centred but a teacher-centred approach (Richards, 1985; Larsen-Freeman, 1986; Ellis, 1997; Richards & Renandya, 2002). However, TPR is a very popular approach/method/technique among Thai teachers and educators because it is associated with a fun classroom environment that Thai learners prefer (Developer B). TPR may be a good approach/method/technique that fits with the Thai context but it cannot be a basic principle for teaching English language as a whole because it limits language learning mostly to listening comprehension and limits the practice of language to the processes of imitation and reinforcement, the practice of drills, habit formation, and isolated skills practice (Richards, 1985; Larsen-Freeman, 1986; Ellis, 1997; Finney, 2002). Its underlying principles contradict the progressive education principle that is basic to Thai education and that promotes learning in an opposite way.
Furthermore, with unconnected descriptions of the goals and content and brief outlines of how to teach and how to assess in each of the methods and approaches proposed in the list, confusion is reinforced. There is a great risk of teachers misunderstanding the whole concept of teaching and learning or the holistic view of language teaching and learning. With the majority of Thai English language teachers having little experience of using English and of designing their own curriculum, and less contact and familiarity with the language teaching and learning area (Ministry of Education Thailand, 2005), the choosing of methods will become complicated and frustrating as a result of indecision about what they should choose as the proper methods for curriculum implementation.

Teachers are expected to integrate pieces of information and study language teaching by themselves. Training principles and philosophies as well as methodologies relating to ELT were not part of the initial training program (Developers B, Officers C and D). The training programs and a pilot program concentrated on a concept of a standards-based curriculum (Centre for Curriculum Development, 2003). Even though there is much being done in the area of Thai foreign language teacher’s development, most teacher development programs focus mainly on the development of a teacher’s language knowledge, and hand-on tips and activities in classroom. A training program that focuses on long term professional development, reflective practices and a teacher’s education has not been greatly evident in the government’s teacher development programs. The latest report from the MOE also supports this claim that school teachers do not received enough systematic and continued professional development (Ministry of Education Thailand, 2005). The provision of training programs that emphasise the development of language knowledge over professional development implies that teachers with a good knowledge of language can teach the language which, in principle, is similar to the traditional grammar translation method. This method believes that learners who master language knowledge can use the language in real life situations, but that is not likely to be the case. However, the traditional method is not welcome anymore as a major part of Thai education in the reform period. So, what kind of teacher training should there be? The curriculum designers would surely agree that teachers should be trained in the same way as the learners are to be educated (Hooks, 1994).
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The next section discusses issues of coherence and non-coherence between methodology and the theory underlying STLM and the possibility of misinterpretation of the philosophies and theories. The two issues are focused in communicative language teaching (CLT) and its definition, Learning Process and activities-based learning.

8.4 An Analysis of STLM with Reference to the ESB Curriculum Philosophies and Theories

Even though the STLM assembled information about the “Learning Process”, some issues such as all-round personal development, culture and wisdom, creative and critical thinking, life long learning, and especially social, civic, and environmental responsibility were not integrated in the STLM. There are also problems about the real meaning of STLM that leads to a conflict between teacher-centred and learner-centred approaches and hence a conflict with the theoretical underpinning of the curriculum. Without a clear delineation of these principles at the methodologies level, the result could be a limitation on teachers’ ability to perform in the classroom. For example, the teacher questionnaires revealed that 5 out of 20 define critical thinking as limited to reading practice.

“The critical thinking teaching is very hard for students who are not good. This is because critical thinking in reading requires students to read every sentence and scan reading. Students have to know detail. Teachers have to use bottom-up method. However, the teaching method that can make students understand is to translate into Thai language, then students can make a conclusion in English or tell story from what they read in English. Critical thinking can occur if students love to read and have a reading habit.” (Questionnaire B)

“Teaching reading skill, then criticise, analyse and conclude with writing. Some of my friends do not care about this term at all” (Questionnaire K)

Critical thinking in language teaching has been introduced into Thai English language education since the previous curriculum and has been discussed extensively among Thai educators. However, the lack of consensus about the meaning of the term “critical thinking”, the lack of how to teach and the lack of integration of critical thinking with language learning have brought the policy of critical thinking and language learning under criticism for its lack of practicality. The teaching of critical
thinking itself has been a strongly debate issue internationally because it is related to whether we can teach critical thinking at all (The Secretariat Centre for Educational Research and Innovation OECD Paris., 1991). If it can, how do we teach it? Is teaching of thinking a separate course (add-on) or infused into subject matter? (Nisbet, 1991, p.179). Some researchers even claim that critical thinking is not suitable for Asian foreign language students, and more suitable for Western learners (Atkinson, 2002). Others strongly disagree and believe that Asian students have a great ability to think critically and it should be an essential component of foreign language development (Benesch, 1993; Gieve, 1998; Wallace, 2002, 2003). Especially for language learners in the 21st century, critical thinking is a process of social practice that students are encouraged to participate in actively, raising issues of concern in their daily lives, such as work, school, housing, and marriage, as topics for class scrutiny (Auerbach & McGrail, 1991, as cited in Benesch, 1993; Freire, 1998, 2004; A. B. Lian, 2006). From the questionnaires (B) and (K) above, we see that teachers do not view critical thinking as a social practice.

Another piece of evidence of the link between the unclear statements of STLM and a limitation on teaching practice can be seen from the questionnaires filled out by the school teachers. The questionnaires revealed that when teachers are asked to rank which Strand they found the most difficult to teach, 8 out of 10 chose the Culture strand. The reasons they gave are as follows: (No.2 stands for the Cultural Strand)

"The most difficult is no. 2 because teachers have to practice the culture of English language correctly first." (Questionnaire E)

"The most difficult is no. 2 teachers are not native speakers, it is difficult to understand the culture."(Questionnaire K)

"The no.2 is the most difficult. Because we do not know other cultures, but other strand is fine, it is about daily life."(Questionnaire F)

These problems demonstrate the lack of clear principles about the teaching and learning of culture and what it means by teaching culture. Such matters were not described in the ESB curriculum. Teachers have to rely mostly on their own interpretation and/or training programs. The question then rests on the role of curriculum. A curriculum without a clear description of principles underpinning the overarching goals, learning outcomes and methodologies, becomes a product that merely contains a list of objectives. The standards based-curriculum type should be
seen as a process whereby principles of teaching and learning are described in order that teachers can further develop, design school-based curricula and provide learning opportunities based on stated principles (LeLoup & Ponterio, 1997). Without enough intellectual input from the curriculum, teachers may find it difficult to make a change in classroom practice. Skilbeck (1984) asserts that teachers need a great deal of intellectual support in order to cope with the development of a school-based curriculum.

Instead of the list of all the available teaching methods, this curriculum should provide basic principles of language teaching and learning explicitly, delineate the methods that are relevant to the principles in a coherent way and mutually develop and integrate the larger purpose of education in order that teachers can have a clear picture or the larger picture of the overall process of teaching and learning. In other words, the curriculum educates teachers in the way that mutual understanding occurs among them but does not limit their practices and negotiation with learners toward what, when, where and how to construct meaning of the world through subject matter.

### 8.4.1 Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Its Definition

According to extracts (A) and (F) from the STLM, what is important is teachers’ self-learning and development of EFL/ESL approaches, techniques and methods related to CLT. The statement implies that teachers can develop any language methods according to their interpretation of CLT.

Nunan (2004) argues that CLT is assumed to be unitary, but in reality consists of a family of approaches. Furthermore, not all those approaches represent CLT in the same way. Similarly K. Johnson (1989b) argues that CLT, though it has broadened the repertoire of teaching techniques, does not offer a principle basis for selecting a

---

25 (A) Foreign language teaching and learning management principles are influenced by different philosophers, psychologists and linguists at different period of time. These groups of people have cooperatively identified various foreign language teaching and learning approaches. The most updated approach is teaching language for communicative purposes (Communicative approach) whose main characteristic is the “learner-centred” approach.

26 (F) Learners know the differences among peers and become the most effective learners according to their abilities.
particular set of techniques that can clearly guide methodology and syllabus designers for selection among them. The STLM did not contain more detail about CLT, only describing it as the teaching of language for communicative purposes with a learner-centred approach. Experience from the previous curriculum indicates that misunderstanding of the communicative approach resulted in an imbalance of macro skill practice; oral skill was emphasized while other skills were ignored. Developer C explained that in the previous curriculum, language teaching focused only on oral skill and not the form of language. However, school teachers themselves could not help learners develop oral proficiency because they had low oral proficiency themselves. Thus, students failed both communicative skills and linguistic competency.

"After structural failed, they stopped teaching structural and grammar. They started to use communicative, ex: "Hi! I'm John", students will learn this many times in different level. Students don't know the correctness. Teachers thought that communicative approach means listening and speaking not writing." (Developer D)

Although the ESB curriculum did not state clearly that oral skill is most important, the language used in the curriculum did accentuate the practice of oral skill, as can be seen from the statement in the content standards and benchmarks. Curriculum developers themselves gave the most common definition of CLT, that is, it is teaching that provides activities to promote the use of spoken language in real life situations.

"It is for communication, to be able to really use... Because Thai society does not use English as daily life, then, teaching in this method will provide activities for students to practice English. English is about skill." (Developer A)

"I think this new curriculum is based on the communicative approach. It is really long run approach, no approach can beat it. It is to teach for communication." (Officer A)

Communicative competence according to Hyrnes (1967, as cited in H. D. Brown, 2000, p.246) is "the aspect of competence that enable us to convey and interpret messages and to negotiate meanings interpersonally within specific contexts". Therefore, teaching for communication is not only about speaking skill but the ability to negotiate meaning. As Williams and Burden (1997) add, Vygotsky focussed on the use of language in all its aspects as a tool in both bringing meaning to and obtaining meaning from learning activities, not only in speech but by sign and symbol. This interpretation of CLT of curriculum developers and stakeholders as equivalent to oral
skill development is generally accepted in the ELT area, not only in Thailand. Internationally most people value the teaching of speaking skill over the other three skills (White, 1988; Lee & VanPatten, 2003). Modern language educators nowadays question this interpretation as well as the CLT itself and argue that CLT promotes talk that is mostly limited to the language classroom. As stated, English language education in the 21st century should move forward to the development of critical literacy approach to ELT that is the promotion of powerful language users who are capable of coping with vast information, capable of criticising ideologies and the power of influences on communities and society (Wallace, 2002; Canagarajah, 2006).

8.4.1.1 The consequence of the stress on oral skill as a communicative competence: the controversy over the provision of learning environment

The focus on oral skill has raised controversies in English language education in Thailand over a long time, especially the problem of real language environment. From the analysis of the suggested learning environment in the ESB curriculum document, we see that because ELT focuses on relating English to the real world, the suggested learning resources and materials accentuate the necessity to provide various authentic inputs to language learning. The developers also stated in the manual that communities and society generally are basically learning resources for learners. This is similar to what Freire (1998, p.36) asserts - “an ‘intimate’ connection of any school curriculum and knowledge … is the fruit of the lived experience of these students as individuals”.

The learning environment and learning resources suggested by curriculum developers are: the surrounding environment such as communities, tourist spots, cable TV, satellite TV, international news broadcasting, and embassies such as those of the United States of America and Australia, and English language summer courses abroad. The suggestions indicate that a classroom environment is not enough for learners of English to engage in learning English for real world communication.

However, because of the focus on the oral skill practice, the benefit of those suggested learning environment can only be seen as a place where real spoken language can be
met. More evidence of the stress on acquiring oral skill comes from the suggestion in the ESB curriculum document of learners studying abroad in a summer school program, as well as from the urgent need for more native speakers, the need of native-like language teachers as proposed by the Thai government.

Focus on oral skill reinforces in school teachers the need to provide interactive classrooms that allows learners to speak in English and to search for real life experiences or real life situations in which learners may practice. This is a positive movement in language learning, if only teachers did not find it so difficult. The real life experience issue has become a controversial one among Thai scholars, school teachers and communities as to how this need can be met realistically. Curriculum developers themselves demonstrated their concern:

"There is less opportunity to use [English] language in Thailand than in USA. And in class, there are about 60 students; after leaving class they have seen nothing in English. The environment is not enough as well as entrance exam is all about multiple choice and writing. So I don't know what to do with it. There must be some method that can help Thai students access an English environment." (Officer A)

"But the environment to use language is important. This is our barrier to language learning." (Developer A)

"Thailand does not have English language environments outside school. And big classrooms. You need to combine. There need to be extra activities, English club, play with English." (Developer D)

Some curriculum developers as well as school teachers believe that only schools that are situated in tourist areas can provide students with real life experience. Tourist areas are places where students can easily meet foreigners and can use English language for different purposes, such as helping tourists with directions, introducing Thai culture, and being voluntary interpreters for a local community (Developer D). On the other hand, country schools and/or schools that are situated in areas where tourists or foreigners hardly visit are places where the opportunities for learners of English to use their knowledge in real situations are very rare, almost none at all (Developer B). This implies that the curriculum developers’ view of language learning is limited. Real situations and authentic environments are not only related to conversations with foreigners, but rather the learning environment involves auspices of everyday issues related to the learner’s life as part of Thai community and world
community. Language learners are encouraged to implement those issues as their English language learning experiences, not only their conversations with foreigners. Therefore, regarding the views of the Thai curriculum developers, in order to ensure that students can use language in the real world, situational and simulated teaching and learning as well as other language activities that are thought to promote oral communication are promoted widely in Thai EFL classrooms. And Thai language teachers are encouraged to use English language as a medium in the classroom as much as they can.

"In the past, Thai language teacher has never used English language in classroom. So we will be good in reading and listening, not a productive skill. But this curriculum will help to promote more speaking in classrooms." (Developer A)

"We need a campaign that we should not use a lot of Thai language, enthuse them to develop continually, to help learners to speak in classroom." (Developer B)

Furthermore, teachers always complaint about the lack of funding and lack of those teaching materials that are conducive to communicative language teaching (that emphasise only practicing speaking the language). This problem has existed in Thai EFL education since 1978, when the communicative approach to language teaching was first introduced (Ketbhichai, 1981; Churteerasathien, 1983). From the interviews with school teachers and the questionnaires, we see that even now teachers continuously complain about this matter. Thus, while the government encourages local resources as part of learning resources and materials, the stress on spoken English language limits teachers and learners to freely adopt what is available in the community as learning resources. Rather, this approach creates more difficulties in the selection of learning resources and materials. As a result, school teachers who mainly think of real conversation with foreigners and materials related to the practice of oral communication as best learning materials, require more funding to produce such a condition and they cannot use any resources available in the community. This is true especially of schools situated in the non-tourist areas. This research argues that the learning resources for language learning should not be limited to oral-oriented materials. Communication in this sense involves every contact possible to send messages and receive them and then to discuss (Williams & Burden, 1997; Lantolf, 2000). A.-P. Lian and Lian (1997) suggest that therefore teachers should provide
complex environments where different sources of knowledge can collide that is not limited to spoken language but is about communication.

**The use of English language in the classroom**

Figure 8.1 is a graph showing school teachers' opinions about their language use in the classroom. It shows an increased rate of English language use in classrooms compared with the previous curriculum. This comparison between the use of English language in the previous curriculum and in the present curriculum is shown in percentage terms. The percentages come from teachers' own estimations of their use of English in the classroom.
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**Figure 8.1: Thai school teachers' on English language use**

The graph shows that 18 teachers tend to use English language more than they used to. The overall average of English language use is 70% and 30% of Thai language in the classroom. Even though this percentage may not be a precise measurement of the real use of English, it initially reveals teachers' perceptions about the greater use of English language in the language classroom. The emphasis on the use of English language in classroom can also be seen from the report in Matichon Daily Online (April 26, 2004) that the government pressed school teachers to use more English
language in language classrooms. There may be tendencies to use English more in the future; if key language educators and curriculum stakeholders believe that greater the use of English language in the classroom will promote better oral skills in learners. However, research indicates that many other factors that support language learning development; the use of language as a medium of instruction in classrooms is only one of them.

Furthermore, the latest reinforcement of the use of English language as much as possible in the classroom can be seen from the “Strategic plan for elevating the ability of English language usage of Thai citizens for the competitive ability of the country” (Ministry of Education Thailand, 2005). All schools are required to use English language as a medium for instruction for the whole classroom (Ministry of Education Thailand, 2005). However, if English language is used as in traditional classrooms where students have a passive role, then communicative skills are not likely to improve because there is no interaction and hence there is a lack in the learners’ organization of their internal mechanisms to produce what they have learned. With an unclear statement of philosophies and theories underlying the ESB curriculum that links to traditional practice, there is a possibility that English language as a medium of instruction in classroom may not solve the problem.

- The need for native speakers of English

The focus on oral proficiency leads to the requirement of native-like speakers and native speakers of English to be English language teachers in Thai schools. After the proclamation of the ESB curriculum, the Thai government searched for foreigners who were willing to be volunteer English language teachers in schools. This is one of results of the definition of communication agreed among government officers and curriculum stakeholders that oral skill is the focus. The question rests upon who are eligible language teachers in Thailand.

The solution to English language education in Thailand, proposed by the government, may certainly help Thai language learners. However, native speakers, native-like teachers, and real English language learning environments may not really solve the problem because persons, who can speak the language, may not be able to teach the language. And how many native speakers are needed to provide this solution is also
an interesting question. Thai language teachers have low proficiency in English language, so how to help them become native-like speakers is a very challenging task. An even more challenging task is the development of language teachers who are capable of developing language learners in a holistic approach and who discuss about a critical pedagogy (Freire, 1998; Phipps & Guilherme, 2004; Canagarajah, 2006). This matter was not even mentioned by the Thai government.

CLT has been under attack for some time on the grounds that the goal tends to be ‘talking’ for its own sake and simple talking is not enough (Wallace, 2002). Modern language educators challenge the concept of CLT that does not allow learners to become powerful language users, but rather limits learners’ ability to the practising of technical language skills that are only one part of the process of becoming English language competent in the Information Age (Pennycook, 1998; Wallace, 2002, 2003). The question rests on whether the requirement for learners to speak the language is only to serve a “social-economic efficiency” perspective where English becomes a powerful language for the exchange of international trade. If that is so, the need of English language learning does not originate from learners’ intrinsic values, but rather from a more oppressive view of education which could induce negative attitudes toward English rather than positive. In addition, perceptions of English language teaching only in the social-economic efficiency perspective contradict Thai educational philosophies that view language learning as a way to promote a democratic society and learners who mind social issues. This implies that curriculum developers did see English language learners as only capable of speaking with foreigners with accuracy and fluency, but rather as powerful language users for whom both macro and micro skills are an essential part of their English language learning. Therefore, by solely valuing the CLT and treating it as the best method, Thai curriculum developers should themselves question their beliefs and ask themselves whether their values are enough for the preparation of the new generation for the 21st century or not.
8.4.1.2 Summary of the controversies related to CLT

The overarching goals of the new curriculum promote English language learners for the 21st century who are able to think critically and creatively and who are learners with language competence who are able to cope with the forces of globalisation. Therefore, what we have discussed here is not the practice of oral skills, or even four macro skills but a discussion of the provision of learning environments that enable learners to cope with the pace of change, environments that have complexities similar to those in the real world, environments that meet learners’ needs on multiple levels including engaging in critical discussion. These environments are not limited to an emphasis on spoken language but should focus on a great range from the macroscopic (social practices including cultural, political, and historical literacies themselves) to the microscopic (particular texts within sociocultural contexts in that classroom) that is shaped by the macroscopic (Morgan, 1997; Kumaravadivelu, 2006). These environments do not require mainly native speakers, but rather teachers who can provide a learning environment that makes it possible for different perspectives to collide and for the participants to explore forms of legitimation in terms of what they construct and enact of reality, not merely reinterpreting imposed knowledge (Lian, A. B., 2003, as cited in A-P. Lian, 2004).

Thus, whether learners will speak the language and will use the language in what way depends on the learners’ decisions when they engage in the environment provided to challenge them. Further, when and what learners experienced at home is greater than what the school provides; the separation of learners from classroom and schools is wider, especially with the availability of technology in the home, such as the Internet with its vast fund of information the new generation engages with every day. Therefore, practising oral skills for an unpredicted and unpredictable future far from the learner’s interest is not a comprehensible input for the study of English language nowadays. The inherent meanings of ‘speaking ability’ and ‘communicative competence’ are undeveloped in Thai EFL educational contexts. This implies a lack of a good theoretical basis of language teaching and learning among curriculum stakeholders and hence school teachers.
In conclusion, without a clear definition of English language teaching and learning management, problems we face in terms of the learning environment, inculcating positive attitudes toward English, critical thinking in language learning, and the matter of eligible language teachers, will never be solved. These problems can be seen since the first introduction of English language education in Thai schools, as stated in Chapter 2. As indicated in Chapter 1, most researches points to teachers’ knowledge of ELT as a major problem in ELT. The latest government reports also indicate that problems in language teaching and learning are related to teachers’ low proficiency in language knowledge and teaching methodologies. The MOE reported on Thai school teachers’ lack of teaching techniques that can develop language learners and motivate learners to have a positive attitude in English language learning (Ministry of Education Thailand, 2005). The report by MOE implies that the Thai government always relates English language teaching and learning problems to teachers’ lack of knowledge, but does not approach the problem from different perspectives stemming from the theoretical and philosophical underpinning of the curriculum and the indiscriminate tendency between theories and practice as discussed in this research.

### 8.4.2 The Learning Process and Activities-Based Learning

Curriculum developers explained that “learning by doing” and “activities-based learning” are equivalent to the “learning process” and hence to the “learner-centred approach”.

“Learning Process will be in when they are doing the activity.” (Developer A)

“This curriculum emphasis on learning by doing, encourage students to do activities. We hope that teachers will introduce activities that encourage students to use different skills.” (Developer C)

“Learning by doing”, “activities-based learning”, “learner-centred approach” and “learning process”, are all terms relevant in the progressive education movement and share fairly similar meanings, though each is not exactly synonymous with the others. The learning process does not only include activities or the process of doing things, but the process of cognitive involvement and the meaning making process. The learning process is a set of principles that not only means physical engagement in learning but entails cognitive development, that is, the process of negotiation for meaning, critical awareness, and problem solving and posing and/or a dialogue
(Freire, 2004). And a "learner-centred approach" means not only that learners are doing activities, but includes learners' opportunities to negotiate what to learn, and taking charge of the learning process. However, Pillay (2002) and Fry (2002) claim that Thai teachers perceived the "learner-centred approach" as activities-based learning whereas it entails more principles than this single interpretation. In the "Synthesis report: From crisis to opportunity, the challenges of Educational Reform in Thailand report to the Office of the National education Commission and the Asian Development Bank", Fry (2002) states that

"There is tendency to equate student-centred learning with activity-based learning. While activity-based learning can be a valuable part of student-centred learning, it is only one of multiple methods that can be used to promote active and student-centred learning." (p.37).

This research findings support agreements put forward by Pillay (2002) and W. Fry (2002) argument. In practices, curriculum developers' interpretations of "learning process" as an activities-based learning were promoted successfully. From the questionnaires, school teachers were enthusiastic to provide learning-activities based on their local knowledge and learners' needs. The school teachers' interviews reveal an attempt to provide more opportunity to learners to use English language within and outside the classroom by creating activities such as English language camps (Teacher A). The questionnaires show 16 teachers out of 20 teachers use activities as their teaching techniques. They include activities in their classroom practices. In addition, the questionnaires indicate that teachers were asked what a "learner-centred approach" is, and 12 out of 20 said that students should be encouraged to do activities.

"Students learn when they do activities on their own. Learning by doing and interacting." (Questionnaire B)

"Students have to be able to think while doing activities and content that they learn. Students have their own thinking process." (only at secondary level) (Questionnaire C)

"Provide activities according to students' interests." (Questionnaire D)

"Students practice, practice every skill from native speakers and other sources. Students do activities according to teacher's recommendation, and practice from authentic situation." (Questionnaires K)

"Students have role to do activities by 75-80% in each lesson." (Questionnaire N).
Nevertheless, the activity is appropriate because the curriculum emphasis on activities conveys a belief that students construct their understanding from experience and personal manipulation of concepts (Ellis, 1997; Nunan, 2004). This would be a positive change in ELT if learners had an opportunity to take charge of their own learning. However, the purpose of a provision of activities is questioned whether it promotes the process of self-actualisation, knowledge construction, learners’ negotiation etc. or it is merely a process of practicing English language and drills. Because, in the extract (B), the “learning process” was specified in terms of practice just language skills.

Even though other meanings of “learning process” - such as cooperative learning, self-knowledge construction and integrated learning - were introduced in the LAM (the list of approaches and methods), teachers could disregard the list as fundamental thinking because the list was not compulsory; it was only a guideline that teachers could either choose or disregard. Further, as stated earlier, the list dispersed the holistic view of principles into pieces. Teachers may not be able to connect those pieces and disregard others. Thus, teachers can perceive a “learning process” as a process of practicing English language, but not the process of self-actualisation, self-learning, knowledge construction, etc. that are fundamental to the ESB curriculum and Thai education.

### 8.4.2.1 Activities that promote rote learning

As discussed here and in previous chapters on the interpretation of curriculum developers related to “Learning process”, there is a risk that “learning process” means doing activities that only focus on the practice of English language skills and promote rote learning. Rather than being an activity that is the process of self-construction of knowledge that empowers learners to learn at their own pace and in their own time, it becomes an activity in which learners carry out a mere process of memorisation without understanding. In other words, the policy draws on the progressive approach, but in practice the “learning process” may be restricted to an academic rationale and social-economic efficiency approach that values the mastery of knowledge and skill practices over the learners themselves. The evidence of this concern can be found in

---

27 (B) Teaching and learning language principles under the communicative approach emphasise “learning process” that include practising and using language in the real situation according to language communicative functions
the ESB curriculum manual. Some descriptions and examples of lesson plans in the STLM of the ESB curriculum manual show this concern.

### Principles, Practice and Production (PPP): Communicative or Rote Learning

The curriculum manual explains that there are three processes in the CLT: teacher’s presentation, learner’s practice and then production. PPP is the process that most curriculum developers, school teachers and teacher trainers refer to as for CLT.

> "The first process in teaching is teacher’s presentation, then student practices and produces. At the production stage, we can see the result, if it is not working, then we teach again. I say one sentence first, and then I tell them what the structure of the sentence is. At the end, I make conclusions in Thai in order for students to have a clear understanding." (Teacher B)

> "It is the process of presentation, practice and then production." (Officer C)

> "The most important thing is that teachers need to think the task that is a real life situation for students to have opportunity to use their learning language. The problem is that teacher have never come into the production stage, they will do at the practice stage, and finish, only asking students to do role plays. Teachers have never realized that students need to use the language in the real situation to make their practice." (Officer D)

At the presentation stage, teachers introduce new knowledge to learners including language structures and vocabulary. The second stage is to practice under the controlled conditions or directed activities where teachers are the leaders in the practice and learners should practice many times (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2002b, p.111). The last stage is production which is about transfer of learning to a new situation to ensure that learners have memorized and understood what they have practised. Langford (2005) argues that PPP is fundamentally a process of rote learning that is teacher-centred not learner-centred. In the end, teachers transfer to learners their knowledge of grammar and learners memorise it in order to perform in a specific new context. This process does not expose learners to unpredicted situations, does not challenge learners to explore the process of becoming to know or engage learners in a complex learning arena. This process basically digests the complexity of the nature of learning for learners.

This PPP process influences most of the descriptions in the manual including the description of "constructivism", as follows:
From the table, we see that "orientation" and "exchange and clarification" are similar to "principles" stage where what to learn is introduced and without learners’ choices. The "challenge" and "comparing new and old ideas" are similar to "Practices" stage where learners practise what they should do with the information given. The "testing new thinking" is similar to the "production" stage by repeating previous process with new information. Though it seems from the table that learners are asked to perform their thinking, they are not empowered to explore what they learned; rather the teaching is limited to and by the teacher’s choices. It is worth questioning whether this process is the promotion of a learner-centred approach or a new form of the old teacher-centred approach.

Table 8.2 shows not only the presentation of the PPP, but also the concept of writing the process is contradictory in itself. Teachers delineate and digest learning process into simplicity and the linear process. Constructivists do not believe that learning
process can be delineated in a linear form; rather they believe in complexity and holistic inter-relation where learning by individuals occurs differently and at different points in time in the process of self actualisation and realisation (Clark, 1987; Williams & Burden, 1997; Richards, 2001; Langford, 2005). By displaying the process in a linear fashion shown above, learners may be limited to doing other things and not be placed in a holistic process of development. Though the challenge of knowledge is good, this linear representation of the process of learning cannot serve the multiple engagement of learners. In the end, it is the teachers who name the reality, not the learners. This is back to the traditional view of education as Auerbach (1992, p. 12) states. It is back to the academic rationale and social-economic efficiency perspective in which the educator/expert does more of the work of naming the reality, determining the needs and objectives, developing the educational plan, providing the materials, and evaluating the outcomes. As a result, according to Freire (1981), the educator acts as a problem-solver for the student, “curing” the student by prescribing or transmitting educational medicine (in the form of skills, behaviours, or competencies), with the result that the student’s voice is silenced (Barnes, 1976).

- **Examples of activities-based learning and rote learning**

In the ESB curriculum manual where there are more details of STLM delineated, there is an emphasis on the exploration and analysis of the learner’s needs and the needs of parents, community, locality and an emphasis on the integration of English language with other subject matter. Furthermore, the general description about language teaching and learning contains matters set out in the NEA 1999. However, some examples and some descriptions that were given in the manual, did not articulate well with the learner-centred approach, a learning process focus, integrated learning and even socially constructed learning. Rather they represent traditional methods that are drill practices, accumulation of vocabulary, and the customary teacher-centred approach. Teachers decide what, when, how about language learning, almost leaving nothing to the learner’s involvement and contribution to curriculum development. English language knowledge is only the end of learning, rather than a means toward other learning outcomes. The following examples that are taken from the ESB curriculum manual, Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development (2002b), and translated by the researcher. They show evidence of this claim.
(a) Example 1: An example of a lesson plan for grade 5 students of task-based learning

**Task:** Occupation  
**Objectives:** Describe occupation  
**Vocabulary:** about occupation  
**Grammar structure:**  
- What does...?  
- Where does...?  
**Practice:**  
1. Students have to do pair work and make conversation by using the given questions structures  
   - What does your mother/father work? [What work does your mother do?]  
   - Where does she/he work?  
2. Show pictures about occupation, students have to describe the pictures  
3. Work in a group, students have to choose one occupation for their peer to make a guess, five sentences each.  
**The assessment:**  
- Check the correctness in the conversation  
- Check the writing from description of occupation

Some teachers may perceive in this example describing occupations that its aim is to allow learners to perform the description of one occupation. However, task-based learning according to this example is not different in the end from drill practice; learners have to practice the prescribed sentences. In general, task-based learning allows complexity to occur in the classroom. That means macro skills and life skills are at the centre of classroom activity and cognitive development is mutually advanced with physical involvement (Nunan, 2004). However, the example emphasises the practice of speaking that is equivalent to an audio-lingual approach that stresses memorisation of conversation with grammar knowledge of "What does + S.+ Verb ?". As Schulz (1984) states, there is the danger that some may use a notional-functional approach as an audio-lingual drill method. Instead of memorizing and reciting dialogues and grammatical patterns, students memorize and recite lists of various phrases to fulfil communicative functions. This is not educative experience, but rather technical skills practice. Furthermore, if the ESB curriculum overarching goals are to be met in terms of cultivating Thai EFL learners to be creative and critical thinker, the extended meaning of task-based learning is required. As Wallace (2002) argues the organisation of teaching and learning of language should go beyond task-based learning that deals with small-scale, day-to-day encounters as we see in the *Threshold Syllabus* of the 1970s (Wallace, 2002). Rather, A.-P. Lian (2001) adds that
foreign language communicators require multiple engagement, the development of critical awareness and they should be sensitive to a broad range of circumstance and engage in practical tasks that are related to real world uses or in everyday life experiences.

(b) Example 2: Lesson plan for grade 1 students

The unit of learning is about “myself”

Learning plan:
Myself: Name/Nickname
Time: 1 hour
Important substance: Conversation for greeting, basic social skill in order to apply in real life situation in daily life
Learning objective: Communicate, exchange information easily
Guided objective:
1. Pronounce words
2. Tell meaning of new vocabularies
3. Greeting by speaking, introducing one self, say good bye with gesture

Content
Skills: Listening and speaking
Function: Greeting and Leave taking
Dialogue:
John: Hello, I’m John
Suda: Hello, John. I’m Suda. How are you?
John: I’m fine, thank you.
Suda: Goodbye, John
John: Bye Bye

Vocabulary: Hello, Goodbye, Bye-bye

According to this lesson plan, students will be asked to listen to a tape and repeat after the tape to ensure that what they produce will be similar to what they have heard. In pairs, they practice in role play until they can memorize the dialogue given. Higher grade learners, have undergone the same process except that the conversations provided are more complex by means of more sentences. In this example as well as its description of teaching and learning, we see an outstanding contradiction to the conceptual basis of learning proposed in the ESB overarching goals that stresses the process of learning not only the product of learning. This example clearly stresses the leaning product without allowing learners to explore. First, as can also be seen from the guided objectives and learning content, the language becomes an end in itself not a means for knowledge enhancement. Second, the activity introduced is nothing more than an activity for mimicking. It represents very traditional language classrooms that
promote drill practices as well as presuming that the whole class will move as a block through the units of work such as in the textbook at the same pace. K. Johnson (2001) argues that learners of language are different in their capacity to learn a foreign language and even if some are exposed to the language at a very early age, they could not be assumed to possess the target language in the same way as when they are exposed to their first language at an early age.

(c) Example 3: Lesson plan for English for Agriculture for grade 11 students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 4:</th>
<th>Health Care and Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>Instructions to use Chemicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning period:</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important substance:</td>
<td>Telling working procedure that is about telling (process) of various things in order to practice correctly and with safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning objectives:</td>
<td>Present information, story and various situation in daily life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided objective:</td>
<td>1. Tell the meaning of vocabulary that is chemical name 2. Tell sentence characteristics that are used in writing working procedures 3. Write the working procedure of chemical use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content:</td>
<td>Passage, articles, recommendation related to chemical use (How to use chemicals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning materials:</td>
<td>Leaflet, Brochures, Labels, Posters that are related to chemical use both in English and Thai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, we see that the curriculum committee has tried to integrate other subject matter with English language and promote learners to produce what they have learnt. However, this lesson plan has already defined what learners need to know, how to know and where to search for information and learning resources. Then, learners are not challenged in this task, and they were not allowed to explore the process of learning by themselves. Teachers provide everything for the learners. In the end, learners are not challenged to think and explore, accommodate and assimilate their knowledge background to the new challenged information, knowledge etc. In the description of learning activities for this lesson plan, learners are asked to look up the vocabulary in the leaflet provided by teachers. This includes use of dictionary, memorising, telling what the sentences are that are used in the writing task. In the end, students are asked to work in groups and follow the same process again as they have already done with the teacher. This implies that teachers define the learning process for learners, and what learners have to do is to repeat that process again on
their own. However, this is not the exploration of knowledge, but habit formation and rote learning: once learners are trained to do a certain thing, they are expected to repeat and when they accomplish the process it means they have achieved the learning objective. Even though this is a good initiative plan, the traditional perspective on learning controls the classroom atmosphere. Learners are not empowered, but are imposed on by merely a new form of knowledge.

8.4.3 The Conflict between “Teacher-centred” and “Learner-centred” Approaches to Language Learning

Three examples given above imply firstly that the curriculum developers viewed language as an end. Second, learners do not engage in complex environments where their intellectual, moral and physical development can take place. The examples show the traditional belief of language learning that learners can memorise and using that scant knowledge are able to cope with reality. As D. Brown (2004) argues, most Thai education institutions at primary, secondary and tertiary levels have been criticized by both Western and local educationalists for taking a traditional and conservative approach to the teaching of EFL. Strategies whereby learners take responsibility for their own learning rather than being guided by teachers are largely absent. There is still large scale reliance on essentially instructional and clear support for continued emphasis on the teaching of structure and grammar (Ministry of Education Thailand, 2005). The learner's job is thus to re-synthesize language that has been taken apart and presented to him in small pieces; this synthesis generally takes place only in the final stages of learning, at the so-called 'advanced' levels. The sample is carefully controlled by the teaching situation. This indicates traditional methods of foreign language teaching that are embedded in Thai English language education since the first serious introduction of English language education in 1978. This also indicates that the larger meaning of language education has not been communicated among curriculum developers, curriculum writers and the teachers.

8.4.3.1 Learners' needs

Although the ESB curriculum claims to try to interest students and make English relevant to their lives, there is very little student choice of subject matter. The topics of the units are decided, and all of the activities are spelled out. In this sense the curriculum cannot really accommodate student's personal interests. In order to write
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School-based curriculum, teachers are asked to prepare lesson plans whereby what to teach has to be written beforehand. Therefore, the negotiation between teachers and learners over what to learn and how, does not occur. The result is contrary to the professed goals that learners should be put first and learning should be based on the learner's needs and interests. In addition, the content is already defined by the Thresholds level, and what is left to learners' decisions is very little. It is difficult to help learners to become individual learners as stated in the education philosophies.

Furthermore, from the description of a learner-centred language curriculum in the curriculum manual, we see the first process in planning the curriculum is to define the learner's needs. The examples imply that the learner's needs did not emerge from a negotiation between teachers and learners but instead comes from the teacher's analysis of the learners' backgrounds, levels, ages and their fundamental abilities as learners. The second process is to define goals and objectives. The third process is to select content that covers language skills and learning skills. Planning the curriculum in this way clearly represents the processes of the objective model that values pre-specified content and a linear approach to planning. The learner-centred approach here can be viewed only in terms of the teacher's prediction of the learner's needs, but not the real needs of learners. However, according to the description of the learner-centred curriculum in the curriculum manual, learners are allowed to choose learning materials and negotiate learning content after the objective have been designed, which in itself is a positive step towards the learner-centred approach as stated in the official documents - "should allow learners to understand and see advantages of what to learn...teachers and learners can negotiate about learning resources and some of content" (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2002b, p.106).

In conclusion, STLM was developed at almost the last stage with little understanding of its practicality and incoherent principles. The literature points out that the weaknesses of the objective approach to curriculum planning is that it treats objectives as the most important item whereby decreasing awareness of the coherent principles that draw in other curriculum elements.
The evidence of activities as rote learning and the contradiction between teacher-centred and learner-centred approaches, as can be seen from the examples of lesson plans in the ESB curriculum manual, could be the result of different working committees. As has already been observed, the ESB curriculum manual was developed by a number of committees. This development process implies that the holistic view of education and the philosophies and theories underlying the curriculum were not communicated well amongst members of the different committees. It also implies that there were too many committees thus creating difficulties at a fundamental level.

In addition, as stated previously, most Thai school teachers do not have their education background in foreign language teaching area, thus have less experience and knowledge of language teaching. The MOE reported that 80% of primary school teachers have not graduated in the ELT area and 51.91% of those who have ELT as a major learning area need more development (Ministry of Education Thailand, 2005). Further, Jornburee (2004) adds that Thai teaching focuses mostly on memorisation. Therefore, if the learning process was not described clearly in the STLM, there is a risk that the activities could then be understood as the customary and familiar activities such as drill practice and pair work based on the memorization of conversation dialogues similar to what was given in the manuals. If this is the case, Thai EFL education will never be improved and what occurs as problems almost 30 years ago, exist in the present and will still be seen in the future.

8.5 An Analysis of Learning Assessment with Reference to the ESB Curriculum Philosophies and Theories

Compared with the previous curriculum, the introduced learning assessment method is not changed; it is an “authentic assessment”. Trainers A, C and D argued that this ESB curriculum reinforces the essentials of “authentic assessment” into classroom practices in order that the “Learning process” which is one of the three key elements of learning reform can be promoted well in school.

“It is authentic assessment as it was before in the old curriculum, so it is not really much of a change in terms of evaluation. But it was written clearly in the curriculum that evaluation needs to be an authentic assessment. It is clearer and it is the emphasis point of this curriculum that teaching and
testing have to go mutually. Teachers cannot have only multiple choice tests, from now, they have to evaluate from what they teach and students work while learning through objectives." (Officer D)

The ESB curriculum stated that the most important learning assessment is “authentic assessment”, that is, a form of alternative assessment based on such things as observations and the student’s portfolio. An examination of the ESB curriculum manual shows that learning assessment focuses on process and product, a mixed method of assessment that comes from the student’s performance, the teacher’s observations, teacher interviews of the learner and note taking. That is not a one-off test, but rather on going evaluation on the process of learning.

This suggestion coheres well with the concept of promoting the learning process if authentic assessment can be carried out well within the clear meaning of ELT with clear understanding of the meaning of knowledge, learner, learning, and society. On the other hand, the assessment itself influences all those meanings of knowledge and how the learning should be. As Luke and van Kraayenoord (1998) state it is seems obvious in curriculum theory that practice and what counts as knowledge are influenced by the assessment system. A test is one of the influential factors in the success of any language program. As K. Johnson (2001) states, if teachers perceive learning assessment is based on an observation of the learner’s growth, then language teaching and learning may well be perceived the same way. The next sections discuss the meaning underlying each ESB curriculum element and the learning assessment.

8.5.1 Incoherent Theoretical Bases Underlying ESB curriculum Elements and Learning Assessment

Most curriculum developers and trainers mutually agree that teachers simply test learners against the Standards.

“What government need is that what students learn have to cover standards. For example, today, teacher might not want to teach pronunciation, but later they have to. This means when it comes to testing, teachers simply test students those standards” (Developer C)

“In the training program, we [trainers] emphasised that teachers can do anything as long as students meet standards. Teachers can design their own testing system as long as it tests against the standards” (Trainer D)
As discussed in previous chapters, the most problematic issues of this ESB curriculum are the meanings underlying terms used, unclear statements of learning outcomes, various definitions of theories and incoherence use of theories of learning. As discussed in Chapter 7, some parts of the benchmarks did not make clear what to look for in students' progress, and some benchmarks separated the KPA into pieces of information. Without a clear guideline and explanation related to details of learning, therefore, it is a challenging task for school teachers to observe a learner's growth and progress and how learners learn because each school teacher may have different views on progress and growth. Thus, when it comes to assessment, the great difficulty is what in fact students should be assessed on. For example, how the culture of language learning is assessed and in what way, in order that learners are seen as language learners who are culturally competent; how the technology in language learning is assessed in order that learners are seen as part of the Information Age; and how the concept of good citizens is assessed.

There is a great risk of testing for language knowledge rather than the process of learning, as we see from the evidence of the details of benchmarks, and the example of lesson plans. All these elements have a major impact on teacher's perception of classroom testing. Thus, even though, the ESB curriculum introduced alternative assessments, in reality, teachers could test knowledge mastery both in implicit and explicit ways. For example, if the example of activities and lesson plans in the ESB curriculum manual as discussed previously are the real practice of the teacher, what teachers assess then is the learner's performance on sentence practice and memorisation of dialogue, rather than the process of understanding and demonstrating their ideas and opinions. If authentic assessment assessed real use of English, but the 'real' use is in role play and mimicking conversation, is this an authentic assessment? If it counts as 'real', then there is an urgent need for rethinking the conceptual bases of the ESB curriculum. According to the curriculum documents, schools have to develop their own testing criteria and scales from classroom level to school level (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2001b). The curriculum leaves the evaluation methods and criteria totally up to the teacher. There is a great risk that the test processes are not coherent with the overarching goals, philosophies and theories.
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The evidence that supports this claim is from the report of the government last year. After the ESB curriculum was implemented for almost three years, the MOE reported that school teachers, despite implementing the ESB curriculum, tested knowledge of language structure as their assessment of learners, rather than the use of language (Ministry of Education Thailand, 2005). The report did not explain why. Nevertheless, the analysis of this report can explain the major reason for this testing problem that stems from the incoherent theoretical bases of the curriculum at the planning process.

Thus, what developers and trainers stated sounds simple, but when it comes to the classroom practices, it is very complex, especially with the problematic curriculum guidelines. In other words, the fragmented theories and philosophies underlying the ESB curriculum are not conducive to the proposed authentic assessment or alternative assessment.

8.5.1.1 Workload and overload of innovative practices

Furthermore, regardless of the issues of incoherent theoretical bases of the curriculum, in order that the authentic assessment is well implemented in classroom, teachers need a great deal of support and professional development (Brindley, 2001, p.139; Richards & Renandya, 2002). However, the interviews with trainers reveal that the training program focused only on specific issues, and for the classroom learning assessment teachers had to work on their own without any guidance on appropriate evaluation or evaluation methods, only that they have to implement “authentic assessment”. From the questionnaires with school teachers, it is clear that they complained that there is a great lack of government support especially on the testing issues (Questionnaire D, G, H, I, K, O, Q, and S). Most of them said that they need to do everything on their own; it is a workload for them. Because the curriculum is not based on traditional lectures and instead concentrates much more on interaction and activity, teachers themselves have to have a clear understanding of the new learning principles. Developer B stated that

"Teachers had to deal with new teaching methods, new principles, a new curriculum system, and the training programs and a new quality assurance system all at once in time; this is an overload for them" (Developer B)

After the initial implementation process, teachers were indeed victimized by innovation overload. In their responses to the questionnaires, Thai English language
teachers reported that they were working with nine or more new educational principles and concepts simultaneously (Questionnaires F, J and M).

8.5.1.2 Teachers' complaints on the quality of training

The curriculum developers assumed that the curriculum overarching and Standards would be accepted by school teachers. Therefore, workshops were not created to convince teachers of the validity of the curriculum philosophies and to describe the principles underlying the standards (Developer B and Trainer A and D). The government training seminars, which were openly promoted to every teacher, were not able to prepare teachers sufficiently in details of foreign language teaching and learning development; rather the emphasis was more at the level of curriculum writing and the basic concepts of standards-based curriculum. To some extent, teachers learnt only the concepts of the new school-based curriculum but, not the knowledge of how to teach in the new educational environment. The data from the questionnaires with school teachers showed 15 out of 20 teachers did not receive the training or knowledge necessary for English language teaching and learning.

8.5.1.3 Professional isolation

One of the great constraints discovered in responses to the questionnaires and interviews with school teachers is professional isolation. School teacher D complained “I do everything on my own when I’m writing the curriculum; but no one wants to discuss.” Thai English language teachers were the object of pity among other school teachers. Not only did they have to cope with the new innovative practices and associated problems by themselves, but they also had to handle pressures from the public and the community, as result of the globalization movement and the Thai Prime Minister Dr. Taksin’s policy that views English language education as part of social and economic development.

Therefore, the unclear definitions of theories and philosophies of the ESB curriculum, the lack of philosophical discussion among trainers and school teachers, the overload of the innovative practices and professional isolation are not conducive to the designing of learning assessment that is based on alternative methods and/or authentic assessment and are not conducive to the EFL education as a whole.
8.5.2 The Linear Approach and National Testing and Accountability

Furthermore, the ESB curriculum development took a linear approach to curriculum planning and, as a result, the test was left to be discussed at the end. Despite the introduction of an authentic assessment or alternative test that coheres with the overarching goals, as discussed previously, how the authentic assessment is implemented realistically is not critically discussed. Therefore, it is not surprising that the fragmented theory underlying each curriculum element was not their concern and was even left untouched.

Another reason that the planning of learning assessment gained the least attention of the working committee was because they were not responsible for the test design in terms of a national test (Developer A). It is the responsibility of the testing department to design the national test and it is the responsibility of the Office of National Education Standards and Quality Assurance (ONES), (now changed to the Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment (ONESQA)) (Office of the Education Council, 2004, p.89) to design the Educational Standards to provide the basis for internal quality assurance and for external quality assessment.

At the time of the promulgation of the ESB curriculum, a national test had yet not finished. Thus, both the ESB curriculum developers themself and school teachers were not clearly informed how their performance as well as their learners’ achievements would be tested and against what. Therefore, matters such as how critical thinking and problem solving take their place in the examination is quite uncertain at this stage. The curriculum working committee did not prepare for this type of assessment at the national level at the launch of the ESB curriculum, despite the movement having been initiated long before. Whether the national test will emphasise the use of English language or not in the future is one concern. What can be seen here is that a grammar test is likely to appear (Developer A, Officer A, Trainers B, C and D). The curriculum working committees were aware of the possibility of a grammar test, and accepted the fact that they could not find any solution and it was beyond their control.
"I know that the test, however, is still a paper and pencil test. The test is still focused on grammatical knowledge. But there was nothing I can do at the moment; it is the national test centre that is responsible for the test design."
(Developer A)

"Yes, it is still the problem, the test of grammar, not the communicative skill"
(Officer A)

What they know is that the national test is provided to ensure that learners are meeting the standards. The national examination was created both for students and for curriculum evaluation. Students will get scores on the examination that could be used for placement or promotion. In addition, the examination plays a formative role. Therefore, information from it will probably be used to determine whether the students have understood the main concepts in the curriculum and how effectively the teachers are teaching this new, demanding curriculum (Developer A, Trainers C and D).

8.5.2.1 The influence of the test on classroom practice - "Washback"

According to response from interviews and government documents, an economic rationalist approach was adopted in developing the national tests that stresses accountability and adaptation of a human capital model. This provided a socio-political context for development of a national standards test for every key stage. Developers A and Officer D explained that teachers can do anything, use any methods, as long as they help learners to meet the standards which will be assured by the national test provided by the government. As stated above that the national test is likely to be a grammar test or the test of language knowledge (it has been a grammar test for almost 30 years), thus that teachers have to teach grammar knowledge to students in order to pass the national testing system.

Even though the concept of authentic assessment coheres with the overall curriculum goals, if the national test is not changed, then it also affects the part that is changed. Then the goals of language teaching will only test mastery of grammatical knowledge which belongs to the traditional teaching method. The issue of "washback" that can greatly influence practices clearly was not part of the discussion in the planning of the ESB curriculum. K. Johnson (1989b) argues that the "washback" or the impact of assessment is a kind of hidden curriculum that limits language teaching and learning
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...to a form of test-driven learning. In the end, teachers may interpret standards and benchmarks as objectives that emphasise a learner’s correctness knowledge of the target language. They may not pay attention to how their students are to become language competent, good Thai citizens and active social persons in a world that has adopted globalisation. The contradictions between in-class evaluation and the national test could bring about the largest non-coherence between implementation of the curriculum and different government agenda.

This means that what curriculum developers claimed as freedom in teaching and learning does not exist in reality. In the end, teachers have no choice but to teach for the test. Worse, learners have no choices on what, when, and how to learn English language. In other words, it is an oppressive education rather than the provision of education that promotes the learner’s initiative and freedom to think and to be an active participant in the society.

In addition, school-based curriculum development claimed to promote the ownership of the curriculum at school level which then gave teachers more freedom in the planning of learning experiences. However, as stated by Luke and van Kraayenoord (1998), the tighter control of government educational goals can also been seen with the issues of accountability; freedom cannot be practiced as the policy tries to sell. Thus, the scope of school-based management and school based-curriculum is in question because the issues of accountability and the detail to judge learners’ achievement limit school performance in providing input related to learners’ interests and social issues (Burns, 2003).

Issues of accountability, standardised tests and national benchmarks are all part of an international trend that concerns progressive educators who value alternative assessments over multiple choice and standardised tests (Skilbeck, 1984; Luke & van Kraayenoord, 1998; Burns, 2003). Luke and van Kraayenoord (1998) remark on the case of Australian education that was influenced by socio-political and social economic movements that recently introduced national benchmarks and standardized tests discarded 20 years ago in an attempt to innovate curriculum, instruction and assessment to promote learners’ achievements in literacy and critical literacy. This is
also the case in Thai education. This implies that while Thai education follows the international Standards movement, the possibility of its limiting freedom of learners in classrooms should be raised and taken into greater consideration because rather than the school-based curriculum promoting learner-centredness and a social-reconstruction conception, it can easily conform to the academic rationale and social and economic sufficient conception under the weight of issues of accountability and control (Skilbeck, 1984; Luke & van Kraayenoord, 1998).

8.6 Conclusion

This chapter discusses two main issues: suggested teaching and learning management and suggested learning assessment. Though these elements of curriculum had taken into account the stated goals and philosophies of the ESB curriculum and the NEA 1999, it is found that the meaning underlying some suggested information is problematic and even incoherent. The problem lies in the descriptions offered in STLM both in the curriculum document and the manual. Despite the terms and introduced approaches representing the modern approach in line with the Thai learning reform movement, the descriptions have an inherently traditional meaning.

A linear approach to curriculum development, like the Thai ESB curriculum that left the design of teaching and learning as well as assessment to the last stage, alters the overall framework of the curriculum as is evidenced by the unsolved problems of assessment and the inconsistencies between teaching methods and the goals of the curriculum. In addition, the working committees consisted of groups of stakeholders and personnel who changed during the planning process; this caused the lack of coherence between the theoretical underpinnings of the STLM, especially in the curriculum manual, and the principles underpinning the ESB curriculum generally as well as the clear practices toward and authentic assessment.

The suggested learning assessment has incorporated the learning process by reinforcing the implementation of authentic assessment with mixed methods. However, the large-scale test, especially the national test, remains a crucial barrier to the development of English language education with a progressive education
perspective. The curriculum working committees themselves could not provide a solution to this problem while planning the curriculum. This is because assessment and tests were designed at the end, and the curriculum working committees were not aware of the “washback” effect on curriculum goals and objectives which are of greater importance. Therefore, despite an emphasis on the “Learning process”, in the long run the curriculum teaches content knowledge. At least, this is what the examination tests. Tacit knowledge, ethics, personal experience and development (both academic and social) are largely ignored.

This chapter argues that the meaning underlying each element of the curriculum and different interpretations of theories and philosophies contributed to the success and/or failure of the curriculum implementation. At this stage, the greater concern is the lack of a holistic view of language learning and the larger purpose of education in the suggested teaching and learning and learning assessment. In addition, the training program could not serve the load of teachers’ demand for help, especially regarding the principles, philosophies and theories of the ESB curriculum that has its basis in progressive education, as well as a lack of professional support among English language teachers. These situations distort dramatically the larger purpose of education and intended holistic approach to teaching and learning, hence great difficulties in the development of EFL education toward the 21st century.
Chapter 9
Conclusion and Recommendations

9.1 Introduction

This chapter revisits and reflects on the previous chapters to summarise and integrate the major findings and implications of the overall study. It begins by examining how the research questions have been addressed by the research outcomes described in Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. These are related to the literature described in Chapter 2. The literature and discussion in previous chapters then highlight this study's contribution to a further understanding of the English language curriculum and English language teaching and learning development in the Thai school systems in the national context.

9.2 Major Findings and Discussion

The three main research questions for this study, as stated in Chapter 1, were:

1. What are the philosophies and theories underpinning the national English Language Standards-Based Curriculum? Are these philosophies and theories coherent with one another and how?

2. What factors need to be considered and are involved in planning the English Language Standards-Based Curriculum in the Thai context?
3. Based on the answers to questions 1 and 2: Are the design and plan of the curriculum appropriate in terms of the needs of Thai society, knowledge of learners' needs, and in terms of foreign language education and curriculum development contexts?

The study has examined the following specific subsidiary research questions in chapters 4 to 6:

**Chapter 4:**
What processes are there in the ESB curriculum planning? Who and what produces, constitutes and validates knowledge in the school curriculum, and how is this legitimated? Who can be a 'knower' in the planning process? and What are the planning approaches to the ESB curriculum development?

**Chapter 5:**
Where does the ESB curriculum originate from? Why is the EFL curriculum standards-based? Who were the decision makers in the selection of the standards-based curriculum?

**Chapter 6:**
What counts as curriculum knowledge? Who decides what and on what basis? How is access to such knowledge determined? Whose interests are being served by the selection, legitimation and production of curriculum knowledge? How is that knowledge expressed and made visible/invisible? Where does the knowledge come from? What is the value system of Thai education and does it affect the English language curriculum? and What concepts and conceptions are hidden in the ESB curriculum?

**Chapter 7:**
Have the details of benchmarks or the curriculum content philosophically informed practices in a coherent way as claimed by the stated goals? What are the skills that support the effective practice of Thai citizenship? What are the skills that lead to creating English language competence in learners? How can appreciation of English
language be developed? Of the many English language skills students might acquire, which ought to be taught and why?

Chapter 8:
What pedagogical suggestions as well as language teaching and learning methods that support the achievement of ESB goals are available for teachers? How should language teaching be structured so as to facilitate the learning defined in the educational goals? Which methodology or methodologies are teachers being directed towards? What are the evaluation methods, guided by curriculum policy, that enable teachers to evaluate students? Are the suggestions theoretically and philosophically coherent with the ESB curriculum overarching goals or not?

In addressing the research questions, this thesis has presented findings from data analyses and discussion in the previous five chapters. The analysis in this study of the newly developed English language curriculum (the ESB curriculum) reported that the national education movement is the major factor in the development of an EFL curriculum and in the planning of an EFL curriculum in a policy context in Thailand. The EFL curriculum principles and overarching goals are required to conform to various pieces of national educational legislation. Further, the philosophies and beliefs of those who hold a legitimate position in the curriculum planning process, political interference and Western influences were also factors that greatly influenced the theoretical basis of the curriculum.

The ESB curriculum’s overarching goals indicate a great range of learning theories and modern concepts of curriculum development, and take into account the needs of both the wider Thai society and local communities in the development of English language learners in the 21st century. The analysis shows the hybridity of philosophy and theory underlying the ESB curriculum. The hybrid nature of the curriculum derives in part from a mix of traditional Thai culture and wisdom in education, social-economic efficiency, learner-centeredness and social reconstructionists’ conceptions. However, this hybridity of educational concepts was not elucidated well in each of the curriculum planning processes, and hence in the curriculum document as a result of the lack of a clear definition of theories, a variety of interpretation of the terms used and incoherent theories underpinning curriculum elements. These lacks affect the
appropriateness of the ESB curriculum in meeting the needs of Thai society and the learner's particular needs. These lacks also contradict much of what is found in the literature about modern EFL curriculum development and practice. This resulted in a theoretical incoherence in the curriculum, rather than a coherent eclectic curriculum that is a combination of best practice theories for a specific context.

While a range of issues related to specific theoretical coherence and lack of coherence in the ESB curriculum are discussed in the previous chapters, the focus of this chapter is to integrate these specific findings into more general reflections on both EFL curriculum planning and development and English language teaching and learning in the following dimensions:

- The curriculum planning process: the shifting roles of responsible parties and the distortion of underlying principles of the ESB curriculum.
- The philosophies and beliefs of curriculum developers and how these affected approaches to curriculum planning and influenced how school teachers developed their school-based curriculum.
- The critical nature of definitions and meanings of terms used in the curriculum and their impact on the theoretical coherence of the curriculum.
- Contemporary education in the form of traditional practices.

The major findings in each of these dimensions are outlined and discussed below through a review of the findings and their relevance to the literature.

9.2.1 The Shifting Roles of Responsible Parties and the Distortion of Underlying Principles of the ESB Curriculum

The research findings indicate that a shift in the role of the curriculum working committees and a shift in decision making power contributed greatly to the incoherence of philosophies and theories underlying the ESB curriculum. The shift in the role of curriculum developers in the curriculum planning process resulted from political circumstance - changes at the administrative level as well as political interference at the planning process level.
There were various committees that participated in the ESB curriculum planning process. The large number of responsible parties in the process resulted in difficulties in the communication process. As Sowell (2005) asserts, large numbers of people involved in curriculum decisions can confound the planning process. Consequently, there was a lack of communication and critical discussion in the planning process from the principle drafting stage, through the editorial stage to the revision stage among curriculum committees. Even where there was communication, the communication was seen as a process of knowledge imposition from the previous curriculum working committees to the newly formed curriculum committees, rather than critical reflection and negotiation of meaning. This research argues that such knowledge imposition is not conducive to an effective curriculum development, because it is a process whereby the members of curriculum committees were treated as passive participants, not as active members who questioned and opened negotiations to further their understanding of and to argue about the policy, theories and philosophies of the curriculum. As a result, there were incoherent theories and philosophies among all the elements of the curriculum from different interpretations of and views about learning, learners, knowledge, foreign language and society held by the different participants and those who had power over each planning stage.

Furthermore, the Chair of the curriculum committees changed during the drafting process, hence there was a lack of continuity of leadership and oversight of the whole process of curriculum planning and maintenance of the larger purpose of education. As K. Johnson (1989) states that the process of developing and sustaining coherent language curriculum requires the existence of organisational structures which facilitate its achievement (p.12). The research findings imply that working with different teams and different members at different stages creates more work for the curriculum working team and unquestionably produces problems of curriculum coherence, confusion about the meanings underlying the curriculum, and even greater confusions about curriculum principles, philosophies, and theories.

These research findings correlate with the report from the MOE in the document “Strategic plan for elevating the ability of English language usage of Thai citizens for the competitive ability of the country” by Ministry of Education Thailand (2005). This report has summarized major problems relating to Thai English language education
since the introduction of the ESB curriculum in 2003. The report said there was a lack of good cooperation and good communication among responsible parties. There were often changes of advisory committees and curriculum working committees, resulting in a lack of continuity of curriculum development. Above all there was a lack of systematic planning and a greater lack of a responsible party to oversee the holistic and systematic EFL curriculum development (Ministry of Education Thailand, 2005). However, the report did not state the specific consequences of this unsystematic curriculum planning process, reporting only that it created problems in EFL curriculum development and hence unsuccessful practice. Therefore, these research findings add valuable empirical information to the government report. This research argues that distorted meaning and an incoherent theoretical curriculum influences adversely the beliefs and philosophies of curriculum implementers. That is the fundamental problem affecting good practice. The implication of this finding is that there should be a responsible party who can oversee and monitor the whole process of curriculum development. Further, the government should stress the kind of communication among curriculum members that promotes “dialogue” (Freire, 1998) and critical scrutiny of theory underlying every element of the curriculum. This kind of dialogue must replace the imposition of knowledge from politically highly regarded persons or from experts on working committees or from knowers to knowees. In other words, curriculum planning should be seen as a process (Stenhouse, 1975) and even further viewed as praxis (Grundy, 1987), not as product. Thus, there is an urgent need of reconceptualisation in the curriculum planning and development of the ESB curriculum in Thailand.

9.2.2 The Philosophies and Beliefs of Curriculum Developers and How these Affected Approaches to Curriculum Planning and Influenced How School Teachers Developed Their School-Based Curriculum

The Thai ESB curriculum planning process has shown a rationale or objectives approach toward curriculum planning, as evidenced by the linear process of planning. The curriculum starts with the identification of experts in the field to determine the objectives of the curriculum; later, curriculum content, teaching methodologies and learning assessment were developed respectively. The planning was strictly controlled as can be seen from the advisory committee’s proposal to invite experts to consider
curriculum change, and the strong perception of the expert as knower and the other participants as knowees.

The linear approach to the ESB curriculum development led to incoherent principles underlying all the curriculum elements. By treating curriculum objectives as the most important, other curriculum elements were explicitly and implicitly treated as less important and some issues were left unexplored. For example, while the curriculum goals contain the philosophies of teaching and learning that focus on the learning process, neither the curriculum content nor the curriculum manual clearly elaborated these philosophies and even where they do, they do so in a muddled way, so that the curriculum content distorts the philosophical meaning underlying the curriculum goals.

Furthermore, by using an objective model, in the end the ESB curriculum contains lists of objectives, lists of teaching methods and details of specification of what to do and what to teach. Some parts of curriculum content and some examples of suggested teaching and learning reinforce traditional practices of ELT that promote grammar translation, drill practice and memorizing of knowledge rather than learners' self construction of knowledge. Specification of this kind in the curriculum distorted both the ESB curriculum philosophies and the national educational philosophies that view curriculum as a process of reflection containing principles for teachers to further develop into classroom practice or a critical pedagogy in ELT.

9.2.2.1 The ESB curriculum planning approach and classroom curriculum planning approach

The research findings indicate that philosophies and beliefs of the ESB curriculum developers toward curriculum planning has heavily shaped and influenced curriculum planning at the classroom level. As stated previously, the curriculum developers took a linear process or an objectives approach to curriculum development. From the analysis of curriculum content and suggested teaching and learning methodology, it was found that both the organisation of the curriculum content and the organisation of teaching and learning are based on this objectives approach and that this approach greatly influences how school teachers perceive the curriculum. In addition, curriculum developers also suggested the linear approach for the organisation of the
foreign language curriculum at the classroom level and the organisation of teaching and learning.

According to educational philosophy, principally a school-based curriculum should be seen as a process-oriented curriculum that is not centred on specifications of what to learn. The linear approach to curriculum development should not be welcome because it can specify and limit flexibility at the classroom level and does not allow negotiation of what to learn as well as the learners' construction of knowledge. The research finding argues that the linear written curriculum can confuse teachers and influence how they should perceive the curriculum. In this case, EFL education cannot show progress because the curriculum represents traditional practices only in modern terms. This research finding supports the suggestion that there should be a critical discussion of the philosophies and beliefs of those involved in the curriculum planning process, especially the way curriculum developers perceived the curriculum.

9.2.3 The Critical Nature of Definitions and Meanings of Terms Used in the Curriculum and Their Impact on the Theoretical Coherence of the Curriculum

The findings suggest that the ESB curriculum lacks explicit underlying principles and philosophies as well as consensus definitions of theories used in designing the curriculum. The omission of clear and explicit curriculum underpinning philosophies, can lead to possible misunderstandings about the embedded intent underlying the meaning of the standards-based curriculum. Furthermore, most foreign language theories originated in the most updated trends that need further clarification and connection with the larger purpose of education. The developers of the curriculum appeared not to have been aware of the difficulties that arise from differences in interpretation that can distort the stated goals. As Skilbeck (1984) and White (1988) state, problems of communication and interpretation at the implementation stage adversely affect curriculum development.

The most controversial issues would lie at the level of practice, especially at the school level where school teachers have had minimal exposure to English language teaching and learning. Teacher trainers had a duty to explain the principles underlying the curriculum, but if teacher trainers were not in a position to explain precisely or
accurately then the school teachers interpreted erroneously in following the teacher trainers. Indeed, the interpretations by teacher trainers are another issue that should be questioned. This raises further questions about training workloads and the need for funds and human resources for teacher training. Such issues affect the overall curriculum development plan.

In Chapter 2 part of the discussion centred on the Thai EFL curriculum in a different period of time when most research findings revealed that Thai English language teachers experienced great difficulties in implementing the curriculum. Most of the research indicated that the difficulties in EFL practice at the schools level were related to the design of curriculum goals and objectives that were too broad and vague. This is true of both the previous EFL curriculum as well as the new ESB curriculum (Ministry of Education Thailand, 2005). Unfortunately, those researchers did not state what their criticism of “too broad” and/or “vague” means. This present research illustrates and discusses in Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8, in considerable detail, what those researchers had left unexplained. This research strongly argues that the problems of the EFL curriculum are related to how the curriculum goals and objectives and its constituent elements are designed. The critical problems are rooted in the lack of consensus over meanings underlying the stated objectives and the lack of explicit philosophies and theories.

The strong suggestion is that there should be a serious discussion relating to definitions and the meaning of the terms used in the curriculum. At the conclusion of such discussion the consensus should be shared with communities in order that everyone can share the same picture of development despite using different methods to realise the same end. For example, the lack of a clear definition of “critical thinking” correlates with what was discussed by Lankshear et al.(1997) who pointed out that often policy makers only add the word “critical” without paying attention to its real meaning. Another example is the methods such as ‘learner-centred’ and ‘authentic assessment’ that teachers claimed to possess were still questionable in terms of real usage in the classroom. The interpretation of learner-centred approach may vary. The research by Sooksomchitra (2004) recently on the term ‘learner-centred approach’ used among Thai English teachers, found that Thai EFL teachers have a great range of definitions of ‘learner-centred’ approach and some definitions
were closely linked to teacher-centred rather than learners. Dr. Rung Keawdang, states that “a number of teachers, administrators and parents are still not clear about, or misinterpret, the concept of a learner-centered approach resulting in confusion at present” (p.VI).

In order to link the curriculum to school practice, or theory to practice and rhetoric to reality, the problems relating to the meaning level of the curriculum need to be solved. Therefore, there is an urgent need to develop explicit definitions of theories and terms constituting the curriculum.

9.2.3.1 Western influences
As can be seen clearly from Chapters 4 to 8 the new movement in Thai education, especially as reflected in this English language curriculum, is greatly influenced by movements in Western education. It is not surprising to find traces of Western education principles in a Thai curriculum because their influence has long been embedded in Thai education, in fact since the reign of King Rama 5th. The trend toward ELT is a very strong driving force in teaching and learning. However, the interpretation of such a trend is even more powerful. For example, the interpretation of Thai EFL curriculum developers of CLT (Communicative approach to language teaching) and Constructivism, indicates inherent traditional thinking. Thus, adopting Western trends with a wrong interpretation is likely to be a barrier to the provision of English language education rather than a positive move. This research has raised awareness of the degree of Western borrowing of knowledge and policy. What is implied is that transfer of knowledge has not occurred simply by using the same terms and that what is needed is a thorough and critical negotiation of the meanings underlying the terms.

Therefore, as the foregoing analysis of the different terms used in the new English language curriculum in different documents by different people and in diverse situations shows, the terminology used in the official curriculum needs some urgent attention. To begin with, there should be a larger process of awareness of the new terms and concepts than have been brought into the Thai curriculum to date. The principles of the curriculum, which can be interpreted from a close reading of its name, have not received much attention from curriculum writers or educational
stakeholders. It is reasonable to conclude that the curriculum writers and educational stakeholders were not so aware of the possibility of misinterpretation of the underlying meanings attached to the terms.

9.2.4 Contemporary Education in the Form of Traditional Practices

Globalization, Westernization and economic rationalism have changed the face of education, not only in Thailand, but in neighbouring countries as well. The research findings indicate that though learner-centeredness and a social reconstructionists' view are stressed in the new ESB curriculum, evidence from the analysis of the curriculum content, teaching practice and learning management shows that traditional education practice, especially the social-economic efficiency model, can powerfully guide emerging practice. It means that the utilitarian view of education that sees education as serving social needs, stresses accountability and reduces education to training is more valued than the view that emphasises the education of the whole child and how learners learn. Some of the findings of this piece of research confirm expectations in the extant literature, but it is the first time that this has been done for a Thai EFL curriculum. At the time of the EFL curriculum development in Thailand, there was great speculation about issues related to these findings, but there was no empirical testing. These research findings then add a new depth to our understanding of the contradictory view of education in the new ESB curriculum which comes of mixing part academic-rationale, part socio and economic efficiency, part learner-centeredness and part social reconstruction conceptions.

The present Thai government endorses the strong socio-economic movement of economic rationalism. It is thus a challenge to educators, both at the administrative level and at the school level, to rethink the bigger picture of the curriculum, to ensure that economic rationalism does not dictate the overall educational purpose and ignore the all-round development of the person. As Giroux stressed, either educators have to betray their original aspiration of developing the whole child, or betray the educational policy that strongly emphasises capitalism that may benefit only limited and specific groups of people (Giroux, 2004). This research implies that there should be greater critical thinking about these influences and open discussion should be promoted not only among policy makers but also stakeholders, school teachers,
communities and learners. As Freire (1998) argues the lack of “dialogue” or critical talk that questions ideologies among teachers, learners and other stakeholders blinds them to reality, sustains particular powerful groups of people and results in inequality in society. Hence, the democratic society is in danger. As Goodlad (1979) comments, most often the choice of how capital should be allocated places restrictions on the freedom exercised by local schools which then, in turn, have far reaching implications for what boys and girls want to study in the schools. Widdowson (1990) argues the case that where educational policy is designed to prepare pupils to fit into an established social order, this would be incompatible with a methodology which was person-oriented and encouraged independent initiatives in learning.

The curriculum is a highly political place where one ideology can overpower what young generations should perceive (Pennycook, 1998; Giroux, 2004). Therefore, the younger generation should be empowered to engage in reality and question issues related to life and society. Furthermore, the NEA 1999 (National Education Act 1999) also stressed the need for critically literate English language learners who are able to participate as global citizens in democratic way. From the analysis, the Thai ESB curriculum does not serve this side of education well. This research suggests the need of a great change in fundamental thinking right from the level of policy initiation which will greatly influence change at the school level, will change learners and hence change the democratic society. As Saylor et al. (1981) state, the change in policy does not occur only on paper, but occurs amongst people and society.

9.3 Contributions to Theory and Practice

The focus of the thesis is on the analysis of coherent and non coherent theoretical bases underlying the ESB curriculum, on the development of the ESB curriculum at large and on the appropriateness of the curriculum to Thai society and learners’ needs. Through the analysis, this thesis explored the planning process of the ESB curriculum and related curriculum documents. In a relatively new approach to English language curriculum development, this research developed an analytical framework that encompassed literature relating to both English language teaching and learning, and curriculum development studies. Readers interested in this research will be various:
policy makers, curriculum developers, school teachers, including educators engaging in standards-based curriculum development, scholars interested in understanding the English language subject in mainstream education in the 21st century and Thai educators interested in foreign language curriculum development.

The study makes its contribution to theory and practice in the following respects. First, the study contributes to the expansion of knowledge in the foreign language curriculum field and to a further understanding of English language education in mainstream education in the 21st century. It integrates knowledge of education, curriculum studies and foreign language teaching and learning development in a holistic manner. As discussed in the review of EFL curriculum development, viewing the English language program in terms of education process is still new. This study is the first empirical study to examine the planning process of the Thai foreign language curriculum and its underlying philosophies and theories as well as to integrate a broad range of educational issues into the EFL curriculum analysis. To date and to the best knowledge of this researcher, this study is the first empirical research to suggest the need for a critical discussion on the conceptualisation and planning process involved in the Thai national EFL curriculum development. A critical discussion is necessary in order that the EFL curriculum be developed in preparing English language learners for globalisation and for the Information Age as well as in line with the national educational goal that values the development of the whole child. This study makes its contribution to ELT especially from the point of view of English as a global language where English language education is not only for training learners in English language skills but to develop powerful language users.

Second, this research critically argues that a curriculum is a process of critical reflection not a product in itself. The curriculum as a process of reflection engages curriculum stakeholders in critical discussion, rather than imposing knowledge or negotiating only for mutual understanding (Grundy, 1987). Further, a schools-based curriculum should be developed in the same way: the curriculum engages teachers and learners in open negotiation and critical discussion entailing social and life issues. Such a curriculum does not separate schools from society nor from reality. In other words, a curriculum is not the place for legitimising, but for the practice of freedom. The study suggests that the process of developing a successful English language
curriculum offers the opportunity for a dynamic interactive process between ideas held by different participants. The argument is that an open, positive and discerning attitude of exploration of knowledge facilitates and expands English language curriculum development. Therefore, issues that were hidden and implicitly stated in the curriculum should be explicitly discussed and open to scrutiny. Unpacking the curriculum in this way opens the way to a thorough understanding of problems in English language teaching and learning that grew out of the planning process.

Third, the study provides recommendations regarding conceptualising, designing, and developing an English language curriculum nationally. The following recommendations are offered in relation to English language curriculum development at national and school level:

(1) The theoretical and philosophical basis of English language education is to educate the whole child. Therefore, English language acquisition is not seen as an end, rather as a means in the learner's growth process. The holistic approach to language learning that engages the learner intellectually, physically and morally should be adopted and applied to every element of the curriculum. Thus, English language education in schools should not be seen as having a training purpose that aims to produce a technically skilled person, but rather an educative process that enables a person to solve and to pose problems in a complex world and to participate fully in a democratic society. Freire (1998) names this education that is concerned with the issue of social practice “Critical Education”.

(2) For “Critical Education” to be achieved, it requires critical learning, critical pedagogy and critical educators and learners (Freire, 1998). In addition the policy must not merely insert of the word “critical” but critically implement in the education process. Therefore, in the ELT view, English language becomes a means for negotiation, critical engagement within and outside the community and the world, rather than learning language only to serve socio-economic and socio-political agendas. In other words, it is “English language literacy” (Pennycook, 1998; Wallace, 2003) and further critical literacy that policy makers and English language educators have to discuss in the planning
of EFL curriculum. Viewing English language in this way appreciates the learner's intrinsic values; rather than promotes utilitarian positions in which education has the potential to become oppressive and stultifying.

(3) The curriculum should not be seen as subject specific; therefore the content of the curriculum should be developed in such a way that the larger purpose of the curriculum is integral. In other words, the integration of subject matter across the curriculum and issues related to life and society should be promoted and introduced in a holistic way. Further, the integration of learning subjects or pieces of information should not be left entirely in the hands of teachers and learners because they will never perceive the larger purpose of education, hence learning could become fragmented.

(4) In order to integrate the holistic picture of the curriculum or pursue the larger purpose of education throughout the curriculum planning process, curriculum elements should not be seen as separate entities. This means that curriculum development is not a linear process whereby the objectives are first developed in order that the next element may be devised. Curriculum elements should be mutually developed and discussed in a critical and reflective way.

(5) Procedures should be established to illustrate to teachers that language learning will only be brought about in these circumstances through cognitive strategies involving meaningful, authentic interaction between students in the resolution of communication problems that are based on negotiation with learners rather than through activities that are based on drill practices. The EFL education is not merely a process for problem solving but it is a process of problem posing and emancipatory interest (Grundy, 1987; Wallace, 2003).

(6) There should be an immediate call for the reconceptualisation of learning theories related to English language teaching and learning. More theoretical consideration should be paid to the planning of teaching and learning management in order that the stated goals are related to the learning process.
(7) Teachers require considerable development and education in a professional manner that encourages self-reflection and self-development; short-term approaches and hands-on activities are not enough (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992; Grimmett & Neufeld, 1994; Edwards & Usher, 2001; Pettis, 2002; Bredeson, 2003; Diaz-Greenberg & Nevin, 2004). If teachers are to teach in a holistic environment they should be educated along the same lines as the whole child is educated.

Fourth, the study suggests that a national English language curriculum is value-based and contextualised. The current Thai national English language curriculum is context dependent and inevitably influenced by particular cultural contexts, both strong traditional Thai cultural contexts and Western views. The policies and the curriculum framework derived from Western educational ideas and pedagogies have made a great contribution to Thai education and Thai ELT. It is understandable that curriculum developers held beliefs and conceptions that were compatible with the Western literature on ELT infused with Thai embedded traditional practice. The study suggests that before the curriculum draft was disseminated, what was needed was a critical discussion focusing on the concepts, theories and terms that come with the Western trends in ELT, curriculum and education in general as well as empirical testing of the concepts to ensure success in developing an appropriate English language curriculum. Ongoing discussion and continued curriculum development contributes greatly to a coherent curriculum.

To sum up, the study advances persuasive arguments from the research that should form the basis for action to forestall curriculum developments ending up serving a ‘socio-economic orientation’, rather than an ‘educational orientation’ one based on the premise of fairness and opportunity.
9.4 Implications for EFL Curriculum Development

9.4.1 Development of an English Language Literacy Curriculum

The research findings critically illustrate that an “English Language literacy curriculum” should be fully developed and implemented in Thai schools in order to prepare critically literate English learners and critical communicators for the Information Age and Globalisation as required by the National Education Act (NEA 1999). This statement is also supported by a strong group of international foreign language educators who empirically argue that English language education should promote powerful language users who have developed a critical awareness of individuals, societies and communities within and outside the country who also value the essential integration of life and society. This concept also conforms to the Buddhist concept of learning. Dr. Prawase Wasi (2000) adds that according to Buddhism, life is education and education is life, thus life is about learning, not separated from one another, and argues that Thai education separates life from learning or schools from life, and takes life away from learners so that learning is not relevant to the learner’s life experience. Based on the findings and discussion of the lack of critical elements in the curriculum and the incoherent theoretical underpinning of the curriculum, much more effort is needed from curriculum stakeholders, private organizations and school teachers in order to succeed in promoting a critical literacy in the English language curriculum in the Thai school system.

9.4.2 Holistic EFL Curriculum Development

The study critically asserts that English language curriculum studies are very complex and are not limited to the views of ELT but encompass a broad area of education. Every part and element of the curriculum is essential and contributes to a coherent curriculum. Overlooking one element of the curriculum could result in an incoherent curriculum. The analysis of the ESB curriculum elements illustrates the curriculum developers’ distorted theories, misunderstanding, misinterpretation and/or misuse of the larger purpose of Thai education. There is a need to revisit every element of the curriculum in a holistic way. In other words, the larger purpose of education should be revisited along with a re-examination of the process of curriculum planning.
This research identifies the possible issues that would need to be considered in adopting a more effective curriculum planning process in the light of policy practicality. This research describes what is needed and how development should proceed in order to achieve a more coherent curriculum. This research opened up and expanded on key issues that should have been critically discussed among curriculum stakeholders, school teachers, learners and the community regarding the larger purpose of English language education and its possibility of being an oppressive and/or a liberating practice for our children. The English language standards-based curriculum is very new in Thailand, both in terms of its structures and its theoretical bases. The research implies that in order to successfully implement the standards-based curriculum, there is a need for clear discussion of the underlying principles such as views on the nature of language, the nature of learners, the role of teachers and the nature of learning to help clarify language teachers’ knowledge and experience and carefully integrate the pieces of information to form a larger purpose of English language education.

9.5 Implications for Policy and Practice

9.5.1 The Public Sector: Curriculum Stakeholders

(1) This research presents an overall picture of English language curriculum planning that encompasses the conceptualising of the curriculum, the designing of the curriculum goals and content, and suggestions for teaching methodologies and assessment methods. The analysis framework of this research critically reflects the need for curriculum stakeholders to take a holistic approach to curriculum planning in order to develop a more coherent curriculum. Such an approach is vital especially within the working conditions of more than one group of curriculum developers being involved in the planning process. An overall picture of the curriculum process can assist curriculum developers at every stage of curriculum development to understand the underlying principles and their real contribution to future curriculum development.
(2) Presentation of the philosophies and theories of the ESB curriculum in this research has provided another in-depth conclusion drawn from the thinking behind the ESB curriculum originating in the National Educational Legislation, the curriculum documents and the intentions of the curriculum planners. Further, the discussion of English language teaching and learning principles underlying the Thai curriculum, as well as the problems of incoherence in the curriculum, contributes to a broader understanding of present English language teaching and learning. The incoherent curriculum is itself evidence of the lack of critical awareness of fundamental thinking behind the curriculum that eventually led to an ineffective change in all aspects. Curriculum stakeholders could use this research as theoretical research-based data for any near or future national English language curriculum development. Even though the research scope was restricted to study at the school level, the implications of the study can be further applied to any level related to English language curriculum development and policy such as at tertiary level and in language institutions.

(3) This research has developed a “Curriculum Analysis Framework for an English Language Standards-Based Curriculum” which can be used as a guideline for future curriculum analysis. In addition, the analysis of the curriculum content, the suggested teaching methodologies and accompanying learning assessment provides a basis for further development of curriculum documents related to the ESB curriculum, such as the new curriculum manuals and training program manuals based on a discussion of the ESB curriculum’s underlying principles. As mentioned earlier, most research that investigated the curriculum and its products has focused on the evaluation aspect in curriculum development. On the other hand, this curriculum analysis proposes an interactive process of curriculum development that includes the conceptualising process, the origins of the curriculum and the eligibility of curriculum developers.

(4) This research has identified the issues necessary for inclusion in the national language curriculum planning process. The issues so identified will be useful for government officers and other curriculum stakeholders to consider in
reviewing the strengths and weaknesses in the process of developing a more effective curriculum in the future. Further, these issues are not limited to the Thai context but can be applied to other countries in Asia that are experiencing similar English language education provision problems.

9.6 Limitations of the Study

This research attempted to generalise findings by using a number of additional supporting data. However, since details of the planning process of the ESB curriculum came from interviews with curriculum developers and the interviews required their recall of the process, such impressions could not totally represent what actually happened at the time. Furthermore, because there were various curriculum committees, it was difficult to include the views of every stakeholder in order to generate more detail related to the curriculum planning process. And access to the actual total content of meetings was beyond the reach of an outsider. Therefore, further research, which should be carried out by government personnel or designated curriculum committees who can participate in the actual planning process and use this research analysis framework, could add further empirical data to policy planning in Thai contexts.

The second limitation has to do with the data relating to classroom practice. Classroom problems that were identified as resulting from incoherent practice were based on predictions drawn from the relevant literature and research in the ELT area and data from questionnaires and interviews of school teachers who experienced the ESB curriculum. There might be a discrepancy between what the teacher participants said, what they thought they did and what they actually did. Further research focusing on the consequences of an incoherent curriculum on classroom practice and learners' achievements would be required to generate a more comprehensive picture about the consequences of the incoherent national English language curriculum planning and the implementation of that curriculum.
Despite these limitations, the findings of the study provide an exploratory indication of the state of English language curriculum development at the national level and at the classroom practice level. The findings constitute a basis for further research.

**9.7 Directions for Future Research**

This research has focused on the policy making process, which can be one of the major contributions to problems of classroom practice, rather than on the product, the curriculum itself. The problem of incoherent theoretical bases of the curriculum will be a national educational problem if the English language curriculum is not the only curriculum to experience theoretical incoherence. According to the Educational reform policy in Thailand, a standards-based curriculum was not introduced specifically and solely for the English language subject area but for every subject in schools. Learning theories underlying NEA 1999 are the shared philosophies among school practices. The findings of this research imply that in the case of the ESB curriculum, even those curriculum developers who were most familiar with the reform concepts and had Western educational backgrounds could still distort the theoretical bases of the curriculum and produce an incoherent curriculum. This same result may occur in other subject areas that pursue the NEA 1999. An analysis, similar to this research, of curricula in other subject areas should be carried out in order to make the Thai government aware of the complexity of the curriculum conceptualisation process and to warn the government of possible effects for the future of Thai education.

In addition, these research findings have remarked on the importance of an English language literacy curriculum conforming to educational movements at both national and international levels. Research on the development of an English language literacy curriculum should be carried out. Specific questions need to be addressed. For example, How can the national curriculum content and curriculum manuals be written to promote an understanding of critical literacy among school teachers? How may English language critical literacy be promoted in Thai classrooms? What conditions need to be taken into account? What are conditions that schools need in order to promote critical literacy in English language? How may educators overcome
perceived difficulties in the teaching and learning of critical literacy in ELT in Thai contexts?

9.8 Conclusion

In conclusion, the presentation and discussion of research instruments and their results, using a mixture of document analysis, interviews and questionnaire data, generally confirms that all three research questions were answered critically. This study analysed the Thai national English language curriculum and described and analyzed the planning process of the curriculum. The study highlighted the importance of critical discussion in the curriculum planning process. Such discussion greatly influences the philosophical and theoretical bases of the curriculum by questioning who determines curriculum knowledge and on what basis, and what factors influence the creation of a national English language curriculum.

The implications of the study for the EFL curriculum are significant. The research findings imply a correlation between curriculum developers’ educational backgrounds and the theories and philosophies introduced in the curriculum against a background of influences from the national education legislation and international trends. This research also indicates the need for more critical reflection on theories and definitions in every element of the curriculum for the purpose of generating a more coherent curriculum and hence coherent practice. It is of potential benefit to the teachers, the learners and Thai communities for developers to reflect upon this issue.

In the national education legislation, there is a strong movement toward the development of a holistic approach to foreign language learning. In a holistic approach, English language is part of the learner’s growth process intellectually, morally and physically. Therefore, English language education is not seen as mere practice of macro skills, but the education of the whole child. In this thesis the researcher has attempted to detail those theoretical principles and issues that decision-makers needed to consider. The purpose of this research has been to critically review the theoretical framework of the ESB curriculum in the hope that the review will
ensure that the curriculum in practice can promote effectively the key learning areas of "Knowledge, Learning Process and Affectivity".

It has been noted by others that education should be developed in a way that ensures that children can benefit from the influences of globalization and the Information Age. The national English language curriculum should aim to empower learners and promote a critically literate English language learner. Therefore, the whole English language curriculum development process should strengthen the perspective of empowerment and critically literate English language learners by stressing issues of curriculum studies and education and the process of conceptualization, by raising questions about the influence of curriculum planners, and by examining the meaning making process and curriculum development as a reflective action. The English language curriculum planning process should be open to emancipatory dialogue for the benefit of the children and the country. This will ensure that while the development of the country is enhanced, learners will also feel that their needs are fulfilled.
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Appendix 1
Strands and Standards

These strands and standards are translated from "English Language Strands and Standards, Basic Education Curriculum B.E. 2544 (A.D. 2001), Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development (2002a)" by the researcher.

Strand 1: Language and Communication (Communication Strand)

Standard F 1.1 Comprehend listening and reading processes; capable of interpreting messages derived from listening and reading all kinds of written words from various media; capable of applying knowledge critically

Standard F 1.2 Have language communicative skill, capable of exchanging information, news; expressing feeling and opinion by using technology and appropriate management for life long learning

Standard F 1.3 Comprehend speaking, writing processes and communicate information, concept and opinion about various subjects creatively, efficiently and aesthetically

Strand 2: Language and Culture (Culture Strand)

Standard F 2.1 Comprehend the relationship between languages and culture of target languages and apply it appropriately to time and place

Standard F 2.2 Comprehend the similarities and differences between languages and cultures of target language and those of Thai; and apply it critically
Appendix 1

Strand 3: Language and Other Subject Groups' Relationship (Connection Strand)

Standard F 3.1 Use foreign languages to connect knowledge with other subject matters strands and standards; and to be the basic of self-development and the self-broadening of world view.

Strand 4: Language, Community and World Relationship (Community Strand)

Standard F 4.1 Be able to use foreign languages to encounter different situations within educational institutions, community and society.

Standard F 4.2 Be able to use of foreign languages as a tool to learn, to work, to earn living, to stimulate co-operation and to live together in society.

The Government Translation: Strands and Standards

These strands and standards are the English version of foreign language learning strands and standards, written by the DCID. The researcher prefers to use her own interpretation because it was found that the translation version of the DCID did not perfectly represented Thai language version of foreign strands and standards.

Strand 1: Language and Communication (Communication Strand)

Substance F 1.1 Understand listening and reading processes; capable to interpret message derived from listening and reading all kinds of written words from various media; capable to apply knowledge critically.

Substance F 1.2 Process skills for language communication, for data, information and ideas exchanges; capable to apply technology to express feeling and manage learning process appropriately.

Substance F 1.3 Understand speaking and writing processes; communicating data, opinions and concept of various subjects creatively, efficiently and aesthetically.

Strand 2: Language and Culture (Culture Strand)

Substance F 2.1 Understand language and own culture relationship; utilizing language and culture as appropriate to time and place and other factors.
Substance F 2.2 Understand similarities and differences between the language and own culture and those of Thai; utilizing language intelligently and with consideration

Strand 3: Language and Other Subject Groups’ Relationship (Connection Strand)

Substance F 3.1 Utilize foreign languages for studying other subjects; own self developing and broadening the world view on language bases

Strand 4: Language, Community and World Relationship (Community Strand)

Substance F 4.1 Possess skills in the use of foreign languages to encounter different situations within and outside educational institutions, community and society

Substance F 4.2 Process skills in the use of foreign languages to acquire knowledge, to work, to earn living, to stimulate co-operation and to live together in society.
Appendix 2
Benchmarks

The benchmarks are organized into four key stages. Each key stage consists of three grade levels from grade one to twelve.

1. **Key Stage 1** = *Preparatory-level* (lower primary level) (P.1-3) (Grade 1-3)
2. **Key Stage 2** = *Beginner Level* (upper primary level) (P.4-6) (Grade 4-6)
3. **Key Stage 3** = *Developing Level* (Lower secondary level) (M.1-3) (Grade 7-9)
4. **Key Stage 4** = *Expanding Level* (upper secondary level) (M.4-6) (Grade 10-12)

P = Pratom (primary education)
M = Matathayom (secondary education)

These benchmarks are translated from “English Language Strands and Standards, Basic Education Curriculum B.E. 2544 (A.D. 2001), Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development (2002a)”
Strand 1: Language for Communication

**Standard F 1.1** Comprehend listening and reading processes; capable of interpreting messages derived from listening and reading all kinds of written words from various media; capable of applying knowledge critically

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.1-P.3</th>
<th>P.4-P.6</th>
<th>M.1-M.3</th>
<th>M.4-M.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand orders, requests, gestures and simple sentences in surrounding situation</td>
<td>1. Understand orders, requests, gestures and recommendations in surrounding community</td>
<td>1. Understand accents, (tone or intonation) speakers' feelings as well as understand orders, requests, recommendations and real life or authentic description and media</td>
<td>1. Understand accents, (tone or intonation) speakers' feelings as well as understand explanations, lectures (speech), recommendations, information and various manuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Read aloud and spell words, phrases, and simple sentences correctly and grammatically</td>
<td>2. Read aloud and spell words, sentences, and simple texts correctly and grammatically</td>
<td>2. Read aloud texts correctly, following pronunciation principles and fitting with contexts</td>
<td>2. Read aloud texts correctly, following pronunciation principles and fitting with contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Understand words and phrases by transferring to pictures or symbols</td>
<td>3. Understand short sentences by transferring to pictures or symbols and vice versa</td>
<td>3. Understand and interpret non-text information into different form by transferring into self-word or transfer to non-text information</td>
<td>3. Understand, interpret and/or express more complex ideas about various information that is (essays, articles) texts and non-texts and transferring into self-word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Understand conversations or easy tales with pictures</td>
<td>4. Understand conversations, easy tales and story telling.</td>
<td>4. Understand, interpret and express idea about texts, information and news from information, printed texts or electronic sources that are related to students’ daily life interest</td>
<td>4. Understand, interpret and analyze and express idea about more complex texts, information, news, articles, documentary, and fiction from printed texts or electronic sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Standard F 1.2** Have language communicative skill, capable of exchanging information, news; expressing feeling and opinion by using technology and appropriate management for life long learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.1-P.3</th>
<th>P.4-P.6</th>
<th>M.1-M.3</th>
<th>M.4-M.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use simple and short language to create interpersonal relationship by using easy innovative materials</td>
<td>1. Use simple and short language to create interpersonal relationship by using easy innovative materials and technological materials available at schools</td>
<td>1. Use language according to social customs to create interpersonal relationship and be able to continually communicate by using technological materials available inside and outside of schools</td>
<td>1. Use language according to social custom to create interpersonal relationship and be able to continually and appropriately communicate by using technological material available inside and outside of schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use simple and short language to express self-need by using technological materials available at schools</td>
<td>2. Use simple and short language to express self-need, offer help and services to other people and plan learning plan by using available technological materials available from learning resources both inside and outside of schools</td>
<td>2. Use language to express self-need, offer help and services to other people, negotiate and plan learning plan by using available technological materials available from learning resources both inside and outside of schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use simple language to ask for information about people and surrounding things by using language learning materials and learning skills outcomes</td>
<td>3. Use simple language to request and ask for information, describe person and things that experienced in daily life and create knowledge by using language learning material and learning skills outcomes</td>
<td>3. Use language to describe, lecture, compare different daily life stories, things that experienced in daily life and interest, create knowledge by using language learning materials and learning skills outcomes as well as developing learning plan and career</td>
<td>3. Use language to describe, lecture, compare and exchange various kind of knowledge or issues and current affair in community, create knowledge by using language learning materials and learning skills outcomes as well as developing learning plan and career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use simple language to express self-feelings by using the advantages from language learning</td>
<td>4. Use simple language to express self-feelings and tell reasons by using the advantages from</td>
<td>4. Use language to express self-feeling toward various stories in daily life and future projects as</td>
<td>4. Use language to express self-feeling toward past and present situations as well as giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials and the result from skills practices, and know the effective language learning methods</td>
<td>language learning materials and the result from skills practices, and select the effective language learning methods</td>
<td>well as giving reasons by using the advantages from language learning materials and the results from skills practices, and search for the effective language learning methods that is suitable for self</td>
<td>reasons by using the advantages from language learning materials and the results from skills practices, and search for the effective language learning methods that is suitable for self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Standard F 1.3** Comprehend speaking, writing processes and communicate information, concept and opinion about various subjects creatively, efficiently and aesthetically

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.1-P.3</th>
<th>P.4-P.6</th>
<th>M.1-M.3</th>
<th>M.4-M.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Give information about self and surrounding things in general with gestures, pictures, words and short messages</td>
<td>1. Give simple information about self, surrounding and society that are close to self with short messages</td>
<td>1. Present information and short stories or daily routines, experiences and general stories</td>
<td>1. Present information and stories about experiences and general stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Present concepts about various daily routines information</td>
<td>2. Present concepts about stories that are closed to self</td>
<td>2. Present concepts about self-experience or various affairs</td>
<td>2. Present concepts about various affairs, activities, goods, or services in local community using different methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Present opinions toward information and facts correctly</td>
<td>3. Present opinions toward stories that are closed to self critically</td>
<td>3. Present opinions toward various affairs in local community and social world creatively</td>
<td>3. Present opinions toward various affairs, activities, goods or services in local community with different and various methods creatively and effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Present language activities that are suitable for ages, interests with fun</td>
<td>4. Present songs or well-known poems or information from different sources according to interests with fun</td>
<td>4. Present songs, skit, affairs, poems or information from different sources according to interests with fun</td>
<td>4. Present poems or skits, by using foreign poems and skit structures or compose them freely with fun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strand 2: Language and Culture

**Standard F 2.1** Comprehend the relationship between languages and culture of target languages and apply it appropriately to time and place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.1-P.3</th>
<th>P.4-P.6</th>
<th>M.1-M.3</th>
<th>M.4-M.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand styles, characteristics and phases, simple expressions for contacting and interacting according to the cultures of foreign language study</td>
<td>1. Understand styles, characteristics and phases, expressions for contacting and interacting according to the cultures of foreign language study</td>
<td>1. Use language and gestures to communicate appropriately to person’s status and cultures of foreign language study</td>
<td>1. Use language and gestures to communicate appropriately to person’s status, times, places and cultures of foreign language study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Know customs, traditions, festivals and feasts in cultures of foreign language study</td>
<td>2. Know customs, traditions, festivals and feasts in cultures of foreign language study</td>
<td>2. Know the origin and reasons of traditions, national important dates, religions and cultures of foreign language study</td>
<td>2. Give opinions toward cultures, customs, beliefs and foreigners’ living conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Standard F 2.2** Comprehend the similarities and differences between languages and cultures of target language and those of Thai; and apply it critically

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.1-P.3</th>
<th>P.4-P.6</th>
<th>M.1-M.3</th>
<th>M.4-M.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand differences between foreign languages and Thai language about tones, vowels, alphabets, words, phrases, sentences and simple messages</td>
<td>1. Understand differences between foreign languages and Thai language about tones, vowels, alphabets, words, phrases, sentences and simple messages, and apply correctly</td>
<td>1. Understand differences between foreign languages and Thai language about words, phrases, expressions, sentences, complex texts, apply correctly and appropriately</td>
<td>1. Understand differences between foreign languages and Thai language about words, phrases, expressions, sentences, complex texts and apply critically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Understand similarities and differences between foreign cultures and Thai cultures</td>
<td>2. Understand similarities and differences between foreign cultures and Thai cultures that have influences on language usages and apply correctly</td>
<td>2. Understand similarities and differences between foreign cultures and Thai cultures that have influences on language usages and apply appropriately</td>
<td>2. Understand similarities and differences between foreign cultures and Thai cultures that have influences on language usages and apply critically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. See the advantages of foreign language learning for searching for more information and entertainment</td>
<td>3. See the advantages of foreign language learning for searching for more information and entertainment and for stepping into the society</td>
<td>3. See the advantages of foreign language learning for searching for more information and for stepping into the society and career</td>
<td>3. See the advantages of foreign language learning for searching for more information and for stepping into the society and career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interested to be involved in language activities and cultures</td>
<td>4. Interested to be involved in language activities and cultures</td>
<td>4. See its value and involved in language activities and cultures according to interests</td>
<td>4. See its value and involved in language activities and cultures according to interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Realise values of language and cultures and apply knowledge of language and cultures into self, family, community and society development</td>
<td>5. Realise values of language and culture into self, family, community and society development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strand 3: Language and other subject groups’ relationship

**Standard F 3.1** Use foreign languages to connect knowledge with other subject matters strands and standards; and to be the basic of self-development and the self-broadening of world view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.1-P.3</th>
<th>P.4-P.6</th>
<th>M.1-M.3</th>
<th>M.4-M.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Understand words and phrases of foreign languages that are related to other subjects strands</td>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Understand and transfer simple contexts and contents of foreign language that are related to other subjects strands</td>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Understand and transfer contexts and contents of foreign language that are related to other subjects strands from various sources</td>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Analyse and synthesise contexts and contents of foreign languages that are related to other subjects strands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Transfer words meaning and phrases that are related to other strands in foreign language</td>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Understand and transfer contents and contexts that are related to other strands in foreign language</td>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Apply foreign language to search for knowledge that are related to other strands with various methods</td>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Apply foreign language to search for knowledge that are related to other strands in order to expand global vision from various and different sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Discuss experiences about foreign language usages when applying foreign language for searching for information about other subject areas and strands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strand 4: Language, community and world relationship

**Standard F 4.1**  Be able to use foreign languages to encounter different situations within educational institutions, community and society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.1-P.3</th>
<th>P.4-P.6</th>
<th>M.1-M.3</th>
<th>M.4-M.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use foreign language according to different situations at school</td>
<td>1. Use foreign language according to different situations at school with simple methods and forms</td>
<td>1. Use foreign language according to different situations at school and community with various methods and forms</td>
<td>1. Use foreign language according to different situations at school and community with various complex methods and forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use foreign language to communicate with internal school personnel</td>
<td>2. Use foreign language to communicate with internal school personnel</td>
<td>2. Use foreign language to communicate with internal school personnel and community</td>
<td>2. Use foreign language to communicate with internal school personnel, community and society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2

### Standard F 4.2
Be able to use of foreign languages as a tool to learn, to work, to earn living, to stimulate co-operation and to live together in society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.1-P.3</th>
<th>P.4-P.6</th>
<th>M.1-M.3</th>
<th>M.4-M.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use simple language to primarily communicate about various careers in local community</td>
<td>1. Use language to communicate at work or apply for jobs in roles-play or real situations</td>
<td>1. Use language to communicate at work or apply for jobs and careers, as well as giving and asking information about careers in roles-play or real situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use foreign language to work with others happily, by knowing how to listen to other's opinions and express self-opinions appropriately</td>
<td>2. Use foreign language to work with others happily, by knowing how to control self, listen to other's opinions and express self-opinions appropriately, parley and convince negotiate rationally</td>
<td>2. Use foreign language to work with others happily, by knowing how to control self, listen to other's opinions and express self-opinions appropriately, parley and convince negotiate rationally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Use foreign language for specific purposes, for communicating, further their study and/or career purposes</td>
<td>3. Use foreign language for specific purposes, for communicating, further their study and/or career purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Use foreign language for disseminating and informing information, news of community and local or nation, in order to promote and create society cooperation</td>
<td>4. Use foreign language for disseminating and informing information, news of community and local or nation, in order to create creative cooperation and the competitive world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Examples of “Sa-Ra-Karn-Reain-Ru”- The Content

(Taken from Connection Strand, Standard F.3.1)
The Lower Primary Year 1-3 (Grades 1-3) Portion of Scope and Sequence for English

**Strand 3: Language and Other Subject Groups’ Relationship**

**Standard F 3.1** Use foreign languages to connect knowledge with other subject matters strands and standards; and to be the basis of self-development and the self-broadening of world view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Understand English words and phrases related to other strands | - Vocabularies  
- Phrases related to other strands |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Understand English words and phrases related to other strands | - Vocabularies  
- Phrases related to other strands |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Understand English words and phrases related to other strands | - Vocabularies  
- Phrases related to other strands |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. Communicate meaning of words and phrases related to other strands in English | - Vocabularies  
- Phrases related to other strands |
The Upper Primary Year 4-6 (Grades 4-6) Portion of Scope and Sequence for English Language Curriculum

**Strand 3: Language and Other Subject Groups’ Relationship**

**Standard F 3.1** Use foreign languages to connect knowledge with other subject matters strands and standards; and to be the basic of self-development and the self-broadening of world view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Primary Level 4</th>
<th>Upper Primary Level 5</th>
<th>Upper Primary Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contents</strong></td>
<td><strong>Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand simple English contents that are related to other strands</td>
<td>- Language that are related to other strands</td>
<td>1. Understand and communicate simple English contents that are related to other strands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Understand and transfer contents that are related to other strands in English</td>
<td>- Contents that are related to other strands</td>
<td>2. Understand and transfer contents that are related to other strands in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Lower Secondary Year 1-3 (Grades 7-10) Portion of Scope and Sequence for English Language Curriculum

**Strand 3: Language and Other Subject Groups’ Relationship**

**Standard F 3.1** Use foreign languages to connect knowledge with other subject matters strands and standards; and to be the basic of self-development and the self-broadening of world view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand English contents that are related to other strands from various resources</td>
<td>- Language that are related to other strands</td>
<td>1. Understand and transfer English contents that are related to other strands from various resources</td>
<td>- Language that are related to other strands</td>
<td>1. Understand and transfer English contents that are related to other strands from various resources</td>
<td>- Language that are related to other strands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use English to seek knowledge that are related to other strands from various resources</td>
<td>- Language for seeking knowledge that are related to other strands</td>
<td>2. Use English to seek knowledge that are related to other strands from various resources</td>
<td>- Language for seeking knowledge that are related to other strands</td>
<td>2. Use English to seek knowledge that are related to other strands from various resources</td>
<td>- Language for seeking knowledge that are related to other strands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Upper Secondary Year 4-6 (Grades 11-12) Portion of Scope and Sequence for English Language Curriculum

**Strand 3: Language and Other Subject Groups’ Relationship**

**Standard F 3.1** Use foreign languages to connect knowledge with other subject matters strands and standards; and to be the basic of self-development and the self-broadening of world view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Secondary Level 4</th>
<th>Upper Secondary Level 5</th>
<th>Upper Secondary Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contents</strong></td>
<td><strong>Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Analyse and synthesise English contents that are related to other strands</td>
<td>- Language that are related to other strands</td>
<td>1. Analyse and synthesise English contents that are related to other strands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use English to seek knowledge that are related to other strands in order to expand global vision from various resources in different forms</td>
<td>- Language for seeking knowledge that are related to other strands</td>
<td>2. Use English to seek knowledge that are related to other strands in order to expand global vision from various resources in different forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discuss about experience of using English to research contents that are related to other strands in English</td>
<td>- Language for researching knowledge that are related to other strands</td>
<td>3. Discuss about experience of using English to research contents that are related to other strands in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3
Description of the Entry and Exit Proficiency Level

Student's Proficiency and its scope are translated from “English Language Strands and Standards, Basic Education Curriculum B.E. 2544 (A.D. 2001), Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development (2002a)” by the researcher. Details of the requirements at each level are described below.

Preparatory Level (Lower Primary) P.1-3

1. Understand and use foreign language for exchanging and presenting information that is related to self daily life, and surrounding environment

2. Possess language usage skills, emphasis on listening and speaking. Students can listen and speak according to topics which are related to themselves, family, schools, surrounding environment, foods, drinks and interpersonal relationship. The vocabulary limitation is 300-450 words (concrete vocabulary)

3. Use one word sentences and simple sentences in conversations that can be used in daily life

4. Possess knowledge and understand language culture and lifestyle of foreigners according to level
5. Be able to use the language for presenting information. The information can be about other subjects according to students’ interests and ages

6. Be able to use the language in classrooms and schools for fun, relaxation and knowledge

### Beginner Level (Upper Primary) P.4-6

8. Understand and use foreign language for exchanging and presenting information that is related to self daily life, and surrounding communities

9. Possess language usage skills, emphasis on listening, speaking and reading. Students can listen and speak according to topics which are related to themselves, family, schools, surrounding environment, foods, drinks, interpersonal relationship, hobbies, activities, weather, health and facilities buying and selling. The vocabulary limitation is 1,050-1,200 words (concrete and abstract vocabulary).

10. Use one word sentences, simple sentences and compound sentences to communicate in different contexts.

11. Understand formal and informal conversations in various contexts

12. Possess knowledge and understand language, culture and lifestyle of foreigners according to the texts found at each level

13. Be able to use the language for presenting information. The information can be about other subjects according to students’ interests and levels.

14. Be able to use the language in classrooms, schools for searching for more information and fun

### Developing Level (Lower Secondary) M.1-3

1. Understand and use foreign language for exchanging and presenting information, be able to create interpersonal relationships, express thought and ideas by using pronunciation and gestures that are suitable for times, places and people.
2. Possess language usage skills, emphasis on listening, speaking, reading and writing. Students can do all skills with topics which are related to themselves, family, schools, surrounding environment, foods, drinks, interpersonal relationship, hobbies, activities, weather, health and facilities, buying and selling, education and career, traveling, services, places, language, science and technology. The vocabulary limitation is 2,100-2,250 words (higher abstract vocabulary).

3. Use compound sentences and complex sentences to represent meaning in various contexts, both in formal and informal conversations.

4. Understand formal and informal conversations in various contexts with Discourse Makers (Linkers)

5. Possess knowledge and understand language, culture and lifestyle of foreigners according to the texts found at each level.

6. Be able to use the language for information presentation. The information can be about other subjects according to students' interests and levels.

7. Be able to use the language inside and outside schools for searching for more information continually and fun, and for the foundation of further education and career.

8. Understand and use foreign language for exchanging news and information, be able to create interpersonal relationship, express thoughts and ideas that are related to education, career, community and social world issues appropriate for times, places and people.

9. Have language usage skills, emphasis on listening, speaking, reading and writing. Students can do all skills with topics which are related to themselves, family, schools, surrounding environment, foods, drinks, interpersonal relationship, hobbies, activities, weather, health and facilities, buying and selling, education and career, traveling, services, places, language, science and technology. The vocabulary limitation is 3,600-3,750 words (vocabulary that have different levels of usage).
10. Use compound sentences and complex sentences to represent meaning in various contexts, both in formal and informal conversations.

11. Understand formal and informal conversations in various contexts with *Discourse Makers* (Linkers).

12. Possess knowledge and understand language, culture and lifestyle of foreigners according to the texts found at each level, and be able to apply to appropriate times and places.

13. Have knowledge and understand the usage of language, and be able to search for information that is related to other subjects according to students' interests and levels from different and various sources.

14. Be able to use the language inside and outside schools for searching for more information, continually and for fun, and for the foundation of further education and career
Appendix 4  
Informed Consent Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informed Consent Form For</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the interview of the policy makers and school teachers on the foreign language standards-based curriculum in the Thai school system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Critical Analysis of the 2001 National Foreign Language Standards-Based Curriculum in the Thai School System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supanit Kulsiri, a PhD student at the School of Languages and International Education, University of Canberra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fax</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following study has been reviewed and approved by the Committee for Ethics in Human Research.

The objective of this research is to demonstrate the relevance of analysing the English language curriculum in Thailand and trends in the development of that curriculum. This study consists mainly of an analysis of the English language core curriculum, which has just been launched as a new official curriculum for all Thai schools. It examines an array of important concepts used in the process of curriculum development, and questions the premises on which these rest.

The participants will be expected to provide information about the policy planning process and their experiences during the planning. In addition, school teachers and administrators will be expected to provide information on the experiences of their implementation of the policy.

The duration of participation for participants is up to one hour for each participant.

No procedures have been designed to modify the knowledge, thinking, attitudes, feelings and/or behaviour of the participants. No risks or discomfort will be caused by the project.

No compensation will be given for participation.

The identity of participants will not be disclosed and the data collected will be securely stored and not disclosed in accordance with guidelines set out by the University.

The data associated with the project will be stored under lock and key at the University on completion of the project for a period of five years. Only the principal researcher has access to the information collected.

An information sheet summarising the major findings of the research will be sent to each participant when the study is complete. The complete report will also be available on a website to be created. Each participant will be advised of the website location in a letter accompanying the summary information sheet.

Participation in the research project is entirely voluntary. The participants have the right to withdraw their participation or avoid answering questions they do not wish to answer at any time during the research process.
If the participants have any enquiries concerning the research, they should contact the principal researcher Supanit Kulsiri in the first instance. Her contact details are as follows:

**Contact Information**

- **Telephone number**: 61-02-6201-2271
- **Fax**: 61-02-6201-5089
- **Email**: Supanit.Kulsiri@student.canberra.edu.au
- **Address**: School of Languages and International Education
  20C15 University of Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia

Please sign and return the following note at the end of the information session.

I, ........................................................ have read and understood the information provided. I am not aware of any medical condition that would prevent my participation. I agree to participate in “The interview of the policy makers and school administrators and teachers on the second language teaching and learning core curriculum in the Thai school system” project. I fully understand the entire process of the project and acknowledge that participation in the project is voluntary and I reserve the right to withdraw from the project at any time during the research process.

........................................................  ........................................................
Participant’s signature  Date
Appendix 5
The Main Details for the Interview Sessions

The following questions were the main points in the interview session

I. The curriculum planning process

- Recall of the process in the development of the English core curriculum.
  a. Who was the key person and why?
  b. How did their views fit in with the work on developing the curriculum?
  c. What were their difficulties in comprising the ideas while developing the curriculum?
  d. What were the processes in decision-making and on what basis? What were the processes for creating curriculum documents?
  e. What were the difficulties in the decision-making process, from a curriculum developer’s view?
  f. Where did the proposed learning objectives come from?

- Their views on language teaching and learning management.

- The assessment criteria. How does the assessment help to realize the learning objectives?
II. Points of view on foreign language teaching and learning and curriculum

- The opinion on foreign language teaching and learning (especially related to learning objectives in the curriculum). What were their views on language teaching and learning?

- The opinion on the development of foreign language curriculum in Thai schools both at the government level and school level. The adequacy of the official curriculum in terms of a guideline for school-based curriculum.

- The belief about trends in foreign language teaching and learning

- The definition of terms used in the curriculum and explanation of theories underpinning the ESB curriculum

III. The main details of the interview with the school teachers

1) What did curriculum goals, aims and objectives mean in their terms? (Their understanding of learning objectives)

2) What did they think about them?

3) How much relationship had they found between foreign language teaching and learning and purposed curriculum? How did they help learners achieve the learning outcomes?

4) Did they see any advantages in the new curriculum?

5) What have they learned from government support programs? What sort of training did they have? What did they think about in-service and pre-service support provided by the government?

6) Have they seen any relevance between the official curriculum and support programs?

7) What do they need from the official curriculum as an individual?

8) What did they do before? Have they changed any teaching methodologies with the new curriculum?
Appendix 6
The Translation of the Questionnaires

This questionnaire is a part of a research project entitled A Critical Analysis of the 2001 National Foreign Language Standards-Based Curriculum in the Thai School System conducted by Ms. Supanit Kulsiri, a PhD candidate at the School of Languages and International Education, University of Canberra, Australia.

Information obtained from this questionnaire will be used as baseline data for this research. No parts of the given information will be available to the public for other purposes unless informed consent is obtained from the respondent.

1. What is the position of your school?
   - Pilot schools
   - Affiliated schools
   - Implementing the curriculum in 2002 schools

2. Gender
   - Male
   - Female

3. Email

-----------------------------
4. Educational history
   Undergraduate ........................................................................................................
   Postgraduate ...........................................................................................................
   Others (Please specify) ............................................................................................

5. Have you ever studied abroad? Please specify.
   ........................................................................................................................................

6. If you did not graduate in the field of language teaching and learning, have you ever
   receive certificates or participated in a language teaching and learning seminar?
   ........................................................................................................................................

7. How long have you been teaching English language?
   School level ________ year
   Other level ________ year Please specify ..............................................................

8. Current teaching level ☐ Primary ________ ☐ Secondary ________

9. Have you participated in TESOL (Teaching English to the Speakers of Other Languages)
   seminars (not including this one)? How many times?
   ........................................................................................................................................

10. What do you expect the most from participating in the English language teaching
    seminar? Please specify from the most expected first.
    1. .................................................................................................................................
    2. .................................................................................................................................
    3. .................................................................................................................................

    Others. Please specify .............................................................................................
11. What is your most used language teaching method? Could you please briefly explain your methods of language teaching (e.g. descriptive method, exercise practice method, activities)

12. Where are your methods derived from? (Refer to the most source you take as 1)
   From experience
   From an educational institution
   From government advice
   From conferences
   From self-learning and internet
   Others. Please specify,

13. What methods do you use to evaluate language skills in the classroom?

14. In your opinion, what does authentic assessment mean?

Where did you learn the term from?

Do you think your colleagues would agree with your opinion? Please specify.
15. In your opinion, what does learner-centered learning in language teaching mean?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
Where did you learn the term from? ......................................................................................
Do you think your colleagues would agree with your opinion? Please specify.
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

16. What methods do you use in order to teaching critical thinking along with language skills in your language classroom?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
Where did you learn the term from? ......................................................................................
Do you think your colleagues would agree with your opinion? Please specify.
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

17. Do you think that critical thinking can be learned with language skills?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

18. Do you agree or not agree with the statement that theory in language teaching that came from Western literature, is not suitable for Thai culture? Please give details.
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
19. In your opinion, what are the characteristics of language learning in Thai schools? Why do you think they are unique to Thai schools?

20. What are the strengths and weaknesses of those characteristics? What could be improved?

21. In your opinion, what are the characteristics of language teaching in Thai schools? Why do you think they are unique to Thai teachers?

22. What are the strengths and weaknesses of those characteristics? What could be improved?
Comprehension of the standard based curriculum, opinion on the implementation of standard based curriculum and the clearness of the standard based curriculum and its objectives

The Opinion on Standard Based Curriculum

23. In your opinion, what is Standard Based Curriculum? What are the differences between this curriculum and the previous one?

24. In your opinion, what are the reasons for changing the curriculum?

25. Do you think the information provided about implementing the Standards-Based Curriculum is sufficient?

26. Does the implementation of Standards-Based Curriculum bring difficulties to your teaching?
27. As a language teacher, do you agree with the changes in the curriculum? What do you think about the changes?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

28. Does the Standards-Based Curriculum serve the need in language teaching and learning development?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

29. What do you think about the new language teachers' roles in this new curriculum?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

30. Did your attitude to language teaching and learning change after the changes in the curriculum?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

31. Which curriculum, present or previous curriculum, do you prefer?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
32. In your opinion, what is *expected learning outcome*?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

33. What do you think about the four strands? Do you think that you can teach all of them? Can you order them from easiest to the most difficulty strand?

Strand 1  Language for communication
Strand 2  Language and culture
Strand 3  *Language and other subjects* groups’ relationship
Strand 4  Language, community and world relationship

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

34. Do you plan the curriculum individually or cooperatively with your colleague?

........................................................................................................................................

35. At present, how many hours of language teaching per week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Curriculum</th>
<th>mins/lesson</th>
<th>lessons/week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Curriculum</td>
<td>mins/lesson</td>
<td>lessons/week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. What teaching methods do you use in order to achieve learning objectives?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

37. Using English language in the classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Curriculum</th>
<th>English %</th>
<th>Thai %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Curriculum</td>
<td>English %</td>
<td>Thai %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. What have you learned from the government’s assistance in implementing the new curriculum? What have you been trained about? What are your opinions on the government’s assistants?

39. What have you learned from the training? What kind of training have you received from the government that most helps? What are your opinions on help that you received from the government about the new curriculum?

40. In what aspects of the implementation of the new curriculum do you need assistant from the government?

41. Would you rather have comprehensive teaching instruction in the new curriculum to the *Standard Based Curriculum*?
42. What do you need more from the Standards-Based Curriculum?

....................................................................................................................................... 
....................................................................................................................................... 
....................................................................................................................................... 

43. What are the important factors that determine success or failure of implementing the new curriculum in English language subject?

....................................................................................................................................... 
....................................................................................................................................... 
.......................................................................................................................................