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Abstract

Teaching and learning English at the grade 3 level of primary school in Thailand: Evaluating the effectiveness of three teaching methods

The aim of this study was to examine the effectiveness of communicative language teaching approaches as implemented by teachers teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in selected Thai primary schools. The study developed three teaching units using different methods within a communicative approach, and investigated the extent to which these units assisted EFL teachers at the primary level to implement effective English teaching. A case study approach was adopted involving four in-service EFL teachers in four public primary schools in Maha Sarakham, Thailand. These teachers were purposively selected as EFL teachers who did not graduate with an English major. Each teacher implemented all of the three units: a unit of a weak version of communicative language teaching (CLT weak version), a unit of the concentrated language encounters method using paper materials (CLE+paper), and a unit of the concentrated language encounters using computer-based language activities (CLE+COBLA). Data were gathered using both qualitative and quantitative methods. The qualitative data were gathered through unstructured interviews, observational field notes and audio taped transcriptions; the quantitative data were collected using an observation form, and students’ pre-tests and post-tests.

The study found that most teachers had difficulties implementing approaches to English teaching provided. Only the teacher with pedagogical experience was able to effectively carry out her class through three phases of the CLT weak version unit, meanwhile the other three participating teachers were stuck only in the first two phases. The same three teachers also faced difficulties teaching the CLE + paper unit. All teachers implemented the CLE+COBLA unit effectively. The CLT weak version unit yielded significant improving scores in two classes taught by the teachers who had much pedagogical experience. The CLE + paper unit yielded significant result only when implemented by the teacher who was pedagogically experienced and had sufficient preparation time. The CLE+COBLA units were appealing and yielded significant improvement for all classes. Students from all participating classes had positive perspectives to learn with the CLE+COBLA unit. Most of them, except those in the class with an effective teacher, found lessons in the CLT and CLE+paper units
were difficult. However, they were happy to do activities in phases 3-5 of the CLE method in both paper unit and COBLA unit. Two teachers viewed the CLT unit difficult. Most of them, except the one who had much English teaching experience and had enough time for teaching preparation, perceived the CLE+paper unit difficult and less attractive for their students. All teachers accepted that the CLE+COBLA unit was appealing for their students. Many conditions impacting classroom pedagogy were found. These were teachers’ English proficiency, overloaded teachers, too many subjects to teach, extra school duties, quality and accessibility of the teaching materials, and the insufficient activeness of the teaching methods.

The research findings show that EFL teachers in Thai primary schools need to be supported by teaching materials or innovations which enhance their language development and confidence in teaching English. Training programs for various pedagogic developments need to be provided for the in-service primary EFL teachers. Educational administrators need to address the problems of the excessive workloads of the primary teachers as an important strategy for improving English language teaching in Thai schools.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 English teaching and learning in non-native English speaking countries

It is undeniable that during the past decades English has been playing an increasingly crucial role in all spheres of life for people around the world. Globalisation has made English a pivotal factor for the development of all countries in terms of economy, information technology, politics, education and cultures (Carter & Nunan, 2001). As a result, most countries have realised that the English communicative competence of their citizens must be urgently developed and English pedagogy in all schools must be improved to meet this goal. In many countries, in addition to their own languages, English is used as a second language (ESL). It is used as the medium for teaching and learning in schools, and for official purposes in government and business sections. In many other countries, English is neither a home language nor official language, but rather is taught and learned in schools as a foreign language to prepare students to communicate with foreigners. In these cases it is known as EFL, English as a Foreign Language. Recently, these countries have extended the time for learning English, and English language teaching has started at the lower levels in primary schools.

The reasons for teaching English to younger children vary. It is believed that young children are more likely to adapt to sound systems and acquire phonological patterns of a new language than adults (Lee & Azman, 2004). Additionally, there has been a call for early commencement of English teaching and learning (p.6) because of the public disappointment with the poor English learning outcomes of students at secondary and tertiary levels. In some countries, English has been introduced to young students as early as grade 3, for example, Taiwan (in 2005), South Korea (in 1997), and Vietnam (in 1996) (Scott & Chen, 2004; Lee, 2004; Sinh, 2006), while in other countries such as Indonesia, children start learning English from grade 4 (Wiwiek, 2004). Japan introduced English conversation into the primary schools’ curriculum in 2000 (Jones, 2004).

However, the successful implementation of English teaching and learning at lower school levels in these countries is challenging, particularly in terms of teaching methods, teachers’ proficiency and the facilitation of teaching and learning improvements. In
keeping with international trends, Thailand, where people learn and use English as a foreign language (EFL) and which has mandated teaching and learning English in schools for more than a hundred years, has realised the increasing importance of the English language. Thus, English teaching and learning has recently been developed and expanded to include a wider range of people including younger children. It may be useful to recount some of the developments over the last century or so in relation to English teaching and learning in Thailand.

1.2 Development of English teaching and learning in Thailand

English teaching and learning in Thailand can be traced back to the reign of King Rama III (1824 – 1851) (Durongphan, Aksornkool, Sawangwong & Tiancharoen, 1982). Intensive learning and teaching of English began in the royal palace compound in the reign of King Rama IV (1851 – 1865). Native English speaking teachers were hired to teach the royal children and selected royal officials from the high aristocracy. The objective of learning English at that time was to acculturate royal officials who were in contact with westerners in terms of trade and diplomacy, and to cope with western colonial power (Aksornkool, 1985). In fact, since 1890, English has been included in the National Education Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1996). Since that time, the English Curriculum has occasionally been changed and adjusted many times in terms of content, and teaching and learning methodology. English as a school subject has been alternately considered as compulsory or optional. In 1921, it became a compulsory subject of the curriculum starting from Grade 5 (Aksornkool, 1985). Influenced by the educational and religious tradition of Thai culture, the teaching and learning of English at that period occurred primarily through rote memorization and grammar translation. In 1960 English was included in the curriculum as a prestigious elective subject. An audio-lingual method was introduced and implemented to replace the old traditional methods with the expectation that it would enhance learners’ communicative competence. However, this method had limited success in enabling Thai students to communicate through English language (Foley, 2005).

Another change took place in 1977 when foreign languages were classified as an elective subject beginning from Grade 5. Most of the schools nationwide still selected English language for their students. During this time the communicative approach to English language teaching was introduced (Foley, 2005). This approach focuses on
having learners use the language through as much involvement in communicative activities as possible. However, the studies of Nampeth (1981), Ratanapredagul (1981), Choradol (1986) and Sribunruang (1991) found that a number of Thai EFL teachers were using a low number of communicative activities in their classes. As a result of the unsatisfactory outcome for successful English implementation, a dramatic change took place in 1996 and English was made compulsory for all students from grade 1 on. The objective of learning English was for students to be able to use the English language in communication, in acquisition of knowledge, and for study at tertiary level. Following this change, the Thai National Basic Education Curriculum 2001 classified the twelve-year period of school into four levels, and English curriculum was accordingly classified into four levels: Preparatory, Beginner, Developing, and Expanding (Ministry of Education, 2001). The first two levels relate to the curriculum in primary schools and the other two relate to the secondary schools. The Preparatory level is implemented in grades 1 to 3, the Beginner level in grades 4 to 6, the Developing level in grades 7 to 9, and the Expanding level in grades 10 to 12.

The Ministry of Education has articulated its specific expectations for students after they have finished each level. At the Preparatory level, after the first three years in primary school, the students are expected to be able to use English to converse about their personal life, family, school, surrounding issues, food, drink, and simple relationships. They are also expected to understand at their level of competence the culture of English speaking people. They are expected to be able to use simple sentences involving a maximum of 300-450 words (vocabulary), to present and retrieve information in English, and to use English for entertainment activities (Ministry of Education, 2001). When completing the Beginner level after six years in primary schools, students are expected to be able to converse using longer dialogues in English, and to be able to read and exchange information on the same topics as in the Preparatory level, but also topics about recreation, health, weather, purchasing and selling. They are expected to be able to use a maximum of 1200 words (vocabulary) in the form of single sentences, compound sentences in reading and conversation. They are also expected to be able to utilise their English to present and retrieve information in disciplines other than English, to understand English speakers’ cultures, and to use English language for further study and entertainment activities (Ministry of Education, 2001).
Under current arrangements, in the Thai National Basic Education Curriculum 2001, there is a greater emphasis on active learning than previously, and teachers are expected to implement and adapt many pedagogical concepts and techniques to the level of their classes in their teaching of English. For example, teachers are introduced to the concepts of teaching English: such as learner-centred language curriculum, communicative language teaching, content-based instruction, project-based learning, task-based learning, and constructivism (Ministry of Education, 2001). And, teachers need to understand the concepts and procedures of the approach they are using, so that they can play the role of good organisers and facilitators for English communicative activities. They also need to be proficient in the English language so that they can be good models and leaders for their classes. This issue is a key one for the current study.

1.3 Children’s cognitive development and language learning
In order to implement the suggested teaching methods effectively and successfully in an EFL primary classroom, a basic knowledge of child development and learning needs to be insightfully related to EFL pedagogy. It is believed that children’s cognitive development and language learning occur through interaction with the surrounding environment and social contexts. Also, children’s knowledge is thought to be constructed when they take part in activities presented to them by others in the surrounding world, and also through the support and scaffolding of these more experienced others (Cameron, 2001). More knowledgeable people can help children to learn by talking to them or asking them some questions while they are playing or doing tasks. The interaction between the more expert and the children, when tuned to suit the children’s level, means comprehensible input is presented. Children process this input internally and eventually acquire the language they have been exposed to (Krashen, 1982). Children can better undertake the tasks that they can nearly do by themselves with help or guidance from adults or more experienced others (Vygotsky, [1934] 1978). According to Piaget’s notion, children’s learning and development occurs through several chronological stages, from birth to the age of over twelve (White, Hayes, & Livesey, 2005). Through each stage children construct and acquire knowledge from interaction with different features of surrounding environments. Children develop their knowledge through their sensory impressions and actions and concrete contexts, and they are able to learn through imagination and abstract phenomena as they grow older. Children, aged from five to twelve, which is the age of students in the primary schools,
can learn through objects, words and images that represent the surrounding world. They can understand the outside world well through concrete experiences, but have difficulty dealing with abstract issues. Knowledge about children’s learning and cognitive development is the basis for determining classroom activities, teaching and learning aids which are appropriate to the stage of children’s development.

1.4 Communicative language teaching (CLT)
The activities for EFL classes are designed according to principles of meaningful input, which means developing engaging tasks and teaching and learning aids suitable for students’ ages. These activities need to be so engaging that students become enthusiastically involved in learning and using the language in the class. The communicative language teaching approach (CLT), which has been introduced to and implemented in Thai EFL classes for more than twenty years, based on principles identified above. The goal of the CLT implementation is that students gain an ability to use English effectively because they develop a competence with grammatical knowledge, and with functions of language suitable to context, language discourse, and strategies to compensate for their inability to express what they want to say (Hedge, 2000). These competences can be developed through communicative activities in classrooms, such as information sharing, negotiation of meaning, and completing information gaps. These activities can be carried out through group work, pair work and individual work (Richards & Rogers, 2001). In a CLT classroom, the teacher plays three main roles: an activity facilitator, a participant observer and a learner. This means the teacher of a CLT class needs to be competent in providing activities, be proficient in English so that he/she can use the language in the activities, and have and ability to observe and learn from classroom implementation (Breen & Candlin, 1980).

The approach that is currently implemented in Thai EFL classes tends to be a weak version of CLT. A strong version is rarely carried out in Thai schools, because students and teachers are unable to use English to interact in classes as intended by the strong version of this approach. The weak version of CLT consists of three main phases, namely presentation, practice, and production (Holliiday, 1994). These three phases are necessary for students in EFL contexts because there is no English context for students to be immersed in. All models of language have to be provided for students in the
presentation phase and communicative situations are provided only through the practice and production phases.

1.5 Concentrated language encounters (CLE)
Another way that the EFL class can offer an English speaking context and communicative situations for students is through a related method called Concentrated Language Encounters (CLE). With this method students learn and use the language through five phases (Rattanavich, 1992). The language models are presented through the starter story or tasks in the first phase of CLE. Students are encouraged to practice using the language through talks and discussions about the story or the task in the second phase. They have opportunities to jointly write a text for the whole class in the third phase, and write a text for their own group in the fourth phase. They practice the discrete points of language through various activities in the fifth phase. CLT in its weak version and CLE are different in that the CLT provides learners from small parts of language to the whole part, while CLE involves learners in the whole part of language in the provided situation before embarking on discrete points of the language. The common feature of these two methods is that both need the proficient teachers in the classroom, teachers who can carry out attractive and appropriate activities. Teachers’ English proficiency in the CLE class needs to be sufficient for them to be good models and to provide effective scaffolding for their students.

1.6 Computer-based language activities (COBLA)
Computer-based language activity software (COBLA) has been constructed to facilitate the teachers’ presentation of accurate models of language and language activities to their classes. It stores a starter story as language context and models, and includes various activities for students to respond to. Each activity is presented to the students through multi-media information such as texts, animated illustrations and sound. The lessons can be played back many times. Therefore, students can access ample models of language and language contexts in various activities. Students are able to select and click to have the texts read aloud or they may choose to respond to a computer and get some evaluating feedback immediately. These multi-sensory features of the computer-based activities are found effective for engaging students in the activities at high and long levels of concentration (Pearman, 2003) and for helping students remember vocabulary for longer periods of time (Siribodhi, 1995; Clement, 1997; Yu-Huei, 2002). Due to the
fact that most schools throughout Thailand have been provided with computers for school administration and for classroom pedagogy, according to Thai National Education Reform under the National Act 1999, COBLA designed in line with CLE methods is viewed as being helpful for the EFL teachers in Thai primary schools, as they face the challenges in their EFL classes. The promising effectiveness of using computers to assist teaching and learning English is evidenced by the studies of many Thai EFL teachers (Siribodhi, 1995; Chonlapap, 2002; Prakobnun, 2002).

1.7 Challenges of EFL pedagogy in Thai schools

The Thai curriculum puts high expectations on students’ English learning but there is increasing dissatisfaction with the quality of teaching and learning English in Thailand. The majority of students who have studied English for more than ten years are still unable to use English at advanced levels by the end of the study, and students’ English achievements at both primary and secondary levels do not meet national expectations (The Office of Education, Religion, and Culture Development in Educational Region 10, 2003). The reports of the Bureau of Education Testing reveal that the mean scores of English achievements tests of all grade students in all schools under the Office of the Basic Education Commission of Thailand have actually tended to decrease in recent years as shown in table 1.

Table 1. English mean scores of grade 6 and 9 students in Thailand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.56</td>
<td>47.40</td>
<td>41.14</td>
<td>37.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.95</td>
<td>45.31</td>
<td>37.92</td>
<td>32.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


One key obstacle to improving quality of English teaching and learning lies with the English teachers themselves. Research conducted under the Basic Education Curriculum 2001, investigating the teachers’ perspectives on teaching and learning English found the majority of Thai English-teachers still have limited English proficiency and misunderstand the concept of a communicative approach. Therefore, they are unable to use English appropriately and are incapable of providing communicative activities in their classes (Butler, 2004; Prapaisit, 2004; Nonkuketkhong, 2006). This is a common
problem in the majority of Thai schools, especially at the primary level where there is a
dearth of teachers who majored in English. The present day teachers of English simply
cannot facilitate the kinds of interaction required for a communicative approach in their
classrooms. The limited number of proficient teachers and the decreasing students’
scores in the national English test each year are a double bind for all concerned.

The Ministry of Education of Thailand reported in 1997 that 66 % of English teachers in
schools throughout the country did not graduate in English (Ministry of Education,
1997). The lack of the teachers majoring in English is more critical in remote schools.
For example, only 3.41% of 850 teachers in sixty-six primary schools in the district
where the field work of this research was conducted had an English major degree (The
Office of Basic Education of Maha Sarakham, Region 1, 2005) and half of these English
majors were teaching in two big schools in town. Thus, the percentage in most schools is
very low and the indication is that most English teachers did not graduate with English
as a major subject. Most of these teachers lack the ability to teach English with
confidence and accuracy. Even though the Thai Ministry of Education recommends
many teaching methods that emphasise communicative activities, these teachers
understandably continue to run their classes in the traditionally passive ways, without
communicative activities or communicative tasks. Most of them rely predominantly on
Thai to clarify any problems of communication in their classes (Pripaisit, 2004;
Sinprajakpol, 2004; Nonkukhetkhong, 2006), thus further marginalising English in the
classroom.

It is clear, as Masaeng (1989) has argued, that a classroom with no stimulating and
enjoyable activities or innovation, results in negative consequences for young Thai
students. The negative attitude towards English and the limited English competence of
young students then impacts on their learning at the higher levels (Chomdokmai, 1998).
Classes become boring and teachers rely heavily on text-book centred approaches to
pedagogy. As a result, teachers are unable to support children’s learning of English, and
children become even more alienated and ‘turned off’. This has resulted in the majority
of Thai students being unable to use English productively, despite their twelve years of
learning English at school.
The problem can really only be tackled when both students’ and teachers’ English knowledge is improved. However, to realise this expectation is a daunting task for all involved institutions. This is especially due to the fact that highly proficient students are the products of highly proficient teachers and vice versa. Students can only learn English effectively at higher levels when they have an adequate foundation developed in their early levels of schooling. It is a great challenge for the Thai Education Ministry to realise its high expectations of Thai students when the teachers of English at primary levels lack understanding of English teaching and learning and are not proficient in English themselves. In order to overcome the difficulties in teaching and learning that Thai EFL teachers are facing, these primary EFL teachers need to be provided with programs and innovations that can assist them to develop their English proficiency and enhance their understanding regarding English pedagogy.

Whilst a number of studies have found Thai EFL teachers face some challenges in implementing communicative language teaching, CLE has been found to yield satisfactory results for students’ EFL learning (Rattanavich, 1990; Thongsuthi, 1990; Ketthong, 1991; Pakhadee, 1998). However, the successful CLE instruction in these studies was conducted by capable EFL teachers who were proficient in EFL pedagogy and who could use the target language for interaction in their classrooms. Therefore, the challenge becomes: how do we support teachers themselves in the context in which they are struggling to teach children when they do not have an English major? Do the computer-based lessons assist these teachers to overcome the difficulties they have in implementing CLE in their EFL classes? Due to many studies finding that computer-assisted language learning programs can help students to learn language (Siribodhi, 1995; Clement, 1997; Yu-Huei, 2002), the programs are also expected to encourage primary teachers to improve their teaching of English as a second or foreign language, but do they in fact do so? There appears to be great promise in the combined possibilities of CLE methods of teaching language and the use of computer-assisted technologies for students’ language learning. This research was undertaken in large part to assess this possibility.

1.8 Purposes of the study
The main purpose of this study is to examine which teaching methods are effectively implemented by Thai EFL teachers at grade 3 level in Thai rural primary schools. The
study examines how effectively these teachers implemented different methods of communicative language teaching. In particular, the study aims to explore how the four participating teachers carries out the Communicative Language Teaching in the weak version; and how they implemented the Concentrated Language Encounters teaching method when using two different sets of teaching materials. One specific purpose is to examine what challenges the teachers are facing during the implementation, what enables them to implement their EFL classes effectively; whether computer-based language activities (COBLA) can help the teachers to carry out their EFL classes effectively; and what are the perspectives of the teachers towards teaching by different methods. Another purpose is to examine students’ learning from, and their perspectives towards different teaching and learning methods.

1.9 Research questions
As this study is intended to help Thai EFL primary teachers to overcome the difficulties in implementing successful teaching methods in their English class, three teaching units with different teaching methods and materials are provided. The first unit is designed in line with the weak version of the communicative language teaching (CLT), the common method carried out in Thai EFL classes. The second and third units are designed around CLE methods facilitated by two sets of teaching materials: paper printed materials and computer-based language activities (COBLA). The research questions are as follow.

1. How do Thai primary EFL teachers implement communicative language teaching through three methods: weak version of CLT, CLE+paper printed materials and CLE+COBLA in grade 3 English classrooms?
2. What effects do the three methods have on grade 3 students’ English learning achievements, and on their perspectives on learning English?
3. What are teachers’ perspectives on implementing each of the three methods in grade 3 English classrooms?

1.10 Significance of the study
This study explores the challenges that Thai primary teachers encounter in their EFL classes, and seeks techniques and innovations that might help the teachers carry out their teaching effectively. The study hopes to bring about crucial insights into classroom implementation for EFL educators and, as a result develop a greater awareness of the
obstacles faced in EFL classes. Additionally, it seeks to establish what assistance the teachers needed and how to support the teachers of English who have limited proficiency in English and English pedagogy that requires effective implementation of the communicative language teaching approach in their classroom. It is expected that the findings from this study would provide information about practical aspects of EFL pedagogy in the primary classroom, so that in the future, the researcher can present and discuss about effective EFL pedagogy in his pre-service teachers’ classes, and can work more effectively with in-service teachers in the region to develop their EFL teaching. It is thought the findings might reveal a need for support on computer technologies, after showing how effectively existing technologies are used in the primary schools. Such information would be beneficial for the Ministry of Education so it can provide adequate and suitable support for English teachers in primary schools. It is expected also, that the study will make a contribution to the field of language education in Thailand and also other countries where English is taught as EFL.

1.11 Summary and structure of the thesis

This chapter presents the situation of EFL implementation in Asia, and the evolution of EFL teaching and learning in Thailand. It also provides a brief overview of children’s development and learning as it informs fundamental theories of language pedagogy. Then, the challenges facing Thai Education running EFL pedagogy are established. The chapter argues that Thai students have encountered declining achievement mean scores in EFL implementation in both primary and secondary schools, and that there is the need to find the ways to help the EFL teachers who are facing difficulties with implementation of particular approaches to teaching and learning in their EFL classes. It is explained that this research aims to explore the factors which influence the effectiveness of EFL implementation in Thai primary classrooms, when teachers are provided with sets of lessons designed in line with three different methods using different sets of teaching materials. Findings from this study may be useful for EFL educators and educational administrators to provide suitable support for EFL classes in Thai primary schools.

Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature relevant to children’s development, English pedagogy and research. First, theories relating to children’s development and language learning are described. Second, second language learning and teaching are presented in
terms of formal instruction in second language class; input, output and interaction in second language acquisition; and children’s second language classroom. Then more information about the communicative language teaching (CLT), the concentrated language encounters (CLE), and computer assisted language learning (CALL) are presented. Finally, the research in the implementation of CLT, CLE, and CALL in the EFL classes, and the gap that these research streams present in the Thai primary classes is described.

Chapter 3 presents the framework for the methodology used in the study. The research design, participants, instruments, procedures of developing materials for implementation and data collection and analyses are described.

Chapter 4 offers findings in the forms of qualitative descriptions from classroom observations and field notes and evidences of audio tape transcriptions. The findings from different sources are discussed and triangulated unit by unit.

Chapter 5 reports the findings from quantitative data. First, students’ learning achievement from the implementation of each teaching unit across four schools is presented. Second, a comparison of three teaching methods used in each school is presented school by school. The third section presented the conclusion of the results of the implementation of all teaching units across four participating teachers. The fourth section presents the results of the implementation of two sets of CLE method; CLE using COBLA and CLE using paper materials. The following two sections report the findings from student and teacher interviews.

Chapter 6 presents my discussion of the results of the study. The limitations and implications of the study are also discussed. Recommendations for further research in the field of teaching English to EFL primary classes are suggested.
Chapter 2
Literature review

English language education world-wide has experienced dramatic changes in recent decades. Besides a revolution in pedagogic methodology, one of the apparent changes is the increased instruction time used. Many countries, particularly the ones with EFL settings, have lowered the age of learners starting to learn English. In order to implement the second or foreign language effectively, it is crucial for language educators to understand children’s psychological development at different ages and have an accurate concept of approaches to language teaching and teaching aids in use. This chapter reviews and presents the current understanding of children’s development and language learning, second and foreign language learning, communicative language teaching, concentrated language learning, and computer-assisted language learning.

2.1 Children’s cognitive and sociocultural development

Development and language learning in children can be explained by two influential theories: Piaget’s theory and Vygotsky’s theory. Both theories regard the surrounding world as the important factors for children’s development and learning (Cameron, 2001). Piaget’s theory explains that children are active learners who construct their own knowledge from interaction with the surrounding world and do so in identifiable stages of development. When children confront the surrounding environment they take action to solve the problems presented by the environment. Through this interaction children internalise the action in their mind, and their thought is derived from the action. Through this process knowledge is actively constructed and thinking is developed (Cameron, 2001). According to the Piagetian notion, children’s cognitive development takes place in four discrete stages: sensorimotor, preoperational, concrete operational and formal operational stage (White, Hayes & Livesey, 2005). All children have to pass through these four stages in a determined chronological order. Infants in the sensorimotor stage, aged from birth to two years old, develop their thoughts through experiencing the world around them via their immediate sensory impressions and actions. They represent the world by drawing on direct sensory experience. Children in the preoperational stage, aged around 2 to 7, learn from and use objects, words, and images to represent the world. In this stage children practise, strengthen, and extend their representational skills through pretending and symbolic play. The play in this stage develops children’s ability to
sustain their attention, memorise, logically reason, create their language and adopt a perspective. Children aged around 7 to 12 in the concrete operational stage can create and manipulate representations of the outside world in order to solve practical problems. They can identify reasons for the existence of immediate and tangible problems. However, children in this stage have difficulty in dealing with hypothetical and abstract events. In the formal operational stage children are about twelve years old or above. Children, in this stage, can reason logically about concrete events and abstract symbols. Understanding about these stages in the learning development of children is the basis for decisions about what are suitable activities for various levels of English classes.

In contrast to the notion of development stages which are formed from the views of Piaget, Vygotsky’s theory focuses on the influence of the social environment (Berk & Winsler, 1995). According to Vygotsky’s theory, children learn and develop their thoughts through collaboration and interaction with more knowledgeable members of their society. During the interaction language is used to express and exchange thoughts, as well as to influence one another’s thought and behaviour. The cooperative dialogues between children and their more proficient partners, together with the partners’ guidance or assistance while doing the tasks, become internalized by the children and this enables them to guide their own actions and to accomplish skills themselves (Berk & Winsler, 1995). Vygotsky calls the distance of the children’s development from the level of their existing competence to the level of their developed competence after being assisted by adults ‘the zone of proximal development’ (ZPD). He states that children’s learning occurs effectively in this zone (Vygotsky, [1934], 1978). Both Piaget’s and Vygotsky’s theories have influenced current approaches to language teaching.

According to both Piaget’s and Vygotsky’s theories, the tasks which are provided to promote students’ learning and thinking development need to be engaging and suitable for the students’ various stages of cognitive development. The tasks and settings provided for children in a classroom need to be in their ZPDs and relevant to their social histories and social experiences. This means that the activities have to be challenging for the children and slightly above the level of their current ability. Teachers also need to provide suitable assistance for each student at the right time. Of course, teachers have to be in a position to stretch learners through interactive activities.
2.2 Children’s language development

Children’s language development is a social phenomenon. The interaction between children and their parents, older siblings or other adults using both physical actions and verbal language enables them to express their feelings and their needs (Christie, Enz & Vukelich, 2003). During the interaction adults interpret what children are trying to express and scaffold them with some questions and models of appropriate wordings or actions. Children watch, listen and imitate what people say and respond to them. This process encourages children to internalise the ‘input’, and eventually to produce meaningful and correct utterances in spoken language (Painter, 1986).

Generally, children learn language well because they have natural abilities and behaviours to enhance their language learning (Moon, 2000). Firstly, children like to take risks and experiment with language. This increases their opportunities to get feedback from others, which enable them to modify their language and use it accurately. Secondly, children have a good instinct for interpreting the sense or meaning of a situation through using their knowledge of everyday life and the clues provided by the situation. This ability enables children to work out what is going on in the situation, and what the words mean. Thirdly, children are capable of picking up ‘chunks’ of language (Ellis, 1990) and can use these ready-made utterances to communicate and take part in conversations in the early stages of language learning. Later they may be able to break down these phrases and recombine the words in new ways. The fourth characteristic enhancing their language learning is that children like to have fun. A pleasant activity can involve and absorb children for a long time, hence increasing their exposure to language input and their chance to practise the language in meaningful ways. Their positive attitudes towards the language are also increased. The fifth characteristic which supports children to better learn language is that children like to join in action. Children are naturally curious and active, therefore they are eager to interact with other people and the surrounding environment through physical activity and to experience things at first hand. The sixth characteristic that makes children learn language effectively is that children tend to be more enthusiastic and willing to talk than older children, even though they have very limited language. Young children will talk a lot and happily when they are engaged in an interesting activity and when they feel secure. This talk is useful for language learning in that it increases children’s opportunities to practise using the language. The process of children learning their first language, and the characteristics
and abilities involved in language learning can be drawn on as a basis for the insights into how children learn a second or foreign language (Ellis, 1985).

### 2.3 Second language learning and teaching

Children are able to learn a second or foreign language effectively when they have specific purposes for learning the language, and when they are provided with supportive learning conditions, sufficient motivation, plentiful time for learning, and adequate exposure to meaningful input (Moon, 2000). However, in contexts where the target language is learned as a foreign language, language learning conditions are rarely found in the general surroundings. They have to be mostly provided in the language classroom. Moreover, the procedures of foreign language pedagogy draw on the procedures of second language pedagogy. In order to better understand foreign language pedagogy, it is essential to understand second language pedagogy. In this chapter, I provide an overview of it under the following headings: the role of formal instruction in second language learning, the role of input, output and interaction in the second language learning, and children’s second language classrooms.

#### 2.3.1 The role of formal instruction in second language learning

As discussed in the previous sections, language learning occurs through interaction between learners and the surrounding people in a supportive context. In second or foreign language situations such interactions and contexts are mostly provided through instruction in a classroom. Second language classroom instruction is a planned intervention carried out to enhance language learning in a condition where settings, participants, topics and purposes are explicitly organised (Ellis, 1990). It can be planned in three ways, according to its intended focuses, namely: form-focused instruction, meaning-focused instruction, and a combination of form and meaning-focused instruction (p. 14).

Form-focused instruction encourages learners to focus their attention on specific properties of the linguistic code. It is undertaken according to the assumption that learners are able to learn what they are taught, and that directing the learners’ attention to the formal properties of the code can contribute to second language learning. The instruction may be carried out inductively, in that it simply provides plentiful
opportunities for learners to produce utterances containing the target item; or, it can be conducted deductively, by explicitly explaining the properties of the item.

Meaning-focused instruction provides activities that involve learners in authentic communication in the classroom. The instruction activities are designed to encourage learners to communicate using whatever resources they have for the communication, whether linguistic, non-linguistic or both. Through communication learners develop strategic competence to deal with communication problems, pick up new language knowledge from the comprehensible input they are exposed to (Long, 1996), and eventually respond to their counterparts using the output constructed in their mind (Swain & Suzuki, 2008). Meaning-focused instruction is partly associated with both communicative language teaching (CLT) and concentrated language encounters (CLE) which will be overviewed in the following sections.

Another form of instruction in second language class is a combination of form and meaning-focused instruction. This integral form of instruction provides learners with activities of communication in which the planned structures are intended to be used. Ellis (1990) noted in his studies that although the learners were able to use the grammatical point they had learned correctly in a planned situation, they failed to use these linguistic forms spontaneously. He claims that in order to be able to use the target language accurately and spontaneously, learners need to be provided with sufficient form-focused instruction and meaning-focused instruction so that students are exposed to communicative activities and able to use the structures planned in the activities. Such instructional and communicative activities can be provided in a second language classroom. This way of instruction is also congruent with both the CLT and CLE methods.

Formal instruction has an effect on learners’ language development. Classroom learners can learn more rapidly and progress further than natural learners (Ellis, 1990). Formal instruction aids the acquisition of useful formulas because learners may pick up the ready-made phrases from the instruction although teachers also aim to teach the learners the rules of language. Even though formal instruction has no major impact on the acquisition of linguistic rules, it can have an immediate effect on communication, providing that certain conditions are met and if the linguistic complexity level is suitable
to the level of a child’s development (Ellis, 1990). The instruction directed at complex structures can prove successful if the learner is developmentally ready to acquire the new feature, and when the instruction proceeds in conformity with the natural sequence of development.

2.3.2 The role of input, output and interaction in second language acquisition

Input
Input, in second language acquisition research is the language that is used either by a native speaker or by other learners to address second language learners (Ellis, 1985). It contains a communication-intended message which needs both the learner’s attention and comprehension (Vanpatten, 2003). Whenever the learner is actively engaged in trying to comprehend something in the second language, he/she is receiving input which then serves as the basis for language acquisition. The message the learner attempts to comprehend may be in the form of an oral utterance or a written sentence. There are two major types of input, namely conversational and non-conversational input (Vanpatten, 2003). Conversational input is the language that a learner hears in a two-way communication in which the learner is taking part. The learner can receive this kind of input through everyday conversations, classroom interactions, and games. Non-conversational input is the language that learners hear when they are not part of the interaction: for example, when there is input from TV, radio, or a formal lecture. In CLT and CLE classes input is provided via various activities throughout the process: for example it is in communicative exercises and activities as reviewed in the teaching method section.

Input processing
Second language acquisition takes place by the facilitation of two factors: second language data availability as learner input; and learner’s internal mechanisms for data processing (Ellis, 1985). The input that effectively caters for second language learning in a classroom must be comprehensible for a learner. To make the input comprehensible teachers need to adjust the language they use to make it appropriate to the learners. The adjusted speech contains some of the following features: shorter utterances, fewer complex grammatical structures and disfluencies, a simplified vocabulary, more imperative directives, and more clarification requests (Ellis, 1985). When the input is
comprehensible, learners can process and hold it in their memory. Such adjustments however, presuppose a capability on the part of the teacher.

Input processing refers to the way learners attempt to comprehend and obtain linguistic data from the message in the language directed to them. Input processing consists of at least two subprocesses: making form-meaning connections, and parsing (Vanpatten, 2003). In making form-meaning connections learners try to comprehend the language they are listening to or are reading by applying whatever strategies that enable them to access meaning. For example, they seek out content words in the utterance or sentence. The content words guide the learners to briefly hold bits and parts of information in their memory (Vanpatten, 2003).

Parsing is another subprocess of input processing which contributes to input comprehension. Parsing refers to the projection or mapping of syntactic structuring onto a heard utterance. For example, when learners hear a sentence, they know which noun is the subject and which is the object. Or when encountering the beginning of a sentence with subject and verb, they can compute what must come next as an object. For example, when a learner hears this utterance ‘Yesterday I was sick. I went to see ..........’, they are able to know that the missing word after the verb see is ‘the doctor’ (Vanpatten, 2003).

Communicative activities which are designed in line with the understanding of input processing enhance learner’s comprehension and correct responses.

The role of input in second language learning
Several features of input influence second language learning (Hatch, 1978c; 1978d cited in Ellis, 1985). These features include formulaic speech, vertical structures and frequency of models. Formulaic speech input, or ready-made chunks of speech, can be used by learners in immediate communication. Later on the learners break them down into their constituent parts, and by doing so the learners’ interlanguage system is augmented. These chunks are raw materials for the learner’s internal mechanisms. An ability to remember and to use the ready-made chunks in communication then contributes indirectly to the route of second language acquisition. Another feature of input is vertical structures. Vertical structures are a process whereby, during a conversation, learners repeat a previous utterance produced by native interlocutors, incorporating it into their utterance. The learners may also delete and substitute some
words into the new utterance. Vertical structures extend and sustain a conversation. Another feature of input influencing second language learning is the frequent modelling of specific grammatical forms. When specific grammatical forms are modelled the learners then subconsciously acquire the forms.

Comprehensible input is important for second language acquisition. Learners can acquire the language when they receive input which contains exemplars of the language a little above their existing understanding but from which they can infer meaning (Krashen, 1985). However, learners’ internal processing mechanism can work only when the learners can comprehend the input, leading to the acquisition of the language (Ellis, 1985). Ellis suggests that input can be made comprehensible by the use of structures and vocabulary the learners have already known. Additionally, the input should be in a ‘here-and-now’ oriented topic. The here-and-now input, such as a story about students’ everyday life and surrounding environment, enables learners to use the linguistic and extralinguistic contexts and also their general knowledge to interpret the language directed to them. Then the learners assimilate the comprehensible input into their interlanguage system. Second language acquisition occurs through this process. Learners acquire the second language rapidly when they receive a high quality of input; desire to communicate in the second language; can control the propositional content by themselves; and process the input adhering to the ‘here-and-now’ principle (Ellis, 1985). In EFL classes, it is essential that communicative activities are incorporated with the principles above, so that students can understand and learn the language effectively.

**Output**

Output in second language acquisition is the language that learners produce to express the meaning of what they want to communicate. Output happens through two steps: access and production (Vanpatten, 2003). When learners need to generate a message to present their thought they access appropriate lexical items and grammatical forms to express particular meanings. Then they use production strategies to put together the lexical items and forms and express the created message in the form of sentence or utterance.

Output is important for second language acquisition in several ways (Swain & Suzuki, 2008). For example, the need to produce output pushes the learners to use alternative
means to overcome communication breakdowns. Frequent use of the language gives more chances to the learners to test hypotheses about the target language, and encourages them to move from understanding meaning to understanding syntactic structures (Gass & Mackey, 2007). For example, when learners produce a problematic utterance and receive feedback showing that their utterance is not comprehensible, they are pushed to reformulate their utterance more syntactically accurately. Continued use of the target language brings about more fluent and automatic production (Gass & Mackey, 2007). Output production is the last stage of the three important stages of weak version communicative language teaching.

**Interaction in the second language classroom**

Classroom interaction refers to the conversations between a teacher and learners, and amongst learners in the classroom (Tsui, 2001; Gibbons, 2003; Gass & Mackey, 2007). The classroom interaction process is undertaken through learners receiving input, comprehending the input, producing output and responding to the input, and receiving feedback on the production. One important mechanism for engaging is the teacher’s allocation of appropriate turns for the learners, with the learners having sufficient opportunities for turn-taking. At each turn, the teacher asks the learners a question; the learners process the question and respond to the teacher (Tsui, 2001). Of course, teachers may face difficulty in engaging learners in interaction if questions are too complex, or the learners feel anxious about learning a new language. If the questions are incomprehensible, teachers need to modify the questions by paraphrasing difficult words, simplifying syntax, and making the main point salient. In order to enhance learners’ confidence to respond, the teacher should allow waiting-time for them to process a question and formulate an answer. Additionally, teachers should provide opportunities for learners to rehearse their responses by consulting with their friends, or writing down the response before presenting it to the class (Tsui, 2001).

Teacher’s questions can be classified into two types: display questions, the answer to which is known by the questioner; and referential questions, the answer to which is not known by the questioner. Display questions are predominant in teacher’s interaction with learners (Tsui, 2001). They are central resources for teachers and students to organize their lessons and produce language pedagogy, through the essential parts of language, which are pre-planned for the learners to acquire (Lee, 2006). Meanwhile,
referential questions are more conducive to production of lengthier and more complex responses by learners (Tsui, 2001). In the EFL classroom, the display questions are important, particularly for students to drill and practise using them in the provided communicative situations. Interaction in a classroom is an essential process contributing a student’s language learning. The simple way for interaction to take place in class is that the class be provided with pre-planned sentences which students learn and understand so that they can then use these sentences as a tool for the interaction.

Understanding about formal instruction in the second language classroom is crucial for organising EFL classes in Thai EFL contexts, and insights about input, input processing, output, and interaction in second language classes as reviewed above, are vital factors for effective implementation of EFL teaching and learning in EFL classes. The following section is a review of literature related to second language classroom.

2.3.3 Children’s second language classroom
Children can learn a second language effectively providing that two crucial factors are available to them: a proficient teacher who can provide attractive activities and learning input; and engaging conditions for language learning (Cameron, 2001).

Teachers for second language students
Teaching children is not simple or straightforward. Rather, it is a complex task that needs skilful teachers who can understand children’s worlds (Cameron, 2001). The teachers in primary classrooms need to be insightful about how children interact and make sense of the world, and how they learn. As Moon (2000) states young children like to talk and experiment with language, interpret the meaning, imitate chunks of language, and join pleasant activities. For a primary language class a teacher is important as a provider of such learning contexts and resources for language input. A good teacher for a young second language class needs to possess the important fundamental qualities, such as love, language proficiency, and teaching proficiency (Cameron, 2001). Love is an important foundation for a teacher’s positive attitude to teaching young children. It contributes to friendly interaction which brings about a secure atmosphere in the classroom. Proficiency in the target language is also a vital quality for a teacher of a second or foreign language class. Such a quality makes the teacher a crucial source of model language input for the children.
Another important quality for a second language teacher of a young children’s class is teaching proficiency. Moon (2000) suggests that teachers of EFL classes and English as a second language (ESL) classes of young students need to be capable of encouraging children to have a real need to use the language. EFL teachers also need to be skilful in time management so that their students have sufficient time for practising and using the language in various contexts. They need to be capable of providing meaningful input focusing on communication within a friendly atmosphere, and capable of giving appropriate feedback to the students’ response, so that students can notice the underlying patterns in the language. Additionally, they need to be capable of creating engaging tasks and of keeping students on the tasks (Cameron, 2001).

**Engaging classrooms for young second language students**

Another main factor making for effective teaching and learning of a second language in young classes is active student engagement. Children’s learning and thinking development occur through the process of interactions between them and the surrounding environment and other people in various social contexts as explained by Vygotsky’s theory (Berk & Winsler, 1995). Therefore, it is through children’s engagement that they are exposed to such interaction. In order to engage students in classroom activities, the classroom needs to have the following aspects: good relationships between teachers and students, effective organisation of students and resources, effective communication between teachers and students, appropriate support for students’ language learning, and interesting and stimulating learning materials and resources (Moon, 2000).

Good relationships in a classroom make students feel secure and confident. Such a positive atmosphere encourages students to take part in learning activities and dares them to take risks in experimenting with new language to interact with their peers or teachers (Savignon, 1983). In such a classroom, the teacher is patient and gives sufficient time for students to finish their activities. If the students face a difficulty with instruction, the teacher is able to explain again in different ways or by using actions or visuals. Besides classroom atmosphere, appropriately organising students into class activities is another way of maximising their engagement. These activities can be organised through pair work and group work. They are the ways that increase students’ opportunities to get access to language input, and to increase practice and involvement in
language learning. Moon (2000) states that pair work and group work are effective when students are prepared carefully, and when they understand a goal, procedures and outcomes of the activities. The effective classroom activities need to provide students with opportunities to be involved in active demonstrations, and to gradually loosen control of the activity (Moon, 2000).

Another important strategy to use to engage students in activities in a second or foreign language class is effective communication between teachers and students. Through effective interaction students learn the new language through exposure to the language models in the teachers’ talk. Eventually, they are able to imitate and use the chunks of language heard from the talks in the interaction with their peers or the teacher. Chunks of language which teachers use in the classroom occur in many forms: for example, teachers use language for instructions, discipline control, feedback, praise, and questions. For the class where students’ target language proficiency is very limited a teacher needs to provide some clues to support what they are saying. For example, a teacher may use visual aids, such as pictures, realia, word cards, and gestures (Moon, 2000). During classroom activities teachers may use some of the following strategies to involve the students in the activities: showing genuine interest in and responding positively to students’ answers; correcting students’ mistakes in a constructive way; prompting or cueing students to say more; relating talk to familiar contexts which are meaningful for students; and working in partnership with students to achieve a common goal. These teachers’ positive strategies are very important features of scaffolding and support of students’ language learning in CLE classes.

Another important feature to ensure an engaging second language classroom for young students is appropriate support for students while they are involved in classroom activities. Providing support for children while they are learning a new language is done mostly through language, techniques to conduct classroom activities and resources. Support by means of language may be carried out by using language at the children’s level, by adjusting students’ responses, teacher’s speech and volume, and by using gestures or actions (Gaies, 1977 cited in Allwright, 1988, pp. 215-217; Moon, 2000). Support by techniques or resources can be undertaken in a variety of ways, such as moving from concrete to abstract and from known to new, by focusing on things, actions and events which children can see, by using practical ‘hands-on’ activities in which
language is supported by actions, by giving children a clear and understandable purpose for doing activities, and by providing language prompts or models to help students carry out activities. These features of support are embedded in each phase of CLE lessons.

Using interesting materials for classroom activities is another important aspect that engages students in learning activities and assists them to learn language. Besides traditional materials such as textbooks, workbooks, story books, videos, cassettes, pictures and real-life artefacts, recently, computer technology makes teaching and learning materials more interesting (Hanison-Smith, 2001). Children can work with multi-media material, such as computer-based language activities, so that they are offered more authentic input than using other traditional materials. However, the benefit for students learning language from these materials depends on how effectively they are used along with other class activities. The use of materials and learning activities will be most effective in a class of young children when they provide appropriate input for students, clear procedures and outcomes, and a clear role for the teacher (Nunan, 1989).

2.4 Methods of teaching language
In the implementation of communicative approaches in EFL classes understanding of formal instruction in second language classes, the ways children learn language, input, output, and interaction in a second language classroom as reviewed above are important. These insights are underpinning background for effective implementation of communicative language classes. Three communicative teaching methods in this study are designed under the notions of these theories. The following sections review these three methods: the weak version of communicative language teaching (weak version CLT), concentrated language encounters using paper materials (CLE + paper), and concentrated language encounters using computer-based language activities (CLE+COBLA).

2.4.1 Communicative language teaching (CLT)
Communicative language teaching (CLT) has evolved as a means of addressing the need to use language as a communicative medium in the globalised world. It has shifted focus to the use of language rather than the concentration on form (Harmer, 2007). The primary goal of CLT is to enable learners to use the language appropriately in real communication (Richards & Rogers, 2001; Gebhard, 2006). To be able to communicate
successfully, the learners need to be equipped with four main communicative competences: grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence (Savignon, 1983). Grammatical and discourse competence means learners having knowledge of grammar, such as sentence structure, vocabulary, sounds and being able to use them appropriately in discourses. For example, students know when and how to initiate, enter, interrupt, check and confirm the information in a conversation (Hedge, 2000) or know the interconnectedness of a series of utterances or a meaningful written text (Savignon, 1983). For sociolinguistic competence learners know when to perform language appropriate to the accompanying social context. For example, they know when and how to use language and nonverbal behaviours for apologising, complaining, interrupting, asking for permission, requesting, and turning down an invitation. Strategic competence means learners knowing how to use strategies other than verbal language to initiate, terminate, maintain, repair and redirect communications (Savignon, 1983; Gebhard, 2006).

CLT was introduced to Thai schools in 1977 and has greatly influenced the thinking of EFL teachers in Thailand since 1996 (Foley, 2005). In the CLT class students need many opportunities to be involved in communicative activities. It is essential that communicative activities provided in an English class be meaningful for the students and to be embedded with communicative purpose. Students eagerly take part in communication when they have a desire to communicate something. Harmer (2007) stated that if students are involved in meaning-focused communicative tasks, then “language learning will take care of itself” (p. 69). Involvement in meaningful communicative activities provides students with opportunities to use the integrated skills to communicate information with each other and therefore to learn. The communicative activities conducted in groups or in pairs will provide students with opportunities to practise strategic competences such as initiating, maintaining and terminating a conversation. Students may learn to use other strategies to repair and redirect the communication when they are not able to use verbal language in a conversation (Savignon, 1983; Richards & Rogers, 2001; Gebhard, 2006). Such activities might be provided through role play, simulation, information gap, information sharing and negotiation of meaning (Richards & Rogers, 2001).
The teacher in a communicative classroom plays three main roles, namely, that of facilitator of the communicative process, a participant in the process, and an observer and learner (Breen & Candlin, 1980). Therefore the teacher’s task in the CLT class involves providing comprehensible input, communicative situations and exercises for students. The teacher sometimes also takes part as a member of a group during group activities, and/or interacts with students in group work or group conversation. In this process the teacher can give appropriate feedback to students about their language use. Effective feedback in the CLT class should first focus on communicative aspects before addressing of the form of the language used by the students (Nunan, 1991; Savignon, 1991). To appropriately carry out the roles noted above, CLT teachers need to understand effective input, engaging students in an English class, and what constitutes helpful support for their students.

Learners in a CLT class play the role of participants actively involved in the communication processes. They are expected to use the language they are learning, even though it has been imperfectly mastered, to negotiate meaning rather than simply repeating and absorbing language (Nunan, 1989). Students in the CLT class play the role of ‘negotiator’ who tries to find meaning in the target language using information provided during the classroom activities, through interaction and discussion with peers and teacher (Breen & Candlin, 1980). However, in order to develop a particular skill that is required to be able to use the language in communicative activities, learners need to rehearse that skill in the practice activities provided in class under the guidance and stimulus of the teacher. The practice then contributes to students’ mastery and ability to apply their newly acquired linguistic forms (Nunan, 1989).

The communicative language teaching approach can be seen as having two versions: a weak version and a strong version (Holliday, 1994). The weak version focuses on learners practising the use of language by following the models presented to them. In the weak version of CLT language models and communicative conditions are provided through three main phases: presentation, practice and production. In first two phases learners learn the forms and meanings of the language through the language models and then practise the language through different types of drills before they integrate these skills into communicative situations that are provided in the production phase.
(Littlewood, 1981). The teaching and learning outcomes are indicated by the learners’ ability to use the language, with a focus on oral language.

The strong version focuses on learners producing texts after they interact with language in a text that is provided. The lesson input could be a piece of writing or a recording of speech. It could be whatever is written in textbooks or other material, and include whatever students say or write. The purpose of the work is that the students can help each other to solve language problems. Learners engage in communicative activities by communicating with rich text and producing useful hypotheses. The aim of implementing the strong version of CLT is that the students are able to produce a new text in the form of speaking or writing (Holliday, 1994). These procedures are partly congruent with those of the CLE.

The weak version of CLT is widely adopted in EFL contexts where English exposure in the surrounding societies is limited (Littlewood, 1981). It is suitable for beginning- and intermediate-level EFL students. The procedures of the weak version of CLT has been adopted in, and adapted for, Thai EFL classes. The following teaching and learning procedures has been recommended by the Thai Ministry of Education:

- **Warm up**
  - Discussion on what is about to be learnt
  - Games and songs

- **Presentation**
  - New words, sentences
  - Structures, grammar
  - Pronunciation

- **Practice / using words or sentences have been learnt**
  - Pair works
  - Group works
  - Games

- **Production/ using the words or sentences have been learnt**
  - Role play / in the given situation
  - Completing the assigned tasks

- **Wrap up and follow-up**
  - Games / songs
  - Collecting students’ works in a portfolio

(Ministry of Education, 2001, p. 54).
Research on communicative language teaching
This method has been widely implemented in EFL contexts in Thailand and other non-English speaking countries, according to the promised effectiveness of communicative language teaching for developing the communicative ability of learners. However, it seems the CLT method is optimally effective when the teachers who conduct the instructional activities are experienced and proficient in the target language. A review of English teaching and learning at primary level in EFL contexts, carried out after English was mandated to be taught to younger learners in some countries in Asia, found that there are difficulties that must be overcome to enhance the effectiveness of CLT.

Lee’s study (2004) on English teaching and learning in primary schools in South Korea found that the poor performance of CLT as a teaching method is a result of teachers’ lack of English proficiency especially in listening and speaking skills, and a lack of confidence in using English in the classroom. The study also found that students lack opportunities to use English outside the classroom and, also, they need exposure to English in context. Large class sizes are another problem, because they result in difficulty in organising communicative learning activities. Although half of the teachers in Lee’s study were confident that communicative teaching methods were suitable for their situation, in practice in their classroom the same teachers rarely used activities which would be considered communicative.

In Taiwan, Scott and Chen (2004) found that most elementary EFL teachers in grades 3-6 still emphasised complete mastery of form rather than using English for real communication, even though the government curriculum required them to implement a communicative teaching method in their English classes. The reason for this defiance of government policy was due to the fact that most teachers were not adequately proficient in using English in communication and that they lacked knowledge of communicative pedagogy. Additionally, the culture of teaching and learning in Taiwan and the attitude to teaching and learning of Taiwanese teachers was different from those in the west where the CLT is claimed to be effective for communicative learning.

In China, implementation of EFL classes was found unsuccessful due to several reasons. The Ministry of Education focuses on communicative pedagogy, but this approach is controversial because it is regarded as being incompatible with the cultural context and
learning styles of Chinese students (Lai, 1993, cited in Yang, 2004). Students have little motivation to use English because they do not have the opportunity to be exposed to English outside the classroom, and teachers of English have few authentic English language support materials. The teachers themselves had limited proficiency in English and lacked training of EFL teaching. Therefore, classroom instruction of English still emphasises drills instead of communicative activities (Dzau, 1990 cited in Yang, 2004).

In Thailand, although implementation of the CLT method encounters some constraints, resulting from teachers’ limited proficiency and understanding of the CLT concept (Vacharakunee, 2000; Prapaisit, 2004), the study by Iemjinda (2003) found Thai primary EFL teachers were able to implement the CLT methods effectively in their English classes when they were provided with sufficient guidance and support, especially if they had graduated with English as their major subject. This indicates that teachers’ English proficiency and their understanding of EFL pedagogy are crucial for the effective implementation in their EFL class. In the contexts where the EFL teachers did not have an English major, it is doubtful whether CLT can be effectively implemented, particularly at the preparatory level.

There are many teaching methods based on the principles of CLT. Although they are diverse, most draw on the concepts of the communicative approach and borrow some ideas from each other. These communicative-based methods include the natural approach, cooperative language learning, content-based instruction and task-based language teaching (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Concentrated language encounter (CLE) is considered a method that embodies CLT principles and is also compatible with many methods named above (Ratanavich, 1990). The method has been found promising for teaching and learning both mother tongue and other languages. It is influential in this study in that it is the basis for the design of the lessons in units 2 and 3 in this study. The notion of CLE is reviewed and discussed in the next section.

2.4.2 Concentrated language encounters (CLE)
Concentrated language encounters CLE) is a method of teaching and learning that engages learners in classroom tasks and interactions so that they are encouraged to produce language, and jointly construct texts with support from more expert others. The term “Concentrated language encounters” was coined by Courtney Cazden to refer to
“Condensed forms of familiar interaction experiences”. When employed in a classroom, it could be best described as “text focused lesson sequences” (Cazden & Gray, 1992). The sequences fall into three phases, namely: defining a teaching or learning goal focusing on learners being able to produce texts; creating a context in accordance with the learner's culture; and, cooperatively building up a text through scaffolding techniques. CLE focuses on using and producing both oral and written texts (Northern Territory Department of Education, 1985). An oral text can be any kind of life script such as an announcement, a conversation, a lesson, a diagnosis or a dialogue to make a request, an order, an appointment, a classroom discussion and such like. A written text is a kind of cohesive and meaningful written stretch of language varying from poem to a sign, from a text book to a comic (p.11). The written texts which are created by students themselves are used as a source of support in the development of their reading and writing at more challenging levels.

**Theoretical framework for CLE**

The CLE method is similar to, and draws on, some other techniques and approaches to language teaching, namely natural language learning, communicative language teaching, the scaffolding technique and the genre-based approach (Rattanavich, 1992). Natural language learning considers meaningful input as an important component for children’s understanding, something which enables them to communicate with their parents. According to natural language learning, a teacher has the important role of being the primary source of comprehensible input (Richards and Rogers, 2001), which is in the form of a constant flow of language accompanied by multiple meaningful non-linguistic clues. When students receive this input provided by means of classroom activities language learning occurs (p.187).

CLE also draws on many of the features of communicative language teaching addressed previously in this chapter. CLE teaching aims to get the children to use spontaneous oral language relevant to the topic through language encounters in the classroom context. These language encounters may be in the form of role plays, dialogues or discussions about an experience or a story shared by the teacher and children (Northern Territory Department of Education, 1985). The ultimate goal of CLE is that students independently produce a text based on the text they have read, discussed and performed with the guidance and support from their teacher.
An influential concept underlying CLE teaching is ‘scaffolding’ (Rattanavich, 1992). According to this notion, learning is essentially a social and cultural process which involves transaction and interaction between people (Hammond & Gibbons, 2001). The metaphor ‘scaffolding’ refers to the nature of support and guidance in learning that is temporarily given to the children by adults. In a classroom, it refers to the support and guidance that the learners receive from their teachers. Successful scaffolding embodies the following features (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976, cited in Hammond & Gibbons, 2001, p.2-3):

- focusing on the children’s attentions on the task at hand;
- keeping the children motivated and working on the task;
- providing models of appropriate language;
- providing a challenging task at an appropriate level of difficulty; and
- providing temporary support and guidance to extend children’s current abilities and understanding so that they are gradually able to accomplish the task independently.

Scaffolding has two aspects, the macro level and the micro level (Sharpe, 2001; Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). Macro- or ‘designed-in’ scaffolding emerges from consciously planning classroom learning. This includes establishing goals to be achieved, how the classroom is to be organised, what kind of tasks are to be selected and how the tasks are to be sequenced in a unit of work. It occurs by the teacher deliberately planning and sequencing tasks and activities based on students’ prior knowledge and experience. Macro-scaffolding draws heavily on the genre-based approach in terms of teaching and learning procedures (Hammond & Gibbons, 2001). A genre-based approach has the procedures of implementation or the curriculum cycle organized in four stages (p.28). The first stage is the teacher building the field of knowledge relevant to the curriculum. The second stage is the modelling stage, in which the teacher introduces the class to a specific genre and guides the students through explicit talk, demonstration, text deconstruction, and so on. The third stage embraces ‘joint construction’ in which the students jointly work with the teacher, rehearsing, co-constructing and reconstructing a text in the genre learned from the model. The fourth stage has students independently constructing a text in the target genre. During this stage the teacher gradually withdraws support as students increasingly write independently. The teacher who will be able to provide effective scaffolding at the macro level needs to possess the key characteristics,
namely: having clear goals; understanding the linguistic demands of the associated tasks; knowing the students and their current abilities and understandings; careful sequencing of tasks designed to develop the practices required to achieve the goal; and a gradual but constant shifting of responsibility for task completion from teacher to students (Dansie, 2001). These four stages of the ‘design-in scaffolding’ are the framework of the CLE units in this study.

Micro-scaffolding occurs through contingent interactions between the teacher and students during the task activities in the classroom (Sharpe, 2001). It is the support that is provided for students at the time they really need it. Teachers can provide contingent scaffolding in the classroom in various ways. For example, teachers may set particular themes and elicit responses that draw students along a particular line of reasoning, perhaps give students prompts for the responses to the questions through visual aids, gestures and voice cues, or, share experience of work in progress with students. Such features of scaffolding allow students to get access to the language in more than one mode. This enables them to comprehend the language because they can interpret the message directed to them through various modes of language, for which Gibbons and Sharpe coined the term ‘message abundancy’ (Sharpe, 2001; Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). Feedback to students’ responses is also an important aspect of scaffolding. The feedback might be in the form of teachers recapping students’ responses, repeating students’ remarks, recasting and appropriating student contributions, providing cued elicitation, and increasing prospectiveness (Sharpe, 2001). The feedback such as repetition, recap, and praise contributes to students’ confidence to use the language. Meanwhile, recast and expansion help students use the language more correctly and comprehensibly (Long, 2006). In a CLE classroom these features of scaffolding are essential in all phases, especially during discussions about stories and activities required to complete a task. To provide scaffolding effectively the teachers of the CLE classes need to be proficient in English so that they can respond to their students’ approximations immediately.

Teaching and learning procedures of CLE
CLE in Thailand has adapted many of these principles for the Thai EFL context. The CLE can be classified into three stages, namely stage 1 for beginning learners; stage 2 for middle grade; and stage 3 for upper grade (Rattanavich, 1992). Each stage may cover
two or three years for the full implementation of a sequence of units. Each unit in each stage lasts two or three weeks. This study was conducted with young students aged around 8-9 years. The stage of CLE instruction for students at this level is stage 1, which is described as follows.

**CLE Stage 1**
The teaching units for stage 1 are divided into two according to the types of materials used for the lessons. There are the text-based units and activity-based units. The teachers may choose either aspect for their classes. Within each unit in both aspects of stage 1, the classroom teacher and students work through five phases as shown in the following sections. This study used the text-based units, which has the procedures as follows.

**A Text-based Program Unit**

**Phase 1: Shared reading**
This phase aims to have the students understand the whole starter story through text and illustration and understand various elements in the story, such as what happens, who are in the story, etc. The teacher may use various techniques of scaffolding such as using pictures from the context; gesturing or explaining essential concepts in the children's first language.

**Phase 2: Absorbing the meaning of the text**
Phase 2 aims to have students recall what they have heard and read during phase 1. The essential activities in this phase are talking about what happened in the story, retelling the story, and role-play. The teacher has the role of the director helping the students to perform their roles and to speak their sentences as dramatically as they can.

**Phase 3: Negotiating a group text**
After phase 2, students understand the meaning of the story so that they are able to retell and talk about the story using their own version. The teacher asks the students again about what happened in a story, and writes students' answers on a big chart. The teacher will often ask the class for the other better sentence and write the version they prefer. When writing each sentence, the teacher will ask the class to read the words chorally.

**Phase 4: Making a big book**
After the students have jointly produced a story with the teacher on big chart sheets and have read the story chorally two or three times, each group makes their own group book by copying from the big book made in phase 3. The students work in groups reading and printing the text, discussing what should be in the illustrations on the pages of the book.

**Phase 5: Language games and other group activities**
Through phase 1 to 4, the students have produced their own text so that they are able to read and understand the text in their own book with ease and are able to identify any word within the context as well as in isolation. The book then is used as a resource for the language activities focusing on the smaller parts of language such as sentences, words,
letters and phonic correspondences, and sub-skills such as spelling and parsing. The practice of these discrete points of language is achieved through various language games. (Rattanavich, 1992, p. 13-19)

Teacher’s roles
To stimulate the students to use the language in interactions in the concentrated encounter sessions, the teacher needs to play the following roles (Northern Territory Department of Education, 1985, p.8):
- a model to whom the children can relate;
- a conductor who helps control the flow of dialogue among group members; and
- a creator who poses the problems of situations that the children must deal with in their group interaction.

Research on CLE
CLE was experimented with and found effective in EFL classes in Thailand. After twenty 20-minute periods of experiment of CLE in grade four, and ten 50-minute periods in grade five classes at Prasanmitr University’s Demonstration School, students’ language developed significantly in all macro skills, and students were able to remember and use vocabulary from the unit content over time (Rattanavich, 1990). CLE was also experimented in EFL classes within Thai secondary schools. Most of the studies found that students’ English achievements and the attitudes to English of the students learning with CLE method were significantly better than those who had traditional teaching methods. (Thongsuthi, 1990; Ketthong, 1991; Phungworn, 1994; Pakhadee, 1998).

Therefore, it is apparent that the CLE teaching method is helpful for students in the EFL classes in Thai schools, both at the primary and secondary levels, as a means of developing their English language in all skills. However, all of these studies were conducted by proficient EFL teachers. It is doubtful whether CLE can be effective in EFL classes in Thai primary schools in the rural areas where most of the EFL teachers are not sufficiently proficient in English and in English pedagogy. It is hoped that CLE will be effectively implemented in these challenging contexts when the teaching unit is facilitated by computer-based activities.

2.4.3 Computer-based teaching and learning
Computer programs have become an important source of empowerment for teachers in managing teaching and learning. They are designed and developed to present
information, to perform tasks and to offer exercises to students. The computer programs that are used to assist instruction are called instructional software or courseware (Roblyer, 2006). They have developed over the decades from simple functioning programs to more complex ones. Their names have also changed into different names, such as computer-assisted instruction (CAI), used primarily to tutor students, computer-based instruction (CBI), computer-based learning (CBL), and computer-assisted learning (CAL) (p. 77). The programs have been developed to assist language learning and are used for what is collectively known as computer-assisted language learning or CALL (Hanison-Smith, 2001). In this study the researcher developed the programs to help teachers implement language activities that accompany CLE teaching method. It is called 'computer-based language activities (COBLA).

Theoretical foundations of computer program
There are two theories which play important foundational roles for instructional software. These two theories are objectivist theory and constructivist theory. Objectivist learning theory assumes that knowledge exists separately outside the human mind, and learning happens when this knowledge is transmitted to and is then deposited into people’s minds (Roblyer, 2006). According to the objectivist learning theory, learning is behaviour that can be inferred from information encoded into memory, and as a process of encoding information into memory. Under this concept, learners need sufficient opportunities to have practice, stimuli and reinforcement. The computer program based on this theory is attractive, with consistent, reliable stimuli and reinforcement, as well as a well-designed system of instruction and instructional events which are appropriately sequenced. Programs of this kind also provide repetitive application and practice on an individual basis, and are appropriate to students’ skill levels, in terms of speed, accuracy and sequences of information and activities (Roblyer, 2006).

An additional basis for instructional courseware is the constructivist learning theory. According to this theory, learning is assumed to occur through processes by which learners build new knowledge on their existing understanding (Beatty, 2003). For constructivists, learning is defined as cognitive development occurring through social interaction among students on problems and issues directly related to them, or through interaction with environment. It is different from the transmission orientation of objectivist theory. In this theory children individually progress through certain stages of
cognitive development appropriate to their levels of social maturation, and develop best when they are assisted by experts, to build on their existing knowledge (Roblyer, 2006). Instruction drawing on this theory stresses collaborative activities which are connected to real-world issues, related to learners’ needs and preferences, and matched to their stages of development. The instructional software that is designed under notions of constructivist learning theory gives learners sufficient opportunities to explore information and complex environments, and provides students with different ways to learn and show their competence. It is designed to support collaboration, visual presentations and visual scaffolding which together help learners to understand complex concepts and to connect abstract concepts with real-world applications (Roblyer, 2006).

Computer-assisted language learning software has been developed from devices for language knowledge transmission in the notion of objectivist theory and from devices for construction of language knowledge in constructivist theory. Before viewing in detail, functions of computer-assisted learning software, which have been developed along with the notions of the two theories, are presented in the following sections.

Functions of instructional software
Based on the two theories, instructional software is designed and developed to serve the learners with several different functions: drill and practice, tutorial, simulation, instructional game and problem solving (Roblyer, 2006). Drill and practice and tutorial functions are categories related to objectivist theory whereas simulation, instructional game and problem solving can be identified as either objectivist or constructivist theory, depending on the purpose and the means of use.

Drill and practice software is used in exercises for students. It presents questions to students who then work out the answers, usually one item at a time, and gives feedback in response to students’ input. Drill functions are divided into different aspects to deal with students’ needs. They are flash card activities, branching drills and extensive feedback activities. A flash card presents questions or problems item by item to a student who then answers and the program gives feedback. By comparison, a branching drill is a more sophisticated activity. It presents to students different questions or problems depending on a number of correct answers at the predetermined mastery level of each student. The program will proceed to the more advanced levels after the student gets a
number of correct answers or to the lower levels if the student gets wrong answers. The other type of drill function is extensive feedback activities. Such drills provide students with, not only just correct or incorrect feedback, but also some detailed explanations of the correct answers. Effective drill software needs to be controllable by students so that they have enough time to answer and examine the feedback provided to each question. Drill and practice software activities can offer students sufficient rehearsal to enable students to transfer new information into long-term memory. However, drill is claimed to be an outmoded approach to teaching because it is used for isolated skills. It is contradicted by the new trends in teaching and learning which emphasize integrating skills (Roblyer, 2006).

Tutorial software presents an entire instructional sequence which is complete enough to stand by itself (Roblyer, 2006). The contents in the tutorials are covered by sufficient explanation and examples, and set out in an appropriate sequence accompanied by appropriate graphics. Good tutorials can be simply controlled by the users, so that they have sufficient time for each instructional frame before going on to the next one or choosing to end the program. Tutorials are often categorized as linear tutorials and branching tutorials (Alessi & Trollip, 2001). In a simple linear tutorial all students receive the same instructional sequence of explanation, practice, and feedback. A branching tutorial, by contrast, diagnoses the level of the students’ mastery in a certain part of that material and determines the kinds of instruction they need, then directs them to a suitable path. Well-designed tutorial programs provide an adequate number of questions and problems for students to respond thoughtfully and frequently along with appropriate practice and feedback to guide their learning. The positive features of tutorial software enable students to learn the provided topic by themselves, at their own pace. However, the software is sometimes criticised by constructivists in that it delivers direct teaching instead of letting students construct new knowledge through hands-on tasks.

A simulation, by definition, is a program modelling a real or imaginary system. It is used to teach about something or how to do something which students cannot take part indirectly because of some restrictions such as visibility, availability, cost, safety, speed, time, and distance. For example, the programs may present physical phenomena, or procedures of evolution that takes a very long time in reality, or conversational situations, or hypothetical situations in which students cannot interact or cannot see the
impact of those actions in real life. Besides the benefits mentioned above, simulation programs are attractive and encouraging for students’ collaboration in working to achieve challenging goals (Roblyer, 2006).

Instructional games are software-based learning activities composed of game rules and competition to increase students’ motivation. They are used to supplement lessons, providing exercises and rewards, or they are used to teach cooperative group working skills. Good instructional games should have appealing formats, activities and instructional value, and provide a reasonable level of physical dexterity, and a minimum of violence or aggression. The use of games and simulations can engage students in the curriculum topic that is being focused on. However, teachers should bear in mind that overuse of games may cause negative effects on students, for example, they could develop a competition-oriented habit, and inefficient learning (Roblyer, 2006). This software therefore is most useful when it is used along with teachers’ well-planned activities.

Problem-solving software is the type of program which provides challenging environments and opportunities for students to practice and develop component problem-solving skills so that they can develop the ability to create solutions for complex problems. The subskills which are necessary for students to possess in order to achieve the problem-solving skill include metacognition, observing, recalling information, sequencing, analysing, finding and organising information, inferring, predicting outcomes, making analogies, and formulating ideas. These subskills can be practiced through interesting and motivating activities provided in the software. As a result, students can develop more meaningful knowledge and skills through actively discovering such by themselves (McCoy, 1990, cited in Roblyer, 2006).

Currently, instructional software packages may be classified into many feature because they contain different activities which may perform different functions. The optimum benefits from these software packages depend on how they are used, the number of well-planned activities that accompany their use, and how the learners become involved.
Collaborative learning with computer instructional programs

Collaborative learning refers to a process in which two or more learners work together to achieve a common goal, such as task completion or question answering (Beatty, 2003). Collaboration in a classroom occurs through actions and talk when working with each other. It can be illustrated by actions such as showing a willingness to listen to others’ ideas, criticisms, explanations, justifications, clarifications, and elaboration of ideas (Crook, 1994). Through such talk learners experience public articulation of their reasoning, discussion on conflict and co-construction of problem-solving resources. Collaborative interaction is essential for learning. Through collaboratively talking, sharing and listening about social issues that are familiar to learners, learners are exposed to plentiful input, and at the same time they are supported to produce comprehensible output while exchanging their opinions in the talk. These interactions are essential for the growth of learners’ vocabulary, skills and language awareness. Such group activities increase learner speech, motivation, enjoyment, independence, social integration, and learning how to work with others (Beatty, 2003). Such collaboration is important for an EFL class in that students have opportunities to help each other and share their ideas. As a result, they feel sufficiently warm and confident to engage in the class activities and are encouraged to produce their language to interact with each other.

Collaborative learning can be encouraged by computer programs. The computer-based task can be set for a pair or group of the learners to work collaboratively with one computer (Crook, 1994). Learners receive the comprehensible input by having a computer respond to their inquiries. At the same time they are fostered to present comprehensible output by undertaking tasks and answering questions assigned by the computer. During the interaction between learners and the computer, learners in each group brainstorm and discuss the reasons for making the correct choices or debating for alternative solutions or paths to solutions (Beatty, 2003). These kinds of interactions promote learners to use language around a computer-based activity.

Collaboration via computers is effective given that the teacher carefully structures the group task in light of the following aspects: assigning students to mixed-ability teams; establishing positive interdependence; teaching cooperative social skills; insuring individual accountability; and helping groups process information (Hamm, 1992, cited in Beatty, 2003).
Collaborative interaction that results in comprehensible input and offers learners opportunities for producing comprehensible output needs to be embedded in six aspects of scaffolded instruction, namely recruiting interest in task; simplifying the task; maintaining pursuit of a goal; marking critical features and discrepancies between what has been produced and the ideal solution; controlling frustrations during problem solving; and demonstrating an idealised version of the act to be performed (Ellis, 1988, cited in Beatty, 2003).

For effectiveness of collaboration in computer-based learning, teachers need to be capable of enhancing learners’ willingness to participate in group discussion. It is important that teachers keep learners aware of activities’ objectives. Challenges often occur when the learners perceive the objectives of the activities differently from the way the teacher does. For example, learners are more likely to emphasise winning a game rather than using the language as intended by the game. This has obvious implications for use of computers in large EFL classrooms. The instructional software used in this study was designed partly in line with both objectivist and constructivist theories, and the functions of the software varied, depending on each activity in the lesson. It consisted of drill and practice, tutorial and instructional game functions. It was designed for students to work either collaboratively in groups, or individually. The computer-based language activities are referred to as COBLA in this study. It is the kind of software which is pervasively known in the language education field as a computer-assisted language learning (CALL) program. Insights into CALL are therefore important for better understanding about COBLA used in this study.

**Computer-assisted language learning (CALL)**

Computer-assisted language learning (CALL) refers to application software used in language teaching and learning. It has been developed to present simple tasks such as basic textual gap-filling exercises in tutorial and grammar drills and to present interactive multimedia consisting of sound, animation and full-motion video. Nowadays, it can be installed in a Compact Disk Read-Only Memory (CD-ROM) which provides easy navigation (Beatty, 2003). CALL might be designed to present information in small steps which learners have to accomplish, going from simple to more advanced steps. It might be assigned to present learners with knowledge according to their diagnosed score.
If they are found deficient in each unit, they will be taught until ‘mastery’ (Beatty, 2003) occurs.

At present, a CALL program in the form of stories on CD-ROM has been developed to provide students with texts, motivated illustrations, pronunciation, definition, and feedback. Students can see a text and can have the selected words or whole text pronounced or read aloud by a computer. They can echo read or repeat the computer reading. Additionally, students can choose to have definitions of unfamiliar words presented while they are reading. With this provided multimedia they can read and understand the story on their own and can talk about the story. Appropriately designed computer programs are essential sources of target language models. The programs provide learners with authentic, natural models of language. These models may be in the form of ‘formulaic language’ which can be stocked by learners and then used later for interaction with their peers and teachers during classroom activities (Levy, 2006). Attractive activities which are controllable by the learners, along with multiple types of input, including text, sound, motive image, or animation can verify learners’ comprehension and can continuously engage learners in an interactive experience (Bancheri, 2006). The supportive features of the electronic lesson are consistent with the scaffolding strategies (Pearman, 2003) which can then lead to comprehension achievement (Reinking, 1988, cited in Pearman, 2003, p. 3). The supportive features of the programs therefore provide students with accurate language models and input.

However, a computer program in a language classroom is not a perfect tool; it cannot take the place of a teacher. Its obvious limitations mean it needs to be used with, and alongside, well-planned activities provided by teachers (Beatty, 2003). Beatty points out that CALL materials are good to use for marking and giving feedback on multiple-choice answers, but they are ineffective in monitoring and correcting unpredictable student answers in the form of sentences. There is evidence that having children learn by themselves using a computer, without interaction with a teacher or adult, cannot lead to their learning development (Towndrow & Vallance, 2004; Donaldson & Haggstrom, 2006). As Donaldson and Haggstrom put it: “the simple fact of giving students easy access to the target language and culture via the new technologies is not, in itself, necessarily more effective than simply handing them a foreign-language dictionary”
Donaldson & Haggstrom, 2006, p. viii). CALL software may be of little advantage when students use it without teachers’ well-planned support.

Therefore, to gain the optimal benefit of utilising software in a classroom, the class needs to be managed, balancing the parts played by the teacher and computers and taking into account the features of the lesson, the age of the students and the purpose of the activity. It is essential that students are provided with supportive activities along with access to computers for collaborative use (Haugland, 1992, cited in Towndrow & Vallance, 2004, p. 291). This assumption underpins the design of COBLA.

**Research on computer-assisted language learning (CALL)**

As the use of computer software in language classes has been increasing (Hanison-Smith, 2001), meta-analysis of studies on the effectiveness of these tools on language learning achievements reveals positive results (Butzin, 2001, cited in Pearman 2003, p. 32). Some studies on the implementation of computer-based lessons which contain text accompanied by graphics and sound have found computer-assisted English vocabulary learning at primary and intermediate levels have enabled students to gain higher achievements than they otherwise would in terms of word recognition and retention scores (Siribodhi, 1995; Clement, 1997; Yu-Huei, 2002; Prakobnun, 2002).

However, it must be accepted that students are likely to learn and use the language well when they learn language holistically by alternating between comprehending context (Top-down) and learning the discrete parts (bottom-up) (Weaver, 1994 cited in Ediger, 2001, p. 157) rather than learning through one particular aspect only, such as vocabulary out of context. Many studies have found CD-ROM books enable young students and students who had difficulty in reading to improve their reading ability (Carlough, 2000; Hastings, 2001; Pearman, 2003; Marilyn, 2005). However, these studies were conducted in an English-speaking context where English is a common medium of communication. In an EFL classroom, all target language contexts are created only from materials provided by the teacher, while contexts beyond the classroom are in their mother tongue. Students lack the chance to practice and get instances of authentic English communication in their community so the use of CD-ROM lessons to provide students with the most authentic context, incorporated with collaboratively interactive activities
managed by the teacher, may enhance students’ comprehension of the contextual story and thus their ability to learn English properly.

A CD-ROM book that presents students with multi-sensory input may increase EFL students’ understanding of a text within the target language. Students are able to comprehend language directed to them easily when they get access to the language via more than one mode of language (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005; Sharpe, 2006) as is the case with the CD-ROM book. CD-ROM stories associated with designed teaching methods, instead of having students learn independently, are expected to be an effective strategy to enhance the English learning of young EFL students. Due to the versatility of CD-ROM books, they constitute a suitable resource for comprehensible input and provide a suitable learning context in EFL classes. The scaffolding features of an electronic story book are intended to appropriately support both EFL teachers and students in CLE instruction. Teachers with insufficient English language proficiency should be able to use the language presented by the computer as a model and then interact with their students using the language learned from the story. Students would thus have an opportunity to read the starter story via computer as many times as they need within an allotted period, without sole dependence on a teacher who possibly has a low level of proficiency in English.

There are some studies on how CD-ROM can facilitate CLE teaching in English as a foreign language in the classroom. The studies of Dokkham (1999) and Chonlapap (2002) indicated that CLE lessons implemented along with facilitation of CD-ROM lessons is an effective way of enhancing students’ English learning achievements and motivation. However, both of these studies were conducted with teachers who were proficient in English and EFL pedagogy. Furthermore, students were in the middle grade and thus had better English to use for communication in simple situations. For preparatory levels in primary schools, classes in which the teachers are lacking competence in English and EFL pedagogy, computer-based language activity programs provide alternative innovations to support the teachers to effectively implement their EFL classes. Therefore the classroom implementation of CLT, CLE with and without COBLA needs to be explored and investigated in order to ascertain: 1) which of the methods best support language learning for grade 3 students in remote schools; and 2) what factors influence language teaching and learning effectiveness.
2.5 Summary
This chapter has described the theoretical concepts related to children’s development and aspects which provide the foundations for the educational management of children at the primary levels. The notions about children’s language development and second language learning and teaching were reviewed and presented in this chapter. The review explored the factors that are influential in shaping the effectiveness of second language pedagogy, namely the role of formal instruction in second language teaching and learning; the role of input, output and interaction in second language acquisition; and the teachers and the classrooms for children’s second language classes. Specifically, the literature review provided the theoretical background to communicative language teaching (CLT) especially in relation to the ‘weak version’ and the concentrated language encounter methodology. These two methods are thought to be suitable and effective for enhancing the development of students’ communicative competence. Additionally, the chapter provided the theoretical frameworks for computer-assisted teaching and learning, and collaborative learning with the computer. This framework is the basis for the innovation of computer-assisted language learning (CALL) which itself is the framework of the computer-based language activities (COBLA) program used in this study. The chapter also reviewed and presented a number of studies that have been undertaken on CLT, CLE, and CALL.
This chapter addresses the general methodology used in the research. The main sections in the chapter include the overview of the research design, the case studies, timeline of the research, ethical issues, development phase of the research materials, the data gathering phase, and the data analysis phase.

3.1 Research design

The current research was designed to investigate the challenges of teaching English in Thai schools, and to find the most suitable ways of dealing with the challenges. Therefore, some innovations have been developed, based on results of literature review on the development of EFL as well as on the development of computer assisted language learning (CALL), with the hope that they had the potential to help EFL teachers improve their English pedagogy. This research characterised and mapped phenomena in EFL pedagogy, implementing the provided innovations in Thai primary classrooms in Maha Sarakham Province in Thailand. Most of these schools are remote schools with special difficulties which are discussed in the relevant sections of this chapter. The study examined the effectiveness of the implementation of teaching units designed under the weak version of communicative language teaching (CLT) and the concentrated language encounters (CLE) methods. The relevant research questions were as follows: How do Thai EFL primary teachers encourage their students to learn English through three methods of CLT: weak version of CLT, CLE+paper printed materials and CLE+COBLA? Which methods yield satisfactory results of learning achievement and students’ and teachers’ perspectives on learning and teaching English?

To fulfil the purpose of the study and answer the research questions, four classrooms, from four different primary schools in Maha Sarakham were involved in a set of case studies. For the case studies, data were gathered through participant observations, unstructured interviews, field notes and students’ pre-tests and post-tests. The following sections present an overview of the research design and the rationale for the design, the timeline followed in the research, the demographics of the participants, the ethical issues encountered and how they were dealt with and the methods used in the collection of the data. The major phases of the project are presented, namely the research materials
development phase, the data gathering phase, and the data analysis phase. With regard to ethical issues, the four participating schools are referred to as schools A, B, C and D and the teachers of the four schools, are hereafter given the pseudonyms Aran, Bussaba, Charida and Dara respectively. The initial of each teacher’s pseudonym is related to the schools in which they teach. An overview of the design of the case studies is illustrated in the following figure and will be fleshed out in the later discussion.

Figure 3.1 The design of the case studies
3.2 The case studies

A case study is a suitable method for gathering data from phenomena in real situations (Yin, 2003). It is an appropriate way to gain insights into teachers’ practice and in a classroom (Nunan, 1992). Mackey and Gass (2005) note that case studies can be conducted with more than one individual learner or more than one group of learners for the purpose of comparing and contrasting their behaviors within a particular context. Case studies have the potential for rich contextualization contributing to insights into the complexities of the second language learning process and the factors shaping learners’ lives. There is a large body of case study research undertaken by ESL teachers in different parts of the world that reveals rich contextual insights into classroom phenomena, such as how language teachers operate their classrooms, how they practice language pedagogy, and how they deal with issues in their teaching (Richard, 1998). In this study it was intended to examine phenomena in individual English classrooms, to observe the classroom practice of individual teachers, and assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the teaching units using different teaching methods. The effectiveness was determined from students’ learning achievements and teachers’ perspectives on and students’ feedback to the implementation of each teaching unit. Such classroom insights were appropriately revealed through the case study method. The insights can inform later studies of a non-systematic kind.

The cases selected specifically for this study were four EFL teachers and their English classes in four schools in the central district of Maha Sarakham Province. All were equally involved in three teaching units (see Figure 3.1). The four teachers participated in two workshops. The first workshop was held before the implementation of Unit 1. It included discussion and practice of communicative language teaching (CLT). The second workshop was conducted before starting Unit 2. It consisted of discussion and practice of the concentrated language encounters method (CLE), both CLE using paper materials and CLE using computer based language activities (COBLA). At the beginning of each unit a pre-test was conducted on all students. During teaching and learning, each class was observed on an average of two times a week. After finishing each unit a group of students in each class was interviewed and did a post-test. A teacher interview was conducted after the completion of all teaching units. The detailed timeline of all steps of the research is shown in the next sections.
3.3 Timeline of the research

The timeline of this research was divided into two sections: time was allocated for research instrument development and also for classroom data collection.

Table 3.1 Timeline of the research instrument development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research activities</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Permission to conduct research</td>
<td>April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Selection of the participating schools</td>
<td>April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Meeting with the participating teachers and discussion on</td>
<td>April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English curriculum for grade 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Designing three English teaching units (paper) and developing</td>
<td>April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievement tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Piloting and adjusting the lessons and tests</td>
<td>June - July 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Piloting and improving the COBLA</td>
<td>September – November 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research commenced at the beginning of April, 2006. The participating schools were selected based on their locations being practical for the researcher to visit at the time planned. A meeting with the participating teachers was conducted to discuss the English curriculum and the syllabus for grade 3 classes. From the middle of April 2006 to July 2006 the teaching units were designed on paper and achievement tests for the teaching units were constructed. Then the teaching units and the tests were piloted and adjusted. After that the COBLA software was constructed in August - September 2006. The COBLA lessons were piloted and improved from the middle of September to the end of November, 2006.
Table 3.2 Timeline of classroom data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research activities</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Workshop 1 CLT (2 days)</td>
<td>October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teaching Unit 1 (CLT weak version)</td>
<td>November – December 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pre-test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All four classes implementing the teaching unit following CLT weak version method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Post-test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Workshop 2 CLE (2 days)</td>
<td>December 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pre-test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All four classes implementing the teaching unit following CLE method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Schools A &amp; B using COBLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Schools C &amp; D using paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Post-test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teaching Unit 3 (CLE)</td>
<td>January – February 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pre-test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All four classes implementing the teaching unit following CLE approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Schools A &amp; B using paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Schools C &amp; D using COBLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Post-test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interviews</td>
<td>February 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classroom data collection was done through three ten-hour phases for teaching units 1, 2 and 3 respectively. Each teaching phase took five weeks because only two English classes per week were allocated for grade 3 in each school. In phase 1 every school implemented a weak version of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). In phase 2
the four schools implemented the teaching unit following the Concentrated Language Encounters method. Schools A and B used COBLA (CLE+COBLA), and the other two schools, C and D, used paper materials (CLE+paper). In phase 3, the schools and instructional methods were reversed: schools C and D used CLE+COBLA, while A and B used CLE+paper. The research design was fair for all participating schools because it provided equal opportunities for the four schools to be involved in each of the three teaching methods, and it gave the teachers the chance to evaluate each in an informed and experienced way.

3.4 Participants
This study involved four teachers and 116 grade 3 students from four classrooms in four schools. The classes were purposively selected from a total of 64 primary schools in the central district of Maha Sarakham, a province in the Northeast of Thailand. The classroom selection was based on the educational background of their EFL teachers, the distance from town (for the feasibility of observation), and the cooperative attitude of the participating teachers and school directors. The four participating teachers did not graduate in English (see Table 3.3), but were willing to cooperate in the research project. Schools B, C and D were in rural areas which can be reached in thirty minutes by car, whereas school A was a big school in the capital town. All participating teachers stayed in town and they went to school by their own cars. Interestingly, teachers in the remote schools appeared to be very busy with teaching hours and extra duties. There were no computer shops in the rural villages at the time the research was conducted. On the other hand, there were many computer shops and internet cafés in town. Therefore the children in town had more opportunities to access computers than the children in the remote villages. Many students in the remote schools participating in this study were from families with a number of problems. The details of the demographics are discussed in the following sections. The demographics of the participating classrooms and teachers are illustrated in Table 3.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of students in the participating class</th>
<th>Students’ family background</th>
<th>Age/ Gender</th>
<th>Graduated major subject</th>
<th>Years of teaching English/ Grade</th>
<th>Teaching load &amp; subjects</th>
<th>Other school duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>In town</td>
<td>41(17 M, 24 F)</td>
<td>Business Labourer Public servant</td>
<td>55/F</td>
<td>Social – Sciences 35 years ago</td>
<td>20 ys in Gr 5,6 1 y in Gr 3</td>
<td>18hs/w -Eng gr3 8 groups -boy scouts 1 group -ethics class 1 group</td>
<td>Head of English teachers at preparatory level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15 kms. from the town</td>
<td>25(12 M, 13 F)</td>
<td>Labourer Farmer</td>
<td>47/F</td>
<td>Thai language 25 years ago</td>
<td>4 ys in Gr 2,3</td>
<td>17hs/w -Eng gr2-3 2 groups -Thai gr2-3 2 groups -Art gr 2-3 2 groups -girl guides 1group</td>
<td>Director’s secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12 kms. from the town</td>
<td>29(16 M, 13 F)</td>
<td>Labourer Farmer</td>
<td>53/F</td>
<td>Health-Sciences 32 years ago</td>
<td>1 y in Gr3</td>
<td>25hs/w -All subjects 1 group</td>
<td>School treasurer, Health care teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>13 kms from the town</td>
<td>21(7 M, 14 F)</td>
<td>Labourer Farmer</td>
<td>49/F</td>
<td>Social-Sciences 27 years ago</td>
<td>20 ys in Gr 5,6 2 ys in Gr 3</td>
<td>25hs/w -All subjects 1 group</td>
<td>Students’ lunch provider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The four schools involved in the research project were diverse in terms of instructional management, facilities, school size, distance from town, surrounding communities and teachers’ background. These factors were bound to have an influence on the implementation of the teaching units in each case study. The ‘real life’ situations of the participants are revealed through the demographics of the case studies demonstrated in the following sections.

3.4.1 School A
School A is located in the urban centre of Maha Sarakham Province. It is the largest public school in the district in terms of number of students (2,425 students in 2006). The organization of this school, conforming to the national curriculum, consists of three levels: kindergarten, level one, and level two. At the time of the study there were two grades (K1 and K2) at kindergarten level; three grades (Pratom 1 – 3) at level one; and three grades (Pratom 4 – 6) at level two. The ages of students at each level were similar to those in the other three schools. Kindergarten children were aged around 5 – 6 years; level one were around 7 – 9 years; and level two, around 10 – 12 years. The class selected for this study was Pratom 3/8. There were forty-one students in the class, of whom twenty-four were female and seventeen were male. These students were from different social backgrounds and from a variety of places around the city, namely urban, suburban and some rural communities.

Facilities in school A
School A had one language laboratory and two computer rooms financed from the government’s support. The laboratory consisted of two screen monitors in the front corners and two loudspeakers in the middle of two side walls. However one of the screen monitors was not working when the data was collected. The laboratory room provides forty-two booths with headsets for students to listen to audio tapes played at the controlling desk in front of the class. In the process of data collecting, this sound lab room was used once in the first phase of CLE+COBLA unit which is the first hour of teaching unit 2. The difficulty found in using the room was that it was situated in a different building, so it took about ten minutes to walk to the room, and five minutes to arrange the students in their seats.
The two computer rooms were almost fully allocated for computer classes of all grades throughout a year. In the CLE+COBLA unit of this study, one of these rooms was used in the fifth phase of the unit. The room contained ten computers for students to work at in groups, and one in the front for the teacher. To use the room for this research, the teacher had to make a reservation a week in advance. Some problems were faced when using the room. First the soundcards of the computers had been taken out by the technician teacher who taught computer classes. He explained that the soundcards were taken out because the students often played games with disturbing noises and this made the classes difficult to control. He said the students were only taught to work with word processing, therefore sound was not essential. Thus school A’s students had to do activities in the fifth phase without hearing the sound of the language. They listened to the teacher and her assistant reading the texts instead.

**Class A’s teacher (Aran)**
The participating teacher in this school graduated with Social Sciences as her major 35 years ago. She had taught English to grade 5 - 6 students for twenty years before changing to grade 3 a year ago. She had been appointed as the head of the English teachers at the first level, grade 1 - 3 classes. She had eighteen teaching hours per week. Of these hours, sixteen were with grade 3 English classes (eight classrooms), one was with a Boy Scout class, and the other one hour was with an Ethics class. She attended English teaching training twice a year.

**Class A’s context**
Grade 3 classes had two hours per week allocated for English classes. At the time of the research, the English classes for Pratom 3/8 fell on the second period of Tuesday morning and on Thursday afternoon. The class was usually taught in their permanent room in the building in the corner of the school area. The building was located next to two city roads, and the classroom, as well as the other rooms, were open rooms, and therefore heavily disturbed by the noisy traffic on the roads. The large number of students (41) sometimes made classroom management difficult.

**3.4.2 School B**
School B is located in a rural area, fifteen kilometres from Maha Sarakham City. At the time of this study, it consisted of 310 students from the surrounding villages. The school
was organized into four levels: kindergarten, level one, level two and level three. There were two grades (K 1 and K 2) at kindergarten level and three grades at each of level one, two and three (that is, Pratom 1 – 3 at level one; Pratom 4 - 6 at level two; and Mattayom 1 – 3, an equivalent of grade 7 – 9, at level three). The Pratom 3 class involved in this study was attended by twenty-five students, twelve boys and thirteen girls. Most of the students were from farming and blue collar worker families. Approximately seventy percent of these children were in the care of their grandparents because their parents were away for work and usually came to visit them once a year.

**Class B’s teacher (Bussaba)**

Bussaba, the participating teacher in school B graduated with a Thai major and became a teacher twenty-five years ago. She began teaching English to grade 2 and 3 classes four years ago. She attended English teaching training once every year. Her teaching hours added up to seventeen per week, including English, Thai, Arts and Girl Guides for both grades 2 and 3. In addition, she was the appointed secretary to the school director. This duty took some of her time every day. She lives in an urban area of Maha Sarakham Province and it took her about thirty minutes to go to school by car.

**Class B’s context**

The grade 3 class in School B had two hours a week for English, one on Monday morning and the other on Wednesday afternoon. The class was taught in a permanent room on the second floor of a wooden building and located between grades 4 and 2 classes. There was often disturbing noise from the neighboring rooms. The room was inadequately lit because there were many big trees around the building and there was only one electric light on the high ceiling. The students’ desks were arranged in four rows, each row divided into three pairs. Some desks and chairs were old. At the time of observation, one of the chairs in the class broke causing a boy to fall on the floor. This was a distraction to the teaching and learning activities. School B had one language laboratory and one computer room. At the time of the data collection the language lab was being repaired, and the computer room was not in any condition to be used. In the first phase of the CLE+COBLA unit, the class was provided with two laptops and two loudspeakers, but in the following phases they were provided with one computer.
3.4.3 School C
School C is situated in the middle of a village, twelve kilometres from Maha Sarakham City. At the time of the study, the school had 168 students in three levels, kindergarten, level one and level two. Each level had three grades. The grade 3 class was attended by twenty-nine students, sixteen were boys and thirteen were girls. All of them were from farming and blue collar worker families. Approximately half of these students were cared for by their grandparents because their parents were working in other provinces or were divorced.

Class C’s teacher (Charida)
The participating teacher in this school graduated with a Health Sciences major thirty-two years ago. She has taught every subject, except English, to a grade 3 class since she started her teaching career, but at the time of the study she had been teaching English to grade 3 for the first year without training in English teaching at all. Her teaching hours added up to twenty-five hours a week, which is the full schedule for a teacher at this level. She also had to spend some time working on the school’s finances and student health care because she has been appointed school treasurer and also a health care teacher.

Class C’s context
At the time of the study, school C scheduled one hour per week for the grade 3 English class. It fell on Wednesday morning. To be able to cover the content necessary for the research, the English class was expanded by thirty minutes a week and each unit took more weeks than in other schools. All subjects, including English, were implemented in the permanent classroom on the second floor of a wooden building. There was a language laboratory in school C but it was not ready for use at the time of the data collection. In the CLE+COBLA unit, students were provided with two laptops and two room speakers and they were taught by the researcher in order to ensure common experiences of the methods.

3.4.4 School D
School D is located in a rural village, thirteen kilometres from Maha Sarakham City. Similar to School B, this school was organized in four levels. There were 157 students in total in all grades at the time of the study. The grade 3 class involved in this study
comprised twenty-one students, seven boys and fourteen girls. Most of the students were from farming and blue collar worker families. Half of them lived with their grandparents because their parents worked as laborers in other provinces. Some were divorced.

**Class D’s teacher (Dara)**

Dara, the participating teacher from class D, graduated with Social Sciences twenty-seven years ago. She had taught English for Grade 5 – 6 in her ex-school for twenty years and had been teaching English to grade 3 in the current school for two years. Her teaching schedule was full at 25 hours a week, teaching all subjects. Furthermore, she was working as a student lunch provider and had to devote a large amount of time to this extra duty.

**Class D’s context**

The grade 3 class was allotted two hours per week for English. The class was arranged into three groups of six. However, three boys were not put into any group, but sat individually in a single column in the middle of the classroom. There was no computer room or language laboratory in school D. In the CLE+COBLA unit the class was provided with two laptop computers accompanied by two room speakers. The computers were controlled by the researcher during the implementing time.

**3.5 Ethics**

Ethical issues are an important consideration for any researcher and appropriately handled can aid the sincere cooperation of the participants. The university ethics committee of the institution under which the research was conducted stipulated a clear regulation that all research students must submit an ethics proposal and receive a letter of approval before commencing their research fieldwork. Before the commencement of this fieldwork, the researcher approached the director of the Office of Basic Education Region 1, Maha Sarakham, presenting him a letter from the university and detailed information on the research project in both English and Thai. Then the researcher received an approval letter which contained an official invitation for the selected schools to cooperate in the project. The participant schools were selected from the list of primary schools available at the Office of Basic Education Region 1. The directors of these schools were personally approached and briefed about the research project. They were all willing to allow their teachers and their classes to participate in the project, assuming
their teachers also voluntarily agreed. The researcher then met and briefed the prospective participant teachers about the research project. They were all pleased to be involved in the study. Formal invitation letters introducing the project, and providing detailed information and the formal consent form (Appendix F) were subsequently presented to the directors and the teachers in both English and Thai. Letters were sent to the students’ parents via the class teachers. All parents consented to having their children involved in the study. This ethics clearance process was not only necessary for human research, but it was also important as it is Thai tradition to pay respect and politeness to the institutions and the people involved.

With awareness of ethical issues, the researcher realized the diversity among the four cases from the onset, as presented in case demographics. It was obvious that the four participating schools were different, in terms of the teachers’ experience, school facilities and students’ background. Therefore, the research was designed to emphasize the richness of the findings gathered through the various collecting methods during the implementation of all teaching units in each case, rather than emphasizing comparisons between cases or teaching methods. The results reported in the following chapters are intended to reveal the outcome of the research in multiple dimensions.

3.6 Collecting methods

The case studies employed multiple methods, both qualitative and quantitative, for gathering and analysing data from the classroom implementation of the three teaching units. The employment of multiple measures to gather and analyse data in research is known as methodological triangulation. This is a methodological technique that contributes value by corroborating information (Nunan & Carter, 2001), thus allowing the researcher to be more confident of the results obtained (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000). In particular, it reduces bias and enhances the accuracy of the information (Mackey & Gass, 2005). The findings from different measures of data collection and analyses in this study illuminate the multiple dimensions of English teaching and learning at the early level in the Thai primary classroom.

The instruments for collecting data were classified into qualitative and quantitative instruments. The measures used to gather qualitative data included field notes during observations and interviews recorded on audio tape cassette. In addition, quantitative
data were collected through structured observations and pre-tests and post-tests. Each unit used a ten-item set of tests for pre-test and post-test. The observational data were gathered by using an audio tape and a structured observation form. Field notes were also undertaken immediately after each observation period. After finishing each of the teaching units, a group of students in each class were interviewed and a focus group interview was carried out with the four teachers after finishing all three teaching units. The interview results were analysed qualitatively. The procedures for the construction and development of these instruments, as well as the course books, computer-based language activities (COBLA) and accompanying materials such as word cards, pictorial cards, and work sheets are described in the following sections.

3.6.1 Classroom observation

Observation is a way to collect ‘live’ data from a situation. It is a useful means to gather in-depth information about phenomena in a second and foreign language classroom, such as types of language, activities, interactions and instruction (Mackey & Gass, 2005). Through this method, an observer is able to watch children’s behavior and their participation in a classroom learning context. The observation in this study included structured observations adapted from the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching scheme (COLT) developed by Spada and Frohlich (1995, cited in Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 196-197), and also field note recording and audio taping. COLT is a structured observation scheme developed to describe differences in communicative language teaching; it allows one to focus on pedagogic and verbal behaviour (Mackey & Gass, 2005), and can be used to compare different language classrooms (Nunan, 1992). The observation scheme was originally divided into two sections: part A for real-time coding (Part A), and part B for post-observation analysis of tape recordings. The observation form was trialled with the four participating schools before the commencement of the research teaching units. The findings from the pilot observation in each case were used as a basis for making an adjustment of the categories in the observation form. Some categories were added for the observation that had not been structured in the form; on the other hand, some categories were removed because no such structured behaviour occurred in any class. Doing this enabled the researcher to highlight and compare relevant observed activities and behaviours across four very distinct sites and three teaching units.
For this research, part A of the form was replaced by a field note. Part B of the form was focused on features of language used by teachers (Teacher’s language and actions) and students (Students’ language and actions) during classroom implementation. The parts of teacher’s and students’ language and actions were divided into several categories (see Appendix A). In the teacher’s part the form collected the occurrences of input through language modelling by teacher or by computer. These models might be in the forms of uttering, which means pronouncing words or sentences, gesturing/acting, oral reading and spelling/writing. Besides giving models of language, the other features of input in the teacher’s part in the form included instructing, questioning, explaining translating and prompting. Teacher’s feedback and support were collected through the categories of teacher’s praising, correcting, repeating, recasting and expanding the students’ responses. In the students’ part the categories included students repeating language models, performing independently, asking and answering with predicted and unpredicted situations (see Appendix A). The frequency of the language and action accurences were tallied in the observation sheet by listening to the audio tapes recorded throughout the observing period. The rates of frequency were analyses by dividing the total amount of frequency by the total minutes of observation time. For such behaviour as writing, its frequency were counted at the low rate, but it took a long time, therefore it was additionally explained and analysed through field notes.

Before the classroom implementation was carried out, the researcher visited the classes to play games and sing English songs with them. Furthermore, during the implementation of each teaching unit, the researcher also played a role as an instructor’s aide, helping the teacher with the instructional materials such as setting up the computers and distributing the paperwork sheets. Thus the presence of the researcher during observation periods was not intrusive to the classes.

3.6.2 Interviews
After the implementation of each unit, an interview was conducted with a group of nine students in each class, and then a focus group interview was also carried out with the four teachers after finishing all units. A group interview is appropriate when working with children because it can establish ease, trust and confidence. It might also be less intimidating for the children than an individual interview (Cohen et al., 2000). A focus group interview is useful because it is economical in terms of time and cost, allows
orientation to a particular issue as a focus, enables the gathering of qualitative data, generally empowers participants to express their opinion in their own words, and is used to triangulate with data from other methods (Cohen et al., 2000). Both group and focus group interviews undertaken in this research were unstructured. However, they helped guide the discussion to cover particular issues that yielded insights for the study. The questions for the students’ group interview were centred on the following issues: their English background knowledge, the activities and games they liked in their English classes, their feelings about learning English and English language. For the teachers’ focus group, the main issues for discussion were: the teachers’ background in English knowledge and teaching, their opinion on the prepared teaching units, the obstacles to teaching and learning English in their classes, and the support they had for teaching and learning English. Both students’ and teachers’ interviews were audio tape recorded. The interview data were summarized immediately after the interview and written as descriptive narratives by extracting information from the audiotape tape. A descriptive narrative is argued to be the suitable analysis method for case studies (Cohen et al., 2000).

3.6.3 Pre-test and post-test

In order to examine the results of classroom phenomena, the students’ English learning achievement was one aspect to be studied. The achievement investigation required a pre-test and a post-test to evaluate changes in students’ English conversational abilities. The pre-test and post-test for each teaching unit used the same set of ten items constructed in a multiple choice format (see Appendix C). This format of the test can be used in the context of a conversation (Hughes, 2003). A multiple choice test is best in terms of the possibility of having objectivity in scoring, economy in marking and also allowing comparability (Carroll, 1980). As a result, this type of test was consistent with one of the aims of the study which was to examine students’ learning achievement in each unit and to examine whether there were any differences in achievement levels between units or across schools. The content in the conversation test came from the activities undertaken in the classroom. Hughes (2003) noted that the test used with young learners should consist of what the children have had opportunity to practice before doing the test. The draft tests were presented to three experienced teachers of English to consider the content validity and objectives. The tests were edited according to the three teachers’ comments and then were trialled with 65 grade 4 students in another primary school in
the area. The answers were analysed to assess the difficulty and discrimination of each item by using the B-Index program developed by Sakorn Saengphueng of the Supervisory Unit, Ed. Region 8, Chiang Mai, Thailand. The ten items that were selected for inclusion in each test had a discrimination value between .27 and .73 and a difficulty value between .25 and .85. The three tests were acceptable because their values fell between .20 and 1.00. This rate is considered to be acceptable quality (Srisa-ard, 1992, pp. 87-93). The reliabilities of the three tests were above .70.

Due to the fact that the participating students were at the beginning level and their knowledge of English was not sufficient to read the tests items themselves, the researcher who was the test-giver explain the test instruction clearly and read the them in English, without translation, the questions and choices of the answers. Doing this was to ensure that students understood what they were asked to do with the tests and what they should respond the questions. It seemed that each test was too short because it consisted of only ten items. However the test covered the content of conversation situations in the teaching unit. Additionally, testing was conducted as a part of examination for the results of the classroom phenomena in addition to observing the completion and creation of students’ group activities. Cohen et al. (Cohen et al., 2000) stated that a long test might result in boredom and loss of concentration and might eventually impair reliability.

3.7 Research procedures
The research was managed in three distinct stages: (1) preparation of the research materials (2) classroom intervention and (3) data analysis. Each stage is discussed in this section.

3.7.1 Procedures of the preparation of the teaching and learning materials

3.7.1.1 Instructional units
The instructional units were designed following the guidelines of the English curriculum for Thai students at the preparatory level. First, the curriculum was rigorously studied in terms of objectives, content, and level of language for the students at the preparatory level (grade 1-3). Then a meeting with grade 3 English teachers was held before the commencement of semester 1. The meeting involved a discussion on the content of English, the text books, the instructional materials, and the time allocated for English
lessons. Consequently, the lessons were designed and presented to grade 3 English teachers for their comments on the difficulty of the content and the suitability of activities. Then the draft units were presented to the researcher’s supervisors for their comments on communicative effectiveness and accuracy. After that, text books, workbooks, computer-based language activities (COBLA) and other instructional materials such as word cards, pictorial cards and wall charts were produced.

3.7.1.1 Pilot study of instructional units
The pilot study for the instructional units was conducted in two phases. The first phase was a trial of paper-based units, while the second phase was a trial of COBLA units. In the first phase the drafts of the instructional units using paper materials were piloted in three schools other than the sample schools. The pilot study took six weeks, starting from the middle of June and lasting until the end of July 2006. The pilot study of each unit is illustrated in the following sections.

Unit 1: My interests (weak version CLT)
Unit 1 was piloted with 27 students in grade 3 at school E, which is twenty kilometres from Maha Sarakham City. The unit was divided in three main topics: ‘My favourite sports’, ‘My house work’ and ‘My free time’. After the pilot study, it was found that ‘My favourite sports’ lasted four hours, ‘My house work’ three hours and ‘My free time’ two hours. Some sentences in the units were found to be too long and complicated for grade 3 students. Thus, the sentences were modified to suit the students' linguistic proficiency. To implement the unit within a nine-hour period, each topic was adjusted to suit the students’ proficiency and their attention span. The topic ‘My favourite sports’ was divided into four subtopics, each of which took one hour. The second topic, ‘My house work’, was divided into three one-hour subtopics. The topic ‘My free time’ was adjusted into two one-hour subtopics. Then the teaching materials were adjusted. They consisted of a workbook, pictorial and word cards, sentence strips and nine instructional plans. The procedures for teaching and learning prepared in each plan were in line with the weak version of communicative language teaching (Holliday, 1994) and adapted for a Thai EFL class (Ministry of Education, 2001).
Unit 2: Environment (CLE)
This unit was piloted with nineteen grade 3 students in School F, five kilometres from school E. The unit was created in line with CLE teaching method, stage 1 for beginning learners (Rattanavich, 1992). The lesson for this unit was about world environments. The lesson consisted of a written starter story which included some illustrations on fifteen large sheets of paper, each page consisting of four to five sentences; there were six activities on worksheets for comprehensive discussion of the story and for scaffolding students’ writing; and there were also drawing materials for students to produce their group texts. It took nineteen hours to complete the whole unit. The findings from the pilot study indicated that the language in the story was suitable for the students’ level, but the story and the activities were too long. Therefore, the story was adjusted and divided into two units; each was designed to be finished in nine hours. The first unit was ‘Seasons and weather’. The starter story for this unit was ten-pages long, with two to four sentences on each page. There were six activities on the worksheets that were done following the story. The second unit was ‘Life in the country’. The story in this unit consisted of eight pages. Each page had two to seven sentences. These sentences were short and were parts of conversations, so they did not cause difficulty for the students to utter and read. Seven activities on the worksheets were provided following the starter story. Each unit was also provided with sets of drawing materials so students could produce their own story books.

Unit 3: Cultural events (CLE)
This unit was prepared in the same way as unit 2. It was piloted with twelve grade 3 students at school G, seven kilometres from school F and eight kilometres from Maha Sarakham City. The content of this unit was about cultures in Maha Sarakham Province and in the USA. The starter story of this unit covered three famous festivals, namely ‘Boon Boek Fa’ (Red Cross Fair), ‘Boon Bang Fai’ (Local Rocket Festival), and ‘Christmas Day’. The story was written and drawn on big sheets. The accompanying teaching materials were worksheets, big sheets of paper and drawing materials for producing class and group books. After ten hours implementation of the pilot, it was found that the students were not able to remember the words in the story, neither could they fill in the missing words in the story. A lot of words were difficult for the students to utter or to spell. Based on this experience, a decision was taken to exclude this unit from the research.
The findings from the pilot study informed the development of the instructional units for this research. There were three units: unit 1 ‘My interests’, unit 2 ‘Seasons and weather’, and unit 3 ‘Life in the country’. The last two units were then installed on software as units of computer-based language activities (COBLA). The process of constructing COBLA units took place from the beginning of August 2006. Computer programmers in Maha Sarakham were selected and the researcher kept in contact with them in order to collaboratively work on developing the COBLA units. Unfortunately, the programmers had not started the work by late August, so the researcher contacted other programmers in Khon Kaen Province and started working collaboratively from late August 2006. The COBLA units were constructed by using the program ‘Macromedia Flash Player 6.0.21.0’. Each unit consisted of a story which could be clicked to have it read aloud along with animated illustrations. Additionally, there were activities for questioning and answering questions about the story, completing some parts of the story, making sentences, and spelling (see Appendix D3). These activities could be selected and ordered as needed by the computer users. Words or sentences in all activities could be clicked on to have them read aloud by the computer. In this way the learners could choose to listen to sentences and words as often as they wanted. The learners could respond to the computer to complete the activities in various ways; for example, they could click to choose the correct choice of answers, drag and drop words to complete sentences and click on letters to spell words. These attractive activities can increase understanding in the lesson and engage learners in the classroom activities (Bancheri, 2006). Computer-based activities have potential to contribute to learners’ collaborative learning, when the learners jointly work in groups with a computer (Beatty, 2003). The two computer-based units were then piloted through second phase with a grade 3 class in another school.

3.7.1.1.2 Pilot study of COBLA

The trials of the COBLA units took place in school H, ten kilometres from Maha Sarakham City. The researcher spent three weeks doing these trials which involved the two COBLA units. There were nine students in the class. The first COBLA unit, ‘Seasons and weather’, was implemented in the last week of September and the first week of October, 2006. In the first phase of the teaching unit, all the students sat around two computers that were provided and watched the story together from the screens of the
computers and listened from two speakers. In the next phases, the class was divided into two groups of five and four students, and each group worked on a computer. All the activities of the unit were properly finished within the planned periods. The study indicated that some minor points need to be improved; for example, the colour of the environment in summer looked too green, and as a result, students were unable to distinguish between summer and spring. Therefore, the summer picture was made to appear more brown than the spring picture, and the spring picture was made cloudier because the story said ‘it is cloudy and warm in the spring’. Another aspect that was adjusted was the scoring system in each activity following the story, which had not been installed in the program prior to the COBLA pilot.

The second COBLA unit, ‘Life in the country’ was trialled in the first week of November, 2006. The materials and activities involving the class were the same as those in the previous unit. The activities in the lesson lasted the planned time. Some technical aspects were improved, such as the colouring of the letters in the text, some matching of words and illustrations. The samples of the two COBLA units are shown in Appendix D3.

### 3.7.1.2 Instructional plans

After the pilot studies of the CLE units and facilitation with both paper materials and computer-based activities (COBLA), the instructions for the two units, “Seasons and weather” and “Life in the country” were adjusted. The procedures for the teaching and learning of the two units using CLE methods in this study involved five phases (Ratanavich, 1992). These phases were based on a genre-based curriculum cycle which is one designed to scaffold students at the macro-level (Hammond & Gibbons, 2001). The five phases consisted of: 1) sharing the reading of a provided story as the language context; 2) absorbing the meaning of the text; 3) jointly constructing a text; 4) independently constructing a text; 5) games and activities about points of language contained in the text.

### 3.7.2 Classroom intervention

**Teaching unit 1: My interests (CLT)**

The classroom intervention of the main research was commenced in the second semester of the Thai school calendar. As planned in the research design and shown in the timeline
of the classroom data collection process (Figure 3.1 and Table 3.2), the study began with a workshop for the four participant teachers on 30 October, 2006, two days before the school term commenced. In the workshop there was a discussion on communicative language teaching, and a teaching demonstration for unit 1 ‘My interests’. The materials and instructional plan for this unit were provided for the teachers in the workshop. According to the planned schedule, all four classes were designed to implement the unit in ten hours during a period of five weeks, from 1 November to 8 December, 2006. On the Monday and Tuesday mornings of the first week the researcher visited the four classes and conducted a pre-test of the unit in each. Plans were made to visit the classes for observations in the third and fourth weeks. During the first week the researcher also spent every afternoon doing the pilot study of COBLA unit 2, ‘Life in the country’. Therefore, the first week of the study was a tough period, but the research activities were manageable because the pilot school was not far from the sample schools and the teachers managed the time for the pre-test.

However, during the observation period it was found that the schedule that was initially planned was not possible to follow. The four schools sometimes had some special activities that students were required to undertake, and the teachers sometimes had urgent work to address during the period of their English classes. These unpredictable events resulted in some disruptions to the English class and, consequently, to the time they spent participating in the research activities. The first set of observations was conducted in 4 - 15 December, 2006. It was found that the participating classes of schools A and B were on track, while the class of school D was running an hour later than the planned schedule. School C was three hours behind the schedule. This was because only one hour per week was allocated for the grade 3 English class in school C. These disruptions resulted in an uncertain duration of implementation in each class and may also be one of the factors to impact the results of implementation. The post-test and interviews were conducted with each class after they had finished the unit. For school C, the post-test was conducted three weeks later than the other schools.

**Teaching unit 2: Seasons and weather (CLE)**

Before unit 2 commenced, the second workshop was arranged for the four teachers on Saturday, 16 December, 2006. In the workshop there was a discussion on the CLE teaching method and a teaching demonstration of the implementation of the CLE lesson
using both paper materials and computer-based language activities. The teachers understood the procedures of the method, but were not confident in operating a computer. The starting time of this unit was not in the same week in each school. This was because the individual timing in each school made it impossible to finish each unit at the same time as planned in the research schedule. However, classes A and D seemed to be at the same pace, while class B was a little faster and class C lagged quite far behind the others. The pre-test was conducted with each class before the unit was started. The teaching method was in line with the CLE method but the teaching materials were differentiated into two groups: two classes used COBLA, whereas the other two used paper materials.

**Teaching unit 3: Life in the country (CLE)**

In this unit the teaching methods were reversed between the four classes: the classes which previously used the COBLA method reversed to doing the unit using paper materials, and vice versa (see Figure 3.1). The inversion was done for fairness among the four participating teachers and their classes, that is, all of them were equally provided with the same teaching methods and types of teaching materials. The research procedures were arranged in the same ways as in unit 2. During this unit, the teacher of class C was unable to operate her class. To keep the class in the research project the researcher managed the class himself. Detailed descriptions of the pedagogy and classroom phenomena relating to the three units in the four classes are presented in chapter 4.

**3.7.3 Processing and analysing data**

The study used both qualitative and statistical analyses to investigate the research questions. The data from field notes and interviews were analysed by using descriptive naratives, while the quantitative data obtained from classroom observation were analysed by proportions of frequency of the occurrences of language and actions performed by the teachers and students. Students’ achievements from the pre-test and post-test were analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to conduct the repeated measures t-test to investigate the significance of the increasing mean of each unit in each school; and the one-way repeated measures ANOVA to determine whether
there was a significant difference in the pre-test and post-test among the three teaching units within each school. These data and methods of analysis are illustrated in table 3.4.

The integrating analysis of the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test of each unit, the data in observation forms, and data in field notes and interviews give thick description about the implementing phenomena in each class. This approach to analysis brings about convenient and clear answers for the reader (Cohen et al., 2000). The conclusion of the methods of data collection and data analyses are presented in the Table 3.4. The following two chapters present the findings from the case studies and the mean scores.

### Table 3.4 Data and analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Methods of analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Data from field notes</td>
<td>Descriptive narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Data from interviews</td>
<td>Descriptive narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Data from observations</td>
<td>Proportions of the frequency of language performance and actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students’ achievements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comparing the mean scores from pre-test and post-test of each school in each unit</td>
<td>SPSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comparing increasing scores from the implementation of three units in each school</td>
<td>One-way repeated measures ANOVA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4
Results

As I indicated in chapter 3, this research aimed to characterize and map phenomena in EFL pedagogy and to examine its effectiveness in Thai primary classrooms at grade 3 level. The research design provided all four participating schools with three teaching units. The first unit was carried out using the weak version of the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach under the topic ‘My interests’. The same sets of teaching aids were provided for all four schools in the first unit. The second and third teaching units were carried out using concentrated language encounters (CLE) under the topic ‘Seasons and weather’, and 'Life in the country’ respectively. Each of the two latter units was facilitated by two different sets of teaching materials, computer-based language activities (COBLA) and paper printed materials. In teaching unit 2, schools A and B used the COBLA, while schools C and D used the paper printed text. In the third unit, the teaching materials were reversed for the two groups of schools.

This chapter presents the findings to address research question 1, ‘How do Thai primary EFL teachers implement communicative language teaching through three methods: weak version of CLT, CLE+paper printed materials and CLE+COBLA in grade 3 English classrooms? As noted in the methodology chapter, the data for this research question were obtained through participant observations and field notes. Observational data were audio tape recorded and transcribed. Then the data were coded and analysed in an observation form adapted from the COLT scheme as explained in chapter 3. Research question 1 is addressed through analyses of the observational data in the observation form, the descriptions obtained from field notes and some evidence from the audio tape transcriptions. In order to illustrate the rigorous insights into the four participating classroom, the research contexts in each class are presented along with the phenomena of the implementation of the three teaching units.

4.1 Findings about research contexts
The observation results revealed that the four teachers were different in their teaching backgrounds and contexts, in the number of hours and subjects they were teaching, their extra school duties, their EFL teaching experiences, the number of students in their classes, and their school location. Aran was teaching in school A, which was a large
school in town. She had graduated with a Social Sciences major more than thirty years ago. She had had twenty years experience of EFL teaching with grade 5-6 students and had been teaching English to grade 3 classes for one year. By the time of the research project, she was teaching English with eight grade 3 classrooms, as well as Boy Scouts and Ethics for two classrooms. Her teaching load was 18 hours per week. Her school extra duty beyond teaching was as head of English teachers at level 1 (grade 1-3). Her participating class consisted of 41 students.

Bussaba was a teacher in school B, which was 15 kilometres from town. She graduated with a Thai major twenty-five years ago. She had been teaching English to grade 2 – 3 for four years. By the time of the research project she was teaching English, Thai, and Arts to grade 2 and 3 classes, and Girl Guides to grade 2. The total number of her teaching hours was 17. Beyond teaching, she spent at least three hours every day as a Director’s secretary. Her participating class consisted of 25 students.

Charida was a teacher in school C, which was 12 kilometres from town. She graduated in Health Sciences more than thirty years ago. She had had no experience in teaching English. It was her first year of EFL teaching at the time of the research project. She was teaching all subjects for a total of 25 hours which was the full teaching load for a grade 3 teacher. She also had an extra duty as a school treasurer and a health care teacher. She spent about two to three hours per day for the extra duty. Her class consisted of 29 students.

Dara was a teacher in school D, 13 kilometres from town. She graduated in Social Sciences more than twenty-five years ago. She had had 20 years of experience of EFL teaching of grade 5 – 6 students in other schools before she moved to this school. Similar to Charida, Dara was teaching all subjects to her class. Her teaching load was 25 hours a week. She also had a school extra duty as a lunch provider. This duty took her at least two hours a day as she was buying some raw materials to cook for lunch for all the students in her school and one hour looking after the school kitchen and dining place. Her participating class consisted of 21 students.

Schools B, C, and D were located in rural areas where there was no computer café in any surrounding place for the students to get access to computers. By contrast, school A was
situated in town where students could easily access computers in computer game shops. The backgrounds of the students in the four schools were also different. Most students in schools B, C, and D were from farmer and blue collar worker families and many of their parents had left home to work in Bangkok. Students in school A were from families with diverse background, including business, public servant, farmer, and worker families. The organisation of the four participating schools was also different. Schools B and D had four levels of students (from kindergarten 1 to grade 9). Schools A and C had three levels (from kindergarten 1 to grade 6). Concerning the provision of an English context for learning, only Aran, the teacher of school A, provided an English context for her class by decorating the walls around the classroom with some English words and pictures about days, months, numbers 1 – 20, some fruits and animals. An English context provided through English speaking rarely occurred in any of the participating schools. The four teachers usually used Thai language to operate ordinary classroom activities. The backgrounds of the schools organisation, teachers’ experiences, students’ families, and classroom contexts might be one of the factors impacting EFL implementation in the classes. The findings regarding the implementation of the three teaching units in the four participating classes are presented in the following sections.

4.2 Findings about the implementation of three units
The data from observation forms, classroom field notes, and audio tape transcriptions, concerning the implementation of the three units, were analysed and are presented in four aspects related to the effectiveness of input provision, teachers’ support classroom activities and students’ performance.

4.2.1 The implementation of unit 1 “My interests” (weak version of CLT)
The findings of the four aspects concerning the implementation of unit 1 in all classes are presented through the analyses of data in an observation form (Table 4.1), with accompanying explanations from field notes and some evidence from audio tape transcriptions.

4.2.1.1 Input in CLT unit
Input can be presented to students in many ways, namely models of language, questions, answers and instructions during interactions in a classroom, and also with language
games. The observational findings in this study indicated that the way that the four participating teachers provided input to their students varied from teacher to teacher.

**Table 4.1 Observational data of unit 1** (Adapted from Part B of COLT scheme)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction and language use</th>
<th>Average Frequency (Frequency divided by number of observing minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class A 50 mins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher's language and actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modelling - Uttering</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gesturing/Acting</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructing (Eng)</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning : Predicted (Eng)</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form explaining</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompting/Guiding</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praising (Eng)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recasting</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking on content</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking off content</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students' language and actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating models - Uttering</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gesturing/Acting</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent - uttering</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gesturing/Acting</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- oral reading</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- writing/drawing</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- word-picture matching</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning : Predicted (Eng)</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering : Predicted (Eng)</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking on content</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking off content</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(…)= inaccuracy in sentence structure or pronunciation

A common input that the four teachers presented to their classes was language models. Bussaba and Dara, the teachers of schools B and D presented uttering models to their
students at a high rate (.43 and .52). By contrast, Aran and Charida gave their classes uttering models at lower rates than the former two teachers (.22 and .13), but they also provided their classes with oral reading models (.10 and .30). The high rate of models in classes B was due to the fact that Bussaba always broke sentences into small chunks whereas the high rate in class D was a result of Dara often leading her students to say out sentences in dialogues. Some of Bussaba’s models were inaccurate in sentence structures, and Charida’s language models both in speech uttering and oral reading were wrong in pronunciation. This might be due to the fact that these two teachers had had little experience in ELF teaching and had insufficient time to prepare their English classes.

Findings in field notes indicated that most of the models that Aran and Dara presented to their classes were expressed in meaningful discourses and contexts. Students therefore received comprehensible input and had greater opportunities to practice using the sentences in comprehensible contexts. While presenting sentence structures, Aran and Dara also had their students chorus sentences along vertical structures by having them substitute subjects in a question and verbs in an answer, depending on the teachers’ assignments. The vertical substitution is the technique which provides learners with meaningful input (Ellis, 1985). Aran sometimes asked her students with the sentences they were learning and practising, and sometimes with unpredicted questions; the students comprehended the questions and were able to respond to the teacher in English. On the other hand, Bussaba’s students were not able to respond to Bussaba’s questions because they were confused with the inaccurate structures in the sentence models which Bussaba presented to them. Charida rarely asked her students by using the sentences they were learning. She asked her class with only two questions in oral reading style. One or two students were able to give her the required responses. Dara usually had her students ask and answer in pairs. Examples of how input and language contexts were presented in each class is illustrated in the following extracts.

**Extract 1. Context and input in Aran’s class**

[Aran has students walk to the teachers’ desk in front of the class one by one, take a picture and say a sentence ‘I ………………….’]

58  
T:  Amnat, come here.  
What do you do? [And translates into Thai]  
Ann:  [Takes a picture]
I watch TV.

Piya: [Takes a picture]
I play computer game.

T: [Shows a picture ‘ride a bike’] {prompt}
Together

Ss: I ride a bike
[Aran presents a sentence “We watch TV in the free time.” and asks students to say the sentence. She shows them picture by picture.]

Ss: We read a newspaper in the free time.
We listen to the radio in the free time.
We watch TV in the free time.

[Aran explains how to use the words “he and she”. Then she showed the pictures of father, mother, sister, brother, and Wichai, picture by picture, and matched the pictures of people with the pictures of daily activities.]

T: [Th] (What does the mother do?)
[Aran shows a picture of ‘listening to the radio’]

Ss: Listen to the radio
T: She … {prompt}
Ss: She listen* to the radio.
[Aran shows a picture of ‘father’.]

T: father
T: [Th] (What does he do?)
Ss: Read a newspaper.
T: He reads a newspaper.
Ss: He reads a newspaper.

T: gain please.
C: He reads a newspaper.
[Aran shows the picture of “sister”.]

T: What does your sister do in the free time?
[Aran shows the picture of “watch TV.”]

Ss: She watches TV.
[Aran instructs the class (in Thai) to say the question again.]

Ss: What does your sister do in the free time?
T: Again, together
Ss: What does your sister do in the free time?
[Aran instructs the class (in Thai) to say the answer.]

Ss: She watches TV.

T: together
She watches TV
Ss: She watches TV

* = miss ‘s’ or ‘es’ sound/ wrong pronunciation

Extract 2. Context and input in Bussaba’s class

Bussaba often gave her class very short chunks of language models.

[Bussaba shows a picture ‘watch TV’.]
T: Wanna stand up please (point to one student) watch TV
Wan: watch TV
T: watch

15 Wan: watch
T: TV
Wan: TV
T: Patchara, stand up please. watch TV, watch TV
Pat: watch TV

20 T: Oh good.

Some times Bussaba’s models of structures were incorrect.

165 T: [Thai] (Together)
T: One two three.
Ss: What does your...
T: your Nilawan** [inaccurate structure]
Ss: [silent] (Cf)

170 T: your Nilawan do in her free time** [inaccurate structure]
T: She... [Thai] (What does she do?)
T: Nilawan come here and show... [Showing a ‘watch TV’ picture]
She..... She watch* TV.
Nil: She watch*
T: No she watch*TV. [Bussaba asks the class to say.]

175 Ss: She watch* TV.
T: Ok good.
T: [Thai] (Say the sentence together.)
Ss: What does your .... (Cf)

179 T: Oh no no your sister.

* = miss ‘s’ or ‘es’ sound/ wrong pronunciation
** = wrong structure
{Cf} = students were confused

Extract 3. Context and input in Charida’s class

14 T: [in Thai] (What does the man in the picture do?)
Ss: [in Thai] (He reads a newspaper.)
T: read* a newspaper
Ss: read* a newspaper
T: [in Thai] (Read again.)

19 Ss: read* a newspaper
[Charida asks the students to give the meaning in Thai]

………………………………………………..
[Charida points to a picture of a family and asked the class about the
people in the picture]

30 T: [Thai] (What is “father”?)
Ss: [translates into Thai word.]
T: [Thai] (What is “mother”?)

33 Ss: [translates into Thai word.]
Extract 4. Context and input in Dara’s class

T: What does your brother do in his free time?

Ss: What does your brother do in his free time?

T: Again please. ....What does your brother

Ss: What does your brother

T: do in his free time

Ss: do in his free time

T: He plays computer games

Ss: He play computer games

T: He plays.

Ss: He plays computer games.

[Dara explains that the subjects can be changed from ‘brother’ and ‘sister’ to ‘mother’ and ‘father’.]

T: What does your (showing a picture of a mother)

Ss: mother

T: mother do in her free time?

T: What....... [prompting the class to say a sentence.]

Ss: What does your mother do in her free time?

T: She ...(showing a picture ‘watching TV’)

Ss: She watch* TV

[Dara instructs the class (in Thai) to ask the question again.]

T: What does

Ss: What does your mother do in her free time?

[Dara shows the class a picture of ‘riding a bike’.

T+Ss: She rides a bike.

T: She rides a bike.

[Dara reminds students to be aware of “s” in the verb “ride”. Then she shows the picture of ‘a father’ and has students change the subject to be “father”.]

T: [Thai] (together)

Ss: What does your father do in her** free time?

T: in his free time

Ss: do in his free time ?

T: Again please.

Ss: What does your father do in his free time?

[Dara shows the picture of ‘playing computer game’.

Ss: He play* computer games.

* Miss ‘s’ or ‘es’ sound ** wrong pronoun
Another input that occurred in most classes involved instructions and praise. These two aspects of input were models of formulaic utterances which students could imitate and use in interactions with each other in real communicative settings. Aran, Bussaba and Dara often used simple English as short instructions (.48, .45, .35 respectively) while running their classroom activities. However, they sometimes used Thai language along with the English instructions. Charida used only Thai to instruct her class. Praise was used only by Bussaba and Dara (.30 and .10). Even though the rates of instructions and praise looked high, they occurred in only a few phrases or sentences, such as “Again please”, “Stand up, please”, “Look at …..” etc; and praises were “good”, “OK”, “Thank you”, and “Clap your hands for……”.

4.2.1.2 Support in CLT unit

A proficient EFL teacher needs to be capable of providing support through appropriate encouragement and feedback on students’ responses in order to assure students and indicate whether their responses are correct or not. The feedback contributes to students’ adjustment of their output and enables them to produce more correct and expanded phrases or sentences. Feedback can be provided in various ways through classroom interaction such as teacher praising, repeating, recapping, recasting, expanding and correcting students’ responses (Allwright, 1988; Hammond & Gibbons, 2005; Sharpe, 2006). Overall, the observations conducted for CLT teaching in unit 1 revealed that the ability of the four teachers to provide encouragement and feedback was different (see Table 4.1). Aran’s students had ample opportunity to drill utterances of English sentences (.30), to ask (.16) and to answer questions (.22) independently, and Aran’s support and feedback occurred mainly in prompts (.08) and expanding students’ responses (.06). Bussaba, school B’s teacher, did not give her class much opportunity to perform the language themselves. However, she frequently used some phrases of praise (.30) to acknowledge her students’ responses. Even so, the praise was ineffective in enhancing students’ responses, thus resulting in their less language performance. Charida, school C’s teacher, almost never provided feedback or support for her class. All Charida did was that she instructed her students (in Thai) to read aloud words or phrases. When the students got stuck she instructed them to read after her word by word. Dara, the teacher of school D, used a lot of prompting (.13) to enable her students to say some words or phrases, but she did not use much feedback. She occasionally praised students when they were able to speak fluently.
4.2.1.3 Classroom activities in CLT unit

Effective activities provide students with linguistic environments which are good sources of meaningful input and also scaffolding from the teachers. These eventually enhance students’ ability to produce and perform their language and to convey the information to others (Krashen, 1985; Long, 1996; Gibbons, 2003). My observations revealed that the four teachers had different levels of effectiveness and resourcefulness of providing activity.

Aran, the teacher of school A, provided her class with several engaging activities. She assigned her students to play games and sing songs when she found some students tired and distracted after chorusing sentences and phrases for some time. Students had opportunities to express instructions and perform actions in the games and songs. This appeared to have the desired result because it could involve all students with later language activities. She also assigned students to ask (.16) and answer (.22) the questions by themselves. After students were able to say the sentences fluently, Aran assigned her students to work individually by, for example, writing and drawing about some information, and presenting it to the class. Such opportunities for practice using language in conversations and in communicating information in the classroom are an important contribution to students’ learning development.

Considering the three phases of CLT, Aran was well able to carry out her class through all three phases. In the presentation phase Aran was competent in presenting vocabulary and grammar points to her students in meaningful contexts. She taught some grammar points to her students by having students say the new words in sentences, instead of just uttering the phrases in fragmented forms. In the practice phase Aran seemed to be capable of providing activities for her students to practise using the language being learned. First, she took part as an interlocutor of the whole class asking them some questions. Students responded in unison. Then she divided the class into two big groups and had the two groups ask and answer each other. Aran took part as a director who set up situations for dialogues by showing each group pictures of people and activities they did. In the production phase Aran assigned her students to write a sentence, draw a picture, and read out loud the sentence they had learned and practiced as a means of giving information about what people in their families did. This production was a one-way conversation because students did not have time to ask and answer each other.
Bussaba, the teacher of school B, was not adequately fluent in running classroom activities. The beginning of her lesson seemed to be ineffective as a means of engaging her students in the desired classroom interaction. The students did not understand what Bussaba was talking about nor the purpose of her talk. Bussaba led her students into the lesson by asking about the day and month in English. The students were unable to give her an answer. Then she switched to explaining how to use the pronouns: he, she, her, and his. The students listened to her with no response. Following this, she sang a song ‘Good morning to you’. Instead of having the students sing along, she stopped and began to present a new sentence. No pair work or group work was assigned. Most of the activities involved students drilling utterances after the teacher’s models. Bussaba often used English instructions (.45) and praise (.20). She sometimes asked the class some questions (.05). However, students were sometimes confused with her questions and instructions.

In regard to implementation of the three phases of the weak version of CLT, Bussaba was able to take her class through only two phases: presentation and practice. A lot of the time was spent on pronunciation drills in the presentation phase. Most of the drills were conducted fragmentally, out of meaningful discourse and context. In the practice phase Bussaba made an attempt to have her class practise using the sentences they were learning. However, she could not let her students ask and answer by themselves because students could not say whole sentences correctly. This problem may be attributed to the fact that the language models which Bussaba always presented to her class were in meaningless short chunks, and sometimes inaccurate. Examples of some difficulties Bussaba faced in her class are highlighted in the following extract.

**Extract 5. Implementation in Bussaba’s class**

1  
T: What is today? [and translates into Thai.]

[No answer]

T: Look at. look at… look at me…. December

Ss: December

T: December [and translates into Thai]

[Bussaba explains in Thai about how to use ‘she, her, he and his’ and tells the students to remember. After that she spends around two minutes preparing some picture cards and word cards. She tells the class that they are going to learn about people in a family.]

5  
T: Look at the blackboard everybody. …..Look at the blackboard please.

[Thai] (Are you ready?)
[Bussaba sings “Good morning to you” song. Then she presents a new sentence.]

T: What does your family do in the free time?
Ss: What does your family do in the free time?
T: What does your family do in the free time?
Ss: What does your family do in the free time?

Bussaba translates the sentence into Thai and talks to the class about what people do in their free time.

T: *What does your* 
Ss: *What does your* 
T: *do in the free time* 
Ss: *do in the free time* 
T: *What does your* *do in the free time?* 
Ss: *What does your* *do in the free time?*

Saowakon

T: I play computer
Sao: I play computer
T: games
Sao: games
T: I play computer
Sao: I play computer
T: games

T: Oh good.

* wrong structure

Bussaba has all the boys ask a question and she calls on one boy to come to show a picture of ‘listen to the radio’ in front of the class.

T: Suksan stand up. Come here, and show.
[Bussaba asks the girls to say after her.]
T: He listens [Thai] (The girls say after me.)...He listens
Girls: He listens
T: Look at the picture… The girls look at the picture… and answer.
Girls: Answer [Cf]

T: No [She tells the girls not to say the instruction] He listens
Girls: He listens
T: to the radio
Girls: to the radio
T: He listens

Girls: He listens
T: to the radio
Girls: to the radio
T: Ok.

{Cf} = students were confused
Charida, school C’s teacher, often instructed the students to read aloud words or phrases by themselves, but unfortunately she did not give them feedback or support. In some cases poor pronunciation got in the way of communication. As a result, the students often felt confused and appeared to find it difficult to respond to the teacher. Charida often, unwittingly, led the class to talk both on the content (.10) and beyond the content of the lesson (.08). The combination of lack of support and overly challenging content in class C prevented a communicative atmosphere and hindered students’ learning achievements and their ability to use the language in meaningful conversation. In regard to implementing the three phases of the weak version of CLT, Charida spent almost all the time on the presentation phrase. She almost never assigned her students to practice through asking and answering. Only two students were asked by Charida about what the people in a workbook did. Highlights in the following extract show some of the difficulties Charida was facing in her class.

**Extract 6. The implementation in Charida’s class**

46  T:  [Thai] (Who can read this word?)
Ss:  …[silence]…
S1,2: on TV.
S3:  watch TV
[Charida points to the words (phrases) on the board phrase by phrase. She points to ‘playing computer game’.]

50  Ss:  play computer game
[Charida points to the phrase “listen to the radio”. Students were silent.]
T:  [in Thai] (This word is read) “listen* to the radio”
Ss:  listen* to the radio
T:  [in Thai] (You should remember it… read it again)

54  SS:  listen* to the radio

…………………
[Charida asks about the pictures of people on the work sheet.]

89  T:  Kanda, what does* your father do in his free time?
T:  He…
Kan:  Watch TV.
T:  Wirat, what does* your brother do in his free time?
[Charida explains how to answer.]

93  T:  He…
T:  [Thai] (Read a newspaper, how do you say?)
T:  He…….(what) [Thai]
T:  [Thai] (How is this word read?)

97  Wi:  [Thai] (I can’t read.)

[Charida instructs the class to read together. *She complains that all students should be able to read the words on the board; otherwise they
would be unable to finish the lesson. Then she read aloud the phrase for the class.

* = wrong pronunciation

Dara, school D’s teacher, provided a lot of time for her students to practise using the sentences in unison and in pairs (.25). However, most of the pairs in this class could not perform a dialogue fluently, so they worked under the close monitoring of Dara. Dara was often challenged by discipline issues of her students. Half of the students were insufficiently attentive in classroom activities. They played and talked while other pairs of students were practising dialogues in front of the class. Dara sometimes had to stop the class activities to discipline such students. After practising speaking sentences in a dialogue, Dara had students do an exercise in a workbook instead of having students to use the sentences that they had learned in a conversation to exchange information. Dara was able to carry her class through only two phases of the weak version CLT, but she could not carry out the production phase. This might be the result of the disturbances in the class resulting in the teacher not being able to follow the teaching plan.

Overall findings about the activities in each class indicate that most teachers, except Aran of school A, encountered some challenges in providing effective activities throughout the three phases of the CLT weak version. Only Aran was able to assign productive activities for her class. It is important that students have time to produce the language to exchange information. This enhances students’ ability to produce comprehensible output which is crucial to the process of learning language (Swain and Suzuki, 2008).

### 4.2.1.4 Students’ performance in CLT unit

Students’ performance in a classroom provides opportunities for them to use the language. Thus, it is important for teachers to allocate turns for students to use the language (Tsui, 2001). My observations revealed that students’ opportunities to perform the language in each class were diverse, in terms of the features of language they performed and the frequency with which they performed. The data in the observation form (Table 4.1) indicate that students in all classes had high rates of performing language through uttering their teacher’s models and uttering by themselves. Of all teachers in the study, Aran provided her students with the most opportunities to perform
the language. Their performances were in the forms of repeating the teacher’s sentence uttering (.22), oral reading (.10), speaking (.30) and reading by themselves (.38). They also had many opportunities to use the sentences to ask questions of (.16) and answer (.22 + .06) each other. Bussaba’s students repeated the pronunciation of words or phrases after the language models performed by the teacher at quite a high rate (.43). Besides repeating models, they were sometimes assigned to say aloud words or phrases themselves (.20). Students in this class had no chance to use the sentences in conversation. Students of class C also had no chance to use the language in conversation; they just pronounced the words or phrases through uttering and oral reading after their teacher (.13 and .20) and by themselves (.13 and .30). Class D’s students had chances for both practising pronunciation of words and sentences (.38 after teacher, .08 by themselves) and using the sentences in conversation (.25). It is obvious that students in Aran’s and Dara’s classes had opportunities to use the language in meaningful discourses, such as dialogues or in interaction between them and their teachers, whereas students in the other two classes did not.

4.2.2 The implementation of unit 2 CLE ‘Seasons and weather’

The CLE teaching unit was designed to involve learners in language contexts and to allow them to be exposed to the language input provided in five phases. Through interaction during the various activities in each phase, students were expected to absorb and learn the language via language models and scaffolding from teachers and their friends. The ultimate goal of implementation of the activities through the five phases is to promote students’ language learning and capacity so that the learners would be able to produce an appropriate text in context. The effectiveness in implementing a CLE class in this study was analysed through 3 main aspects namely, provision of quality input for the class, proper support and scaffolding in the classroom, and the students’ performances. The findings are presented through analyses of the data using an observation form (Table 4.2), with explanations provided from field notes and some evidence from audio transcriptions.

4.2.2.1 Input in unit 2 (CLE ‘Seasons and weather’)

Language context in this teaching unit was provided through a starter story about seasons and weather in Thailand and in the USA. Language input was presented to the classes
through the story and activities that followed the story. Data in the observation form (Table 4.2) indicates that Aran presented language input through many aspects.

Table 4.2 Observational data of unit 2 (Adapted from Part B of COLT scheme)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction and language use</th>
<th>Average Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Frequency divided by number of observing minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190mins. (COBLA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s language and actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uttering (computer)</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uttering (teacher)</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gesturing/Acting</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading (computer)</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading (teacher)</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructing</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning : Predicted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eng- by computer )</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eng- by teacher )</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form explaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompting/Guiding</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eng)</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recasting</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking on content (Th)</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking off content (Th)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ language and actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uttering</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gesturing/Acting</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent - uttering</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gesturing/Acting</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- oral reading</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- writing/spelling</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- matching &amp; fill in - by computer</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- matching &amp; fill in - on worksheet</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning : Predicted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eng)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering : Predicted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eng)</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking on content (Th)</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking off content (Th)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Aran’s class which was intended to have COBLA implemented could not carry out some activities by using computers as planned because of difficulties getting access to a computer room. Therefore, Aran presented uttering and oral reading models to her class by using a computer at a low rate (.07 and .27). Most of the other input was presented by Aran herself. For example, she led her students in pronouncing (.15) and reading aloud words and sentences (.41). In some activities she asked questions of her students (.35).

Despite the limitation of access to a computer room, Aran herself was able to ask the questions fluently in a natural way. Examples of Aran giving input to her class through interaction in the CLE classroom are highlighted in the following extracts.

**Extract 7. Aran involving students in the starter story**

*Figure 4.1 Sample frame of a starter story unit 2 ‘Seasons and weather’*

Frame 1 [Students watch and listen to the story and talk about what happens.]

C: *Dang and Tom are friends. Tom lives in the USA. Dang lives in Thailand. Tom writes a letter to Dang about the seasons and weather in the USA.*

T: [Thai] (Who are in the story?)

10 Ss: [Thai] (Tom and Dang.)

T: [Thai] (Where do they live?)

Ss: [Answers in Thai.]

T: *Tom lives in the USA.*

[Aran explains what the USA is.]

T: [Thai] (Repeat after me.)

15 T: *Tom lives in the USA.*

Ss: *Tom lives in the USA.*

T: *Dang lives in Thailand.*

Ss: *Dang lives in Thailand.*

*C refers to computer’s turn  T refers to teacher’s turn  Ss refers to students’ turn*
Extract 8 Aran having her class answer the questions on a worksheet.

291 T: *Number 1. Where does Dang live?*
[Has students look at the picture on a worksheet and answer.]
Ss: *In Thailand.*

Ss: Dang lives in Thailand.

299 T: *Number 3. How many seasons are there in the USA?*
[Translates and has students look at the picture.]
Ss: *Four seasons.*
T: *There are four seasons Read together.*
Ss: There are four seasons.
T: *What are they?*

305 Ss: *Summer …*
T: They are summer
Ss: They are summer, …….
T: Fall

310 Ss: Fall, windy and spring
T: *[Th] (Winter not windy. Say all seasons again.)*
Ss: Summer, fall, winter, spring.
T: They are summer, fall, winter, and spring.

314 Ss: They are summer, fall, winter, and spring.

Bussaba used computers to facilitate her classroom activities at a high rate (see Table 4.2). She frequently used computers to present utterance (.27) and to lead oral reading of English phrases and sentences (.53). She also used a computer to ask questions or conduct language activities (.09). After having students listen to the language models via computers, Bussaba sometimes presented sentences or phrases herself (.20). She appeared to be confident to present some sentences or phrases to her class in this unit. There was no mistake or confusion in her models of sentences as had occurred in teaching unit one. The following extract is an example of how Bussaba used the computer to ask the class questions.
Extract 9. Bussaba having her class answer the questions on a computer.

Figure 4.2 Sample frame of a question to discuss a story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>376</th>
<th>C: 6. What can Tom do in the summer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T:</td>
<td>[Thai question]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:</td>
<td><em>He can go to the ................</em> (prompt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>beach</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>flower</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>picnic</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 379  | Ss: beach                           |
|      | [Click] Yeh!                        |

C refers to computer’s turn T refers to teacher’s turn
Ss refers to students’ turn

It was evident that students in both Aran’s and Bussaba’s classes received input via many modes through both the computers and teachers. They listened to pronunciation, looked at illustrations, printed texts on computers, together with pronunciation and explanation by teachers. These multiple modes of language enhanced students’ comprehension, so that they were able to respond to the teachers and to the computers accurately.

According to the design of this research, as presented in chapter 3, schools C and D were intended to implement the CLE unit by using paper materials. The input of the language was presented to the classes through language context in a starter story provided in a big book. The data in observation form (Table 4.2) shows that Charida, school C’s teacher, always led her class to read aloud the story and the text in every activity throughout the unit (.78). More than half of these models were small chunks of fragmented sentences, taken out of a discourse context. Charida was still facing problems with pronunciation as she was in teaching unit 1. She sometimes presented inaccurate pronunciation to her class (.04).
In a similar way to Charida, Dara, the teacher of school D, seemed to focus principally on having her class read aloud all of the texts. Data in the observation form indicate that throughout the unit Dara gave her class reading models at a high rate (.65). The questions in some activities were asked in oral reading style (.09). The way Charida and Dara presented the input of the language in the story to their classes through a big book appeared to be unattractive for the students. Interaction in the class therefore almost always occurred in the form of oral reading.
4.2.2.2 Support and scaffolding in unit 2 (CLE ‘Seasons and weather’)

The support and scaffolding in the CLE method can be conducted at two levels: the macro level and the micro level (Sharpe, 2001; Hammond and Gibbons, 2005). The macro scaffolding is provided through activities designed into the teaching unit, from the beginning to the end. The CLE units in this study were divided into five phases, beginning from involving students in language context in the first phase, through discussing and absorbing meaning of the context in the second phase, collaboratively constructing text in the third phase, independently constructing text in the fourth phase, and at the end, by conducting activities and games on discrete parts of the language in the fifth phase (Rattanavich, 1992; Hammond and Gibbons, 2001). Micro-scaffolding, different from the macro-scaffolding, is support which teachers provide for students when they need it. This contingent scaffolding can be provided in many ways, such as cue elicitation, prompts for students’ responses, talk to lead students’ ideas, explanation, and various types of feedback, such as praising, repeating, recapping, recasting, appropriating, and correcting (Sharpe, 2001). This section presents the findings at these two levels of scaffolding during implementation of unit 2 in four classes.

Macro scaffolding

Scaffolding at the macro-level was similarly provided for all classes through various activities during the five phases of the designed unit. Observational findings from field notes revealed some differences in the effectiveness of the implementation of the five phases of CLE by the four teachers. Aran was able to engage her students in each phase effectively. She involved students in language contexts in phase one by means of an interesting presentation of the starter story via a computer in a language laboratory. In the following phases Aran led her students to talk about the story by answering her questions. This process was conducted in a natural way of interaction with various aspects of contingent scaffolding. After students were able to respond to her in a discussion about a story, she left them to work in their groups completing a draft story themselves. After students were ensured their story was accurate, they were encouraged to adapt the story for their own groups, before playing language games. Aran was able to involve her students in language contexts and encourage them to use the language in the interactions in classroom activities through all phases. Students were eventually able to write up their stories by copying and adapting the story themselves.
Bussaba also effectively involved her class in the language context in the starter story via multimedia on two computers. In the following phases Bussaba had her class answer questions and complete some activities using the computer. This process was very appealing to her students. They obviously enjoyed being involved in the computer-based language activities. Even though access to a computer was limited, they were able to work together in a big group with one computer. The students received a lot of scaffolding from the multimedia in the computers as presented in the following section. The weak point in Bussaba’s class was that students had little chance to say full sentences when responding to the computer. Another problem was the large number of students working with only one computer, so that the students could not read or listen closely with the computer. Students were able to help Bussaba complete a draft story. And, when they were left to make a story themselves, students enthusiastically worked collaboratively in their groups. Some groups with proficient students were able to adapt some parts of the story.

Charida and Dara had to make a real effort to involve their students in the language context through a starter story on a big book. Particularly, Charida appeared to be not confident in undertaking all activities throughout the five phases. She was not able to lead her students to read the starter story, as well as the texts in all activities, fluently. There was no questioning and answering in the normal way, but rather through oral reading. In the phase that required the students and teacher to jointly work to complete a story, the students were assigned to look for the words to fill in the story themselves. It took quite a long time because Charida provided them no support in this process. Students in this class were able to copy the story they had completed when they were assigned to make up their own story, but it took a long time.

Dara was able to read the starter story fluently to her class, but she seemed to encounter difficulties in engaging some students in the lesson. Nearly half of the students, in two groups at the back of her classroom, were insufficiently involved in reading the story. Only half of them paid serious attention to the lesson. In the following activities Dara read aloud and translated each question for the class. She encouraged her students to respond to her questions in English by having them read out the answers and fill in the missing words in the answer. However, the students were often stuck or responded with short phrases. Therefore, Dara kept helping them read out most of the answers. When
asked to help complete a story, students were able to help Dara to choose the correct choices. Two groups were able to adapt the story when they were assigned to make their group books. The other two groups had to work with close attention from the teacher.

**Micro scaffolding**

Various aspects of micro-scaffolding occurred in the four classes, but at different rates (see Table 4.2). Aran regularly provided contingent scaffolding for her students in many aspects. She often used prompts (.05) to encourage her students to respond to her instructions or questions. When students read or responded to her, she often provided her class with some effective scaffolding, namely expanding (.09), repeating (.06), praising (.05), and recasting (.04). These types of scaffolding resulted in students’ confidence to use the language for responding to the teacher. In Bussaba’s class, contingent scaffolding occurred in many aspects at diverse rates both through a computer and through Bussaba. The contingent scaffolding by the computer occurred in the form of prompts presented through texts, illustrations, and sound or pronunciation assistance. Features of scaffolding that were frequently provided by Bussaba included prompting (.13), repeating (.10) and praising (.06). Charida rarely provided scaffolding for her class. The feature that Charida used most was prompting, to encourage her students to read the texts aloud (.05). She also used praising and expanding, but at a very low rate whereas Dara gave prompts to her class at a high rate (.10). Other aspects of scaffolding that Dara sometimes provided to her class were praising (.04), repeating (.03), and expanding (.03).

The findings regarding contingent scaffolding in the four participating classes indicate that Aran provided the most effective features of contingent scaffolding in her class, namely recasting and expanding. The other three teachers did not provide these features of scaffolding, except Dara, expanding some of her students’ utterances, but at a low rate. As literature in the field has demonstrated, these features of scaffolding are very important for student’s language improvement because they are sources of accurate and meaningful language models (Hammond & Gibbons, 2001; Long, 2006). The examples of interactions and contingent scaffolding in Aran’s class are highlighted in the following extract.
Extract 11. Interaction and scaffolding in Aran’s class

[Aran points to the picture on the page and asks.] (prompt)

402  T: How is the weather in the summer?
Ss: .................
T: It’s sunny and hot.
[Translates]
Repeat after me. It’s sunny and hot.

405  Ss: It’s sunny and hot.
T: What can Tom do in the summer?
[Translates]
Tom can go........../points to a picture of ‘people going picnic’/[prompt]
Ss: ..picnic..
T: Tom can go for a picnic. (expand and recast)
[Thai] (What else?)
Tom can go to the …. [points to a picture of ‘beach’] [prompt]
Ss: to the beach

410  T: Tom can go to the beach. (expand)
[Thai] (What does Tom say on the page?)
I can go for ......... [prompt]
Ss: I can go for a picnic. I can go to the beach.
T: Very good. I can go for a picnic. I can go to the beach. (repeat)

4.2.2.3 Students’ performance in unit 2 (CLE ‘Seasons and weather’)

Students’ performance in the CLE unit had a similar pattern in the four classes. The common feature of students’ performance was that they repeated reading aloud after computers or teachers. This occurred at high rates in all classes (.63, .74, .72, and .63, see Table 4.2). There were some differences found between the classes using COBLA and the classes using paper printed materials. First, students had a lot of opportunity to respond to a teacher or to a computer as in Aran’s and Bussaba’s classes (.36 and .20), but they had fewer chances when their classes were implemented with paper materials, as in Charida’s and Dara’s classes (.08 and .15). Another difference was that the classes using COBLA were more appealing for students than the classes using paper materials. This was evidenced by the fact that Bussaba’s students were very enthusiastic to take part in computer-based activities whereas some of Dara’s students were often distracted from their class activities in this teaching unit. Students in Charida’s class sometimes felt uneasy to respond to the teacher’s instructions.

Bussaba’s students had many chances to respond to the language on a computer, but most responses were done in a big group. They had a lot of chances to listen to the texts
on the computer and to respond through clicking on the answer choices. However, they had few chances to speak by themselves. The chances to practise reading were also limited because of the inadequate number of computers. Aran’s students had more chances to respond to their teacher using English than students in other classes, because Aran was able to ask them naturally and to give them effective scaffolding.

Students in all classes were happy to work in groups while completing parts of a story and to draw pictures illustrating the story. Some groups of students in Aran’s, Bussaba’s and Dara’s classes were able to adapt the story into one of their own and half of them were able to read their story fluently.

4.2.3 The implementation of the unit 3 CLE ‘Life in the country’

Similar to the above section on unit 2, this section presents findings about the effectiveness of the implementation of CLE in unit 3 by the four participating teachers. The data from the observation form (Table 4.3), field notes, and audio transcriptions were analysed in regard to 3 main aspects, namely provision of quality input, proper support and scaffolding in a classroom, and student performances.

Table 4.3 Observational data of unit 3 (Adapted from Part B of COLT scheme)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction and language use</th>
<th>Average Frequency (Frequency divided by number of observing minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s language and actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uttering (computer)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uttering (teacher)</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gesturing/Acting</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading (computer)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading (teacher)</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructing (Eng)</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning : Predicted (Eng- by comput)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eng- by teacher)</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompting/Guiding</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praising (Eng)</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Students’ language and actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Predicted (Eng)</th>
<th>Unpredicted (Eng)</th>
<th>Predicted (Th)</th>
<th>Unpredicted (Th)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correcting</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referring</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking on content</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking off content</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Predicted (Eng)</th>
<th>Unpredicted (Eng)</th>
<th>Predicted (Th)</th>
<th>Unpredicted (Th)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repeating models - Uttering</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gesturing/Acting</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent - uttering</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gesturing/acting/role playing</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- oral reading</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- writing/drawing</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning : Predicted</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (Th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering : Predicted</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (Th)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (Th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking on content</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking off content</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.3.1 Input in unit 3 (CLE ‘Life in the country’)

Input that the teachers in the four classes presented to their students varied from class to class. Aran’s and Bussaba’s classes were provided with paper printed materials. Aran provided input through many means. She was able to fluently read a story to her class and to lead them to clearly read the story aloud. While reading, Aran engaged her students in the story by asking them and leading them to talk about the story and perform some actions to explain the meaning of texts in the story. The data in Table 4.3 show that Aran gave oral reading models to the class at a high rate (.53). She was able to ask her class some questions naturally (.17) and encourage students to answer in English (.24) or to do some action by using instructions both in Thai and in English.

An example of Aran’s implementation in unit 3 is illustrated in the following extract.

**Extract 12: Aran involving students in language context in the starter story and discussing the story**

[Aran has the class look at the cover page and talk about a fruit garden and a farm. Then Aran reads page 1 and asks the class some questions.]  

p.1
1 T: **Life in the country**  
Tam lives in the country. On the weekend, he helps his father and mother on the farm.

T: [Thai] (What do you see in the picture?)  
Ss: [Thai] (Tam and his parents... a buffalo... trees.)

3 Ss: Tam, Father, mother,.. buffalo.

5 T: [Thai] (That’s right.)  
Father, mother, a buffalo, and trees. (Expand)

T: [Thai] (Do you know where they are?)

Ss: [Thai] (On a farm.)

T: **On a farm.** (Recast)

T: [Thai] (In the city or in the country?)

10 Ss: [Thai] (In the country.)

T: In the country

The class discusses the story by students answering the questions on the worksheet.

T: 4. What does Tam do in the fruit garden?

T: *[Asks students to look at the picture and translates]* (prompt)

316 T: He  
- picks some fruit
- goes fishing
- plants some vegetables

317 Ss: picks some fruit  
T: *he picks some fruit [Asks students to do an action]*
In unit 3, Bussaba presented the starter story by using an audio CD player. After this she led her class in reading the story aloud and doing all activities on the worksheet. Her models of oral reading appeared at very high rates (1.11) because she always led her class in reading out the texts. In this unit Bussaba appeared not confident to present long sentences to the class. She usually broke sentences in to fragmented chunks. She rarely asked questions to her class but read the questions aloud instead. An example of Bussaba implementing of the CLE class in unit 3 is shown in the following extract.

**Extract 13: Bussaba involving her students in language context in the starter story**

p.3

[Students look at page three and listen to the tape and then answer the teacher’s questions.]

**CD player**

“*What are you doing, Dad?*”
“*I’m picking some fruits.*”
“*What fruits are they?*”
“*They are mangoes, papayas, oranges, and durians.*”
“*Can I help you, Dad?*”
“*Yes, you can.*”
“*mangoes, oranges, papayas, durians.*”

T: [Th] (What is the father doing?)
Ss: [Th] (He is picking some mangoes.)

65 T: [Th] (There are a lot of fruits. What are they?)
Ss: [Th] (Mangoes, durians, papayas, and oranges)
T: [Th] (What are the names of the fruits in English? What do you hear from the tape?)
Ss: Mango, Durian...
T: [in Thai] (What else?)
[Students cannot tell the other two fruits.]

70 T: Papaya, orange. [Translates into Thai]
Papaya
Ss: Papaya
T: Orange
Ss: Orange
T: [Th] (Now, read after me.)

75 T: What are you doing, Dad?
Ss: What are you doing, Dad?
T: What are you
Ss: What are you
T: doing, Dad?
Ss: doing, Dad?
T: I’m picking some fruits.
Ss: I’m picking some fruits.
T: I’m
Ss: I’m
T: I’m picking
Ss: I’m picking
T: some fruits.
Ss: some fruits.

[The class discusses the story]

T: Number 4. What does Tom do in the fruit garden?  
[Translates.]  
Ss: [Th] (He helps his father pick some fruit.)
T: [Th] (Listen to the three given answers. Only one is correct. Which is the correct one?)  
He picks some fruit.  
He goes fishing.  
He plants some vegetables.
Ss: He picks some fruit.
T: [Th] (In which line?)
Ss: [Th] (The first line)
T: [Th] (That’s right.)
Ss: Yeh!

Class C was taught by the researcher. Language input was presented to the class through many modes. The starter story was presented via two computers. Students received input of language through multimedia on computers and through encouraging questions by the teacher. As shown in Table 4.3, students received language input through many prominent aspects, including through uttering models by the computers (.12) and by the teacher (.26), oral reading by the computers (.19) and by the teacher (.13), and through questions raised by the computers (.22). Furthermore, the students had opportunities to learn the language through actions, gestures and role plays. The examples of class C being involved in language contexts and exposed to language input in the CLE unit 3 are illustrated in the following extracts.
Extract 14: Class C’s students answering questions on computers.

Figure 4.3 Sample of a question to discuss the story in unit 3

[Students listens to the question on a computer]

379  Comp: Number two: What does Tam do on the weekend?  
     He …………………

380  T:   [Asks in Thai]  
     [Students listen to the answer choices on a computer.]  

381  Comp:  
    - helps his father and mother work on their farm.  
    - goes swimming at the river

382  Ss:   helps his father and mother…  
     [click on the answer choice]

C refers to computer’s turn  T refers to teacher’s turn  
Ss refers to students’ turn

In a similar way to what occurred in class C, language input in Dara’s class was presented through two computers and the teacher. Students received input through many modes namely, uttering models by the computer (.22) and by the teacher (.9), oral reading models by the computer (.36) and by the teacher (.32), and questions by the computer (.20). The following extract shows an example of Dara’s class involving students in language context in the starter story.

Extract 15: Dara involving her students in language context in the starter story

Figure 4.4 Sample frame of a starter story unit 3
Frame 2
[The class look at and listen to frame 2:]

26 C: **At the fruit garden:**

   “There are a lot of trees on the farm.”
   “ I like the trees.”
   “Why?”
   “ The trees give us fresh air.”

T: At the fruit garden

   [Th] (Do you know where it is? Look at the picture.)

Ss: [Th] (At the fruit garden.)

T: [Th] (That’s right.)

**At the fruit garden.** {Recast}

30 Ss: At the fruit garden.

T: [Th] (There are a lot of something in the garden. What are they?)

Ss: [Th] (Fruit and trees.)

T: **There are a lot of trees on the farm.** {Recast}

   [Translates into Thai.]

T: [Th] (Do you think the father like the trees.)

Ss: [Th] (Yes)

T: [Th] (That’s right. The father says.)

   I like the trees. [Translates into Thai.]

   [Th] (Why does the father like the trees?)

Ss: [Th] (They produce a lot of fruit for him so he can get a lot of

money from the fruit.)

T: [Th] (Besides the money the trees also give us fresh air and make

us cool in the hot season.)

   The trees give us fresh air. [Translates into Thai.]

   [Now read after the computer.]

40 C: At the fruit garden

Ss: At the fruit garden

C: There are a lot of trees on the farm.

Ss: There are a lot of trees on the farm. [Not clear]

T: **There are a lot of trees** {Repeat}

Ss: There are a lot of trees

T: on the farm.

Ss: on the farm.

C: I like the trees.

Ss: I like the trees.

50 C: Why?

Ss: Why?

C: The trees give us fresh air.

Ss: The trees give us fresh air.

T: **The trees give us fresh air.** {Repeat}

55 Ss: The trees give us fresh air.
4.2.3.2 Support and scaffolding in unit 3 (CLE ‘Life in the country’)

Macro-scaffolding

The observations revealed that the implementation of the five phases of CLE in this unit was fluent in most classes except in class B. Aran, class A’s teacher, was able to provide her students with meaningful input through activities that she provided in each phase of the CLE unit. She presented the language context to her class by reading the starter story in a big book by herself. She was resourceful to insert something interesting into her classroom activities. While leading students reading a story she had her students do physical actions along with uttering some phrases. In the discussion phase, Aran had students read aloud the story, then listen to her reading questions on a worksheet and answering them orally together as a whole class before writing down the answers. In the third phase students were able to work independently in groups after reviewing the answers. In the fourth phase many groups of students were able to adapt their own stories from the story they jointly completed with the teacher. In the fifth phase students were able to do the activities on a worksheet themselves, with the teacher helping when needed.

Implementation through the five phases of CLE in class B seemed not to be fluent. Bussaba tended to have her students read a lot in each phase. She had her students listen to the starter story in a big book read aloud by an audio CD player once. Then she led the class in reading the text herself. She often broke sentences into fragmented chunks. Discussion about the story was conducted by means of Bussaba reading questions aloud and the students helping the teacher to choose the answers from answer choices. In the third phase, students worked with close help from the teacher to complete activities on a worksheet and a story on big pages. Then the students were asked to draw pictures on the pages. In the fourth phase, when students were assigned to complete and adapt a draft story and make a story book for each group, two groups were able to adapt some parts of the story. In the fifth phase, Bussaba let her students do activities on a worksheet themselves and allowed them to look for the answers in their group books.

In class C, students were actively involved in each phase of the CLE unit. The starter story was presented to students via two computers. While watching and listening to the story, the students were asked to answer some questions and to consider some wordings in the story. These questions reinforced the students to listen to and watch the story.
purposefully and carefully. Students were sometimes assigned physical actions to perform to illustrate the meanings of some words or phases. They were also assigned to do role plays of some parts of the story after they were able to fluently read the story aloud after the computers or after the teacher. Discussion about the story was conducted through two computers. Students were divided into two groups, each group working with a computer. Students in each group took turns to respond to the questions or the sentences on the computer using help and advice from surrounding friends. After collaboratively answering questions on the computers and questions by the teacher, students were able to understand the language in a story, and they were able to help the teachers complete a story on big pages of paper, and draw pictures to illustrate the story on the pages. In phase 4, students were assigned to work in groups of five to make a story book by completing a given draft story. Three groups were able to write up a story by adapting some parts of the story that they had completed with the teacher. The other groups copied the entire story. Each group was able to read aloud the story to the class. In phase 5 the teacher provided the class with some language games before having them do language activities on the two computers. The students were happy to be involved in the classroom activities throughout all five phases of the CLE unit.

Class D carried out this teaching unit by using COBLA. Dara, the teacher of class D, had her students listen to and read the starter story after it was heard on the two computers. She had students review the story by reading along with the computers and read the story provided in paper books. Students were divided into two groups, each group working with one computer, answering questions, completing sentences, dialogues and a story. The activities were very appealing for all students. A competitive sense was found between the two groups while they were completing activities on the computers. After finishing activities via the computers, the students in the class helped the teacher complete the story on six pages of big sheet paper and draw pictures on the pages. Around half of students were able to read the story aloud when they had completed it. When assigned to produce their group story books three groups were able to adapt the story; the other groups were able to copy the story correctly. In phase 5 students conducted language activities on the two computers again. Students in class D appeared to be more enthusiastically involved in the classroom activities than they were in the implementation of the previous two units. The findings indicate that the COBLA could help Dara to carry out her CLE class effectively through all phases in this unit.
Micro scaffolding

Many aspects of contingent scaffolding occurred in all classes, but at different rates (see Table 4.3). Prompts were provided at a high rate in all classes. The prompts were especially high when the activities were conducted by COBLA. Multimedia in the COBLA provided students with a lot of effective prompts such as illustrations, texts and pronunciation. Aran and the research teacher in class C presented their students with gesturing and acting. This feature helped students to understand the meaning of the language very easily. Feedback is also important to help students feel confident in using language and to use the language more accurately. Many aspects of feedback were provided for students in all classes. Aran often recast her students’ responses (.04), and sometimes repeated (.02), expanded (.01), and praised (.02) her students’ responses. Bussaba was able to provide some feedback for her students. The features of feedback sometimes provided by Bussaba were praising (.02), repeating (.02) and expanding (.02). In class C the teacher provided various features of feedback but none at high rates. The feedback that was used most often in class C was praising (.04), repeating (.03), and expanding (.04). Scaffolding in Dara’s class occurred through repeating (.03) and expanding (.03) her students’ responses.

Using Thai language was another important support to help students understand the text they were reading and listening to. All teachers often used Thai to ask students questions (.30, .19, .23, and .25 respectively), with the aim to encourage students to respond in English. Translation was also often used by all teachers (.13, .17, .08, and .18 respectively).

The data regarding the use of both macro- and micro-scaffolding in this unit indicated that most teachers, except Bussaba, were able to fluently implement classroom activities through five phases of the CLE unit. Classes C and D benefited from the help of COBLA. Bussaba appeared not to be confident in implementing the CLE unit using paper-based activities. The four teachers, including the research teacher instead of Charida, had similar techniques of providing contingent scaffolding for their classes. The most common features of contingent scaffolding in the four classes were repeating and expanding students’ responses. However, ‘actions’ and ‘gestures’ were provided in only classes A and C. Role plays were performed only in Class C. These physical actions and
language performances can enhance students’ ability to remember the phrases and to use them correctly.

4.2.3.3 Students’ performance in unit 3 (CLE ‘Life in the country’)

Data in Table 4.3 indicated that students in the four classes performed language using different features and at different rates, depending on the input and support received from their teachers. Class A’s students were assigned to perform the target language using many features. They practised the language by repeating the teacher’s utterances (.11), gesturing or acting (.05), oral reading (.42) and writing (.06). They had opportunities to perform the language by themselves through uttering (.16), gesturing (.08), oral reading (.42), writing and drawing (.15), and, reading and matching words with pictures (.06). They had many chances to respond to the teacher’s questions in English (.24).

The language performance of students in Bussaba’s class was mainly focused on reading aloud, both repeating after the teacher and reading by themselves (1.08 and .50). However, the students did not have much chance to respond to their teacher in English (.09) and they had little chance to do writing work in the third and fourth phases of the designed CLE.

Class C’s students performed language using many features both by following the teacher and by themselves. They repeated the teacher’s uttering and repeated reading aloud after computers (.13 and .30). They did acting and gesturing following their teacher (.07). They performed some features of the language themselves such as uttering (.18), gesturing (.08), and oral reading (.10). They had many opportunities to do writing work (.20) both through activities provided by the teacher and activities provided in each phases of CLE. Class C’s students had many chances to respond to the teacher in English (.33). The findings indicated that class C’s students were able to be involved effectively in all activities. They were able to perform language effectively using various features when they were provided with quality models and input, and when they were supported properly.

Class D’s students read aloud a great deal in this unit. They read after the computer and also after the teacher at a high rate (.82). They had opportunities to read aloud by
themselves at a half rate by repeating models (.42), but had few chances to respond to their teacher in English (.17) compared with their involvement in oral reading. They appeared to be happy to do writing work and drawing during phases 3 and 4 of the CLE unit and were more involved in class activities in the COBLA unit. This might have been because of the appealing features of the COBLA lesson.

4.3 Summary
The overall results of the observations point to several conclusions in terms of the effectiveness of input provided, teachers’ support, and activities to encourage students’ performance in the three teaching units. The four participating teachers were differently proficient and therefore differently equipped to provide the three pedagogic aspects in the implementation of the three teaching units. In regard to the implementation of the weak version of CLT in unit 1, Aran, school A’s teacher, was the most effective among the four teachers. She was able to provide meaningful input and language contexts to her class. She was able to provide classroom activities to encourage her students to practice using the language in meaningful discourses and to use the language in communicative situations. Her support and feedback did not occur in a wide variety of forms and not so often, but it was provided at the proper time, according to student needs and their language performance.

Dara, the teacher of school D, was able to provide her class with language models in meaningful discourse. She provided a lot of time for her students to practice using the language in dialogues. However, she was not able to conduct communicative activities to reinforce her students’ use of the language in communicative situations. Dara often gave prompts to encourage her students to say sentences aloud. Her feedback to students’ performances was in the form of praising, together with response correction.

Bussaba and Charida seemed inadequately proficient in providing effective language input and communicative activities for their classes in the CLT unit. Both teachers spent too much time on presenting language models to students, and too little time allowing the students to practice using the language in meaningful discourses. Their language models were often fragmented phrases devoid of meaningful context, and some were inaccurate. Neither teacher was able to provide communicative activities that enabled their students to use the language with communicative purposes. Bussaba often used
praising phrases, sometimes at unreasonable moments. Charida did not give her class any support and feedback, but just used Thai instructions to reinforce students to read aloud particular phrases or words.

When it came to the implementation of CLE in units 2 and 3, Aran appeared to be able to carry her classroom effectively in both units. She presented the starter story in unit 2 effectively through a laboratory room, and presented the story in unit 3 fluently by herself. She was able to implement activities in unit 2 fluently, even though sometimes her class could not access computers. Her English proficiency and EFL teaching experiences gave her the ability and resourcefulness to adapt the methods for good management of the activities in each phase of the CLE unit. While discussing the stories, and while completing drafts of stories in both units, Aran was able to encourage her students to respond to her both in Thai and English. During these interactions Aran provided her class with some important features of scaffolding, such as prompting the students to perform the language, and recasting and expanding their language. These supports were effective as a means of enhancing students’ understanding of the language they were exposed to, and their ability to produce long and accurate sentences. Therefore, students were eventually able to produce a story book by adopting and adapting the story in the classroom context.

Bussaba seemed to receive much advantage from COBLA in the implementation of unit 2 ‘Seasons and weather’. She appeared to be able to present language models to her class more confidently when compared to her implementation of the other two units. In the unit of CLE+COBLA, Bussaba let her students work in a big group with one computer. COBLA activities which were parts of the process in each phase of CLE were implemented fluently by the computer. Bussaba managed the queue for students to work with a computer and sometimes explained some parts of the activities in Thai. Feedback occurred often in the form of repeating students’ utterances; praising and recasting were also sometimes used by Bussaba. Assistance from COBLA allowed Bussaba to carry out each phase of the CLE confidently. Students looked very willing to help the teacher complete a story and to produce their own story books. On the contrary, Bassaba seemed to face some difficulties with the implementation of the CLE+paper in her teaching unit 3. The presentation of the story and the implementation of activities throughout the five phases of the unit appeared to be conducted heavily in an oral reading style and sentence
completing exercises. Students seemed more dependent on the teacher when completing a story and producing their own story books.

Charida, the school C teacher, seemed uneasy at implementing the CLE lesson facilitated by the paper-printed text. She always led her class by reading aloud texts in a story and in activities on worksheets. She often assigned students to read aloud, even though they were unable to read by themselves. Charida rarely provided support and feedback for her students. Activities during each phase of the unit seemed to be unattractive for her students. However, the class were able to produce a group story book by copying the story they jointly completed. Charida withdrew from teaching the COBLA unit. The researcher took the responsibility for the implementation of this unit, in order to determine whether the students in this class were able to learn English with the CLE method when facilitated by computer-based activities (COBLA). When being involved in the COBLA lesson, together with some games and role plays, and proper scaffolding, the students were very enthusiastic and able to do all activities given to them. They were also able to write up a story adapted from the class story.

Dara had difficulties in involving her students in classroom activities in CLE+paper unit. Dara herself seemed improperly prepared for the unit because she carried out most of the activities on the worksheet through oral reading. Her support and feedback were mostly conducted for oral reading. Around half of her students were inattentive during the class. However, when provided with a COBLA lesson through computers, the students appeared to be more attentive than they had been in the previous two units. Students were involved in all activities during each phase of the CLE through two computers. Students appeared more eager to help the teacher complete a story on big pages and to jointly work in groups to produce their group books. Some students were able to produce their own story book by adapting the class story.

The common problem found in CLE+COBLA classes in all schools was the lack of computers. School A’s computer room was difficult to book and the computer did not function properly. Schools C and D were provided with only two computers, whereas school B had only one computer. These problems prevented students from working closely and longer with computers.
Chapter 5
The effects of the three methods

5.1 Introduction to data collection and data analyses
As presented in the previous chapter, the findings from the data in the implementation of EFL teachers of grade 3 English classes using the three teaching methods, weak version of CLT, CLE + COBLA, and CLE + paper, revealed differences across the four participating schools. These differences were categorized into several aspects, namely features of input that teachers provide for their students, classroom activities, support in the classroom, and students’ performances. The differences in classroom implementation among the four schools might be a factor contributing to different degrees of students’ language learning achievement, and students’ perceptions of learning English.

To investigate the effect of each method’s implementation on students’ learning achievements and students’ perspectives on learning in each school, the results from pre-tests and post-tests of all schools, and the students’ responses at the group interview conducted with each school after each teaching unit were analysed. The data were therefore used to address research question 2: What effects do the three methods have on students’ English learning achievements and students’ perspectives on learning English?

According to the research design, as explained in chapter 3, all four participating class teachers had to implement all of the three teaching methods, methods which have been regarded as effective for language learning and communicative skill development. The weak version of CLT is considered to be effective by enabling students to use the language being learned in meaningful interactions and communications. The CLE method promises to engage students in using each of the four skills of language in the provided contexts and set up situations. The research design shows that teaching unit 1 was provided in accord with the weak version of communicative language teaching (CLT); teaching units 2 and 3 were provided in keeping with concentrated language encounters (CLE) and facilitated by two different sets of teaching materials.

In implementing unit 1, all schools used identical learning materials and instructional method. In units 2 schools A and B used a COBLA lesson, while schools C and D used a paper lesson. In unit 3, the sets of instructional materials were reversed: schools A and B
used a paper lesson, while schools C and D used a COBLA lesson. Switching teaching materials gave the participating teachers equal opportunities to implement the lesson by using different sets of materials. The reversing of the materials used in the classroom also minimized the possibility of a significant effect on the order of use of different materials on students’ learning achievement. Teachers’ perspectives on teaching with the three methods were investigated in the teacher focus group interviews conducted after all teaching units were finished. The findings addressed research question 3 “What are teachers’ perspectives on implementing each of the three methods in grade 3 English classrooms?”

The data on learning achievement were collected by using ten-item multiple choice pre-test and post-test for each teaching unit. In each school, not all data from all students in the class were used for the purpose of the analyses; but some data were excluded because those students lacked one, or some sets of scores in the pre-tests or post-tests. The analyses used data from 33 students from school A; 23 from school B; 22 from school C; and 17 from school D. Investigations into the effectiveness of each teaching method in the four participating schools were conducted by using sets of analyses operated by the SPSS program. The repeated measures t-test was conducted to investigate whether there was any significant improvement between pre-test and post-test mean scores as a result of the implementation of each teaching method in each school. The one-way repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in the change scores from pre-test to post-test among the three teaching units within each school. The findings from the analyses are presented in regard to three dimensions: students’ learning achievements by each teaching method across 4 schools, students’ learning achievements by three teaching methods within each school, and students’ perspective on learning English through the three teaching methods. The findings from focus group interviews conducted with the four teachers after finishing all units are presented in the last section.

5.2 Students’ learning achievement in each unit across the four schools

5.2.1 Unit 1 (weak version of CLT)

The implementation of the weak version of the CLT method affected students’ learning achievement in all four participating schools. All four classes showed mean gains on the achievement tests; however, only two results reached significance (see graph 1).
Graph 1 shows that the mean score from the pre-test to post-test of school A’s students increased dramatically in this unit (from 2.76 to 5.27). School D students also obviously improved from the pre-test to post-test mean scores (3.29 – 4.76). School B students improved a little, whereas school C students gained a very small improved mean score.

The repeated measures t-test was conducted to investigate whether the improvement of mean scores from pre-test to post-test in each school was significant. The result in table 5.1 shows a significant improvement (p < .05) for schools A and D, whereas the improvement in schools B and C did not reach significance (p > .05). These results mean that the implementation of CLT in schools A and D had a positive effect on students’ learning, while school B’s and C’s implementations had little effect on students’ learning.

Table 5.1 Summaries of t-test for pre-test and post-test in unit 1 (CLT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/N</th>
<th>Pre-Post</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Std. Error mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/33</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-6.54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/23</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/22</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/17</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-4.03</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.2 Unit 2 (CLE)
In unit 2 the four participating schools implemented the lesson in accord with the CLE method. Teaching aids were divided into COBLA and paper text. Schools A and B used COBLA, and schools C and D used paper text. The results of the implementations in the four schools were differentiated in the two groups (see Graph 2).

Figure 5.2: Graph 2 Improved mean scores from the implementation of unit 2

Graph 2 shows that the mean scores of schools A and B obviously improved, whereas C’s and D’s mean scores increased slightly. The repeated measures t-test was conducted to determine whether the improvement from the pre-test mean score to the post-test mean score of each school in unit 2 was significant. The data from the t-test (see Table 5.2) indicates that the mean scores of schools A and B, using COBLA to facilitate the CLE teaching method, significantly increased from pre-test to post-test (p < .05). The t-test demonstrates no significant improvement for the C’s D’s mean scores (p. > .05). The result from the t-test indicates that the implementation of CLE using COBLA in schools A and B effectively contributed to students’ learning. Meanwhile, the implementation of CLE using paper materials in schools C and D were not nearly as effective for students’ learning.
Table 5.2 Summaries of t-test for pre-test and post-test in unit 2 (CLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/N/ Materials</th>
<th>Pre-Post</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Std. Error mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/33 COBLA</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-4.13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/23 COBLA</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-2.54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/22 Paper</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/17 Paper</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3 Unit 3 (CLE)

In unit 3, schools A and B used paper text, while schools C and D used COBLA. All schools still implemented in keeping with CLE method. In this unit Charida, the teacher of school C, withdrew from the research program. Therefore the class in school C was taught by the researcher. The results of the implementation indicated that the mean scores greatly increased in the three schools: A, C, and D (see Graph 3).

Figure 5.3: Graph 3 Improved mean scores from the implementation of unit 3

![Graph 3 Improved mean scores by unit 3](image-url)
Graph 3 shows that even though schools A and B used the same sets of teaching materials (CLE+paper), they had different results. School B’s mean increased a little from pre-test to post-test (from 4.35 to 4.91), whereas school A’s mean increased greatly (from 3.79 to 5.55). The mean scores of schools C and D from implementation of the COBLA lesson increased obviously. School C’s mean increased the most (from 3.68 to 6.23). The repeated measures t-test was conducted to investigate the significance of the increased mean in each school (see Table 5.3).

### Table 5.3 Summaries of t-test for pre-test and post-test in unit 3 (CLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/N Method</th>
<th>Pre-Post</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Std. Error mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/33 Paper</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-3.85</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/23 Paper</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/22 COBLA</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-6.30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/17 COBLA</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis result shows that the increase of means in schools A, C, and D was significant (p < .05). Only school B’s mean score did not increase significantly (p > .05) from the implementation of CLE using paper materials. The t-test result as well as the graph presentation indicates that Bussaba, the school B teacher, was incapable of implementing the CLE method facilitated by paper materials, whereas Aran, the school A teacher, was capable of implementing CLE using paper materials. The implementation of CLE using COBLA by the researcher in school C and by Dara in school D, was effective.

Based on the overall results shown in the three graphs and the three tables of t-test results, it can be concluded that Aran and Dara, the teachers of schools A and D respectively, were able to implement the CLT method effectively, so that students in these two schools learned and improved their English significantly during the classes of the research period. Only Aran was able to teach all methods effectively, but Dara was capable of teaching with CLT and CLE facilitated by COBLA. Bussaba was able to
teach effectively only in the CLE method using COBLA. For both Dara and Bussaba COBLA provided vital additional support in their teaching. Charida, the school C teacher, was incapable of teaching English when using CLT method and also the CLE method facilitated by paper materials. There was no information regarding Charida’s implementation of CLE using COBLA because she quit the research program during the implementation of teaching unit 3.

5.3 Students’ learning achievements from three teaching methods within each school

To demonstrate the effects of the three teaching methods on student’s learning achievements, and to investigate whether the effects from using the three teaching methods were different in each school, the results of the pre-test and post-test were analysed using the one-way repeated measures ANOVA. The results are presented in graphs and descriptions in the following sections.

5.3.1 School A

**Figure 5.4: Graph 4 Improved mean scores in school A**

Graph 4 shows that Aran, the school A teacher, implemented all three methods effectively. It is obvious that the implementation of the CLT method in unit 1 yielded the highest increase in mean scores (from 2.76 to 5.27), whereas with the other two units implementing CLE facilitated by either COBLA or paper materials yielded similarly high improvements. According to the repeated measure t-test results, the improvement in the mean scores of all units was significant. The result from the one-way repeated
measures ANOVA indicates that the improvement in mean scores (changing scores) in three of the units were not significantly different [Wilks’ Lambda = .886, F (2, 31) = 1.99, p > .05, multivariate partial eta squared = .11].

5.3.2 School B

**Figure 5.5: Graph 5 Improved mean scores in school B**

Graph 5 shows the improvement in mean scores across the three teaching units in school B was slightly different. The implementation of CLT in unit 1 resulted in an apparent increase of the mean score from pre-test to post-test (3.09 to 4.13). In unit 2, when the class implemented CLE using COBLA, the post-test mean score appeared to increase more than it did in unit 1 (3.48 to 4.87). In the implementation of CLE using paper materials in unit 3, the mean score increased only slightly (4.35 to 4.91). The investigation using the one-way repeated measures ANOVA revealed that the improving mean scores from pre-test to post-test among the three units in school B were not significantly different [Wilks’ Lambda = .914, F (2, 21) = .99, p > .05, multivariate partial eta squared = .09]. That means none of the implementations in school B yielded a different level achievement. However, based on the mean scores shown in graph 5 and the results of the repeated measures t-test presented in 5.2.1 – 5.2.3, Bussaba, the teacher of school B, was able to implement more effectively when she used computer-based activities to facilitate her classroom activities.
Graph 6 shows little increase in the post-test means in units 1 and 2. The result from the repeated measures t-test presented in 5.2.1-5.2.3 indicates that the increasing mean scores from the pre-test to post-test of the two units are not significant. This indicates that the implementations of the CLT lesson and CLE using paper materials in units 1 and 2 respectively by Charida, the teacher of school C, were ineffective for learning improvement. In unit 3, when the class was taught by the researcher, using COBLA, the students’ mean score increased dramatically from pre-test to post-test (3.68 – 6.23). This result was in accord with the findings presented in chapter 4 that students were enthusiastic to learn the language in this unit when their class was provided with computers and more powerful pedagogic strategies that involved using various language activities, role playing and gesturing.
5.3.4 School D

**Figure 5.7: Graph 7 Improved mean scores in school D**

Graph 7 shows that the mean scores of the pre-test and the post-test of the three teaching units in school D were different. The mean score from the implementation of CLT in unit 1 improved obviously (from 3.29 to 4.76). The mean score increased very little after the implementation of CLE using paper materials in unit 2 (3.59 – 4.06). The mean score obviously increased again after the implementation of CLE using COBLA (4.12 – 5.41). Even though the testing using the one-way repeated measures ANOVA indicates that the differences in the score changes among the three units were not significant [Wilks’ Lambda = .865, F (2, 15) = 1.17, p > .05, multivariate partial eta squared = .14], the results of the analysis by the repeated measures t-test presented in 5.2.1 and 5.2.3 showed that the increasing means of units 1 and 3 were significant, but that of unit 2 was not. This indicates that the implementation of the CLT method and CLE+COBLA in school D affected students’ learning achievements, whereas the implementation of CLE using paper materials had very little affect on students’ learning.
5.3.5 Improved mean scores from the implementation of the three methods across four schools

Figure 5.8: Graph 8 Improved mean scores by the three teaching methods across 4 schools.

The illustrations on Graph 8 show that the improving mean scores from the implementation of the three units among the four participating schools look different. The mean scores of school A’s students increased greatly in all three units. The mean scores of school B’s students developed in small ranges from the implementation of CLE using paper text and of the CLT method, but developed well with the CLE+COBLA unit.

The mean scores of school C’s students increased very slightly from the implementation of the CLT weak version in unit 1 and of CLE using paper in unit 2 by Charida. The mean score surged dramatically from the implementation of CLT+COBLA in unit 3, taught by the researcher. School D’s students improved their mean scores well in units 1 and 3 when they were taught by using the CLT method and the CLE+COBLA lessons.

These findings indicate that the teachers in the four schools had different pedagogic proficiencies. School A’s teacher was proficient in teaching all methods. School B’s teacher taught effectively when she was facilitated by COBLA. School C’s teacher was not proficient in English teaching as far as she took part in the research project. There was no finding about the benefit of COBLA to the teacher of school C because she withdrew from the project before the implementation of the COBLA unit. School D’s
teacher was proficient in teaching the CLT weak version and CLE+COBLA units. However, she was unable to implement CLE using paper effectively.

5.4 Students’ learning achievement with the implementation of CLE method

The effectiveness of the implementation of the CLE method was investigated across the four participating schools. The findings have been presented in three sections. The first section presents the results of the implementation of CLE using COBLA by the four participating schools. The second section presents the results of the implementation of CLE using paper materials. The third section presents a comparison of the results of the implementation of CLE using COBLA and CLE using paper materials.

5.4.1 CLE + COBLA

The implementation of CLE using the COBLA lesson positively impacted students’ learning in all four participating schools (see Graph 10).

Figure 5.9: Graph 9 Improved mean scores by CLE+COBLA

The graph shows that the mean scores of each school increased greatly. The mean score of school C rose at the most because the class was taught by the researcher in this unit. The mean scores of the schools A, B and D improved in similar ranges. This indicates that the CLE + COBLA lesson contributed to an effective implementation by the participating teachers of these schools. Particularly, a CLE + COBLA lesson is very effective when it is implemented by an experienced teacher. The results from the
repeated measures t-test shown in Table 5.2 and Table 5.3 verify that all the improving scores of all four schools were statistically significant.

5.4.2 CLE + paper
The implementation of CLE facilitated by paper materials seemed ineffective in all schools, except school A (see Graph 11).

Figure 5.10: Graph 10 Improved mean scores by CLE+paper

The graph shows that the mean score increased significantly only in school A. In the other three schools the mean scores improved only within small range. The results from the repeated measures t-test shown in Table 5.2 and Table 5.3 indicate that only the improving score of school A was statistically significant. This result reveals that CLE + paper materials is effective for the students in the third grade when it is implemented by an experienced teacher who is able to provide the class with various engaging activities and with appropriate and meaningful scaffolding of language choices. CLE + paper materials is difficult to implement well by an inexperienced teacher who is not able to resource various activities that involve students in the lesson and model language properly for them.
5.5 Students’ perspectives on learning English

After finishing each teaching unit, nine students from every group in each class were selected for an interview. The interview was in the form of an informal discussion about their English background knowledge, the English class they were involved in, and their feelings about learning English. The discussions were audio taped and then summarized as a transcription. The findings revealed that students in all schools started learning English from their time in kindergarten class. Most of them liked to learn English, but their perspectives on the implementation of each teaching unit varied from school to school. The details of the findings are presented school by school as follows.

School A’s students

Most of the students in the interviewed group of school A said they had studied English from the time of their kindergarten class. They had been taught to say some sentences, recite the alphabet, read and spell some words, and write words or sentences. Most of them thought English was fun to study. When asked about the CLT lessons in unit 1, ‘My interests’, implemented by using the weak version of the CLT method, they said it was fun because they had had a lot of opportunities to speak English in the classroom. They said they were able to ask and answer in English. They thought the vocabulary in this unit was not difficult because some words were used in their daily life.

In regard to the CLE + COBLA used in unit 2, ‘Seasons and weather’, students in class A said that the story was quite difficult. But after listening to the story and watching the illustrations many times they could understand the story and were able to read it aloud while following the computer. One of the girls in the group said the screen was far away from her when the story was presented, so she was unable to see the texts on the screen. All students interviewed regretted the activities in the last period of the unit (phases 5 of CLE) because their computers had no sound. However, they were happy to do activities on computers.

When asked about learning with the CLE + paper materials in unit 3 (‘Life in the country’), the students said the story was quite difficult, but they were able to read and speak out most of the sentences after listening the uttering models from the teacher. They said that they liked to act out to show the meaning of some words or phrases. They said the CLE+paper lesson would be more interesting if it had been implemented through
computers. They asked for an extra COBLA lesson, but there was not enough time for this. Most students were happy to work in a group, completing a part of the story, drawing illustrations and chorally reading aloud the story in both units 2 and 3. A few students said that the part of the story they were assigned to complete and read was quite difficult and they could not read it by themselves. One girl in the interviewed group said some of the students in some groups were ostracised by the others in the group so they did not help completing some activities. This was because their colleagues were worried that they might cause some mistakes or unsatisfactory results.

**School B’s students**

Students interviewed in school B said that they started learning the English alphabet when they were in the kindergarten class. However, most of them said they were unable to remember all the letters, but they could recognise some, even at the time of the research project. They said they liked to learn English in all three units. However, they felt the lessons in unit 1, ‘My interests’, were quite difficult. They were unable to ask and answer in English by themselves because they could not remember long sentences and some words. When asked about COBLA in unit 2 ‘Seasons and weather’, most of them said they were happy to learn English through computers. They said they liked to play games on a computer; therefore they were happy to do the exercises on the provided computers. However, one girl in the group said, ‘Only studying on computer will not help me to be able to read. I need to learn how to read and write with the teacher.’ One boy said he had few opportunities to work with a computer. He wanted to work in a small group with a computer so he would have more chances to respond to the computer. Another boy said he was upset and ashamed when he was blamed for choosing a wrong answer on the computer. Most of them said they were happy to write up a story and draw illustrations jointly with their friends in their groups.

In regard to the CLE using paper materials in unit 3 (‘Life in the country’), most of the students claimed that the lesson was difficult. One boy said, ‘It was difficult. I couldn’t read the story. But I was happy in drawing pictures.’ Another boy thought that the lesson in unit 3 should have been implemented by computers as was the lesson in unit 2. He said ‘There should be more fun if this unit had been taught through computers.’ One girl said that there were a lot of conversations in the starter story. The sentences were not difficult and she could read some sentences. She could not retell the story herself, but
could read the story following the teacher. To sum up, most of the students in Bussaba’s class were happy to learn with CLE+COBLA, but regretted that there were insufficient chances to get access to a computer. Most students liked to write and draw pictures and make up a story book in their groups.

**School C’s students**

Students interviewed in school C in Charida’s class said that English was difficult, but they liked to learn English. They said they started to learn the English alphabet in their kindergarten class. However, in the previous years they had learned English by only writing the alphabet and words and orally reciting some words. They had never been taught to speak or read a story. When asked about CLT in unit 1 ‘My interests’, they said they were able to remember only some words in the unit, but they were unable to ask and answer questions by using the sentences in the lesson. When asked about studying the CLE lesson using paper materials in unit 2, ‘Seasons and weather’, class C’s students said the story was long and the sentences were difficult. They were unable to read the story that the teacher had assigned them to read by themselves. A boy said he did not want the teacher to ask him any questions because he could not answer. He said it made him feel uneasy in the class. Most students said they took a long time to complete a story on big pages because the teacher assigned them to look for the words to fill in the draft story by themselves.

By contrast, most of the interviewed students in school C said they liked to learn with CLE + COBLA in unit 3, ‘Life in the country’. They said working with a computer was fun, and they liked to respond to the questions on a computer. Two boys said they liked to speak in role plays, and they were able to remember some English sentences. They said they were happy to act out to show the meaning of the sentences or phrases. Some of them showed some actions and spoke aloud some sentences, for example, ‘*What are you doing, Dad?*’; ‘*What are you doing, Mom?*’; ‘*I’m picking some fruits.*’ ‘*I’m fishing.*’; ‘*Go fishing.*’; ‘*Go swimming.*’ They said it would be more fun if they were taught by computers in every unit, and if there was one computer for each group of four students. Students were happy to join each other to fill in the story on the big pages, and they enjoyed drawing pictures on each page very much.
School D’s students
The group of students interviewed in Dara’s class in school D reported they had begun their study of English in a different year. Some said they started in their kindergarten class, while others said they started in grade 1. Most of them said that the learning activities in unit 1 (CLT weak version: ‘My interests’) were not difficult. They reported that they were able to understand the meaning of the words and sentences presented to them through pictorial cards and word cards. The teacher gave them a lot of chances to practise speaking English in this unit. One girl in the group said that she was unable to remember some words and could not read words and phrases in the dialogue by herself, but always repeated the sentences after the teacher while practising speaking. When asked about feelings while learning the CLE lesson using paper materials in unit 2 ‘Seasons and weather’, the students’ responses varied widely. Most of them said that they could not remember the seasons and the weather in the USA. Two girls said they could read all the text in the story, whereas three boys said they could read only some words. They said they liked drawing pictures to illustrate the story, but sometimes the picture seemed incongruent with the story.

When asked about the COBLA in unit 3, most of them said they liked the COBLA lesson because it was exciting. They had liked listening to the story and look at the animated illustrations on the screen. They liked to see the feedback when they responded correctly, and they had fun with the feedback when they chose the wrong answers. One girl said she could not read the text on the screen because she sat far away from it. Another girl said that she did not understand the texts in the story, but she could guess what happened in the story from the illustrations presented with the story in each frame. A boy from this group said it would be more fun if there were enough computers for all students. They were happy to work in groups completing a story on big pages and producing a story book.

The overall findings from students’ interviews indicate that school A’s and school D’s students felt happy to study the CLT lesson in unit 1. They thought the vocabulary and activities in the CLT lesson in teaching unit 1 were not difficult. They said that they had a lot of opportunities to speak in dialogues by using the sentences they were learning. On the contrary, school B’s and C’s students found the CLT lesson difficult. They said they could not remember the words or the sentences in the lessons, so they could not speak
English in a conversation. Students from all schools viewed the story in the CLE lesson using paper-printed materials quite difficult. Most students from the four schools said they could not remember all the sentences in a story or in activities, nor could they read the text in the story and the activities. However, school A’s students said they were happy to play games and do activities provided by their teacher. Some said they were able to read the story after they had learned to utter the sentences with their teacher. Even though the students from all schools said the CLE lesson using paper-printed materials was difficult, most of them were happy to work in a group drawing pictures to illustrate a story. It was apparent that students from all schools were happy to study with the CLE lesson using the COBLA. They said working with a computer was excited even though they jointly worked in big groups. However, they regretted that they had few chances to work with a computer themselves.

5.6 Teachers’ perspectives on implementing the three teaching methods
This section addresses research question 3 “What are teachers’ perspectives on implementing the three methods in grade 3 English classrooms?” The teachers’ perspectives on the implementations of the three teaching methods were investigated by means of focus group interview at the end of three teaching units. The interview was an informal talk guided by the questions under the themes as follows: background of English knowledge and teaching experience, opinion on the provided lessons, obstacles in teaching and learning English in their classes, and support in teaching and learning English. Findings from the focus group interview are analysed and presented teacher by teacher below.

Aran
Aran reported that she graduated with a Social Sciences major more than thirty years ago. She had taught English to grades 5 and 6 students for more than twenty years, but had been teaching English to third graders for one year. She said she was happy in teaching English. In the year that the research was conducted she was teaching English to eight classes of grade 3 students in her school. When asked about implementations of the three units, Aran said each subtopic provided in the CLT unit (Unit 1: My interests) was suitable for her students. However, she often adjusted classroom activities to suit her big class; for example, she had students ask and answer in unison in big groups or as a whole class, or sometimes randomly selected students to write and read a report.
individually. Through the adjustment, she was able to monitor the activities thoroughly. She said that doing pair work was difficult because there were too many students. She said having students write and read a report was a suitable activity in the production phase.

Aran viewed the COBLA lesson in unit 2 (Seasons and weather) as an interesting and helpful one. It helped her by saving a lot of energy in presenting the starter story in the first phase of CLE. She did not need to shout to read out the story to the class by herself. The problem in implementing the COBLA unit was that she could not use computers during phases 2 – 4, because the computer room in her school was fully occupied by other classes. Therefore, she had to provide paper text and worksheets for her students instead of doing the activities through computers. In phase 5 she was able to get access to the computer room, but it was not well prepared for language activities. The computers’ soundcards were taken out. Aran had to read some sentences or some words for the class. She also complained that it took a long time to get access to the computer room because it was situated far away from her regular classroom.

When asked about the implementation of CLE + paper printed texts in unit 3 (Life in the country), Aran commented that the topic was interesting. She said the activities in the unit were generally suitable for the level of her students, and the language was not difficult. She said students were happy do some actions to show the meaning of the phrases. Aran also said having students complete a drafted story was a better strategy than having them write up a whole story by themselves. She thought grade 3 students were unable to write a sentence by using their own language. She reported that some groups of her students were able to adapt their story from the draft story they jointly completed with the teacher.

When talking about support and obstacles in EFL implementation in school A, Aran was concerned about difficulties to access computers and quality of computers, as discussed above. Another concerning problem was the large number of students in her class.
**Bussaba**

Bussaba reported that she had graduated with a Thai major. She had taught English to grades 2 and 3 for four years. She thought it was not difficult to teach English at this level provided that the teachers were well prepared. She said that before she became an EFL teacher she knew a little English, but after teaching English for two or three years she had learned English a lot and was able to speak English by using simple sentences. When asked about the implementation of the three units, Bussaba said that unit 1 (CLT: My interests) contained so many subtopics that her class was unable to conduct all the activities. She said her aim in the implementation of the CLT lessons in unit 1 was that students would be able to utter the new words correctly and remember those words. She intended to teach her students to read and write too, so it was necessary that her students remember and write all of the letters of the English alphabet. She said that she made a serious attempt to teach her students to speak in a dialogue, but they were unable to remember the sentences, and unable to put new words into the sentences. She claimed that it was difficult to have students use the language in real communication when they were unable to say even simple words and sentences correctly.

When asked about CLE implementation in unit 2 (Seasons and weather), Bussaba commented that the unit was interesting. The COBLA unit was so appealing that her students were enthusiastic to take part in the lesson. She said the COBLA unit was useful in helping her and her students to read aloud the texts accurately and to learn the meaning of the texts easily. She added that her students were excited to watch and read the story and to do the exercises on the computer. Her students were able to respond to most of the questions on the computer. Bussaba claimed there were, nonetheless, some problems in the COBLA class. There was the limited access to the computer which meant some students were distracted from the classroom activities. She also claimed that most students were not familiar with using computers, so it took them a long time to click on the answer or to drag letters to spell a word. She commented that the lesson would be more effective if there were enough computers for her students, at least one computer to four students.

When asked about the implementation of CLE + paper materials in unit 3 (Life in the country) Bussaba commented that her students were less interested in the lesson.
presented in the big book than the COBLA lesson presented through a computer in the previous unit. She said that even though she was provided with an audio CD player, it was inconvenient for her to manage the CD player and a big book at the same time. She said she attempted to read all activities for her class because she wanted to teach her students to be able to read aloud correctly.

Bussaba thought that it was difficult for her students to write up a story by themselves, but even so they were able to help the teacher complete a draft story in both CLE units by telling her some missing words to fill in the blanks. She said there were two or three female students who were more active and better at English than the other students. These students were able to read some words and help her complete stories or texts in all activities. They were able to adapt some sentences in the story when they were assigned to write up their own story.

When asked about obstacles in implementing her EFL classes, Bussaba pointed out some problems. She complained that the computer room and the language laboratory of her school were always in an unusable condition. Another complaint was that most of her students were very poor at English, so it was difficult to manage fluency activities. She also complained about her busy life that came from preparing herself for her teaching promotion in Thai class of grade 2 students. According to Bussaba’s demographic, she was teaching some other subjects than English to both grade 2 and 3. These subjects included Thai, Arts and Girl guides.

**Charida**

Charida said she graduated in Health Sciences around thirty years ago. She had been teaching English in grade 3 for one year, but had never attended EFL teaching training before. She said that the class needed an experienced English teacher. When asked about the teaching units, Charida said that her students were unable to read and remember the words in unit 1 (My interests). She perceived that the aims of teaching and learning English at grade 3 level were that students learn the letters in the English alphabet, remember and recite some simple words such as vocabulary about animals, numbers, days and months. She thought that performing a conversation was too difficult for students at this level. She said that even herself had only a little experience in English
both in teaching and learning. Therefore it was impossible for her to teach her students to use English in a real or set up communication.

When asked about the implementation of CLE using paper printed text in unit 2 (Seasons and weather), Charida reported that the story in unit 2 was long. The only way to help her students understand the story was by reading them the whole story and explaining the story in Thai. She acknowledged it was impossible to talk about or discuss the story using English. She commented that her students were not able to answer the questions in the provided activities in English. Therefore she always led them to read and talk about the story in Thai. She did not expect that her students would be able to read the story or write up the story themselves.

There appeared to be several obstacles in the implementation of Charida’s EFL class. Charida complained that she taught all subjects to the class and her teaching time per week was fully loaded. Furthermore, she had some extra duties as a school treasurer and a health care teacher which took a lot of her time. Therefore, she had not enough time to prepare her EFL class. She also accepted that she herself had a little experience in teaching English and had limited English proficiency. As a result she was incapable of providing activities and support for her class. Charida eventually withdrew from the research project and had no idea about the implementation of CLE facilitated by COBLA in unit 3.

**Dara**

Dara said she graduated in Social Sciences, but had been teaching English in primary school for more than twenty years. She taught grades 5 and 6 in other schools for twenty years, and had been teaching grade 3 in school C for two years. When asked about the three teaching units, Dara said the topic and subtopics in unit 1 (My interests) were suitable for her class. Some were congruent with the content they were learning in other subjects. Activities in unit 1 offered her students a lot of opportunities to practice conversation. Dara believed that when students had a lot of chances to practice speaking in pairs or in groups they would remember and be able to use the language in the future.

With regard to the teaching of the CLE lesson using paper materials unit 2 (Seasons and weather), Dara reported that the lesson in a big book was quite difficult for her students. She commented that her students could not remember all the seasons. She said they were
unable to say long sentences correctly. She stated that a suitable way to teach the story was having students read aloud each sentence as much as possible. When asked about CLE+COBLA in unit 3 (Life in the country), Dara commented that the COBLA unit made her students more enthusiastic to take part in the classroom activities. Most students were excited to watch and read the story and to do the exercises through computers. Dara made the comment that having only two computers to conduct the COBLA was not sufficient for her students because it meant that many students were unable to read the texts on the screens at the same time. Therefore she gave each group two story books and worksheets.

Dara reported that her students were able to help her complete draft stories in both units 2 and 3. They were able to write up a story by copying and adapting the story they jointly completed. Students seemed to be happy with drawing pictures on pages of the story, even though most of them were unable to fluently read the text on the page.

In regard to obstacles of implementation in the EFL class, Dara reported that she faced two main problems. First, some of her students were often undisciplined and so were always distracted from the classroom activities. Some boys sometimes even skipped from the classroom and took her two or three hours to bring them back. She said that some of her students were from families which had had tough backgrounds. Half of them lived with their grandparents while their parents worked far away and came to visit them only once or twice a year. Some parents were divorced. She believed that the tough background of students’ families made them unready to study any subject. The second problem was that she was usually busy with her extra duty, so that she had not enough time to prepare her EFL teaching.

The overall findings from the interview with the participating teachers indicate that the four teachers had different experiences in teaching English. Their perspectives on the three teaching methods were also different. Aran and Dara had had long experience in teaching English for grade 5 and 6 classes. Aran had one-year experience in teaching English for grade 3, meanwhile Dara had two-year experience. Bussaba had taught English for grade 2 and 3 classes for four years, whereas Charida was in her first year of teaching English. Aran and Dara found the lessons in CLT unit suitable for their classes and supportive for their students as a means of using the language in a conversation.
Meanwhile, Bussaba and Charida thought that the provided CLT lessons contained a lot of new vocabulary so that they had to take a long time for pronunciation drill in class. The latter two teachers felt it was difficult for their students to speak in a communicative context. In regard to the implementation of the CLE using paper materials, all teachers, except Aran, said the lesson was difficult and seemed to be unattractive for their students. The three teachers said their students were unable to read and to remember the entire starter story. They usually had their classes read the questions and answers in all activities aloud after them, but they were unable to ask and answer normally, as in a general interaction, as Aran did. In regard to implementing the COBLA unit, all teachers accepted that the lesson was appealing for their students. They found students enthusiastic to participate in the classroom activities carried out with computer. They said that students were able to respond to the questions and to complete the story on the computer correctly. Bussaba and Dara said the COBLA lesson helped their students read aloud better than when they learned with the CLE using paper materials. The common problem encountered by all teachers was the limitation of the number of computers. All of them said that the COBLA would be most effective if there were suitable number of computers for their classes.

5.7 Summary of chapter findings
The overall findings reveal some differences among the four schools about the effectiveness of the implementation of the three teaching methods. School A’s mean scores from the post-test increased greatly in all units. These results suggest that Aran, the teacher of school A, was able to implement all teaching methods effectively and these results are supported by the positive attitude to learning of all students in her class. In school B, the mean scores improved well only in the CLE + COBLA unit. This means Bussaba, the teacher of class B, was able to teach effectively when she was supported by COBLA. This is very revealing and bears significantly on the research question about the usefulness of computer-based language learning in classrooms where teachers have less than optimal language skills. Bussaba’s students also had a positive attitude to learning English when they were taught by using computers.

In class C, the post-test scores in the CLT unit and CLE + paper materials unit increased but at a low rate. These results suggest that Charida was unable to implement language teaching strategies effectively for both CLT and CLE using paper materials. Students of
class C felt learning English was difficult. They sometimes felt uneasy and afraid of reading out loud English words and sentences. This feeling reversed when they were taught by the researcher, using CLE+COBLA lesson in unit 3, in the topic ‘Life in the country’. Most of the students in the class were enthusiastic to join the class activities both through computers and the teacher (researcher). Most of them were able to speak out several phrases and sentences in the story, and do physical actions along with the utterances.

In class D, the mean scores improved well in the CLT unit and the CLE + COBLA unit. This means that both the CLT method and CLE method using COBLA were suitable for the class in school D, whereas CLE using paper materials was difficult for them. It was obvious that the COBLA unit was engaging for school D’s students. Most students enthusiastically took part in computer-based activities all through the unit. It is clear from this that students’ attitudes related to their attentiveness to classroom activities and to their learning achievement. The scores of units 1 and 3, where students were highly involved in language practice and responding to the activities by the computers or the teacher, similarly improved.

The findings about students’ perspectives on learning English by means of the three teaching methods are quite similar. Most of the students taking part in the group interviews expressed that they were happy to learn with CLE + COBLA units. This perspective was relevant to their mean scores from the post-test. All schools improved well in CLE + COBLA unit. The common problem that the students from all schools commented on was the inadequate number of computers. Schools B’s, C’s, and D’s students stated that they needed to work in small groups with a computer instead of working in a big group as they had experienced in the research period. Meanwhile school A’s students regretted that their computers had no sound, so they asked to learn using one more COBLA unit with high quality computers.

The overall findings indicate that COBLA was helpful in many respects. It helped the teachers save their energy in giving accurate language models to their students. The scaffolding features in COBLA resulted in accurate comprehension of texts or stories. The prominent advantage of the COBLA was that it was appealing for students. It could
engage students, even those who were usually distracted and failed to join classroom activities eagerly.

In the next chapter the key findings about classroom implementations, both observational results and student’s learning achievements, and the implications of the findings for each method of teaching and learning of English are discussed.
Chapter 6
Discussion

6.1 Introduction to the discussion
The purpose of this study was to examine how effectively Thai EFL teachers at the grade 3 level in Thai rural primary schools implemented three teaching methods of communicative language teaching (CLT), specifically the weak version of CLT, CLE + paper printed materials, and CLE + COBLA. The study also investigated what effects the three different methods had on students’ language learning and their perspectives on learning English; and what perspectives the participating teachers had on teaching each of the three methods. To understand the complexity of the implementation of each teaching method by each participating teacher, the research was designed to involve each of the four participating classes in all three of the teaching methods. The main objectives were to explore what facilitated effective teaching and learning, what challenges the teachers experienced during the implementation of each teaching method, in what ways the computer-based activities improved effectiveness in implementing a CLE lesson, what were obstacles of using computer-based activities, and what were the implications of the results of the research for teaching of English in Thai primary schools. The study was carried out using the following research questions for guidance:

1. How did Thai primary EFL teachers implement communicative language teaching through three methods: weak version of CLT, CLE+paper printed materials and CLE+COBLA in grade 3 English classrooms?
2. What effects did the three methods have on grade 3 students’ English learning achievements, and on their perspectives on learning English?
3. What were teachers’ perspectives on implementing each of the three methods in grade 3 English classrooms?

This chapter discusses the findings of the research project in relation to the research questions, presents the implications of the results regarding the implementation of the three methods for teaching English in Thai primary schools, the limitations of the study and the recommendations regarding further study. The findings are interpreted with reference to previous studies on teaching English under the communicative language
teaching approach in EFL contexts, particularly the studies relating to the implementation of CLT, concentrated language encounters, and the use of computer-assisted language teaching in primary and secondary classrooms.

In order to depict the multi-dimensions of the findings about the implementation of the three teaching methods in four classrooms, the first section discusses the findings from the data recorded in the observation field notes and observation form, together with the findings of learning achievements of students as a result of the implementation of all units by the four participating teachers. The second section discusses the effects of the three teaching methods on students’ learning achievements and their perspectives on learning in the three methods. The third section discusses the perspectives of the participating teachers about the implementation of the three teaching methods. The last three sections present limitations of the study, implications of the study, and recommendations for further research.

6.2 How did Thai primary teachers implement the three teaching methods in English class for grade 3 classrooms, and what were the results?

Figure 6.1: Graph 8 Improved mean scores by the three teaching methods across 4 schools.
6.2.1 School A’s teacher

Overall observations reveal that Aran, the teacher of school A, was proficient and resourceful and able to implement all three teaching methods. She was confident in presenting language models in meaningful discourse and language contexts. She was capable of encouraging students to respond to her in English, and of providing scaffolding and feedback for students’ responses in many aspects. She could adapt classroom activities to suit available teaching aids. In teaching unit 1, she was able to organise the classroom activities through the three main phases of CLT weak version. Students had opportunities to perform the language through practice and production phases. Therefore, students in Aran’s class were able to use the language in conversation fluently. With quality support and feedback from the teacher, most students in class A were able to write up a sentence to communicate some information to their class. They were able to understand the sentences they were saying and able to change some words in the sentences. This resulted from the fact that students had a lot of chances to use the language both in the practice phase and production phase. Gass and Mackey (2007) stated that the frequent use of the language provides students more chances to trial using the target language, and to enhance understanding of meaning and eventually of syntactic structures.

Aran implemented both CLE teaching methods effectively in both units 2 and 3. In implementing CLE+COBLA in teaching unit 2 she effectively provided language input for her class through both computers and herself and she was able to adjust classroom activities when facing difficulties with access to a computer room and when computers did not function properly. In implementing CLE+paper materials in teaching unit 3, Aran was able to present the language models and input effectively by herself. She encouraged her students to talk about a story by asking them several questions and provided appropriate features of feedback and support to students through out both of the CLE units. The questions provided in all units were crucial resources for interaction, important for language learning, in the classroom (Tsui, 2001). Her students therefore had many chances to respond in English and to receive feedback and scaffolding which helped them to adjust their language to be more accurate in longer discourses. In the CLE units 2 and 3 students were able to comprehend a draft story and know which words could be put in the blanks of the story to make their own story. This finding
indicates that students understood the structure of the sentences and knew which should be appropriate nouns or verbs of the sentences. This process of language learning is referred to as ‘parsing’ in input processing which is crucial for language understanding (Vanpatten, 2003). The effective implementation in all teaching units of Aran’s classroom yielded significantly positive results for language learning as shown in graph 8.

There were several conditions that might have had an effect on Aran’s pedagogic effectiveness. The first condition is related to her teaching experience. Aran had more than twenty years of experience in teaching English to students in grade 5 and 6; therefore she had English proficiency and pedagogical proficiency which were possible to adapt for her grade 3 classes. Another factor contributing to Aran’s teaching effectiveness was that she taught only English for grade 3 classes at the time. As a result, she was able to devote her preparation of her English classes to this level. Together with the fact that Aran’s extra school duty was about EFL teaching in grades 1 to 3, there were many opportunities for Aran to attend seminars and training about EFL pedagogy.

These findings are compatible with the study by Iemjinda (2003) which found that Thai primary EFL teachers were able to implement CLT methods effectively when they were regularly involved in pedagogic training workshops. In addition, the implementation of CLT was found effective when the teachers themselves were proficient in English or had graduated with an English major. The effectiveness in implementing CLE methods in the unit using paper materials in Aran’s class was in accord with a number of the studies on the CLE teaching method which have found the method to be effective to students’ language learning in all skills (Thongsuthi, 1990; Ketthong, 1991; Phungworn, 1994; Pakhadee, 1998). In regard to the improvement of the students’ learning scores from the implementation of the COBLA unit in Aran’s class, the contribution of Aran herself as well as facilitation from the COBLA needs to be taken into account. Aran’s proficiency might have clear effects on the results of the implementation of the COBLA unit because her class had difficulty accessing computers and where there were computers they functioned improperly in some phases. However, Aran herself was able to adjust the activities and provide input and models of language effectively in all these circumstances.
6.2.2 School B’s teacher

Graph 8 indicates a low improvement in the scores from pre-test to post-test in the CLT unit and the CLE+paper unit in Bussaba’s class. This result might be related to the characteristics of classroom implementation in the two units. The findings from overall observations of the implementation of the three units in Bussaba’s classes revealed that Bussaba appeared to face difficulties in implementing the unit of the weak version of CLT and the unit of CLE using paper materials. She was not sufficiently confident to present language models to her class. She often guided her class to read short chunks of broken sentences with inaccuracy of sentence structures in the CLT unit. She was unable to carry out communicative activities in the CLT unit. In the implementation of CLE+paper unit, Bussaba usually led her students to read aloud a story and also texts in all activities on worksheet. She often broke sentences into small chunks. Students had very few chances to respond to the teacher in natural ways. Scaffolding and feedback that Bussaba provided for her class in the CLT unit and the CLE+paper were not sufficiently effective to enable her students to use the target language correctly and fluently.

The findings are compatible with studies of some Thai researchers who found that Thai EFL teachers encountered constraints in implementing CLT methods because of their limited English proficiency (Vacharaskunee, 2000; Prapaisit, 2004). Findings regarding the implementation of the CLE+paper unit are not congruent with findings in many studies of the implementation of CLE in Thai secondary and primary schools; previous studies have found the CLE lessons effective for students’ English learning (Thongsuthi, 1990; Ketthong, 1991; Rattanavich, 1992; Phungworn, 1994; Pakhadee, 1998). The ineffective implementation of CLE by Bussaba was due to the fact that Bussaba herself was not proficient in English. Therefore she was unable to be a good model for her students, and the scaffolding techniques and support that she provided for her class was insufficient to be effective, and enhance students’ language development. In the CLE method, a teacher plays an important role as a model to whom the children can relate; a conductor who controls the flow of dialogue; and a creator who poses engaging situations for students (Northern Territory, Department of Education, 1985). Bussaba lacked the ability to perform these functions.
Difficulties that Bussaba faced during the implementation of her CLT and CLE classes could have other causes and be related to her background in English, her EFL pedagogic experience, the number of grades and school subjects that she taught, and her school extra duties. In regard to Bussaba’s background of English proficiency, she did not graduate with an English major, but she got a bachelor’s degree with a Thai major. Even though she had had four years of experience in teaching English to grades 2 and 3, she also taught other subjects such as Thai, Arts, and Girl Guides for both grades 2 and 3. Furthermore, at the time of the research, she was very busy preparing herself for an assessment to get promotion for a higher level of her teacher position. This promotion was determined from the successful implementation of her Thai class for grade 3 students. Therefore, most of her energy and time was being spent on Thai class preparation at that time. Another condition observed as an obstacle for Bussaba’s effective teaching in her EFL class was the fact that Bussaba spent around two hours a day in the director’s secretary role. These conditions had crucial impacts on her preparation for her English classes.

When considering the implementation of the COBLA unit, it was found that COBLA was helpful for teaching and learning in Bussaba’s class. Bussaba’s students had chances to learn language through the multimedia presentations on computers. The students enjoyed responding to questions and completing written texts on a computer with prompts and feedback from computer and by Bussaba. COBLA helped Bussaba to present language models and give feedback to students’ responses effectively and confidently. She was able to say long sentences without mistake or confusion. She often repeated students’ responses and sometimes was able to recast their responses into English. These engaging and scaffolding features of the COBLA unit had a crucial effect on students’ learning. As indicated in graph 8, Bussaba’s students’ scores improved significantly only from the implementation of the COBLA unit. The engaging and helpful features of COBLA were also beneficial for the implementation of CLE in schools C and D as is discussed in the following sections.

6.2.3 School C’s teacher
Charida took part in teaching the CLT weak version in unit 1 and the CLE using paper in unit 2. The findings from observation and field notes indicated that Charida faced difficulties in implementation in both units. In unit 1 Charida was unable to present the
language models in meaningful discourse. She often gave inaccurately pronounced models of words or phrases. There was no communicative conversation of dialogue provided for the students. Most of the time was spent on reading aloud words or phrases. Sometimes students seemed stressed to read words aloud by themselves and to respond to the teacher’s questions. There was almost no feedback from the teacher. In the CLE+paper unit, Charida almost had her class read the texts in all activities aloud after her, but she rarely provided her class with any features of scaffolding or feedback. Some wrong pronunciations also occurred. Very little interaction in English occurred in this class. The students’ learning scores in class C increased very little in both the CLT unit and CLE+paper unit. These increases were not statistically significant. This indicates that Charida was unable to implement the two units effectively.

There were some reasons for the difficulties Charida had in implementing the EFL lessons in both units. One reason was that Charida had no experience in teaching English. At the time of the research, Charida had just started teaching English; she was in the first year. Furthermore, she had little knowledge of English and EFL pedagogy and had never attended EFL pedagogic training. She herself felt English was the most difficult subject for her while she was a student. Besides her limited English knowledge and teaching experience, she was overloaded with teaching hours for all school subjects. Charida taught all subjects for a total of 25 hours per week. Therefore, she could not pay high concentration to only English classes, but needed to attend to all classes equally. In addition to her teaching hour overload, Charida also had school extra duties as a school’s treasurer and a health care teacher. The extra work took a lot of her time from her classroom.

Charida’s lack of English proficiency was the crucial reason for her inability to provide meaningful and accurate language models, classroom interaction, and language games for her class. These models are the ready-made chunks of language that students might copy and use in communicative interaction in the classroom (Hatch, 1978c, cited in Ellis, 1985). Her lack of EFL pedagogic proficiency and experience left her unable to provide meaningful input with a communicative and friendly atmosphere; create situations and tasks to encourage students to use the language; and provide feedback for students’ responses. These capabilities are crucial for an EFL teacher of a young children’s class (Moon, 2000; Cameron, 2001).
In the COBLA unit, Charida withdrew herself from the research project. Class C, therefore, was taught by the researcher. The findings of the implementation of the CLE+COBLA unit in school C indicate that the students in class C were very enthusiastic to be involved in classroom activities through both computers and teacher. They had chances to learn the correct language models from the COBLA, incorporated with activities provided by the teacher. They were able to learn and imitate some formulaic sentences and phrases in dialogues in the starter story presented by the COBLA. They were happy to do role-plays and physical actions along with speaking out these dialogues. Most of students in class C were able to remember and to speak out those phrases or sentences correctly and confidently. Graph 8 shows that the improving score from pre-test to post-test of Class C’s students increased dramatically.

This finding indicates that students can learn the language effectively through CLE activities supported by COBLA. The engaging and scaffolding features of COBLA unit can involve students in classroom activities for a longer time (Bancheri, 2006); and students can learn the language through multimedia on a computer together with CLE activities provided by the teacher. Use of these multi-modes of language enhances students’ comprehension and ability to use the language. Gibbons, Hammond and Sharpe state that students learn language well when they get access to the language in more than one mode such as listening, speaking, reading, writing, bodily gesture and role play. These various modes were referred to as “message abundancy” (Sharpe, 2001; Hammond and Gibbons, 2001, 2005). This finding is consistent with earlier research about implementing CLE in EFL classes in Thai primary and secondary schools which found the CLE method is effective to help EFL students to develop all skills of their English language when it is implemented with teachers who are proficient in English and in EFL pedagogy (Thongsuthi, 1990; Ketthong, 1991; Phungworn, 1994; Pakhadee, 1998), especially when it is supported with computer-based activities (Dokkham, 1999; Chonlapap, 2002).

6.2.4 School D’s teacher

Observations in school D revealed that Dara was able to provide her students with language models in meaningful discourses and provide a lot of chances for students to practice using the language in dialogues. However, she was unable to provide a
communicative situation for students to use the language to communicate with each other. In the implementation of CLE+paper unit, Dara heavily emphasised oral reading in all activities throughout the CLE five phases. Interaction between the teacher and students during discussion about a story or about completing texts occurred mostly through oral reading. More than half of the students were unable to read by themselves. Dara seemed to encounter some difficulties while implementing her classes in unit 1 and 2. About half of the students were often distracted from classroom activities in both units. However, the COBLA unit appeared more engaging and appealing for Dara’s students. All of them were obviously enthusiastic to take part in classroom activities of the five phases. Students were able to respond to the computer correctly. Dara provided some support and feedback for her students in all units but most of students were still unable to perform the language by themselves. They still often repeated the teacher utterances and oral reading.

Graph 8 shows significant improvement in scores in CLT weak version in unit1 and in CLE+COBLA in unit 3. These indicate that Dara was able to implement these two teaching methods effectively. This effectiveness is related to certain factors. In the CLT unit 1, even though Dara’s students had no chance to use the language in communicative situations in the production phase, they had a lot of chances to practice using the language in dialogues in the practice phase. Through the practice phase, students had chances to rehearse the skills under the guidance and support of the teacher. Ellis (1985) asserted that when learners repeatedly say ready-made chunks of modeling speech, they are consequently able to use those formulaic sentences in immediate communication and subconsciously acquire the form of the sentences. And vice versa, practice eventually contributes to students’ mastery and comprehension, and ability to apply the linguistic form to communicative language (Nunan, 1989).

In the CLE+COBLA unit, most of Dara’s students were eagerly engaged in classroom activities. They were able to understand the language in each activity, and were able to respond to the computers correctly. They were able to help the teacher complete a story correctly. Bancheri (2006) stated that the engaging features of the computer activities can involve students in classroom activities for a long time. Therefore, students have much time to learn the language presented to them through multimedia on computers. While discussing the story and completing activities of computers, students had a lot of
chances to read, listen to and learn the meaning of texts on the screen. They had chances to debate in groups for the correct answers. Through this process students can comprehend the meaning of the language by facilitation from the multimedia (Reinking, 1988, cited in Pearman, 2003, p.3). They consequently are able to use the ‘formulaic language’ they receive from the computer (Levy, 2006).

The improving score in the CLT unit implies that Dara’s long experience of EFL teaching for her students in grade 5 to 6 helped her to adapt her EFL teaching in grade 3. The improving score of students in this class probably would have been higher if the class had had a chance to use the language in the production phase. The communicative situation in the production phase push students to use the language to communicate the information they need. It provides chances for students to try to use the target language and to improve their language skills through feedback from their interlocutors. This process is crucial for second language acquisition (Swain & Suzuki, 2008).

However, Dara’s EFL pedagogic experience was insufficient to help her implement the CLE+paper unit effectively. This finding is not consistent with a number of earlier studies on CLE implementation by the experienced teachers. The ineffective implementation in Dara’s CLE+paper classes might result from several conditions. First, Dara seemed not to prepare her English classes properly, apparent from the lack of interesting activities to support her CLE classes and the production phase in CLT classes. This might be the effects of her extra school duty as a lunch provider which took her at least two hours a day. Another condition that might result in ineffective implementation in the CLE+paper unit, similar to what was found with Charida in school C, were the large number of school subjects that Dara taught, as well as a heavy load of teaching hours. Her teaching hours for all five or six subjects were up to a total 25 hours a week. This number was a full load for a primary teacher. Such constraints of time might be a crucial obstacle for EFL class preparation. Teaching too many subjects was one prominent hindrance to Dara’s concentration on her EFL class. This finding indicates that to implement the CLE+paper unit effectively, besides having teaching experience and English proficiency, the teacher needs to have time to prepare classroom activities.
One condition which resulted in difficulties for classroom implementation in Dara’s class was the students’ discipline problem. Disturbance from some students often obstructed the fluency of Dara’s class. This problem might be related to the students’ family backgrounds because nearly half of the students in this class were looked after by their grandparents. Their parents left to work in other cities, and visited them just once or twice a year, or less. The family’s difficult situations might be one factor decreasing students’ learning motivation and support. A supportive situation and motivation in family, in society and in school are important factors enhancing children’s ability to learn a second or foreign language (Moon, 2000).

However, COBLA appeared to be helpful to address difficulties in the implementation of CLE classes by the four teachers. It helped Aran save her energy to present language models in the starter story. It made Bussaba feel confident to present language models and other input to her class. It enhanced class C’s students’ ability to perform language in several modes. And it engaged most of Dara’s students in classroom activities throughout five phases of the CLE unit 3. As a result, the mean scores of all classes from the implementation of the CLE+COBLA unit increased at statistically significant rates.

The reasons to support the effectiveness of COBLA are explained by some computer-assisted language learning educators. Levy (2006) argues that appropriately designed computer programs can provide learners with meaningful language models which learners can stock and use. The attractive computer-based activities can continuously engage learners in learning activities (Bancheri, 2006). Scaffolding strategies provided in computer-based activities, as in COBLA, can lead to comprehension (Reinking, 1988, cited in Pearman, 2003, p.3).

The findings about effectiveness of COBLA are supported by the findings of several earlier studies. Meta-analysis of studies on computer-assisted language learning found that these teaching tools were effective to improve language learning achievements (Butzin, 2001, cited in Pearman 2003, p. 32). Several studies found that computer-based lessons which contain texts accompanied by graphics and sound assisted learners to learn English vocabulary at primary and intermediate levels effectively, in terms of word recognition and retention (Siribodhi, 1995; Clement, 1997; Yu-Huei, 2002; Prakobnun, 2002). Marilyn (2005), Pearman (2003), Hastings (2001), and Carlough (2000) found
that CD-ROM books enabled young students and students who had difficulty in reading to develop their reading ability.

The findings about the effectiveness of COBLA in CLE classes in this study are compatible with the results of studies by Dokkham (1999) and Chonlapap (2002). The two studies found that when the CLE lessons were implemented with support of CD-ROM lessons, their students’ English learning achievement increased significantly as well as students’ learning motivation. Interestingly, the increasing learning achievement and the reflection on learning English of students in Bussaba’s and Dara’s class indicated that the COBLA is effective for CLE class even though the class was run by the insufficiently proficient EFL teacher, or by the teacher who had limited time for classroom preparation.

6.3 What effects do the three methods have on students’ learning achievements; and what perspectives do students have on learning English in each method?

6.3.1 The effects of the three methods on students’ learning achievements in four schools
This section discusses the effects of the three methods on the learning achievement of each class. Data for analyses were obtained from the scores of ten-item multiple choices pre-tests and post-tests conducted with all students in the four classes. The improving scores from pre-test to post-test were analysed to investigate language development in each class. If the range was high, it meant that students had showed considerable improvement between administration of pre-test and post-test. The results of classroom implementation by each teaching method are discussed as follows.
6.3.1.1 The effects of CLT (weak version) on students’ learning achievements

Figure 6.2: Graph 1 Improved mean scores from the implementation of the weak version of CLT in unit 1

The results from the implementation of CLT in the weak version method by the four participating teachers varied. Graph 1 shows that the mean score of school A’s students improved greatly, followed by the mean score of school D’s students. The improving mean scores of students in these two schools were found to be statistically significant. The mean score of school B’s students improved noticeably, whereas the score of school C’s students improved a little. However, the improvement of the students’ scores in the latter two schools was not statistically significant. The demographics of the four participating teachers were described in chapters 3 and 4; Aran and Dara had had language experience in teaching English to EFL students in grade 5 and 6 for more than twenty years. Therefore, they were assumed to have sufficient English proficiency and EFL pedagogic experiences.

The findings indicated that implementation of communicative language teaching in the weak version method is effective in Thai primary EFL classes if the teachers of the classes are proficient in English and are sufficiently experienced in EFL teaching (Iemjinda, 2003). The implementation is ineffective if it is implemented by EFL teachers who have limited experience in teaching English, and limited English proficiency. This finding is compatible with the case study of Nonkukhetkhong (2006) which found that most of Thai EFL secondary teachers, even though all had English majors, still choose to implement their English classes in traditional ways instead of implementing them with communicative language teaching and learner-centred as recommended by the Thai Educational Ministry. Nonkukhetkhong claimed that the ineffective implementation
resulted from the limitation of time for teaching and learning and the assessment system. The findings are also compatible with the studies by Vacharaskunee (2000) and Prapaisit (2004) which found Thai EFL teachers encountering some constraints in CLT implementation because of their limited English proficiency and limited understanding about CLT.

The findings about the ineffectiveness of CLT implementation in Bussaba’s and Charida’s classes in this case study are consistent with findings in a number of studies on CLT pedagogy in EFL primary schools in Asia. Lee (2004) found poor performance of CLT in South Korean primary schools. Scott and Chen (2004) found teachers in grade 3-6 in Taiwan primary schools still were unable to implement the CLT method in their English classes. Dzau (1990 cited in Yang, 2004) found EFL classes still emphasising drills instead of providing communicative activities for their classes. The common reason for the difficulty in implementing CLT in these three countries is the lack of proficient EFL teachers. This is also a vital problem in Thai schools, especially at the primary levels in rural areas.

6.3.1.2 The effects of CLE using paper materials on students’ learning achievements

Figure 6.3: Graph 10 Improved mean scores by CLE+paper

According to graph 11, the results of implementation of the CLE method using paper-printed materials were found effective only in school A. The increasing mean scores in
school A were statistically significant (p < .05). Meanwhile, the implementations in school B, C, and D were slightly effective for students’ language learning. The mean scores of the latter three schools were not statistically significant (p > .05). This finding indicates that only Aran, the teacher of school A, was proficient in implementing the CLE lesson using paper-printed materials. As found in the observation, Aran was capable of reading the starter story to her class, asking her class questions about the story, encouraging students to respond to her questions in English, and giving her students suitable feedback and support. She was also capable of providing her class with games and some actions, so the students had a lot of chances to learn the language through many sources and to use the language to respond to the teacher.

The underlying framework for CLE states that a teacher in a CLE class has an important role as the primary source of comprehensible input (Richards & Rogers, 2001) and needs to be capable of providing students with models of language, engaging tasks for interaction, proper support and scaffolding (Hammond and Gibbons, 2001). The observational findings about Aran’s capacity in providing effective CLE activities, support and scaffolding for her class verify that CLE can be effectively implemented by a qualified teacher such as Aran. This finding is in accord with the findings in regard to CLE implementation in Thai schools by Thai EFL expert teachers (Thongsuthi, 1990; Ketthong, 1991; Rattanavich, 1992; Phungworn, 1994; Pakhadee, 1998).

On the contrary, the other three teachers, Bussaba, Charida and Dara, the teachers of schools B, C, and D, rarely provided interactive activities and scaffoldings for their classes. They just assigned the classes to read aloud the texts in the lessons. Bussaba and Charida seemed not confident to speak out a long sentence to their classes, so they often broke the sentences into small chunks out of meaningful context when leading the class to read a story. During discussion, these three teachers usually read aloud and translated the questions and had students read the answers instead of naturally asking and answering. They did not provide attractive games or activities to support the use of language. The lack of interaction contributed to the limitation of chance to receive the language models, supports and scaffoldings from the teacher, resulting in students’ little improvement in language learning and communicative skills. Tsui (2001) and Gass and Mackey (2007) asserted that language learning development occurs when there is an interaction in the classroom between the students and teachers or among the students. In
an interaction students have opportunities to receive contingent scaffolding from the teacher, which is an important factor to enhance students’ language learning (Sharpe, 2001).

The findings about the ineffectiveness in CLE implementation using paper materials teaching aids in classes B, C and D suggest that CLE method is impractical for most Thai primary EFL teachers, who have insufficient English proficiency to use in the interaction in English class, who have limited EFL pedagogic experience, and who have inadequate time for English class preparation.

6.3.1.3 The effects of CLE using COBLA on students’ learning achievements

The results of the implementation of the CLE method using COBLA found the methods were effective in all schools. The mean scores of students’ achievement in the four schools apparently increased from pre-test to post-test (see graph 12). The improvement of the students’ mean scores in all participating schools was statistically significant (p < 05).

Figure 6.4 Graph 9 Improved mean scores by CLE+COBLA

The findings indicate that the COBLA lessons were effective for students’ language learning. This might be the result of the COBLA lessons providing students with meaningful input through authentic models of language and attractive activities facilitated by multimedia on the computer and controllable by the students. These multiple types of meaningful input and attractive activities on the computer contribute to students’ comprehension and continuous engagement in classroom interaction through
the computer (Bancheri, 2006). These multiple aspects of input and multimedia with COBLA are effective scaffolding strategies enhancing comprehension in the language and in the story students were being engaged in, leading to their language development (Pearman, 2003). This finding is congruent with a number of studies on computer-assisted language learning as discussed above.

The scores of class C’s students improved dramatically, compared to those of the other three classes. This effectiveness is the result of the attractive and supportive features of the COBLA itself that engaged students in classroom activities and enhanced their language learning. The effectiveness of COBLA incorporated with effective classroom activities and appropriate classroom organization by the teacher increased students’ opportunities to comprehend and to use the language to interact with the teacher and with the computers in the classroom. Class C’s students were allocated a reasonable amount of time to read the story and to discuss the story by responding to the questions on the computers. Tsui (2001) asserted that these questions are central resources for interaction in the classroom. These questions are comprehensible input that students receive before they produce output as a response. During the process of interaction students learn to use the language and have opportunities to get feedback from the teachers or other interlocutors. While working with computers students had opportunities to work collaboratively in two groups and had ample chances to listen to texts, to read and talk about meaning of the texts or stories alongside multi-media support shown on the screen. When discussing the correct choices of answers, students had opportunities to talk about the meaning of the texts in the tasks they were completing. They listened to the answer choices many times before deciding to choose an answer. Through such collaborative working and interaction in the classroom, students can construct their knowledge and develop their writing and reading skills (Crook, 1994; Beatty, 2003). Additionally, class C’s students were assigned to do effective activities, namely acting gesturing, role playing and playing language games. These multimodal aspects of students’ performances are an important contribution to students’ language learning. Hammond and Gibbons (2005) and Sharpe (2001) stated that students learn the language effectively when they get access to ‘message abundancy’, which means the various modes of language that students are exposed to in their interaction with others.
6.3.2 Students’ perspectives on learning English in each method

The overall findings from the student interviews indicated that students in all schools generally liked to study English, but their perspectives on learning English in each unit appeared to be related to how attractively their classroom activities were conducted. School A’s and school D’s students had a positive perspective on CLT lessons in unit 1. They reported that they were able to ask and answer in the classroom by using English sentences. This is a result of having many chances to speak English in dialogues. School A’s students said they were happy to communicate information through several modes of language, such as writing, drawing, and oral utterances. In units 2 and 3, students from school B, C, and D viewed the CLE+paper lessons as quite difficult, while most of school A’s students were happy to read a story and to work in groups writing up a story along with illustrations. They enjoyed doing physical actions in this unit. This is because Aran, school A’s teacher, provided her class with meaningful models and input and attractive activities. As a result, students were positively involved in all classroom activities.

Another obvious example about the relation between classroom engagement and students’ perspectives occurred in school C’s class. School C’s students felt the language in the CLT lessons in unit 1 and in the CLE + paper unit was difficult. Some of them were even stressed because they were unable to respond to the teacher’s questions. When they were involved in the CLE + COBLA unit, their perspective to English learning became positive. They enjoyed working in big groups with computers, working in small groups doing physical actions and role plays, writing up a story, and drawing pictures on pages of the story. They were even able to remember and speak out some formulaic sentences in the dialogues in role plays.

This arose from the fact that the COBLA had engaging and scaffolding features together with the teacher’s understanding of children’s natural abilities to learn the language. It is important that the teacher provide classroom activities based on the nature of children’s language learning. The nature of children’s language learning include: 1) Children like to take risks and experiment with language. 2) Children are capable of picking up ‘chunks’ of language and can use these ready-made speeches to communicate and take part in conversations in the early stages of language learning. 3) Children like to have fun, so they can be involved and absorbed with a pleasant activity for a long time. 4) Children
like to join in action because they are naturally curious and active. Therefore, they are
eager to interact with other people and surrounding environment through physical
activity, and to experience things first hand. 5) Young children tend to be more
enthusiastic and willing to talk than older children, even though they have very limited
language (Moon, 2000). Class C’s students were provided with activities addressing
these features of the nature of language learning.
Furthermore, the CLE+COBLA class in school C was engaging, so students were eager
to take part in all activities. Moon (2000) asserted that an engaging classroom consists of
good relationships between teachers and students, effective organisation of students and
resources, effective communication between teachers and students, appropriate support
for students’ language learning, and interesting and stimulating learning materials and
resources.

Due to the engaging and scaffolding features of the COBLA unit, most students in all
schools preferred learning with the COBLA than with the other methods. This was
obviously evidenced by Dara’s class. Most of Dara’s students were enthusiastic to take
part in classroom activities, different from the other two units in which Dara often
encountered students’ distraction problems. The only complaint about COBLA was
about an inadequate number of computers in the classroom. Some students complained
that they were not satisfied with the few chances to work with computers. Some boys felt
unhappy when they were blamed for choosing wrong answers on the computers. And
some girls complained that they could not read texts on the screen closely.

6.4 What are teachers’ perspectives on implementing the three methods in grade 3
English classrooms?
The analyses of the teachers’ focus group interview show that the four
participating teachers graduated with other majors beyond English more than twenty
years ago (refer Table 3.3). They had different experiences in and opinions about EFL
teaching. Their perspectives on implementing each unit varied, depending on the
effectiveness of their implementation. Aran was happy to teach English in all units. She
thought the CLT unit was suitable for her students and she was able to adapt a lot of
activities for her students to use the language. She also viewed the CLE + paper unit
suitable and effective for her class, and CLE+COBLA helpful in that it saved her energy
in presenting a starter story. She did not seem to be happy with the difficult access to a computer room and with the improper quality of computers in her school.

Bussaba appeared not to be happy with the implementation of CLT unit and CLE + paper unit. She commented that the CLT unit and CLE + paper unit were quite difficult. The CLT unit consisted of too many activities and that her class was unable to conduct all of them. She thought that it was difficult to have her students speak English in dialogues or to answer the questions in the interaction while discussing about the story because they were not proficient enough to use the language in a communicative situation. She was happy with only the CLE + COBLA unit. She said it was appealing for her students, and helpful for them in learning new words and phrases. She complained about three problems. First, she said her students were not sufficiently proficient to use the communicative language. Second, she complained about the unusable conditions of a computer room and a language laboratory in her school. As a result of these problems her class had to implement the COBLA with only two computers in the first phase and only one computer in the following phases. Third, Bussaba complained that she was very busy with her heavy workload, so she did not have enough time to develop her EFL class.

Charida was apparently unhappy in the implementation of both the CLT unit and the CLE+paper unit. She did not think that her students were able to use the sentences in the lesson they were learning in a conversation or to answer questions. She accepted that she herself was insufficiently proficient to speak English. She also accepted that she had not enough time for EFL class preparation. Therefore, she thought it was difficult to conduct a communicative situation for her students. She had no idea about CLE using COBLA because she withdrew from the research project.

Dara thought that the activities in the CLT unit were suitable for her class. They provided her students with a lot of chances to use the language in a conversation. Dara reported that she was quite unsuccessful in carrying out the CLE+paper unit. She said she had not enough time to add interesting activities into her class during the regular phases of CLE in this unit. She complained that some of her students were quite often distracted from the class activities in the CLT unit and the CLE+paper unit. She was satisfied with the COBLA unit which helped her to carry out the CLE unit conveniently.
She said COBLA was engaging for her students so she felt it easy to involve her students in classroom activities.

Three teachers, Aran, Bussaba, and Dara, had positive opinions about the COBLA unit. This is consistent with the students’ perspectives. The positive perspectives were the result of the engaging and scaffolding features of COBLA, as discussed above. However, all teachers pointed out the same problem in implementing COBLA, the deficient number of computers in their schools. Another common problem and complaint made by Bussaba, Charida and Dara concerned their lack of time for their EFL class preparation. They said they had a heavy load of teaching hours and extra duties. They also complained that they taught too many subjects other than English to their classes. Bussaba said she taught many subjects to two grades, grades 2 and 3 students. These problems had impacts on the effectiveness of the implementation of their EFL classes and on their perspective on teaching each unit.

The teachers’ perspectives on each unit were also related to their language proficiency and EFL pedagogic experiences. According to the data in the field notes, Bussaba and Charida seem to have had negative perspectives on CLT and CLE+paper units because they had limited English proficiency themselves. Therefore, they perceived that having their students use the language in communicative activities was a difficult task because they were unable to provide accurate models, feedback and support for their students themselves. These perspectives were in contrast to those of Aran, school A’s teacher. Aran had positive perspectives on every teaching unit because she was able to carry out all units effectively. She had qualities required for children’s second language classrooms as stated by Cameron (2001). First, she was a provider of learning contexts and resources for language input. Second, she had sufficient target language proficiency, and teaching proficiency. Aran had many features of teaching proficiency suggested by Moon (2000) as being necessary qualities of teaching proficiency for young EFL class. First, she was capable of encouraging children to have a real need to use the language. Second, she was skilful in time management. Third, she was capable of providing meaningful input focusing on communication within a friendly atmosphere. And fourth, she was capable of giving appropriate feedback to the students’ responses. She also had the capability of creating engaging tasks for her class, which is a necessary quality for EFL teacher as suggested by Cameron (2001).
6.5 Limitations of the study

This study was undertaken under the constraints of participants, time and resources. It was conducted with a small number of participants. There were four EFL teachers and their four grade 3 EFL classes from four primary schools in a restricted area. However, even though a small group of participants is thought to be unsuitable for generalizations of the findings to schools in other contexts, this case study research obtained data collected in depth from various sources. As a result, it is expected that the findings can be linked to general schools in the same contexts.

The time for the research project was limited. First, the time for workshops of pedagogic methods was limited because the available time of the four teachers was different. As a result it was difficult to schedule workshop time to suit all teachers. Second, the time for the implementation of each teaching method was limited. Each method was implemented in only five weeks. The unit implementation might be insufficiently effective for assessment in this short period. Additionally, the time for collecting data was uncertain. Teaching schedules in participating schools were often changed due to school events requiring students’ participation.

One limitation of the study was that the COBLA units were implemented with a limited number of computers in most participating schools. CLE+COBLA implementation might yield more insights into classroom interaction and more effects on students’ learning and perspectives. Another limitation was that the COBLA was designed to use with only CLE teaching method. The COBLA might have positive impact on other teaching methods. Therefore there should be a study about the COBLA facilitating other teaching methods.

One of the limitations was that the achievement scores were collected from only conversation tests, because the purposes of teaching and learning EFL at the preparatory focus on basic ability to use the language for fundamental conversation. However assessments of reading, spelling and writing abilities should reveal effectiveness of the classroom implementation in different methods on students’ language skill development, and how much they were ready to study at the higher level.
6.6 Implications of the study

This study reveals the characteristics of the implementation of three different teaching methods: the weak version of CLT, CLE using paper text, and CLE using COBLA by four participating teachers in Thai primary EFL classes. The study also reveals the effects of the implementation of the three teaching methods on students’ achievement in language learning, teachers’ and students’ perspectives on three different teaching methods. The findings from this study raise significant implications for teaching of English in young Thai primary classes in several respects, based on the factors or conditions affecting teaching and learning English, which can be categorized into three factors, namely institutional factors, pedagogical factors, and educational factors.

6.6.1 Institutional factors

The findings from this study reveal three obvious school conditions affecting the characteristics of the teaching of the teachers in their English classes. The first condition apparently affecting the teaching of most participating teachers is the overloaded teaching hours and the number of subjects taught. School B’s teacher even taught more than three subjects to two grades. The heavy load of teaching hours and number of subjects results in a deficiency in the time teachers spend on their class preparation. The second condition is that the teachers are spending some more hours a day on school extra duties. Bussaba, Charida and Dara, the teachers of school B, C, and D respectively, spent a lot of time on the extra work and sometimes had to ignore their classrooms. As a result, teachers often insufficiently prepared themselves for the implementation of the teaching units. This impacted the effectiveness of the implementation of some units. The teachers’ pedagogical proficiency could have been developed if they were not responsible for several extra duties beyond teaching. They should have been freed to develop their teaching proficiency. This problem is common in Thai schools at the foundation level.

The other condition found affecting the characteristics of teaching and learning of CLE using COBLA in most participating schools was the deficit of computers. School B had both a language laboratory room and a computer room. However, at the time of the research, both rooms were not in a usable condition. Schools C and D had no computer rooms. Students in schools B, C, and D, therefore, were provided with only one or two computers while they were studying COBLA lessons. The class took long time to finish each activity because the teachers had to make a queue for individual students to work
with a computer. The limited chance to work closely with a computer is an obstacle in the practice of reading, listening and pronouncing by using computers. In contrast to the three mentioned schools, school A had both a language laboratory and a computer room, but availability of the computer room was limited because it was fully booked. When a computer room was used in phase five in school A, the computers had no sound; so students had no chance to listen to the pronunciation of the words on the computers. Such problems about the limitation and quality of computers are still common in Thai primary schools.

It is crucial that Thai primary schools provide EFL classes with innovative teaching units and aids to teaching materials. The supporting sources for language teaching and learning, such as a language laboratory and a computer room, need to be provided and allocated to serve the EFL teachers in every grade. All teachers have to be trained to use these teaching aids effectively. Another important factor to consider is that a teacher’s workload needs to be taken into account by educational policy providers. Primary teachers should not be overloaded with teaching hours and extra duties. It is also important that each teacher take responsibility for specific subjects at each level. These specific teachers need to attend training courses or workshops regularly in the specific subject they are teaching. One teacher teaching all subjects can impact on the quality of their implementation.

6.6.2 Pedagogical factors

The findings in this study indicate that the three teaching methods were differently challenging for the four participating teachers. The weak version of the CLT lessons were effective when implemented by teachers who had a long experience in teaching EFL and had sufficient English proficiency. On the other hand, it appeared not to be effective when the teachers had limited experiences in EFL teaching and limited English proficiency. These findings indicate that the CLT teaching method is still challenging for most EFL teachers at the primary level, especially in rural schools. Most of these teachers have inadequate experiences in teaching English and also inadequate English proficiency. Most of them did not graduate with an English major.

In regard to the implementation of CLE+paper materials units, the findings indicate that the CLE method was challenging for most of the participating teachers when the classes
were supported by paper-printed materials. The observational data across the four participating classes indicated that three of the four participating teachers were challenged to carry out the activities in the five phases of the CLE teaching methods. These teachers were likely to let their students read aloud the text all through the lessons. Only Aran, the teacher of school A, was able to encourage her students to respond to her in English, and to provide interesting activities regularly throughout each phase. On the contrary, Dara, the teacher of school D, who had had as much experience in EFL teaching as Aran, and who implemented the CLT unit quite effectively, was unable to carry out the CLE+paper materials effectively. She accepted that she had no time for the preparation of this unit.

In regard to the implementation of CLE using COBLA units, the findings from classroom observations indicate that the lessons were attractive for students, and the multimedia through computers helped students to better understand the text than in the lessons facilitated by paper materials. The COBLA units were helpful for the teachers to carry out their CLE classes fluently. The data from pre-test and post-test showed significant improvement of scores from pre-test to post-test in all classes.

The findings indicate that the COBLA units were helpful for all participating teachers to implement the CLE method to some extent of effectiveness, even though they were encountering constraints of time for classroom preparation. The multi-media and scaffolding features of COBLA can compensate for teachers’ limitations in teaching experiences and their English proficiency. On the contrary, the CLT weak version is effective in the EFL classes with experienced teachers. Meanwhile, CLE implementation with support from paper materials is effective when the teachers possess teaching experiences, time for preparation, and English proficiency.

From the findings it can be implied that computer-based language activities can be used to help EFL teaching and learning at young primary levels to accomplish satisfactory results, providing that there are sufficient computers to support the class. The CLT and CLE with paper materials are challenging as far as teachers do not have proper experiences in EFL pedagogy and English proficiency.
6.6.3 Policy factors
As found in the teachers’ interview in this study, an effective EFL teacher usually had a positive perspectives on teaching and learning English, as well as proficiency in teaching and in English Language. On the contrary, the EFL teacher who had little proficiency in teaching and in English Language generally had negative views to teaching and learning English. The latter type of teacher is more likely to skip and overlook his/her EFL teaching in the classes. They might carry out their EFL classes with the old traditional and rote teaching style, instead of trying to develop an English class with communicative teaching. They might focus on other subjects which they also teach to their class instead. To motivate EFL teachers’ positive thoughts, and to develop their pedagogic proficiency, as well as their English proficiency, there needs to be EFL pedagogic courses, training workshops, and fundamental English development courses for in-service teachers regularly each year. At the same time, there needs to be an urgent policy by the Thai Educational Ministry to recruit a sufficient number of English majored EFL teachers to each level in Thai primary schools. If the suggested recruitment policy is not possible, it is crucial that all pre-service teachers be mandated to take EFL pedagogy as a foundation course, so that they can teach English effectively when they are employed, without concern for whatever major they graduate in.

6.7 Recommendations for further research
This study was conducted in schools provided with a limited number of computers. It is suggested that similar research be conducted with schools that are equipped with sufficient computers. Another suggestion is that the COBLA lessons be constructed in line with some different teaching methods; and research be conducted to compare the effectiveness of the implementation of these teaching methods supported by COBLA. It is suggested that each participating class implement only one method of COBLA, but with longer duration, for example the fifteen weeks of the whole semester.

This study found that one of the participating teachers felt uneasy teaching English because she had very little experience of EFL teaching and had little English proficiency. However, she was mandated to teach all subjects for grade 3 class, so she had to teach English, too. This situation might have unsatisfactory results and the consequences for EFL pedagogy in the following grades could be seriously negative. There should be a study exploring problems and needs in teaching and learning EFL at the different levels
of primary school. There should be programs for professional development to assist primary EFL teachers who are encountering difficulties in implementing their EFL classes.
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Appendix A: Observation form (Adapted from part B of COLT scheme)

Unit 1: My interests

School ........................................ date ................................ sheet no .................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction and language use</th>
<th>Frequency of language performance and actions within 60 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s language and actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uttering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gesturing/Acting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructing (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning: Predicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form explaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompting/Guiding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praising (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recasting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking on content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking off content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ language and actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uttering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gesturing/Acting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uttering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gesturing/Acting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing/drawing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Word-picture matching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning: Predicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering: Predicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking on content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking off content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Unit 2: Seasons and weather

School .......................... date ............................. sheet no ..........

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction and language use</th>
<th>Frequency of language performance and actions within 60 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher’s language and actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling - Uttering (computer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling - Uttering (teacher)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling - Gesturing/Acting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling - Oral reading (computer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling - Oral reading (teacher)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling - Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructing - Eng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning: Predicted (Eng by com)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eng by teacher)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form explaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompting/Guiding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praising - Eng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recasting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking on content (Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking off content (Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students’ language and actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating models - Uttering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gesturing/Acting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent - uttering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gesturing/Acting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- oral reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- writing/spelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- matching&amp;fill in (computer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- matching&amp;fill in (worksheet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning : Predicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering - Predicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking on content (Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking off content (Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Unit 3: Life in the country

School ……………………..date ……………………..sheet no ………………

### Interaction and language use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s language and actions</th>
<th>Frequency of language performance and actions within 60 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modeling</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uttering (computer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uttering (teacher)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gesturing/Acting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading (computer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading (teacher)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questioning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted (Eng - by com)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eng - by teacher)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form explaining</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translating</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompting/Guiding</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Praising</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correcting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repeating</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recasting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expanding</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking on content (Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking off content (Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students’ language and actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating models - Uttering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gesturing/Acting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oral reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent - uttering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gesturing/Acting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- oral reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- writing/spelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- matching&amp;fill in (computer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- matching&amp;fill in (worksheet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questioning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredicted (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking on content (Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking off content (Th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Interviews schedules

A focus group interview was conducted with the teachers after their implementation of overall three units. Meanwhile student group interviews were conducted with each class separately after finish the implementation of each teaching unit. These interviews were unstructured. However, there were guiding questions related to the issues that insights into the study as follows.

Questions for teacher focus group interview
1. Can you introduce the background of your education and learning and teaching English?
2. What advantaged and difficulties did you find during the implementation of 3 teaching methods through the three provided units?
3. What are obstacles for teaching English in your school?
4. What support do you need in teaching English?

Questions for student group interviews
1. When did you start learning English?
2. How did you feel about learning English in the previous years?
3. How do you feel when you learn English with this unit?
4. Can you tell me games and activities that you like in your English classes?
5. How often did you play games in English classes?
6. How often do you play games on a computer?
7. How do you feel when you study English with computers?
Appendix C: Pre-post tests
Unit 1

Part A: Look at the pictures and choose the words that best complete the conversation.
(ดูภาพแล้วเลือกคำตอบที่ถูกต้องที่สุด)

1. A: What does your father do in his free time?
   B: He __________ in the garden.
   a. rides a bike
   b. works
   c. plays hide and seek

2. A: What does your sister do on Saturday morning?
   B: She ____________________.
   a. washes the dishes.
   b. cleans her room.
   c. cooks breakfast.

3. A: What do you do to help your family on the weekend?
   B: I __________________
   a. water the plants.
   b. feed my dog.
   c. I clean my house.

4. A: Do you like to ____________?
   B: Yes, I do.
   a. play tennis?
   b. watch tennis?
   c. play golf?.

5. A: What sport do Pim and Pam like?
   B: They like ___________
   a. basketball.
   b. football.
   c. volleyball.
6. A: How often do you swim?
   B: I swim _______________.
   a. with Tom.
   b. every day.
   c. at the swimming pool.

Part B: Choose the sentences that best complete the conversation.
(เลือกประโยคที่เติมบทสนทนาได้ถูกต้องที่สุด)

7. A: ……………………………………………
   B: He plays computer games.
   a. What does Tom do in his free time?
   b. What does your sister do in her free time?
   c. What do you do in your free time?

8. A: I like to watch football on TV.
   B: ………………………
   A: David Beckham.
   a. How often do you play football?
   b. Who is your favorite football player?
   c. Where do you play football?

9. B: Tom and I play football every day.
   A: ………………………
   B: We play at the football field in our school.
   a. How often do you play?
   b. Where do you play?
   c. Do you like football?

10. A: My father likes to watch boxing on TV.
    B: ………………………………………
    A: Once a week.
    a. How often does he watch?
    b. What sport does he like to watch?
    c. Does he like to watch boxing on TV?
Unit 2

A: Look at the pictures and choose the words that best complete the conversation.
(ดูภาพแล้วเลือกคำที่เติมบทสนทนาให้ถูกต้องที่สุด)

1. Tom: How is the weather in the rainy season?
   Dang: It is rainy and ___________.
   a. dry
   b. wet
   c. snowy

2. Tom: How is the weather in the cold season?
   Dang: It is cold and ___________.
   a. windy
   b. warm
   c. cloudy

3. Dang: I don’t like the hot season.
   Tom: Why?
   Dang: It’s very hot and ___________.
   a. dry
   b. wet
   c. windy

4. Dang: How is the weather in the spring?
   Tom: It is ________________.
   a. snowy and cold.
   b. warm and cloudy.
   c. rainy and wet

5. Tom: Look. There is a lot of snow. I like snow.
   Dang: I like to play in snow.
   Tom: Yes, we like ____________.
   a. winter.
   b. spring.
   c. Summer
6. Tom: I like the summer.
   Dang: Why?
   Tom: ______________________
      a. It’s wet. I can swim.
      b. It’s cold. I can play snow.
      c. It’s sunny. I can go to the beach.

B: Look at the pictures and choose the sentences that best complete the conversation.
(ดูภาพแล้วเลือกประโยคที่เติมบทสนทนาได้ถูกต้องที่สุด)

7. Tom: How many seasons are there in Thailand?
   Dang:……………………………
      a. There are three seasons.
      b. There are four seasons.
      c. Hot season, rainy season, and cold season.

8. Tom: What can you do in the cold season?
   Dang: _______________________
      a. I can go for a picnic.
      b. I can fly a kite.
      c. I can play in snow.

9. Dang: ______________________
   Tom: It’s windy and cool.
      a. Do you like fall?
      b. How is the weather in the fall?
      c. I don’t like the fall.

10. Dang: How many seasons are there in the USA?
    Tom: ________________________
       d. There are three seasons.
       e. There are four seasons.
       f. Summer, fall, winter and spring.
Unit 3
A: Look at the pictures and choose the words or sentences that best complete the conversation.
(ดูภาพแล้วเลือกคำหรือประโยคที่เติมบทสนทนาให้ถูกต้องที่สุด)

1. A: Where does Tam live?
   B: Tam lives…………………………
       a. in the vegetable garden.
       b. in the river near the farm.
       c. on the farm in a country.

2. A: What does Tam do on the weekend?
   B: ……………………………………………
       a. He goes swimming at the river.
       b. He picks some vegetables.
       c. He works on the farm.

3. Father: I like the trees.
   Tam: Why?
   Father: ……………………………
       a. There are a lot of trees.
       b. The trees give us fresh air.
       c. I’ve got a big fish.

4. Tam: What are you doing, Dad?
   Father: ………………………………………
       a. Yes, you can.
       b. There is a lot of fruit
       c. I’m picking some fruit.

5. Tam: Can I help you, Mum?
   Mother: ………………………………………
       a. Yes, you can
       b. There are a lot of vegetables.
       c. I’m planting vegetables.
6. Father: There are a lot of fish in the river.
Tam: ...........................................
   a. Let’s go swimming.
   b. Let’s go fishing.
   c. Let’s go away.

7. A: Where do Tong and Lek go swimming?
B: They go swimming at the ..............
   a. river
   b. garden
   c. farm.

8. Lek: Let’s swim to Tam.
   Tong: OK. Go!
   Tam: .............................. The fish are going away.
   a. Please don’t swim here.
   b. Please swim here.
   c. Hi, Tong and Lek. I’m fishing.

9. Tam: What vegetables are they?
Mother: They are ...............................
   a. carrots
   b. onions
   c. lettuces

10. Tam: What fruits are they?
Father: They are..............................
    a. papayas
    b. oranges
    c. mangoes
Appendix D 1
Sample teaching unit 1: My Interests

Lesson 1: I like Sports

Period 1: Do you like sports?
A: Look, listen, and say the names of sports.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="badminton" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="basketball" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="boxing" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="football" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>badminton</td>
<td>basketball</td>
<td>boxing</td>
<td>football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="golf" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="swimming" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="tennis" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="volleyball" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>golf</td>
<td>swimming</td>
<td>tennis</td>
<td>volleyball</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worksheet 1.1
Look, listen, and match the pictures with the words.
ฟังชื่อกีฬาแล้วโยงภาพกับชื่อให้ถูกต้อง

a. badminton
b. basketball
c. boxing
d. football
e. golf
f. swimming
g. tennis
h. volleyball
B: Look at the pictures, listen to the conversations and repeat.

**Tom:** Do you like football, Tim?

**Tim:** Yes, I do.

**Tim:** Do you like tennis?

**Tom:** No, I don’t.

**Tim:** Do you like swimming, Tom?

**Tom:** No, I don’t.
Worksheet 1.2

Ask your friends “Do you like ………….?” ถามเพื่อนด้วยประโยค “Do you like ………….?”

Put a √ under the sports that your friends say “Yes, I do.” กาเครื่องหมาย √ เมื่อเพื่อนตอบ “Yes, I do.”

Put a X under the sports that your friends say “No, I don’t.” กาเครื่องหมาย X เมื่อเพื่อนตอบ “No, I don’t.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sports</th>
<th>football</th>
<th>basketball</th>
<th>volleyball</th>
<th>badminton</th>
<th>tennis</th>
<th>golf</th>
<th>swimming</th>
<th>boxing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise 1.

A. Choose the correct answers.

1. **Tod:** Do you like golf?
   
   Sam: ____________
   
   a. Yes, I do.
   b. No, I don’t.

2. **Tod:** Do you like badminton?
   
   Sam: ____________
   
   a. Yes, I do.
   b. No, I don’t.

3. **Tod:** Do you like volleyball?
   
   Sam: ____________
   
   a. Yes, I do.
   b. No, I don’t.
B. Fill in the dialogues with the words in the box.
เติมค่าวันบทสนทนาให้ถูกต้องโดยเลือกจากคำที่ให้ไว้ในกรอบ

1. Tom: Do you like ______________?
   Tim: ________, I do.

2. Tim: Do you _______ tennis?
   Tom: No, I _______.

3. Tim: ______ you like swimming?
   Tom: _______. I don’t.

football
Yes
like
don’t
Do
No
Lesson 2: My house work

Period 5: What do you do on the weekend?
A: Look at the pictures and listen to the sentences.

I clean my house.
I water the plants.
I cook some food.
I wash the dishes.
I feed my dog.
I wash the clothes.
I work in the garden.

B: Look at the pictures and listen to the conversations.
Sam: What do you do on the weekend?
Dan: I feed my dog.

Sam: What do you do on the weekend?
Dara: I cook.

Sam: What do you do on the weekend?
Don: I work in the garden.

Sam: What do you do on the weekend, Ted?
Ted: I clean my house.

Sam: What do you do on the weekend?
Sally: I wash the dishes.
Worksheet 5.2
Ask your friends and write the answers in the table.
ถามเพื่อนภายในกลุ่ม แล้วบันทึกคำตอบลงในตาราง

What do you do on the weekend?
I ______________.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>House work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise 5.
Complete the conversation with the words given in the box.

1. A: What do you ______ on the weekend?
   B: I _______ in the garden.

2. A: ______ do you do on the weekend?
   B: I wash the ____________.

3. A: What do ______ do on the weekend?
   B: I _______ the dog.

4. A: What do you do on the ____________?
   B: I ____________ the plants.

do  work  What  dishes
you  feed  weekend  water
Lesson 3: Our free time

Period 8: What we do in our free time.

A: Look at the pictures, listen to the audio CD and repeat. after the CD.

| 1.  | go shopping |
| 2.  | go for a picnic |
| 3.  | play hide and seek |
| 4.  | sing karaoke songs |
Worksheet 8.1
Look, listen, and match the pictures to the correct words.
ฟังเสียงอ่านคำในข้อ 1-4 จากเทป หรือ CD แล้วโยงคำกับภาพให้ถูกต้อง

1. go shopping

2. go for a picnic

3. sing karaoke songs

4. play hide and seek
### B: Look at the pictures, listen to the conversations and repeat saying the conversations.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.** | **Jack:** Don, what does your family do in the free time?  
**Don:** We go shopping. |
|   | **2.** | **Jack:** What do you and your brother and sister do in your free time?  
**Dan:** We play hide and seek. |
|   | **3.** | **Jack:** What do your brother and sister do in their free time?  
**Dan:** They sing karaoke songs. |
|   | **4.** | **Jack:** What do you and your family do in the free time?  
**Dan:** We go for a picnic. |
Worksheet 8.2
Ask and answer about what your family and your friends’ family do. 
Tick √ the answers in the table.
ถามและตอบเรื่องสิ่งที่ครอบครัวของตน และครอบครัวของเพื่อนท่านทำ แล้วบันทึกลงในตาราง

What do you and your family do in the free time?

We go for a picnic in the free time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>go for a picnic</th>
<th>go shopping</th>
<th>play hide and seek</th>
<th>sing karaoke songs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My family</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>………..’s family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>………..’s family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>………..’s family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>………..’s family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Lesson 3: Our free time
Period 9: What does your brother do in his free time?

A: Look at the pictures, listen to the audio CD and repeat. after the CD.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. listen to the radio
2. watch TV
3. read a newspaper
4. play computer games
5. ride a bike
Worksheet 9.1
Look, listen, and match the pictures to the correct words.
ฟังเสียงอ่านคําในข้อ 1-5 จากเทป หรือ CD แล้วโยนคํากับภาพให้ถูกต้อง

1. listen to the radio

2. watch TV

3. read a newspaper

4. ride a bike

5. play computer games
B: Look at the pictures, listen to the conversations and repeat saying the conversations.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | Sam: What does your brother do in his free time?  
    Pam: He listens to the radio. |
| 2. | Dan: What does your brother do in his free time?  
    Sam: He watches TV. |
| 3. | Sam: What does your father do in his free time?  
    Dan: He reads a newspaper. |
| 4. | Pam: What does your brother do in his free time?  
    Dan: He plays computer games. |
| 5. | Pam: What does your sister do in her free time?  
    Dan: She rides a bike. |
Worksheet 9.2
Tick what you and your family do in the free time.

**My family**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>listen(s) to the radio</th>
<th>watch(es) TV</th>
<th>ride(s) a bike</th>
<th>read(s) a newspaper</th>
<th>play(s) computer games</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worksheet 9.3
Ask and answer about what your friends’ families do. Write the answers in the table.
ถามและตอบเรื่องสิ่งที่ครอบครัวของเพื่อนทำ แล้วบันทึกลงในตาราง

What do you do in your free time?

What does your (father) do in (his) free time?
   (mother)   (her)
   (brother)  (his)
   (sister)   (her)
He __________ (s, es) …..

_________ ’s family (My friend’s name)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>listen(s) to the radio</th>
<th>watch(es) TV</th>
<th>ride(s) a bike</th>
<th>read(s) a newspaper</th>
<th>play(s) computer games</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(My friend) _________</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His/Her father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His/Her mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His/Her brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His/Her sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise 9
Read and listen to Wichai talking about what people in his family do in their free time. Match the people with the correct things or places.

ผมและครอบครัวของฉันมีกิจกรรมในว่างเวลาอย่างไรกันบ้าง ให้ระบุภาพตามที่ให้ขึ้นต่อไปนี้:

1. My father plays computer games.
2. My mother rides a bike around the garden.
4. My sister reads a newspaper.
5. My dog watches TV.
7. My family and I go for a picnic at the central park.
8. My brother and I play hide and seek in the garden.
9. My mother, my father and my sister go shopping at the shopping mall.

Match:

1. a.
2. b.
3. c.
4. d.
5. e.
6. f.
7. g.
8. h.
9. i.
Appendix D2
Sample CLE+paper unit
Unit 3: Life in the country

A starter story on a big book

Life in the country

Tam lives in the country.
On the weekend;
He helps his father and mother work on the farm.
At the fruit garden

Tam: There are a lot of trees on the farm.

Father: I like the trees.

Tam: Why?

Father: The trees give us fresh air.
Tam: What are you doing, Dad?

Father: I'm picking some fruits.

Tam: What fruits are they?

Father: They are mangoes, papayas, oranges, and durians.

Tam: Can I help you, Dad?

Father: Yes, you can.

Tam: mangoes, oranges, papayas, durians.
At the vegetable garden

Tam helps his mother plant some vegetables.

Tam: What are you doing, Mum?
Mother: I'm planting vegetables.

Tam: What vegetables are they?
Mother: They are cabbages, onions, carrots and lettuces.

Tam: Can I help you, Mum?
Mom: Yes, you can.

Tam: Cabbages, onions, carrots and lettuces. Wow!
On Sunday, Tam and his father go fishing at the river near their farm.

Tam: Look! Dad!
There are a lot of fish in the river.

Father: Look! Tam!
I've got a big fish!
Tong and Lek go swimming at the river.
The water is cool and clean.

Tong: Look! That's Tam.
Lek: Hi Tam. What are you doing?

Tam: Hi Tong, and Lek.
I'm fishing.
Tong: Let's swim to Tam.

Lek: OK. Go!

Tam: Please don't swim here.

The fish are going away!
A. Choose the best words to complete the conversation.

1. Father: I like the trees.
   Tam: Why?
   Father: The trees give us ________.
   - fresh air
   - cool water

2. Tam: What are you doing, Dad?
   Father: I'm ________________.
   - fishing
   - planting some vegetables
   - picking some fruit

3. Tam: What __________________, Dad?
   - fruits are they
   - vegetables are they
   - the trees give us
   Father: They are mangoes, papayas, 
oranges and durians
4.

Tam:____________________
  • What are you doing, Mum?
  • What vegetables are they, Mum?
  • Can I help you, Mum?
Mom: Yes, you can.

5.

Lek: Let's swim to Tam.
  Tam: Please don't swim here.
  The fish are ______________
  • fishing
  • going away
  • fresh
B: Choose the correct words to answer the questions.
(จงเลือกคำตอบที่ถูกต้อง)

1. Where does Tam live?
   He lives in the..............
   • country
   • river
   • garden

2. What does Tam do on the weekend?
   He .................
   • helps his father and mother work on their farm.
   • goes swimming at the river

3. What do the trees give us?
   The trees give us .................
   • some vegetables
   • fresh air
4. What does Tam do in the fruit garden?
   He ........................................
   • picks some fruit
   • goes fishing
   • plants some vegetables

5. What does Tam do with his mother?
   He ........................................
   • picks some fruit.
   • goes fishing
   • plants some vegetables

6. What are the fruits in the garden?
   They are ...................................
   • mangoes, oranges, durians and bananas
   • durian, mangoes, papayas and apples
   • mangoes, papayas, oranges and durians

7. What are the vegetables in the garden?
   They are .................................
   • carrots, cabbages, onions and lettuces.
   • carrots, tomatoes, onions and cabbages
   • lettuces, onions, cabbages and beans
8. Where do Tam and his father go fishing?
They go fishing at the………………………………..
- garden
- river
- farm

9. What are in the river?
There are a lot of ............... in the river.
- fish
- fruits
- vegetables

10. Who goes to swim at the river?
- Tam and his father.
- Tong and Lek.
- Tam’s mother
11. How is the water in the river?
- It’s hot and clean.
- It’s clean and cool.
- It’s cold and clean

12. Is Tam happy when Tong and Lek swim to him?
- Yes.
- No.

Why or why not?
- He does not like swimming.
- The fish are going away.
- Tong and Lek cannot swim.

C: True or False.

1. Tam lives in the country. □ True □ False
2. Tam works on the farm on the weekend. □ True □ False
3. Tam helps his mother pick some apples. □ True □ False
4. Tam helps his mother plant some vegetables. □ True □ False
5. There are a lot of fish in the garden. □ True □ False
6. Tam swims in the river with his friends. □ True □ False
7. The water in the river is clean and cool. □ True □ False
D. Complete the story.

Choose the words in the box that best complete the blanks.

(เลือกคำในกรอบที่เติมช่องว่างให้ถูกต้องที่สุด)

Tam lives _______________ in the country.

On the weekend
He helps his _______________ on the farm.

There are a lot of trees _______________.
Tam’s father likes the _______________.
The trees make _______________.

father and mother
fresh air
on a farm
trees
At the fruit garden

Tam helps his father ________________.
He picks some mangoes, oranges, durians and __________.

At the vegetable garden

Tam helps his mother ________________.
They plant cabbages, lettuces, onions and ____________.
On Sunday

Tam and his father _______________ at the river.
There are a lot of fish___________________ .

Tong and Lek __________________ at the river.
The fish are _____________.

**go fishing**
**in the river**
**go swimming**
**going away**
E. Match the pictures with the correct words.

1. [Picture of mangoes]  
   a. mangoes

2. [Picture of a river]  
   b. vegetables

3. [Picture of pears]  
   c. fish

4. [Picture of carrots]  
   d. carrots

5. [Picture of a basket filled with vegetables]  
   e. trees

6. [Picture of an orchard]  
   f. river

7. [Picture of various fruits and vegetables]  
   g. fruit
F. Match the pictures with the sentences.
(จับคู่ประโยคกับภาพให้ถูกต้อง)

1. a. There are a lot of fish in the river.
   
2. b. Tam picks some fruit.
   
3. c. Tam and his father are fishing.
   
4. d. There are a lot of trees on the farm.
   
5. e. Tong and Lek are swim at the river.
   
6. f. Tam plants some vegetables.
G. Spell the words from the given letters.

(สะกดคำด้วยตัวอักษรที่กำหนดให้)

1. 
\[ a \ f \ m \ r = f \_ \_ \_ \_ \]

2. 
\[ e \ i \ r \ r \ v = r i \_ \_ \_ \_ \]

3. 
\[ i \ f \ r \ t \ u = f r \_ \_ \_ \_ \]

4. 
\[ a \ b \ e \ e \ e \ g \ l \ v \ t = v \_ \_ g e t \_ \_ b \_ \_ \]

5. 
\[ e \ h \ m \ o \ r \ t = \_ o t h \_ \_ \_ \]

6. 
\[ a \ e \ f \ h \ t \ r = \_ a t h \_ \_ \_ \]
Appendix D3
Sample CLE+COBLA unit
Unit 3: Life in the country
Sample frames of starter story and activities
Story Frame 5

Story Frame 6.1

Story Frame 6.2

Activity A Page1

Activity A Page2

Activity A Page2.1(False)

Activity A Page2.1(True)

Activity B Page1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity D Page2</th>
<th>Activity D Page2.1(False)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity D Page2.1(True)</td>
<td>Activity E Page1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity E Page2</td>
<td>Activity E Page2.1(False)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity E Page2.1(True)</td>
<td>Activity F Page1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Sample teaching plans

Appendix E1. Sample teaching plan of unit 1 (CLT weak version method)

Teaching plan unit 1: Unit 1: My Interests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreign language</th>
<th>Period 9</th>
<th>Pratom 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Lesson 3: Our free time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Terminal Objectives:** Students are able to talk about activities in their free time.

**Enabling Objectives:** Students are able to:
1. pronounce the words of daily activities correctly.
2. ask and answer about daily activities correctly.
3. ask and give information about what family’s members do effectively.

**Concept:** Conversation about activities in free time fundamental skills of people’s daily life.

**Duration:** 1 ชม.

**Contents:**

- **Vocabulary:** listen to the radio, watch TV, ride a bike, read a newspaper, play computer games, his, her

- **Sentences:**
  - What do you do in your free time?
  - I ...(listen to the radio)...
  - What does your brother do in his free time?
  - He ...(plays computer games)....
  - What does your sister do in her free time?
  - She …. (rides a bike)....

**Teaching and learning materials:**
1. audio tape or CD of words and sentences
2. word cards and pictures
3. sentence cards
4. worksheet

**Teaching and learning activities:**

- **Warm up**
  1. Have students look at pictures, read and listen to the words read by an audio tape player of teacher. Match the pictures and words in worksheet number 9.1.

- **Presentation**
  1. Students pronounce the words along with the pictures shown by the teacher.
  2. Students pronounce the words family’s members and say the sentences “What does your sister do in her free time?” and “She …rides a bike”
  3. The teacher raises pictures of other members and ask; “What does your ...(brother)...do in his free time?”
     And answer “He .. plays computer games…”
  4. The teacher explain he, she, his, her
  5. The teacher write the sentences of the question and answer on the Blackboard.
  6. Students are separated into to parts to ask and answer while the teacher show them pictures to give students some information to talk.
  7. Students are divided into groups, each group take turn picking up picture
and asking the class by using the sentence they are learning, the class answer the question in unison.

Practice

1. Assign students to walk to ask some friends in the other groups.

Production

1. Students tick in the table on worksheet 9.2 what he/she and others in his/her family do in the free time.
2. Ask one friend for activities they do during their free time and tick the answer in the table on worksheet 9.3.

Wrap up

1. Do exercise 9

6. Evaluation:

1. Evaluate the accuracy of sentences used in the conversations.
2. Evaluate the fluency in conversation.
3. Observe the incorporation in classroom activity.
4. Check the exercise

7. Teacher’s recommendation

1. result of teaching…………………………………………………………………..
2. problems…………………………………………………………………………
3. recommendation………………………………………………………………
Appendix E2. Sample teaching plan of unit 3 (CLE+COBLA)**

Teaching plan unit 3: Life in the country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreign language</th>
<th>Pratom 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period 1-9</td>
<td>Lesson 3: Our free time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concept: Listening, speaking, reading and writing about surrounding events in English is essential for life development.

Terminal Objectives: Students are able to understand the story they listen to, look at and read, and able to transfer the story to others.

Enabling Objectives: Students are able to:
1. answer the questions about the story they have listened and read correctly.
2. retell the story they have listened and read.
3. jointly complete or build up a story similar to the one they have listened and read.
4. read and spell the words in the story.

Contents:

The starter story: Life in the country
Language activities A-G.

Teaching and learning materials:

1. computers
2. COBLA CD
3. Big sheets
4. A4 sheets
5. colours
6. stapler
7. sticky tape

Teaching and learning activities:

Period 1:

Phase 1. Listening to, watching, and reading the story on computers.
1. Guess what happens in the story
2. Listen to the story once and talk about the story.
3. Listen to, watch, and read each frame consisting of parts of the story, and talk about what they learn in each frame

Frame 1
Life in the country
Tam lives in the country. On the weekend, he helps his father and mother on the farm.

Discuss the story in the frame and read again after computers.

Frame 2
At the fruit garden;
“There are a lot of trees on the farm."
“I like the trees.”
“Why?”
“The trees give us fresh air.”
Discuss the story in the frame and read again after computers.

**Frame 3**
“What are you doing, Dad?”
“I’m picking some fruits.”
“What fruits are they?”
“They are mangoes, papayas, oranges, and durians.”
“Can I help you, Dad?”
“Yes, you can.”
“mangoes, oranges, papayas, durians.”

Discuss the story in the frame and read again after computers.

**Frame 4**
At the vegetable garden;
Tam helps his mother plant some vegetables.
“What are you doing, Mum?”
“I’m planting vegetables.”
“What vegetable are they?”
“They are cabbages, onions, carrots and lettuces.”
“Can I help you, Mum?”
“Yes, you can.”
“cabbages, onions, carrots and lettuces, Wow!”

Discuss the story in the frame and read again after computers.

**Frame 5**
On Sunday;
Tam and his father go fishing at the river near their farm.
“Look! Dad! There are a lot of fish in the river.”
“Look! Tam! I’ve got a big fish.”

Discuss the story in the frame and read again after computers.

**Frame 6**
Tong and Lek go swimming at the river.
The water is cool and clean.
“Look! That’s Tam.”
“Hi Tam. What are you doing?”
“Hi Tong and Lek. I’m fishing.”
“Let’s swim to Tam.”
“OK. Go!”
“Please don’t swim here. The fish are going away!”

Discuss the story in the frame and read again after computers.
Period 2:
Phase 2. Students retelling the story
1. Listen to and read the story again
2. Work in groups with computers, doing activities A and B
3. Students recall the story and say some dialogues from the story and do action.

Period 3-4:
Phase 2. (continue)
1. Read and listen to the story again. Do role plays extracted from the story.

Phase 3. Jointly write up a story with the teacher
1. Do activity C by using computers
2. Do activity D by using computers, filling in words, phrases or sentences to complete the story.
3. Jointly write up a story with the teacher and friends.
4. Read aloud the story while writing.

Period 5:
Phase 3. (continue) Jointly writing up a story with the teacher
1. Students draw pictures on the pages they wrote.
2. Show and read the page

Period 6-7:
Phase 4. Making a group book
1. Read the pages they wrote and drew
2. Write the story on A4 sheets drawing pictures and binding as a story book

Period 8-9:
Phase 5. Language activities
1. Read the story in the group book and compete role plays.
2. Work in group doing activity E, F and G by using computers

6. Evaluation:
1. Evaluate from retelling story and role play.
2. Evaluate from the group story book.
3. Observe the incorporation in classroom activity.
4. Check from the accuracy of computer activities.

7. Teacher’s recommendation
1. result of teaching.................................................................
2. problems.................................................................................
3. recommendation.................................................................

** Note: The teaching plan of the CLE+paper unit is similar to the one of the CLE+COBLA unit. The differences are that the materials used in class are totally paper based.
My name is Sooksil Prasongsook. I am a lecturer at Maha Sarakham Rajabhat University. I am also a PhD student undertaking research in teaching and learning English at the primary level in Thailand.

My research is concerned with how to improve the effectiveness of teaching and learning English in the early years of primary schools in Thailand. I plan to investigate the effectiveness of three different methods of English teaching at grade 3 level in four primary schools. These three approaches include:

i) The weak version of the communicative language teaching (CLT)
ii) Concentrated Language Encounters (or CLE) method (using print-based lessons);
iii) Concentrated Language Encounters method (or CLE+) (using computer-based lessons).

I will investigate the effectiveness and appropriateness of the three methods through classroom observation, videotaping, pre and post-tests, and interviews.

The four classes I investigate will implement all three methods over three consecutive sessions. The unit of the first session will be designed in alignment with the weak version of the communicative language teaching, while the later two units will be designed using CLE method using paper printed text and CLE using CD-ROM text. In the first session, all teachers will implement a weak version communicative approach. Later, they will use the CLE method, switching from print to computer software or vice versa.
As part of my research, I will work closely with each participating teacher. Before the first session, there will be a workshop on the overall aims of the research and a session on communicative language teaching. There will be a later workshop before session two and three to develop participants’ understanding of CLE method using both paper printed text and CD-ROM text. Pre and post-tests will be employed at the beginning and the end of each session to assess students’ development of children’s speaking and listening skills. A group interview will be conducted with targeted students from each class after each session to investigate their perspectives to learning English and differences in the perspective on each method. Classroom observation will be conducted three times for each unit. I will be visiting each classroom and observing the session using a combination of structured observation, video recording and field note taking. At the end of three sessions, there will be a focus group meeting to discuss participating teachers’ experiences and views about the three teaching approaches.

This program will be implemented in the second semester of Thai primary schooling, from November 2006 to February 2007.

My PhD in Education is important research conducted within the School of Education and Community Studies, Division of Communication and Education, University of Canberra. I may be contacted on (001166) 43712170 or (001166) 72375610 if you have any queries or concerns.

My primary supervisor for this research project is Dr Mary Macken-Horarik, School of Education and Community Studies, Division of Communication and Education, University of Canberra. She may be contacted by phone on (001612) 6201 2973.

My secondary supervisor is Dr Robert Fitzgerald, Division of Communication and Education, University of Canberra. He may be contacted by phone on (001612) 6201 2658.

NATURE OF YOUR REQUESTED INVOLVEMENT AS AN ADMINISTRATOR
The teaching program will be implemented with grade 3 students in 4 schools namely,
1. School A
2. School B
3. School C
4. School D
Approximately three units will be taught in 15 weeks. Each unit will take ten hours over five weeks, in two one-hour periods per week.

The teacher participants and I will discuss the content of each unit. The content will be based on the core curriculum suggested by Thai Ministry of Education. The programmed lessons will be implemented in the normal English classes of grade 3 students after informed consent has been granted by students’ parents/guardians, director of OBEC area 1 of Maha Sarakham, school directors, and participating teachers.

At the beginning of each unit, there will be a pre-test to investigate students’ initial conversation ability. The test of each unit consists ten multiple-choice items. The test will be conducted to assess all students’ conversation ability.
Observations will be undertaken once per week for each. The tools I will use for observation include the observation form for collecting data of interaction between the teacher and students, video camera for recording ongoing phenomena in the case study group, and field notes for recording classroom phenomena beyond categories in the observation form.

RIGHT TO DECLINE
- Please note that participating schools are under no obligation whatsoever to participate in this research program.
- Schools have the right to choose not to participate in the program, and to withdraw from the study at any time.
- Teachers and school executive staff have the right to ask any question about the research program at any time.
- Any information that you provide is on the understanding that names and any personal information will not be used in any publications resulting from this research. Confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained at all times.
- Only the researcher, his assistants and the research supervisors will have access to the audio and videotapes. Any research assistant who may be involved in recording or transcribing video and audio tapes will sign an agreement to maintain confidentiality.
- You and the sample schools will be provided access to a summary of the findings, and to any written documentation which is produced from this research.
- The video recordings and observation recordings will be used only for obtaining data for this research, unless specific permission is obtained from you.
- The participating schools have the right to request that any particular sequence in video and audio records they are involved be deleted at any time. All tapes will be stored securely in a research archive at the University of Canberra.

CONFIDENTIALITY
All records, interviews, field notes, videotapes and transcriptions will be identified by code number during the research and by pseudonym in the final report. The key list linking names, code numbers, and pseudonyms will be stored securely and separately from other materials, and will be accessible only to the researcher.

SHARING OF INFORMATION
Throughout the research participants will have access to their own data. Parents/guardians can access to their children’s data with the opportunity to discuss it. At the completion of the study the participating schools will receive any final report. Any articles written within the project will be submitted to the participants for their consent, with the right to any editing of material which could identify or be harmful to them in any way.

USE OF INFORMATION FROM THE STUDY
The results of this study will be published in the researcher’s PhD of Education thesis, and probably published in professional journals and/or presented at research or professional conferences. These will be done after all participants have had the opportunity to read them and provide feedback. The researcher insists to maintain confidentiality at all times and to ensure that no harm is done to any participant by either data collection or publication of the results.
Appendix G: Consent forms
1. Consent forms for the director of the office of basic education commission area 1 of Maha Sarakham Province

UNIVERSITY OF CANBERRA
Division of Communication and Education
School of Education and Community Studies

Research Title: Teaching and learning English at grade 3 level in primary school
Thailand: Evaluating the effectiveness of three teaching methods

Researcher: Sooksil Prasongsook
Course: PhD of Education
Primary Supervisor: Dr Mary Macken-Horarik
Secondary Supervisor: Dr Robert Fitzgerald

RESEARCH CONSENT FORM FOR THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF BASIC EDUCATION COMMISSION AREA 1 OF MAHA SARAKHAM PROVINCE

I…………………………have read and understood the information provided in the Information Sheet on the research, Teaching and Learning English At Grade 3 Level in Primary Schools in Thailand; Evaluating The Effectiveness of 3 Approaches to Teaching. The questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I understand that the research is conducted by Sooksil Prasongsook as part of his PhD in Education at the University of Canberra, and that I may contact Sooksil or his supervisors with any queries or concerns throughout the study.

I agree to let the schools under my administration participate in the project on the understanding that those schools’ participation is voluntary, and that they have the right to withdraw from the study at any time.

Name : ……………………………………………………………………..(Block letters)

Signature:………………………………………….. Date…………………………

(Director of OBEC Area 1 Maha Sarakham, Thailand)
2. Consent form for school director

UNIVERSITY OF CANBERRA
Division of Communication and Education
School of Education and Community Studies

Research Title: Teaching and learning English at grade 3 level in primary school in Thailand: Evaluating the effectiveness of three teaching methods

Researcher: Sooksil Prasongsook
Course: PhD of Education
Primary Supervisor: Dr Mary Macken-Horarik
Secondary Supervisor: Dr Robert Fitzgerald

RESEARCH CONSENT FORM FOR THE SCHOOL DIRECTOR

I…………………………have read and understood the information provided in the Information Sheet on the research, Teaching and Learning English At Grade 3 Level in Primary Schools in Thailand; Evaluating The Effectiveness of 3 Approaches to Teaching. The questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I understand that the research is conducted by Sooksil Prasongsook as part of his PhD in Education at the University of Canberra, and that I may contact Sooksil or his supervisors with any queries or concerns throughout the study.

I agree to let my school participate in the project on the understanding that the participation is voluntary, and I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time.

Name: ………………………………………………………………………..(Block letters)

Signature:………………………………………………… Date…………………………

(School Director)
3. Consent form for teacher participants

UNIVERSITY OF CANBERRA
Division of Communication and Education
School of Education and Community Studies

Research Title: Teaching and learning English at grade 3 level in primary school in Thailand: Evaluating the effectiveness of three teaching methods

Researcher: Sooksil Prasongsook
Course: PhD of Education
Primary Supervisor: Dr Mary Macken-Horarik
Secondary Supervisor: Dr Robert Fitzgerald

RESEARCH CONSENT FORM FOR THE TEACHER PARTICIPANT

I……………………………………………have read and understood the information provided in the Information Sheet on the research, Teaching and Learning English At Grade 3 Level in Primary Schools in Thailand; Evaluating The Effectiveness of 3 Approaches to Teaching. The questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I understand that the research is conducted by Sooksil Prasongsook as part of his PhD in Education at the University of Canberra, and that I may contact Sooksil or his supervisors with any queries or concerns throughout the study.

I am aware that my participation is voluntary, and I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time.

Name: ……………………………………………………………..(Block letters)

Signature:………………………………………… Date…………………………

(School Director)
RESEARCH CONSENT FORM FOR PARENTS/GUARDIANS OF PARTICIPATING CHILDREN

I ___________________________ parent/guardian of ______________________________ have read and understood the information provided in the Information Sheet on the research, Teaching and Learning English At Grade 3 Level in Primary Schools in Thailand; Evaluating The Effectiveness of 3 Approaches to Teaching. The questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I understand that the research is conducted by Sooksil Prasongsook as part of his PhD of Education course at the University of Canberra, and that I may contact Sooksil or his supervisors with any queries or concerns throughout the study.

I am aware that my child’s participation is voluntary, and that I have the right to choose that my child not participate and that I have the right to withdraw him or her from the study at any time.

I agree that my child participates in the project on the understanding that confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained at all times, that information will be stored securely,
and that information will be used only for this research and publications arising from this project in a form that does not identify my child in any way unless my permission is given.

I understand that I will be provided access to a summary of the findings and any written documentation produced from this research.

I have read and understood the information provided and give my consent to the following (Please circle either consent or do not consent to indicate your choice):

1. I **consent**/do not consent to my child participating in this research project.

2. I **consent**/do not consent to my child’s participation being video or audio taped. I am aware that I have the right to view all the tapes involving my child, and that I have the right to ask for the video or audio tape to be turned off at any time during interviews, observations, or teaching.

I have read and understood the information provided and agree to my child,…………
…………………………participating in this research.

Name : …………………………………………………………
(Block letters)

Signature:……………………………………………………Date…………………………
(Block/Guardian)