

Current State and Guidelines for Development of Thai
Teachers Teaching in English Program in Thailand



Miss Chonnikarn Wongsawat

จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย
CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY

An Independent Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts in English as an International Language
Inter-Department of English as an International Language
Graduate School
Chulalongkorn University
Academic Year 2019
Copyright of Chulalongkorn University

สภาพปัจจุบันและแนวทางการพัฒนาครูไทยที่สอนใน โครงการจัดการเรียนการสอนตามหลักสูตร
กระทรวงศึกษาธิการเป็นภาษาอังกฤษในประเทศไทย



สารนิพนธ์นี้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษาตามหลักสูตรปริญญาศิลปศาสตรมหาบัณฑิต
สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษานานาชาติ สหสาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษานานาชาติ

บัณฑิตวิทยาลัย จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

ปีการศึกษา 2562

ลิขสิทธิ์ของจุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

Independent Study Title	Current State and Guidelines for Development of Thai Teachers Teaching in English Program in Thailand
By	Miss Chonnikarn Wongsawat
Field of Study	English as an International Language
Thesis Advisor	Assistant Professor MANEERAT EKKAYOKKAYA, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School, Chulalongkorn University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Master of Arts

INDEPENDENT STUDY COMMITTEE

..... Chairman
(Assistant Professor APASARA CHINWONNO, Ph.D.)

..... Advisor
(Assistant Professor MANEERAT EKKAYOKKAYA, Ph.D.)

..... Examiner
(Assistant Professor PORNPIMOL SUKAVATEE, Ph.D.)



จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย
CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY

ชื่อนิกานต์ วงศ์สวัสดิ์ : สภาพปัจจุบันและแนวทางการพัฒนาครูไทยที่สอนในโครงการจัดการเรียนการสอนตามหลักสูตรกระทรวงศึกษาธิการเป็นภาษาอังกฤษในประเทศไทย. (Current State and Guidelines for Development of Thai Teachers Teaching in English Program in Thailand) อ.ที่ปรึกษาหลัก : ศศ. ดร.มณีรัตน์ เอกโยคยะ

งานศึกษาวิจัยที่ผ่านมาได้มีการสำรวจสภาพปัจจุบันและแนวทางการพัฒนาครูไทยที่สอนในโครงการจัดการเรียนการสอนตามหลักสูตรกระทรวงศึกษาธิการเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ แต่ยังมีงานวิจัยจำนวนไม่มากที่ศึกษาเกี่ยวกับความเชื่อและการปฏิบัติของครูไทยในโครงการ งานวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อสำรวจประเด็นที่กล่าวไว้ข้างต้นจากครูไทยจำนวน 34 คน ที่สอนในโครงการจัดการเรียนการสอนตามหลักสูตรกระทรวงศึกษาธิการเป็นภาษาอังกฤษในโรงเรียนสวนกุหลาบวิทยาลัย ธนบุรี และโรงเรียนเซนต์คาเบรียล ผลการวิจัยจากแบบสอบถามและการสัมภาษณ์ถึงโครงสร้างพบว่าวุฒิการศึกษาของครูมีความสอดคล้องกับวิชาที่สอนและครูส่วนใหญ่มีประสบการณ์ในการทำงานในโครงการเป็นระยะเวลา 1 – 5 ปี ครูเห็นด้วยกับเป้าหมายของโครงการที่จะทำให้ให้นักเรียนมีความสามารถในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในระดับสูง ขณะที่รักษาความสามารถระดับเจ้าของภาษาในการใช้ภาษาไทย ครูให้ความสำคัญกับเนื้อหาทางวิชาการมากกว่าภาษาอังกฤษ และเชื่อว่านักเรียนมีความสามารถในการอ่านและฟังภาษาอังกฤษในระดับที่สูงกว่าทักษะการเขียนและพูด ทั้งนี้งานวิจัยยังอภิปรายถึงแนวทางการพัฒนาครูไทยที่สอนในโครงการในด้านภาษา ความสมดุลระหว่างภาษาและเนื้อหา และผู้เรียนอีกด้วย



สาขาวิชา ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษานานาชาติ
ปีการศึกษา 2562

ลายมือชื่อนิสิต
ลายมือชื่อ อ.ที่ปรึกษาหลัก

6187515020 : MAJOR ENGLISH AS AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE
 KEYWORD CURRENT STATE, GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPMENT,
 D: BELIEFS, PRACTICES, ENGLISH PROGRAM

Chonnikarn Wongsawat : Current State and Guidelines for Development of
 Thai Teachers Teaching in English Program in Thailand. Advisor: Asst.
 Prof. MANEERAT EKKAYOKKAYA, Ph.D.

Although a number of previous studies have explored the current state and guidelines for development of teachers teaching in English Program, little research has been conducted regarding beliefs and practices of Thai teachers in the program. This study aimed to investigate the issues addressed above from 34 Thai teachers teaching in English Program at Saunkularb Wittayalai Thonburi School and Saint Gabriel's College. The results of a questionnaire and a semi-structured interview showed that the teachers' educational background was consistent with their responsible subject and the majority of the teachers had 1 – 5 years of teaching experience in English Program. The teachers agreed with the goal of the program to make students achieve a high level of English language proficiency while maintaining their native proficiency in Thai. They focused more on academic content than the English language and believed that students have a higher level of English proficiency in reading and listening skills than writing and speaking skills. The guidelines for development of Thai teachers teaching in the program regarding language, balancing between language and content, and learners were also discussed in the study.



Field of Study:	English as an International Language	Student's Signature
Academic Year:	2019
		Advisor's Signature
	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study would not have been completed without support from others. First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to my advisor, Asst. Prof. Maneerat Ekkayokkaya, Ph.D. for her valuable guidance throughout the study. I also own my gratitude to my individual study committees, Asst. Prof. Apasara Chinwonno, Ph.D. and Asst. Prof. Pornpimol Sukavatee, Ph.D. for their helpful comments and suggestions.

I would also like to express my sincere thanks to Asst. Prof. Chansongklod Gajaseni, Ph.D., Asst. Prof. Prannapha Modehiran, Ph.D., and Chittraporn Chutong, Ph.D for devoting their time in validating the research instruments. Grateful thanks also go to the teachers teaching in the English Program at Saunkularb Wittayalai Thonburi School and Saint Gabriel's College for their cooperation during the data collection process.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family, friends, classmates, and seniors in the English as an International Language program for their constant help and encouragement.

Chonnikarn Wongsawat

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT (THAI)	iii
ABSTRACT (ENGLISH).....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background of the study.....	1
1.2 Research questions.....	2
1.3 Objectives of the study.....	2
1.4 Significance of the study.....	3
1.5 Scope of the study.....	3
1.6 Definition of terms.....	3
Literature Review.....	3
2.1 Bilingual education.....	4
2.2 English Program in Thailand.....	4
2.3 Teachers' beliefs and practices.....	5
Methodology.....	5
3.1 Participants.....	5
3.2 Research instruments.....	6
3.3 Data collection.....	6
3.4 Data analysis.....	6
Results.....	7
4.1 What are Thai teachers' beliefs and practices in English Program in Thailand?.....	7
4.2 What are the guidelines to develop Thai teachers in English Program in Thailand?.....	12
Discussion.....	15

Limitation and Recommendation for further studies	16
REFERENCES	17
APPENDICES	19
Appendix A: Questionnaire	20
Appendix B: Semi-Structured Interview Questions	26
Appendix C: The Analysis of the Index of Item Objective Congruence.....	27
Appendix D: List of Experts Validating the Instrument.....	39
VITA.....	40



LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: The mean and standard deviation of the beliefs about language.....	8
Table 2: The mean and standard deviation of the beliefs about balancing between language and content.....	8
Table 3: The mean and standard deviation of the beliefs about learners.....	9
Table 4: The mean and standard deviation of the practices about language	10
Table 5: The mean and standard deviation of the practices about balancing between language and content.....	10
Table 6: The mean and standard deviation of the practices about learners	11

Introduction

1.1 Background of the study

Due to globalization, the English language has become an indispensable tool for communication in every domain ranging from education to business. Therefore, the acquisition of English language skills will be required to prepare people to meet with the national and international demands and increase the nation competitiveness against other nations. By realizing the significance of the English language, the Thai government was urged to improve the English language proficiency of Thai people. Bilingual education has been proposed as one of the policies to help achieve that aim (Punthumasen, 2007). According to Cummins (2013), bilingual education refers to a program that offers instruction in at least two languages to teach subject content. However, the term, bilingual education, is “a simple label for a complex phenomenon” (Cazden & Snow, 1990, p. 9). Its definition and the way it is operated may vary largely in different contexts depending upon the goal of the program. For Thailand, with the goal to promote the English language of Thai students, immersion bilingual education for majority language students in a foreign language has been adopted (Chantarasiri, 2014). In this form of bilingual education, students study at least fifty percent of the subjects through a foreign language they aim to acquire and the other subjects through the majority language of the community (Lyster, 2007). In Thai schools, this type of bilingual education is commonly known as the English Program (EP) which refers to a school program that provides total or partial Thai national curriculum subjects in English (Ministry of Education, 2008). However, the implementation of the program and program details may vary from one school to another. For example, some schools may offer an English Program that uses English as a medium of instruction to teach all subjects in Thai national curriculum except for Thai Language and Social Studies in the parts that are related to Thai law, and Thai tradition and culture (Ministry of Education, n.d.). Other schools may offer a Mini English Program (MEP) where English is used as a medium of instruction to teach subjects depending on a school's readiness (Ministry of Education, n.d.), or an Intensive English Program (IEP) where additional subjects are taught in English.

Through the English Program, students are given more opportunities to improve their English language skills as they are provided with English language environment through its adoption as a medium of instruction. Moreover, because the English language serves as a tool for content instruction, it allows students to learn the language in authentic and meaningful ways, unlike the traditional second language program where the English language is explicitly taught. Genesee (1994) mentions that with the integration of second language instruction in content instruction, the second language is taught more successfully than when it is taught separately. Furthermore, the results from a number of research studies across different contexts reveal that with an effective implementation, bilingual programs can lead to students' improvement in the target language without undesirable effects on students' first language competence and content knowledge (Cummins & Hornberger, 2008; Huguét, Lasagabaster, & Vila, 2008, as cited in Cummins, 2013). Nevertheless, research studies have identified some problems that are found in immersion bilingual education. For example, in terms of students' linguistic development in the target language, it was found that students' writing and speaking skills seem to fall behind

their reading and listening skills (Cummins, 2013; Genesee, 1983, 1994). These problems bring to light challenges teachers may face while teaching in the program as Walker and Tedick (2000) address that “How to promote a successful learning environment in which both language and content develop simultaneously and successfully continues to be the crux of immersion language teaching” (p. 22).

Among other variables, teachers are one major factor that should be paid attention to in the operation of bilingual programs (García, 2009). Teachers can be considered as one of the important stakeholders who influence the effectiveness of bilingual education. Since teachers involve directly in the implementation of the program, they undeniably take a vital role in the success or failure of the program. Hence, it is important to know how teachers carry out their pedagogical practices in the classroom and their beliefs which underlie their classroom actions. According to Borg (2001) a belief can be described as “a proposition which may be consciously or unconsciously held, is evaluative in that it is accepted as true by the individual, and is therefore imbued with emotive commitment; further, it serves as a guide to thought and behavior” (p. 186). More specifically, he defines teachers’ beliefs as “teachers’ pedagogic beliefs or those beliefs of relevance to an individual’s teaching” (p. 187). Erkmen (2012) points out that beliefs affect how teachers make plans, make decisions, and act inside the class. Moreover, beliefs can determine teachers’ instructional behaviors towards students which, in turn, influence the students’ performance as Fang (1996) concludes that “teachers’ beliefs always lead to teachers’ actions that impact students’ learning – for better or worse” (p. 59).

Exploring the teachers’ beliefs is; therefore, necessary for understanding and developing the educational process. Even though various research studies have explored teachers’ beliefs and practices (Day & Shapson, 1996; Flores, 2001; Tan, 2011), little is known about beliefs and practices of Thai teachers in the field of bilingual education. Hence, in order to investigate the current state of bilingual education in Thailand, this study examines beliefs and practices of Thai teachers in English Program.

1.2 Research questions

1. What are Thai teachers’ beliefs and practices in English Program in Thailand?
2. What are the guidelines to develop Thai teachers in English Program in Thailand?

1.3 Objectives of the study

1. To study Thai teachers’ beliefs and practices in English Program in Thailand
2. To develop the guidelines for Thai teachers in English Program in Thailand

1.4 Significance of the study

1. The results of the study offer insights into the current state of Thai teachers teaching in the English program in Thailand which help teachers, schools, and stakeholders get a better understanding of how the English Program is being operated.

2. The study provides some guidelines for the development which teachers, schools, and stakeholders can adopt to increase the effectiveness of the English Program.

1.5 Scope of the study

The participants in this study were 34 Thai teachers teaching grade 7 – 12 in programs that use English as a medium of instruction to teach Thai national curriculum subjects at Saunkularb Wittayalai Thonburi School and Saint Gabriel's College. For Saunkularb Wittayalai Thonburi School, the programs offered are an English Program which provides instruction in English in all subjects except for Thai Language, Arts, and Physical Education, and a Mini English Program which provides instruction in English in 6 subjects which are English, Mathematic, Science, History, Buddhist Studies and Computer. For Saint Gabriel's College, the offered program is called an Intensive English Program which refers to a program that provides instruction in English in 5 intensive subjects which are English, Mathematic, Science, Social Studies, and Computer and Technology.

1.6 Definition of terms

1. Current state refers to the current beliefs and practices of Thai teachers in three aspects which are language, balancing between language and content, and learners.

2. Guidelines refer to suggestions for the development of Thai teachers in English Program in Thailand in three aspects which are language, balancing between language and content, and learners.

3. Teachers' beliefs refer to propositions that teachers consider to be true which guide their practices in the classroom. Teachers' beliefs are influenced mainly by their educational background and teaching experiences (Kindsvatter, Willen, & Ishler, 1988, as cited in Abdi & Asadi, 2015).

4. Thai teachers refers to Thai teachers teaching in the English Program at Saunkularb Wittayalai Thonburi School and Saint Gabriel's College.

5. English Program refers to a school program that provides total or partial Thai national curriculum subjects in English (Ministry of Education, 2008). In this study, it includes the English Program, where all subjects except for Thai language and some parts of Social Studies are taught in English, Mini English Program, where subjects are taught in English according to a school's readiness, and Intensive English Program, where additional subjects are taught in English.

Literature Review

This section presents the review of literature in the following topics: (1) bilingual education, (2) English program in Thailand, and (3) teachers' beliefs and practices.

2.1 Bilingual education

One goal of bilingual education is to promote bilingualism for students who speak a majority language of the community (e.g., English speakers in Canada) and one example of this type of bilingual education is an immersion program. Originating from Canada in the 1960s (Castro-García, 2018), the immersion program was initially served as an effective means for the majority group of English speaking Canadian children to acquire proficiency in French which is considered a minority language by using it as a medium of instruction. That is to say, the immersion bilingual education for language majority children involves the use of the target language as a medium to teach significant portions of the school curriculum.

Due to the success of French immersion in Canada, the immersion program has been adopted in a variety of contexts; for example, a context where a foreign language is used as a medium of instruction. Nonetheless, there are some common features that are shared among immersion programs. Johnson and Swain (1997) have described the characteristics that must be found in an immersion program to some extent which are: (1) the target language is used as a medium of instruction, (2) the curriculum of immersion program parallels the standard first language curriculum, (3) the students' development of first language is supported, (4) additive bilingualism is an aim of the program, (5) the target language is mostly exposed only inside the classroom, (6) students have similar levels of proficiency in the target language, (7) the teachers are competence in both students' first language and target language, and (8) the culture of classroom reflects the majority language of the community.

As long as the immersion bilingual education is concerned, the integration of language and content instruction which is considered as "the hallmark" of the program should be discussed (Genesee, 1983, p. 2). Approaches that integrate language and content can be classified into points on a continuum from language-driven to content-driven (Met, 1997, 1999). While the language-driven approaches focus on language teaching by using content as a tool for creating language learning experiences, the content-driven approaches focus on content teaching by using the target language as a medium of instruction, and that the development of academic content may be equal or more important than the target language. In these latter approaches, the target language may not be explicitly taught or taught minimally because it is thought to be developed naturally through the teaching of content (Met, 1997). The immersion program is a notable example of the content-driven approaches.

2.2 English Program in Thailand

In Thailand, the bilingual education was proposed by the Ministry of Education as a part of the teaching and learning reforms to improve the quality of Thai education with the idea of creating authentic language learning and teaching (Ministry of Education, 2008). The bilingual education or as known as the English program in Thailand refers to a school program that provides a total or partial of Thai national curriculum subjects in English. This program can be considered as a type of immersion in a foreign language where a foreign language is used as a medium of instruction to promote bilingualism for language majority students.

Ministry of Education provides the guidelines for the management of the English Program (Bureau of Educational Innovation Development, 2005). Some parts of the guidelines regarding the management of learning and teaching include: (1) educational institutions can provide an English program at all levels from pre-primary to secondary level, (2) in secondary level, English can be used as a medium of instruction in all subjects except for Thai language and Social Studies in the parts that are related to Thai ways of life, Thai law, and Thai culture and traditions, and (3) English has to be used as a medium of instruction for more than 18 periods per week (not less than four subjects).

In addition, regarding the selection and management of teachers, it states that teachers must hold at least a Bachelor's degree, and have a certificate of education in their subjects or related fields. For teachers who are not native speakers of English, they must have a native-like English proficiency in listening, speaking, reading and writing for communication, and obtain TOEFL score of not less than 550 or IELTS score of not less than 5.5.

Since its initiation in 1995, English program has been established in both public and private Thai schools throughout the country (Kaur, Young, & Kirkpatrick, 2016). According to Chantarasiri (2014), the statistics show that there are 405 schools, comprised of 246 public schools and 159 private schools in Thailand in which English program is provided for students in primary and secondary levels.

2.3 Teachers' beliefs and practices

According to Richards and Lockhart (1996) teachers' belief systems developed from "the goals, values, and beliefs teachers hold in relation to the content and process of teaching, and their understanding of the systems in which they work and their roles within it" (p. 30). Kindsvatter, Willen, and Ishler's study (as cited in, Abdi & Asadi, 2015) reveal that teachers' beliefs derived from five sources as follows: (1) experience as language learners, (2) experience from teaching, (3) personality, (4) existed practices of a school or a community, and (5) education-based or research-based principles.

Although various research studies indicate that teachers' beliefs have a great impact on their instructional practices (Borg, 2001; Handal & Herrington, 2003), how teachers behave in the classroom does not always correspond to what they believe (Khader, 2012). Fang (1996) informs that "Earlier researchers have noted that the complexities of classroom life can constrain teachers' abilities to attend to their beliefs and provide instruction which aligns with their theoretical beliefs" (p.53). He goes on mentioning "administrator and collegial attitudes" (p.54) and the "psychological, social and environmental realities of...schools" (p. 54) as the factors that influence the extent to which the beliefs can be put into instructional practices.

Methodology

3.1 Participants

The participants were 34 Thai teachers teaching grade 7 – 12 in English Program at Saunkularb Wittayalai Thonburi School and Saint Gabriel's College. Among 34 teachers, 2 teachers from each school were selected based on a voluntary basis to participate in a semi-structured interview. The first teacher was a Math

teacher who held a Master's degree in Chemical Engineering. The second teacher was a Science teacher who held a Master's degree in Science. The third and fourth teachers taught Social Studies and held a Bachelor's degree in Social Studies. All of them reported having 1-5 years of teaching experience in English Program.

3.2 Research instruments

This study employed two research instruments which are a questionnaire and a semi-structured interview.

Questionnaire

The teachers' beliefs, and practices questionnaire was developed based on literature reviews on immersion program and the integration of language and content (Genesee, 1983, 1994; Johnson & Swain, 1997; Met, 1997, 1999; Walker & Tedick, 2000). The questionnaire consists of three sections. The first section is general information on teachers' professional backgrounds. The second section is a 31-item questionnaire of teachers' beliefs and practices which are divided into 6 categories: beliefs about language (items 1-5), beliefs about balancing between language and content (items 6 - 13), beliefs about learners (items 14 - 16), practices about language (items 17 - 21), practices about balancing between language and content (items 22 - 28), and practices about learners (items 29 - 31). In this section, teachers are asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement on a Likert scale of 1–5 (1 = Strongly disagree; 5 = Strongly agree). The last section consists of 3 open-ended questions asking about pros and cons of being a Thai teacher, their difficulties and solutions, and suggestions about the program. The questionnaire was designed in English and translated into Thai language except for the second section in which 31 items regarding teachers' beliefs and practices were written in both English and Thai language to ensure that Thai translation of technical terms will be understood correctly.

Semi-structured interview

The semi-structured interview consists of 9 open-ended questions. The questions are concerning the teachers' opinions about English Program in general, their beliefs and practices in 6 categories mentioned in the questionnaire, difficulties and solutions, and suggestions about the program. Nevertheless, the researcher may delve into other issues that arise during the interviews and allow the participants to provide further opinions freely.

3.3 Data collection

The questionnaires were distributed to 51 Thai teachers teaching grade 7 – 12 in English Program at Saunkularb Wittayalai Thonburi School and Saint Gabriel's College. Out of 51 questionnaires, 34 (67%) were returned to the researcher. After collecting the questionnaires, four teachers were selected to participate in a semi-structured interview which was conducted in Thai and audio-recorded.

3.4 Data analysis

The data analysis process involves both quantitative and qualitative analysis. The quantitative data obtained from the closed-ended items of questionnaire were

analyzed using descriptive statistics. The qualitative data obtained from open-ended items of the questionnaire and semi-structured interview were analyzed using content analysis.

In order to analyze the quantitative data, the range of 5-Likert scale (Srisa-ard, 2002) was interpreted as follows:

Average Score	Interpretation
4.51 - 5.00	The teachers strongly agreed with the beliefs and practices
3.51 - 4.50	The teachers agreed with the beliefs and practices
2.51 - 3.50	The teachers were undecided on the beliefs and practices
1.51 - 2.50	The teachers disagreed with the beliefs and practices
1.00 - 1.50	The teachers strongly disagreed with the beliefs and practices

Results

Based on the analysis of the data obtained from the questionnaire and the semi-structured interview, the results were illustrated and explained to answer two following research questions:

1. What are Thai teachers' beliefs and practices in English Program in Thailand?
2. What are the guidelines to develop Thai teachers in English Program in Thailand?

4.1 What are Thai teachers' beliefs and practices in English Program in Thailand?

The results of this research question are divided into three sections: (1) professional backgrounds, (2) beliefs in language, balancing between language and content, and learners, (3) practices in language, balancing between language and content, and learners, and (4) open-ended questions.

4.1.1 Professional backgrounds

Among the 34 teachers, 52.94% held a Bachelor's degree, 41.18% held a Master's degree, and only 5.88% held a Doctoral degree. The teachers' majors/fields of study were Science (29.42%), Applied Mathematics (20.59%), Social Studies (14.71%), and others (35.28%). For subject of teaching, the teachers taught Science (29.42%), Mathematics (26.47%), Social Studies (20.59%), and others (23.52%). When comparing the data of the major/field of study of the teachers with their subject of teaching, it was found that all of them graduated from the major/field of study related to the subject they taught. For their teaching experience, 52.94% had 1 – 5 years, 41.18% had 6 – 10 years, and only 5.88% had more than 10 years. For their

teaching experience in EP, most of the teachers had 1 – 5 years (70.59%), 26.47% had 6 - 10 years, and only 1 teacher (2.94%) had more than 10 years. In terms of training, 55.88% reported to receive training in subject content, and 61.76% indicated that they received training in English language. For training they received in order to teach in the EP, 79.41% had no training reported, while 8.82% received training in English language skills, 5.89% in technology enhanced learning, 2.94% in curriculum development, and 2.94% in teaching methodology.

4.1.2 Beliefs

Beliefs in three aspects of Thai teachers in English Program were analyzed as follows:

Beliefs about language

Table 1: The mean and standard deviation of the beliefs about language

Statements	\bar{X}	S.D.	Meaning
1. The goal of the EP/MEP/IEP is to make students achieve a high level of proficiency in the English language while maintaining native proficiency in Thai.	4.59	0.56	Strongly Agree
2. Students learn most effectively when they are taught exclusively in the English language.	3.18	1.02	Undecided
3. The use of English as a means of instruction allows students to receive more comprehensible input (English language that can be understood) and engage in meaningful use of the English language.	4.41	0.66	Agree
4. Bilingual students' exposure to the English language mostly occurs inside the classroom.	4.03	1.03	Agree
5. Teachers in the EP/MEP/IEP are required to have native-like proficiency in both Thai and English language.	4.12	0.81	Agree
Total	4.06	0.44	Agree

Table 1 shows that the teachers agreed with the beliefs about language ($\bar{X} = 4.06$, S.D. = 0.44). The statement with the highest mean score was statement 1 “The goal of the EP/MEP/IEP is to make students achieve a high level of proficiency in the English language while maintaining native proficiency in Thai.” ($\bar{X} = 4.59$, S.D. = 0.56), while the statement with the lowest mean score was statement 2 “Students learn most effectively when they are taught exclusively in the English language.” ($\bar{X} = 3.18$, S.D. = 1.02).

Beliefs about balancing between language and content

Table 2: The mean and standard deviation of the beliefs about balancing between language and content

Statements	\bar{X}	S.D.	Meaning
6. Students can learn both English language and academic content simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in the English language.	4.32	1.04	Agree
7. The teachers in the EP/MEP/IEP play both roles of content teacher and English language teacher.	4.12	1.01	Agree
8. The bilingual students' development of English language is as important as academic content.	4.24	1.02	Agree
9. Content objectives are determined by the Basic Education Core Curriculum.	4.32	1.04	Agree
10. English language learning objectives should be included in the lesson plan.	4.06	1.07	Agree
11. Teaching academic content is the primary focus while teaching English language is secondary.	4.12	1.18	Agree
12. It is not necessary to explicitly teach the English language.	4.12	0.95	Agree
13. Students should be assessed on the academic content, not English language.	3.91	1.08	Agree
Total	4.15	0.43	Agree

Table 2 reveals that the teachers agreed with the beliefs about balancing between language and content ($\bar{X} = 4.15$, S.D. = 0.43). The statements with the highest mean score were statement 6 “Students can learn both English language and academic content simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in the English language.” ($\bar{X} = 4.32$, S.D. = 1.04) and statement 9 “Content objectives are determined by the Basic Education Core Curriculum.” ($\bar{X} = 4.32$, S.D. = 1.04), while the statement with the lowest mean score was statement 13 “Students should be assessed on the academic content, not English language.” ($\bar{X} = 3.91$, S.D. = 1.08).

Beliefs about learners

Table 3: The mean and standard deviation of the beliefs about learners

Statements	\bar{X}	S.D.	Meaning
14. Students begin the EP/MEP/IEP with similar levels of English language proficiency.	3.03	1.14	Undecided
15. Students in the EP/MEP/IEP have a high level of English proficiency in reading and listening skills.	3.71	1.17	Agree
16. Students in the EP/MEP/IEP have a high level of English proficiency in writing and speaking skills.	3.35	1.10	Undecided
Total	3.36	0.98	Undecided

Table 3 demonstrates that the teachers were undecided on the beliefs about learners ($\bar{X} = 3.36$, S.D. = 0.98). The statement with the highest mean score was statement 15 “Students in the EP/MEP/IEP have a high level of English proficiency in reading and listening skills.” ($\bar{X} = 3.71$, S.D. = 1.17), while the statement with the

lowest mean score was statement 14 “Students begin the EP/MEP/IEP with similar levels of English language proficiency.” ($\bar{X} = 3.03$, S.D. = 1.14).

4.1.3 Practices

Practices in three aspects of Thai teachers in English Program were analyzed as follows:

Practices about language

Table 4: The mean and standard deviation of the practices about language

Statements	\bar{X}	S.D.	Meaning
17. I aim to make students achieve a high level of proficiency in the English language while maintaining native proficiency in Thai.	4.44	0.75	Agree
18. I do not use the Thai language or use it minimally inside the classroom.	3.94	1.01	Agree
19. I provide English language that can be understood by students in meaningful contexts.	4.41	0.61	Agree
20. I use the English language with my students only inside the classroom.	4.03	1.19	Agree
21. I have native-like proficiency in both Thai and English language.	3.88	1.07	Agree
Total	4.14	0.47	Agree

Table 4 shows that the teachers agreed with the practices about language ($\bar{X} = 4.14$, S.D. = 0.47). The statement with the highest mean score was statement 17 “I aim to make students achieve a high level of proficiency in the English language while maintaining native proficiency in Thai.” ($\bar{X} = 4.44$, S.D. = 0.75), while the statement with the lowest mean score was statement 21 “I have native-like proficiency in both Thai and English language.” ($\bar{X} = 3.88$, S.D. = 1.07).

Practices about balancing between language and content

Table 5: The mean and standard deviation of the practices about balancing between language and content

Statements	\bar{X}	S.D.	Meaning
22. I play both roles of content teacher and English language teacher.	3.79	1.10	Agree
23. I facilitate the students’ development of both academic content and English language.	4.32	0.64	Agree
24. I define content objectives according to the Basic Education Core Curriculum.	4.65	0.88	Strongly Agree
25. I include English language learning objectives in my lesson plan.	2.82	1.38	Undecided
26. I focus more on teaching academic content than teaching the English language.	4.44	0.86	Agree

Statements	\bar{X}	S.D.	Meaning
27. I provide little or no explicit English language teaching.	3.76	1.37	Agree
28. I assess students on the academic content, not English language.	4.24	0.74	Agree
Total	4.00	0.47	Agree

Table 5 indicates that the teachers agreed with the practices about balancing between language and content ($\bar{X} = 4.00$, S.D. = 0.47). The statement with the highest mean score was statement 24 “I define content objectives according to the Basic Education Core Curriculum.” ($\bar{X} = 4.65$, S.D. = 0.88), while the statement with the lowest mean score was statement 25 “I include English language learning objectives in my lesson plan.” ($\bar{X} = 2.82$, S.D. = 1.38).

Practices about learners

Table 6: The mean and standard deviation of the practices about learners

Statements	\bar{X}	S.D.	Meaning
29. I provide instruction that match the students’ needs and levels of English language proficiency.	4.24	0.86	Agree
30. I provide sufficient opportunities for students to read and listen to the English language.	4.29	0.68	Agree
31. I provide sufficient opportunities for students to write and speak the English language.	4.09	0.79	Agree
Total	4.20	0.59	Agree

Table 6 reveals that the teachers agreed with the practices about learners ($\bar{X} = 4.20$, S.D. = 0.59). The statement with the highest mean score was statement 30 “I provide sufficient opportunities for students to read and listen to the English language.” ($\bar{X} = 4.29$, S.D. = 0.68), while the statement with the lowest mean score was statement 31 “I provide sufficient opportunities for students to write and speak the English language.” ($\bar{X} = 4.09$, S.D. = 0.79).

4.1.4 Open-ended questions

The teachers pointed out several pros of being a Thai teacher which are a good understanding of content and students, aiding students’ comprehension, and adjusting the content to match with National Educational Test such as O-NET or PAT. In terms of cons, a number of teachers mentioned their limitations on English language and students’ use of Thai language to communicate.

Furthermore, the results from the questionnaire and semi-structured interview revealed that students’ incomprehensibility of content, difficulty in explaining technical terms, different levels of students’ English language proficiency, and teachers’ English language skills were identified as the difficulties the teachers faced while teaching in the program. In order to cope with these difficulties, the teachers explained content and technical terms in Thai, gave more examples, provided a list of technical terms, asked students to translate the terms, assigned students to work in

groups, tried to provide opportunities for all students to use English, and make a preparation for lesson beforehand.

Students may not be able to translate the technical terms in the English written exam. So, I have to give them Thai translation of words during the class. Similarly, when they did an admission exam which was written in Thai, they also could not understand some vocabulary in Thai such as median or tautology. Therefore, I have to use both English and Thai language inside the class. Moreover, because of the different levels of the students, some students might not be able to catch up with others. So, I made them work in groups and had their classmates give them explanations.

(Teacher 1)

I have difficulties with grammar rules and technical terms. So, I prepare my lessons and translate the terms beforehand.

(Teacher 4)

In addition, the questionnaire and semi-structured interview results illustrated the teachers' suggestions about the improvement of the program as follows: (1) training in English language skills should be provided for teachers, (2) study trips should be held domestically and abroad to observe the management of other English Programs, (3) students should be selected based on a certain level of English language proficiency to study in the program, and (4) students should be classified into classes according to their similar levels of English language proficiency.

Students' English language is very important for studying in the EP. Students with a low level of English language proficiency will have a hard time studying in the program and the teachers may not be able to make them understand at all. If we classify the English language ability into five levels, students should be at least at level 3 for the program to work effectively.

(Teacher 2)

4.2 What are the guidelines to develop Thai teachers in English Program in Thailand?

The results of this research question are divided into three sections: (1) guidelines of language, (2) guidelines of balancing between language and content, and (3) guidelines of learners.

4.2.1 Guidelines of language

The results from the questionnaire indicated that the teachers strongly agreed with the goal of the program and acted accordingly to make students achieve a high level of English language proficiency while maintaining their native proficiency in Thai.

Similarly, the results from the semi-structured interview showed that the teachers expressed their positive attitudes towards the goal of English Program. One teacher mentioned that the English Program gave students an advantage on furthering their study in international programs.

Due to the goal of the program, the EP students can continue their study in international programs without English language difficulties while maintaining their Thai language proficiency.

(Teacher 1)

In addition, the teachers reported to incorporate students' first language into their instruction in several cases such as attracting students' attention, controlling the class, making an emphasis, explaining technical terms, and checking comprehension.

I use Thai to emphasize on what students should remember. This is the key point (In Thai). The formula of this one... (Explaining the formula in English). What was the formula? (In Thai).

(Teacher 1)

When I encountered a difficult word that made students don't understand the lesson, I would explain it by using a simpler word in English first and if they still couldn't understand, I would translate it into Thai.

(Teacher 2)

I use Thai language to confirm that students understand the concepts that I taught. At the end of the lesson, I would ask the students to summarize what they've learned in Thai.

(Teacher 3)

4.2.2 Guidelines of balancing between language and content

The results from the questionnaire showed that the teachers agreed that students can learn both English language and academic content simultaneously when the English language is used as a medium of instruction to teach subject matter. Apart from that, the teachers agreed that the content objectives are determined by the Basic Education Core Curriculum and they defined their content objectives based on it.

In congruence with the questionnaire, the results from the semi-structured interview revealed that the teachers paid more attention on teaching academic content than the English language.

I focus more on the content since when students understand the content, their acquisition of language will follow. On the other hand, if they don't understand the content, they will resist to learn both content and language.

(Teacher 1)

I don't focus on grammar when I teach. Even when I focus only on the content, I almost not be able to cover everything in my lesson. Since there is a time limitation, I have to focus on teaching the content that I have planned for each period.

(Teacher 3)

Nevertheless, the teachers reported to integrate the language teaching into the content teaching when it is necessary and when it is relevant to the content.

I will not teach the English language explicitly except that students made the same mistakes again and again. In that case, I have to provide some language instruction, but I will not focus too much on it because it is not the primary objective.

(Teacher 4)

I teach grammar such as passive voice, and technical terms when they are presented in the content that I'm teaching but I don't focus on them solely.

(Teacher 1)

I teach English language such as technical terms, grammar, and correct pronunciation along with the content.

(Teacher 2)

4.2.3 Guidelines of learners

The results from the questionnaire demonstrated that the teachers agreed that students have a high level of English proficiency in receptive skills and that they provide sufficient opportunities for students to read and listen to the English language.

Likewise, the results from the semi-structured interview showed that the teachers pointed out students' better performances on listening, reading, and speaking than writing skills.

Students have a better receptive skills than productive skills. They can barely write, but they can speak although it may be short or contain incorrect grammar.

(Teacher 1)

Students could speak a lot of English. They could reply in long sentences when I asked them to give an explanation on something. In the exam, there was a part where students were required to write an explanation. Some students could write very well. Some students wrote a short answer, while low level students could not write at all.

(Teacher 2)

Moreover, the teachers reported to provide opportunities for students to use English language skills to some extent.

There was an activity for students to work in groups and deliver a presentation. The students were also asked to review the lesson for their classmates at the end of the class.

(Teacher 2)

Students had to read passages in a textbook and answer the questions. They were also assigned to do a project in groups and give a presentation. Apart from that, they were also asked to explain the meaning of words and give their opinions throughout the class.

(Teacher 3)

Discussion

This study illustrated the current state of Thai teachers in English Program by investigating on their beliefs and practices, and suggested approaches that can be adopted in order to develop Thai teachers in the program.

Regarding the language, it was found that the teachers in the English Program not only have to make students achieve a high level of English language proficiency but also have to maintain students' native proficiency in Thai which is congruence with the aim of the immersion program that the second language is acquired with no detrimental effect on the first language (Johnson & Swain, 1997).

In addition, the results showed that the teachers could support the students' first language development by using it in different situations inside the classroom; for example, the teachers may use it when they want to attract students' attention, to control the class, to make an emphasis, to explain technical terms, and to check students' comprehension. These results match with what Jacobson (1979, as cited in Alsulami, 2017) states about the use of code switching for teaching purposes such as grabbing the students' attention, developing the students' understanding of concepts, and enriching lexicon knowledge.

Regarding the balancing between language and content, the results revealed that the teachers in English Program focus on the academic content and consider the English language as a byproduct. These results appeared to be consistent with Walker and Tedick' study (2000) in that in the immersion program, language was believed to be developed naturally through the instruction of academic content and students' mastery of content is of greater importance than language skills.

However, the teachers could integrate the language teaching into the content teaching by employing instructional strategies that make students focus more on the English language; for instance, having students work in pair or group to discover a grammatical pattern from a text provided, encouraging students to compare patterns between languages, and providing metalinguistic information such as error correction for students (Lyster, 2011, as cited in Ó Ceallaigh, 2016).

Regarding the learners, the results showed that students demonstrate more proficient in receptive skills than productive skills and the teachers provide more opportunities for students to read and listen than to write and speak the English language. These results agree with the results of Genesee' study (1994) which concluded that immersion students tend to achieve a lower level of productive skills than receptive skills due to limited opportunities to use the language productively.

In order to improve students' productive skills, teachers may provide opportunities for students to speak the English language by asking students questions, encouraging students to have a conversation in English when talking to the teacher, having students play the teacher' role by giving an instruction on a certain topic in front of the class and answering questions from their classmates, and having students participate in a whole class discussion (de Courcy, 1997). Additionally, teachers may design pair and group activities for students to engage in extended discourse in the English language such as having students ask questions from their partners to complete the missing information in the given text, having students work in pair to make a correct sequence of a story and present it to the class, and having students write a creative story in group and read it aloud to the whole class (Punchard, 2002).

Limitation and Recommendation for further studies

This study focused on investigating the current state of English Program from Thai teachers teaching at Saunkularb Wittayalai Thonburi School and Saint Gabriel's College. Therefore, the results of the study may represent only for the specific group of participants. This study calls for more research that focuses on teachers at different schools in order to find whether the results will be similar in different contexts and populations.

REFERENCES

- Abdi, H., & Asadi, B. (2015). A Synopsis of Researches on Teachers' and Students' Beliefs about Language Learning. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 3(4), 104-114.
- Alsulami, S. Q. (2017). Partial Immersion Program for Saudi Bilinguals. *English Language Teaching*, 10(2). doi:10.5539/elt.v10n2p150
- Borg, M. (2001). Key Concepts in ELT: Teachers' Beliefs. *ELT Journal*, 55(2), 186-188. doi:10.1093/elt/55.2.186
- Bureau of Educational Innovation Development. (2005). *The Guidelines for the Management of the English Program following the Curriculum of the Ministry of Education*.
- Castro-García, D. (2018). *Three Forms of Bilingual Education: Immersion, Dual Language and CLIL*. Heredia: Ediciones de la Escuela de Literatura y Ciencias del Lenguaje.
- Cazden, C. B., & Snow, C. E. (1990). English Plus: Issues in Bilingual Education. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 508, 9-11. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1047613>
- Chantarasiri, P. (2014). The Study of the Current State of English Program Instruction in Suratthani Province through the Perspectives of Teachers in the Program. *Online Journal of Education*, 9(1), 118-132.
- Cummins, J. (2013). BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING (CLIL): Research and its classroom implications. *Padres y Maestros*, 349, 6-10.
- Day, E. M., & Shapson, S. M. (1996). *Studies in Immersion Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- de Courcy, M. C. (1997). Benowa High: A decade of French immersion in Australia. In R. K. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion: International perspectives* (pp. 44-62). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Erkmen, B. (2012). Ways to Uncover Teachers' Beliefs. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 141-146. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.628
- Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research*, 38(1), 47-65. doi:10.1080/0013188960380104
- Flores, B. B. (2001). Bilingual Education Teachers' Beliefs and Their Relation to Self-Reported Practices. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 25(3), 275-299. doi:10.1080/15235882.2001.10162795
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA and Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Genesee, F. (1983). An invited article: Bilingual education of majority-language children: The Immersion experiments in review. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 4(1), 1-46. doi:10.1017/s0142716400001739
- Genesee, F. (1994). *Integrating language and content: Lessons from immersion*. Retrieved from Washington, DC: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/61c8k7kh>
- Handal, B., & Herrington, A. (2003). Mathematics Teachers' Beliefs and Curriculum Reform. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, 15(1), 59-69.
- Johnson, R. K., & Swain, M. (1997). *Immersion education: International Perspectives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Kaur, A., Young, D., & Kirkpatrick, R. (2016). English Education Polity in Thailand: Why the Poor Results? . In *English Language Education Policy in Asia*: Springer.
- Khader, F. R. (2012). Teachers' pedagogical beliefs and actual classroom practices in social studies instruction. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(1), 73-92.
- Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Met, M. (1997). Integrating language and content: Issues to consider. *Ikastaria: cuadernos de educación*, 9, 27-39.
- Met, M. (1999). *Content-Based Instruction: Defining Terms, Making Decisions*. Retrieved from Washington, DC: <http://carla.umn.edu/cobaltt/modules/principles/decisions.html>
- Ministry of Education. (2008). *Towards a Learning Society in Thailand: An introduction to Education in Thailand*.
- Ministry of Education. (n.d.). *Towards a Learning Society in Thailand: Developing language and communication skills*.
- Ó Ceallaigh, T. J. (2016). Second Language Acquisition and Form-Focused Instruction in Immersion: Teaching for Learning. *World Journal of Educational Research*, 3(2), 388-410. doi:10.22158/wjer.v3n2p388
- Punchard, I. (2002). Improving immersion student oral proficiency by fostering the use of extended discourse. *ACIE Newsletter*, 1-8.
- Punthumasan, P. (2007). *International programme for teacher education: An approach to tackling problems of English education in Thailand*. Paper presented at the The 11th UNESCO-APEID International Conference Reinventing Higher Education: Toward Participatory and Sustainable Development, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second Language classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Srisa-ard, B. (2002). *Introduction to research* (7 ed.). Bangkok: Suweeriyasarn.
- Tan, M. (2011). Mathematics and science teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the teaching of language in content learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(3), 325-342. doi:10.1177/1362168811401153
- Walker, C. L., & Tedick, D. J. (2000). The Complexity of Immersion Education: Teachers Address the Issues. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(1), 5-27. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/330445>



APPENDICES

จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย
CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY

Appendix A: Questionnaire**Questionnaire****Current State and Guidelines for Development of Thai Teachers
Teaching in English Program in Thailand****Section 1: General information**

Instructions: Please tick (✓) in the [] and fill in the blank where indicated.

1. Educational degree

[] Bachelor's degree [] Master's degree [] Doctoral degree

[] Other (please specify)

2. Major/Field of study

3. Subject of teaching

4. Years of teaching experience

[] 1 – 5 years [] 6 – 10 years [] More than 10 years

5. Years of teaching in the English Program

[] 1 – 5 years [] 6 – 10 years [] More than 10 years

6. Have you received any subject content training?

[] Yes (please specify)

[] No

7. Have you received any English language training?

[] Yes (please specify)

[] No

8. What kind of training have you received in order to teach in the EP/MEP/IEP?

Section 2: Teachers' beliefs and practices questionnaire

Instructions: Please tick (✓) in the box that indicates your level of agreement with each of the statements. How well do you agree with the following statements: (1) Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly agree.

No.	Statements	Agreement degree				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
		(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
Beliefs about language						
1.	The goal of the EP/MEP/IEP is to make students achieve a high level of proficiency in the English language while maintaining native proficiency in Thai.					
2.	Students learn most effectively when they are taught exclusively in the English language.					
3.	The use of English as a means of instruction allows students to receive more comprehensible input (English language that can be understood) and engage in meaningful use of the English language.					
4.	Bilingual students' exposure to the English language mostly occurs inside the classroom.					
5.	Teachers in the EP/MEP/IEP are required to have native-like proficiency in both Thai and English language.					

No.	Statements	Agreement degree				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
		(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
Beliefs about balancing between language and content						
6	Students can learn both English language and academic content simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in the English language.					
7.	The teachers in the EP/MEP/IEP play both roles of content teacher and English language teacher.					
8.	The bilingual students' development of English language is as important as academic content.					
9.	Content objectives are determined by the Basic Education Core Curriculum.					
10.	English language learning objectives should be included in the lesson plan.					
11.	Teaching academic content is the primary focus while teaching English language is secondary.					
12.	It is not necessary to explicitly teach the English language.					
13.	Students should be assessed on the academic content, not English language.					

No.	Statements	Agreement degree				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
		(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
Beliefs about learners						
14.	Students begin the EP/MEP/IEP with similar levels of English language proficiency.					
15.	Students in the EP/MEP/IEP have a high level of English proficiency in reading and listening skills.					
16.	Students in the EP/MEP/IEP have a high level of English proficiency in writing and speaking skills.					
Practices about language						
17.	I aim to make students achieve a high level of proficiency in the English language while maintaining native proficiency in Thai.					
18.	I do not use the Thai language or use it minimally inside the classroom.					
19.	I provide English language that can be understood by students in meaningful contexts.					
20.	I use the English language with my students only inside the classroom.					
21.	I have native-like proficiency in both Thai and English language.					

No.	Statements	Agreement degree				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
		(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
Practices about balancing between language and content						
22.	I play both roles of content teacher and English language teacher.					
23.	I facilitate the students' development of both academic content and English language.					
24.	I define content objectives according to the Basic Education Core Curriculum.					
25.	I include English language learning objectives in my lesson plan.					
26.	I focus more on teaching academic content than teaching the English language.					
27.	I provide little or no explicit English language teaching.					
28.	I assess students on the academic content, not English language.					
Practices about learners						
29.	I provide instruction that match the students' needs and levels of English language proficiency.					
30.	I provide sufficient opportunities for students to read and listen to the English language.					
31.	I provide sufficient opportunities for students to write and speak the English language.					

Section 3: Open-ended questions

Instructions: Please answer the following questions.

1. Is there any pro or con of being a 'Thai teacher' teaching in EP/MEP/IEP? (If yes, please specify)

2. What are the difficulties that you have encountered while teaching in the program and how did you handle them?

3. What are your suggestions about the improvement of the program?

Appendix B: Semi-Structured Interview Questions

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. How do you feel about English Program in Thailand?
2. What do you think about the use of English as a medium of instruction to teach subject content?
3. How do you implement the use of English as a medium of instruction to teach subject content in the classroom?
4. What do you think about the integration of language and content?
5. When you teach, do you pay more attention to your students' content knowledge or their English language skills?
6. What do you think about your students in the English Program?
7. Do your students have any problems studying subject content in English?
8. What are the difficulties that you have encountered while teaching in the program and how did you handle them?
9. What are your suggestions about the improvement of the program?

Appendix C: The Analysis of the Index of Item Objective Congruence

No.	Statements	Analysis of IOC from Experts			IOC Score	Results
		1	2	3		
Beliefs about language ความเชื่อเกี่ยวกับภาษา						
1.	<p>The goal of the English Program is to make students achieve a high level of proficiency in the English language while maintaining native proficiency in Thai.</p> <p>เป้าหมายของ English Program คือทำให้นักเรียนมีความสามารถในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในระดับสูง ขณะที่ยังรักษาความสามารถระดับเจ้าของภาษาในการใช้ภาษาไทย</p>	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
2.	<p>Students learn most effectively when they are taught exclusively in the English language.</p> <p>นักเรียนเรียนได้ผลดีที่สุดเมื่อได้รับการสอนเป็นภาษาอังกฤษเท่านั้น</p>	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid

No.	Statements	Analysis of IOC from Experts			IOC Score	Results
		1	2	3		
3.	<p>The use of English as a means of instruction allows students to receive more comprehensible input (English language that can be understood) and engage in meaningful use of the English language.</p> <p>การใช้ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นสื่อในการสอนเปิดโอกาสให้นักเรียนได้รับข้อมูลที่สามารเข้าใจได้ (ภาษาอังกฤษที่สามารถเข้าใจได้) มากขึ้นและได้มีส่วนร่วมในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษอย่างมีความหมาย</p>	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
4.	<p>Bilingual students' exposure to the English language mostly occurs inside the classroom.</p> <p>นักเรียนสองภาษาได้สัมผัสกับภาษาอังกฤษในห้องเรียนเป็นหลัก</p>	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
5.	<p>Teachers in the English Program are required to have native-like proficiency in both Thai and English language.</p> <p>ครูใน English Program จำเป็นต้องมีความสามารถเหมือนกับเจ้าของภาษาทั้งในภาษาไทยและภาษาอังกฤษ</p>	+1	+1	0	0.67	Valid

No.	Statements	Analysis of IOC from Experts			IOC Score	Results
		1	2	3		
Beliefs about balancing between language and content						
ความเชื่อเกี่ยวกับความสมดุลระหว่างภาษาและเนื้อหา						
6	Students can learn both English language and academic content simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in the English language. นักเรียนสามารถเรียนทั้งภาษาอังกฤษและเนื้อหาทางวิชาการไปพร้อมๆกันได้ในห้องเรียนที่วิชาถูกสอนด้วยภาษาอังกฤษ	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
7.	The teachers in the English Program play both roles of content teacher and English language teacher. ครูใน English program มีบทบาทเป็นทั้งครูสอนเนื้อหาและครูสอนภาษาอังกฤษ	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
8.	The bilingual students' development of English language is as important as academic content. การพัฒนาภาษาอังกฤษของนักเรียนสองภาษาสำคัญเท่ากับเนื้อหาทางวิชาการ	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
9.	Content objectives are determined by the national curriculum (Thai curriculum). วัตถุประสงค์ของเนื้อหาวิชาถูกกำหนดโดยหลักสูตรของชาติ (หลักสูตรไทย)	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid

No.	Statements	Analysis of IOC from Experts			IOC Score	Results
		1	2	3		
10.	English language learning objectives should be included in the lesson plan. วัตถุประสงค์ในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษควรถูกรวมอยู่ในแผนการสอน	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
11.	Teaching academic content is the primary focus while teaching English language is secondary. การสอนเนื้อหาทางวิชาการมีความสำคัญเป็นอันดับแรก รองลงมาคือการสอนภาษาอังกฤษ	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
12.	It is not necessary to explicitly teach the English language. ไม่จำเป็นต้องสอนภาษาอังกฤษโดยการเจาะจงสอน	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
13.	Students should be assessed on the academic content, not English language. นักเรียนควรถูกประเมินบนพื้นฐานของเนื้อหาทางวิชาการ ไม่ใช่ภาษาอังกฤษ	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
Beliefs about learners ความเชื่อเกี่ยวกับผู้เรียน						
14.	Students begin the English Program with similar levels of English language proficiency. นักเรียนเริ่มต้น English Program ด้วยระดับความสามารถในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษที่ใกล้เคียงกัน	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid

No.	Statements	Analysis of IOC from Experts			IOC Score	Results
		1	2	3		
15.	Students in the English Program have a high level of English proficiency in writing and speaking skills. นักเรียนใน English Program มีความสามารถในการเขียนและพูดภาษาอังกฤษในระดับสูง	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
16.	Students in the English Program have a high level of English proficiency in reading and listening skills. นักเรียนใน English Program มีความสามารถในการอ่านและฟังภาษาอังกฤษในระดับสูง	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
17.	Students in the English Program maintain native proficiency in the first language. นักเรียนใน English Program รักษาความสามารถระดับเจ้าของภาษาในการใช้ภาษาไทยได้	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
18.	Students in the English Program achieve the same levels of academic competence as comparable students in regular programs. นักเรียนใน English Program มีความสามารถด้านเนื้อหาวิชาการเทียบเท่ากับนักเรียนในระดับเดียวกันในโครงการปกติ	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid

No.	Statements	Analysis of IOC from Experts			IOC Score	Results
		1	2	3		
Practices about language การปฏิบัติเกี่ยวกับภาษา						
19.	I aim to make students achieve a high level of proficiency in the English language while maintaining native proficiency in Thai. ฉันตั้งเป้าหมายจะทำให้นักเรียนมีความสามารถในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในระดับสูง ขณะที่รักษาความสามารถระดับเจ้าของภาษาในการใช้ภาษาไทย	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
20.	I do not use the Thai language or use it minimally inside the classroom. ฉันไม่ใช้หรือใช้ภาษาไทยในห้องเรียนแค่เพียงเล็กน้อย	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
21.	I provide English language that can be understood by students in meaningful contexts. ฉันใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในบริบทที่สื่อความหมายที่นักเรียนสามารถเข้าใจได้	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
22.	I use the English language with my students only inside the classroom. ฉันใช้ภาษาอังกฤษกับนักเรียนแค่ในห้องเรียน	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid

No.	Statements	Analysis of IOC from Experts			IOC Score	Results
		1	2	3		
23.	I have native-like proficiency in both Thai and English language. ฉันมีความสามารถเหมือนกับเจ้าของภาษาทั้งในภาษาไทยและภาษาอังกฤษ	+1	+1	0	0.67	Valid
Practices about balancing between language and content การปฏิบัติเกี่ยวกับความสมดุลระหว่างภาษาและเนื้อหา						
24.	I play both roles of content teacher and English language teacher. ฉันมีบทบาทเป็นทั้งครูสอนเนื้อหาและครูสอนภาษาอังกฤษ	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
25.	I facilitate the students' development of both academic content and English language. ฉันส่งเสริมการพัฒนาของนักเรียนทั้งด้านเนื้อหาทางวิชาการและภาษาอังกฤษ	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
26.	I define content objectives according to the national curriculum (Thai curriculum). ฉันกำหนดวัตถุประสงค์ของเนื้อหาวิชาตามหลักสูตรของชาติ (หลักสูตรไทย)	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
27.	I include English language learning objectives in my lesson plan. ฉันใส่วัตถุประสงค์เกี่ยวกับการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษไว้ในแผนการสอนของฉันด้วย	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid

No.	Statements	Analysis of IOC from Experts			IOC Score	Results
		1	2	3		
28.	I focus more on teaching academic content than teaching the English language. ฉันให้ความสำคัญกับการสอนเนื้อหาทางวิชาการมากกว่าการสอนภาษาอังกฤษ	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
29.	I provide little or no explicit English language teaching. ฉันไม่สอนภาษาอังกฤษโดยการเจาะจงสอนหรือสอนแค่เพียงเล็กน้อย	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
30.	I assess students on the academic content, not English language. ฉันประเมินนักเรียนบนพื้นฐานของเนื้อหาทางวิชาการ ไม่ใช่ภาษาอังกฤษ	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
Practices about learners การปฏิบัติเกี่ยวกับผู้เรียน						
31.	My students enter the English Program with similar levels of English language proficiency. นักเรียนของฉันเริ่มต้น English Program ด้วยระดับความสามารถในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษที่ใกล้เคียงกัน	0	-1	+1	0	Invalid

No.	Statements	Analysis of IOC from Experts			IOC Score	Results
		1	2	3		
32.	<p>My students in the English Program have a high level of English proficiency in writing and speaking skills.</p> <p>นักเรียนของฉันใน English Program มีความสามารถในการเขียนและพูดภาษาอังกฤษในระดับสูง</p>	0	-1	+1	0	Invalid
33.	<p>My students in the English Program have a high level of English proficiency in reading and listening skills.</p> <p>นักเรียนของฉันใน English Program มีความสามารถในการอ่านและฟังภาษาอังกฤษในระดับสูง</p>	0	-1	+1	0	Invalid
34.	<p>My students in the English Program can maintain native proficiency in the first language.</p> <p>นักเรียนของฉันใน English Program สามารถรักษาความสามารถระดับเจ้าของภาษาในการใช้ภาษาไทยไว้ได้</p>	0	-1	+1	0	Invalid
35.	<p>My students in the English Program can achieve the same levels of academic competence as comparable students in regular programs.</p> <p>นักเรียนของฉันใน English Program มีความสามารถด้านเนื้อหาวิชาการเทียบเท่ากับนักเรียนในระดับเดียวกันในโครงการปกติ</p>	0	-1	+1	0	Invalid

Open-Ended Questions

No.	Questions	Analysis of IOC from Experts			IOC Score	Results
		1	2	3		
1.	<p>Is there any pro or con of being a 'Thai teacher' teaching in the English Program? (If yes, please specify)</p> <p>การเป็นครูไทยที่สอนใน English Program มีข้อดีหรือข้อเสียหรือไม่ (ถ้ามีโปรดระบุ)</p>	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
2.	<p>What are the difficulties that you have encountered while teaching in the program and how did you handle them?</p> <p>คุณประสบความยุ่งยากอะไรบ้างขณะที่สอนในโครงการและคุณมีวิธีการจัดการอย่างไร</p>	0	+1	+1	0.67	Valid
3.	<p>What are your suggestions about the improvement of the program?</p> <p>คุณมีข้อเสนอแนะอะไรบ้างเกี่ยวกับการพัฒนาโครงการ</p>	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

No.	Questions	Analysis of IOC from Experts			IOC Score	Results
		1	2	3		
1.	How do you feel about English Program in Thailand? คุณรู้สึกอย่างไรเกี่ยวกับ English Program ในประเทศไทย	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
2.	What do you think about the use of English as a medium of instruction to teach subject content? คุณคิดอย่างไรเกี่ยวกับการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นสื่อในการสอนเนื้อหาวิชา	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
3.	How do you implement the use of English as a medium of instruction to teach subject content in the classroom? คุณมีวิธีการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นสื่อในการสอนเนื้อหาวิชาในห้องเรียนอย่างไร	0	+1	+1	0.67	Valid
4.	What do you think about the integration of language and content? คุณคิดอย่างไรเกี่ยวกับการบูรณาการภาษาและเนื้อหา	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid

No.	Questions	Analysis of IOC from Experts			IOC Score	Results
		1	2	3		
5.	When you teach, do you pay more attention to your students' content knowledge or their English language skills? เมื่อคุณสอนคุณใส่ใจต่อความรู้ด้านเนื้อหาหรือทักษะทางภาษาอังกฤษของนักเรียนมากกว่ากัน	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
6.	What do you think about your students in the English Program? คุณคิดอย่างไรเกี่ยวกับนักเรียนใน English Program	0	+1	+1	0.67	Valid
7.	Do your students have any problems studying subject content in English? นักเรียนของคุณมีปัญหาเกี่ยวกับการเรียนเนื้อหาวิชาเป็นภาษาอังกฤษบ้างหรือไม่	+1	+1	+1	1	Valid
8.	What are the difficulties that you have encountered while teaching in the program and how did you handle them? คุณประสบความยุ่งยากอะไรบ้างขณะที่สอนในโครงการและคุณมีวิธีจัดการอย่างไร	0	+1	+1	0.67	Valid
9.	What are your suggestions about the improvement of the program? คุณมีข้อเสนอแนะอะไรบ้างเกี่ยวกับการพัฒนาโครงการ	0	+1	+1	0.67	Valid

Appendix D: List of Experts Validating the Instrument

1. Asst. Prof. Chansongklod Gajasen, Ph.D

Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University

2. Asst. Prof. Prannapha Modehiran, Ph.D

Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University

3. Chittraporn Chutong, Ph.D

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Suratthani Rajabhat University



VITA

NAME Chonnikarn Wongsawat

DATE OF BIRTH 4 March 1994

PLACE OF BIRTH Suratthani

**INSTITUTIONS
ATTENDED** B.A. (English, First Class Honors), Kasetsart University

HOME ADDRESS 234 Moo 9, Tumbol Chuntalay, Muang District,
Suratthani, 84100



จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย
CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY