

FROM THE BOTTOM UP: A CASE STUDY OF TEACHER TRAINING FOR PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS OF ENGLISH IN A THAI SCHOOL IN NORTH EASTERN THAILAND

Steven Graham

Introduction

Thailand has the legislation in place to move from a teacher centred to a learner centred approach to English language education. The 1999 Education Act details what is required; however, the implementation of the act has been an extremely slow process, resulting in little or no progress in some rural areas of Thailand. The reasons why Thai students have low performance in English is detailed by Punthumasen (2008), in that they find learning English boring and they do not like the teaching methods. They also complain about the materials and the surrounding where they are being taught as well as there not being enough language learning technology, especially in rural areas. The problem with rural areas is that they are predominantly poor regions. "It should be obvious that even with schools of equal quality a poor child can seldom catch up with a rich one" (Illich 2002: 6).

Wiriyachitra (2002) states the importance of an independent and learner-centred approach in Thailand where analytical learning instead of rote learning has to be incorporated. This is not the case in many schools at this time, resulting in Thailand marking time as the rest of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) competes in the globalised world. Furthermore, language learning is one of the most "face threatening" subjects to learn at school due to the pressure of operating using a rather limited language code (Dörnyei 2001: 40), which does not help when matters of "face" are deemed so important for both teachers and students in Thailand.

Difficulties with the implementation of communicative language teaching (CLT) have been highlighted by Jarvis and Atsilarat (2004) and include low English proficiency, large class sizes, limited time and low student responsibility as well as the fact that students are not comfortable with CLT. There is a danger that the change is too great and that teachers will want to revert back to teacher centred teaching when the task of change becomes insurmountable (Watts 2004). These problem areas are all relevant

to the success of this project; however, the communicative activities detailed are only a small part of the teaching and learning that takes place, as these activities are seen as "add-ons" to the existing teaching that has already taken place. Teachers will still conduct their lessons as they have done before; however, there will now be a dialogue or conversation to help reinforce the teaching that has taken place. It is possible that this would be the first time that students have taken part in exercises such as this.

At the moment, there is not nearly enough "comprehensible input" (Krashen 1997: 3) taking place in the classroom for language acquisition to take place, only some of the language makes sense to the students who are studying English (Allwright & Bailey 1991). Thailand is a good example of where "students can articulate formal rules of grammar but cannot use them correctly in spontaneous communication" (Ellis 1985: 230). Some educational commentators would argue that English has become an academic subject taught at schools and is not used as a second or foreign language in Thailand except by the rich elite.

This project came into being because of a much larger proposal put forward to Thailand's Ministry of Education resulting in the request by them for a smaller pilot project to test out the theory. The initial proposal put forward by Graham (2008) detailed the planning and processes undertaken to produce English language trainers and teaching materials for Prathom (primary) teachers of English in Udon Thani province. The smaller project was designed to show what could be achieved with one school as opposed to a whole province. The aims are twofold; the training of primary school Thai teachers of English to adapt to learner centred communicative activities and secondly, the training of their students to cope with the tasks they are given.

The ethos behind the implementation was the publication by Kantamara, Hallinger and Jatiket (2006) which detailed how ineffective the process of top-down change implementation was in Thailand and how the 1999 Education Act had given Thailand the vision; the problem of how to transform that vision into reality had become one

of the country's unmet challenges. They detailed a "scaling up for change" where there is a process by which implementation in a single classroom or school can be implemented on a much wider scale. This scaling up approach they adopted included a difference in that it included government officials, something that has been adopted in this project; and in truth, this project has followed that of Kantamara, Hallinger and Jatiket (2006: 19) in many ways, especially in the "Think Big, Start Small" philosophy which is a radical change from the norm in Thailand's schools and education policy.

This project is a work in progress and has only been running for four months; however, with the backing of the school director and teachers, it is envisaged that this innovation may span years rather than months.

Choice of School

For this case study to be productive, it was important to have a school that would be classed as a typical example of a rural educational establishment. This is not an easy task, as the idea of conducting research and applying new innovations is intimidating to many school directors. What was needed was a school director with vision and leadership who wanted to be part of innovation and not a bystander.

Through constant networking and an element of luck, contact was made with Mr. Channarong Rachbuanoy at the 12th English in South-East Asia (ESEA) conference at King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi (KMUTT) in Bangkok during December 2007, who was completing his Master of Arts degree in the field of Applied Linguistics. He is employed at a school in Udon Thani province, about 75 kilometres from Udon Thani Rajabhat University and was prepared to speak to his school director, Mr. Saneh Boonsaeng of Bantatprachanukoon School about the possibility of conducting research into a transitional phase of communicative activities and learner centeredness in the classroom. Full scale change from teacher centred to learner centred learning has not successfully taken place across Thailand, so a transitional phase is what this project is offering.

Whilst the nature and degree of a director or principle's impact on the lives of teachers, students and schools is the subject of much debate, Hallinger and Heck (1996) inform us that there is still a lack of detail as to how these leaders respond to their school environmental contexts. For this case study it is quite simple, if the director

was not interested, this research would not have happened at his school.

Hallinger and Heck (2002) continue to define the vision of school principles as something that lies both in its impact on one's behaviour and its potential to energize others. This was vital, as if there was a chance that the Thai teachers of English were to waver, then the motivation supplied by the school director would be of great importance, ultimately deciding whether the project is to succeed or not.

Bantatprachanukoon School in Ban Phue district in Udon Thani province, north-eastern Thailand has 347 students from nursery to grade nine. The project was to focus on grades 1-3 (Prathom 1-3) with the hope that if it were successful, then there would be the possibility of extending it to the rest of the school and beyond.

Teacher training

The vast majority of Thai teachers of English in primary school have had little or no formal training in English language teaching. Many of the teachers hold qualifications in other disciplines such as Thai language, home economics and physical education. These teachers have been subjected to some short intensive courses in the past, in the hope that this would make up for the inadequate English language training they had received in the first place. The problem with courses such as this is that although teachers felt motivated at the time, this feeling of euphoria soon vanished once the reality of their classrooms took hold.

Teachers of English in north eastern Thailand, whilst used to dealing with large classes, still have problems due to discomfort; control; individual attention; evaluation and learner effectiveness (Hayes, 1997). These conditions are not conducive to effective language learning.

What was needed was some kind of support system that would scaffold the teachers once they had completed their training course, which would allow them to receive feedback and ask questions on a regular basis in a non threatening environment. All teachers are individuals and their classes are full of individual students, so whilst studies like Richards, Gallo and Renandya (2001); Crandall (2000) reinforces the use of personal reflection by teachers; the reality for these teachers will be when they ask questions which are relevant to them and their classrooms. It is very difficult to anticipate the reaction of their students to the new activities and the problems that the teachers will face.

Great attention was given to previous research in areas relating to teacher training and rural contexts. Mackenzie (2004) provided insight to potential problem areas concerning teacher training and also the development of teacher networks in Surin; whilst Srimavin, Wall and Hull (2008) detailed areas for consideration when dealing with rural people in Thailand concerning the English language and rural people's perceptions. Iemjinda (2005) demonstrates that there should be a focus on the content of the innovation, as well as the process of the implementation, taking into account local context and culture. For this collaboration to take place it was vital to have those taking part to have sufficient cultural sensitivity to function effectively in the situations that were to arise (Carless 2006). If this project was to succeed, it was imperative for as many problem areas to be anticipated before they had time to surface.

Hayes (1995) detailed twelve principles for in-service teacher development which proved insightful in the planning and implementation of this project. He states:

- Change is a slow process.
- Normative re-educative strategies offer the best prospect of securing changes in behaviour.
- All teacher development activities should be classroom centred.
- Teachers should be involved in the preparation of courses.
- Trainers should themselves be teachers.
- Training methodology should be largely task-based and inductive.
- Training/development sessions should value participants existing knowledge.
- Teacher development activities should raise awareness of the teaching-learning issues behind the innovation, and give opportunities for in-depth analysis.
- Teacher development sessions should enable teachers to form generalised conclusions about the topic under review.
- Sessions should give participants an opportunity to put into practice what they have learnt in a non-threatening environment.
- Teacher development sessions should offer opportunities for participants to share knowledge and ideas.
- Every effort should be made to provide follow-up for courses in participants own schools.

This project differs slightly in context from what Hayes described, in that there is very little course-work involved; it is more "hands on" with constant feedback, scaffolding and reflection. More established course designs (Waters 1988; Yalden 1987) and activities and procedures (Ellis 1986) have their place; however, not as a focus in this training initiative as this project involves the teachers experimenting with their classes and learning from the reaction of their students and their own reflections on what has taken place. Using a form of oral approach and situational language teaching (Richards & Rodgers 2001) as well as Hayes' twelve principles that are based on sound experience has proved integral in the planning of this project.

The initial teacher training on 20th August 2008 lasted approximately two hours with a further two hours for questions and further explanations. This might seem quite short; however, the communicative activities are designed to be added to what the teachers have already taught, resulting in a small amount of additional material and the intended change of methodology for the teachers. All the teachers from the primary school classes as well as the nursery class attended the training as the teachers from outside the target years (target grades 1-3) showed an interest in what was taking place. It is important for this interest to be nurtured as the project will be extended to these classes in time in line with successful outcomes.

What followed was a period of a few weeks where the teachers were able to put into practice what they had learned during the training day and a period of reflection for them to think about the problems that they and their students were having. It is important to state that the students are not used to this type of communicative activity and that there was always the possibility that they would not respond favourably to it.

A co-ordinator was needed to act between the school and the project leader. If we alienated the

teachers, then all good intentions would be wasted (Pring 1989). Mr. Channarong Rachbuanoy selflessly gave his time to this project, translating constantly so that conversations, meetings and feedback were understood by all. Without this service from one of the school teachers, the project would not have got started. This enthusiasm, coupled with that of the teachers themselves exemplified that it is the teachers themselves who ultimately determine the success of a programme (Richards 2001). For future projects such as this, there needs to be someone on the inside (one of the teachers themselves) who acts as a go-between, between the course provider/scaffolder and the teachers.

There was the possibility to observe grades 1 (Prathom 1, Ms. Pranee Boonsaeng) and 3 (Prathom 3, Ms. Sasicha Pawasri) on 9th September and grade 2 (Prathom 2, Mr. Manop Yasoonthorn) on 23rd September 2008 where the teachers demonstrated some of the activities that were discussed during the training day. There are thirty six students in Prathom 1 and thirty each in Prathoms 2 and 3. It is at this stage that it became clear that there was going to be a problem with the designing of materials as the teachers did not feel confident to produce them themselves.

Materials used

Smooth Moves is a project being worked on by Dave Hopkins, specifically for teachers who are non native speakers of English. He has developed a set of materials for English language teaching which is designed for students who are "beginners" at grades 5-9, which equates to Prathom 5 to Mathayom 3 in Thailand. What is interesting about this material is that the lesson model is a template for learning a communicative approach to teaching as well as limiting the core target language. In addition, teachers are able to adapt their own content materials to a communicative approach.

These lessons are designed to supplement traditional activities and there is also a support system of mentors and trainers which has been developed. This was crucial in the setting up of this project, as the Thai teachers of English were not in a position to move directly into learner centred communicative activities without some kind of transition and plenty of scaffolding; albeit nine years after the Education Act had been passed.

Although there has always been discussion concerning the correct choice of materials for courses (Richards 1998; Graham 2008a), having taken into account the pre-occupation with O-Net

test results that exists in the Thai education system, it seemed prudent to use materials from the O-Net syllabus to construct the dialogues and conversations which will form the basis of the materials used. The style of Smooth Moves and the perceived ease in which it could be imparted to Thai teachers of English at primary school level made this type of material viable. This gave way to the production of materials seen as a "smooth transition" from the established teaching methods and materials, before the adoption of something as communicative as Smooth Moves. English language teaching commences at grade 1 (Prathom 1) and whilst not all educational commentators would agree to a second language being taught at this early age, it is the case in Thailand, so materials were needed to start from the first grade.

There are many O-Net products on the market for use in preparation for the O-Net multiple choice examinations, so a different course book was chosen from that being used at the school in order to give more chance for material development at a later date. The process of making dialogues and conversations from the new material could be mimicked at a later date to make subsequent conversations and dialogues using the existing books that the school was using. The course book used was "Prepare to Test Prathom 1" from Modern Academic Press Co., Ltd. with the additional resource of a vocabulary book, "Handy Vocab Prathom 1" from Salesian Education Center. Dialogues and conversations taken from the text books are at the Appendix. Certain words have been underlined to show the areas of word substitution that students will be encouraged to use once they become more used to this type of activity. It is important for the students to use these resources in order to "take an active part in the learning process" and partake in this type of comprehensive, holistic language practice. (Dubin & Olshtain 1986: 31).

Materials have been developed for the grade 1 (Prathom 1) students and these materials have been used by all the classes taking part in the project. A CD was recorded at a professional studio using two children and one adult, all sounding like native speakers. In time further materials will be developed and more CDs recorded; however, the difference in English language ability between grades 1-3 (Prathom 1-3) is minimal and time restraints dictated the use of one set of materials at this time. Flashcards were also distributed for use by the teachers to help with vocabulary substitution which would take place later.

Classroom observations took place on all three classes on 12th November at the beginning of the new semester using the Prathom 1 materials that had been created. The materials will be monitored in accordance with Richards (2001) to ensure that effective communicative activities take place and that any alterations that are needed can be made along the way.

First observations

During the first round of observations on 12th November, it was pleasing to see that all three teachers were using different methods to teach the same lesson. An example of this was where Prathom 1 had the first two conversations written on a large piece of card in English and this was displayed in front of the blackboard. Students were sat on the floor in the front of the classroom and some sat in the first row. Prathom 2 had the first conversation written on the blackboard in English and in Thai, with students sat at their desks. Prathom 3 had the first conversation written in English only and they were sat in a big group on chairs at the front of the class. Three different ways; however, each proved equally effective.

In Prathom 1, the teacher played the CD many times and gave explanations in Thai frequently in order for the students to understand what they were saying. Whilst the students were speaking in pairs, some were trying to read from the large conversation card at the front of the class and others were trying to commit to memory. This was repeated many times with all students taking part in the conversations. The Prathom 2 teacher played the CD and it was noticeable that the students were disappointed when the CD was stopped as they wanted to continue listening to the conversations. Students were encouraged to come out to the front of the class and copy the conversation they had heard in pairs, either from memory or by reading the blackboard. Prathom 3 had all the boys playing the boy's part and all the girls playing the girl's part before students took turns in pairs with the conversations. This was repeated so that everyone had a turn.

From the clinical supervision conducted (Gaies & Bowers 1990; Wallace 1991), it was evident that the students were enjoying themselves; however, it will be some time before they get used to the idea of taking part in conversations and dialogues on a regular basis. At this stage, there is no way of knowing if their enjoyment was because of the novelty factor of these activities or whether the students, because of their age, liked the direction that was being given by the teachers as according

to Beard (1969), children of this age lack direction in their thinking. These dialogues and conversations are intended to give them the support at the beginning to start to expand their initial understanding with the vocabulary substitution exercises that will come later.

Feedback

There was immediate feedback to all three teachers individually; however, it was evident that there was a certain amount of anxiety (Randall & Thornton 2001), so the major feedback session was held the following week, together with the school director on 19th November. The feedback session is an essential ingredient of learning (Dörnyei 2001) and proved very productive; going far better than expected.

Ms. Pranee Boonsaeng from Prathom 1 was concerned by what she called the "slow progress" her class were making. The students were reported to have a very short attention span, so she was only able to go so far before taking a break and then starting again. She was also worried about the student's intonation as it did not sound the same as the example on the CD. From the observation it was clear that the students were making steady progress, some better than others and that it was the teacher's high expectations that needed to be adjusted. Reassurance was given concerning the progress that was being made and confirmation of the importance of the meaning of what was being said and the fact that students needed to be able to read the conversations in order that they could transfer the language to their O-Net tests. The problem about intonation was dealt with by explaining that the children on the CD sound like native speakers, so her students only needed to be understood and that a Thai accent was to be expected and perfectly acceptable. Problems would occur when pronunciation interfered with understanding.

The Prathom 2 teacher, Mr. Manop Yasoonthorn wanted to know if it was acceptable to teach the lessons in Thai as well as English. It was suggested that Thai had to be used in the classroom as the level of English that the students possessed was not of a high enough standard to have English only. A sandwich method of explanation was put forward, allowing the teacher to use English, Thai and then English again. If further help was needed, Thai and then the use of English again would be used until the students understood what was expected of them. This way English is used first and last.

Eight students from Prathom 3 were identified as having had problems early on with taking part

in the conversations; however, Ms. Sasicha Pawasri used a song from one of the British Council CDs "Genki English" and this had proved effective in overcoming the students' initial difficulties.

All teachers were upbeat and positive; however, they were concerned about their progress, in addition to the development of their students. Encouragement was given and the restating of the fact that they were taking part in a project which was contributing to the development of English education at primary level. Their concerns about failure were alleviated by explaining that due to the decision by the school to conduct action research whilst others were standing still, no harm was to become their students by taking part in this project; there could only be positives.

It was encouraging to see three Thai teachers of English take part in a feedback session and show the depth of their interest and concern for the development of English language teaching in their country. Their commitment and that of Mr. Channarong Rachbuanoy in the co-ordination and constant translation of proceedings has demonstrated what can be done when all are committed to the same cause. In the planning of feedback sessions, it was appreciated that everyone concerned in this project would have their own "different agendas" in the sessions (Randall & Thornton 2001: 143); however, these agendas seemed to be pointing in the same direction; everyone wanted the project to work. This feeling of involvement and success has been a motivating factor (Yule 1996) and this motivation, due to positive feedback, is intended to lead to more success.

Discussion

Williams (1992: 38) asked whether it was time to "find out what kinds of communication Thais actually are involved in and with whom and then teach them what they really need." Unfortunately, the Basic Education Curriculum B.D.2544 (A.D.2001), whilst thorough, does not give sufficient guidelines on implementation. The basic education curriculum clearly defines the standards and benchmarks for each level of primary and secondary education; however, the implementation of this new curriculum has remained a problem for many years due to insufficient support and guidelines explaining how it is to be done. The difference from where Thai basic education is and where it wants to be is vast and as Thai teachers are used to centralised government directives, the idea that teachers, schools and directors have to implement changes

themselves from a teacher centred curriculum to a learner centred one has resulted in confusion and stagnation.

Supportive collaborative action research is needed for effective change to take place in line with the 1999 Education Act. Studies by Bilash and Kwangsawad (2004) highlight the obstacles of time, money, resources, infrastructure and skilled leadership that can hinder development of communicative language teaching in Thailand. The Prathom students in this project are not yet ready for task-based English speaking instruction as detailed by Pattapong and Chinwonno (2005) and the teachers do not have a clear idea how to implement the new Basic Education Curriculum without support and leadership. It is proposed that following one course of action rather than the many lectures and workshops that seem confusing due to the different sets of information imparted by the lecturers (Wannapiro & Luksaneeyanawin, 2005) may be the direction that is needed.

The students in this study are not used to task-based learning and communicative activities, due partly to their cognitive profile; so in order for them to succeed they need to be trained in how to learn. Similarities with Japanese students in a study by Burrows (2008) indicate that this is probably an Asian phenomenon; however, the situation appears far worse in Thailand than that of Japan. Teachers and their students need to be familiar with the teaching and learning strategies needed to motivate themselves to teach and learn effectively (Bernaus & Gardner 2008), in that teachers need to assess their students' perceptions of the new strategies that they are using for effective English language learning to take place.

The transition from teacher centred to learner centred English language teaching has led to an "emphasis on process rather than product, a focus on learner differences, learner strategies and on learner self-direction and autonomy" (Richards 2002: 5). Rural schools are not ready to move from one type of teaching to another without some kind of transition as this change is too great to be completed in one step. A smooth transition is needed to allow the principles of learner centred communicative English language education to take effect.

The evaluation of a project such as this might not seem such a daunting task as it first seems, as a retrospective micro evaluation (Ellis 1997) of whether the tasks have worked would suffice. Breen, Candlin, Dam and Gabrielsen (1989) have shown how a programme can evolve by a gradual movement of training based on the trainers' views on teaching and learning to that of the classroom

as seen by the learners. By asking teachers and students for their qualitative input, it will be possible to gauge whether the project was successful and compare that data to any change in O-Net scores achieved by the students. This is beyond the scope of this paper; however, it will be addressed at a future date as part of this ongoing project.

“Language provides the means of getting free of immediate appearance as the sole basis of judgement” (Holt 1969: 7). The administrative context that supports this programme has been clearly defined in accordance with Richards (1990: 164) in that “central office” “the program” and the school know where their responsibilities lie and whilst the bottom up approach is the essence of the project, without the support of training (the program) and the Ministry of Education (central office), success would be limited or not at all.

Problems detailed by Hayes (1995) in his comparison between school initiatives in Malaysia and Thailand were not evident in this project in so far as the lessons were not being taught in the “old style” most probably due to the fact that the communicative activity is seen as an “add-on” and not a replacement to the existing teaching which is still predominantly teacher centred. The project is in its infancy, so time will tell if a learner centred communicative approach will be adhered to in the long term or whether teachers will feel less confident and move to a less communicative teaching style over time. Cathartic interventions (Randall & Thornton 2001) are not anticipated as early indications are that the teachers involved feel proud to be taking the initiative and being involved in something to further advance English language education in Thailand, so that education becomes a “reality” and not just a “slogan” (Dewey 1997: 91).

References

- Allwright, D. and Bailey, K. M.** 1991. *Focus on the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beard, R. M.** 1969. *An Outline of Piaget's Developmental Psychology*. Thetford: Lowe & Brydone Printers Limited.
- Bernaus, M. and Gardner, R. C.** 2008. ‘Teacher motivation strategies, student perceptions, student motivation, and English achievement.’ *The Modern Language Journal* 92/3: 387-401.
- Bilash, O. and Kwangsawad, T.** 2004. Factors influencing Thai teachers' abilities to adapt CLT in their classrooms: A collaborative action research study. *ThaiTESOL Bulletin* 17/1: 1-14.
- Breen, M. et al.** 1989. ‘The evolution of a teacher training programme.’ In R. K. Johnson (ed.), *The Second Language Curriculum* (pp. 133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burrows, C.** 2008. ‘Socio-cultural barriers facing TBL in Japan.’ *The Language Teacher* 32/8: 15-19.
- Carless, D.** 2006. ‘Collaborative EFL teaching in primary schools.’ *ELT Journal* 60/4: 328-335.
- Crandall, J.** 2000. ‘Language teacher education.’ *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 20: 34-55.
- Dewey, J.** 1997. *Experience and Education*. New York: Touchstone.
- Dörnyei, Z.** 2001. *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dubin, F. and Olshtain, E.** 1986. *Course Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R.** 1985. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R.** 1986. ‘Activities and procedures for teacher training.’ *ELT Journal* 40/2 : 91-99.
- Ellis, R.** 1997. *SLA Research and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gaies, S., & Bowers, R.** 1990. Clinical supervision of language teaching: The supervisor as trainer and educator. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (eds.) *Second Language Teacher Education* (pp. 167-181). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graham, S.** 2008. ‘Proposed teacher training for primary school teachers of English in Thailand.’ Retrieved November 17 2008 from <http://www.steves-english-zone.com/images/Papers/proposed-teacher-training-for-primary-school-teachers-of-english-in-thailand.pdf>
- Graham, S.** 2008a. ‘Textbooks: one size does not fit all.’ *Bangkok Post*, February 12, p. L4.
- Hallinger, P. and Heck, R. H.** 1996. ‘The principal's role in school effectiveness: An assessment of methodological progress, 1980-1995.’ Retrieved November 16 2008 from <http://www.springer.com/?SGWID=5-102-45-131790-0>
- Hallinger, P. and Heck, R. H.** 2002. ‘What do you call people with visions? The role of vision, mission and goals in school leadership and improvement.’ Retrieved November 16 2008 from <http://www.springer.com/?SGWID=5-102-45-133094-0>
- Hayes, D.** 1995. ‘In-service teacher development: some basic principles.’ *ELT Journal* 49/3: 252-261.
- Hayes, D.** 1997. ‘Helping teachers to cope with large classes.’ *ELT Journal* 51/2: 106-116.
- Holt, J.** 1969. *The Under-achieving School*. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation.
- Iemjinda, M.** 2005. ‘Teachers and changes: a school-based professional development programme for Thai teachers.’ *Silpakorn University International Journal* 5/1-2: 91-107.
- Illich, I.** 2002. *Deschooling Society*. London: Marion Boyars Publishers Ltd.
- Jarvis, H. and Atsilarat, S.** 2004. ‘Shifting paradigms: From a communicative to a context-based

- approach.' *Asian EFL Journal* 6(4). Retrieved from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/december_04_HJ&SA.php
- Kantamara, P., Hallinger, P. and Jatiket, M.** 2006. Scaling up education reform in Thailand: Context, collaboration, networks and change.' *Planning and Changing* 37/1&2: 5-23.
- Krashen, S. D.** 1997. *Foreign language education the easy way*. Culver City: Language Education Associates.
- Mackenzie, A.** 2004. Small steps in English language teacher development in Surin: Step one. Retrieved November 17 2008 from http://vensite.org/main/images/Small_Steps_Mackenzie.pdf
- Pattapong, K. and Chinwonno, A.** 2005. 'A study of fifth grade students' motivation towards task-based English speaking instruction.' *Working Papers in English as an International Language* 1: 72-83.
- Pring, R.** (1989). *The New Curriculum*. London: Cassell Educational Limited.
- Punthumasan, P.** 2008. International program for teacher education: An approach to tackling problems of English education in Thailand. Retrieved November 24, 2008, from http://www.unescobkk.org/fileadmin/user_upload/apeid/Conference/11thConference/papers/3C3_Pattanida_Punthumasan.pdf
- Randall, M. and Thornton, B.** 2001. *Advising and Supporting Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C.** 1990. *The Language Teaching Matrix*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C.** 1998. *Beyond Training*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C.** 2001. *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C.** 2002. 'Planning aims and objectives in language programs (Vol. 5).' Singapore: Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organisation Regional Language Centre.
- Richards, J. C., Gallo, P. B. and Renandya, W. A.** 2001. 'Exploring teachers' beliefs and the processes of change.' Retrieved November 16 2008 from: <http://www.professorjackrichards.com/pdfs/exploring-teacher-change.pdf>
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S.** 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Srimavin, W., Wall, U. and Hull, J. C.** 2008. 'Do rural communities in Thailand really need English?' Paper presented at the 28th Annual Thailand TESOL International Conference, Khon Kaen, Thailand.
- Wallace, M. J.** 1991. *Training Foreign Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wannapiro, S. and Luksaneeyanawin, S.** 2005. 'An analysis of an educational institution English curriculum for primary education grades 4-6: A case study of Thesabaan Inthapanya School.' *Working Papers in English as an International Language* 1: 39-58.
- Waters, A.** 1988. 'Teacher-training course design: A case study.' *ELT Journal* 42/1: 14-20.
- Watts, E.** 2004. 'The submerged coral reef: The impact of context and culture on how children learn languages in non-western societies.' Retrieved November 24, 2008, from: <http://gisig.iatefl.org/resources/articles/CoralReefMarch2004.pdf>
- Williams, G.** 1992. 'Communicative language teaching and the Thai setting.' *PASA* 22: 29-41.
- Wiriyachitra, A.** 2002. English Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand in this Decade. Retrieved November 16, 2008, from <http://www.apecknowledgebank.org/resources/downloads/English%20Language%20Teaching%20and%20Learning%20in%20Thailand.pdf>
- Yalden, J.** 1987. *Principles of Course Design for Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G.** 1996. *The Study of Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Acknowledgement

Support for this project was provided in part through a research grant from Udon Thani Rajabhat University.

Appendix

Prathom One Conversations and Dialogues

Hello. My name is Bank. What is your name?

Hi. My name is Noi. Pleased to meet you.

Nice to meet you too. Goodbye Noi.

Goodbye Bank.

What is this?

This is a pencil. What is that?

That is a ruler.

Good morning. My name is Bank. What is your name?

Good morning. My name is Noi. Nice to meet you.

Pleased to meet you too. What is this?

This is a rubber. What is that?

That is a chair. Goodbye Noi.

Goodbye Bank.

What are these?

They are cats. What are these?

They are dogs. What are those?

They are bananas. What are those?

They are oranges.

Hello Bank.

Hello Noi.

What are these?

They are books. What are those?

They are monkeys. What are these?

They are elephants. What are those?

They are tigers. Bye-bye Bank.

Bye-bye Noi. See you again soon.

Is this a window?

Yes, it is. Is that a door?

No, it isn't. It is a desk. Are these umbrellas?

Yes, they are. Are those tigers?

No, they are not. They are dogs.

Good evening Noi.

Good evening Bank. Is this an umbrella?

No, it isn't. It is a ruler. Are those ice-creams?
Yes, they are. Is that a chair?
Yes, it is. Are these blackboards?
Yes, they are. Goodbye Bank. See you tomorrow.
Bye-bye Noi. See you soon.

B. Hello Noi. This is Art. He is my friend.
N. Hello Art. Pleased to meet you.
A. Hello Noi. Nice to meet you too.

Art is tall.
Art is a tall boy.
Noi is short.
Noi is a short girl.
They are friends.

Art is fat.
Art is a fat boy.
Noi is thin.
Noi is a thin girl.
They are friends.

Niep is short.
Niep is a short man.
He is my friend.
Goy is thin.
Goy is a thin woman.
She is my friend.

Hello Noi.
Hello Bank.
This is a ball. I like it. These are cars. I like them.
They are dolls. I don't like them.
That is a robot. I don't like it.
Bye-bye Bank.
See you later Noi.

Hi Art.
Good morning Goy.
Is the pig big?
Yes, it is. Is the ball green?
No, it isn't. It is blue.
See you later Goy.
Bye-bye Art.

Hello Noi.
 Hi Bank. Are the dogs brown?
 No, they are not. They are black. Are the cats white?
 Yes, they are. Are the girls small?
 Yes, they are. Goodbye Noi.
Goodbye Bank.

What is it?
 It is a pen. What are those?
 They are houses. What are these?
 They are cats. What are those?
 They are windows. What is that?
 It is a rabbit.

Hello Bank.
Hi Noi. What do you like?
I like ice-cream. What does she like?
She likes dolls. What does he like?
He likes fish. What does it like?
It likes bananas. What does your mother like?
She likes rings.
See you later Noi.
Bye Bank.

Hello Art.
 Hello Goy. What is it?
 It is an apple. What are those?
 They are fish. What are these?
 They are dolls. What do you like?
I like somtam. What do you like?
I like somtam too. What does your father like?
He likes cars. Goodbye Goy.
Bye-bye Art.

What colour is the dog?
It is brown. What colour is the bus?
It is blue. What colour is the sun?
It is yellow. What colour are the shoes?
They are black. What colour are your eyes?
They are brown.

Hello James.
 Hello Satang. Is that fish?
 Yes, it is. Are these eggs?
 Yes, they are. Are these vegetables?
 No, they aren't. They are fruit. Is that ice-cream?
 Yes, it is. Are these sandwiches?
 No, they are not. They are bananas. Is this a glass of water?
 Yes, it is. Bye-bye Satang.
Goodbye James.

The cupboard is in the bedroom.
The stove is in the kitchen.
The shower is in the bathroom.
The sofa is in the living room.

I have a cat.
We have a dog.
You have a ball.
They have a goldfish.
He has a rabbit.
She has a doll.
It has a bone.

I have a black cat.
We have a brown dog.
You have a small ball.
They have a big goldfish.
He has a white rabbit.
She has a beautiful doll.
It has a delicious bone.

Good morning Bank.
Hello Lek. Where are you going?
I'm going to the park. Where are you going?
I'm going to school. Goodbye Lek.
Bye-bye Bank.

The chair is in the living room.
The pillow is in the bedroom.
The plate is in the kitchen.
The toothbrush is in the bathroom.

Noi is on the chair.
I swim in the sea.
We sit under the tree.
A tiger is at the zoo.
They run on the beach.
The light is above the desk.

The monkey is on the table.
The cat is in the box.
The doll is on the sofa.
The flower is in the vase.
Bank is on the mat.
The birds are above the tree.

Students go to school.
Doctors work in hospitals.
Teachers work in schools.
We go picnic at the park.
They swim in the sea.

Hello Noi.
Hello Bank.
Happy New Year. This present is for you.
Thank you very much Bank. This car is for you.
Thanks a lot. Happy New Year.
Goodbye Bank.
See you later Noi.

What day is it today?
Today is Monday.
