



การศึกษาสภาพปัจจุบันของโครงการจัดการเรียนการสอนตามหลักสูตรกระทรวงศึกษาธิการ
เป็นภาษาอังกฤษ (English Program) ในจังหวัดสุราษฎร์ธานี ผ่านทัศนะของครูผู้สอนในโครงการ
THE STUDY OF THE CURRENT STATE OF ENGLISH PROGRAM INSTRUCTION IN SURATTHANI
PROVINCE THROUGH THE PERSPECTIVES OF TEACHERS IN THE PROGRAM

นางสาวภณัฐดาว จันทศิริ *

Phanatdao Chantarasiri

ดร.มนีรัตน์ เอกโยคยะ **

Maneerat Ekkayokkaya, Ph.D.

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อ 1) ศึกษาสภาพปัจจุบันของโครงการจัดการเรียนการสอนตามหลักสูตรกระทรวงศึกษาธิการเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ (English Program) ในจังหวัดสุราษฎร์ธานี ผ่านทัศนะของครูผู้สอนในโครงการ 2) เปรียบเทียบทัศนะของครูชาวไทยและครูชาวต่างชาติ โดยกลุ่มตัวอย่างเป็น ครูผู้สอนจำนวน 47 คน ประกอบด้วย ครูชาวไทย 26 คน และครูชาวต่างชาติ 21 คน ซึ่งสอนในโครงการ English Program ในเขตอำเภอเมือง จังหวัดสุราษฎร์ธานี เครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการวิจัย ได้แก่ แบบสอบถามและแบบสัมภาษณ์ ประกอบด้วยคำถาม 10 ด้าน ที่เกี่ยวกับสถานะและสภาพของโครงการ English Program การวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลเชิงปริมาณ ใช้สถิติเชิงพรรณนา ความถี่ และการทดสอบค่าที่ นอกจากนี้การวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลเชิงคุณภาพ ใช้การวิเคราะห์เนื้อหา ผลการวิจัยพบว่าจากทัศนะของครูผู้สอนในโครงการ English Program ในจังหวัดสุราษฎร์ธานี ทั้งครูชาวไทยและครูชาวต่างชาติ โดยทั่วไปแล้ว ชี้ให้เห็นทัศนะในเชิงบวก ฟังพอใจ และสนับสนุนโครงการ English Program ผลการศึกษาแสดงให้เห็นว่า โครงการมีความแข็งแกร่งในปัจจุบันและมีการเติบโตในอนาคต

* Master's Degree Student, Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (International Program)

Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

E-mail Address: phanatdao.design@gmail.com

** Adviser and Lecturer, Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

E-mail Address: maneerat.t@chula.ac.th

ISSN 1905-4491

Abstract

The study aimed to 1) investigate the current state of English Program Instruction in Suratthani through the perspective of teachers in the program, and 2) compare the perspectives between Thai and foreign teachers. There were 47 teachers including 26 Thai teachers and 21 foreign teachers who work in the English Program in Muang District, Suratthani Province participating in the study. The instruments for this study were a questionnaire and a semi-structured interview consisting of ten aspect questions of the English Program's state and conditions. The quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistic, frequency and t-test. Moreover, the qualitative data was analyzed using content analysis. The finding of the study revealed that from the perspective of teachers who worked in the English Program in Suratthani Province, both Thai and foreign teachers indicated, generally, positive, satisfactory, supportive perspectives of the English Program. The result of the study revealed the current strength and future growth of the program.

คำสำคัญ: โครงการจัดการเรียนการสอนตามหลักสูตรกระทรวงศึกษาธิการเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ/ทัศนะของครูผู้สอน

KEYWORDS: ENGLISH PROGRAM/TEACHER PERSPECTIVES

Introduction

In the world of globalization and information technology, people from any part of the world can easily connect without time and space barriers. All knowledge and innovations can be widely spread and developed unlimitedly. It is undeniable that English language plays a crucial role as an international language, a medium to communicate among people with different languages and cultures. Many transitions in terms of business, education, science or technology require high proficiency in English. Thailand is a part of global community. English is a compulsory foreign language described in the Basic Education Core Curriculum B.E. 2544 (A.D. 2001), and it is required for all grade levels. As a result, the high increased demand of literacy and proficiency in English language has influenced the Thai Ministry of Education to take various steps to enhance the effectiveness of English learning and teaching in Thailand. One of the important educational reforms is to introduce a bilingual education program as a choice of English language learning in Thailand.

Moreover, with the integration of the ASEAN community in the year 2015, language is one of the important tools to gain an advantage of this transition, especially English language, which is the working language of ASEAN. In order to provide the readiness for this change, improving the English proficiency of Thai students is considered a must and English Program is one of the answers.

The term, bilingual education, possesses several meanings and can manifest in various forms depending on "the aim of such education" (Baker, 1996). According to Baker (2011), one of the experts in this field, bilingual education refers to a form of education using more than one language and often including more than two languages. Also it can refer to the education of learners who already have good proficiency in two languages, or to

the education that learners study in another language. García and Baetens Beardsmore (2009) suggests that bilingual education program involves teaching the content through a target language other than the children's native language, as opposed to traditional language program which aims to teach language as a subject. In doing so, bilingual education refers to education that uses more than one language as a medium of instruction.

In Thailand, the Immersion model of bilingual education is designed and implemented in accordance with the principle of teaching 'majority language speakers' a foreign language. Majority language students are immersed or taught exclusively in the language that they are trying to acquire. Johnson and Swain cited in García and Baetens Beardsmore (2009), have identified eight key characteristics of the immersion program as follows: 1) the additional language is a medium of instruction, 2) the immersion curriculum parallels the local majority language curriculum, 3) overt support exists for the home language, 4) the program aims for additive bilingualism, 5) exposure to the additional language is largely confined to the classroom, 6) students enter with similar (and limited) levels of proficiency in the additional language, 7) the teachers are bilingual, 8) the classroom culture is that of the local majority-language community.

The Ministry of Education refers to the term of bilingual education as 'English Program' (EP), a form of bilingual education using English as a medium of instruction in at least four core subjects including English, Mathematics, Science, and Physical Education, excepting Thai language and Social Studies with aspects related to Thai ways of life, Thai law, and Thai culture and tradition. The Ministry developed the English Program Curriculum in 1999 (B.E. 2542) cited in Ourairat (2011) as a part of Thai Education Reform, allowing the school to establish English Program with the aim of enhancing high-level of Thai students' English proficiency as well as retaining Thai culture and identity, while not negatively impacting on the learning of Thai or on Thai customs and practices.

The Thailand Education Act, 1999 (B.E. 2542) affirms that "bilingual education is one solution to the country's need to meet the challenge of globalization" (Ourairat, 2011), Thai citizens shall become bilingual and bicultural to compete internationally. In concordance with the principle that languages are best learned when used in authentic communication rather than when they are explicitly taught, many researchers found that learners who immerse in another language can use that target language more fluently. Additionally, learners who experience both languages are considered more intelligent, flexible, nimble, quick, able to deal with ambiguities, and better at resolving conflicts than monolingual learners. (Kluger, 2013; Ungsakun, 1998 cited in Chitnelawong 2009) Hence, the Ministry of Education developed the English Program Curriculum generally known as Bilingual Curriculum with the belief that this curriculum provides more opportunities for students to achieve academic competence in the use of English both as a content subject as well as a

medium of instruction. This Bilingual Curriculum development also serves as a tool to increase the educational standard of Thailand (Ourairat, 2011).

The study of English Bilingual Education by Bax (2010) indicates that English Program in Thailand is perceived as “popular and attractive to stakeholders and had good prospects for future growth”. The numbers of public primary schools increased from 40 schools in 2007 to 51 schools in 2009 (Bax, 2010). To date, according to Office of the Basic Education Commission, Research and Policy Development Department, and Office of the Private Education Commission, there are 246 public schools and 159 private schools offering English Program for primary and secondary levels. For local level, especially in the southern part of Thailand, there are 42 public schools and 19 private schools providing English Program. To be more specific, in Muang District, Suratthani Province, there are 2 public schools and 2 private schools offer the English Program from kindergarten to lower secondary level. With the belief that proficiency in English language can affirm a brighter future, more opportunities in education, career and life for the children, a number of parents are willing to support their children to study in English Program.

In accordance with García and Baetens Beardsmore (2009), one of the major factors affecting bilingual teaching is the teacher who can be considered the most important agent in the educational process. Teachers are the ones who directly pass on the knowledge and values to the students. They are also responsible for organizing students’ learning experiences (Guadalupe, 2010). In addition, teachers act as mediators between students and “classroom and school rules and conventions, curricula and schemes of work, public examinations, educational policies and conceptions of what counts as language teaching and learning within the system, and the broader societal and global discourse” (Benson, 2013). Therefore, in order to investigate the current state of bilingual education, gathering information from the perspectives of teachers who work in bilingual program will give an overall view of bilingual teaching practices.

As all bilingual education programs are not created equally, English Program for educating the students whose home language is Thai vary from place to place depending on their regions, schools’ curriculums and goals. The implementation of English Program in the southern part of Thailand, namely Suratthani Province, may differ from the one in the capital city, Bangkok. Moreover, while many studies were done trying to identify the problems of bilingual schools in Bangkok metropolis (Karuwan, 2007; Chitnelawong, 2009), little research has been done outside Bangkok. Hence, the researcher is interested in investigating the current state of English Program Instruction in Suratthani through the perspectives of teachers working in the program.

With the result of this non-experimental study, the policy makers, curriculum developers, administrators, and teachers can better understand bilingual teaching in English

Program through teachers' perspectives, in order to help clarify, adjust and support the effective ways and methods to enhance and develop the bilingual teaching in the country.

Objective

The purposes of this study were to 1) investigate the current state of English Program Instruction in Suratthani through the perspectives of teachers working in the program, and 2) compare the perspectives between Thai and foreign teachers.

Methodology

Population and Participants

The population of this study was the teachers, both Thai and foreign, who teach in English Program in Suratthani. There are four schools offering English Program in Suratthani; Anuban Suratthani School, Suratthani School, Joy Bilingual School, and Oonrak International Bilingual School. The participants of this study were 47 teachers, 26 Thai and 21 foreign, who taught in English Program in those four schools. They were purposively selected based on voluntarily participation.

Instruments

Questionnaires

The questionnaires, both Thai and English versions were designed to explore the current state of English Program Instruction in Suratthani through the perspectives of teachers working in the program. They consisted of two parts: general information of respondent, and information about current situation and conditions of English Program. In the second part, there were ten aspects of state and conditions; curriculum, teaching and learning, learners' evaluation, teaching materials and media, readiness of facilities, teacher, learner, administrators, guardian, and other. Teachers were asked to indicate their degree of agreement with the statement about their views toward the program. For each of these questions, respondents chose from five alternatives developed from a five-point Likert scale.

Semi-structured Interview

The semi-structured interview was conducted in order to elicit deeper understanding of teachers' views toward the current state of English Program Instruction in Suratthani. The questions of semi-structured interview consisted of ten open-ended questions based on the ten aspects of state and conditions mentioned in the questionnaires.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection was carried out using questionnaires and semi-structured interview. The questionnaires were distributed to 47 teachers, 26 Thai and 21 foreign, who teach in English Program in the four schools. After that, two participants, one Thai teacher and one foreign teacher, from each school were randomly and voluntarily selected to participate in

semi-structured interview. The interviews were conducted in Thai and English and tape-recorded in order to transcribe for further content analysis.

Data Analysis

The data analysis process can be divided into two phrases. In the first phrase, the quantitative data obtained from the questionnaire was analyzed using descriptive statistics with SPSS Program Version 21 for calculating mean score and standard deviation. Also, in order to compare the mean scores of the ten aspects between Thai teachers and foreign teachers, t-test is used to analyze this relation. Later, the qualitative data obtained from semi-structured interview was analyzed using content analysis.

Results

Demographic Information

The descriptive data of the valid respondents showed that 27.7% of the respondents were male and 72.3% were female. More than half of the respondents were Thai (55.3%). The rest were American (17%), English (14.9%), Filipino (4.3%), and other (8.5%). In terms of age, 38.3% of respondents were between 25-30 years old, 21.3% are between 31-35 years old, and 10.6% were below 25 years old. The rest, 29.8%, were over 36 years old. For the highest level of education that the respondents had completed, 80.9% indicated Bachelor degree and 19.1% revealed Master degree. 44.7% of the respondents obtained Educational study, 12.8% indicated Liberal Arts, 8.5% showed Humanities, and other (34%). In terms of period of teaching in the English Program, 34% of respondents indicated one year, 19.1% showed two years, 12.8% revealed four years, and the rest, 34.1%, indicated not more than 17 years of teaching. Lastly, 44.7% of respondents generally used Thai language for teaching while 55.3% used English language.

Information from ten aspects of the situation and conditions

Table 1: The mean score, standard deviations, t-value and p-value of Thai teachers and foreign teachers on curriculum aspect.

| Statements | Thai Teachers | | Foreign Teachers | | t | P |
|---|---------------|------|------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | X̄ | S.D. | X̄ | S.D. | | |
| Curriculum aspect: | | | | | | |
| 1. The English Program Curriculum is based on standards and indicators specified in the Basic Education Core Curriculum from Ministry of Education. | 3.88 | .588 | 4.14 | .854 | -1.179 | .247 |
| 2. The English Program Curriculum is suitable and relevant to learners' abilities. | 3.77 | .514 | 3.76 | .995 | .031 | .976 |
| 3. The English Program Curriculum can be integrated with other content areas. | 3.69 | .838 | 4.00 | .894 | -1.215 | .231 |
| 4. You comprehend the English Program Curriculum. | 3.69 | .679 | 4.43 | .811 | -3.388 | .001** |

| Statements | Thai Teachers | | Foreign Teachers | | t | P |
|--|---------------|------|------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | X \bar{x} | S.D. | X \bar{x} | S.D. | | |
| 5. You have participated in the English Program Curriculum's planning. | 2.81 | .939 | 3.05 | 1.359 | -7.14 | .479 |

$p > .05$

Table 1 revealed that generally, the mean scores of each item regarding curriculum aspect between Thai teachers and English Teachers were not considerably different at a significant level of .05 ($p > .05$). However, item 4, Thai teachers and foreign teachers indicated different views which t-value was at -3.388 and p-value was at .001 ($p < .05$). It showed that the groups comprehended the English Program Curriculum differently.

According to the semi-structured interview, both Thai teachers and foreign teachers indicated that the English Program Curriculum is appropriate not only to the context of the school but also to the age, nature and abilities of the learners. Both groups of teachers acknowledged that the important matter was how to adjust, adapt and apply the curriculum to the specific levels, ages, and abilities of the learners.

Table 2: The mean score, standard deviations, t-value and p-value of Thai teachers and foreign teachers on teaching and learning aspect.

| Statements | Thai Teachers | | Foreign Teachers | | t | P |
|---|---------------|-------|------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | X \bar{x} | S.D. | X \bar{x} | S.D. | | |
| Teaching and learning aspects: | | | | | | |
| 6. You focus on student-centered courses. | 4.35 | .689 | 4.14 | .854 | .904 | .371 |
| 7. You switch language during your teaching. | 3.27 | 1.002 | 1.38 | .865 | 6.821 | .000** |
| 8. You encourage learners to be more confident in using English. | 3.92 | .796 | 4.90 | .301 | -5.796 | .000** |
| 9. You provide various academic activities according to the learners' nature and abilities. | 4.15 | .613 | 4.67 | .483 | -3.128 | .003** |
| 10. You provide activities that encourage relationships among learners and between learner and teacher. | 4.15 | .613 | 4.81 | .512 | -3.920 | .000** |

$p > .05$

Table 2 showed that majority of the items in the aspects of teaching and learning of both groups of teachers revealed differently on the mean scores. The study found that on item 7, 8, 9 and 10, there were differences between Thai teachers and foreign teachers' views at the significant level of .05, item 7 (t-value= 6.825, p-value= .000), item 8 (t-value= -5.796, p-value= .000), item 9 (t-value= -3.128, p-value= .003), and item 10 (t-value= -3.920, p-value= .000).

Qualitative data from semi-structured interview showed that both Thai and foreign teachers from School B and D indicated the answer, "not really", for the question asking about the challenges or obstacles with their teaching in the English Program. Both groups of teachers from School B and D addressed that a subject, namely science, was difficult to teach in some lessons. While, both groups of teachers from School A and C indicated the

answer “of course”, they certainly encounter some challenges or obstacles with their teaching in the English Program. For instance, they need to be active, fun, and enthusiastic all the time in order to engage the learners to the lessons.

Table 3: The mean score, standard deviations, t-value and p-value of Thai teachers and foreign teachers on learner evaluation aspect.

| Statements | Thai Teachers | | Foreign Teachers | | t | P |
|---|---------------|------|------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | X̄ | S.D. | X̄ | S.D. | | |
| <u>Learner evaluation aspect:</u> | | | | | | |
| 11. Instruments for evaluating learners are varied and appropriate. | 4.00 | .693 | 3.52 | 1.167 | 1.650 | .109 |
| 12. Instruments for learner evaluation are in accordance with the Ministry of Education’s regulation. | 4.04 | .662 | 3.86 | .910 | .764 | .450 |

The table above demonstrated that in the aspect of learner evaluation, Thai teachers and foreign teachers’ mean scores were not significantly different. It revealed that both groups of the teachers had an agreement on this aspect.

The result from semi-structured interview showed that both Thai and foreign teachers considerably agreed on appropriateness of learners’ evaluation. Both groups of teachers indicated several methods used to evaluate the learners depending on the learners’ age and level, for example, homework, quiz, observation, game, daily work, interview, participation and exam.

Table 4: The mean score, standard deviations, t-value and p-value of Thai teachers and foreign teachers on teaching materials and media aspect.

| Statements | Thai Teachers | | Foreign Teachers | | t | P |
|--|---------------|------|------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | X̄ | S.D. | X̄ | S.D. | | |
| <u>Teaching materials and media aspects:</u> | | | | | | |
| 13. The school provides sufficient textbooks, references, and course handouts that correspond to the curriculum. | 4.19 | .634 | 4.10 | 1.221 | .330 | .744 |
| 14. The school provides teaching tools, media, technology and facilities that are ready and efficient. | 4.15 | .613 | 3.62 | 1.396 | 1.634 | .114 |
| 15. The usage of media and technology is appropriate to age, interest and learners’ ability. | 4.12 | .516 | 4.14 | .964 | -.118 | .907 |
| 16. You prepare teaching materials or course documents by yourself. | 4.12 | .816 | 4.14 | .854 | -.112 | .911 |

Table 4 clearly revealed that the mean scores of both group of Thai and Foreign teachers were not significantly different. Both groups of the teachers showed substantial agreement on teaching materials and media aspects.

The qualitative data from the semi-structured interview showed that both groups of the teachers supported that the teaching materials and media were appropriate. Foreign

teachers indicated that if some content or lessons from the textbooks were too difficult for learners' abilities, they would adjust, adapt and simplify the contents before teaching certain lessons.

Table 5: The mean score, standard deviations, t-value and p-value of Thai teachers and foreign teachers on readiness of facilities aspect.

| Statements | Thai Teachers | | Foreign Teachers | | t | P |
|---|---------------|------|------------------|-------|-------|--------|
| | X̄ | S.D. | X̄ | S.D. | | |
| Readiness of facilities aspect: | | | | | | |
| 17. Equipment in classroom including tables, desks and chairs are maintained in good condition. | 4.38 | .752 | 4.05 | 1.244 | 1.147 | .257 |
| 18. Classroom size is appropriate to the number of learners. | 4.35 | .797 | 3.19 | 1.436 | 3.300 | .003** |
| 19. The school provides sufficient area to organize English Program's activities. | 4.27 | .827 | 3.71 | 1.271 | 1.805 | .078 |
| 20. The school provides sufficient classroom, language operation room and library facilities for the English Program. | 4.15 | .784 | 3.57 | 1.248 | 1.862 | .072 |

p=.05

The table above displayed the mean scores of each item in the aspect of readiness of facilities between Thai and foreign teachers which were not significantly different at a significant level of .05 ($p > .05$). However, Thai teachers and foreign teachers showed dissimilar views on item 18 which t-value was at 3.300 and p-value was at .003 ($p < .05$).

According to the semi-structured interview, both Thai teachers and foreign teachers from School B, C and D indicated that the provided facilities were appropriate, ready and efficient to support their teaching. On the other hand, teachers from School A addressed that the facilities such as computers and speakers were always broken. Also, they emphasized that the classroom size was not suitable to the number of learners.

Table 6: The mean score, standard deviations, t-value and p-value of Thai teachers and foreign teachers on teacher aspect.

| Statements | Thai Teachers | | Foreign Teachers | | t | P |
|--|---------------|------|------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | X̄ | S.D. | X̄ | S.D. | | |
| 21. In general, the number of foreign teachers is sufficient. | 3.96 | .774 | 4.24 | .944 | -1.105 | .275 |
| 22. In general, foreign teachers have related degree or graduated with educational degree. | 3.77 | .815 | 2.95 | 1.161 | 2.830 | .007** |
| 23. In general, foreign teachers have experiences in teaching. | 3.92 | .845 | 3.43 | 1.363 | 1.453 | .156 |
| 24. In general, foreign teachers use English as their first language. | 4.38 | .752 | 4.71 | .463 | -1.844 | .072 |
| 25. In general, Thai teachers have related degree or | 4.27 | .533 | 3.24 | .831 | 5.154 | .000** |

| Statements | Thai Teachers | | Foreign Teachers | | t | P |
|--|---------------|------|------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | X̄ | S.D. | X̄ | S.D. | | |
| graduated with educational degree. | | | | | | |
| 26. In general, Thai teachers can use English. | 3.50 | .707 | 2.57 | .746 | 4.366 | .000** |
| 27. In general, Thai teachers have been received training to develop their English language skills. | 3.62 | .637 | 2.76 | .831 | 3.986 | .000** |
| 28. In general, Thai teachers have experiences in teaching bilingual courses. | 3.23 | .652 | 2.71 | 1.056 | 1.961 | .059 |
| 29. You have attended seminars or workshops about bilingual education. | 3.27 | .874 | 3.38 | 1.532 | -.297 | .768 |
| 30. You have exchanged knowledge or experience with Thai and foreign teachers officially and unofficially. | 3.58 | .857 | 3.62 | 1.322 | -.126 | .900 |
| 31. You are assigned tasks according to your qualifications and readiness. | 3.77 | .765 | 3.95 | 1.117 | -.640 | .526 |
| 32. You have been informed about activities in school. | 4.04 | .720 | 3.33 | 1.278 | 2.256 | .032** |
| 33. You are satisfied with remuneration and benefits that your school provides. | 3.50 | .762 | 3.90 | 1.044 | -1.536 | .132 |

p=.05

Table 6 demonstrated generally, the mean scores of Thai and foreign teachers of each item in the aspect of teacher were not considerably different at a significant level of .05 ($p>.05$). Nevertheless, the study revealed that on item 22, 25, 26, 27 and 32, there were differences between Thai teachers and foreign teachers' views at the significant level of .05, item 22 (t-value= 2.83, p-value= .007), item 25 (t-value= 5.154, p-value= .000), item 26 (t-value= 4.366, p-value= .000), item 27 (t-value= 3.986, p-value= .000), and item 32 (t-value= 2.256, p-value= .032).

Furthermore, qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews showed that both foreign teachers addressed that they had less contact with Thai teachers and rarely exchanged knowledge or experience with Thai teachers because of the language barrier. This situation also happened to Thai teachers. Moreover, teachers from School A revealed that they were seldom informed about school activities or other information from school.

Table 7: The mean score, standard deviations, t-value and p-value of Thai teachers and foreign teachers on learner aspect.

| Statements | Thai Teachers | | Foreign Teachers | | t | P |
|--|---------------|------|------------------|------|-------|--------|
| | X̄ | S.D. | X̄ | S.D. | | |
| Learner aspect: | | | | | | |
| 34. Learners have great achievement from their studies | 3.88 | .588 | 3.76 | .889 | .544 | .590 |
| 35. Learners can use English to communicate. | 4.04 | .599 | 3.81 | .873 | 1.064 | .293 |
| 36. Learners have great attitudes towards English. | 4.23 | .587 | 3.57 | .746 | 3.391 | .001** |
| 37. Learners can use English to seek more information and expand their knowledge through textbook, books | 3.88 | .516 | 3.86 | .793 | .143 | .887 |

| Statements | Thai Teachers | | Foreign Teachers | | t | P |
|---|---------------|------|------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | X \bar{x} | S.D. | X \bar{x} | S.D. | | |
| and information technology. | | | | | | |
| 38. Learners in each classroom vary in their level of English proficiency. | 4.19 | .634 | 4.86 | .359 | -4.527 | .000** |
| 39. Learners in English Program have good relationship with students in regular Thai program. | 3.69 | .884 | 3.57 | .926 | .456 | .650 |

p=.05

Table 7 revealed both groups of teachers' means scores of each item regarding to learner aspect were not dramatically different at a significant level of .05 ($p>.05$). However, Thai teachers and foreign teachers indicated dissimilar views on item 36, t -value=3.391 and p -value=.001 ($p<.05$), and item 38, t -value=-4.527 and p -value=.000 ($p<.05$).

Qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews showed that both groups of Thai and English teachers from School B, C and D had an agreement on learner aspect. They revealed that the English Program learners were more active, enthusiastic, and confident than the regular program learners. Also, they mentioned that it was normal that there were some low English ability learners that would be slower than others in class and would need extra support. However, the teachers from School A indicated that the majority of their learners had poor to no proficiency in English language, and were inactive and diffident which made it difficult for them to continue in English Program.

Table 8: The mean score, standard deviations, t -value and p -value of Thai teachers and foreign teachers on administrator aspect.

| Statements | Thai Teachers | | Foreign Teachers | | t | P |
|--|---------------|------|------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | X \bar{x} | S.D. | X \bar{x} | S.D. | | |
| Administrator aspect: | | | | | | |
| 40. School administrators comprehend the principles of the English Program management. | 4.15 | .784 | 3.86 | .964 | 1.164 | .250 |
| 41. School administrators have visions, creative ideas and potential to develop the qualities of English Program management. | 4.12 | .864 | 3.57 | 1.207 | 1.799 | .079 |
| 42. School administrators are capable of coordinating with the English Program network from other schools. | 3.92 | .845 | 3.48 | 1.167 | 1.522 | .135 |
| 43. School administrators are open-minded and listen to others' opinions. | 3.88 | .864 | 3.81 | 1.078 | .265 | .792 |

Table 8 illustrated that both Thai and foreign teachers' mean score on administrator aspect were not dramatically different. Both Thai and foreign teachers' views on administrator aspect were similar.

Additionally, the result from semi-structured interview was consistent with quantitative data showing that both Thai and foreign teachers from School B, C and D agreed that their school administration were well-organized and well-managed. The

coordinators between the schools and foreign teachers worked effectively. While, both groups of teachers from School A indicated that they communicated less with the school administrator. Sometimes they miscommunicated with the school.

Table 9: The mean score, standard deviations, t-value and p-value of Thai teachers and foreign teachers on parent/guardian aspect.

| Statements | Thai Teachers | | Foreign Teachers | | t | P |
|--|---------------|------|------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | X \bar{x} | S.D. | X \bar{x} | S.D. | | |
| Parent/guardian aspect: | | | | | | |
| 44. Parent/guardians are aware of the importance of English. They support and cooperate with the English Program vigorously. | 4.31 | .679 | 3.86 | 1.236 | 1.497 | .145 |
| 45. Parent/guardians participate in determining school policy or the curriculum of the English Program. | 3.81 | .939 | 3.52 | 1.030 | .987 | .329 |
| 46. Parent/guardians have high expectations in English Program. | 4.42 | .643 | 4.24 | .944 | .766 | .499 |
| 47. Parent/guardians participate in activities of the English Program. | 3.88 | .864 | 3.67 | 1.197 | .724 | .473 |

The table above showed that the mean scores of Thai teachers and foreign teachers on parent/guardian aspect were not considerably different. The study showed the result of ample agreement of Thai teachers and foreign teachers on parent/guardian aspect.

Likewise, both groups of the teachers from School B, C and D showed substantial agreement that the guardian's feedback toward the English Program were great, supportive and positive. Most of the parents were willing to support any activities with the schools. Also, both groups of teachers could directly communicate with the parents. On the other hand, teachers from School A revealed that they had no communication with the parents and the parents were less associated in school activities.

Table 10: The mean score, standard deviations, t-value and p-value of Thai teachers and foreign teachers on other aspect.

| Statements | Thai Teachers | | Foreign Teachers | | t | P |
|--|---------------|------|------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | X \bar{x} | S.D. | X \bar{x} | S.D. | | |
| Other aspects: | | | | | | |
| 48. The school provides activities to promote the English Program. | 4.04 | .662 | 4.19 | .750 | -.738 | .465 |
| 49. The school provides extra classes for the English Program students after school. | 3.96 | .871 | 2.86 | 1.352 | 3.239 | .003** |
| 50. The school provides an English Camp. | 4.15 | .967 | 4.48 | .680 | -1.290 | .204 |

p=.05

Table 10 displayed that at the significant level of .05 ($p > .05$), the mean scores of Thai teachers and foreign teachers on item 48 and 50 were likely similar. However, there is a difference between Thai teachers and foreign teachers' view on item 49 which t-value was

at 3.239 and p-value was at .003 ($p < .05$). It indicated that Thai teachers and foreign teachers had different views on extra classes providing for English Program students after school.

According to the semi-structured interview, both Thai teachers and foreign teachers indicated there were field trips or English Camps provided especially for English Program learners. However, teachers from School A revealed that there used to be an English Camp outside Thailand but it was cut off because of financial problem.

Discussion

The results of the study indicated, generally, positive, satisfactory and supportive perspectives from both Thai and foreign teachers of English Program in Muang District, Suratthani Province which confirmed the study by Bax (2010) that English Program in Thailand is perceived as popular and attractive to all stakeholders and had good prospects for future growth. According to the demographic information of the respondents, the majority of the teachers have obtained Educational degrees which can imply that there was a selection process to recruit teachers with Educational degrees to work in English Program. The second and third degrees from the top were Liberal Arts and Humanities which were in the language field showing that the schools emphasized language area.

From the aspect of curriculum, foreign teachers tended to understand more about the English Program Curriculum. The study found that because most of the Thai teachers also taught in the regular Thai program, they tended to base more on regular Thai program curriculum. In terms of teaching and learning aspect, the results found that foreign teachers tended to encourage learners to be more confident in using English, and provide various academic activities according to the learners' nature and abilities. Also, foreign teachers encouraged relationships among learners and between learner and teacher. It revealed that because of the English Program's emphasis on the English language, the foreign teachers needed to encourage the learners to use the language via variety of activities. The teachers needed to provide peaceful learning environments and relationships for the learners to be confident to use English in classes. However, the study found that Thai teachers switched the language during their teaching more than foreign teachers. It was reasonable that some Thai teachers used English as the medium of instruction, but might switch the language in order to clarify some content for the learners. Furthermore, the results revealed that there were only a few of the teachers who were bilingual and none of the bilingual teachers were foreign teachers. This finding appeared to be inconsistent with Johnson and Swain (1997) cited in García and Baetens Beardsmore (2009) in that the teachers in immersion program are bilingual.

According to the result of the aspect of readiness of facilities, Thai and foreign teachers differently perceived classroom size versus the number of learners. The majority of

foreign teachers emphasized that the numbers of learners outnumbered the size of the classroom which made it difficult for the learners to practice the English language as well as difficult for the teachers to control the classroom. For teacher aspect, the study indicated that Thai teachers associated and communicated less with foreign teachers and foreign teachers rarely exchanged knowledge or experience with Thai teachers because of the language barrier. The study found that the coordinators between Thai teachers and foreign teachers and between the schools and the foreign teachers, were one of the most important agents in English Program. Nevertheless, in every participating school, there were weekly meetings among foreign teachers in order to exchange information, experiences and problems with each other. The study also found that both groups of the teachers responded differently about school activity informing. In some schools, foreign teachers were only seldom to sometimes being informed about school activities. This finding supported what Karuwan (2007) and Chitnelawong (2009)'s claim of problems of bilingual schools in Bangkok metropolis that most of the time, foreign teachers were not informed about school activities.

Furthermore, for learner aspect, foreign teachers indicated lower learners' attitudes towards English than Thai teachers and emphasized that learners in each classroom vary in their level of English proficiency. It was reasonable because the foreign teachers were responsible in the part of English language so they would be able to address their learners' attitude towards English as well as level of English proficiency of learners. Lastly, both groups of teachers had different views on extra classes provided for English Program students after school. Thai teachers' mean score were higher than foreign teachers. The study revealed that most of the extra classes after school were taught in Thai in order to help clarify some lessons that were taught in English.

In conclusion, from the perspective of teachers who worked in the English Program in Suratthani Province, both Thai and foreign teachers indicated positive, satisfactory and supportive perspectives of the English Program. The result of the study revealed the current strength and future growth of the program.

Recommendation for Future Research

When interpreting results from this study, it is significant to note that this reaserch was conducted only in one province, the result may not be generalized to every province. Nevertheless, this study sucessfully elicited the perspctives of both groups of teachers who actually work in the English Program. Hence, it is highly recommended to the policy makers, curriculum developers, administrators, and teachers to pay attention to this kind of information in order to help clarify, adjust and support the effective ways and methods to enhance and develop the bilingual teaching in the country.

References

- Baker, C. (1996). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon England: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism, (5th edition)*. Clevedon England: Multilingual Matters.
- Bax, S. (2010). *Researching English bilingual education in Thailand, Indonesia and South Korea*. [e-book] Malaysia: British Council. pp. 11-28. Retrieved December 16, 2013, from http://www.britishcouncil.org/publication_2_-_researching_english_bilingual_education.pdf.
- Benson, P. (2013). *Autonomy in language teaching and learning: How to do it 'here'*. Unpublished paper.
- Chitnelawong, S. (2009). *A study of state and problems of the administration of bilingual private kindergartens under the office of the private education commission in metropolitan Bangkok*. Master of Education. Chulalongkorn University.
- García, O. & Baetens Beardsmore, H. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell Pub.
- Guadalupe, C. (2010). *Teachers as primary agents of educational systems*. Retrieved December 10, 2013, from <http://www.focal.ca/en/publications/focalpoint/259-june-2010-cesar-guadalupe-en>.
- Karuwan, S. (2007). *An analysis of problems and solutions of bilingual schools in Bangkok metropolis*. Master of Education. Chulalongkorn University.
- Kluger, J. (2013, July 18). How the brain benefits from being bilingual. *Time*. Retrieved December 10, 2013, from <http://science.time.com/2013/07/18/how-the-brain-benefits-from-being-bilingual>.
- Ministry of Education. (2001). *Basic Education Curriculum B.E. 2544*. Department of Curriculum and Instruction Development. Bangkok, Government Printing Office. (Mimeographed).
- Ministry of Education. (2001 and 2008 revised). *1999 Education Act*. Thailand's Core Curriculum Guidelines. Bangkok, Government Printing Office. (Mimeographed).
- Ourairat, A. (2011). *Bilingual curriculum development and implementation in Thailand: a case study of Satit bilingual school of Rangsit university*. The Degree of Doctor of Education. Rangsit University.