# An Impact Evaluation of a Masters TEFL Program Operating at a Language Institute in Thailand

## Kittitouch Soontornwipast

Bachelor in Education,
Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

Master of Arts in Teaching English
to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
California State University, Los Angeles, USA

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Education, School of Education,
Faculty of Arts, Education and Human Development,
Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia.

## 2008

# Declaration

I, Kittitouch Soontornwipast, declare that the Doctorate of Education dissertation entitled *An Impact Evaluation of a Masters TEFL Program Operating at a Language Institute in Thailand,* is no more than 60,000 words in length, exclusive of tables, figures, appendices, references and footnotes. This dissertation contains no material that has been submitted previously, in whole or in part, for the award of any other academic degree or diploma. Except where otherwise indicated, this dissertation is my own work.

<table>
<tr><td>███████████████████</td><td></td><td>**Tuesday, 27May 2008**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Signed</td><td></td><td>Date</td></tr>
</table>

# Acknowledgments

I would like to thank all those individuals who supported and assisted me throughout the doctoral study. I would like to extend special thanks to:

I owe a debt of gratitude to all the people, named and unnamed, who supported me on this journey. Their generosity will never be forgotten and my promise is to pass it on.

# Abstract

The Master of Arts program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (MATEFL) has been operating since 1998. To date, it has produced approximately 300 graduates expected to fill various English teaching positions in Thailand at all levels. Up till the time that this research began, the MATEFL program had never been formally evaluated. Therefore, there was practically no information regarding the effectiveness of the program. The introduction of educational reform and increased quality assurance in Thailand raised concerns about the quality of educational programs and acted as an impetus to program evaluation.

This evaluation examined the impact of the MATEFL program on the graduates from the first three years of the program. The research design included a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods: document reviews, surveys, and semi-structured interviews. The program documents and the quality assurance documents were examined. Survey questionnaires were administered to the program stakeholders: (1) the graduates; (2) the students who started but did not complete the program; (3) the staff; and (4) the graduates' employers. The interviews were conducted with purposefully selected participants from the first three groups of stakeholders. Data analysis methods included descriptive statistics and content analysis.

The evaluation findings indicated that the program had a positive impact on the program graduates in preparing them to be English teachers. In addition, the program achieved its goal in developing the quality and standards of English teachers to meet workplace requirements. The evaluation offers recommendations for improvement of the program in six areas: professional development, teaching and learning process, teacher education, evaluation utilization, program management, and organization

change. The evaluation also offers recommendations for the improvement of the program evaluation process, as well as for future research.

# Table of Contents

# List of Tables

# List of Figures

# Chapter 1

# Introduction

## Background

English is used as a medium of communication by one-third of the world's population: it is regarded as the global language. It achieves this status because it is taken up by many other countries around the world: by becoming the official language being used as a medium of communication in such domains as government, the law courts, the media, and the educational system; and by being made a priority in a country's foreign language teaching. English is now the language most widely taught as a foreign language in over 100 countries (Crystal, 1997).

In Thailand, English is the most widely studied foreign language. It has played a role in the life of Thai people since the American missionaries came to Thailand in the reign of King Rama III (1824-1851). Those missionaries taught English to children in Montai Village, Bang Luang Canal, as well as to noble children and government officials. Later King Rama IV (1851-1868) was convinced that learning English led to the learning of western academic knowledge, the understanding of the European political situation and the survival of Thailand from colonization. Therefore, he hired foreign teachers to teach English to the royal children. English played more important roles in Thai education in the reign of King Rama V. An 'English school' was established in the palace to prepare princes and

noble children for further studies abroad. In 1881 English was taught at Pratumnak Suankularb School, which was the first time that English was officially included in the curriculum in the history of Thai education. Since then, English has been continuously taught in Thai schools (Ungwattanakul, 1997).

The teaching of English in Thailand is considered to be the teaching of English as a foreign language (TEFL) rather than as a second language (TESL) because English is used neither as a medium of instruction nor as an official language (Olshtain, 1979, p. 99; Harris & Hodges, 1981, pp. 103-104; Richards et al., 1992, pp. 123-124; Ungwattanakul, 1997, p. 10). Significantly, learners have limited opportunities to use English outside classrooms (Ungwattanakul, 1997).

Globalisation makes the world seem smaller, and hence more accessible; accordingly, English is a must for international communication in the 'borderless world' (Srisa-an, 2000). English is used not only for communicating with foreign travellers, but is also a necessary skill or quality required in school and college graduates for reading textbooks and manuals, understanding international societies and communicating with various foreigners (Ketutat, 1993, cited in Pitayanon, 1996). In the future, society will be knowledge-based and global literacy will be expected of graduates. Therefore, both learners and teachers must possess the ability to use international languages, the most currently common of which is English (Shinawatra, 2001). These statements by Thai scholars emphasize the worldwide status of English as a global language as stated by Crystal (1997).

The Thai government has realised the importance of English. In 1995, the Ministry of Education proclaimed that English is the first priority foreign language for Thai students and it had to be taught from the primary level (Ministry of Education, 2006). The importance of the English language is also mentioned in the National Education Act of B.E. 2542/1999 (ONEC, 1999) in section 23, chapter 4. The Act indicates that 'knowledge and skills in languages, both Thai and foreign languages, shall be emphasised in

education'. English has been included in the Basic Education Curriculum B.E. 2544/2001 (Ministry of Education, 2006). English is a compulsory subject, commencing in the first year of education. In addition, the strategic plan to reform English Education in Thailand (2006-2010) in order to increase the country's competitive ability provides justification for this awareness (Ministry of Education, 2006).

Although English has been taught in Thailand for a long time, a study conducted by the Sub-Committee for the Study of Progress and Standards of Foreign Language Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2006) shows that Thai people still cannot use English to communicate effectively. In addition, the study reveals, significantly, that most of the causes of problems are teacher-related: teachers' lack of knowledge and skills (in language skills, lesson planning, implementing the plans, teaching and learning methods, designing and producing teaching aids); lack of positive attitudes towards teaching and learning English. Other causes are a lack of professional development support and class sizes that are too large.

In order for the teaching and learning of English to be successful, teachers, textbooks, teaching/learning aids and materials, and the learning environment must be ready in terms of both quantity and quality. English teachers are considered to be the first priority. Without a sufficient number of qualified teachers of English, English teaching can do students more harm than good.

The quantity and quality of teachers have long been a concern of the Thai government. The necessity to increase the number and the quality of the trained teachers was included in the First National Scheme for Education proclaimed in 1898 (Pitiyanuwat et al., 2002). Since then, the Thai government has issued policies on teacher education with various aims and focuses depending on the country situation. One example was a project, initiated by the Ministry of Education in 2003 to improve the quality of teaching and learning English, which focused on the development of English teachers at all levels.

Even though it seemed that the government has paid attention to the development of teachers, problems regarding teachers still remain in some areas. For example, there is an inadequate number of qualified vocational teachers; some in-service teachers have less than satisfactory qualifications. Ungwattanakul (1997) points out that there are problems regarding the quantity and quality of English teachers at all levels of education in Thailand. Guidelines to solving the problem of a shortage of teachers are provided by Pitayanon (1996). She suggests that higher educational institutions, with support from and in cooperation with the government, should establish teacher education programs, especially in the fields where these shortages exist.

Teacher training and teacher education programs in Thailand are many and varied: non-degree or degree programs, pre-service or in-service program, certificate, diploma, bachelor's degree, graduate diploma, master's degree, or doctoral degree levels. Since such programs are expected to have considerable effect on their clients, such as prospective teachers, in-service teachers, students as clients, etc., their quality should be monitored and controlled. According to the National Education Act of B.E. 2542/1999 (ONEC, 1999), the need to establish a system of educational quality assurance is specified to ensure improvement of educational quality and standard at all levels. In addition, the devotion of the entire seventh Chapter to teachers shows the concern for the quality of teachers, faculty staff, and educational personnel.

The Language Institute of Thai University (LITU) offers a teacher education program – a Master of Arts Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (MATEFL program). This program was established in 1998. The program goals are: to develop the quality and standards of English teachers at all levels; to offer a curriculum of effective English teaching theory and practice for those who are interested in this career; to help solve the problem of a shortage of qualified English teachers at primary, secondary and university levels (Program document, 1998). The program accepts thirty

students in each intake which occurs once a year. The complete description of the MATEFL program can be found in Chapter 2 of this study and in Appendix A.

For almost a decade, the MATEFL program has played an important role in the development of English teachers in Thailand. This settled and established program has operated according to its original plan without any major deviation since its inception. The advent of educational reform in Thailand, however, as well as introduction of Quality Assurance, have led to increased concern for higher quality of educational programs including, of course, the MATEFL program. There has been an expressed need to gain information regarding different aspects of the program in order to find out what needs to be done, what needs to be changed, and what policy needs to be made to maintain and raise the quality of the program. This, I believe, may best be achieved by conducting a program evaluation.

## Statement of the Problem

The LITU Self-Assessment Report (SAR) of 2001 (TU, 2001), which was prepared as part of a quality assurance process, reported that no formal evaluation of any education programs offered by LITU – including the MATEFL Program – had been conducted since their inception. There have been course evaluations by students in the middle and at the end of each course and the results of those evaluation, which are only statistical, are reported to the faculty member of each course and also the Director of the LITU. It appears that the results were utilised for self-improvement of each faculty member only and they have never been reported to or considered by the LITU committee for the program improvement. One research study was undertaken by a MATEFL student who evaluated both the MATEFL program and the MA in English for Careers program as an exercise in a course named 'Independent Study'. The results were not reported to the program administration for utilisation. Thus, to this point in time, the LITU

has received no information as to whether or not their programs have been effective in meeting the intended goals. Nor has the effectiveness of the MATEFL program in preparing or producing English teachers been examined. The quality assurance committee suggested that LITU should evaluate all of its programs, take the findings into consideration, and utilise them to improve program quality and standards.

As one of the instructors at LITU and a member of the quality assurance committee, I was interested in undertaking an evaluation of the MATEFL program in order to gain such information. My research was, therefore, part of the evaluation of the LITU program as suggested by the quality assurance committee in SAR (TU, 2001). The information gained was to be used to identify the areas needed for development and the priorities in making a development plan. It was also to provide the launching pad for change and a basis for making decisions about the improvement of the quality and standard of the program.

Overall, it became essential that I should conduct a program evaluation of the MATEFL program in order to respond to the concerns for quality imposed by the university, the Ministry of Education, and by society at large.

## Significance of the Study

This study will reveal the strengths and weaknesses, the aspects that work well and why, and the aspects that did not work well and why. The study will also reveal the progress and the achievement of the LITU MATEFL program. The knowledge from the findings will provide the people involved in the program administration with the basis for making decision about refining the program in action; justifying the approaches used; determining the program worth; and/or accounting for the resources spent on developing and implementing the program. With this knowledge, they can develop policies and practices to improve the quality and standard of the program in the

future. Furthermore, this study will provide recommendations for the quality assurance process that is to be introduced within the next three years.

## Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were:

- To evaluate the MATEFL program operating at a Thai University;

- To use this evaluation to make recommendations for quality assurance process associated with Thai University's MATEFL program.

## Research Questions

This evaluation was conducted in order to answer the following research questions:

1.  **How effective was the MATEFL program?**

    - Were the stated goals of the program achieved?

    - Did the program develop the quality and standards of English teachers at all levels?

    - Did the program offer a curriculum of effective English teaching theory and practice for those who are interested in this career?

    - Did the program help solve the problem of a shortage of qualified English teachers at all levels?

2.  **How well did the program meet the expectations of stakeholders?**

    - Were any gaps between the program and workplace requirements identified?

    - What was the nature of these gaps?

    - What suggestions were offered to overcome deficiencies due to these gaps?

3. **Were there any unintended outcomes and what was their nature?**

4. **What are the essential aspects of the quality assurance process that could be applied to the MATEFL program?**

5. **What quality assurance criteria emerged as a result of this evaluation?**

## Organization of the Study

This study is divided into five chapters. This first chapter contains an introduction of the study including the background, the statements of problems, significance of the study, research objectives, and the research questions.

Chapter two consists of the review of related literature. It presents the detailed information of the Master's Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language operating at Thai University. In addition, it includes the literature on evaluation, development of quality and standards of English teachers, and quality assurance.

Chapter three deals with the methodologies used in the study. The chapter details the research design that incorporates quantitative and qualitative methods. The participants and selected methods, the inquiry methods, and data analysis methods are described in detail to allow for possible replication of the design.

Chapter four presents the findings of the study. The analyses of quantitative and qualitative data from the survey questionnaires and interviews conducted with the representatives of the MATEFL graduates/students, staff, and employers are presented, along with the discussion of the themes and categories that emerged from the data. This chapter also attempts to address and answer the research questions.

Chapter five consists of a reflection on the Impact Evaluation. It presents key issues arising from this evaluation, recommendations arising

from these issues, how these recommendations overlap with the literature, reflections on the process, and implications for future research.

# CHAPTER 2

# Literature Review

## Introduction

This research is an evaluation of a Master's Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language operating at the Language Institute of Thai University (LITU). The program goals are (1) to develop the quality and standards of English teachers at all levels; (2) to offer a curriculum of effective English teaching theory and practice for those who are interested in a teaching career; and (3) to solve the problem of a shortage of qualified English teachers at all levels.

This evaluation aims to find out the effectiveness of the program in relation to whether the program's goals were achieved, how well the program met the expectations of stakeholders, and what the unintended outcomes, if any, were like. It was also intended to find out the essential aspects of the quality assurance process that could be applied to the program.

Literature related to program evaluation was reviewed as the basis for a decision on which form and approach of evaluation would be appropriate and how an evaluation should be implemented.

The development of quality and standards of English teachers was also reviewed in order to find out what is meant by quality and standards of English teachers and what an effective teacher education program for developing English teachers comprises. These pieces of literature serve as

guidelines for developing questionnaires and interview questions which were used to collect the data on views of the program's stakeholders ─ staff, graduates/students, and employers of graduates ─ on different program elements and aspects of teaching English. It also assists in providing a basis for making suggestions on program improvement.

Furthermore, the literature with regard to the quality assurance process of the Language Institute of Thai University helps find out what had been done and which aspects were related to the MATEFL program.

In order to provide an understanding of the evaluated program, the curriculum of the Master of Arts Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language operating at the Language Institute of Thai University is also reviewed.

This chapter is organised into the following topics:

- Evaluation

- Program Evaluation

- Impact Evaluation

- Development of Quality and Standards of English Teachers

- Quality and Standards of English Teachers

- Effective Teacher Education Programs

- Quality Assurance

- The Master of Arts Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language Operating at the Language Institute of Thai University

**Evaluation**

The term 'evaluation' is defined differently by different people. It may refer to

- the systematic investigation or collection and analysis of information of something (McGregor & Meiers, 1982, cited in McGregor & Meiers, 1983; Brown, 1989, cited in Weir & Roberts, 1994; the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1994); or

The terms 'something', 'object of evaluation' or 'evaluand', used by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1994) and Owen with Rogers (1999), can be educational and social programs, policies, and personnel (Scriven, 1991a, cited in Clarke, 1999; House, 1993).

In education, something to be evaluated has been referred to as:

- educational and training programs, objects and materials (The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1994);

- the teaching and organisation activities which support student learning and include the assessment of students performance (Calder, 1994);

- an educational practice (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997);

- the operation of the whole program … course objectives, organisation, resources, context, methods, student assessment and student learning. (McGregor & Meiers, 1982, cited in McGregor & Meiers, 1983);

- students, performance, program managers and institutions, and programs, departments and institutions (Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005).

Evaluators need to determine, make judgments or decisions about the worth, merit and value of the object of evaluation according to appropriate criteria

(McGregor and Meiers, 1982, cited in McGregor & Meiers, 1983; Weiss, as quoted in Alkin, 1990:83; Scriven, 1991a; House, 1993:1; McMillan & Schumacher, 1997: 541; Clarke, 1999; Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005). The objects of evaluation as mentioned above are different depending on disciplines and areas of concerns. Whatever they are, the common purposes of evaluation are to improve, justify, or change the object of evaluation (McGregor & Meiers, 1982; McGregor and Meiers, 1983; Brown, 1989, cited in Weir & Roberts, 1994; House, 1993:1, paraphrasing Scriven, 1991a, cited in Clarke, 1999; Calder, 1994; McMillan & Schumacher, 1997).

According to Stufflebeam (cited in Isaac & Michael, 1990), the statement 'to improve' suggests that a judgment must be made regarding what constitutes worth or value. In other words, the term evaluation typically is associated with how effective or ineffective, how adequate or inadequate, how good or bad, how valuable or invaluable, and how appropriate or inappropriate a given action, process, or product is in terms of the perceptions of the individual who makes use of information provided by an evaluator (Isaac & Michael, 1990).

The allowance for improvement is stated by Scriven (1967, cited in Mark et. al, 2000) who identifies two purposes for evaluation: formative and summative. Formative evaluations are those designed to facilitate program improvement, whereas summative evaluations are those intended to provide a definitive judgment of a program or policy's merit and worth. In addition to those two purposes, knowledge development is proposed as a third possible purpose of evaluation. It focuses on developing or testing (or both) general propositions about such matters as the causes of social problems, the solutions to social problems, and the processes of policy-making, even though the knowledge may not directly improve or judge the specific program or policy being studied.

Mark et. al. (2000) identify four primary purposes for which evaluation findings can be employed: assessment of merit and worth,

program and organisational improvement, oversight and compliance, and knowledge development.

Assessment of merit and worth refers to the development of warranted judgments about the effects and other valued characteristics of a program or policy. When the evaluation purpose is program and organisational improvement, efforts are made to provide timely feedback to modify and enhance program operations. Formative evaluation is the precursor term. Evaluations with the purpose of evaluating oversight and compliance estimate the extent to which a program meets specified expectations. They can show what level participants are achieving on outcome measures. Such evaluations can help meet program sponsors', funders' and the public's need to oversee the program and hold staff and administrators accountable. The evaluation purpose of knowledge development refers to efforts to discover and test general theories and propositions about social processes and mechanisms as they occur in the context of social policies and programs.

People often confuse the term 'evaluation' with 'assessment'. These terms are often used interchangeably, but they are technically different. Therefore, it is necessary to clarify the distinction between evaluation and assessment. Assessment of an individual student's progress or achievement is an important component of evaluation: it is that part of evaluation that includes the collection and analysis of information about student learning. For example, the primary focus of assessment in the area of teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) has been language assessment and the role of tests in assessing students' language skills. Evaluation goes beyond student achievement (and language assessment) to consider all aspects of teaching and learning, and to look at how educational decisions can be informed by the results of alternative forms of assessment (Genesee, 1996).

In the UK, the assessment of student performance is referred to by the term 'assessment'. The term 'evaluation' refers primarily to the evaluation of

teaching and organisation activities which support student learning and includes the assessment of student performance as just one aspect or function. In the USA, the term 'evaluation' is used to describe both the assessment of individual student performance in terms of what they have learnt or accomplished and the evaluation of the teaching and other organisational activities which support student learning (Rowntree, 1977 cited in Calder, 1994). Nevertheless, some institutions use the term 'evaluation' solely to describe the assessment of student performance.

The differences in the way the terms are defined and used can cause confusion, especially in the Thai language in which the two different English terms are translated into the same Thai term, 'การประเมิน' (Kaan Pra Moen).

In this research, I will use the term 'evaluation' because the focus is placed on the overall aspects of the program, not just student achievement.

## Program evaluation

The term 'program' refers to different things. Programs can be educational activities that are provided on a continuing basis. Examples include a school district reading program, a military or industrial training program, a medical education program, or a professional continuing education program (The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1994). In addition, a program can be anything you try because you think it will have an effect. A program might be something tangible, such as a set of curriculum materials; a procedure, such as the distribution of financial aid; or an arrangement of roles and responsibilities, such as the reshuffling of administrative staff. A program might be a new kind of scheduling, for example, a four-day workweek; or it might be a series of activities designed to improve workers' attitudes about their job. (Herman et al., 1987) Furthermore, a program can be a set of planned activities directed toward bringing about specified changes in an identified and identifiable audience (Smith, 1989 cited in Owen with Rogers, 1999).

Funnell & Lenne (1989 cited in Owen with Rogers, 1999) identify specific types of programs as educational, advisory, regulatory, case management, and product or service provision programs. Educational programs are programs which emphasise the acquisition of information, skills and attitudes typically provided through formal learning settings by institutions such as schools, colleges and universities.

Owen, with Rogers (1999) refers to several objects of evaluation: policies, organisations, products, and individuals and 'a program' is referred to as one of the objects of evaluation. When an object of evaluation is a program, it is called 'program evaluation'. In this research, the MATEFL program is the object of this evaluation.

Program evaluation is defined differently by many evaluators. Patton (1986, p. 14 cited in Clarke, 1999) defines program evaluation as the systematic collection of information about the activities, characteristics, and outcomes of programs for use by specific people to reduce uncertainties, improve effectiveness, and make decisions with regard to what those programs are doing and affecting.

Calder (1994) describes program evaluation as evaluation which focuses on programs of study. It is at this level the pedagogic, management and often the financial responsibilities lie in education and training. It is usually here that responsibility for the detailed issues, quality and accountability have to be exercised. Programs of study are sets or groupings of courses which share some sort of common aim. That aim may be the award of a qualification for students who successfully completed a requisite number or series of courses in an area of expertise; or it may be that a particular audience is targeted, or a particular teaching medium is used.

Chooto (1988) identifies evaluation as activities in collecting data, analysing needs, finding methods for improvement and implementation strategies, and identifying outcomes of the program. The aim is to increase the quality and effectiveness of the program.

Isaac & Michael (1990) state that within program evaluation lies a simple three step sequence: *objectives* – state clearly and specifically each objective in measurable or observable terms; *means* – plan the various strategies and activities which will be implemented to attain each objective; and *measures* – select or develop the measure(s) by which attainment of each objective will be determined. They also say that program evaluation most often manifests in one of two guises: (1) accountability, analogous to the bank auditor checking the books to determine whether or not there is an acceptable balance across the original expectations, final accomplishments, and associated cost-effectiveness considerations; and (2) feedback, analogous to the athletic coach skilfully shaping and refining the performance of an individual or team toward continuing improvement.

## Owen's program evaluation

According to Owen, with Rogers (1999), program evaluation can be classified conceptually into five categories or Forms as Proactive, Clarificative, Interactive, Monitoring, and Impact evaluation. This classification is based on the 'Why' questions; i.e., the reasons for conducting an evaluation and the state of the program being evaluated. Each Form has different purposes or orientations, which determine evaluation design and approaches. The five Forms of evaluations are summarized in Figure 2.1.

This research falls into the Impact evaluation because it intends to evaluate the Master's program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language, which is an established program and has operated long enough to see an effect. That is to say, students have graduated and worked as English teachers for a period that is long enough to see the impact of the program on them.

**FIGURE 2.1    OWEN'S FORMS OF EVALUATION**

---

**1.  Proactive evaluation**

Proactive evaluation takes place before a program is designed. The major purpose is to provide input on decisions about how best to develop a program in advance of the planning stage. The major approaches include needs assessment or needs analysis, research review, and review of best practice and the creation of benchmarks.

**2.  Clarificative evaluation**

Clarificative evaluation concentrates on clarifying the internal structure and functioning of a program or policy. This form of evaluation is needed when there is pressure for developers to implement an intervention without an opportunity to think through its underlying structure and rationale or when those responsible for delivering a program are in conflict over aspects of its design, or when there is confusion about how the program should ideally be implemented. The major approaches include logic development or evaluability assessment, and accreditation.

**3.  Interactive evaluation**

Interactive evaluation provides information about delivery or implementation of a program or about selected component elements or activities. It can be concerned with the documentation or incremental improvement of an innovation, or establishing what is happening to help staff to understand more fully how and why a program operates in a given way. This Form of evaluation supports programs which are constantly evolving and changing. The major approaches include responsive evaluation, action research, quality review, developmental evaluation, and empowerment evaluation.

**4.  Monitoring evaluation**

Monitoring evaluation is appropriate when a program is well established and ongoing. The program may be on a single site or it may be developed at several sites. There is usually a need for managers to have an indication of the success or otherwise of the program or one or more of its components. The major approaches include component analysis, devolved performance assessment, and system analysis.

**5.  Impact evaluation**

Impact evaluation is predicated on the not-unreasonable assumption that citizens at large should know whether programs funded by government, or in which they have an interest, are making a difference. Impact evaluation has a strong summative emphasis in that it provides findings from which a judgment of the worth of the program can be made. Impact evaluations are retrospective in that they logically occur at an end-point, a time at which it is decided to take stock of the program. Ideally, Impact evaluations are undertaken on programs which are in a mature or settled stage and have had sufficient time to have an effect.

---

**Source:** Owen, with Rogers, 1999

## Impact evaluation

According to Owen, with Rogers (1999), an Impact evaluation is concerned with:

- determining the range and extent of outcomes of a program;

- determining whether the program has been implemented as planned and how implementation has affected outcomes;

- providing evidence to funders, senior managers and politicians about the extent to which resources allocated to a program have been spent wisely;

- informing decisions about replication or extension of the program.

Outcomes are a major concern of Impact evaluation. Therefore, this evaluation form is similar to the outcome evaluation model proposed by Isaac & Michael (1990) that determines whether or not the objectives have been attained and often includes an analysis of program strengths and weaknesses, with recommendations for future modifications, if appropriate.

Owen, with Rogers (1999, p. 264) defines outcomes as:

> … benefits for participants during or after their involvement with a program. Outcomes relate to knowledge, skills, attitudes, values behaviour, condition or status. For a particular program, there may be various levels of outcomes, with one level of outcome leading to a 'higher' or longer-term outcome. Examples of outcomes include: increased knowledge of nutritional needs, changes in literacy levels, getting a job, and having higher self-dependence.

Owen, with Rogers (1999, p. 266) points out that Impact evaluation benefits not only program stakeholders but also the wider community of scholars and policy-makers, probably more than any other evaluation Form. They also add that:

> Impact evaluation findings related to a given program may contribute to the funded knowledge about a phenomenon of which the given program is typical. Either individually, or by aggregating findings across similar programs, it is possible to arrive at some generalisation about the phenomenon.

Evaluation findings can contribute to the social science knowledge base. Impact evaluations are concerned with establishing what works and why. To be able to back up claims that a program is having an impact, the logic of

evaluation principles must be translated into action. This involves selecting of key variables, setting standards and having access to evidence from which the success or otherwise the intervention can be determined. The key features of Impact evaluation are summarized in Table 2.1.

Objectives-based is the key evaluative approach employed in this evaluation. According to Owen, with Rogers (1999, p. 267), this approach is based on a judgment of whether the stated goals or objectives of a program have been achieved. In this approach, the goals of a program are taken as a

**TABLE 2.1      SUMMARY OF IMPACT EVALUATION**

| Dimension | Properties |
|---|---|
| **Orientation** | • Establishment of program worth<br>• Justification of decisions to mount the program<br>• Accountability to funders and other stakeholders |
| **Typical issues** | • Has the program been implemented as planned?<br>• Have the stated goals of the program been achieved?<br>• Have the needs of those served by the program been met?<br>• What are the unintended outcomes?<br>• How do differences in implementation affect program outcomes?<br>• What are the benefits of the program given the costs? |
| **State of program** | Settled |
| **Major focus** | • Focus on delivery and/or outcomes.<br>• Most comprehensive studies combine both delivery and outcomes known as process-outcome studies |
| **Timing (vis-à-vis program delivery)** | • Nominally 'after' the program has completed at least one cycle with program beneficiaries.<br>• In practice, impact studies could be undertaken at any time after program is 'settled'. |
| **Key Approaches** | • Objectives-based<br>• Needs-based<br>• Goal-free<br>• Process-outcome studies<br>• Performance audit |
| **Assembly of evidence** | Traditionally required use of pre-ordinate research designs, where possible the use of treatment and control groups, and the use of tests and other quantitative data. Studies of implementation generally require observational data. Determining all the outcomes requires use of more exploratory methods and the use of qualitative evidence. |

**Source**: Owen, with Rogers, 1999

given, and decisions about the success of the program are based on the extent to which goals are achieved, according to some standard or level of achievement. In some cases, these objectives are expressed in terms of gains in attainment of program participants. The translation of program goals or objectives into valid measures of outcomes is a major methodological issue. Therefore, one of the main tasks is to determine the real objectives or goals of the program. The determination process will be described in Chapter 3.

# Development of Quality and Standards of English Teachers

This section will be concerned with development of quality and standards of English teachers. It is divided into two subsections: quality and standards of English teachers and effective teacher education programs. The first part considers what it means by effective teachers regardless of subject disciplines. The following section describes the characteristics of effective English teachers in general, and characteristics of Thai teachers of English, in particular. This is followed by the characteristics of effective English as a foreign language teachers that were developed by me. The second part first considers what is meant by a teacher education program. This is followed by a taxonomy of teacher education programs, pre-service and in-service teacher education programs, and elements of successful or effective EFL teacher education programs.

## Quality and standards of English teachers

There are several different terms used to refer to quality and standards of teachers. Examples are the characteristics of effective teachers, qualities of good teachers, successful teachers, and desirable characteristics of teachers. In this research, all of these terms are used; the meaning of each is discussed in the sections below.

**Effective teachers**

Regardless of the subject disciplines, many educators have proposed several characteristics of effective teachers, many of which cover similar areas and deal with both knowledge and ability to use knowledge. For example, Arends (2001, p. 18) states that effective teachers have command of at least three broad knowledge bases that deal with subject matter, human development and learning, and pedagogy. In addition to those three bases, Arends (2001) lists additional personal qualities which are about developing human relationships and creating socially just classrooms, command of a repertoire of teaching practices, and being disposed toward reflection, problem solving, and lifelong learning.

Although not including knowledge of human development and learning and pedagogy, Boag (1989, p. 47) lists 'know the subject', which is similar to the command of subject matter as proposed by Arends, as one of the qualities that make a good teacher. Boag also emphasizes personal qualities that include the ability to enthuse students, to be loving and warm, to empathise with students, to be fair, firm, and flexible, and to have a sense of humour.

The Teachers' Council of Thailand (1996, p. 353) included the command of pedagogy – the ability to impart knowledge and facilitate learning – as one of the nine desirable characteristics of teachers. Other characteristics dealt with personal qualities such as putting themselves up as good models in promoting ethical and moral values, refraining from being an adversary to the mental and physical development of students and refraining from taking advantage of their students. The list also included continuous professional development so as to keep up with the social, political, and economic changes, and developing positive attitudes toward their teaching profession. These are similar to the last characteristic – being disposed toward reflection, problem solving, and lifelong learning – mentioned by Arends (2001). What has been added or are different from the ones

mentioned above are those concerned with preserving and developing Thai wisdom and culture.

Similar to The Teachers' Council of Thailand, Pitiyanuwat et al. (2002, p. 353) placed an emphasis on teachers' personal qualities among the 12 desirable characteristics of teachers. Examples of these personal qualities are being eager to work, behaving as a good role model, sacrificing for the benefits of the group, being kind, being morally upright, willing to work until successful completion of assigned tasks, working with speed and vigour, spending free time usefully, exhibiting polite manners and even dressing appropriately. In addition, they mentioned transferring knowledge to students completely, which is classified as pedagogy command and being diligent, perseverant, persistent, and unafraid to overcome obstacles, which can be classified as being exposed to reflection, problem solving and lifelong learning.

It is quite difficult to categorise those characteristics or qualities proposed by those educators into specific groups because many different characteristics or qualities are mingled into the same item. It is interesting to find that culture plays an important role in specifying what is meant by an effective teacher. Overall, the lists of characteristics developed by Thai educators stressed the personal qualities of teachers. That is, they emphasized personality characteristics, manners, and behaving in a moral way. This is so because the status of teachers in Thailand is high. Teachers are respected and obeyed as is portrayed in the metaphor, teachers are 'second parents'.

**Effective English teachers**

Many experts have proposed lists of the characteristics or attributes of an effective English teacher. Allen (1980, p. 429, cited in Brown 2001) pointed out the following characteristics of good language teachers: (1) competent preparation leading to a degree in TESL; (2) a love of English language; (3) critical thinking; (4) the persistent urge to upgrade oneself; (5) self-

subordination; (6) readiness to go the extra mile; (7) cultural adaptability; (8) professional citizenship; and (9) a feeling of excitement about one's work.

Brown (2001, p. 430) proposes a list of characteristics of a good language teacher which are divided into four areas as technical knowledge, pedagogical skills, interpersonal skills, and personal skills. The essential elements of each area are summarized in Figure 2.2. The characteristics proposed by Brown (2001) had some features in common with those proposed by Allen (1980, p. 429, cited in Brown 2001). For example, both included knowledge and skills of language and learning which can be obtained from formal studies, cultural understanding, and enthusiasm to develop oneself continuously.

The characteristics of effective language teachers appeared to be consistent with characteristics of effective teachers stated earlier. These characteristics should be taken into consideration in designing and delivering teacher education programs.

**FIGURE 2.2      CHARACTERISTICS OF GOOD LANGUAGE TEACHERS**

- Technical knowledge is concerned with command of the English language and language learning. Moreover, it deals with the understanding of culture and continuous professional development.

- Pedagogical skills cover command of language teaching methods and techniques, lesson planning and conducting effective lessons, and selecting, adapting, and using instructional media.

- Interpersonal skills include skills in maintaining good relationships with people, especially with students and colleagues and also in dealing with learners' cultural and ability diversity.

- Personal qualities are concerned with personality characteristics which are conducive to the teaching profession. Additionally, it includes behaving in ethical and moral ways.

**Source:** Brown, 2001

**Standards for P-12 ESL teacher education**

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL, Inc) (TESOL, 2002) developed the standards for P-12 ESL teacher education programs across the United States. It consists of five domains and related

standards: Language; Culture; Planning, Implementing, and Managing Instruction; Assessment; and Professionalism. The details of the standards are contained in Figure 2.3.

The first three standards are similar to the technical knowledge and pedagogical skills categories on the list of characteristics of a good English teacher proposed by Brown (2001). The differences are in the assessment and professionalism standards; there is more emphasis placed on cultural standards.

**Characteristics of good Thai teachers of English**

The characteristics of a good or effective English teacher mentioned above have been developed by educators in English-speaking countries. There is also a list of characteristics of good Thai teachers of English. According to Thailand National Standards for English Language Teachers developed by the Basic Education Commission (2005), there are three areas or strands that good English teachers should master: English language proficiency, teaching ability, and professional development. The focus of each strand is addressed below. The standards associated with the strands are shown in Figure 2.4.

*English language proficiency*

This strand focuses on technical knowledge or the command of language, which is similar to the ones proposed by Brown (2001) and TESOL (2002).

*Teaching ability*

This strand is similar to some sub-skills in the category of technical knowledge and some pedagogical skills proposed by Brown (2001). It is also similar to one standard in the language domain and most of the standards in the planning, implementing, and managing instruction domain as proposed by TESOL (2002).

**FIGURE 2.3     STANDARDS FOR ESL P-12 ESL TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM**

**1. Language**

- Describing Language. Candidates demonstrate understanding of language as a system and demonstrate a high level of competence in helping ESOL students acquire and use English in listening, speaking, reading, and writing for social and academic purposes.

- Language Acquisition and Development. Candidates understand and apply concepts, theories, research, and practice to facilitate the acquisition of a primary and a new language in and out classroom settings.

**2. Culture**

- Nature and Role of Culture. Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to the nature and role of culture in language development and academic achievement that support individual students' learning.

- Cultural Groups and Identity. Candidates know, understand, and use knowledge of how cultural groups and students' cultural identities affect language learning and school achievement.

**3. Planning, Implementing, and Managing Instruction**

- Planning for Standards-Based ESL and Content Instruction. Candidates know, understand, and apply concepts, research, and best practices to plan classroom instruction in a supportive learning environment for ESOL students. Candidates serve as effective English language models, as they plan for multilevel classrooms with learners from diverse backgrounds using standards-based ESL and content curriculum.

- Managing and Implementing Standards-Based ESL and Content Instruction. Candidates know, manage, and implement a variety of standards-based teaching strategies and techniques for developing and integrating English listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and accessing the core curriculum. Candidates support ESOL students in accessing the core curriculum as they learn language and academic content together.

- Using Resources Effectively in ESL and Content Instruction. Candidates are familiar with a wide range of standards-based materials, resources, and technologies, and choose, adapt, and use them in effective ESL and content teaching.

**4. Assessment**

- Issues of Assessment for ESL. Candidates understand various issues of assessment (e.g., cultural and linguistic bias; political, social, and psychological factors) in assessment, IQ, and special education testing (including gifting and talented); their importance of standards; and the difference between language proficiency and other types of assessment (e.g., standardized achievement tests of overall mastery), as they affect ESOL student learning.

- Language Proficiency Assessment. Candidates know and use a variety of standards-based language proficiency instruments to inform their instruction and understand their uses for identification, placement, and demonstration of language growth of ESOL students.

- Classroom-Based Assessment for ESL. Candidates know and use a variety of performance-based assessment tools and techniques to inform instruction.

**5. Professionalism**

- ESL Research and History. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of history, research, and current practice in the field of ESL teaching and apply this knowledge to improve teaching and learning.

- Partnerships and Advocacy. Candidates serve as professional resources, advocate for ESOL students, and build partnerships with students' families.

- Professional Development and Collaboration. Candidates collaborate with and are prepared to serve as a resource to all staff, including paraprofessionals, to improve learning for all ESOL students.

Source: TESOL (2002)

**FIGURE 2.4    THAILAND AND NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR ENGLISH
                LANGUAGE TEACHERS**

---

**Strand 1: English language proficiency**

**Teachers have proper and modern knowledge about the language and culture that can be applied in their teaching. This strand consists of two standards:**

1.  Linguistic Competency

    In order to meet this standard, teachers must understand phonology, vocabulary, grammatical structure, language function, and culture.

2.  Communicative Competency

    In order to meet this standard, teachers must be able to use languages in various situations, to use language in building personal relationships, e.g., in classroom management.

**Strand 2: Teaching Ability.**

**Teachers have and are able to apply not only theoretical knowledge and learning strategies in their teaching for the language learner, but also thinking skill development. This strand consists of two standards:**

1.  Knowledge in concepts, idea and theories about English Language Teaching (ELT) and learning strategies.

    In order to reach this standard, teachers must understand the nature of language learning, understand EFL teaching theories, approaches and strategies, and understand communicative approach of language teaching.

2.  Teaching competency in accordance with the school curriculum.

    In order to meet this standard, teachers must be able to analyse curriculum, manage learning activities, and perform proper evaluation systems.

**Strand 3: Professional Development.**

1.  Teachers have skills and experience in teaching, positive attitudes towards English teaching and learning, appreciate the teaching career and are enthusiastic about teaching as well as self development. It has one standard which is continuous self professional development.

    In order to meet this standard, teachers must have an on-going development in language knowledge and skills, on-going development in their teaching ability and be able to search new knowledge to keep up with changes.

---

Source: TESOL (2002)

### *Professional development*

This professional development strand resembles the professionalism domain as proposed by TESOL (2002).

### Five characteristics of good teachers of EFL

Considering the quality and standards of English teachers suggested by this literature review, I have developed five characteristics of good teachers of

English as a foreign language. Effective EFL teachers should possess the following skills and qualities:

1. Technical skills which include the theoretical knowledge and skills of the English language, e.g., phonology, vocabulary, morphology, syntax; the knowledge of language acquisition and development; an awareness of culture and the knowledge of its nature and role; and the ability to use the language.

2. Pedagogical skills which include the knowledge and skills of pedagogical methods, e.g., planning and implementing lessons, managing classes, using resources effectively, problem solving, an awareness of students' needs, organizing a conducive classroom atmosphere, and assessment.

3. Interpersonal skills which include an awareness and acceptance of learners' differences, e.g., in opinions, cultures, and abilities; other personalities, e.g., enthusiasm, fun, warmth, sense of humour, friendliness, etc.

4. Personal qualities which include being well-organized, reliable, flexible, creative; and having high morals and adhering to the code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct of Teachers.

5. Professionalism which includes engaging in professional development which helps strengthen competence in linguistics, culture, reflection; engaging in life-long learning; being aware of the value of foreign language learning; and having positive attitudes towards the profession.

The literature highlights that it takes more than just being a native speaker of English or just having a good command of English to become a good or effective English teacher. Rossner (1988, p. 107) comments that being a

native speaker does not necessarily guarantee that that person will be a good EFL teacher:

> It has to be admitted that a very large number of EFL teachers, whether native speakers of English or not, begin teaching English with no prior training at all, and in many countries it is still common for EFL and other language teachers to begin service with no more competence to do so than that implied by a degree in English literature, a Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency in English, or, in the case of native speakers, their mother tongue. This does not necessarily mean that they will work ineffectively or incompetently.

The case is made here for an effective training program for teachers of EFL, regardless of their linguistic background. The belief that it is necessary for teachers to be trained how to be good teachers is stated by Srisaarn (1992). He says that the teaching job is considered as a high level profession and the nature of the job involves intellectual methods, and so teachers must be educated and trained for a long period of time. This will assure that teachers will be able to give a high quality of service up to the professional standards.

The above qualities or characteristics of good EFL teachers will be used as a basis for developing questionnaires, the development of which will be described in detail in Chapter 3.

## Effective teacher education programs

Since the MATEFL program aimed to produce English teachers, it is necessary to determine whether it can be categorised as a teacher education program and if so, what type of teacher education program it is. This section contains characteristics of teacher education programs, taxonomy of teacher education programs, pre-service and in-service teacher education programs, and elements of successful or effective EFL teacher education programs.

**Teacher education programs**

English teachers can develop themselves professionally through a variety of means and programs, each of which has both similarities and differences in respect to names, objectives, inputs, focuses, length of time, qualifications obtained, and so on. The programs can be categorized as 'teacher training programs', 'teacher preparation programs', 'teacher development programs', or 'teacher education programs'. There are both similarities and differences among these terms. According to Ur (2000, p. 3), the terms 'teacher training' and 'teacher education' are often used apparently interchangeably in literature to refer to the same thing: the professional preparation of teachers.

Many educators prefer 'teacher education', since 'training' can imply unthinking habit formation and an over-emphasis on skills and techniques, while the professional teacher needs to develop theories, awareness of options, and decision-making abilities – a process which seems better defined by the word 'education'. Others have made a different distinction that 'education' is a process of learning that develops moral, cultural, social and intellectual aspects of the whole person as an individual and member of society, whereas 'training' (though it may entail some 'educational' components) has a specific goal: it prepares for a particular function or profession such as scientists, engineers and nurses.

Sometimes the term 'teacher education' is used as the broadest term covering other kinds of programs. According to Rossner (1988), the term 'teacher education' is used to include skill- or technique-focused programs with mainly practical orientation (teacher training), programs that aim to develop the confidence, awareness, self-reliance and self-esteem of practicing teachers (teacher development), and programs that combine various focuses and might imply a one-year full time commitment (e.g., certain MA or Diploma programs). The terminological problems are symptomatic of what is, world-wide, a complex pattern of provision.

The Master's Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language, which is the object of this evaluation, seems to fit in the category of teacher education program as it requires a combination of a variety of components and is conducted over quite a long period of time.

**Taxonomy of teacher education programs**

Henrichsen (1997, p. 3) points out that in the world of English language teaching, teacher-preparation courses exist for many different purposes, serve disparate audiences, and operate in diverse settings.

The differences among teacher preparation programs exist because of the particular concerns and challenges associated with their setting, objectives, and audience. Recognizing this will help us design our teacher education curricula more appropriately. Understanding that each program typefaces particular challenges and needs to address them in its own distinct ways, we may also become more cautious in our prescriptions regarding what teacher preparation programs 'ought to look like.'

Henrichsen (1997, pp. 3-4) organized the taxonomy of the many different kinds of ESL/EFL teacher-preparation programs across the eight different dimensions as follows:

1. institutional base (i.e., university or college, government agency, language school, business, church community, or social service agency, and distance learning arrangement);

2. objectives (i.e., university degree, teacher certification, certificate, teacher requalification, and volunteer training);

3. timing (i.e., pre-service, in-service, and post-service), educational purpose (i.e., training and development);

4. intensity (i.e., full-time, part-time and periodic);

5. length (i.e., short, medium, and long);

6. target teaching level (i.e., primary, secondary, university, and adult education); and

7. linguistic/cultural setting (i.e., ESL and EFL).

**Pre-service and in-service teacher education programs**

Concerned with the differences in the program objectives and input, teacher education programs can be divided into two kinds: initial or pre-service and post-experience or in-service teacher education programs.

Rossner (1988) defines initial or pre-service teacher education programs as programs that aim to enable people who are not teachers, or are not EFL teachers, to teach English as a foreign language at school level or in further education. Those programs fall into four categories:

1. Components or modules in postgraduate or in undergraduate schools;

2. Components at teacher-training colleges;

3. Short courses associated with examining boards;

4. Short courses available to all-comers.

The MATEFL program operates under the University Graduate School and the Language Institute of Thai University. It accepts candidates with at least bachelor's degrees who are interested in becoming English teachers. Teaching experience is not an admission requirement. The program offers a graduate degree, namely Master of Arts (MA). Therefore, it fits into the first category among the four categories of pre-service teacher education programs. The details of pre-service teacher education programs are shown in Figure 2.5.

Post experience or in-service teacher education program (INSET) is defined by Bolam (1986, p. 18, cited in Roberts 1998) as:

education and training activities engaged in by teachers and principals, following their initial professional certification, and intended primarily or exclusively to improve their professional knowledge, skills and attitudes in order that they can educate children – and learners of all other ages – more effectively.

Rossner (1988) adds that by far the most common type of in-service teacher education is institution-based or sponsored by an education board or authority. It usually takes the form of staff meetings, workshops and seminars, and (apart from purely administrative issues) the aims are usually related to the preoccupations of educational planners, materials writers and senior staff in the institution of authorities. However, increasingly teachers' own concerns and requirements are being taken into account. Teachers are consulted about these programs and perhaps given responsibility in the design and running of them. Moreover, teachers themselves are taking the initiative and organising their own in-service session. In addition, regional, national and international teachers associations are flourishing and can make a valuable (if infrequent and sporadic) contribution to in-service teacher education.

**FIGURE 2.5     CATEGORIES OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

1. Components or modules in postgraduate programs (in Britain, for example, PGCE) or in undergraduate degrees (e.g., BEd) at universities.

2. Similar components of long term courses at teacher-training colleges, known in some countries as 'normal' schools.

3. Short courses leading to 'recognized' qualifications guaranteed by examining boards or other bodies (in Britain, the Royal Society of Arts Preparatory Certificate is an example).

4. Short (and not so short) courses offered by specific institutions to all-comers, or perhaps only to teachers who are to work at the institution in question. Normally such courses lead only to an institutional certificate. Good examples of such courses are to be found at certain Latin American bi-national Cultural institutes.

Source: Rossner, 1988

This type of provision is crucially important, but its true impact cannot be measured and is likely to vary dramatically from system to system and from institution to institution. Differing levels of support mean that some teachers are deterred from fully committing themselves because of lack of 'space' in their working week, or in the case of some longer-term government sponsored programs, the lack of career incentive. It is not realistic, for example, to expect teachers to give up evenings or whole weekend days to pursue a national or regional refresher or retraining program if it is not going to make any difference to their salaries or career prospects in the longer term.

Post-experience courses fall into the following categories, details of which are shown in Figure 2.6:

1.  Post graduate courses;

2.  Part-time and intensive courses;

3.  Institution or system-based programs.

**FIGURE 2.6     CATEGORIES OF POST-EXPERIENCE OR IN-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

1.  Post graduate courses (e.g., Diplomas, MAs and research degrees) which aim to increase participants' knowledge and understanding of 'informing disciplines' such as applied linguistics and psychology while developing the breadth and depth of their language teaching practice. Usually these do not include teaching practice.

2.  Part-time and intensive courses leading, for example, to Royal Society of Arts diplomas. Such courses do include teaching practice.

3.  Institution or system-based programs leading to internal certification or 'upgrading'.

Source: Rossner, 1988

The MATEFL can be considered as a pre-service program in that some candidates are not English teachers or do not have an educational background in teaching and also as an in-service program in that candidates are currently working as English teachers at different levels. According to the

categorisation by Rossner (1988), the MATEFL program belongs to the first category because it is a comprehensive program, not an intensive one and it offers a higher degree, MA in TEFL, which is comparable to other MA degrees worldwide. In addition, the program also aims to develop broad and deep knowledge and understanding in informing disciplines and teaching practices. It focuses on both theories and practices, although it includes teaching practice component which is part of Teaching Practicum course.

Roberts (1998, pp. 222-223) suggests four types of in-service training (INSET), according to how they are initiated and their purpose. These are detailed in Figure 2.7. The MATEFL program does not seem to belong to any types of in-service program as pointed out by Roberts (1998). The reasons are that the program did not coordinate with any initial teacher education. In addition, the program curriculum was not centrally initiated or controlled by central authority. It was institutionally designed and approved by the Ministry of University Affairs. Additionally, the program was predetermined and although there were several elective courses for students to choose according to their interests, it was not considered as a need-led program.

**FIGURE 2.7      TYPES OF IN-SERVICE TEACHER TRAINING**

1. Programs in co-ordination with initial teacher education (ITE), where elements of ITE are built on once teachers have had some experience (e.g., in a staged system of qualifications).

2. Centrally determined programs, controlled by a central authority, usually to attain long-term educational outcomes set by government policy. Central initiatives are often required by curriculum innovations, system wide changes which may demand changes in teaching style.

3. Locally determined content, with local control: emphasis on system needs, met by local providers with a clear brief set by the administration but with attention to local conditions (e.g., courses offered by a teachers' centre; also cascade schemes).

4. Determined by individual needs: emphasis on the personal or professional development of teachers (e.g., by following higher degrees; flexible needs-led workshops; self-directed self-help activities).

Source: Roberts, 1998

The classification of English teacher education programs mentioned above helps in identifying the kind of program; however, some programs contain various components which make it more difficult to be classified. Rossner (1988) pointed out four factors that differentiated teacher education programs: types of participant groups, length of courses and modes of instruction, purposes of the course, and funding. The details are contained in Figure 2.8.

When the MATEFL program is considered according to each of Rossner's four factors, above, it proves to be quite a unique program. Its participants are heterogeneous in terms of purposes of study, experience,

**FIGURE 2.8    CRITERIA FOR CLASSIFYING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

1. Different types of participant group: some are homogeneous (e.g., all from the same level in the same national education system), and some heterogeneous (as on 'open enrolment' courses in Britain). In post-experience courses, this may mean that little or none of the previous experience gained by different participants is equivalent in type or duration, and that the teaching contexts participants are being prepared to cope with differ radically.

2. Differing lengths of course and modes of instruction: there is a world of difference not just between longer (e.g., 200 hour) courses and shorter (e.g., 40 hour) ones, but also between full-time and part-time courses, where, in the case of initial training, the time available between sessions may allow greater opportunities for assimilation and adjustment. Moreover, if as in many universities and teacher-training colleges the main contact with educators is through lectures and academic papers, the impact may be different from courses in which lectures are mixed with workshops, demonstrations, supervised teaching practice and the examination of 'data' gathered in classrooms. Again if video cameras and playback facilities are available, these may increase the effectiveness of the course.

3. Purpose of the course: some are voluntary in the sense that participants sign up for them if they wish to. Others are obligatory, either because participants cannot begin as EFL teachers until the qualification in question has been gained, or because it falls within the terms of a practicing teacher's contract with his or her employer (as is the case in short courses run by some education authorities). Apart from this, some courses, whether initial or in-service, aim to assist teachers to cope with TEFL across a range of teaching situations, while others focus on a specific context, or aim to bring about premeditated changes in classroom practice, for example when new teaching materials are being introduced to a school system or when there is a new syllabus implying a methodological shift to more 'communicative' classroom work.

4. Funding: if participants are paying their own course fees and these monies are used directly to staff and resource the course, organization motivation and impact may be different from courses where participants are 'sponsored' or courses for which funding is 'indirect' (or non-existent).

Source: Rossner, 1988

educational background, background knowledge, ages, and jobs. With its different purposes of study and experience, it can be considered as both a pre-service and in-service program. The program is a full-time, weekend program in which students, staff and instructors have full and personal contact both on weekdays and weekends. While it is a voluntary program that participants freely choose to attend, it is obligatory in the sense that participants need the MATEFL degree to be able to teach English in universities. The program aims to prepare participants to be able to cope with different teaching situation, although the focus is on the teaching in secondary and university levels. It also aims to produce English teachers who are proficient in the English language, teaching and learning theories, and pedagogy; this statement may be validated by considering the components of courses offered as discussed later in this chapter and shown in Appendix A. With respect to funding, the program is a self-supporting program dependent mostly on students' tuition fees. The costs and expenses of the program, e.g., staff and resources, are met mostly from students' fees; however, the program does share some costs with other graduate programs in the LITU.

Matching MATEFL program against the criteria considered above helps to increase an understanding of the nature, context and characteristics of the program which will assist in the explanation of the results of the evaluation – the impact of the program – and also in giving suggestions for program improvement.

**Elements of successful or effective EFL teacher education programs**

EFL teacher education programs consist of many elements. Woodward (1991) proposes parameters or constituent elements in teacher training – individual parameters, external conditions, and course components.

***Individual parameters***

Individual parameters consist of trainees, groups, trainers, and other people concerned. As Woodward (1991) points out, trainees can be different in

goals, needs, attitudes, experiences, age, sex, nationality, lifestyle, educational background, language ability in all skills, teaching experience, learning style, mental models, time to study, view of own role, motivation, energy level, and view of the course. An effective program should take these differences of trainees into consideration. Regarding the groups, an effective program should check if trainees coming together to train form a homogeneous or heterogeneous group, and also check the ratio of trainees to trainers, the turnover of trainers and trainees, the size of the group, how many are attending voluntarily or compulsorily, and the basic chemistry of the group. Concerning the trainers, they are every bit as unique and different from each other as trainees are. Trainers can differ too in their commitment to the style of past courses or to the present course and its approach, methodology and tactics. Trainers can differ in individual training style as well as in age, background, qualification and in all the ways that trainees or any group of people can differ from each other. It is as important to take into account the trainers' perceptions of themselves, their roles, their jobs and salaries, etc. as it is to take into account the trainees' perceptions of themselves, their roles in and out of the course and their view of the amount they give in time, money and energy.

Individual parameters are also emphasized by Rossner (1988) who proposes the criteria for selecting EFL teacher educators (the so-called 'trainers' of Woodward (1991)), to assist with or to take responsibility for teacher education programs in EFL. Those criteria are concerned with TEFL experience, other experiences, education, qualifications, personal skills, personality and predominant teaching style. With regard to experience, EFL teacher educators should have long teaching experience in many teaching situations, localities and countries. As well, they should have experience in teaching all levels of students, using a wide range of materials and resources. Apart from teaching, they should be involved in doing other duties. In addition to teaching general English, they should have experience in teaching different types of English for specific purposes or doing other teaching than

English. Lastly, they should have broad experience of teacher training. With respect to their education, qualifications, and personal skills, EFL teacher educators should have professional and post-graduate qualifications, and relevant degree (e.g., English) TEFL qualifications, masters or higher degree, and 'informing disciplines' (e.g., psychology, linguistics, education). They should have the capacity of a native-speaker of English and know several languages. In addition, they should have good formal knowledge of grammar and phonology. Finally, they should be skilled in many media. In terms of personality and predominant teaching style, EFL teacher educators should be extrovert, sociable, consultative, dynamic, energetic, carefully methodical, gentle, approachable, learner-centred, unflappable, self-aware, and uncommitted to any methodology. These parameters indicate that EFL teacher educators require different combinations of skills and characteristics which must be taken into account by the EFL teacher education program administrators in selecting appropriate EFL teacher trainers or educators.

There might be some danger in selecting trainers who are unable to introduce, model or discuss techniques without exposing their own reservations about them. Initial trainees in most contexts need clear opportunities to master a repertoire of techniques for the classroom teaching of a foreign language that will enable them to survive and will provide a basis upon which they can develop, in due course, techniques that are their own and which conform to their own beliefs about language learning. Hesitant and ill-defined demonstrations and discussions which make the issues seem as complex and uncertain as they are in truth will not assist a majority of participants to acquire this repertoire. Conversely, if trainers who are selected are so committed to a given portfolio of techniques that their sole interest is to ensure that trainees have fully and slickly mastered them, the trainees may leave the course unable to adjust to new situations or to judge the appropriateness or otherwise of given techniques since time will not have been made available for proper discussion and evaluation, or practice in adapting technique to purpose. Rossner (1988, pp. 107-108) suggests that it is

not implied that any particular characteristic or combination of characteristics is 'best'. Much will depend on the role that the teacher educator will be assigned during the course, the course aims and the prevailing ideology.

Another important factor affecting selection of new teacher educators is the make-up and balance of the existing team. A majority of courses are given by teams of educators. It is crucial that members of the team should be able to work harmoniously and consistently together in planning, reviewing and administering the course. On the other hand, contrasts — though not conflicts — of style, personality and points of view are often helpful, particularly on in-service courses. What participants have most difficulty in coping with, however, is evidence of lack of consultation, conflicting information, and contradictory advice.

Apart from trainees, group, and trainers, Woodward (1991, p. 33) also mentions other people concerned with EFL teacher education programs. Those people are also different in their views and expectations of the events and play an important role in either support or block the success of the program. Woodward gives some examples of ways in which any one of these individuals can make or break a course:

> …a gentle-hearted director of studies, in charge of interviewing candidates for the course and incapable, really, of failing anyone at interview, who allows onto your course all kinds of applicants who may later find they shouldn't be there. A spouse, who greets a course participant after a gruelling evening's input session with the right mixture of food, drink, privacy or chat, can turn a decision to drop out of a course into a realization that other factors in life can balance stress and make it bearable. A janitor, who bursts into the middle of teaching practice at five minutes to five o'clock, insisting that everyone has to leave immediately so that he can lock up, can create the kind of havoc that leaves a bad taste in everyone's mouth. An examiner, who writes the exam questions carefully and thoughtfully, can, over a number of years, encourage a whole new positive slant to course work, teacher development and teacher training.

Therefore, the views and expectations of these individuals should be taken into consideration by the administration of teacher education program.

### *External conditions*

In addition to individual parameters, Woodward (1991) discusses other external conditions. The quantity and quality, as well as management, of these conditions can have powerful shaping effects on training events. These external conditions include

- physical space (e.g., rooms – number, size, and accessibility; light; noise; colour; furniture),

- hardware (e.g., charts and boards; audio and video recorders;

- OHPs and computers;

- reliable power supply;

- notice boards and wall display space; books; keys and cupboards);

- support (e.g., typing, photocopying and recording facilities;

- post and phone;

- filing and librarianship;

- cleaning; feeding and refreshing);

- finance (e.g., the cost of the course; the fee to the trainer; the charge to the trainee; money available for materials and parties; the costs of not doing the course; the cost of doing it a different way; the cost of supplementary training);

- contact between trainers and trainees (in terms of time, duration, frequency, places, and reasons); and

- beliefs and aims of all those involved in teacher training.

### *Course components*

The course component element is another important element of teacher education. Woodward (1991) poses one major question: what do you and all the other people with a hand in the course wish to have included in it? The content of a course can be described in terms of large chunks, such as 'Background theory' and 'Methodology', or in the form of the labels or names that might be given to individual slots on a timetable.

Zeichner (1983) and Feiman-Nemser (1990 cited in Calderhead & Shorrock, 1997, pp.2-3) provide interesting classifications of ideologies or conceptual orientations in teacher education. These orientations refer to a body of values and beliefs about teaching and teacher education that at different points in history have been particularly influential in shaping the nature of initial teacher education courses. These authors identify five groups of conceptual orientations in teacher education: academic, practical, technical, personal, and critical inquiry orientations. The details of each orientation are presented in figure 2.9.

**FIGURE 2.9     CLASSIFICATION OF IDEOLOGIES OR CONCEPTUAL ORIENTATIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION**

1. The academic orientation emphasizes teachers' subject expertise and sees the quality of the teacher's own education as his/her professional strength; in this view, a sound liberal arts education is seen as the critical ingredient of teacher preparation.

2. The practical orientation emphasizes the artistry and classroom technique of the teacher, viewing the teacher as a craftsperson; it therefore attaches importance to classroom experience and apprenticeship models of learning to teach.

3. The technical orientation emphasizes the knowledge and behavioural skills that teachers require and has been associated with microteaching and competency-based approaches to teacher education.

4. The personal orientation emphasizes the importance of interpersonal relationships in the classroom; in this view, teacher education takes the form of offering a safe environment which encourages experimentation and discovery of personal strengths

5. The critical inquiry orientation views schooling as a process of social reform and emphasizes the role of schools in promoting democratic values and reducing social inequities; an important aspect of teacher education is therefore seen as enabling prospective teachers to become aware of the social context of schools and of the social consequences of their own actions as teachers; within this orientation, teacher education functions to help teachers become critical, reflective change-agents.

Source: Zeichner , 1983 & Feiman-Nemser, 1990

In the MATEFL program, the courses that represent the academic orientation are English Proficiency Development and Comparative Grammar. The courses that represent the practical, technical or personal orientations are Teaching Methodology I and II, Teaching Practicum, etc., supporting the notion that the MATEFL program offers a teacher education program that covers all of the orientations stated above. The details of the courses can be viewed in Appendix A.

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) (2002, p. 3) developed the Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers, details of which are presented in Figure 2.10. It is said that a program must demonstrate that it includes the development of candidates' foreign language proficiency in all areas of communication,

**FIGURE 2.10    PROGRAM STANDARDS FOR PREPARATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS**

1. The development of candidates' foreign language proficiency in all areas of communication, with special emphasis on developing oral proficiency, in all language courses. Upper-level courses should be taught in the foreign language.

2. An ongoing assessment of candidates' oral proficiency and provision of diagnostic feedback to candidates concerning their progress in meeting required levels of proficiency.

3. Language, linguistics, culture, and literature components.

4. A methods course that deals specifically with the teaching of foreign languages, and that is taught by a qualified faculty member whose expertise is foreign language education and who is knowledgeable about current instructional approaches and issues.

5. Field experiences prior to student teaching that include experiences in foreign language classrooms.

6. Field experiences, including student teaching, that are supervised by a qualified foreign language educator who is knowledgeable about current instructional approaches and issues in the field of foreign language education.

7. Opportunities for candidates to experience technology-enhanced instruction and to use technology in their own teaching.

8. Opportunities for candidates to participate in a structured study abroad program and/or intensive immersion experience in a target language community.

Source: ACTFL

foreign language teaching methodology, foreign language learning experience, teaching practice, opportunities to incorporate technology into teaching, opportunities to immerse in a target language community, and qualified trainers and supervisors.

Lie (1998, pp. 39-40) provides directions for professional development of EFL teachers. The key points in designing teacher professional development programs that should be paid attention to are the teachers' current needs and situations. In addition, collaboration among teachers should be enhanced. These details are shown in Figure 2.11.

Ryan (1996, pp. 12-13) has described the aims and content of the Center for English Teacher Training. The following table contains the knowledge, skills and attitudes that we would expect to find in professional teacher. It shows that teachers are required to be knowledgeable in, skilful in, and have positive attitude towards both language and teaching. All of the requirements mentioned are consistent with the elements of teacher education program and standards provided earlier. The details are shown in Table 2.2.

**FIGURE 2.11    PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF EFL TEACHERS**

1. An effective in-service education presupposes that the teacher educators understand the teachers' classroom and institutional situations. An in-service education program, therefore, is likely to be most effective if it grows directly out of the teachers' experiences, assumptions and perceived problems. This implies that teacher educators need to be prepared to devote at least the initial part of the program to a variety of modes of bringing such experiences, assumptions, and problems out in the open.

2. To help teachers to cope with the newly learned methodology, teacher educators may be most helpful by joint exploration of teachers' opportunities and limitations and by reflecting which of the new techniques may best suit their teaching situations.

3. Any educational innovation is most effectively introduced and internalized by building on what teachers already know and do and what occurs in class.

4. An in-service education program should give the teachers the opportunity to network and relate to one another. Teachers need to be empowered through learning communities with other teachers.

Source: Lie, 1998

**TABLE 2.2     KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND ATTITUDES REQUIRED OF ENGLISH TEACHERS**

|  | **Language** | **Teaching** |
|---|---|---|
| **Knowledge of:** | • Systems (phonetic, lexical, syntactic, discoursal)<br>• General linguistics<br>• Related culture (literature, history, etc) | • General pedagogy and educational psychology<br>• Applied linguistics<br>• Principles and techniques of ELT methodology |
| **Skills in:** | • Providing a good model of English to learners<br>• Using English for personal and professional development | • Planning, implementing and evaluating lessons and courses<br>• Observing other teachers and learners, being observed, and using both as a means of development |
| **Attitudes towards:** | • Language as a system, as a culture and as a means of communication | • Responsibilities towards learners and colleagues<br>• Continuing professional development |

Richards (1997, p. 3) concludes that in second language teaching, teacher education programs typically include a knowledge base, drawn from linguistics and language learning theory, and a practical component, based on language teaching methodology and an opportunity to practice teaching. In principle, knowledge and information from such disciplines as linguistics and second language acquisition provide the theoretical basis for the practical components of teacher education programs.

One interpretation of the development of second language teaching in the last twenty years or so is that a substantial degree of professionalisation has taken place. Thus, the theoretical basis of the field has moved from the study of phonetics and grammatical theory – once considered a necessary (and sometimes sufficient) basis to launch a student into a career as a language teacher – to include the study of pedagogical grammar, discourse analysis, second language acquisition, classroom-based research, interlanguage syntax and phonology, curriculum and syllabus design, and language testing. Language teaching has achieved a sense of autonomy, with its own knowledge base, paradigms, and research agenda.

The knowledge base and the practice base are also regarded by Gaudart (1994, pp. 88-90) as the two components in the model for the language education curriculum which interact with each other.

The 'knowledge base' is central to curriculum. This would include what is usually referred to as the 'content area' of the subject itself, as well as 'educational theory' which would include contributions from disciplines.

This would mean that a teacher of English must be knowledgeable about English, the language he or she is teaching, just as a teacher of physics must have knowledge of physics. It also means that a language teacher must be aware of theory of education. Some ESL pre-service teacher education programs (whether for a Diploma, Certificate, Bachelor's or Master's degree) assume that student teachers have this knowledge base. Such assumptions cannot be made, as Gaudart (1994, pp. 88-90) points out:

> It is often assumed that a native speaker of a language, or, worse still, anyone who can speak a language passably, has enough competence in the language to be able to teach it without further study. I am suggesting that language teachers, no matter if they are teachers of English, Mandarin or French, need to be more than just marginally competent in the language they are teaching. They need to be able to deal with the nuances of the language, knowing when to use what kind of language, both in terms of structure and intonation.

The practice base is a more interactive component of teacher education. It is this practice base which will see the realization of theory. This component would include input from psychology, language studies, and methodology. It would also include the development of micro-skills, or pedagogical tasks required in language teaching, something which has hardly been researched into. Teacher educators all too frequently deal with these tasks on a general level without going deeper into the sorts of skills teachers needed to carry out the tasks. This component is referred to as the 'practical component' in the hope that practice would be the basis of the component.

Johnston (1994, pp. 138-139) has developed a model of teacher development which attempts to set the classroom-oriented development that teacher education customarily concentrates on within a larger context of other, broader types of professional development. In this model, all development takes place within the general domain of personal development. This professional development of teachers is called 'teacher development', a blanket term referring to any form of work-related development whether through institutionalized courses or programs, or through individual, teacher-initiated development. Teacher education is seen as an institutionalized form of teacher development. Johnston depicts teacher development as consisting of three interrelated and overlapping areas or domains: classroom teaching, professional development, and knowledge base. The details are contained in Figure 2.12.

**FIGURE 2.12    DOMAINS OF TEACHER EDUCATION**

---

**Domain A, Classroom Teaching:**

- Includes issues relating to the actual practice of teaching in classrooms: materials development, classroom management and so on.

**Domain B, Professional Development:**

- Covers broader issues that relate to the educational experience beyond the classroom: for example administration, curriculum design and program development.

**Domain C, Knowledge Base**

- Refers to knowledge (usually drawn from theory and research) that may inform classroom and professional development: in the case of language teaching this would include knowledge of the language (the ability to use it), knowledge about the language (declarative knowledge of grammar, phonology, etc.), information about second language acquisition, and so on.

---

Source: Johnston, 1994

In this depiction, a conventional pre-service teacher education program concentrates primarily on Domain A and C, and, to a lesser extent, on Domain B. Indeed, Kennedy (1991) argues that for a teacher education program to be effective, these two areas must not just both be covered but must be skilfully integrated by teacher educators. In MA programs, the

emphasis is much more on Domain C, the knowledge base, and to a slightly lesser extent Domain B, Professional Development, while Domain A is relatively less central.

The MATEFL program emphasizes Domains A and C, as intended by the program establishers, with a little more emphasis on the knowledge base due to the beliefs that good EFL teachers should be competent in the language and be a good model of language user for students. Similar to most other MA programs, Domain B is less emphasized. There are no such courses as administration, curriculum development, and program development. However, there are several courses like research methodology and independent study which can be categorised as the professional development domain.

As well as these elements and factors that should be considered teacher education providers, Lange (1997, pp. 254-255) identifies six characteristics of the twenty-first century 'technological society' which influence teacher education: being a knowledge-based society; an increase in flow of information; a rapid change and impermanence of education; an increase in decentralization of organisation, institutions, and systems; being a people-oriented society; major demographic shifts. These characteristics have implications on teacher education in respect to the qualification of candidates entering teaching profession, teacher's roles, key elements to be included in the program, and the way to deal with multicultural issues. These points are summarised in Figure 2.13.

Overall, the literature suggests that there are many elements involved in the teacher education program and those elements interact with one another. To achieve an effective teacher education program for EFL teachers, relevant people should take those elements into consideration.

**FIGURE 2.13    IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION**

1. The teaching profession must attract some of the 'best and brightest.' Entrance standards to teacher education programs must be rigorous.

2. Teachers will have to become facilitators, not repositories of knowledge. They will need preparation in a variety of alternatives in pedagogy and curriculum development (Schubert 1986).

3. Lifelong learning must be a construct in every teacher development program.

4. Experimentation, risk taking, autonomy, and flexibility must be key elements in the development of a model of schooling that places responsibility for learning on students, giving them freedom to try, test, innovate, and create.

5. Schools must allow teachers to take responsibility for professional decisions that affect the classroom.

6. Teacher development programs must be more responsive to the needs of minority students in multicultural settings.

**Source: Lange, 1997**

# Quality Assurance

The ultimate aim of this evaluation is to identify factors that can be utilised in the improvement of effectiveness and quality of the MATEFL program. Therefore, in order to improve the quality of the program in the future, it is necessary to find out what had been done to assure the quality of the MATEFL program up to this evaluation. This section deals with the definitions of quality, concerns for education quality, quality assurance in Thailand and at the LITU.

## Quality in education

According to Yorke (1999, p. 17), the term 'quality' is defined, in the 'quality vocabulary' of ISO 8402 as the

> totality of features and characteristics of a product or service that bear on
> its ability to satisfy stated or implied needs.

Quality, under the ISO 8402 vocabulary, is in the eye of the customer – or, less obviously, in the eye of the supplier who anticipates correctly what the customer will need, even if the latter has not yet realized what the need actually is.

Adams (1998) defines the term 'education quality' as inputs (numbers of teachers, amount of teacher training, number of textbooks), processes (amount of direct instructional time, extent of active learning), outputs (test scores, graduation rates), and outcomes (performance in subsequent employment). Additionally, quality education may imply simply the attaining of specified targets and objectives.

Barnett (1992) points out that the concern for quality in education emerges from governments' interest in expanding the higher education system. To increase participation rates and access, unit costs need to be diminished. This conflict of interest between expansion and diminishing unit costs leads to doubts about the quality of education. In Britain, therefore, 'quality' has become a key word in public debate about higher education. Quality assessment exists 'to ensure that all education for which the Higher Education Funding Council provides funding is of satisfactory quality or better, and to ensure speedy rectification of unsatisfactory quality', the main aim being to 'inform funding and reward excellence' (HEFCE, 1992, 1993, cited in Morley, 2003). Universities have possessed various forms of internal and external mechanisms for assuring the quality of their work. The external examiners system has traditionally been a form of quality assurance.

Quality Assurance in Higher Education in Thailand was first introduced in 1996 by the Ministry of University Affairs. It was furthered emphasized in the National Education Act B.E. 2542 (1999). It reads (ONEC, p. 20, Chapter 6, Section 47):

> There shall be a system of educational quality assurance to ensure improvement of educational quality and standards at all levels. Such a system shall be comprised of both internal and external quality assurance.

This introduction led higher education institutions to establish quality assurance systems that were more explicable and accountable. Universities also set up standards and indicators and also assigned work system to ensure that they meet those standards. As well as these positive impacts, quality assurance led to nervousness as institutions prepared themselves for external examination. The coming of quality assurance has played a significant role in generating change in all higher education institutions.

## Quality assurance at LITU

The Language Institute of Thai University (LITU) has established a quality assurance system within the institution. This internal quality assurance has been done continuously since 2001. Therefore, QA did not exist at LITU during the first three years of the MATEFL program (1998-2000), the period for which the program is being evaluated.

In the LITU annual report or Self-Assessment Report 2006, standards and standard indicators were developed in accordance with Thai University standards. These will be used as the basis for external quality assurance. Seven standards have been developed. Those standards were concerned with the quality of graduates and students, research and innovation, academic services, promoting Thai art and culture, development of organisation and personnel, curriculum and instruction, and quality assurance system. Indicators for each standard were also identified. The total number of indicators for the seven standards was fifty-one.

Since QA did not exist at the time the MATEFL program was evaluated, this evaluation will rely on the standards and indicators developed afterwards in the analysis of data.

## The MATEFL Program at Thai University

In this evaluation, the Master of Arts Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (MATEFL) is the 'object of evaluation' (Owen, with Rogers, 1999, p. 4). Therefore, some salient features of the program should be reported. The MATEFL program was established in 1998. The program goals are: to develop the quality and standards of English teachers at all levels; to offer a curriculum of effective English teaching theory and practice for those who are interested in this career; to help solve the problem of a shortage of qualified English teachers at primary, secondary and university levels (Program document, 1998). The program operates under the University Graduate School and the Language Institute. It is a self-supporting program. The costs and expenses of the program come mostly from students' tuition fees.

The program accepts applicants with bachelor's degree in any field of study. Work experience is not included as an admission requirement. To be admitted to the program, apart from those requirements, the applicants must pass the Graduate English Test (550 points out of 1000 points). The Graduate English Test is a test that every applicant of every graduate program must take. This multiple-choice test aims to test applicants' reading comprehension, grammatical structure, and vocabulary. In addition, the applicants must pass the Language Institute English test which requires applicants to show their higher level of English proficiency by writing a paragraph on the assigned topic, completing sentences, combining sentences according to assigned structure, and correcting errors in sentences. The applicants who pass the written test will attend an interview conducted in English in order to test their speaking ability, attitude towards the program and teaching profession and their compatibility with the program. The program accepts thirty students in each intake which occurs once a year.

In this program, all instruction is conducted in English. Student presentations and assignments must be done in English. Courses are offered

on weekends from 9 a.m. to 12 a.m. and from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m., either full Saturday and half Sunday or half Saturday and full Sunday. The academic year is divided into two 16-week semesters (first and second semesters) and one 8-week summer session. Normally, students can complete the degree in two years. The maximum period must not exceed 14 semesters or seven years.

To graduate, students must have earned at least 42 credits and cumulative GPA not less than 3.00. There are two options available: Plan A (Thesis) and Plan B (Non-thesis). For Plan A, students take 7 required courses (21 credits), 3 elective courses (9 credits) and a master's thesis (12 credits). For Plan B, students take 9 required courses (27 credits) and 5 elective courses (15 credits). Plan A students take fewer courses and conduct the master's research study, while Plan B students take more courses and conduct a small research study in Independent Study course.

The program offers courses in five areas: language skills, language teaching theories, linguistics, learning language teaching, and general /self-study courses. In operation, all of the 30 students are put in one section and take the same courses every semester. The program determines the courses and their sequences, both required and elective. Among the 10 elective courses, the program is able to offer only 5 of them. The details of courses and sequences can be viewed in Appendix A.

After finishing course work, students take comprehensive written and oral examinations. Both exams will test students' comprehensive knowledge of TEFL and also their English skills. They have to pass both components in order to graduate.

The tuition fee is 1,500 baht per credit. Therefore, students who normally take 9 credits or three courses each semester will pay about 13,500 for tuition fees and about 3,000 baht for university fees and others. The total is about 70,000 baht for the entire program.

In practice, the program operates according to the proposed plan and curriculum. There were two deviations from the original plan: the number of elective courses offered; the order of courses. That is, out of ten elective courses proposed, only five were available and taken by students. Those courses were Language and Culture, Materials Development, Testing and Evaluation, Instructional Media, and Teaching English for Specific Purposes. The other courses could not be offered, for two reasons. The first was that there was not a sufficient number of students interested in enrolling in those courses. To be able to offer a course, there had to be at least 15 students enrolled in order to share the cost of the course. The second was the program's lack of experts or instructors to teach in those courses. The program preferred to rely on the resources at hand rather than to seek help from external or part-time instructors. In addition to the number of courses, the order of courses also deviated from the plan. The offerings of some courses, specifically, those without pre-requisite entry requirements, depend on the availability of instructors. Apart from these two deviations, the program has been able to follow the plan strictly as planned.

## Conclusion

The review of literature presented in this chapter was used to formulate the framework for this evaluation. The review has focused on (1) evaluation, (2) development of quality and standards of English teachers, and (3) quality assurance. Throughout the literature review, an evaluative Form and Approach suitable for this evaluation was identified. The qualities and standards of EFL teachers were also described along with the elements of effective teacher education programs for EFL teachers. Finally, the existing quality assurance at the Language Institute of Thai University was addressed. The methodology that has been derived from this literature review will be presented in Chapter 3.

# CHAPTER 3

# Methodology

## Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology of this research. It consists of information about methods, research questions, participants, selections of participants, data collection, instrument development, and data analysis.

This research, a program evaluation, was an impact evaluation of an established program—a Master of Arts Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (MATEFL). This impact evaluation sought to evaluate the outcomes of the settled program in relation to its goals or objectives and is one of five Forms described by Owen, with Rogers (1999). The key approach that was used was an objectives-based evaluation. I conducted this research in order to answer the following questions:

1. **How effective was the MATEFL program?**

   - Were the stated goals of the program achieved?

   - Did the program develop the quality and standards of English teachers at all levels?

   - Did the program offer a curriculum of effective English teaching theory and practice for those who are interested in this career?

   - Did the program help solve the problem of a shortage of qualified English teachers at all levels?

2. **How well did the program meet the expectations of stakeholders?**

   - Were any gaps between the program and workplace requirements identified?

   - What was the nature of these gaps?

   - What suggestions were offered to overcome deficiencies due to these gaps?

3. **Were there any unintended outcomes and what was their nature?**

4. **What are the essential aspects of the quality assurance process that could be applied to the MATEFL program?**

5. **What quality assurance criteria emerged as a result of this evaluation?**

Considering the nature of the MATEFL program and my questions, it was concerned with refining the program in the future; justifying the approach used; determining the program worth; and accounting for the resources spent on developing and implementing the program. This fits the criteria/orientation of an Impact Evaluation Form and an objective-based approach.

## Methodologies Used

In this research, I used a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods. The combination of these two methods in evaluation is consistent with Patton (1987), Wiess (1998) and Royse, et al. (2001). In the quantitative component, I administered questionnaires to collect demographic data of participants, to identify gaps between the program and workplace requirements, and to identify gaps between the workplace requirements or employers' expectation and the actual skills and abilities that the participants bring to the workplace. These self-report methods are legitimate in program evaluation as discussed by King et al. (1987) cited in Weir & Roberts (1994). In the qualitative component, I undertook semi-structured interviews with selected participants

in order to obtain more data about the nature of gaps, the reasons why these gaps exist, and ways of overcoming the deficiencies due to these gaps. Besides that, I reviewed the Language Institute and MATEFL program documents, and the quality assurance documents. Detail regarding each instrument and participants will be described later in this chapter.

## Participants

Weir & Roberts (1994) suggest that different stakeholders should participate in program evaluation because an evaluator cannot provide a comprehensive account of a program on his own. As a consequence, I invited different stakeholders of the MATEFL program, (1) the MATEFL graduates from the first three cohorts; (2) the students who started but did not complete the program; (3) the MATEFL staff – the program developers, administrators, and instructors; and (4) the graduates' employers. The reported experiences and perceptions from these different stakeholders were able to help me better understand the impact of the program on the graduates – the program's products.

## Selection of Participants and Data Collection

Data collection consisted of three stages: stage 1 employing questionnaires to obtain data from the MATEFL graduates/students and staff; stage 2 interviewing selected graduates/students and staff and employing a questionnaire to collect data from graduates' employers; and stage 3 reviewing documents related to the MATEFL program as well as quality assurance. The detail of data collection as well as the selection of participants for each stage is as follows:

## Stage 1

I have summarized the first stage of data collection in Table 3.1. In 2003 I began with obtaining the addresses and telephone numbers of the one hundred and one MATEFL students from the first three cohorts (Years 1998, 1999, and 2000) from student yearbooks. I called those participants to introduce myself to them, explain about the research and check for their contact addresses. The telephone conversations lasted about five minutes. However, some conversations went on for half an hour because the participants were very enthusiastic about giving their opinions concerning the program. An immediate problem was students' mobility because of their jobs and studies. I solved this problem by using the network to update the contact address. With this strategy, I was able to contact seventy-five students and I obtained the email addresses of three students who were furthering their studies abroad. I also found that one student passed away years ago. For the rest whom I could not contact, I decided to use the old addresses that I got from the yearbooks.

After that, I mailed questionnaires to all of the one hundred students with the stamped return envelope. I kept the records of who had replied and when: in the first month there were 38; in the second another 18; the return rate was slow. Therefore, I called the participants whose questionnaires I had

**TABLE 3.1    DATA COLLECTION: STAGE 1**

| Participants | No. of Participants | Selections of Participants /Sampling | Data Collection Methods or Instruments |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Graduates/students from 1, 2, and 3 cohorts** | 100 (67 returned questionnaires) | Students who enrolled on the MATEFL in the years 98, 99, and 00 | Graduates' Questionnaire |
| **2. MATEFL staff** | 12 (11 returned questionnaires) | Staff who really involved in the MATEFL program as program developers, administrators, full-time/part-time instructors | Staff's Questionnaire |

not received to ask whether they got the questionnaires and to remind them to mail questionnaires back to me as soon as they could. I found that most of those participants forgot to do the questionnaire. Some did not get the questionnaire, so it had to be sent to them again. Some said that they were tied up with their regular work and too busy to do the questionnaire. I was forced to wait for another month and then my patience was over. At the end of the third month, I received 67 questionnaires out of 100 – a 67 per cent return. I felt satisfied with it.

Another group of participants in stage 1 was the MATEFL staff – the program developers, administrators and instructors. The recruitment of these MATEFL staff relied on the program documents and the interviews with the program developers – the Director and Deputy Director for administrative affairs who were in office during the time the first three cohorts were in the program. I selected only the MATEFL staff who were directly involved in the development and delivery of the year-long program. Instructors who taught only one semester were excluded. I needed the views of instructors who had taught the full program. The total number of MATEFL staff selected was twelve: the Director; the Deputy Director; the Head of the MATEFL program; and nine instructors. Among these participants, seven were full-time Thai instructors, two were full-time native speaker instructors, and three were part-time instructors. One of the Thai instructors had resigned from the program and was teaching in an American university; nevertheless, I included this instructor in my first survey.

Of the twelve participants in this group, I met ten instructors at their offices to explain about the research. I emailed the remaining two as these instructors were not at LITU. Then I gave questionnaires to these participants and made an appointment for picking up the completed questionnaires. Of these ten questionnaires, I was able to get eight of them back within a week; one took a month. However, only one was not returned and this participant agreed to be discarded from the survey. I also emailed questionnaires to the other two participants whom I could not meet face to face and asked them to

email questionnaires back to me. These two questionnaires were completed and returned to me in a week. So, the total number of the MATEFL Staff's questionnaire was 11 (91.67%).

Most of the MATEFL staff realized the benefit of the evaluation to the program, the clients and the organization and seemed to be engaged by it. However, they expressed their concern about the confidentiality and hurting the feelings of the people involved in the development and delivery of the program. Offering them the chance to check on their answer and assuring the anonymity made them more comfortable and willing to participate in the survey.

When I got the questionnaires back, I checked them for completeness and met the participants whose answers were incomplete so as to find out if there were any reasons for the missing answers. The reason given by those who chose not to answer some questions was their limited knowledge of the program. They would like to make the results as valid as possible. For the staff who forgot to answer some questions, I asked them to complete the questionnaire.

Then the data were analysed using: EXCEL to calculate descriptive statistics for demographic data of participants and opinions toward the program and workplace requirement; content analysis for open ended answers about the strengths and weaknesses of the program and participants' suggestions. The full detail of data analysis will be presented later.

## Stage 2

I have summarized the first stage of data collection in Table 3.1. In stage 2 that began at the end of the year 2003, after I analysed the data from the MATEFL students and the MATEFL staff, I generated the interview questions. Since it was more convenient for me to contact the MATEFL staff than the MATEFL students, I decided to start the

**TABLE 3.2        DATA COLLECTION: STAGE 2**

| Participants | No. of Participants | Selection of Participants /Sampling | Data Collection Methods or Instruments |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Graduates/students** | | | |
| • Kindergarten/primary teacher (satisfied) | 1 | Maximum variation sampling, extreme-case sampling; simple random sampling | Semi-structured interview |
| • Kindergarten/primary teacher (not satisfied) | 1 | | |
| • Secondary teacher (satisfied) | 1 | | |
| • Secondary teacher (not satisfied) | 1 | | |
| • Tertiary teacher (satisfied) | 1 | | |
| • Tertiary teacher (not satisfied) | 1 | | |
| • Student graduating later than the others | 0 | | |
| • Student who is in a doctoral program | 1 | | |
| • Student who did not complete the program | | | |
| • Dismissed (all refused to participate) | 0 | | |
| • Still in the program | 1 | | |
| Sub-total | 8 | | |
| **2. MATEFL staff** | | | |
| • Administrator | 1 | Maximum variation sampling; simple random sampling | Semi-structured interview |
| • Full-time instructor | 1 | | |
| • Part-time instructor | 1 | | |
| • Native speaker instructor | 1 | | |
| Sub-total | 4 | | |
| **3. Graduates' employers** | | Employers of graduates who are teaching English | Employers' Questionnaire |
| Sub-total | 10 | | |
| **TOTAL** | **22** | | |

interview with the staff. I used maximum variation sampling (McMillan &
Schumacher, 1997) to divide the staff into four categories: the program
establisher and administrators (3 persons), full-time instructors who were not
involved in any administration (3 persons), part-time instructors (3 persons),
and English native speaker instructors (2 persons). I used simple random
sampling that took into account gender balance to pick one participant from
each group to be interviewed. Then I met each of them in person to set up

appointment schedules with each person and interviewed each of them alone in their office. Each interview took about between 45 and 60 minutes.

During the interview, I could perceive participants' willingness and eagerness to cooperate in this evaluation. My perception could be corroborated by their offer to give more information; their revelation of important information; their realization of the usefulness of this evaluation to the MATEFL program itself, for the EFL teacher education, and for the EFL education in Thailand; and their enthusiasm for knowing the findings.

After the MATEFL staff interviews, I continued with MATEFL student interviews. I classified those 67 students who responded to my questionnaire into two groups based on the results from the survey questionnaires in stage 1: the students who had already graduated and the students who started but did not complete the program. After that, for the first group, I used two strategies – the maximum variation sampling and the extreme-case sampling (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997) – to purposefully select particular graduates to be semi-structured interviewed. I used the maximum variation sampling to divide the graduates into graduates who were currently teaching English in kindergarten/primary, secondary, and tertiary institutions, graduates who finished the program later than the other graduates, and graduates who were furthering their study in a doctoral level. Besides, I used the extreme-case sampling to select the representatives of each group who were "satisfied" and "not satisfied" with the program. The graduates who were "satisfied" with the program were the ones who ticked "Very satisfied" or "Moderately satisfied" in the questionnaire and the graduates who were "not satisfied" with the program were the ones who ticked "Slightly satisfied" or "Not at all satisfied" in the questionnaire. Then I used simple random sampling to pick one graduate from each group to be interviewed. Those graduates that interviewed were shown in Table 3.2.

However, there were some variations in sampling. According to the results from questionnaires, there were no primary teachers who ticked "Slightly satisfied" or "Not at all satisfied", so I decided to pick one of the

representatives that, although ticked "Moderately satisfied", expressed quite negative comments on the program.

In addition, there were no students who graduated later than the others answering questionnaire, so this group of participants was ignored. The number of the first group of students or the graduates to be interviewed was 7.

The second group of students "Students who started but did not complete the program" was defined as students who were dismissed from the program or the students who were still in the program but had not graduated yet. Of the 67 respondents, there were two students dismissed from the program and they both refused to participate in the interview. There were five students who were still in the program. I used simple random sampling to pick one of them to be interviewed.

The total number of the graduates and students to be interviewed was 8 out of 67 (11.9%).

I called possible participants to make an appointment to semi-structured interview them. The interview took between 45 and 60 minutes for each person.

Additionally, based on the results from the survey questionnaires in stage 1, I mailed the Employers' Questionnaire to the graduates who were currently teaching English to seek their permission to invite their employers to respond to the questionnaire and to ask them to pass on the questionnaire to their employers. By 'graduate's employer' I mean the employer of the MATEFL graduate or his representative who works closely with the graduate and knows his work well. I relied entirely on students' judgment in this regard. The total number of the employers was 41. I got 10 questionnaires back (24.4%).

**Stage 3**

The MATEFL program documents were reviewed to find out its original plan and structure. It will be used as a basis to identify how the operation of the program had deviated from its original plan. In addition, the quality assurance documents were also reviewed to find out what had been done in regard to the MATEFL program.

## Instrument Development

In this section, I will describe the development of the data collection instruments. These instruments were (1) the Graduates'/Students' Questionnaire (See Appendix B), (2) the MATEFL Staff's Questionnaire (See Appendix C), (3) the Employers' Questionnaire (See Appendix D), and (4) the interview questions for the semi-structured interview (See Appendix E).

The Graduates'/Students' Questionnaire, the MATEFL Staff's Questionnaire, and Employers' Questionnaire were adapted from the questionnaire employed in a Diploma in Education Course Evaluation described in Owen, with Rogers (1999: 293-295). My questionnaires were primarily intended to collect data about whether the goals of the MATEFL program have been achieved and how well the MATEFL program met the expectation of stakeholders. Prior to this step, then, the real goals of the program needed to be determined and the translation of those goals into measures of outcomes was also required. To obtain the goals and intended outcomes of the program, firstly, I examined program documents and I found three written goals of the program which can be viewed in Chapter 1. To make sure that the written goals were the real goals and to find out the intended outcomes or the qualifications which were expected from the MATEFL graduates, I interviewed the program developers – The Director of the Language Institute of Thai University, Deputy Director for

Administrative Affairs, and the first Head of MATEFL program. In the interview, I asked them to clarify and explain the goals of the program and intended outcomes, and any hidden intentions behind these goals. Apart from the three explicit goals, thirty-one goals emerged in these discussions. After that, I listed the real goals and intended outcomes derived from the interview and had them confirmed as program goals by the program developers. Then I used the list of thirty-one goals in formulating the questionnaires.

The list of the thirty-one goals or intended outcomes of the Master's Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language; that is, the qualities or characteristics that should be possessed by the MATEFL graduates were examined and then classified according to the five standards of English teachers identified in Chapter 2:

1.  **Technical skills**

    The items associated with technical skills are shown in Table 3.3.

2.  **Pedagogical skills**

    The items associated with pedagogical skills are shown in Table 3.4.

3.  **Interpersonal skills**

    The items associated with interpersonal skills are shown in Table 3.5.

4.  **Personal qualities**

    The items associated with personal qualities are shown in Table 3.6.

5.  **Professionalism**

    The items associated with professionalism are shown in Table 3.7.

**TABLE 3.3     PROGRAM GOALS OR ASPECTS OF TEACHING EFL
                CLASSIFIED AS TECHNICAL SKILLS**

| Item | Aspect |
|------|--------|
| 01 | English proficiency |
| 04 | Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning |
| 13 | An ability to communicate regularly in class in English |
| 18 | An ability to be a good role model in using English in my teaching |

**TABLE 3.4     PROGRAM GOALS OR ASPECTS OF TEACHING EFL
                CLASSIFIED AS PEDAGOGICAL SKILLS**

| Item | Aspect |
|------|--------|
| 02 | Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories |
| 03 | Knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories |
| 05 | Knowledge of language testing and assessment |
| 06 | Knowledge of educational technology |
| 07 | An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning |
| 08 | An understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand |
| 12 | An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning |
| 14 | An ability to use a learner-centered approach in English language teaching |
| 15 | An ability to plan English language lessons |
| 16 | An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan |
| 17 | An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g., creating a comfortable atmosphere. utilizing class time well. etc) |
| 23 | An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material |
| 24 | An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material |
| 25 | An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively |
| 26 | An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students |
| 29 | An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English |
| 30 | An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must play |
| 31 | An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English |

**TABLE 3.5     PROGRAM GOALS OR ASPECTS OF TEACHING EFL
                CLASSIFIED AS INTERPERSONAL SKILLS**

| Item | Aspect |
|------|--------|
| 19 | An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background., levels of proficiency, etc. |
| 21 | Development of interpersonal skills |

**TABLE 3.6**      **PROGRAM GOALS OR ASPECTS OF TEACHING EFL CLASSIFIED AS PERSONAL QUALITIES**

| Item | Aspect |
|------|--------|
| 11 | Creativity in English language teaching and learning |
| 28 | High ethical standards of professional conduct |

**TABLE 3.7**      **PROGRAM GOALS OR ASPECTS OF TEACHING EFL CLASSIFIED AS PROFESSIONALISM**

| Item | Aspect |
|------|--------|
| 09 | Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning |
| 10 | An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning |
| 20 | An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English |
| 22 | An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English |
| 27 | A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession |

## Graduates'/students' questionnaire

The Graduates'/Students' Questionnaire was designed for the collection of data about students' current status and their employment – both before and after their graduation. It was also intended to find out the gaps between the program and workplace requirements in the graduates' perspectives. In this questionnaire, I asked the participants to rate the emphasis each aspect of teaching English was given in their MATEFL program and to rate each aspect of teaching English according to its importance to their current positions as English teachers. In addition, I asked the participants to comment on the strengths and weaknesses as well as to give suggestions about the program. At the end, I asked the participants to indicate their levels of satisfaction with the program on the whole. The Graduates'/Students' Questionnaire can be viewed in Appendix B.

## MATEFL staff's questionnaire

The MATEFL Staff's Questionnaire was designed to collect data about the staff's status in relation to the MATEFL program during the time the first

three cohorts were in the program. I would like to find out whether they were program developers, administrators, full-time instructors, part-time instructors, Thais or native speakers of English. This questionnaire was intended to find out the gaps between the program and workplace requirements in the MATEFL staff's perspectives. I asked them to rate the emphasis each aspect of teaching English was given in the MATEFL program and to rate each aspect according to its importance to English teachers. In addition, I asked the participants to comment on the strengths and weaknesses as well as to give suggestions about the program. At the end, I asked the participants to indicate their overall level of satisfaction with the program. The MATEFL Staff's Questionnaire can be viewed in Appendix C.

## Employers' questionnaire

In the Employers' Questionnaire, I asked the participants to identify their positions in their institution with respect to whether they were Dean, Director, school principal, Head of English Department, English teacher, or others. I also asked them to specify their institutions and the duration they had been the graduates' employers. This questionnaire was intended to find out how well the MATEFL graduate meets workplace requirements in employers' perspectives. I asked the participants to rate how much they expect of an MATEFL graduate in relation to each aspect and rate the extent to which their subordinates as MATEFL graduates currently display each aspect. In addition, I asked the participants to comment on the strengths and weaknesses as well as to give suggestions about the program. At the end, I asked the participants to indicate their levels of satisfaction with the program on the whole. The Employers' Questionnaire can be viewed in Appendix D.

Each questionnaire was examined by experts who were my colleagues and acquaintances to ensure the validity and clarity of the content. I carried out trials of each questionnaire before they were used to collect data, using volunteers who had similar background to the participants. I asked those volunteers to complete the questionnaire and provide me with feedback

on each item and the thinking associated with their responses. The trial of the Graduates'/Students' Questionnaire was conducted with four graduates from other masters program in teaching English. The trial of the MATEFL Staff's Questionnaire was conducted with two program administrators and two instructors (a Thai and a native speaker) from another similar graduate program. The trial of the Employers' Questionnaire was conducted with two employers from educational institutions – one from a public university and the other from a private university. Then I made changes to those questionnaires according to their suggestions.

There were two interesting outcomes from these trials. First, many people representing each of these groups to be surveyed – one graduate, one administrator, and two instructors – suggested that I should translate every questionnaire into Thai, so that participants could understand the items better and in the same way. Therefore, I followed their suggestions by translating the questionnaires into Thai and had them checked by two Thai experts who were English instructors in a university level. Second, some people commented that the questionnaires were too long and suggested that I should contact participants in person to ask them to be patient and really pay attention while they were completing the questionnaire.

A development flow chart for the development of the Graduates'/ Students' Questionnaire, MATEFL Staff's Questionnaire, and Employers' Questionnaire is contained in Figure 3.1.

The semi-structured interview questions were developed after analysis of the questionnaires. From the results of the Graduates'/Students' Questionnaire, the MATEFL Staff's Questionnaire, and the Employers' Questionnaire, I identified the items where the mismatches between the goals and outcomes occurred. For the Graduates'/Students' Questionnaire, this means the mismatches between the emphasis each aspect of teaching English was given in the MATEFL program and the importance of each aspect to graduates' present positions as English teachers. For the MATEFL Staff's

**FIGURE 3.1     QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT FLOW CHART**

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│   ┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐   │
│   │ Study the questionnaire employed in a Diploma in Education    │   │
│   │   Course Evaluation described in Owen, with Rogers (1999:      │   │
│   │                        293-295)                               │   │
│   └─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘   │
│                                │                                     │
│   ┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐   │
│   │ Obtain the program goals from program document and from       │   │
│   │ interview of establishers to find out any hidden goals and    │   │
│   │                    intended outcomes                          │   │
│   └─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘   │
│                                │                                     │
│        ┌──────────────────────────────────────────────────┐         │
│        │         List the real goals and intended outcomes │         │
│        └──────────────────────────────────────────────────┘         │
│                                │                                     │
│     ┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐         │
│     │ Have those goals and intended outcomes checked by     │         │
│     │                    developers                         │         │
│     └─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘         │
│                                │                                     │
│              ┌──────────────────────────────┐                       │
│              │     Write questionnaires      │                       │
│              └──────────────────────────────┘                       │
│                                │                                     │
│        ┌──────────────────────────────────────────┐                 │
│        │  Have questionnaires checked by experts   │                 │
│        └──────────────────────────────────────────┘                 │
│                                │                                     │
│   ┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐           │
│   │ Adjust questionnaires according to comments and       │           │
│   │                suggestions                            │           │
│   └─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘           │
│                                │                                     │
│                  ┌──────────────────────┐                           │
│                  │        Trials        │                           │
│                  └──────────────────────┘                           │
│                                │                                     │
│   ┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐           │
│   │ Adjust questionnaires according to comments and       │           │
│   │                suggestions                            │           │
│   └─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘           │
│                                │                                     │
│        ┌──────────────────────────────────────────┐                 │
│        │  Write the final drafts of the questionnaires │             │
│        └──────────────────────────────────────────┘                 │
│                                                                     │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

Questionnaire, this means the mismatches between the emphasis each aspect of teaching English was given in the MATEFL program and the importance of each aspect to English teachers. Next I asked the participants – representative graduates and MATEFL staff – to give their perspectives on why it happened that way and on the ways of overcoming the mismatches. For the items that the goals and the outcomes were closely related to each

other, I also asked the participants to explain more about their responses. The semi-structured interview questions can be viewed in Appendix E.

## Data Analysis

I analysed the demographic data (e.g. students' current status in regard to the program, their employment before and after their graduation from the MATEFL program, instructors' status in regard to the program, employers' positions in their institutions, and the duration they have been graduates' employers) using cluster analysis and percentage to identify the groups represented in the survey. The results were tabulated and summarized.

For the data from the rating scale questionnaires, I used EXCEL to determine mean and standard deviation for each item. The results helped me identify the gaps between the program and workplace requirements in the items and the spread of the participant's opinion towards each item. The results were tabulated and summarized. The items with the greatest gaps were explored further by interviewing selected participants.

For the data from open-ended questions in both questionnaires, I used the model provided by Dey (1993) in data analysis. After the data was obtained, the steps taken were finding a focus, managing data, reading and annotating, creating categories, assigning categories, splitting and splicing, linking data, connecting categories by associating and linking and using maps and matrices, corroborating evidence, and producing an account.

For the data from the interview, I transcribed it and did the content analysis using Dey's model as mentioned above. Following the grid developed by Hurworth (1996), I created my own grid where questions and categories assigned earlier – the achievement of goal 1, the achievement of goal 2, the achievement of goal 3, program's strengths, and program's weaknesses – categories that emerged were placed along the top and respondents or participants were listed along the side and filled it in. The findings then were summarized.

In this chapter I have outlined the research methodologies for this study. I used both quantitative and qualitative methods employing questionnaires and semi-structured interviews to collect data from the MATEFL program stakeholders – graduates/students, staff, and graduates' employers. The methodologies employed in this study will assist in the undertaking an Impact Evaluation that will provide a guideline for the improvement of the MATEFL program. In addition, it will provide a valuable insight for conducting future evaluation.

# CHAPTER 4

# Findings

## Introduction

This impact evaluation of the MATEFL program operating at Thai University was conducted using three techniques as follows:

1. **Questionnaires**

   The questionnaires were employed to collect data on status and different views of the program's stakeholders — staff, graduates/students, and employers of graduates — on different program elements and aspects of teaching English.

2. **Interview**

   The interviews were conducted to further explore the opinions on the program elements and aspects of teaching English that generate different opinions among stakeholders.

3. **Document review**

   The program documents related to the impact of the MATEFL program were reviewed.

This chapter presents the findings from the questionnaires, interviews and documents, respectively.

# Findings from Questionnaires

The following are the findings from the Graduates'/Students' Questionnaire, the Staff's Questionnaire and the Employers' Questionnaire.

## Stakeholders' demographic data

Presented here are demographic data of the MATEFL program stakeholders, namely (1) the MATEFL staff, (2) the graduates and students, and (3) the graduates' employers. The data regarding the staff include status, and roles and responsibilities. The data concerning the graduates and students include current status, employment status before and after their studies in the program, change in employment, range of levels of graduate teaching, and institutional level of graduate teaching. The data about graduates' employers include institutional level of employers, position of employers, and supervision experience of employers.

## Demographic data of the MATEFL staff

Regarding the status of the MATEFL staff, over three-quarters were Thai nationals, one of whom refused to participate in this study. Just under one-fifth were native English speakers. The details are shown Table 4.1.

With regard to roles and responsibilities of MATEFL staff, just over half were involved solely in the teaching program; of the remainder, all but

TABLE 4.1     STATUS OF MATEFL STAFF

| Status | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Thai | 9 | 75 |
| English native speakers | 2 | 17 |
| Non-participant (Thai) | 1 | 8 |
| Total | 12 | 100 |

**TABLE 4.2      ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF MATEFL STAFF**

| Roles and Responsibilities | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Full-time instructors teaching in the program only | 3 | 27 |
| Part-time instructors teaching in the program only | 3 | 27 |
| Full-time instructor teaching in the program, program administrator and program establisher | 2 | 18 |
| Both full-time instructor and program establisher | 2 | 18 |
| Program administrator only | 1 | 9 |
| Program establisher only | 0 | 0 |
| Both full-time instructor and program administrator | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 11 | 100 |

one taught in the program and nearly half were involved in developing the program. No one had the roles and responsibility of full-time instructor and program administrator concurrently. The mix of respondents in terms of roles and responsibilities increased the facets of answers regarding the MATEFL program. The details are shown in Table 4.2.

**The demographic data of the graduates and students**

Of the survey questionnaires distributed to 100 graduates and students (1 person passed away, so he was not included in the study) in the first three cohorts of the MATEFL program, 67 questionnaires (67 %) were returned.

Regarding the status of the 67 MATEFL graduates and students who enrolled on the MATEFL program in the years 1998, 1999 and 2000:, they comprised the group to whom, in 2003, the questionnaires were administered. The vast majority of respondents had, at this time, graduated from the program. Only a few had not graduated or had been dismissed or retired from the program. The details are shown in Table 4.3.

Of the two students who had left from the program, one retired because of unsatisfactory grades and the other because of financial problems.

**TABLE 4.3        CURRENT STATUS OF GRADUATES AND STUDENTS.**

| Status | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| **Graduated from the program** | 60 | 90 |
| **Have not graduated yet** | 5 | 7 |
| **Dismissed or retired from the program** | 2 | 3 |
| **Dropped out** | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | 67 | 100 |

Of the five students who had not graduated, two were delayed because they changed their study plan from Plan A ─ which the students were required to complete a master's thesis ─ to Plan B, in which students took more courses, did independent study and took comprehensive examination, rather than completing a thesis. Two of them were waiting to retake the comprehensive examination which they had failed the first time. One student was completing an independent study which was supposed to be finished in the previous semester.

Concerning the employment status of the MATEFL graduates prior to starting their studies in the program (60 persons out of 67), just over half were employed in jobs other than teaching. 24 were English teachers, and three persons were unemployed. The vast majority were gainfully employed. The details can be seen in Table 4.4.

These employment details show that many people in other fields were interested to learn or to be trained to be English teachers and many English

**TABLE 4.4        THE EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE GRADUATES BEFORE THEY STARTED THEIR STUDIES IN THE MATEFL PROGRAM.**

| Status | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| **Doing other jobs** | 33 | 55 |
| **Teaching English** | 24 | 40 |
| **Unemployed/not working** | 3 | 5 |
| **Total** | 60 | 100 |

teachers were interested to develop and improve themselves academically and professionally by attending a higher level program, i.e., a master's program. The students who were unemployed provided the reasons for being unemployed. They had just finished their undergraduate study and the graduate degree that they expected to obtain might benefit them in finding a prestigious job in the future. The vast majority were studying part-time.

With regard to the employment status of the MATEFL graduates after they completed the program (60 persons out of 67), just over two-thirds were English teachers; 19 persons were working in jobs other than teaching English. No one was unemployed. The details are shown in Table 4.5. The three graduates who were unemployed before they started studying in the program had obtained employment by the end of the course – although it was unclear whether or not they were teaching English. It is likely that the program benefited them to some extent in helping them to get jobs.

**TABLE 4.5      EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF MATEFL GRADUATES ON COMPLETION**

| Status | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| **Teaching English** | **41** | **68** |
| **Doing other jobs than teaching English** | **19** | **31** |
| **Unemployed** | **0** | **0** |
| **Total** | **60** | **100** |

Regarding the change in the graduates' employment, 17 persons (just over half) of those who were previously not teaching English changed their jobs to be English teachers. The remaining 16 persons were employed in jobs other than teaching English. The details are shown in Table 4.6.

**TABLE 4.6**      **THE CHANGE IN THE GRADUATES' EMPLOYMENT AFTER GRADUATING FROM THE MATEFL PROGRAM**

| Status | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Changed their jobs to be English teachers | 17 | 52 |
| Still doing other jobs than teaching English | 16 | 48 |
| Total | 33 | 100 |

Among the graduates who were still employed but who had not become English teachers, a number of them indicated that they would like to become English teachers one day, but that they could not at the time because the teaching job did not earn them as much money as their current jobs could. For this group, economic issues dictated their career option.

With respect to the range of levels in which graduates were teaching, the vast majority were teaching in one level, only. Seven, out of 41, were teaching in more than one level. The details are shown in Table 4.7. Of the 41 graduates who were English teachers, well over half were teaching in universities, with a small number teaching in schools; no graduates were teaching in the lower secondary or lower vocational certificate levels. The details are shown in Table 4.8. Seven persons were teaching in more than one level; there was a striking range of a mix of levels, although all had some link with teaching English at university level. The master's degree from the MATEFL program qualified graduates to teach in universities. The details are shown in Table 4.9.

**TABLE 4.7**      **RANGE OF LEVELS OF GRADUATE TEACHING**

| Level | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Teaching in one level | 34 | 82.9 |
| Teaching in more than one level: | 7 | 17.1 |
| Total | 41 | 100 |

**TABLE 4.8    INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL OF GRADUATE TEACHING (TEACHING IN ONE LEVEL, ONLY)**

| Level | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| University | 24 | 59 |
| Upper secondary | 4 | 10 |
| Primary level | 2 | 5 |
| Others | 2 | 5 |
| Kindergarten | 1 | 2 |
| Higher Vocational certificate | 1 | 2 |
| Lower vocational certificate | 0 | 0 |
| Lower secondary | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 34 | 83 |

**TABLE 4.9    INSTITUTIONAL LEVELS OF GRADUATE TEACHING (TEACHING IN MORE THAN ONE LEVEL)**

| Level | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| kindergarten + primary + lower + upper secondary + university levels | 2 | 5 |
| upper secondary + university levels | 2 | 5 |
| primary + lower + upper secondary + university levels | 1 | 2 |
| lower + upper secondary + university levels | 1 | 2 |
| higher vocational certificate + university levels | 1 | 2 |
| Total | 7 | 17 |

**The demographic data of the graduates' employers**

Based on the results from the Graduate Questionnaire, I mailed the Employers' Questionnaire to 41 graduates who were currently teaching English. I sought the permission of each to invite their employers to respond

to the questionnaire; if they agreed, I asked them to pass on the questionnaire to their employers. I relied entirely on graduates' judgment in this regard. The total number of the employers receiving the questionnaires from the graduates was unknown to me; I received ten responses from employers.

Seeking opinions from graduates' employer – a significant stakeholder in the program customer – was one of the greatest challenges that I faced in this evaluation. Taking the ethical issue of not forcing the graduates to take an action against their wishes into account, I relied on the graduates' judgment on whether or not to pass on the questionnaire to their employers, knowing that this action was likely to result in low rate of response. The evaluation of the MATEFL program was faced with this irresolvable hurdle.

Concerning the individual level of graduates' employers, most were working for universities, as shown in Table 4.10. This suggests that graduates who had been appointed as university staff were more likely than others to feel sufficiently confident to approach their employer to seek their opinion. It might also be that they placed a higher value on the findings of the evaluation.

With respect to the position of the graduates' employers as shown in Table 4.11, most of them were Heads of the Department in which the MATEFL graduates were working for. This indicates that most of the

**TABLE 4.10    INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL OF EMPLOYERS**

| Level | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| University | 7 | 70 |
| Primary | 1 | 10 |
| Secondary | 1 | 10 |
| Others | 1 | 10 |
| Total | 10 | 100 |

**TABLE 4.11     POSITION OF EMPLOYERS**

| Position | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Head of Department | 5 | 50 |
| Dean | 2 | 20 |
| Assistant to Director/Principal | 2 | 20 |
| Director of Language Institute | 1 | 10 |
| Total | 10 | 100 |

graduates decided to be evaluated by a person or a supervisor who was closest to them in the hierarchy. The graduates' employers had supervised the graduates' work, for an average of almost 3 years. These data are shown in Table 4.12. This length of time should be sufficient for employers to get to know their employees, and thus be able to make a reliable appraisal on how their subordinates work.

## Stakeholders' Opinions

The stakeholders of the MATEFL program, namely staff, graduates/students, and graduates' employers responded to the questionnaires which contained 31 items in respect to aspects of teaching English. The 31 items, the qualities and characteristics that should be possessed by the MATEFL graduates, were categorized into five groups according to the standards for teachers of English as a foreign language as identified in Chapters 2 and 3. The results are shown in Table 4.13.

**TABLE 4.12     SUPERVISION EXPERIENCE**

| Maximum (years) | Minimum (years) | Average (years) |
|---|---|---|
| 9.3 | 0.5 | 2.95 |

**TABLE 4.13   CLASSIFICATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS BY SKILL CATEGORY**

| Skill Category | Questionnaire Item |
|---|---|
| **Technical skills (TEC)**<br><br>which include the theoretical knowledge and skills of the English language, e.g., phonology, vocabulary, morphology, syntax; the knowledge of language acquisition and development; an awareness of culture and the knowledge of its nature and role; and the ability to use the language. | 01. English proficiency |
| | 04. Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning |
| | 13. An ability to communicate regularly in class in English |
| | 18. An ability to be a good role model in using English in teaching |
| **Pedagogical skills (PED)**<br><br>which include the knowledge and skills of pedagogical methods, e.g., planning and implementing lessons, managing classes, using resources effectively, problem solving, an awareness of students' needs, organizing conducive classroom atmosphere, and assessment. | 02. Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories |
| | 03. Knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories |
| | 05. Knowledge of language testing and assessment |
| | 06. Knowledge of educational technology |
| | 07. An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning |
| | 08. An understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand |
| | 12. An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning |
| | 14. An ability to use a learner-centered approach in English language teaching |
| | 15. An ability to plan English language lessons |
| | 16. An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan |
| | 17. An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g., creating a comfortable atmosphere. utilizing class time well. etc) |
| | 23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material |
| | 24. An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material |
| | 25. An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively |
| | 26. An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students |
| | 29. An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English |
| | 30. An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must play |
| | 31. An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English |

| Skill Category | Questionnaire Item |
|---|---|
| **Interpersonal skills (INT)**<br><br>which include an awareness and acceptance of learners' differences, e.g., in opinions, cultures, and abilities; other personalities, e.g., enthusiasm, fun, warmth, sense of humour, friendliness, etc. | 19. An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background., levels of proficiency, etc. |
| | 21. Development of interpersonal skills |
| **Personal qualities (PER)**<br><br>which include being well-organized, reliable, flexible, creative; and having morals and adhering to the code of ethics and principles of professional conduct of teachers. | 11. Creativity in English language teaching and learning |
| | 28. High ethical standards of professional conduct |
| **Professionalism (PRO)**<br><br>which includes engaging in professional development which helps strengthen competence in linguistics, culture, reflection; engaging in life-long learning; being aware of the value of foreign language learning; and having positive attitudes towards the profession. | 09. Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning |
| | 10. An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning |
| | 20. Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories |
| | 22. An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English |
| | 27. A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession |

### Ratings of the *emphasis* of each aspect of teaching English in the MATEFL program

To make the analysis of these results clearer, the responses of the staff and the graduates/students will be treated separately.

#### *Staff responses*

The MATEFL staff were asked to rate the emphasis that each of the 31 aspects of teaching English was given in the MATEFL program. The results, shown in Table 4.15, were categorized using the criteria contained in Table 4.14.

**TABLE 4.14     CRITERIA FOR CATEGORIZING LEVEL OF EMPHASIS**

| Mean | Judgment |
|---|---|
| **3.40 and above** | **High emphasis** |
| **From 3.01 to 3.39** | **Medium emphasis** |
| **3.00 and below** | **Low emphasis** |

**TABLE 4.15   STAFF: EMPHASIS OF EACH ASPECT OF TEACHING ENGLISH
IN THE MATEFL PROGRAM**

| Rank | Aspects | Mean | SD |
|:---:|---|:---:|:---:|
| 1 | 01.  English proficiency | 3.60 | 0.52 |
| 2 | 24.  An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.50 | 0.53 |
| 3 | 03.  Knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories | 3.50 | 0.71 |
| 4 | 15.  An ability to plan English language lessons | 3.50 | 0.71 |
| 5 | 25.  An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively | 3.50 | 0.71 |
| 6 | 05.   Knowledge of language testing and assessment | 3.45 | 0.69 |
| 7 | 23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.40 | 0.52 |
| 8 | 18.  An ability to be a good role model in using English in teaching | 3.40 | 0.70 |
| 9 | 13.  An ability to communicate regularly in class in English | 3.40 | 1.08 |
| 10 | 29.  An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English | 3.30 | 0.82 |
| 11 | 11.  Creativity in English language teaching and learning | 3.22 | 0.67 |
| 12 | 04.   Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning | 3.20 | 0.63 |
| 13 | 16.  An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan | 3.20 | 0.63 |
| 14 | 30.  An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must play | 3.20 | 0.79 |
| 15 | 20.  An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English | 3.20 | 0.92 |
| 16 | 27.  A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession | 3.20 | 0.92 |
| 17 | 26.  An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students | 3.20 | 0.93 |
| 18 | 22.  An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English | 3.20 | 1.03 |
| 19 | 10.  An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning | 3.18 | 0.75 |
| 20 | 02.  Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories | 3.10 | 0.57 |
| 21 | 17.  An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g., creating a comfortable atmosphere. utilizing class time well. etc) | 3.10 | 0.74 |
| 22 | 12.  An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning | 3.10 | 0.99 |
| 23 | 09.  Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning | 3.09 | 0.83 |
| 24 | 14.  An ability to use a learner-centered approach in English language teaching | 3.00 | 0.67 |
| 25 | 06.  Knowledge of educational technology | 2.91 | 0.54 |
| 26 | 19.  An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background. levels of proficiency, etc. | 2.80 | 0.63 |
| 27 | 21.  Development of interpersonal skills | 2.80 | 0.92 |
| 28 | 07.  An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning | 2.70 | 0.48 |

| Rank | Aspects | Mean | SD |
|------|---------|------|-----|
| 29 | 31.  An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English | 2.70 | 0.82 |
| 30 | 28.  High ethical standards of professional conduct | 2.70 | 1.16 |
| 31 | 08.  An understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand | 2.40 | 1.17 |

The aspect of teaching English which the MATEFL staff think was most highly emphasized in the MATEFL program was English proficiency which is in the technical skill group (TEC). Another two aspects in the same group, namely an ability to communicate regularly in class in English and an ability to be a good role model in using English in teaching were also thought of as highly emphasized aspects. Other aspects which were highly emphasized in staff's opinions were mostly the aspects in pedagogical skill group (PED), especially the ones concerned with an ability to select, create, and use teaching/learning aids and materials.

The aspect of teaching English with lowest emphasis was an understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand which is in the pedagogical skill group. Another aspect which had low emphasis was concerned with professional ethics which is categorized as the personal quality (PER). Other aspects with low emphasis were in the category of pedagogical skill, i.e., the knowledge and application of educational technology and the ability to use the learner-centered approach and in the category of interpersonal skill (INT).

In summary, the MATEFL staff responses indicated that they thought the program placed highest emphasis on technical skill aspects (TEC), moderate emphasis on professionalism (PRO) and lowest emphasis on interpersonal skills (INT) and half of the personal quality aspects (PER).

### Graduates'/students' responses

The graduates/students were asked to rate the emphasis each of the 31 aspects of teaching English was given in the MATEFL program. The results,

shown in Table 4.16 were categorized using the criteria shown in Table 4.14 – the same as for the teacher responses.

**TABLE 4.16     GRADUATES/STUDENTS: EMPHASIS OF EACH ASPECT OF TEACHING ENGLISH IN THE MATEFL PROGRAM**

| Rank | Aspects | Mean | SD |
|:---:|:---|:---:|:---:|
| 1 | 03.   Knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories | 3.72 | 0.45 |
| 2 | 13.   An ability to communicate regularly in class in English | 3.70 | 0.51 |
| 3 | 17.   An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g., creating a comfortable atmosphere. utilizing class time well. etc) | 3.60 | 0.54 |
| 4 | 15.   An ability to plan English language lessons | 3.56 | 0.63 |
| 5 | 18.   An ability to be a good role model in using English in teaching | 3.56 | 0.63 |
| 6 | 26.   An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students | 3.53 | 0.59 |
| 7 | 02.   Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories | 3.51 | 0.67 |
| 8 | 16.   An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan | 3.44 | 0.80 |
| 9 | 30.   An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must play | 3.42 | 0.67 |
| 10 | 14.   An ability to use a learner-centered approach in English language teaching | 3.40 | 0.82 |
| 11 | 29.   An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English | 3.35 | 0.69 |
| 12 | 27.   A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession | 3.33 | 0.78 |
| 13 | 11.   Creativity in English language teaching and learning | 3.33 | 0.84 |
| 14 | 25.   An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively | 3.28 | 0.85 |
| 15 | 22.   An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English | 3.23 | 0.75 |
| 16 | 24.   An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.23 | 0.87 |
| 17 | 23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.21 | 0.83 |
| 18 | 01.   English proficiency | 3.21 | 0.91 |
| 19 | 04.    Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning | 3.19 | 0.79 |
| 20 | 20.   An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English | 3.14 | 0.83 |
| 21 | 12.   An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning | 3.07 | 0.88 |
| 22 | 05.    Knowledge of language testing and assessment | 3.05 | 0.65 |
| 23 | 19.   An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background. levels of proficiency, etc. | 3.02 | 0.89 |
| 24 | 21.   Development of interpersonal skills | 3.00 | 0.85 |
| 25 | 31.   An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English | 2.95 | 0.79 |
| 26 | 28.   High ethical standards of professional conduct | 2.70 | 0.99 |

| Rank | Aspects | Mean | SD |
|------|---------|------|----|
| 27 | 09. **Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning** | 2.67 | 0.84 |
| 28 | 07. **An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning** | 2.63 | 0.76 |
| 29 | 10. **An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning** | 2.56 | 0.93 |
| 30 | 06. **Knowledge of educational technology** | 2.53 | 0.67 |
| 31 | 08. **An understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand** | 2.19 | 0.93 |

The aspect which was thought as highest emphasis was knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories which is in the pedagogical skill group (PED). As with the MATEFL staff, the aspects of teaching English that the MATEFL graduates/students think were highly emphasized in the MATEFL program were concerned with language proficiency which are classified as technical skills (TEC).

As with the MATEFL staff, the aspect of teaching English with lowest emphasis in graduates/student's opinion was an understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand. Two aspects in the pedagogical skill group (PED), namely the knowledge and application of technology, and one aspect in the personal quality group (PER), namely professional ethics, were also regarded by graduates/students as low emphasized aspects, just as by the staff. Two aspects in the professionalism group (PRO) − knowledge and application of research − were given low emphasis

To summarize, the MATEFL graduates/students responses indicated that they thought the program placed highest emphasis on technical skill aspects (TEC), moderate emphasis on professionalism (PRO) and interpersonal skill group (INT), and lowest emphasis on personal quality aspects (PER).

### Comparison between staff rating of emphasis and graduates/students' rating of emphasis

The staff and the graduates/students involved in the program placed a different emphasis on various aspects of teaching English in the MATEFL program. The results, shown in Table 4.18, were categorized using the criteria in Table 4.17.

**TABLE 4.17     CRITERIA FOR CATEGORIZING THE DIFFERENCE IN EMPHASIS**

| For Graduates/Students | For Staff | Judgment |
|---|---|---|
| 0.30 and above | - 0.30 and below | High difference |
| From 0.10 to 0.29 | From - 0.10 to - 0.29 | Medium difference |
| From 0.01 to 0.09 | From - 0.01 to - 0.09 | Low difference |

**TABLE 4.18     DIFFERENCE IN EMPHASIS BETWEEN GRADUATES/STUDENTS AND STAFF IN EACH ASPECT OF TEACHING ENGLISH IN THE MATEFL PROGRAM**

| Rank | Aspects | Students | Staff | Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 17. An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g., creating a comfortable atmosphere, utilizing class time well) | 3.60 | 3.10 | 0.50 |
| 2 | 02. Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories | 3.51 | 3.10 | 0.41 |
| 3 | 14. An ability to use a learner-centered approach in English language teaching | 3.40 | 3.00 | 0.40 |
| 4 | 26. An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students | 3.53 | 3.20 | 0.33 |
| 5 | 13. An ability to communicate regularly in class in English | 3.70 | 3.40 | 0.30 |
| 6 | 31. An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English | 2.95 | 2.70 | 0.25 |
| 7 | 16. An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan | 3.44 | 3.20 | 0.24 |
| 8 | 03. Knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories | 3.72 | 3.50 | 0.22 |

| Rank | Aspects | Students | Staff | Difference |
|------|---------|----------|-------|------------|
| 9 | 19. An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background, levels of proficiency, etc. | 3.02 | 2.80 | 0.22 |
| 10 | 30. An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must play | 3.42 | 3.20 | 0.22 |
| 11 | 21. Development of interpersonal skills | 3.00 | 2.80 | 0.20 |
| 12 | 18. An ability to be a good role model in using English in teaching | 3.56 | 3.40 | 0.16 |
| 13 | 27. A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession | 3.33 | 3.20 | 0.13 |
| 14 | 11. Creativity in English language teaching and learning | 3.33 | 3.22 | 0.11 |
| 15 | 15. An ability to plan English language lessons | 3.56 | 3.50 | 0.06 |
| 16 | 29. An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English | 3.35 | 3.30 | 0.05 |
| 17 | 22. An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English | 3.23 | 3.20 | 0.03 |
| 18 | 28. High ethical standards of professional conduct | 2.70 | 2.70 | 0.00 |
| 19 | 04. Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning | 3.19 | 3.20 | -0.01 |
| 20 | 12. An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning | 3.07 | 3.10 | -0.03 |
| 21 | 20. An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English | 3.14 | 3.20 | -0.06 |
| 22 | 07. An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning | 2.63 | 2.70 | -0.07 |
| 23 | 23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.21 | 3.40 | -0.19 |
| 24 | 08. An understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand | 2.19 | 2.40 | -0.21 |
| 25 | 25. An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively | 3.28 | 3.50 | -0.22 |
| 26 | 24. An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.23 | 3.50 | -0.27 |
| 27 | 06. Knowledge of educational technology | 2.53 | 2.91 | -0.38 |
| 28 | 01. English proficiency | 3.21 | 3.60 | -0.39 |
| 29 | 05. Knowledge of language testing and assessment | 3.05 | 3.45 | -0.40 |
| 30 | 09. Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning | 2.67 | 3.09 | -0.42 |
| 31 | 10. An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning | 2.56 | 3.18 | -0.62 |

The highest differences in emphasis noted between *graduates/students and staff* involved items 17 (PED), 2 (PED), 14 (PED), 26 (PED) and 13 (TEC). The predominant difference in emphasis thus relates to pedagogical skills, together with the technical skill of communicating in English. By comparison, at the other end of the scale the highest differences in emphasis noted between *staff and graduates/students* involved items 6 (PED), 1 (TEC), 5 (PED), 9 (PRO) and 10 (PRO). The predominant difference in emphasis thus relates to pedagogical skills of educational technology and language testing and assessment, and professionalism skills of knowledge and application of research, together with the technical skill of English proficiency.

The medium differences in emphasis noted between graduates/students and staff involved items 31 (PED), 16 (PED), 3 (PED), 19 (INT), 30 (PRO), 21 (INT), 18 (TEC), 27 (PRO), and 11 (PER). This difference relates to pedagogical skills and all interpersonal skills. By comparison, the medium differences in emphasis noted between staff and graduates/students involved items 23 (PED), 8 (PED), 25 (PED), and 24 (PED). All relate to pedagogical skills.

The low differences in emphasis noted between graduates/students and staff involved items 15 (PED), 29 (PED), and 22 (PRO). The predominant emphasis difference relates to pedagogical skills of lesson planning and an awareness of student problems, along with professionalism. By comparison, the low differences in emphasis noted between staff and graduates/students involved items 4 (TEC), 12 (PED), 20 (PRO), and 7(PED). The predominant emphasis difference relates to pedagogical skills of problem solving and application of technology.

Graduates/students and staff noted no difference in emphasis in item 28 (PER), which relates to ethical standards.

**Ratings of i*mportance* of each aspect of teaching English in the MATEFL program**

To make the analysis of these results clearer, the responses of the staff and the graduates/students will be treated separately.

*Staff responses*

The MATEFL staff were asked to rate the *importance* of each of the 31 aspects of teaching English addressed in the MATEFL program. The results, shown in Table 4.19, were categorized using the criteria contained in Table 4.20.

The aspects of teaching English that the MATEFL staff thought were most important in the MATEFL program were concerned with English proficiency which belongs to the technical skill group (TEC).

The aspects which the staff thought were highly important were in the category of pedagogical skills (PED). Two aspects were in the professionalism group (PRO): learning autonomously and positive attitudes towards the profession. Professional ethics which belongs to the personal quality group (PER) was also considered a highly important aspect.

The aspect that the staff thought were least important in the MATEFL program was an understanding of English education in Thailand. All aspects of interpersonal skill group (INT) were also considered as low important aspects.

In short, the MATEFL staff responses indicated that they thought that half of the aspects in the technical skill group (TEC), half of the aspects in the personal quality group (PER) and two-fifths of the aspects in the professionalism group (PRO) were highly important. Two-fifths of the aspects in the professionalism group (PRO) and half of the aspects in the technical skill group (TEC) had medium importance. All of the aspects in the interpersonal skill group (INT) were regarded as low important aspects.

**TABLE 4.19     CRITERIA FOR CATEGORIZING THE LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE**

| Mean | Judgment |
|------|----------|
| **3.80 and above** | **High importance** |
| **From 3.60 to 3.79** | **Medium importance** |
| **3.59 and below** | **Low importance** |

**TABLE 4.20     STAFF: IMPORTANCE OF EACH ASPECT OF TEACHING ENGLISH**

| Rank | Aspects | Mean | SD |
|------|---------|------|-----|
| 1 | 01. English proficiency | 4.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | 05. Knowledge of language testing and assessment | 3.91 | 0.30 |
| 3 | 13. An ability to communicate regularly in class in English | 3.90 | 0.32 |
| 4 | 20. An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English | 3.90 | 0.32 |
| 5 | 26. An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students | 3.90 | 0.32 |
| 6 | 27. A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession | 3.90 | 0.32 |
| 7 | 29. An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English | 3.90 | 0.32 |
| 8 | 12. An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning | 3.80 | 0.42 |
| 9 | 15. An ability to plan English language lessons | 3.80 | 0.42 |
| 10 | 25. An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively | 3.80 | 0.42 |
| 11 | 28. High ethical standards of professional conduct | 3.80 | 0.42 |
| 12 | 23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.70 | 0.48 |
| 13 | 24. An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.70 | 0.48 |
| 14 | 17. An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g., creating a comfortable atmosphere. utilizing class time well. etc) | 3.70 | 0.48 |
| 15 | 18. An ability to be a good role model in using English in my teaching | 3.70 | 0.48 |
| 16 | 22. An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English | 3.70 | 0.68 |
| 17 | 30. An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must play | 3.70 | 0.68 |
| 18 | 09. Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning | 3.64 | 0.51 |
| 19 | 10. An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning | 3.64 | 0.51 |
| 20 | 04. Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning | 3.60 | 0.52 |
| 21 | 14. An ability to use a learner-centered approach in English language teaching | 3.60 | 0.52 |
| 22 | 03. Knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories | 3.60 | 0.70 |

| Rank | Aspects | Mean | SD |
|------|---------|------|-----|
| 23 | **19. An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background. levels of proficiency, etc.** | **3.50** | **0.53** |
| 24 | **16. An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan** | **3.50** | **0.71** |
| 25 | **11. Creativity in English language teaching and learning** | **3.50** | **0.71** |
| 26 | **31. An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English** | **3.50** | **0.71** |
| 27 | **21. Development of interpersonal skills** | **3.30** | **0.68** |
| 28 | **06. Knowledge of educational technology** | **3.27** | **0.65** |
| 29 | **02. Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories** | **3.20** | **0.79** |
| 30 | **07. An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning** | **3.00** | **0.63** |
| 31 | **08. An understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand** | **3.00** | **0.82** |

### *Graduates/students' responses*

The graduates/students were asked to rate the importance of each of the 31 aspects of teaching English addressed in the MATEFL program. The results, shown in Table 4.22, were categorized using the criteria shown in Table 4.21. The majority of the aspects of teaching English that the MATEFL graduates/students thought were highly important in the MATEFL program were in the categories of pedagogical skills (PED) and technical skills (TEC). There was a single aspect that was concerned with ethical standards which belongs to the personal quality group (PER).

The aspects with low importance were mostly concerned with pedagogical skills (PED). Two aspects in the professionalism category (PRO) were also regarded as low important aspects; these were concerned with research knowledge, and application.

In short, the graduates/students thought that half of the aspects in the technical skill group (TEC) and half of the aspects in the personal quality group (PER) were highly important. Three-fifths of the aspects in the professionalism group (PRO), half of the aspects in the interpersonal skill group (INT) and personal quality group (PER) had medium importance.

Two-fifths of the aspects in the professionalism group (PRO) and half of the
aspects in the interpersonal skill (INT) group had low importance.

**TABLE 4.21     GRADUATES/STUDENTS: CRITERIA FOR CATEGORIZING THE
               LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE**

| Mean | Meaning |
|------|---------|
| 3.75 and above | High importance |
| From 3.50 to 3.74 | Medium importance |
| 3.49 and below | Low importance |

**TABLE 4.22     GRADUATES/STUDENTS: IMPORTANCE OF EACH ASPECT OF
               TEACHING ENGLISH**

| Rank | Aspects | Mean | SD |
|------|---------|------|-----|
| 1 | 26. An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students | 3.91 | 0.37 |
| 2 | 17. An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g., creating a comfortable atmosphere. utilizing class time well. etc) | 3.86 | 0.35 |
| 3 | 18. An ability to be a good role model in using English in my teaching | 3.86 | 0.41 |
| 4 | 14. An ability to use a learner-centered approach in English language teaching | 3.81 | 0.45 |
| 5 | 01. English proficiency | 3.79 | 0.47 |
| 6 | 30. An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must play | 3.79 | 0.47 |
| 7 | 12. An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning | 3.77 | 0.48 |
| 8 | 15. An ability to plan English language lessons | 3.77 | 0.48 |
| 9 | 28. High ethical standards of professional conduct | 3.77 | 0.57 |
| 10 | 29. An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English | 3.72 | 0.50 |
| 11 | 27. A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession | 3.72 | 0.55 |
| 12 | 11. Creativity in English language teaching and learning | 3.70 | 0.60 |
| 13 | 22. An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English | 3.70 | 0.64 |
| 14 | 24. An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.67 | 0.57 |
| 15 | 25. An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively | 3.65 | 0.61 |
| 16 | 19. An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background. levels of proficiency, etc. | 3.63 | 0.62 |
| 17 | 20. An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English | 3.60 | 0.58 |

| Rank | Aspects | Mean | SD |
|------|---------|------|-----|
| 18 | **23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material** | **3.60** | **0.66** |
| 19 | **05.   Knowledge of language testing and assessment** | **3.58** | **0.59** |
| 20 | **13. An ability to communicate regularly in class in English** | **3.58** | **0.66** |
| 21 | **03. Knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories** | **3.56** | **0.59** |
| 22 | **16. An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan** | **3.53** | **0.77** |
| 23 | **02. Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories** | **3.47** | **0.63** |
| 24 | **21. Development of interpersonal skills** | **3.47** | **0.77** |
| 25 | **10. An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning** | **3.42** | **0.70** |
| 26 | **31. An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English** | **3.42** | **0.73** |
| 27 | **07. An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning** | **3.35** | **0.75** |
| 28 | **06.   Knowledge of educational technology** | **3.30** | **0.79** |
| 29 | **04.   Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning** | **3.21** | **0.74** |
| 30 | **09. Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning** | **3.21** | **0.78** |
| 31 | **08. An understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand** | **2.88** | **0.91** |

### *Comparison between staff rating of importance and graduates/students' rating of importance*

The staff and the graduates/students involved in the program placed different *importance* on various aspects of teaching English in the MATEFL program. The results, shown in Table 4.24, were categorized using the criteria in Table 4.23.

**TABLE 4.23     CRITERIA FOR CATEGORIZING THE DIFFERENCE IN IMPORTANCE IN EACH ASPECT OF TEACHING ENGLISH.**

| For Graduates/Students | For Staff | Judgment |
|------------------------|-----------|----------|
| 0.20 and above | - 0.20 and below | High difference |
| From 0.10 to 0.19 | From - 0.10 to - 0.19 | Medium difference |
| From 0.01 to 0.09 | From - 0.01 to - 0.09 | Low difference |

**TABLE 4.24    DIFFERENCE IN IMPORTANCE BETWEEN GRADUATES/STUDENTS AND STAFF IN IMPORTANCE OF EACH ASPECT OF TEACHING ENGLISH IN THE MATEFL PROGRAM**

| Rank | Aspects | Students | Staff | Difference |
|:---:|:---|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| 1 | 07. An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning | 3.35 | 3.00 | 0.35 |
| 2 | 02. Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories | 3.47 | 3.20 | 0.27 |
| 3 | 14. An ability to use a learner-centered approach in English language teaching | 3.81 | 3.60 | 0.21 |
| 4 | 11. Creativity in English language teaching and learning | 3.70 | 3.50 | 0.20 |
| 5 | 21. Development of interpersonal skills | 3.47 | 3.30 | 0.17 |
| 6 | 17. An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g., creating a comfortable atmosphere, utilizing class time well, etc) | 3.86 | 3.70 | 0.16 |
| 7 | 18. An ability to be a good role model in using English in my teaching | 3.86 | 3.70 | 0.16 |
| 8 | 19. An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background levels of proficiency, etc. | 3.63 | 3.50 | 0.13 |
| 9 | 30. An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must lay | 3.79 | 3.70 | 0.09 |
| 10 | 06. Knowledge of educational technology | 3.30 | 3.27 | 0.03 |
| 11 | 16. An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan | 3.53 | 3.50 | 0.03 |
| 12 | 26. An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students | 3.91 | 3.90 | 0.01 |
| 13 | 22. An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English | 3.70 | 3.70 | 0.00 |
| 14 | 12. An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning | 3.77 | 3.80 | -0.03 |
| 15 | 15. An ability to plan English language lessons | 3.77 | 3.80 | -0.03 |
| 16 | 28. High ethical standards of professional conduct | 3.77 | 3.80 | -0.03 |
| 17 | 24. An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.67 | 3.70 | -0.03 |
| 18 | 03. Knowledge of specific English learning/ teaching theories | 3.56 | 3.60 | -0.04 |
| 19 | 31. An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English | 3.42 | 3.50 | -0.08 |
| 20 | 23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.60 | 3.70 | -0.10 |

| Rank | Aspects | Students | Staff | Difference |
|------|---------|----------|-------|------------|
| 21 | 08. An understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand | 2.88 | 3.00 | -0.12 |
| 22 | 25. An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively | 3.65 | 3.80 | -0.15 |
| 23 | 27. A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession | 3.72 | 3.90 | -0.18 |
| 24 | 29. An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English | 3.72 | 3.90 | -0.18 |
| 25 | 01. English proficiency | 3.79 | 4.00 | -0.21 |
| 26 | 10. An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning | 3.42 | 3.64 | -0.22 |
| 27 | 20. An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English | 3.60 | 3.90 | -0.30 |
| 28 | 13. An ability to communicate regularly in class in English | 3.58 | 3.90 | -0.32 |
| 29 | 05. Knowledge of language testing and assessment | 3.58 | 3.91 | -0.33 |
| 30 | 04. Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning | 3.21 | 3.60 | -0.39 |
| 31 | 09. Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning | 3.21 | 3.64 | -0.43 |

The highest differences in importance noted between graduates/students and staff involved items 7 (PED), 2 (PED), 14 (PED), and 11 (PER). These differences relate to pedagogical skills, together with the personal quality of creativity. At the other end of the scale, the highest differences in importance noted between staff and graduates/students involved items 1 (TEC), 10 (PRO), 20 (PRO), 13 (TEC), 5 (PED), 4 (TEC), and 9 (PRO). These differences relate to technical skills of communicating in English, and culture; professionalism such as knowledge; application of research; self-directed learning ability.

The medium differences in importance noted between graduates/students and staff involved items 21 (INT), 17 (PED), 18 (TEC), and 19 (INT). These differences relate to interpersonal skills, together with pedagogical skill of classroom management and technical skill of being a good model in using English. By comparison, the medium differences in

importance noted between staff and graduates/students involved items 23 (PED), 8 (PED), 25 (PED), 27 (PRO), and 29 (PED). These differences relate to pedagogical skills of selecting and using teaching and learning aids; understanding of English education in Thailand, and awareness of language learning problems; professionalism skills, and a positive attitude towards the English teaching profession.

The low differences in importance noted between graduates/students and staff involved items 30 (PED), 6 (PED), 16 (PED), and 26 (PED). These differences relate to pedagogical skills. By comparison, the low differences in importance noted between staff and graduates/students involved items 12 (PED), 15 (PED), 28 (PER), 24 (PED), 3 (PED), and 31 (PED). These differences relate to pedagogical skills, together with personal qualities such as professional ethics.

There was no difference in graduates/students' and staff's ratings of the importance of an ability to develop positive attitudes among students towards the learning of English.

### Gaps between the emphasis and the importance

To make the analysis of these results clearer, the responses of the staff and the graduates/students will be treated separately.

### *Staff responses*

As reported by the staff involved in the program, the difference in emphasis that the MATEFL program placed on various aspects of teaching English and importance in each aspect of teaching English to English teachers, shown in Table 4.26, were categorized using the criteria contained in Table 4.25.

**TABLE 4.25    CRITERIA FOR CATEGORIZING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EMPHASIS AND IMPORTANCE**

| Difference | Meaning |
|---|---|
| 0.60 and above | High difference |
| From 0.31 to 0.59 | Medium difference |
| From 0.10 to 0.30 | Low difference |

**TABLE 4.26     STAFF: DIFFERENCE IN EMPHASIS AND IMPORTANCE IN EACH ASPECT OF TEACHING ENGLISH IN THE MATEFL PROGRAM**

| Rank | Aspects | Importance | Emphasis | Difference |
|------|---------|------------|----------|------------|
| 1 | 28. High ethical standards of professional conduct | 3.80 | 2.70 | 1.10 |
| 2 | 31. An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English | 3.50 | 2.70 | 0.80 |
| 3 | 12. An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning | 3.80 | 3.10 | 0.70 |
| 4 | 19. An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background, levels of proficiency, etc. | 3.50 | 2.80 | 0.70 |
| 5 | 20. An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English | 3.90 | 3.20 | 0.70 |
| 6 | 26. An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students | 3.90 | 3.20 | 0.70 |
| 7 | 27. A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession | 3.90 | 3.20 | 0.70 |
| 8 | 08. An understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand | 3.00 | 2.40 | 0.60 |
| 9 | 14. An ability to use a learner-centered approach in English language teaching | 3.60 | 3.00 | 0.60 |
| 10 | 17. An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g., creating a comfortable atmosphere. utilizing class time well. etc) | 3.70 | 3.10 | 0.60 |
| 11 | 29. An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English | 3.90 | 3.30 | 0.60 |
| 12 | 09. Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning | 3.64 | 3.09 | 0.55 |
| 13 | 13. An ability to communicate regularly in class in English | 3.90 | 3.40 | 0.50 |
| 14 | 21. Development of interpersonal skills | 3.30 | 2.80 | 0.50 |
| 15 | 22. An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English | 3.70 | 3.20 | 0.50 |
| 16 | 30. An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must play | 3.70 | 3.20 | 0.50 |
| 17 | 05. Knowledge of language testing and assessment | 3.91 | 3.45 | 0.46 |
| 18 | 10. An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning | 3.64 | 3.18 | 0.46 |
| 19 | 01. English proficiency | 4.00 | 3.60 | 0.40 |
| 20 | 04. Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning | 3.60 | 3.20 | 0.40 |
| 21 | 06. Knowledge of educational technology | 3.27 | 2.91 | 0.36 |

| Rank | Aspects | Importance | Emphasis | Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22 | 07. An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning | 3.00 | 2.70 | 0.30 |
| 23 | 15. An ability to plan English language lessons | 3.80 | 3.50 | 0.30 |
| 24 | 16. An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan | 3.50 | 3.20 | 0.30 |
| 25 | 18. An ability to be a good role model in using English in my teaching | 3.70 | 3.40 | 0.30 |
| 26 | 23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.70 | 3.40 | 0.30 |
| 27 | 25. An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively | 3.80 | 3.50 | 0.30 |
| 28 | 11. Creativity in English language teaching and learning | 3.50 | 3.22 | 0.28 |
| 29 | 24. An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.70 | 3.50 | 0.20 |
| 30 | 02. Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories | 3.20 | 3.10 | 0.10 |
| 31 | 03. Knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories | 3.60 | 3.50 | 0.10 |

The aspect that had the highest difference between emphasis and importance was concerned with ethical standards that was in the personal quality group (PER). The majority of the aspects with high difference were those in the pedagogical skill group (PED). One aspect in the interpersonal skill (INT) and two aspects in the professionalism (PRO) groups also had high differences in emphasis and importance. Most of the aspects that had low differences were in the pedagogical skill group (PED). One aspect in the technical skill group (TEC) and one in the personal quality group (PER) also had a low difference.

In summary, in the staff's opinion, the difference between emphasis and importance of most aspects in the technical skills (TEC) and most aspects in the professionalism group was in the medium level. Half of the aspects in the interpersonal skill group (INT) and half of those in the personal quality group (PER) had high differences, whereas the other half of the interpersonal aspects (INT) had medium difference and the other half of the personal aspects (PER) had a low difference. Most of the aspects in pedagogical skill group had low differences.

In general, the MATEFL staff thought that the level of importance of all aspects, no matter what skill category they belonged to, was higher than the level of emphasis. This means that the program should put more emphasis on those aspects, especially the ones with high differences because they are aspects or skills needed most in the English teaching profession.

### Graduates/students' responses

As reported by the graduates/students, the difference in emphasis that the MATEFL program placed on various aspects of teaching English and importance in each aspect of teaching English to English teachers, shown in Table 4.28, was categorized using the criteria contained in Table 4.27.

**TABLE 4.27    CRITERIA FOR CATEGORIZING THE DIFFERENCE IN EMPHASIS AND IMPORTANCE**

| Difference | Meaning |
|---|---|
| 0.60 and above | High difference |
| From 0.31 to 0.59 | Medium difference |
| From -0.16 to 0.30 | Low difference |

**TABLE 4.28    GRADUATES/STUDENTS: DIFFERENCE IN EMPHASIS AND IMPORTANCE IN EACH ASPECT OF TEACHING ENGLISH IN THE MATEFL PROGRAM**

| Rank | Aspects | Importance | Emphasis | Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 28. High ethical standards of professional conduct | 3.77 | 2.70 | 1.07 |
| 2 | 10. An <u>application</u> of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning | 3.42 | 2.56 | 0.86 |
| 3 | 06. Knowledge of educational technology | 3.30 | 2.53 | 0.77 |
| 4 | 07. An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning | 3.35 | 2.63 | 0.72 |
| 5 | 12. An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning | 3.77 | 3.07 | 0.70 |

| Rank | Aspects | Importance | Emphasis | Difference |
|------|---------|------------|----------|------------|
| 6 | **08. An understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand** | **2.88** | **2.19** | **0.69** |
| 7 | **19. An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background, levels of proficiency, etc.** | **3.63** | **3.02** | **0.61** |
| 8 | **01. English proficiency** | 3.79 | **3.21** | **0.58** |
| 9 | **09. Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning** | **3.21** | **2.67** | **0.54** |
| 10 | **05. Knowledge of language testing and assessment** | **3.58** | **3.05** | **0.53** |
| 11 | **21. Development of interpersonal skills** | **3.47** | **3.00** | **0.47** |
| 12 | **22. An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English** | **3.70** | **3.23** | **0.47** |
| 13 | **31. An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English** | **3.42** | **2.95** | **0.47** |
| 14 | **20. An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English** | **3.60** | **3.14** | **0.46** |
| 15 | **24. An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material** | **3.67** | **3.23** | **0.44** |
| 16 | **14. An ability to use a learner-centered approach in English language teaching** | **3.81** | **3.40** | **0.41** |
| 17 | **23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material** | **3.60** | **3.21** | **0.39** |
| 18 | **27. A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession** | **3.72** | **3.33** | **0.39** |
| 19 | **26. An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students** | **3.91** | **3.53** | **0.38** |
| 20 | **11. Creativity in English language teaching and learning** | **3.70** | **3.33** | **0.37** |
| 21 | **25. An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively** | **3.65** | **3.28** | **0.37** |
| 22 | **29. An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English** | **3.72** | **3.35** | **0.37** |
| 23 | **30. An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must lay** | **3.79** | **3.42** | **0.37** |
| 24 | **18. An ability to be a good role model in using English in my teaching** | **3.86** | **3.56** | **0.30** |
| 25 | **17. An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g. creating a comfortable atmosphere. utilizing class time well, etc)** | **3.86** | **3.60** | **0.26** |

| Rank | Aspects | Importance | Emphasis | Difference |
|:---:|:---|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| 26 | **15. An ability to plan English language lessons** | **3.77** | **3.56** | **0.21** |
| 27 | **16. An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan** | **3.53** | **3.44** | **0.09** |
| 28 | **04. Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning** | **3.21** | **3.19** | **0.02** |
| 29 | **02. Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories** | **3.47** | **3.51** | **-0.04** |
| 30 | **13. An ability to communicate regularly in class in English** | **3.58** | **3.70** | **-0.12** |
| 31 | **03. Knowledge of specific English learning/ teaching theories** | **3.56** | **3.72** | **-0.16** |

The aspect concerned with the ethical standards – in the personal quality group (PER) – had the highest difference. The research application aspect that was in the professionalism group (PRO), an ability to deal with student diversity which was in the interpersonal skill group (INT), and four aspects in the pedagogical skill group (PED) had high differences.

Most of the aspects which had a low difference were in the pedagogical skill group (PED). The others were the aspects in the technical skill group (TEC).

Overall, the graduate/students rated the importance ranking in most items higher than the emphasis ranking, except in the items of knowledge of general learning/teaching theories and knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories in the pedagogical skill group (PED), and an ability to communicate in class in English (TEC) for which the graduates/staff rated the emphasis higher than the importance.

In summary, in graduates/students' opinion, the difference between emphasis and importance of all aspects in the professionalism group (PRO) was in the medium level. Half of the aspects in the interpersonal skill group (INT) and half of those in the personal quality group (PER) had a high difference, whereas the other half had a medium difference. Most aspects in

the technical skills (TEC) had low difference, while most of the aspects in the pedagogical skill group (PED) had a medium difference.

**Expectation of graduates' employers**

The graduates' employers were asked to rate their expectation of the MATEFL graduates in regard to each of the 31 aspects of teaching English. The results, shown in Table 4.30, were categorized using the criteria contained in Table 4.29.

**TABLE 4.29      CRITERIA FOR CATEGORIZING THE LEVEL OF EXPECTATION**

| Mean | Meaning |
|---|---|
| 3.70 and above | High expectation |
| From 3.50 to 3.69 | Medium expectation |
| 3.49 and below | Low expectation |

**TABLE 4.30      EMPLOYERS: EXPECTATION OF MATEFL GRADUATES IN EACH ASPECT OF TEACHING ENGLISH**

| Rank | Aspects | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 01. English proficiency | 3.80 | 0.42 |
| 2 | 03. Knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories | 3.80 | 0.42 |
| 3 | 12. An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning | 3.80 | 0.42 |
| 4 | 13. An ability to communicate regularly in class in English | 3.80 | 0.42 |
| 5 | 22. An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English | 3.80 | 0.63 |
| 6 | 11. Creativity in English language teaching and learning | 3.70 | 0.48 |
| 7 | 14. An ability to use a learner-centered approach in English language teaching | 3.70 | 0.68 |
| 8 | 15. An ability to plan English language lessons | 3.70 | 0.68 |
| 9 | 16. An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan | 3.70 | 0.68 |
| 10 | 18. An ability to be a good role model in using English in my teaching | 3.70 | 0.68 |
| 11 | 20. An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English | 3.70 | 0.68 |
| 12 | 23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.70 | 0.68 |
| 13 | 26. An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students | 3.70 | 0.68 |

| 14 | 27. A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession | 3.70 | 0.68 |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|
| 15 | 29. An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English | 3.70 | 0.68 |
| 16 | 07. An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning | 3.60 | 0.70 |
| 17 | 17. An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g., creating a comfortable atmosphere. utilizing class time well. etc) | 3.60 | 0.70 |
| 18 | 24. An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.60 | 0.97 |
| 19 | 25. An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively | 3.60 | 0.97 |
| 20 | 19. An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background. levels of proficiency, etc. | 3.50 | 0.71 |
| 21 | 21. Development of interpersonal skills | 3.50 | 0.97 |
| 22 | 30. An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must play | 3.50 | 0.97 |
| 23 | 31. An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English | 3.50 | 0.97 |
| 24 | 05. Knowledge of language testing and assessment | 3.40 | 0.70 |
| 25 | 08. An understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand | 3.40 | 0.70 |
| 26 | 02. Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories | 3.40 | 0.84 |
| 27 | 28. High ethical standards of professional conduct | 3.40 | 0.97 |
| 28 | 09. Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning | 3.30 | 0.82 |
| 29 | 06. Knowledge of educational technology | 3.30 | 0.95 |
| 30 | 04. Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning | 3.20 | 0.63 |
| 31 | 10. An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning | 3.20 | 1.03 |

The aspects of teaching English that the graduates' employers most expect of the MATEFL graduates, as their subordinates, are English proficiency in the category of technical skill (TEC), specific learning and teaching theories and problem solving skills in the category of pedagogical skill (PED) and positive attitude in the category of professional skill (PRO). The aspects with low expectation are concerned with research knowledge and applications which are in the professionalism (PRO) category. One aspect in the technical skill group (TEC), namely knowledge of culture was also rated as low expectation.

**Opinions of graduates' employers about graduates' performance**

The graduates' employers were asked to rate the performance of the MATEFL graduates in regard to each of the 31 aspects of teaching English. The results, shown in Table 4.32, were categorized using the criteria contained in Table 4.31.

**TABLE 4.31    CRITERIA FOR CATEGORIZING THE LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE**

| Mean | Meaning |
|------|---------|
| 3.60 and above | High performance |
| From 3.40 to 3.59 | Medium performance |
| 3.39 and below | Low performance |

**TABLE 4.32    EMPLOYERS: PERFORMANCE OF MATEFL GRADUATES IN EACH ASPECT OF TEACHING ENGLISH**

| Rank | Aspects | Mean | SD |
|------|---------|------|----|
| 1 | 16. An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan | 3.80 | 0.42 |
| 2 | 01. English proficiency | 3.70 | 0.48 |
| 3 | 23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.70 | 0.48 |
| 4 | 25. An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively | 3.70 | 0.48 |
| 5 | 27. A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession | 3.70 | 0.48 |
| 6 | 28. High ethical standards of professional conduct | 3.70 | 0.48 |
| 7 | 20. An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English | 3.60 | 0.52 |
| 8 | 22. An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English | 3.60 | 0.52 |
| 9 | 26. An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students | 3.60 | 0.52 |
| 10 | 29. An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English | 3.60 | 0.52 |
| 11 | 11. Creativity in English language teaching and learning | 3.50 | 0.53 |
| 12 | 12. An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning | 3.50 | 0.53 |
| 13 | 14. An ability to use a learner-centred approach in English language teaching | 3.50 | 0.53 |
| 14 | 15. An ability to plan English language lessons | 3.50 | 0.53 |
| 15 | 17. An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g., creating a comfortable atmosphere. utilizing class time | 3.50 | 0.53 |

| | well. etc) | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | **31. An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English** | **3.50** | **0.53** |
| 17 | **13. An ability to communicate regularly in class in English** | **3.50** | **0.71** |
| 18 | **02. Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories** | **3.40** | **0.52** |
| 19 | **18. An ability to be a good role model in using English in my teaching** | **3.40** | **0.70** |
| 20 | **03. Knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories** | **3.30** | **0.48** |
| 21 | **06.  Knowledge of educational technology** | **3.30** | **0.48** |
| 22 | **08. An understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand** | **3.30** | **0.68** |
| 23 | **19. An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background. levels of proficiency, etc.** | **3.30** | **0.68** |
| 24 | **21. Development of interpersonal skills** | **3.30** | **0.68** |
| 25 | **24. An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material** | **3.30** | **0.68** |
| 26 | **30. An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must play** | **3.30** | **0.68** |
| 27 | **05.  Knowledge of language testing and assessment** | **3.20** | **0.42** |
| 28 | **07. An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning** | **3.20** | **0.42** |
| 29 | **04.  Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning** | **3.10** | **0.57** |
| 30 | **09. Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning** | **2.90** | **0.32** |
| 31 | **10. An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning** | **2.80** | **0.42** |

The aspect of teaching English in which the MATEFL graduates performed the best was an ability to conduct lessons which belongs to the pedagogical skill group (PED). Some other aspects in the pedagogical group (PED) and in the professionalism group (PRO) were also rated as aspects in which the graduates performed at a high level. The aspects that the graduates performed in the low level were those in the professionalism group (PRO). These were concerned with research knowledge and applications. There was one aspect in the technical skill group (TEC), namely, knowledge of culture that was rated as low performance. Most aspects with low performance were in the pedagogical skill group (PED).

**TABLE 4.33    CRITERIA FOR CATEGORIZING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EXPECTATION AND PERFORMANCE**

| For Expectation | For Performance | Meaning |
|---|---|---|
| 0.40 and above | - 0.40 and below | High difference |
| From 0.20 to 0.39 | From - 0.20 to - 0.39 | Medium difference |
| From 0.01 to 0.19 | From - 0.01 to - 0.19 | Low difference |

## Gaps between expectation and performance

As reported by the graduates' employers, the difference in expectation and graduates' performance in each aspect of teaching English, shown in Table 4.34, were categorized using the criteria contained in Table 4.33.

**TABLE 4.34    EMPLOYERS: DIFFERENCE IN EXPECTATION AND GRADUATES' PERFORMANCE IN EACH ASPECT OF TEACHING ENGLISH**

| Rank | Aspects | Expectation | Performance | Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 03. Knowledge of specific English learning/ teaching theories | 3.80 | 3.30 | 0.50 |
| 2 | 07. An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning | 3.60 | 3.20 | 0.40 |
| 3 | 09. Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning | 3.30 | 2.90 | 0.40 |
| 4 | 10. An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning | 3.20 | 2.80 | 0.40 |
| 5 | 12. An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning | 3.80 | 3.50 | 0.30 |
| 6 | 13. An ability to communicate regularly in class in English | 3.80 | 3.50 | 0.30 |
| 7 | 18. An ability to be a good role model in using English in my teaching | 3.70 | 3.40 | 0.30 |
| 8 | 24. An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material | 3.60 | 3.30 | 0.30 |
| 9 | 05. Knowledge of language testing and assessment | 3.40 | 3.20 | 0.20 |
| 10 | 11. Creativity in English language teaching and learning | 3.70 | 3.50 | 0.20 |

| Rank | Aspects | Expectation | Performance | Difference |
|------|---------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| 11 | **14. An ability to use a learner-centered approach in English language teaching** | **3.70** | **3.50** | **0.20** |
| 12 | **15. An ability to plan English language lessons** | **3.70** | **3.50** | **0.20** |
| 13 | **19. An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background, levels of proficiency, etc.** | **3.50** | **3.30** | **0.20** |
| 14 | **21. Development of interpersonal skills** | **3.50** | **3.30** | **0.20** |
| 15 | **22. An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English** | **3.80** | **3.60** | **0.20** |
| 16 | **30. An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must lay** | **3.50** | **3.30** | **0.20** |
| 17 | **01. English proficiency** | **3.80** | **3.70** | **0.10** |
| 18 | **04. Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning** | **3.20** | **3.10** | **0.10** |
| 19 | **08. An understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand** | **3.40** | **3.30** | **0.10** |
| 20 | **17. An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g. creating a comfortable atmosphere. utilizing class time well, etc)** | **3.60** | **3.50** | **0.10** |
| 21 | **20. An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English** | **3.70** | **3.60** | **0.10** |
| 22 | **26. An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students** | **3.70** | **3.60** | **0.10** |
| 23 | **29. An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English** | **3.70** | **3.60** | **0.10** |
| 24 | **02. Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories** | **3.40** | **3.40** | **0.00** |
| 25 | **06. Knowledge of educational technology** | **3.30** | **3.30** | **0.00** |
| 26 | **23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material** | **3.70** | **3.70** | **0.00** |
| 27 | **27. A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession** | **3.70** | **3.70** | **0.00** |
| 28 | **31. An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English** | **3.50** | **3.50** | **0.00** |

| Rank | Aspects | Expectation | Performance | Difference |
|------|---------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| 29 | **16. An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan** | **3.70** | **3.80** | **-0.10** |
| 30 | **25. An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively** | **3.60** | **3.70** | **-0.10** |
| 31 | **28. High ethical standards of professional conduct** | **3.40** | **3.70** | **-0.30** |

In items 1-23, the performance was lower than the expectation. Half of the aspects that had a high difference between the expectation and graduates' performance in each aspect of teaching English were aspects in the pedagogical skill category (PED). They were the items of specific learning/teaching theories and educational technology. The other half were in the category of professionalism (PRO), these being research knowledge and applications.

Most aspects that had a low difference between the expectation and graduates' performance in each aspect of teaching English were in the pedagogical skill group (PED), two in the technical skill group (TEC) and one was in the professionalism group (PRO).

In items 29-31, the expectation was lower than the performance. Items 29 and 30 showed low difference between the expectation and graduates' performance in each aspect of teaching English. These were an ability to conduct lessons and an ability to use teaching and learning aids. Both of them were in the pedagogical group (PED). Item 31, in the personal skill group (PER), showed a medium difference.

**Findings from open-ended questions**

The stakeholders of the MATEFL program, namely staff, graduates/students, and graduates' employers were asked to respond to a number of open-ended questions. The staff and graduates/students gave their opinions about strengths, weaknesses of the program and suggestions about how to improve the program. The graduates' employers gave their opinions about the

strengths and weaknesses of not only the MATEFL program but also the graduates as their subordinates.

## Strengths and weaknesses of the MATEFL program

The responses of the program stakeholders, namely staff, the graduates/students and the graduates' employers will be treated separately.

### *Staff's responses*

Staff's opinions about the MATEFL program, shown in Table 4.35, can be divided into strengths and weaknesses of the MATEFL program and issues that were controversial among staff. They are further divided into strengths, weaknesses and controversial issues about students, about instructors, about courses, and about other related issues.

**TABLE 4.35    STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES FROM STAFF**

| Stakeholders | Strengths | Weaknesses | Controversial issues |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Staff** | **About students:**<br>• Highly motivated<br>• High quality; qualified; proficient; skilful<br>• Diverse in terms of background and subject disciplines –- sharing of knowledge and experience<br>• High quality outputs, i.e. graduates (becoming university instructors & furthering studies in Ph.D.) | **About students:**<br>• Diverse in terms of proficiency level (English and autonomous learning) — causing difficulties in teaching and learning | **About students:**<br>• Number of students (too many vs. proper number) |
| | **About instructors:**<br>• Knowledgeable<br>• Experienced<br>• High competent in teaching skills<br>• Diverse expertise / specialization | **About instructors:**<br>• Lack of experts in some areas | |

| Stakeholders | Strengths | Weaknesses | Controversial issues |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **About courses:**<br>• Variety<br>• Balance of theories and practical application | **About courses:**<br>• Limitation in the provision of elective courses | |
| | **Others:**<br>• Convenient location (centre of Bangkok)<br>• Reputation of the university<br>• Affordable tuition fee<br>• Dedicated and helpful supporting staff<br>• Using English as a medium of instruction | **Others:**<br>• Lack of supporting learning resources | **Others:**<br>• Poor program administration and leadership vs. Effective program administration and leadership<br>• Time (weekends vs. weekdays vs. both)<br>• Facilities (poor in quality and insufficient in quantity vs. good in quality and sufficient in quantity) |

Regarding students, the qualification of students was satisfactory in terms of knowledge, skills, and motivation although different levels of English proficiency and autonomous learning skills caused problems in teaching and learning. This indicated that the admission requirements were appropriate and should be maintained. The issue of student intake numbers, however, should be further considered.

Regarding instructors, the responses suggest that they were qualified in terms of knowledge, teaching skills, and experience. There was a variety of expertise in the instructor composition although there was a lack of expertise in some areas.

Regarding courses, the responses indicated that the program structure was satisfactory in terms of variety of courses and balance of theories and practical application, and so it should be maintained. The provision of some elective courses was limited; consequently, the issue of unavailability of elective courses should be further explored.

Others issues that were considered as program strengths concerned the reasonableness of the tuition fees and the university itself – the location and its reputation. Other issues that need to be taken into consideration in the future were concerned with learning resources, time, and program administration: further investigation needs to be undertaken into the nature and causes of these problems.

### Graduates/students responses

Graduates/Students' opinions about the MATEFL program, shown in Table 4.36, can be divided into strengths and weaknesses of the MATEFL program and issues that were controversial among staff. They are further divided into strengths, weaknesses and controversial issues about students, about instructors, about courses, and about other related issues.

**TABLE 4.36    STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES FROM GRADUATES/STUDENTS**

| Stakeholders | Strengths | Weaknesses | Controversial issues |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Graduates/ Students** | **About students:**<br>• Opportunities for candidates from other subject disciplines, thus gaining high motivated candidates<br>• High quality graduates | **About students:**<br>• Class size (too big)<br>• Diverse in terms of proficiency level, background knowledge, and experience (causing difficulties in teaching and learning) | **About students:**<br>• Too diverse student composition vs. Diversity is good. |
| | **About instructors:**<br>• Qualified; meet standards; knowledgeable<br>• Experienced in teaching and conducting research<br>• Good personalities (friendly, open-minded, dedicated, caring, determined) | **About instructors:**<br>• Lack of experts in some areas of expertise<br>• Heavy workload<br>• Unsatisfactory teaching styles | |

| Stakeholders | Strengths | Weaknesses | Controversial issues |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **About courses:**<br><br>• Useful teaching practicum<br><br>• Have both theoretical and practical application<br><br>• Useful and interesting | **About courses:**<br><br>• Limitation in the provision of elective courses<br><br>• Not enough practice (teaching practicum, practical work)<br><br>• Lack of relevance to Thai context<br><br>• Lack of coordination | **About courses:**<br><br>• Praxis balance (good balance between theories and practices vs. poor balance between theories and practices) |
| | **Others:**<br><br>• Convenient location<br><br>• Reputation of the university<br><br>• Reasonable tuition fee | **Others:**<br><br>• Poor/lack of facilities (physical facilities, supporting learning resources)<br><br>• Not marketed the thesis option<br><br>• Lack of the emphasis of morals and professional ethics<br><br>• Lack of extra-curricular activities to promote exchange of ideas and analytical skills. | **Others:**<br><br>• Program length (too short vs. proper vs. too long)<br><br>• Time (weekends vs. weekdays vs. both) |

Regarding students, there was controversy about diversity in student composition. Some thought diversity was advantageous in that there was sharing of different knowledge and experience, while others thought diversity led to difficulties in teaching and learning. Similar to the staff's opinion, the number of students admitted was considered as a weakness; therefore, this issue should be taken into account.

Like the staff, instructors were regarded by graduates/students as qualified in their knowledge and experience but there was a lack of experts in some areas. In addition, these graduates/students thought that instructors had good personal qualities; i.e., friendly, open-minded, dedicated, caring, and determined, even though heavy workloads seemed to be an obstacle. There was a complaint about teaching ability, and this requires further exploration.

With respect to courses, staff and graduates/students had similar opinions about the limitation of the provision of elective courses. Graduates/students added the benefit of including a teaching practicum in the program. However, there was a controversy about the emphasis of theories and practical application. Some graduates/students thought that the practical components were not enough to make good English teachers, whereas others thought the balance of theories and practice was appropriate. Therefore, this issue should be investigated further.

Both staff, and graduates and students thought that the reasonable tuition fees, the university's location, and its reputation were strengths of the programs. There was, however, a complaint about the quantity and quality of learning facilities. Furthermore, they thought that there was a lack of emphasis on moral and professional ethics, marketing of the thesis option, and the provision of extra-curricular activities. Those issues should be further explored in terms of their nature and causes. The issues of program length and time were controversial and should be investigated too.

### Graduates' employer responses

Employers' opinions about the strengths and weaknesses of the MATEFL graduates are shown in Table 4.37.

Employers were satisfied with graduates' knowledge and English proficiency (TEC), teaching ability (PED), willingness to cooperate with school (INT), responsibility and open-mindedness (PER), and willingness to improve themselves (PRO). On the other hand, in spite of having satisfactory knowledge and skills, there were complaints about graduates having weaknesses in the following areas: use of English in teaching (TEC), application of theory into practice, the use of instructional media (PED) and teamwork skills (INT).

**TABLE 4.37     STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES FROM GRADUATES'
                 EMPLOYERS**

| Stakeholder | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| **Employers** | • Knowledgeable<br>• Highly proficient in English and teaching skills<br>• Confident<br>• Responsible, open-minded and willing to improve themselves<br>• Cooperative | • Unaware of the importance of using English in class<br>• Lack of theory application in real situation<br>• Don't create or use teaching aids and instructional media<br>• Lack of teamwork skills |

## Suggestions about the MATEFL program

The responses of the program stakeholders, namely staff, the graduates/students and the graduates' employers will be treated separately.

### *Staff responses*

The staff's suggestions about the MATEFL program, shown in Table 4.38, can be divided into four categories as the suggestions in regard to students, instructors, courses and others. The suggestions made by staff were consistent with the weaknesses of the program mentioned earlier. That is to say, they suggested the ways to solve the diversity problems in English proficiency and autonomous learning skills, the lack of expert problem, elective course problem, and administration problems. These suggestions indicated issues that need to be given priority in subsequent investigations.

**TABLE 4.38     SUGGESTIONS FROM STAFF**

| Stakeholder | Suggestions |
|---|---|
| **Staff** | **About students:**<br>• Consider revising screening process: Take more consideration of applicants' English proficiency and attitude towards language teaching profession<br>• Encourage more active role in autonomous learning (participate in seminars or conference, conduct research studies) |

| Stakeholder | Suggestions |
|---|---|
| | **About instructors:**<br>• Recruit more staff to increase variety and reduce workload |
| | **About courses:**<br>• Seek more financial support so that the program can offer more elective courses<br>• Use alternative forms of delivery |
| | **Others:**<br>• Seek more financial support<br>• Need better and more professional organization and seek more input on policy decisions |

### *Graduates/staff responses*

The graduates/students' suggestions about the MATEFL program, shown in Table 4.39, can be divided into four categories as the suggestions in regard to students, instructors, courses and others.

**TABLE 4.39    SUGGESTIONS FROM GRADUATES/STUDENTS**

| Stakeholder | Suggestions |
|---|---|
| **Graduates/ Students** | **About students:**<br>• Divide students into two classes (about 15 students each)<br>• Consider revising screening process: Take more consideration of applicants' English proficiency, attitude towards language teaching profession, and teaching experience<br>• Provide a remedial course for poor and inexperienced students |
| | **About instructors:**<br>• Seek more instructors specializing in different TEFL disciplines, invite more part-time instructors, or find ways to produce own instructors in the future<br>• Use different classroom techniques, e.g., inductive/discovery learning<br>• Get more foreign instructors |
| | **About courses:**<br>• Provide more elective courses<br>• Allow students to take courses in the other MA program offered by LITU (MA in English for Careers)<br>• More practical components<br>• Revise course content (more relevant and practical)<br>• Lay more emphasis on research |

| Stakeholder | Suggestions |
|---|---|
| | **Others:**<br>• Improve physical facilities, e.g. providing a common room for students, improving classrooms, setting up a real TEFL library or resource centre, etc.<br>• Place more emphasis on morals and ethics (include it in every course)<br>• Encourage extra-curricular activities |

Like staff, graduates/students also made suggestions in relation to different English proficiency levels, lack of experts, and elective courses. What they added, concerning students, was the class size issue; concerning instructors, was the teaching ability issues; concerning the course, was the course structure issue. They also made suggestions about facilities, moral and ethical issues, and extra-curricular activities. The issues that are common among the two groups should be investigated further and given priority. **Graduates' employer responses** The employers' suggestions about the MATEFL program are shown in Table 4.40. Most of them are concerned with pedagogical skills (PED) and one is concerned with technical skills (TEC).

**Overall satisfaction**

The stakeholders of the MATEFL program were asked to rate their overall satisfaction in regard to the program for staff and graduates/students and in regard to graduates for employers. The criteria in Table 4.40 were used to categorize the level of satisfaction. The results, shown in Table 4.41, indicate that staff and graduates/students had a high satisfaction level with the MATEFL program. Similarly, as shown in Table 4.42, the graduates' employers had a high satisfaction level with the MATEFL graduates.

**TABLE 4.40    CRITERIA FOR CATEGORISING THE LEVEL OF SATISFACTION**

| Mean | Meaning |
|---|---|
| 3.01-4.00 | High satisfaction |
| 2.01-3.00 | Medium satisfaction |
| 1.00-2.00 | Low satisfaction |

**TABLE 4.41      LEVEL OF SATISFACTION**

| Stakeholder | Mean |
|---|---|
| Staff | **3.40** |
| Graduates/Students | **3.39** |
| Employers | **3.30** |

**TABLE 4.42      SUGGESTIONS FROM GRADUATES' EMPLOYERS**

| Stakeholder | Suggestions |
|---|---|
| **Employers** | **About courses:**<br>• Focus more on theories and on an application of theories<br>• Focus more on practical application and problem solving<br>• Focus more on the use of English in class |

# Findings from Interviews

The semi-structured interviews were conducted with representative staff and graduates/students. The representatives of staff included a program establisher and administrator, a Thai full-time teacher, a foreign teacher, and a part-time teacher. The representative graduates/students were graduates who were primary teachers, secondary teachers, university teachers, students who started but did not finish the program, and graduates who furthered their studies at doctoral level.

The participants were asked about the achievement of the program goals. Furthermore, they were asked to identify and to elaborate on the strengths and weaknesses of the MATEFL program. In addition, the findings from questionnaires were taken into consideration. The items which showed the mismatches between the emphasis each aspect of teaching English was given in the MATEFL program and the importance of each aspect to English teachers were also explored further during the interviews.

The findings from the interviews were categorised into four issues: (1) the achievement of the program goals; (2) the strengths and weaknesses;

(3) other program elements; and (4) the impact of the program on graduates/students that emerged from the interviews.

## The achievement of program goals

The representatives of each group of stakeholders were asked whether the program achieved its goals: (1) To develop the quality and standards of English teachers at all levels; (2) To offer a curriculum of effective English teaching theory and practice for those who are interested in this career; and (3) To help solve the problem of a shortage of qualified English teachers at all levels. They were also asked to justify their answers by giving the evidence of the achievement. To make the analysis of these results clearer, the responses of the staff and the graduates/students were treated separately and tabulated.

### Staff responses

The opinions of representative staff on the achievement of the program goals are shown in Table 4.43. Both positive and negative opinions about each issue are presented.

**Program goal 1:** To develop the quality and standards of English teachers at all levels, the MATEFL staff thought that the program achieved the first goal in developing the quality and standards of English teachers. There was no doubt about the quality and standards of the program graduates who could enter the profession – i.e., becoming English teachers even at the higher education institutions – and who were capable of working in it.

**Program goal 2:** To offer a curriculum of effective English teaching theory and practice for those who are interested in this career, the staff thought that the program also achieved this goal. The composition of the curriculum was appropriate and acceptable; however, there was a need to seek balance between theory and practice.

**TABLE 4.43    STAFF OPINIONS ON THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE PROGRAM GOALS**

| Represent-ative stake-holders | Program goals | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Goal 1: Quality & standards of English teachers** | **Goal 2: Curriculum (theory + practice)** | **Goal 3: Solve teacher shortage problem** |
| **Staff** | **Positive**<br><br>• Graduates are qualified as English teachers.<br>• Graduates are skilled and knowledgeable.<br>• Graduates improved a lot.<br>• One of our students who did not pass the first comprehensive exam can now become a university lecturer and is happy with her job.<br>• The program produced quality graduates. | **Positive**<br><br>• The curriculum of our TEFL program is comparable to the curriculum at other universities.<br>• We offer the right number of courses.<br>• We offer a variety of courses covering all the areas needed.<br>• Studying in the program qualifies students to obtain MA degree.<br>• Our program is similar to US programs.<br>• It has a good combination of theories and practices.<br>• We can apply what we have learnt and we are confident in our knowledge and teaching skills. | **Positive**<br><br>• Some graduates changed their jobs to become English teachers.<br>• The program produced about 30 graduates every year.<br>• Our intention is to produce English teachers for universities and secondary school rather than primary. |
| | | **Negative**<br><br>• There are overlapping theories in some classes.<br>• Some foreign teachers need to add more theories in their classes. (by Thai instructors)<br>• Some Thai teachers need to add more practice components in their classes. (by foreign teachers)<br>• There is insufficient amount of teaching practicum. | **Negative**<br><br>• It is not going to fill the gap.<br>• The program does not turn out that many teachers, so it is not going to fill the gap.<br>• A few primary teachers came to study in the program. |

**Program goal 3:** To help solve the problem of a shortage of qualified English teachers at all levels, the staff thought that the program achieved this goal to some extent. There was, however, a need to consider the number and the composition of candidates. Increasing the student intake, of course, would increase the number of graduates, but it might lead to other problems,

so this issue should be taken carefully. Similarly, although giving opportunities to candidates from every level of educational institution to enter the program might increase the level of achievement, it is difficult to achieve. These two factors really affect the level of achievement of the program goal, and therefore should be handled carefully.

## Graduates/students responses

The opinions of representative graduates/students on the achievement of the program goals are shown in Table 4.44. Both positive and negative opinions about each issue are presented.

**TABLE 4.44    GRADUATES/STUDENTS OPINIONS ON THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE PROGRAM GOALS**

| Represent-ative stake-holders | Program goals | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Goal 1: Quality & standards of English teachers** | **Goal 2: Curriculum (theory + practice)** | **Goal 3: Solve teacher shortage problem** |
| **Graduates (Primary teachers)** | **Positive**<br>• I am satisfied with the results.<br>• The program helped increase the quality of primary teachers. | **Positive**<br>• The curriculum looked good.<br>• The program has adequate theory. | |
| | **Negative**<br>• Studying in the program is not enough to develop quality teachers—might consider adding more teacher subjects | **Negative**<br>• There is not enough practice in most subjects, esp. teaching practicum. | |
| **Graduates (Secondary teachers)** | **Positive**<br>• Not everyone can become a good teacher. We must be trained. | **Positive**<br>• The program has good proportion of theory and practice<br>• I am satisfied with theory I learned from the program. | **Positive**<br>• People from other fields came into our program. |
| | | **Negative**<br>• There is not enough teaching practice. | |

| Represent-ative stake-holders | Program goals | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Goal 1: Quality & standards of English teachers | Goal 2: Curriculum (theory + practice) | Goal 3: Solve teacher shortage problem |
| **Graduates (University teachers)** | **Positive**<br><br>• We are qualified to teach anywhere at any level because we are well-trained.<br>• We are well trained<br>• The program had very high standards and was really concerned about quality.<br>• We accepted the quality of the program.<br>• If we are not good enough, the program won't let us pass.<br>• We learned new things. | | **Positive**<br><br>• The program created graduates who filled in vacant positions.<br>• The program helped produced Thai teachers to replace unqualified foreign teachers. |
| | | **Negative**<br><br>• There is not enough teaching practice.<br>• The program should focus more on research (both theory and practice). | **Negative**<br><br>• Most graduates worked in Bangkok, so it didn't really helped fill the vacancy in the country. |
| **Students who started but did not finish the program** | | **Positive**<br><br>• The program is up-to-date.<br>• The program didn't follow the planned curriculum. | **Positive**<br><br>• The program can create teachers.<br>• Many of my friends become university teachers. |
| | | **Negative**<br><br>• There is not enough theory and practice.<br>• The program should add more English proficiency development courses. | |
| **Graduates who furthered their studies** | **Positive**<br><br>• The program benefited teachers of other subjects. I want those teachers to get the same education as me.<br>• My friends who became teachers have had good progress, changed in a better way, and tried to apply what they learnt. | **Positive**<br><br>• We have gained fundamental as well as new knowledge and we also had practical experience. | |

| Represent-ative stake-holders | Program goals | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Goal 1: Quality & standards of English teachers** | **Goal 2: Curriculum (theory + practice)** | **Goal 3: Solve teacher shortage problem** |
| | | **Negative**<br>• There is not enough theory.<br>• There is not enough practice, esp. for inexperienced teachers.<br>• The curriculum was not relevant to the Thai context. | |

**Program goal 1:** To develop the quality and standards of English teachers at all levels, the MATEFL graduates/students thought that the program achieved the first goal in increasing the quality and standards of English teachers although there was a request to increase the quality and standards by adding some areas of disciplines into the program.

**Program goal 2:** To offer a curriculum of effective English teaching theory and practice for those who are interested in this career, the graduates/students thought that the program achieved this goal to some extent. The composition of the curriculum was appropriate and acceptable; however, like staff, the graduates/students mentioned a need to seek balance between theory and practice. Besides, the utilisation of the curriculum and the relevance of the curriculum to Thai education were questioned.

**Program goal 3:** To help solve the problem of a shortage of qualified English teachers at all levels, the students/graduates thought that the program achieved this goal to some extent; however, the factor that affected the level of achievement was the distribution of graduates.

Overall, the major stakeholders of the MATEFL program, namely, the staff and graduates/students, thought that the program achieved the program goals although there was still room for improvement to increase the level of achievement.

## Strengths and weaknesses of the MATEFL program

The key stakeholders of the MATEFL programs, namely, the staff and graduates/students, were asked to identify and to elaborate on the strengths and weaknesses of the program. To make the analysis of these results clearer, the responses of the staff and the graduates/students are treated separately.

### Staff responses

The opinions of staff on the strengths and weaknesses of the MATEFL program are shown in Table 4.45. The answers from the respondents were concerned with seven elements of the program: instructors, students, courses, physical setting and facilities, professionalism, admission and administration.

The staff regarded the university's convenient location as the program's strength. The instructors, tuition fees, and study time were regarded as both strengths and weaknesses. As for the instructors, their quality was unquestioned, while a mismatch problem was mentioned. Concerning the tuition fees, the low tuition fees, although regarded as strength, was a major factor affecting the administration of the program. The times at which the program was offered presented both positives and negatives. Offering classes on weekends, which was regarded as a strength,

**TABLE 4.45    STAFF OPINIONS ON THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRAM**

| Stakeholders | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| **Staff** | **About Instructors**<br>• We have qualified instructors who hold doctorate, are knowledgeable, have good command of English, and have academic titles. | **About Instructors**<br>• The courses do not match with the expertise of instructors. |
| | **About Physical Setting and Facilities**<br>• The university is located in the heart of Bangkok and so it is convenient for everyone. | **About Students**<br>• There is a lack of motivation to study autonomously among students. |

| Stakeholders | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
|  | **About Administration**<br><br>• The tuition fees are not high.<br><br>• The program attracts a variety of candidates because it offers courses on weekends, different from most universities that offer courses on weekdays and so students' study time clashes with their work. | **About Administration**<br><br>• As a self-supporting program with low tuition fees, the financial situation of the program is quite tight.<br><br>• As a weekend program, students work on weekdays and come to school on weekends only, so they don't have time to self-study in the library. |
|  |  | **About Courses**<br><br>• We offer limited elective courses.<br><br>• The program can't offer elective courses as students requested. |

allowed more candidates to attend the program. On the other hand, this characteristic of the program limited students' self-study time, especially that of the students who were working full-time on weekdays.

Regarding admission, the staff gave opinions about student composition, number of students, and admission requirement. Student diversity in disciplines and experience was viewed as a positive feature that promotes the sharing of knowledge and experience. The number of students affects the quality of students and program administration. Therefore, the number of students admitted in each intake should be considered in relation to the quality of instruction and the cost of the program. English proficiency and logical thinking skills were the two qualifications that should be considered in candidates.

In relation to elective courses, the staff were aware of the problem of inability to offer elective courses as requested and were informed of the causes of the problem.

The only problem that was related to facilities, as mentioned by staff, was the inadequacy of classrooms.

Regarding scheduling or study time, being a weekend program was viewed as a positive. Some advantages of offering a program on weekdays were also mentioned, along with its disadvantages; however, there was no

indication of which option was better. Some suggested that offering the program on both weekdays and weekends would be good.

With respect to professional ethics, the staff defined ethics in a very similar way. All were aware of the importance of instilling professional ethics in future teachers. In their opinion, the ethical issues could be promoted directly by talking about them in class as part of the subject, or indirectly by showing students how teachers behave and letting them learn from the instructors through this experience.

As a weekend program, the time mismatch of research supervisors and students was regarded as a problem. Choosing the independent study option, as opposed to the thesis, seemed to be a practical solution to this problem. That was why most students chose the independent study option, instead of the thesis option: the latter was regarded as more suitable for a weekday program that students studied full-time and when more instructors were available.

**Graduates/students responses**

The opinions of graduates/students on the strengths and weaknesses of the MATEFL program are shown in Table 4.46. The answers from the respondents were concerned with the seven key elements of the program: instructors, students, courses, physical setting and facilities, professionalism, admission and administration.

The graduates/students regarded the course composition, qualified candidates, a variety of candidates, the reasonable tuition fees, appropriate study time, and convenient university location as program strengths. The instructors were regarded as having both strengths and weaknesses. While the knowledge of instructors and the personal quality of instructors – being friendly, helpful, fair and open-minded – were regarded as program strengths, the teaching and delivery skills also created ambivalence. The

**TABLE 4.46    GRADUATE/STUDENT OPINIONS ON THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRAM**

| Stakeholders | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| **Graduates (Primary teachers)** | **About Curriculum**<br>• The program has high standard.<br>• The program focuses on both theory and practice.<br><br>**About Admission**<br>• Not everyone can get into the program. They must be good enough. | **About Instructors**<br>• Although instructors are good and competent, their heavy workload can reduce the quality of teaching.<br>• I felt that I didn't get anything from some subjects and what the teachers teach does not correspond to the course description.' |
| **Graduates (Secondary teachers)** | **About Instructors**<br>• Instructors are friendly, helpful, and fair.<br><br>**About Administration**<br>• The program is inexpensive compared with the counterpart program. | **About Instructors**<br>• Instructors should have better teaching techniques. |
| **Graduates (University teachers)** | **About Instructors**<br>• The program has friendly, open-minded, fair and helpful instructors.<br><br>**About Admission**<br>• The program offers an opportunity for interested candidates from other fields of studies to enter the program<br><br>**About Administration**<br>• The program charges lower prices compared with the other programs which are always expensive.<br>• As a weekend program, students can work and study. | **About Instructors**<br>• There is a lack of TEFL specialist in teaching staff.<br>• Some instructors have poor teaching/delivery techniques.<br><br>**About Students**<br>• Students lack motivation in autonomous learning and self-development skills.<br><br>**About Professionalism**<br>• It lacks professionalism. |
| **Students who started but did not finish the program** | **About Instructors**<br>• The program has knowledgeable instructors with good teaching skills.<br>• Teachers have good delivery skills, compared with teachers at other universities.<br><br>**About Physical Setting and Facilities**<br>• The university is prestigious and located in a convenient location. | **About Administration**<br>• The program fails to pay attention to students' feedback and comments. |
| **Graduates who furthered their studies** | **About Instructors**<br>• The program has dedicated, devoted, open-minded, and patient instructors.<br>• Instructors are good models of teachers<br>• The teachers here are my inspiration. | **About Curriculum**<br>• There is no connection with Thai curriculum. Or Thai students. |

mismatch of instructors and courses, and their limited availability, were regarded as program weaknesses. In addition, the lack of direct relevance to Thai education, students' lack of motivation, and the program's ignoring of student feedback were regarded as program weaknesses.

In conclusion, although the opinions of the key stakeholders of the MATEFL program – staff and graduates/students – about strengths and weaknesses of the program were concerned with the similar elements, there were significant differences in the details raised by the two groups.

## Opinions of stakeholders on program elements

The findings from questionnaires were taken into consideration. The items that show mismatches between the emphasis on each aspect of teaching English given in the MATEFL program and the importance of each aspect to English teachers were explored further through the interviews. There were some other issues or elements emerging from the interviews, but only the program elements which were mentioned frequently by many respondents and which generated controversy are presented in the following sections.

Following identification of the issues and elements, the stakeholders' opinions from the interviews were grouped into seven program elements: admission, elective courses, facilities, scheduling, professional ethics, and thesis and non-thesis issue. To make the analysis of these results clearer, the responses of the staff and different groups of graduates/students are treated separately.

## Staff responses

The opinions of staff on different program elements – facilities, program admission, elective courses, scheduling, professional ethics, and thesis and non-thesis issue – are shown in Table 4.47.

**TABLE 4.47      STAFF OPINIONS ON PROGRAM ELEMENTS**

| Stake-holders | Program Elements | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Facilities** | **Admission** | **Elective courses** | **Scheduling** | **Professional ethics** | **Thesis vs. Non-thesis (IS)** |
| **Staff** | **Quantity**<br><br>Not enough classrooms. This problem is being solved. | **Student composition**<br><br>It is a good idea that the program accepts both students from related fields and from others.<br><br>Take anybody. I don't mind teaching an air hostess if I can make her a better trainer.<br><br>The program gives opportunity to people from other fields to learn to become English teachers. | **Availability**<br><br>The program couldn't offer elective courses as students requested. It is a self-supporting program. If the number of students interested in a course is low, we can't offer it.<br><br>The program may solve this problem by accepting more students which may leads to the facility problem, increasing tuition fees or recruiting more teachers. | **Weekend program**<br><br>Positive<br><br>Being a weekend program is our strength. It is good in terms of business. More people can come to study.<br><br>Working people can attend, but they have to work harder. | **Definitions**<br><br>Fairness, e.g. in grading students<br><br>Understanding<br><br>Listen to students<br><br>Honesty<br><br>Forgiving<br><br>Perform teachers' role<br><br>Don't let students cheat on the exam.<br><br>No plagiarism<br><br>Like the ethics in other careers.<br><br>I am not sure what it means. | **Thesis Problem**<br><br>If the MATEFL program were a regular program offering courses on weekdays, students and instructors would have time for it. |
| | | **Number**<br><br>Reduce the number of students to 20 in each cohort and increase the tuition fees. The breakeven point is a crucial factor. | | **Weekday program**<br><br>**Positive**<br><br>If we offer courses on weekdays, we can get more and better instructors because some instructors are not willing to work on weekends | **Methods**<br><br>I never talk about it in class. I think students can learn from experience.<br><br>I speak to students directly and explicitly in my subject. I tried to give examples using the content in my subject. | **IS**<br><br>**Positive**<br><br>Students can graduate in normal time.<br><br>It is like an application of research course.<br><br>Students have hands-on experience.<br><br>It is good for their future. |

| Stake-holders | Program Elements | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Facilities** | **Admission** | **Elective courses** | **Scheduling** | **Professional ethics** | **Thesis vs. Non-thesis (IS)** |
| | | | | **Positive** (cont.) Students have more time to study, can meet teachers and their research supervisors more easily, and have more time to use facilities and resources. Better students, more instructors, and solve room problem **Negative** Only government official would be able to attend. They are quite poor in English. **Both** The program should offer both | Make students aware of the negative effect of cheating. I don't talk about it very much, probably I should do more. Discuss it in class and give examples from experience. | Taking one research methodology course and IS are enough. |
| | | **Requirement** Consider English proficiency as an important factor. Consider the ability to think logically so that it will be easier to teach. | | . | | |

With respect to facilities, the staff mentioned that the insufficient number of classrooms was the problem; they pointed out, however, that this problem was being solved.

Regarding program admission, three issues were frequently mentioned: student composition, number of candidates admitted, and admission requirements. The staff preferred the program to give an opportunity to applicants from any disciplines to study in the program as long as they were qualified, i.e., having an appropriate level of English proficiency, and logical thinking skills. After considering the need to increase the quality and standards of the program and after considering problems faced by the program such as a lack of facilities, they specifically suggested that reducing the number of student intake and increasing the tuition fees would be a possible solution. This suggestion contrasted with the suggestion to increase the student intake in order to produce more graduates – which would lead to facilities and resource problems.

The staff were aware that the unavailability of elective courses was a major problem. They understood the situation and causes of the problem. The suggested solution – to increase the number of student intake – might help solve the problem of elective course, would be likely to lead to other problems such as a lack of facilities, increased tuition fees, or a lack of instructors. Therefore, it might not be the best solution for the problem.

Regarding scheduling, the staff mentioned the advantages of being a weekend program as an opportunity to have more candidates because working people who worked on weekdays could apply for the program, which was in turn good for the program in terms of business. They also gave opinions about the advantages and disadvantages of offering the program full-time on weekdays. The advantages were that more instructors would be available for the program, and students would have more time to study, to meet with instructors, and to use on-campus learning resources. The disadvantage of being a weekday program was that only public school teachers and government officials would be able to come to study because private companies would not let their employees to study on weekdays. Those public school teachers and government officials were believed to have a low level of English proficiency. Before any such change was made, the

program would need to weigh these advantages and disadvantages very carefully.

With respect to ethical issues, the staff defined the term ethics in the same way. The staff also realised the importance of promoting professional ethics in MATEFL students because those students would be teachers in the future and they should be good role models for their students. The staff said that ethics could be directly taught to the MATEFL students by including it in every subject. It could also be indirectly taught by the MATEFL instructors by demonstrating a good example to students and letting students learn from their experience.

Regarding the thesis and non-thesis (Independent Study) issue, the staff thought that the Independent Study was a more appropriate option for the weekend program. Time factors were the major reason for this.

**Graduates/students responses**

The opinions of different groups of graduates/students on program elements are presented separately, in five parts: the opinions of primary teachers, of secondary teachers, of university teachers, of students who started but did not finish the program, and of graduates who furthered their studied in a doctoral level.

***Primary teachers***

The opinions of graduates who were primary teachers on program elements are shown in Table 4.48.

Regarding admission, three issues, namely student composition, number of student, and requirement emerged. As for student composition, primary school teachers regarded the diversity of students as advantageous; that is, it promoted the exchange of ideas and experiences. Besides, it was consistent with the program goal in providing opportunities for whosoever was interested in TEFL and in helping solve the problem of teacher shortage.

**TABLE 4.48    PRIMARY TEACHER GRADUATE OPINIONS ON PROGRAM ELEMENTS**

| Stake-holders | Program Elements | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Admission** | **Elective courses** | **Facilities** | **Scheduling** | **Professional ethics** | **Thesis VS Non-thesis (IS)** |
| **Graduates (Primary teachers)** | **Student composition**<br><br>It is good to have diverse students. They can exchange ideas. If there are only teachers in class, the ideas won't be varied.<br><br>Consider the program goal – to produce teachers – student background doesn't matter. | **Availability**<br><br>We were forced to take the courses that we were not interested in but the program could offer.<br><br>We would like to take some elective courses in the MA Career program, but we were not allowed to.<br><br>The program should recruit more teachers so that more elective courses can be offered.<br><br>I don't know the reason why the program couldn't offer some elective courses. Is it because of the place or the teacher? | **Availability**<br><br>The university library has no books in the TEFL areas.<br><br>Quality<br><br>Books are too old.<br><br>. | **Weekend program**<br><br>**Positive**<br><br>Not only people who are unemployed can attend the program.<br><br>It may be difficult for students at the beginning but once they get used to it everything will be OK.<br><br>We can work and study at the same time. | **Definitions**<br><br>Fairness<br><br>Student teachers or prospective teachers like us should not cheat in the exam. We should be good examples for our students. | **Problem**<br><br>Time is the most crucial factor. It is not the matter of difficulty. Nothing is supposed to be easy in a graduate study.<br><br>As a primary teacher, research is not important to my work.' |
| | **Number**<br><br>The class is too big, so it should be divided into two classes or accept fewer students in each cohort. | | **Accessibility**<br><br>The LITU library is not easily accessible. It is crowed like a warehouse. The books are kept in locked cabinets and so it needs keys from a staff member to open the cabinets | | **Method**<br><br>It's not important enough to put in the curriculum as one subject.<br><br>The program should offer an ethics course. | |

| Stake-holders | Program Elements | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | **Admission** | **Elective courses** | **Facilities** | **Scheduling** | **Professional ethics** | **Thesis VS Non-thesis (IS)** |
| | **Requirement** English proficiency is important as well as education background. So they need remedial course. | | | **Weekday program** **Negative** The program will have only unemployed people who have little experience to share in class. | **Awareness** Everyone should be aware of it. It is hard to do. | |

Concerning the number of students, primary teachers thought that the class was too big. They suggested that it could be split into two classes. Regarding admission requirement, English proficiency was considered as the most important qualification of applicants.

As for the elective courses, the unavailability of more appropriate electives was a major problem. Primary teachers felt that they were forced to enrol in courses they were not interested in, because these were the only courses offered in the program. However, they suggested that if the MATEFL program could not offer elective courses as requested by students, students should be allowed to take elective courses in the other master's program operating at the LITU, such as the MA program in English for Careers. They also suggested that to be able to offer more elective courses the program should recruit more instructors. Although they said they did not know the cause of this problem, their suggestions indicated that they partly understood the situation.

Regarding facilities, primary teachers complained about the lack of availability, quality, and accessibility of learning resources - particularly books.

Concerning scheduling, offering the program on weekends was positively viewed as an opportunity for working people. On the other hand,

offering the program on weekdays was negatively viewed as an impediment. Fewer people, probably only the unemployed, could come to study.

With regard to professional ethics, primary teachers thought that teachers should be aware of ethics and should set good examples for their students. Fairness was viewed as an important qualification. Different opinions were given on the means to promote ethics: being included in the program as one course, for example, and not being necessarily included in the program as a course.

In relation to the thesis and non-thesis option, primary teachers thought that the time required was a major factor affecting students' decision on which option to opt for. They thought that research was not important to them as primary teachers. This opinion indicated that they did not realise the importance of research to their profession. This misunderstanding or unawareness needs to be corrected.

### Secondary teachers

The opinions of graduates who were secondary school teachers on the seven program elements are shown in Table 4.49.

Concerning student composition, secondary teachers, as for primary teachers, viewed diversity as positive in giving opportunities to interested people. As for elective courses, secondary teachers complained of a lack of variety. Regarding facilities, they complained of the quality of learning resources, particularly computers. As for scheduling, secondary teachers mentioned both advantages and disadvantages of its being a weekend program. The opportunity for working people to study and work to sustain their lives was viewed as an advantage. In contrast, difficulty in time management was viewed as a disadvantage. Concerning professional ethics, secondary teachers described professional ethics for teachers as being generous, forgiving, and willing to impart knowledge. They also proposed an

**TABLE 4.49    SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHER GRADUATE OPINIONS ON PROGRAM ELEMENTS**

| Stake-holders | Program Elements | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Admission** | **Elective courses** | **Facilities** | **Scheduling** | **Professional ethics** | **Thesis VS Non-thesis (IS)** |
| **Graduates (Secondary teachers)** | **Student composition**<br><br>The program gives an opportunity to people who want to be English teachers to study and they may change their jobs to become teachers in the future. They can be good teachers. | **Variety**<br><br>There were few choices of elective courses, but we could negotiate. | **Quality**<br><br>The computer room is not well-equipped. | **Weekend program**<br><br>**Positive**<br><br>We can work and study and still get pay raise.<br><br>**Negative**<br><br>It is time-consuming and it is difficult for working people.<br><br>It is so hard to study and work at the same time. I am so exhausted. | **Definitions**<br><br>Being a good model for students<br><br>Generosity<br><br>Forgiving<br><br>Willingness to impart knowledge to students. Do not hide anything. | **Thesis**<br><br>**Positive**<br><br>It is important for people who want to further their studies in Ph.D. level.<br><br>**Negative**<br><br>It is time-consuming and it is difficult for working people |
| | | | | | **Methods**<br><br>Teachers should model it naturally. | . |
| | | | | | **Awareness**<br><br>It is important to the profession but it was not mentioned in our program. | |

indirect means to instil ethics in students. Besides, they complained that the MATEFL program was not aware of the importance of ethical issues. Regarding the thesis and non-thesis option, secondary teachers considered not only the time but also students' purposes in taking the program as well as their future plans as factors for choosing the option.

### *University teachers*

The opinions of graduates who were university teachers on program elements are shown in Table 4.50.

**TABLE 4.50 UNIVERSITY TEACHER GRADUATE OPINIONS ON PROGRAM ELEMENTS**

| Stake-holders | Program Elements | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | **Admission** | **Elective courses** | **Facilities** | **Scheduling** | **Professional ethics** | **Thesis VS Non-thesis (IS)** |
| **Graduates (University teachers)** | **Student composition** People with no educational background might not get some ideas in their studies but I didn't consider it as a problem. I think it is challenging and fun. Students can share different ideas, experience, creativity and techniques. Diversity is OK. But there should be remedial courses for needed students in language and education/-teaching. | **Availability** I wanted to take the course that I liked and found useful for my career but they were not available. We should be allowed to take elective course in the MA Career program. Students couldn't choose elective courses because there was no teacher. | **Quantity** Not enough copies of books for students. Not enough computers for students | **Weekend program** **Positive** If I have to resign from my work to study on weekday, I won't have enough money to support myself, so the weekend program is more possible. It is easy to market the weekend program. It is tempting for people who want to get a degree easily. **Both** The program should offer courses on both weekends and weekdays.' | **Definitions** Contribution to society and country. Being a good model in every way. Don't take bribes.' Honesty Don't have sexual affairs with students Behave Being a decent person Fairness, e.g. in making exam questions, giving grades Forgiving | **Thesis** **Negative** I didn't choose the thesis option because I had to work and couldn't devote my time to it. Time to meet with supervisor is a problem. The thesis option should be cancelled because few students has chosen to do the thesis or finished it. There is no staff to take care of the thesis matter. It is difficult to finish. . |

| Stake-holders | Program Elements | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Admission** | **Elective courses** | **Facilities** | **Scheduling** | **Professional ethics** | **Thesis VS Non-thesis (IS)** |
| | | | **Quality** Excellent, well-equipped and state-of-the-art classrooms<br><br>Computers are low in capacity.<br><br>No journals in the areas.<br><br>Accessibility<br><br>The LITU library is always locked.<br><br>The university library is too competitive. | | **Awareness** It is important. Teachers should be aware of it and behave.<br><br>Foreign teachers never emphasised it.<br><br>The teacher evaluation form contains items regarding ethics. | **IS**<br><br>**Positive** It is useful for my work.<br><br>I am proud of myself that I could do it.<br><br>**Both** Positive<br><br>Good to have two options |
| | | | | | **Methods** Give examples or cases and discuss.<br><br>Be a good model.<br><br>Discuss it in class, especially in the teaching practicum.<br><br>**Problem** Some teachers in the MATEFL program do not have ethics concerning fairness. | |

Regarding student composition, diversity was considered as positive in that there was a sharing of ideas, experiences, techniques and creativity. However, they suggested that the program should organise remedial courses to reduce the gap between the experienced MATEFL students and

inexperienced MATEFL students, and between students from related fields and from non-related fields.

Concerning elective courses, university teachers complained about the unavailability of elective courses. They seemed to know that a lack of instructors is one cause of the problem and suggested that students should be allowed to take elective courses in the MA program in English for Careers, the other MA program operating at LITU.

As for facilities, university teachers complained about the lack of quantity, quality, and accessibility of learning resources; i.e., books, journals, computers, and library.

Concerning scheduling, university teachers considered the weekend program as advantageous to working people who would like to improve and upgrade themselves and also had to earn money to sustain their lives. Those people could not take leave from their full-time jobs to study full-time. They also mentioned that being a weekend program was good in terms of business opportunity. Despite this, they also suggested that the program should be offered on both weekends and weekdays.

Regarding professional ethics, university teachers gave additional definitions of ethics beyond those mentioned by the other groups. They included 'fairness' as one qualification that some MATEFL instructors did not possess. They also suggested both direct and indirect ways to build up ethics in MATEFL students. Although they recognised that the MATEFL program was aware of professional ethics by including some points in the evaluation form, they complained of some foreign instructors who were not aware of the importance of addressing ethical issues with the students.

Regarding the thesis and non-thesis option, university teachers considered time, supervision, students' purpose for their studies and administration as major factors affecting whether they would choose the thesis option or whether they would succeed in completing it. They also realised the importance of undertaking the writing of a master's thesis.

Although some suggested that the program cancelled the thesis options because of its unpopularity, others considered the ability to offer two options or the existence of the two options as advantageous.

### Students who started but did not finish the program

The opinions of students who started but did not finish the program on program elements are shown in Table 4.51.

**TABLE 4.51    STUDENTS WHO STARTED BUT DID NOT FINISH OPINIONS ON PROGRAM ELEMENTS.**

| Stake-holders | Program Elements | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Admission** | **Elective courses** | **Facilities** | **Scheduling** | **Professional ethics** | **Thesis VS Non-thesis (IS)** |
| **Students who started but did not finish the program** | **Student composition**<br><br>Accepting applicants from any field make admission more competitive and so the program can get good students. | **Availability**<br><br>I would like to take courses in the MA Career but I was not allowed to.<br><br>Interesting elective courses but there was no teacher and the number of students interested in taking a course was not enough to open the course. | **Quantity**<br><br>The program should invest more in books.<br><br>Alumni should donate books to the LITU library. | **Weekend program**<br><br>**Negative**<br><br>I have to be absent from work often.<br><br>**Both**<br><br>The program should have both systems. | **Definitions**<br><br>Honesty<br><br>Fairness<br><br>Perform teachers' role<br><br>Responsibility<br><br>Being good models for students | **Thesis**<br><br>**Negative**<br><br>I was forced to change from the thesis option to the IS option.<br><br>Students did not have enough knowledge, background, time, and resources to do the thesis.<br><br>Supervision system is not good in terms of the number of supervisors, meeting time, timely feedback, and expertise.<br><br>**Positive**<br><br>It is useful for improving people, society, and thinking skills. |

| Stake-holders | Program Elements | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Admission** | **Elective courses** | **Facilities** | **Scheduling** | **Professional ethics** | **Thesis VS Non-thesis (IS)** |
| | **Requirement** There are big differences and gaps in experience, knowledge, and language proficiency, so the program should offer remedial courses in the first two months. | | | | **Methods** It can be taught both implicitly and explicitly. **Awareness** It is important and used a lot in class. | |
| | | | | | **Problems** If the MATEFL students cheat on the exam, how could they be good models for their students when they become teachers. | |

Regarding student composition, the respondents thought that giving opportunities to applicants from any fields of studies or disciplines was advantageous to the program in that the program had more choices. However, diversity could create gaps in knowledge, experience and English proficiency, so the program should offer remedial courses to reduce the gaps.

Regarding elective courses, they also complained about the unavailability of elective courses and showed their understanding of the situation. Concerning facilities, they complained about the lack of learning facilities, especially books. With respect to scheduling, working on weekdays and studying on weekends caused students difficulties in time management. About professional ethics, honesty was added as a qualification of teachers. They saw the importance of being role models for their students. Regarding thesis and non-thesis options, they considered knowledge, time, resources, and supervision as major factors affecting their success in completing thesis. They also realised the contribution to society of undertaking research.

### Graduates who furthered their studies at doctoral level

The opinions of graduates who furthered their studies in the doctoral level on program element are shown in Table 4.52.

Regarding student composition, the respondents considered diversity as positive in that it was an opportunity for a sharing of opinions. As for elective courses, although they thought that the unavailability was a problem, they admitted that the courses they were forced to take were beneficial to them.

With respect to facilities, they complained about both the quantity and quality of facilities. Regarding scheduling, the weekend program was considered as an advantage for working people, while the weekday program was considered as a disadvantage because fewer people could come to study. As for professional ethics, they defined the ethics as being fair and responsible. They suggested the program included it in courses. Concerning the thesis and non-thesis option, they regarded the time and students' confidence as major factors affecting their decision on the option and their success in doing the thesis. They thought that the Independent Study was more appropriate for the program. However, they thought that the program should remain offering two options.

**TABLE 4.52　　OPINIONS OF GRADUATES WHO FURTHERED THEIR STUDIES AT DOCTORAL LEVEL**

| Stake holders | Program Elements | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Admission** | **Elective courses** | **Facilities** | **Scheduling** | **Profess ional ethics** | **Thesis vs. Non-thesis (IS)** |
| **Gradu-ates who furthered their studies** | **Student composi-tion**<br><br>The program gives an opportunity to people who have determi-nation and would like to contribute to the society as teachers.<br><br>There is a sharing of opinions among teachers and students from other fields. | **Avail ability**<br><br>Elective courses were not elective as their names. We were forced to choose the courses.<br><br>Although I couldn't choose the courses I liked, the courses I took were OK and beneficial.<br><br>I know the reason why the program couldn't offer some elective courses. It was because of lack of teachers, room and staff. At other uni-versity, with only 2-3 stu-dent en-rolment, they still open a course. | **Quantity and Quality**<br><br>Add facili-ties that will help make teachers less tired. | **Weekend program**<br><br>**Positive**<br><br>Working people have opportunities to study and they can af-ford it. | **Definitions**<br><br>Fairness, especially when the class is big<br><br>Responsibility in teaching | **Thesis**<br><br>**Negative**<br><br>It takes time and needs knowledge, so it is dif-ficult for working people.'<br><br>Few students have chosen to do the thesis and many students changed their mind from the thesis option to IS option due to a lack of con-fidence. |
| | | | | **Weekdays**<br><br>**Negative**<br><br>Only teach-ers who can take leaves can attend the program. | **Methods**<br><br>Put it in courses. | **IS**<br><br>**Positive**<br><br>Doing the IS seems to be more possi-ble and more realistic. |
| | | | | | | **Both**<br><br>**Positive**<br><br>It is good to have two options. |

## Impacts of the MATEFL program on graduates/students

The impacts of the MATEFL program on graduates/students which emerged from the interviews with the key stakeholders (the staff and graduates/students) were determined regardless of whether they were intended ones according to the program goals, or unintended ones.

### Intended outcomes

The intended impacts were categorised according to the standards for EFL teachers as shown in Table 4.53.

**TABLE 4.53    IMPACTS (INTENDED OUTCOMES) ON GRADUATES/ STUDENTS**

| Stake-holder | Intended Outcomes | | | | | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Technical skills | Pedagogical skills | Interperson-al skills | Personal qualities | Professional-ism | |
| **Staff** | **Positive** The program uses English as a medium of instruction and so it helps improve students' English proficiency. | | | | | **Positive** Even poor students can get good jobs and be happy with their work. |
| **Graduates (Primary teachers)** | | **Positive** I learnt about teaching theories and teaching techniques. I also had a chance to practice teaching. All of these benefited me a lot. I used what I learnt in my work, e.g. teaching methodology (4 skills), testing and evaluation, phonetics, and language acquisition. | | | | **Positive** It gives me future. My investments return a high rate of interest. |

| Stake-holder | Intended Outcomes | | | | | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Technical skills** | **Pedagogical skills** | **Interperson-al skills** | **Personal qualities** | **Professional-ism** | |
| **Graduates (Secondary teachers)** | | **Positive** I can use a lot of teaching techniques in class. Theories can be applied to real class. **Negative** I didn't see much difference to myself in teaching my high school students. | | **Positive** What I learnt from the MATEFL instructors is how to be a dedicated and sacrificing teacher. | | |
| **Graduates (University teachers)** | **Positive** I improved a lot in terms of English skills, especially pronunciation. | **Positive** I improved myself in terms of teaching methodology. Academically I gained enough knowledge and skills for being a tutor and teaching in secondary schools and in undergraduate level. **Negative** I gained basic knowledge for teaching but not enough to be a quality teacher. | | **Positive** I am confident in my knowledge. I am more confident in teaching skills. I got more analytical mind and became more systematic. | **Positive** The program gave me an opportunity to develop myself professionally. **Negative** The research knowledge and skills gained from the program are not enough for my university work that requires me to do at least one piece of research a year. | **Positive** The program has changed my life. It is like a light at the end of the tunnel or a bridge that leads me to success. The program is like a mould that form good English teachers. |
| **Students who started but did not finish the program** | **Positive** My English proficiency is higher. I gained fundamental knowledge. | **Positive** I know how to plan lessons, analyse and solve students' problems. | | **Positive** I have better thinking skills and system which affect the way I deal with people. | | |
| **Graduates who** | | **Positive** I have more | **Positive** I learnt to | **Positive** I feel that I | **Positive** I got to know | |

146

| Stake-holder | Intended Outcomes | | | | | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Technical skills | Pedagogical skills | Interperson-al skills | Personal qualities | Professional-ism | |
| **furthered their studies** | | techniques to interest students. | listen to people's opinions, especially my students' opinions.<br><br>I learnt to be more open-minded and patient.' | can be a good teacher. | people in the field who encouraged me to study in the Ph.D. level.<br><br>What I learnt from the program helped me get into the Ph.D. program and also helped in my studies. | |

Half of the stakeholder groups – staff, university teachers, and students who started but did not finish the program – thought that the program helped improve their English proficiency which was regarded as the technical skills (TEC), while the other three groups – primary teachers, secondary teachers and graduates who furthered their studies at doctoral level – did not mention anything about this category. In addition, most of the respondents thought that the program had a positive impact in improving their pedagogical skills (PED); that is to say, they could apply teaching techniques and methods they learned in the program to their work; however, the graduates who were secondary teachers did not think that the program affected their teaching ability. They attributed this to school policy, big classes, and poor students. The graduate who was a university teacher thought that while the program helped improve their ability to teach, it was not enough to make them a good teacher.

Concerning interpersonal skills (INT), only the graduates who furthered their studies at doctoral level mentioned the impact of the program in improving the skills that enhanced interpersonal relationships. Those skills were being patient, open-minded, and willing to listen to others. In relation to personal qualities (PER), most of the respondents improved some of their personal qualities – dedication, sacrifice, self-confidence, working more

systematically, and becoming more analytical – through their studies in the program and seeing good role models from the MATEFL instructors.

Regarding professionalism (PRO), the respondents thought that they improved themselves both professionally and academically. However, some thought that the program had no real impact on their research ability which was required of their jobs. Overall, the MATEFL had impacts on graduates and students in every standard or skill category.

**Unintended outcomes**

Other impacts which were not related to intended outcomes were identified as unintended outcomes; these are shown in Table 4.54. Networking, keeping up with others, gaining acceptance and trustworthiness, and valuing teaching profession as well as teacher training were impacts of the MATEFL program on graduates and students. The impact of the program on staff was also determined from the interviews. Feeling proud and happy as well as having a chance to do something to pay back to society were what the staff gained from involving in the program. The opinions of staff suggested that they were approaching the self-actualisation stage in Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs.

**TABLE 4.54    IMPACTS (UNINTENDED OUTCOMES) ON GRADUATES/ STUDENTS**

| Stake-holders | Unintended outcomes |
|---|---|
| **Staff** | • It is a service we provide to our society and it increases the good reputation of Thai University. <br> • I put a lot into it and I also get a lot out of it. I feel I achieve something. <br> • A lot of graduates are using an MA to get the promotion in other jobs. <br> • Taking part in this program and having seen students graduating and getting good jobs make me feel happy and proud that the teaching profession is not devalued or looked down upon. <br> • I feel happy and proud that teaching profession is not devalued or looked down upon. <br> • Some graduates do other jobs that use English., e.g. hotel trainers. |
| **Graduates (Primary teachers)** | • I have good friends from the program. <br> • I belong to the professional group. <br> • I can understand and talk to people in the same field when meeting them in a seminar or conference.' |

| Stake-holders | Unintended outcomes |
|---|---|
| **Graduates (Secondary teachers)** | • I got promoted after I gained an MA in TEFL. <br> • My educational qualification is higher.' |
| **Graduates (University teachers)** | • Positive <br> • I am trusted by others more. <br> • I get to know good people and have more friends. <br> • I got friends from other fields. <br> • Negative <br> • I realised that my knowledge is not enough to further my studies in the Ph.D. level. I felt ashamed.' |
| **Students who started but did not finish the program** | • Other people trust me more. <br> • I got better thinking skills, which affects the way I talk to people and the way I teach. |
| **Graduates who furthered their studies** | • My viewpoints about being teachers have changed. Not everyone can be a good teacher. We must be trained. <br> • I am more accepted by students and colleagues. <br> • I feel that I am part of the country and belong to the profession. I will take on this responsibility to my best ability. |

# Findings Relating to Quality Assurance (QA)

To find out what quality assurance aspects emerged from this program evaluation, the established standards and standard indicators of the Language Institute were reviewed, together with the Language Institute and MATEFL documents applied to the academic years 1998-2000. The findings from questionnaires and interviews were also taken into consideration. The findings concerned with those standards – whether they were from document reviews, questionnaires or interviews – are reported in Tables 4.55-4.59.

According to the quality assurance documents prepared by the Language Institute of Thai University (Language Institute Self-Assessment Report 2001), seven QA standards are specified, along with indicators which explain the way to achieve each standard. Although this evaluation was not intended to judge whether a program achieves each of the standards, it is

reasonable to determine what is expected for each indicator. Those standards, with their indicators, are as follows:

1.  **Quality of Graduates:** employment, employers' satisfaction, publication/presentation of graduates' research, applicant qualification, admission, English proficiency of applicants, graduation rate, and the number of graduates receiving awards;

2.  **Research and Innovation:** instructors' research, publication/presentation of instructors' research, budget to support research, research grant, and research articles cited in refereed journal;

3.  **Academic Services:** offering academic service and activities to public and society, offering academic and professional service to other organisations, application of knowledge and experience gained from providing academic and professional services to instruction and research, and expense on providing academic and professional services;

4.  **Promoting Thai Culture:** projects and activities that promote Thai culture and budget on promoting Thai culture;

5.  **Development of Organisation and Personnel:** development of the organisation to become a learning organisation, administration and management, share of resources within the institution and with other institutions, number of instructors attending seminars and conferences, professional development of instructors, professional development of supporting staff, and budget/expense: FTES;

6.  **Curriculum and Instruction:** ratio of students to instructors, instructors' qualification, instructors' academic title, learning process, students' satisfaction with instructors and resources, use

of instructional technology, workload of instructors, and qualified curriculum; and

7. **Quality Assurance System:** having internal quality assurance and effectiveness of internal quality assurance.

## Standard 1 (Quality of graduates)

The findings relating to Standard 1 (Quality of Graduates) are shown in Table 4.55. Eight aspects or indicators indicated the achievement of this standard: employment, employers' satisfaction, publication/presentation of graduates' research, applicant qualification, admission, English proficiency of applicants, graduation rate, and graduates receiving awards.

As shown in Table 4.55, the stakeholders gave their opinions about the graduates of the MATEFL program in different aspects. They mentioned the ability to gain employment as English teachers and the ability to work. They also mentioned the satisfaction of graduates' employers and society with the MATEFL graduates, and high qualification of candidates in both English proficiency and academic records. Although they were satisfied with

TABLE 4.55    FINDINGS IN RESPECT OF THE QUALITY OF GRADUATES (STANDARD 1)

| Indicators (Explanation) | Program Data from Program Document | Staff opinions | Stakeholders' opinions | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Graduates/Student | Employers |
| **Standard 1: Quality of Graduates** | | | | |
| **1. Employment** (Ability to get a job within one year) <u>Note</u>: According to Thai University indicators, only the employment rate of graduates from undergraduate programs were mentioned. | No graduates were unemployed and almost 83 per cent of graduates became English teachers. | • The graduates are of high quality and they can get jobs easily. | • We have become English teachers at other institutes. | |

| Indicators (Explanation) | Program Data from Program Document | Staff opinions | Stakeholders' opinions | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | Graduates/Student | Employers |
| **2. Employers' satisfaction** | Graduates' employers had high satisfaction with graduates. | • The society is satisfied with our products. | • They are accepted by both public and private universities.<br>• They are also trusted by other institutions. | • I have high expectation of the MATEFL graduate in his work and I am not disappointed at all. |
| **3. Publication/ presentation of graduates' research**<br><br>(No. of Master's thesis or equivalent work published in national or international journals) | The research study (Master's thesis) by a graduate from the first cohort was published in a national journal. | | • The Language Institute should provide some support for students to present their research in an international or national conference and to submit their work to journals of teaching English or applied linguistics.<br>• Add more research courses and academic/ research writing. | |
| **4. Applicant Qualificat-ion**<br><br>(Average G.P.A. of applicants) | 3.06 (1998)<br>2.96 (1999)<br>2.88 (2000)<br>Average: 2.97 | • Students are highly motivated, determined, and of good quality.<br>• The quality of students is high. They are proficient and skilful learners.<br>• Some students are not familiar with spending a lot of time on independent learning which requires them to be able to use their skills in criticizing and analysing. | • The program recruited students who have high level of motivation and good attitude. | |

| Indicators (Explanation) | Program Data from Program Document | Staff opinions | Stakeholders' opinions | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Graduates/Student | Employers |
| **5. Admission** (Admission rate/ competitiveness) | 1 : 7.16 (1998)<br>1 : 4.75 (1999)<br>1 : 4.62 (2000)<br>Average 1: 5.51 | • Classes should be smaller. To be able to do so, we need more financial support.<br>• The program should accept lower number of students (approximately 20 each intake.)<br>• The number of applicants is not high enough, so we don't have a lot of opportunities to select the applicants we want. | • The MATEFL written admission exam's validity is questionable.<br>• More objective tests should be designed.<br>• To be able to get good English teachers, the program should accept only applicants from related fields such as linguistics, education, etc.<br>• It's not easy to get into the program. It is very competitive. | |
| **6. English proficiency of applicants** (Obtain 550 or over on Thai University Graduate English Test – TEGET score) | The average score of three cohorts is 688.85. | • The program recruited students who have good English proficiency.<br>• Candidates in the program are not ideal: That is, some have low level of English proficiency, while others seem to be quite fluent.<br>• In an admission process, the program should take into consideration the applicants' abilities in English proficiency. | • Students in the MATEFL program already have good English skills, so they do not need the English proficiency development course.<br>• The proficiency development course is not enough to improve my English. I myself am not good at writing.<br>• The admission score for the English proficiency test (TU-GET) should be higher. It should be 600-650 instead of 550). | |
| **7. Graduation rate** | 83.17 % of students graduated in normal time (two years). | | • It's not easy to graduate from this program. You have to be good enough. | |
| **8. Graduates receiving awards** | None | | | |

the candidates' qualifications, they made suggestions regarding: improvement to the admission process to increase the quality of candidates; ways to increase the presentation and publication of research conducted by graduates. In mentioning the difficulty of completing the program, the stakeholders referred to the high standards that it demanded.

In conclusion, without having direct reference to QA standards regarding graduate quality, the data gained from program documents and opinions of stakeholders suggest that the program stakeholders were concerned with all of the indicators in this category and aware that the worth of the program depended on many aspects of graduate quality. Although whether or not the QA standards were met was not the concern of this evaluation, it is good to know that the program achieved the QA standards in respect to the quality of graduates.

## Standard 2 (Research and innovation)

The findings relating to Standard 2 (Research and Innovation) are shown in Table 4.56. Five aspects indicating the achievement of this standard were: instructors' research, publication/presentation of instructors' research, budget to support instructors' research, research grants for instructors, and research articles cited in refereed journals.

As shown in Table 4.56, different stakeholders emphasized different aspects of research and innovation. Of the three groups of stakeholders, only the staff mentioned instructors' research. They realised the importance of instructors conducting research studies; moreover, they suggested ways of promoting the conduct of research and presentation of results. The points mentioned by staff were consistent with two out of five indicators in this standard. No stakeholders indicated any awareness of the importance of support from the Institute for instructors' research or awareness of the application of research, nor was any reference found in Institute or program

**TABLE 4.56     FINDINGS IN RESPECT OF RESEARCH AND INNOVATION (STANDARD 2)**

| Aspects (Explanation) | Program Data from Program Document | Staff opinions | Stakeholders' opinions | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Graduates/Student | Employers |
| **Standard 2: Research and Innovation** | | | | |
| **1. Instructors' research** <br><br> (No. of research : No. of instructors) | n/a | The instructors should do more research …. | | |
| **2. Publication/-Presentation of instructors' research** <br><br> (No. of research published in national or international journals) | n/a | The teachers should … and present their work in a conference. <br><br> The Institute should organize seminars or conferences for English teachers. In the seminars, students and teachers can present their research studies or independent studies. This can lead to the quality improvement of research and the dissemination of academic work. | | |
| **3. Budget to support research** <br><br> (Budget allotted for research: No. of instructors) | n/a | | | |
| **4. Research grants** <br><br> (No. of instructors receiving research grants from internal or external source) | n/a | | | |
| **5. Research articles cited in refereed journal** <br><br> (Percentage of research articles cited in refereed journal : No. of instructors) | n/a | | | |

documents to instructors' research, publication/presentation of instructors' research, budget to support research, research grants, and research articles cited in refereed journals.

In conclusion, only two QA elements regarding research and innovation arose from this evaluation.

## Standard 3 (Academic service)

The stakeholders made no mention of the standards for academic services, nor was any reference found in the Institute and program documents relating to these standards.

## Standard 4 (Promoting Thai culture)

The stakeholders did not mention either of the two elements which indicated the achievement of Standard 4 (Promoting Thai Culture).

## Standard 5 (Development of organisation and personnel)

The findings relating to Standard 5 (Development of Organisation and Personnel) are shown in Table 4.57.

**TABLE 4.57      FINDINGS IN RESPECT OF DEVELOPMENT OF ORGANISATION AND PERSONNEL (STANDARD 5)**

| Aspects (Explanation) | Program Data from Program Document | Staff opinions | Stakeholders' opinions | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Graduates/Student | Employers |
| **Standard 5: Development of Organisation and Personnel** | | | | |
| **1. Development of the Organisation to be Learning Organisation** | n/a | The Institute should organize seminars or conferences for English teachers. In the seminars, students and teachers can present their research studies or independent studies. This can lead to the quality | | |

| Aspects (Explanation) | Program Data from Program Document | Staff opinions | Stakeholders' opinions | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Graduates/Student | Employers |
| | | improvement of research and the dissemination of academic work. | | |
| **2. Administration and Management** (The administrators have vision that will drive the organisation to achievement, seek cooperation among people, decentralization, are transparent and accountable, etc.) | n/a | | The program policy and decision are not transparent. The program needs better and more professional organization. The program is administered systematically. | |
| **3. Share of resources within the institution and with other institutions** | n/a | The program should invite more external experts. This will increase the quality and strengths of the program in terms of academic. The LITU has a pool of regular as well as visiting instructors and professors who specialize in different areas in ESL teaching. | We wanted to take some MA Career courses but we are not allowed to. LITU was not enthusiastic about inviting external experts to teach. Not enough resources. We have to go to the university library or other universities. Students and instructors have to share the research library which is very crowded. | |
| **4. Attending seminars and conference** (No. of instructors attending conference, seminar or presenting academic work/academic events) | n/a | The Institute should organize seminars or conferences for English teachers. In the seminars, students and teachers can present their research studies or independent studies. This can lead to the quality improvement of research and the dissemination of academic work. | The LITU is not enthusiastic about keeping abreast of the world. | |

| Aspects (Explanation) | Program Data from Program Document | Staff opinions | Stakeholders' opinions | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Graduates/Student | Employers |
| **5. Professional development of instructors** (Budget to support instructors to develop themselves) | n/a | | The LITU is not enthusiastic about keeping abreast of the world. | |
| **6. Professional development of supporting staff** (Budget to support staff to develop themselves) | n/a | | | |
| **7. Budget/ expense: FTES** | n/a | | | |

The stakeholders commented on the inadequacies and ineffectiveness of program administration and management. They were aware of the importance of continuous professional development. They suggested that the sharing of learning resources would help solve many existing problems. They also suggested the ways to promote learning organisation. There was no reference found in the Institute and program documents with respect to the development of organisation and personnel. The Institute should maintain records on this topic so that when it is appropriate they can be referred to.

## Standard 6 (Curriculum and instruction)

The findings relating to Standard 6 (Curriculum and Instruction) are shown in Table 4.58. The stakeholders mentioned the lack of qualified instructors, the lack of resources, no lesson planning and heavy workload as problems. They also gave suggestions on the adjustment of course, instructor evaluation process and learning process. There was no reference found in the Institute and program documents relating to the ratio of students to instructors, learning process, use of educational technology and qualified curriculum.

**TABLE 4.58     FINDINGS IN RESPECT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION (STANDARD 6)**

| Aspects (Explanation) | Program Data from Program Document | Staff opinions | Stakeholders' opinions | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Graduates/ Student | Employers |
| **Standard 6: Curriculum and Instruction** | | | | |
| **1. Ratio of students to instructors** | n/a | | No teachers for some elective courses.<br><br>There are insufficient number of research supervisors.<br><br>The number of Independent study supervisor to students is too high. (1 : 4 or 5) | |
| **2. Instructors' qualificat-ion**<br><br>(No. of doctorates) | The Language Institute had 9 doctorate instructors. | The instructors teaching in our program are qualified. Most of them have doctoral degree.<br><br>Qualification of foreign teachers is not specified. | Some foreign teachers have low quality.<br><br>The LITU should find qualified, knowledgeable, and skilful instructors more. | |
| **3. Instructors' academic titles**<br><br>(No. of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor) | The Language Institute had 13 Assistant Professors and 4 Associate Professors. | Our teachers are qualified. They have academic titles like associate professor and good command of English. | | |
| **4. Learning process -- focusing on learner-centered-ness, practical application and hands-on experience**<br><br>(No. of practical courses/seminar/ fieldwork : No. of subjects, ) | n/a | There is a combination of teaching and learning of English, linguistics, media, culture, etc.<br><br>Seeking a balance of theoretical and practical application.<br><br>Some instructors did not prepare course outlines in detail -- no detailed plan for each week. | The curriculum focuses on both theories and practices (skills).<br><br>The variety of courses are offered.<br><br>More teaching practicum in real schools.<br><br>Students have different understanding on student-centeredness. Students with no teaching experience couldn't visualize it or apply the ideas.<br><br>Has the seminar course ever been offered? | The Masters Program in TEFL should emphasize teaching theories of every skill, as well as teaching practices in accordance with those theories. |
| **5. Students' satisfaction with instructors and resources** | The Program surveyed students' satisfaction with the courses and instructors every semester. | In course and instructor evaluation, students should be asked to give more details about themselves. | The evaluation form and criteria needs revision. Course and instructor evaluation lacks accuracy. | |

| Aspects (Explanation) | Program Data from Program Document | Staff opinions | Stakeholders' opinions | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Graduates/ Student | Employers |
| **6. Use of educational technology** (Budget on computer lab and Information System centre) | n/a | | A lack of computer room is a problem. I found that the university allows the MATEFL students to use computer at the university computer lab and the Institute will pay for the service staff. | |
| **7. Workload of instructors** (No. of sections : No. of instructors) | Normal load of instructor is 9 hours a week. | The MATEFL program needs a larger staff, more time to devote to the program, and better communi-cation procedures with the students and teaching staff. | Some instructors teach more than one subjects. | |
| **8. Qualified Curriculum** (Percentage of curriculum that meets standard : No. of curriculum) | n/a | | | |

In conclusion, the program stakeholders were aware of the quality of students, instructors, instruction and curriculum as important factors leading to the quality of the program as a whole.

## Standard 7 (Quality assurance system)

The findings relating to Standard 7 (Quality Assurance System) are shown in Table 4.59. The stakeholders indicated their awareness of the necessity of quality assurance and the application of its results to the MATEFL program. There was no mention of the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance, nor was there any reference found in the Institute and program documents relating to quality assurance system during the first three years of the MATEFL (years 1998-2000). This is because the quality assurance system did not exist then.

**TABLE 4.59     FINDINGS IN RESPECT OF THE QUALITY ASSURANCE
                 SYSTEM (STANDARD 7)**

| Aspects (Explanation) | Program Data from Program Document | Staff opinions | Stakeholders' opinions | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Graduates/Student | Employers |
| **Standard 7 : Quality Assurance System** | | | | |
| **1. Internal quality assurance** (Having continuous internal quality assurance system that leads to development of quality of education) | n/a | To keep abreast with the ever-changing global technology and to cope with the current need of our student population, curricula need to be revised every four years. | There should be an evaluation of the program by external experts to improve the academic aspects of the program.' | |
| **2. Effective-ness of Internal Quality Assurance** | n/a | | | |

The stakeholders raised a number of QA issues related to the MATEFL program. Similarly, a number of QA issues could be identified in the Institute and program documents, questionnaires, and interviews. In the main, these were consistent with the quality assurance issues and indicators specified by the Language Institute. Specific data on many QA elements relating to the first three years of the MATEFL program were unavailable as these years pre-dated the advent of QA.

## Conclusion

Demographic data of the MATEFL program stakeholders, their opinions regarding the effectiveness of the program, together with their opinions regarding the program elements and aspects of teaching English, and data on Quality Assurance related to the MATEFL program have been presented in the chapter. Reflections relating to the research, discussion and recommendations will be presented in the next chapter.

# Chapter 5

# Impact Evaluation: A Reflection

## Introduction

This chapter is a reflection on the Impact Evaluation. It contains key issues arising from the evaluation, recommendations arising from these issues, how these recommendations overlap with the literature, reflections on the process, and implications for future research.

## Issues Arising from the Impact Evaluation

In this section, the key issues arising from the Impact Evaluation are identified and discussed: those arising from the questionnaires, the interviews, and with respect to quality assurance.

### Issues from questionnaires

The issues that emerged from the questionnaires are divided into those arising from stakeholders' demographic data, stakeholders' opinions, and open-ended questions. They are discussed in the sub-sections that follow.

### Stakeholders' demographic data

In this Impact Evaluation, the data were collected from the stakeholders of the MATEFL program; namely, staff, graduates/students, and employers of

the graduates. These people were impacted by the program, either directly or indirectly. The focus was placed on the MATEFL graduates upon whom the outcomes of the program had the greatest immediate impact.

The key issue arising from this evaluation was that the program had a positive impact on those graduates in gaining employment as English teachers, especially in universities. Significantly, the MATEFL program qualified graduates to teach in higher education institutions. Appointment as a university lecturer, with its relatively high salary and the high respect it gains from the public, marks this as one of the most prestigious professional advancements that can be made in Thailand. Thus, it can be inferred that career advancement is a major impact of the MATEFL on the graduates. Secondly, it was found that more than half of the graduates who were previously not teaching English changed their jobs to become English teachers. This impact on career changes of graduates can be regarded as another key issue arising from this evaluation. Finally, the program achieved two program goals: to develop the quality and standards of English teachers and to help solve the problem of a shortage of qualified English teachers (although the extent of the program's success in this regard was not studied).

**Stakeholders' opinions**

This Impact Evaluation sought to find out how well the program met the expectations of stakeholders with special reference to workplace requirements. To achieve this, I determined whether or not any gaps existed between the program and workplace requirements and, if they did exist, what was the nature of these gaps. Questionnaires were used to collect data from staff, graduates/students, and employers. Staff and graduates/students were asked to rate the emphasis the program placed on each aspect of teaching English (in order to determine the program requirements) and to rate the importance of each aspect to the actual teaching of English (in order to determine the workplace requirements). Employers were asked to rate their expectations of the graduates, as their employees, on each aspect of teaching

English and to rate the actual performance of the graduates. The results are summarised in Tables 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3, respectively.

In the category of technical skills (TEC), two aspects that staff both highly emphasised and found highly important were English proficiency and an ability to communicate regularly in class in English. In the category of pedagogical skills (PED), there were three aspects that staff both highly emphasised and found highly important: an ability to plan English language lessons; an ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively; knowledge of language testing and assessment.

In the opinion of graduates/students, the aspects which were both highly emphasised and highly important was an ability to be a good role model in using English in teaching in the technical skills group (TEC). The aspects in the pedagogical skill groups (PED) which were significant were an ability to manage an English language classroom effectively and an ability to impart knowledge effectively to students.

With respect to the opinions of staff and graduates/students about the level of emphasis the program placed on each aspect and the importance of each aspect to English teachers, it was found that the MATEFL graduates were well prepared to be English teachers in the aspects identified above, especially in technical skills (TEC). The MATEFL graduates were also well prepared in some aspects in the pedagogical skills group (PED). In other words, the MATEFL program was successful in preparing the MATEFL graduates to meet workplace requirements in those aspects. Therefore, those aspects should be sustained and maintained.

In the opinion of the staff, the aspects with low emphasis and low importance were those in the interpersonal skills (INT) group and selected aspects of the pedagogical skills (PED) group. The former include an ability to cater for students from diverse interests, backgrounds, levels of proficiency, and development of interpersonal skills. The latter include knowledge of educational technology, an ability to apply educational

technology in English teaching and learning, and ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English, and an understanding of the organisation and structure of English language education in Thailand.

**TABLE 5.1        SUMMARY OF ALL STAKEHOLDERS' OPINIONS**

| | | Emphasis/Expectation | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | **High** | **Low** |
| **Import-ance/** *Perfor-mance* | **High** | English proficiency (TEC): *Staff and Employer* | High ethical standards of professional conduct (PER): *Staff and Grad/Student and Employer* |
| | | Ability to communicate in class in English (TEC): *Staff* | |
| | | Ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively (PED): *Staff* | |
| | | Knowledge of language testing and assessment (PED): *Staff* | |
| | | Good role model in using English (TEC): *Grad/Student* | |
| | | Ability to manage class (PED): *Grad/Student* | |
| | | Ability to develop a positive attitude amongst students (PRO): *Employer* | |
| | | Ability to conduct a lesson according to plan (PED): *Employer* | |
| | | Ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner (PRO): *Employer* | |
| | | Ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids (PED): *Employer* | |
| | | A positive attitude toward the English teaching profession (PRO): *Employer* | |
| | | An awareness of the language learning problems of students (PED): *Employer* | |
| | | Ability to impart knowledge effectively (PED): *Grad/Student and Employer* | |
| | | Ability to plan English lessons (PED): *Staff and Grad/Student* | |
| | **Low** | Knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories (PED): *Employer* | Ability to cater for students from diverse interests, backgrounds, levels of proficiency (INT): *Staff* |
| | | | Development of interpersonal skills (INT): *Staff* |
| | | | Ability to take on different roles (PED): *Staff* |
| | | | Knowledge of research in English language teaching (PRO): *Grad/Student and Employer* |
| | | | Application of research knowledge and findings (PRO): *Grad/Student and Employer* |
| | | | Knowledge of educational technology (PED): *Staff and Grad/Student and Employer* |
| | | | Ability to apply educational technology (PED): *Staff and Grad/Student* |

| | | Emphasis/Expectation | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | **High** | **Low** |
| | | | Knowledge of language testing and assessment (PED): *Employer* |
| | | | Understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand (PED): *Staff and Grad/Student and Employer* |

**TABLE 5.2   SUMMARY OF STAFF AND GRADUATES'/STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

| | | Emphasis | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | **High** | **Low** |
| **Import-ance** | **High** | English proficiency (TEC): *Staff* | High ethical standards of professional conduct (PER): *Staff and Grad/Student* |
| | | Ability to communicate in class in English (TEC): *Staff* | |
| | | Ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively (PED): *Staff* | |
| | | Knowledge of language testing and assessment (PED): *Staff* | |
| | | Good role model in using English (TEC): *Grad/Student* | |
| | | Ability to manage class (PED): *Grad/Student* | |
| | | Ability to impart knowledge effectively (PED): *Grad/Student* | |
| | | Ability to plan English lessons (PED): *Staff and Grad/Student* | |
| | **Low** | | Ability to cater for students from diverse interests, backgrounds, levels of proficiency (INT): *Staff* |
| | | | Development of interpersonal skills (INT): *Staff* |
| | | | Ability to take on different roles (PED): *Staff* |
| | | | Knowledge of research in English language teaching (PRO): *Grad/Student* |
| | | | Application of research knowledge and findings (PRO): *Grad/Student* |
| | | | Knowledge of educational technology (PED): *Staff and Grad/Student* |
| | | | Ability to apply educational technology (PED): *Staff and Grad/Student* |
| | | | Understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand (PED): *Staff and Grad/Student* |

166

**TABLE 5.3       SUMMARY OF EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS**

| | | Expectation | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | **High** | **Low** |
| **Perform-ance** | **High** | English proficiency (TEC): *Employer* | High ethical standards of professional conduct (PER): *Employer* |
| | | Ability to develop a positive attitude amongst students (PRO): *Employer* | |
| | | Ability to conduct a lesson according to plan (PED): *Employer* | |
| | | Ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner (PRO): *Employer* | |
| | | Ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids (PED): *Employer* | |
| | | A positive attitude toward the English teaching profession (PRO): *Employer* | |
| | | Ability to impart knowledge effectively (PED): *Employer* | |
| | **Low** | Knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories (PED): *Employer* | Knowledge of research in English language teaching (PRO): *Employer* |
| | | | Application of research knowledge and findings (PRO): *Employer* |
| | | | Knowledge of educational technology (PED): *Employer* |
| | | | Knowledge of language testing and assessment (PED): *Employer* |
| | | | Understanding of the organization and structure of English language education in Thailand (PED): *Employer* |

In the opinion of graduates/students, the aspects with low emphasis and low importance were those in the professionalism group (PRO) and selected aspects of the pedagogical skills (PED) group. The former include knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning and the application of research knowledge and findings. The latter include knowledge of educational technology, an ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning, and an understanding of the organisation and structure of English language education. Although those aspects were emphasised at a low level, they were regarded as of low importance and should be ignored.

In the opinion of both staff and graduates/students, there was one aspect from the personal qualities group (PER) – high ethical standards of professional conduct – that had low emphasis but high importance. It can be inferred that the MATEFL graduates were not well prepared to be English teachers in the aspect of professional ethics. In other words, the MATEFL graduates did not meet workplace requirements in this aspect; therefore, this aspect should be examined with a view to increasing the level of emphasis.

A questionnaire was administered to the graduates' employers to find out whether their expectation of the graduates, as their employees, were met. The aspects with high expectation and high performance were English proficiency, an aspect in the technical skills group (TEC); an ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English, an ability to be self-directed, motivated learners of English, and a positive attitude towards the English teaching profession which are aspects in the professionalism group (PRO); an ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and materials, an ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan, an ability to impart knowledge effectively to students, and an awareness of the language learning problems of students of English – all of which are aspects of the pedagogical skills group (PED).

It can be inferred that the MATEFL program had a positive impact on the graduates so that they were well-prepared to work as English teachers who met their employers' expectations in these selected aspects of technical skills (TEC), professionalism (PRO), and pedagogical skills (PED). Therefore, these aspects should be sustained and maintained. On the other hand, an aspect from the pedagogical skills group (PED) which had high expectation but low performance was knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories. In other words, the program was not effective in preparing the graduates to work or meet employers' expectation in this respect and so this aspect should be improved.

It was interesting to learn that in the opinion of employers, high ethical standards of professional conduct, which was one aspect in the

category of personal qualities (PER), had low expectation but high performance although this aspect was considered by both staff and graduates/students as low emphasis but high importance. This implies that staff and graduates/students thought that the program did not prepare graduates well in the aspect of ethical standards whereas, in reality, the graduates met the workplace requirement in this aspect.

In conclusion, the program had a positive impact on the MATEFL graduates/students in preparing them to be English teachers; it also met some, but not all, workplace requirements. Those aspects that did not meet workplace requirements need to be improved. It can be inferred that the program generally achieved its goal in developing the quality and standards of English teachers to meet workplace requirements. The judgment regarding the achievement of this goal is justified by this research.

Overall, the program achieved its goal in offering a curriculum of effective English teaching theory and practice although, as identified previously, the extent of this achievement was not thoroughly assessed. Being able to meet the workplace requirements in many aspects of the five categories of EFL teacher standards, which cover both theoretical and practical application aspects, justifies this conclusion.

**Open-ended questions**

I found that the aspects that the MATEFL stakeholders – staff, graduates/students, graduates' employers – took into consideration in regard to effectiveness of the program were students, instructors, courses, facilities, administration, and provision of program. Regarding students, the stakeholders considered students' proficiency both before entering the program and after graduating from the program. The stakeholders also took into account the student composition as well as personal qualities. Regarding instructors, the stakeholders considered: instructors' proficiency in terms of knowledge of the subject and teaching ability; instructors' personality, instructor composition, especially in terms of areas of expertise. In respect of

courses, the stakeholders placed their focus on the content, composition and balance of courses. Finally, aspects such as facilities in terms of location and learning resources, administration, and provision of the program (time and length) were also considered. These aspects are important and need to be taken into account when designing, establishing, administering, and evaluating any changes to the program.

The findings from the open-ended questions led me to draw conclusions about the aspects that were considered as the program strengths, those that were considered as the program weaknesses, and those that were controversial amongst stakeholders. The stakeholders were satisfied with: students' and graduates' quality; most of the instructors' knowledge, experience, personality, and teaching ability; the variety of courses which included both theoretical and practical components; the program location, program costs, and the university reputation. It is reasonable to say that those strong aspects of the program should be sustained and maintained.

On the other hand, the stakeholders were not satisfied with the following: the composition of program instructors – a lack of experts in some areas, which was identified as a 'program weakness'; the teaching style of some instructors as well as their availability and accessibility; the limitation in the provision of elective courses; inadequacy of practical application components; imbalance between the thesis and non-thesis option; the lack of relevance to the Thai educational context; a lack of emphasis on moral and professional ethics; a lack of extracurricular activities. These weak aspects of the program should be strengthened and improved.

The aspects that remained controversial were as follows: the student intake numbers; diversity of students; balance between theory and practice; quantity and quality of learning resources; program length and time. I recommend that the program leaders and designers seek balance and agreement on these controversial aspects so that satisfactory changes can be generated in regard to them.

## Issues from interviews

In the previous chapter, the findings from the semi-structured interviews, categorized into four issues, were reported: the achievement of the program goals; the strengths and weaknesses; other program elements; the impact of the program on graduates/students. The key issues arising from the interviews are discussed in the following sub-sections.

## Achievement of the program goals

The major stakeholders of the MATEFL program, namely the staff and graduates/students, thought that the program achieved, to varying degrees, all of the three program goals. With respect to Program Goal 1: *To develop the quality and standards of English teachers at all levels*, most of the stakeholders thought that the program succeeded in developing the quality and standards of English teachers at all levels. A few requested higher quality and standards so that the program could better prepare them to teach or to study at a higher level.

For Program Goal 2: *To offer a curriculum of effective English teaching theory and practice for those who are interested in this career*, the stakeholders thought that the program offered a curriculum of effective English teaching theory and practice, although there was a need to seek balance between these two components and to make it more relevant to Thai education.

For Program Goal 3: *To help solve the problem of a shortage of qualified English teachers at all levels*, the stakeholders thought that the program helped solve the problem of a shortage of qualified English teachers to some extent. The factors that affected the level of achievement were the composition and number of candidates admitted in each cohort and the distribution of graduates when they went into the workforce. The suggestion by some of the stakeholders to increase the level of achievement by varying the candidates' characteristics in terms of level of school in which they were

teaching or intended to teach in order to increase the distribution of graduates, and increasing the number of candidates to increase the number of graduates appears difficult to realize. The solution to one problem is likely to lead to a new set of problems: a chain reaction. For example, increasing the number of candidates would bring about facility problems. Accepting candidates from different background or intention would lead to teaching and learning problems. Therefore, to increase the level of achievement of this program goal, an agreed to or acceptable position related to each factor should be negotiated and sought.

**Strengths and weaknesses**

Several aspects of the program were identified by stakeholders as being either strong or weak points. The high quality and good personality of program instructors, convenient physical setting, effective administration in terms of date of provision and reasonable program costs, high standard and comprehensive curriculum, and admission process in terms of its high standard and offering opportunities for interested candidates from other fields were considered by the major stakeholders as strengths of the program. Those aspects should be sustained.

By contrast, heavy workload and unsatisfactory teaching style of some program instructors, mismatches between courses and instructors' expertise, lack of autonomous learning skills of students, ineffective administration in terms of tight financial situation and failure to pay attention to students' feedback and comments, limited elective courses, no connection with Thai curriculum, and a lack of professionalism were considered as weaknesses of the program. These aspects should be reviewed with a view to making improvements.

**Opinions on program elements**

In the previous chapter, the findings from the interviews with stakeholders were classified into six major program elements: facilities, admission,

elective courses, scheduling, professional ethics, and thesis vs. non-thesis options. These six program elements are discussed below.

### Facilities

It was agreed upon by every group of stakeholders that the program was faced with the problem of limited learning resources, e.g., classrooms, books, and computers in terms of quantity, quality, and accessibility; however, the program administrators were aware of this problem and trying to solve it.

### Admission

Issues of student composition, number of student intake, and admission requirements emerged within this element. The stakeholders regarded the quality of candidates in terms of English proficiency as a top priority. The diversity in student composition was viewed as an advantage in that it provides an opportunity for sharing knowledge and experience and also an opportunity for career change. Candidates' diverse background knowledge would be likely to cause some problems in teaching and learning, but this was not regarded as a major obstacle.

A remedial course was recommended as a solution for the problem. Considering the quality of candidates as the most important factor, the stakeholders were not willing to trade it off with other alternatives such as increasing the number of candidates admitted to the program to increase the revenue – although that would help in solving some existing problems.

### Elective courses

The unavailability of some elective courses was a major problem perceived by everyone. The stakeholders seemed to understand the program's situation – a self-supporting program whose financial condition depends on students' tuition fees – and suggested some alternatives to improve the situation, e.g., increasing the student intake or allowing students to take elective courses in

the other MA program (MA-Careers) that was offered at the LITU. Nevertheless, the program needs to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of these alternatives so that any changes made to the program will yield satisfactory results.

### *Scheduling*

In the stakeholders' view, there were both positive and negative aspects of this being a weekend program. There were two key positive aspects: the most significant was that a weekend program was advantageous to the program in that more candidates, especially working people, could come to enrol and so the program had more qualified choices of candidates; having sufficient number of students was also good for the program financial situation.

There were two key negative aspects: the weekend program caused management difficulties because other programs of the Language Institute operated on weekdays and, as a result, most of the staff worked on weekdays; on the other hand, it was difficult for many students who worked full-time on weekdays to manage their time.

The stakeholders also gave their opinions on the advantages and disadvantages of providing the program on weekdays as opposed to weekends. The greater availability of instructors and more time for students to study were viewed as advantages, whereas fewer students being able to come to study because of work commitment was viewed as a disadvantage. Some stakeholders suggested that the program should be offered on both weekend and weekday bases; however, the issue of program scheduling was controversial.

The program planners should weigh the advantages and disadvantages of these two ways of scheduling the program and also study other factors that play a role in offering the program before any new decision or change is made to the program.

### Professional ethics

The qualities of being fair, honest, and responsible were identified by many stakeholders as examples of ethical professional conduct. They realized the importance of promoting professional ethics in the MATEFL students as prospective or future teachers. They suggested both direct methods (e.g., talking about them in class) and indirect methods (e.g., MATEFL instructors being good models) of instilling professional ethics in MATEFL students. There were complaints made of some students exhibiting unethical behaviour, of instructors not meeting some ethical professional standards, and the failure of the program to promote such ethical standards.

### Thesis and non-thesis options

The majority of stakeholders were aware of the importance of conducting research, and supported the program retaining the two options. A minority suggested cancellation of the thesis option due to its unpopularity so that the program could focus on the non-thesis option in order to make it the best possible program available. Most of the stakeholders thought that the non-thesis option or the Independent Study option was appropriate for the nature of the MATEFL program as a weekend program because it was less demanding.

The stakeholders regarded supervision, resources, their time, purposes of study, future plan, knowledge, and confidence as major factors affecting their decision on which options they would choose and also on their success in conducting research studies.

### Impact of the MATEFL program on graduates/students and staff

The impact of the program was categorized into two groups: the impact that generated intended outcomes; the impact that generated unintended outcomes.

### *Intended outcomes*

Although some stakeholders thought that the program did not have a particularly positive impact on them, most thought that the MATEFL program produced and developed English teachers of high quality and standards. The MATEFL graduates had both theoretical knowledge and practical skills in teaching and research. In addition, they could secure prestigious teaching jobs which in turn helped solve the problem of a shortage of qualified English teachers.

### *Unintended outcomes*

There was an unintended positive impact on both the program graduates/students and staff. The graduates/students regarded networking, keeping up with other people in the field, gaining acceptance and trustworthiness, and valuing teaching profession as well as valuing an importance and benefits of teacher training as valuable unintended outcomes of the program. The staff regarded pride, happiness, and the opportunity to contribute something to the community was an equally valuable unintended outcome gained from involvement in the MATEFL program.

In conclusion, the data above provide verification that the MATEFL is effective because it achieves its goals and meets the expectation of stakeholders.

## Quality assurance, QA

The stakeholders raised a number of QA issues related to the MATEFL program. Similarly, a number of QA issues were identified in the Institute and the MATEFL program documents. For example, the stakeholders identified the ability to gain employment and work as English teachers, satisfaction of graduates' employers, and high quality of candidates which were issues in Standard 1 (Quality of Graduates).

They suggested that the program should improve its admission procedures and increase the number of research presentations and research publications. In particular, they identified the importance of conducting and presenting or publishing research studies which were issues in Standard 2 (Research and Innovation).

They drew attention to the identified ineffectiveness of program administration and management, and the need for continuous professional development. They also suggested that the program should find ways to promote the learning organisation and the sharing of learning resources. These are issues in Standard 5 (Development of Organisation and Personnel).

They drew attention to the lack of qualified instructors in some areas, a lack of learning resources, no lesson planning, and heavy workload of instructors. They suggested the program should adjust the courses and instructor evaluation process. These were issues in Standard 6 (Curriculum and Instruction).

They showed their awareness of the importance of quality assurance system which was an issue in Standard 7 (Quality Assurance System). All of the above were consistent with the quality assurance issues and indicators specified by the Language Institute.

The stakeholders identified far fewer QA issues and there was no reference found in the Institute and program documents in respect of many QA issues such as the importance of supporting research studies which was an issue in Standard 2 (Research and Innovation), ratio of instructors and students, learning process, use of educational technology, and qualified curriculum which were issues in Standard 6 (Curriculum and Instruction), effectiveness of internal quality assurance system, and all issues in Standard 3 (Academic Services) and Standard 4 (promoting Thai Culture). Specific data on many QA elements relating to the first three years of the MATEFL program were unavailable as these years pre-dated the advent of QA.

The issues that were consistent with the QA issues, and that met the standards, should be sustained; the QA issues that were not addressed should be established and the QA issues that did not meet the standards should be improved.

In conclusion, the data gained from the questionnaires, interviews, and program documents provided verification that the MATEFL program was effective. That is to say, the program achieved the goals in developing the quality and standards of English teachers at all levels, offering a curriculum of effective English teaching theory and practice, and helping to solve the problem of a shortage of qualified English teachers (although the actual extent of achievement was not assessed in this evaluation). In addition, the program met the expectation of stakeholders. The evaluation also enabled identification of gaps between the program requirements and workplace requirements, and explained the nature of the gaps. Additionally, the unintended outcomes and the Quality Assurance criteria related to the program were identified. Recommendations related to each of these issues will be presented in the following section.

## Recommendations Arising from Evaluation Issues

Recommendations to improve the MATEFL program were made in four main areas: strengthening the strengths, improving the weaknesses, working out a compromise in the controversial aspects, and assuring higher quality.

### Strengthening the strengths

There were many aspects of the MATEFL program that were considered as the program strengths and that met the workplace requirements. Although those aspects were satisfactory, they can be strengthened to make the MATEFL program more effective.

First, although the program had a positive impact on graduates/students in gaining employment as English teachers at all levels, in advancing their careers, and in helping them change their careers to be English teachers, the program needs to strengthen these aspects. This can be done by establishing a network of the MATEFL staff, graduate and students through setting up alumni and organising seminars, or other social activities. This will provide staff, graduates, students, and employers with opportunities to get to know each other; to share and exchange knowledge, experience and information (especially on job opportunities and professional development). In addition, the program should set up MATEFL program web sites or issue newsletters which will serve as a source of information and channels of communication among TEFL people.

The aspects that had high emphasis/high importance or high expectation/high performance and thus met the workplace requirements were also considered as strengths of the program. These aspects of teaching English can be further strengthened to make the program more effective: English proficiency; ability to plan lessons and conduct lessons according to the plans; ability to select and use teaching and learning aids; knowledge of and ability to apply educational technology; an awareness of language learning problems; ability to take on different roles; ability to manage classroom; ability to cater for diverse students; knowledge of research and an application of research findings; an ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English; an ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English; a positive attitude towards the English teaching profession and an understanding of the organisation and structure of English language education in Thailand.

This strengthening can be achieved by offering in-house remedial courses or training programs to both students and staff involved in these aspects. Furthermore, the program should provide staff and students with information on training programs, seminars, and conferences organised by both internal and external institutions and also provide them with some

financial support as well as other kinds of support that can help facilitate their attendance and participation.

The program should encourage instructors to be life-long and active learners making their own professional development plans, willing to follow their plans, and trying new knowledge and innovation that they have gained in their work. The program should also encourage the instructors to conduct research studies and apply the findings to improve their work.

Program administrators should closely monitor each course by checking course syllabuses, observing classes, and seeking feedback from students to make sure that those strong aspects are sustained. The program providers should have regular faculty and student meetings to promote the sharing and exchanging of knowledge, experience and information among instructors and students, to keep track of their teachings and learning, and to establish and maintain rapport and understanding among them. Instructors who receive good feedback from students in course evaluation surveys should be complimented in faculty meetings. This will encourage the instructors to sustain their good practice. Moreover, the program should provide learning resources that are easily accessible by staff, students, and graduates, relevant, and sufficient in terms of quantity and quality.

An important aspect of the program that needs to be strengthened is the concern for quality of candidates, especially their entry-level English proficiency. As well, the program should take such skills such as analytical and critical thinking into consideration so that the program will enrol better candidates.

The variety of courses, considered a strength, should be sustained. They can be further strengthened by seeking a balance between theoretical and practical approaches.

The low program cost policy, although considered a program strength, needs to be addressed in order to improve the program's tight financial situation; however, the intention of the program establishers to

provide a good teacher development program with low or reasonable costs for teachers who are considered as a low income group of people in society, increasing the program cost by raising tuition fees might not be the best option. New financial policy options need to be considered very carefully.

By introducing these strategies, I think the MATEFL will be able to both sustain and strengthen these strong and satisfactory aspects of the program.

## Overcoming the weaknesses

A number of aspects of the MATEFL program, that did not meet workplace requirements, were identified as program weaknesses. To make the MATEFL program more effective, these weaknesses need to be overcome.

### Ethical Standards

The aspect that, in the view of staff and graduates/students, had low emphasis but high importance was high ethical standards of professional conduct. From the employers' view, this aspect had low expectation but high performance. It suggested that while staff and graduates/students thought that this aspect did not meet the workplace requirement, in reality, as determined by employers, it did. However, the program should take into consideration strengthening this aspect in order to satisfy every group of stakeholders and to make the MATEFL program more effective.

First, the program should make the MATEFL instructors understand what is meant by high ethical standards of professional conduct. The program should also make the instructors aware of the importance of their having high ethical standards and the importance of promoting these in the MATEFL students. This can be achieved by providing the instructors with university documents on professional ethics, by arranging discussion sessions among instructors on the topics of ethics and how to avoid unethical behaviour, and

by setting up the Institute committee to give suggestions to instructors and to monitor instructors' conduct.

The program should take the promotion of morality and professional ethics in students more seriously by making students aware of the importance of being ethical both as students and as future teachers. This can be achieved by talking to them explicitly and showing them concrete examples of the advantages of being ethical and disadvantages of being unethical. The program should encourage the program instructors to be ethical role models and encourage them to raise the topic of ethics in class and lead discussion on these whenever the opportunity arises. Finally, the program should set up a code of appropriate student behaviour that is agreed to by all parties.

The one aspect with high expectation but low performance was knowledge of specific English learning/teaching theories. In other words, the program did not work sufficiently well in preparing the graduates to work in this aspect of teaching English; it certainly did not meet employers' expectations. Knowledge of theories in teaching and learning English was included in almost every course in the program, especially in the following: Introduction to Foreign Language Acquisition, and Teaching English as a Foreign Language Methodology I and II. This suggests that although students learned a lot about those theories, they did not necessarily apply them to their work. The program needs to place greater emphasis on the application of knowledge of specific learning/teaching theories. The cause of graduates' failure to display that they had mastered the theories of specific English learning and teaching should be investigated.

The following are recommendations regarding different elements of the program: students, instructors, courses, facilities, and administration.

**Students**

The program staff complained of a lack of autonomous learning skill of students. To promote this skill in students, one way is to encourage the

instructors to give students tasks that students can practice their autonomous learning skills. Another way is that the program should improve the program learning resources both in quality and quantity. This can be achieved by allocating budget to buy more books for the program library and subscribe to journals in the field of TEFL.

The program should set up a system to make the program library more readily accessible to staff and students and also to bring the library collection up-to-date. The program should also seek help from the university main library and talk them into including more resources in the TEFL field in the main library. The program should obtain more computers with Internet connection and create a link to useful TEFL web sites. The recommendations to help overcome a lack of learning autonomy among students are also applicable to overcoming the lack of facilities identified by stakeholders.

**Instructors**

A lack of experts in some areas was identified as a weakness of the program. One way to solve this problem is to seek more part-time instructors. In addition, the Language Institute might encourage its instructors to further their studies in the fields that are needed.

Another weakness regarding instructors is the unsatisfactory teaching style of some instructors. This problem can be solved by organising training programs for instructors on lesson planning and teaching methods. The unavailability and inaccessibility of instructors were also identified as a weakness of the program.

Heavy workload and a lack of research supervision skills are the causes of the problem. It is difficult to solve the problem of the LITU instructors' heavy workload. The instructors who teach in the MATEFL program also have to teach English courses offered by the LITU. This is not only the problem of the MATEFL program but it is also the problem of the LITU. So to solve this problem, the LITU should request the university to

allocate more instructors to the LITU; this, of course, requires a greater commitment of resources. The supervision problem can be solved by organising workshops or training programs for instructors on how to supervise research students.

**Courses**

A limited range of elective courses was the problem most frequently identified by a majority of stakeholders. A lack of instructors, the program being self-supporting thus forcing it to rely on students' tuition fees, and the number of students enrolled were the chief underlying causes of the problem. Therefore, seeking more part-time instructors and developing our own instructors as identified earlier and raising the tuition fees and increasing the number of students admitted in each intake are possible solutions as long as the program can still maintain its intention in offering a good language education inexpensively to the optimum number of teachers.

Another way of solving the problem is to allow students to take relevant elective courses in other MA programs operating at LITU. Organising workshops or training programs and improving learning resources on the topics relating to unavailable elective courses can compensate for the lack of courses. An alternative solution is that the program should cooperate with other universities so that the MATEFL students can take some courses that they are interested in and transfer the credits to the program.

As well as the limited number of elective courses, the irrelevance of some of these to Thai educational needs was also identified as a problem. The program should consider adding a course in curriculum development in which students would have a chance to learn about Thai curriculum and also learn how to develop a curriculum relevant to their particular situation.

The imbalance between the thesis and non-thesis option is another course weakness. To justify and retain the two options, the program needs to

advertise the thesis option more and develop the program instructors to be sufficiently qualified in terms of education degrees, academic titles, and supervision skills, so that they can supervise masters theses.

The program should add more research courses into the program or organise workshops or training programs on research, supervision, time management, academic writing, and research writing for both staff and students. A lack of extra-curricular activity was also identified. The program should consider adding extracurricular activities such as field trips to other schools, organising English camps, or other social service activities. Such activities will provide students with opportunities to apply in practice what they have learned in class.

**Program administration**

The program's ignorance of students' comments and lack of feedback was identified. The program normally seeks feedback from students on each course through an evaluation form administered twice a semester. The first set of questionnaires, obtained in the middle of the semester, are returned directly to the instructor. The second set of questionnaires, obtained in the last session of each course are forwarded to a statistician for analysis. The results, subsequently, are supplied to the instructor and also to the director of the MATEFL program. This feedback, including the comments, is never taken into consideration, nor are the comments taken seriously.

To improve this aspect of the program, the program should adjust the evaluation process, and the evaluation form: in order to gain more information; to encourage the instructors to take the feedback from students more seriously; to use feedback in order to improve their teaching. In addition, the MATEFL committee should meet regularly, keep track of the program, be sensitive to the feedback and comments from students, and take action according to those feedback and comments to improve the program.

A final problem regarding program administration is the tight financial situation. Since the program relies heavily on students' tuition fees as identified several times earlier, raising the tuition fees is a possible way of solving this problem; however, several factors need to be considered before doing so. Getting other sources of funds is a possible solution. The program developers should approach the alumni and organise fund-raising activities, especially the kind of activities that involve the areas of TEFL.

With these strategies, I think the MATEFL will be able to improve the weaknesses of the program and make the program more effective.

## Working out a compromise in the controversial aspects

There were several controversial issues regarding students, and program scheduling that were identified.

### Students

The number in each student intake was controversial: the program accepts 30 students each year. There were complaints that the class of 30 students was too big. A suggestion was made that instead of reducing the number of students admitted the program might split the class into two. This, however, would likely lead to a financial problem, because the program would have to pay more for the instructors. In making any decision regarding the number of student, the program needs to take the break-even point into consideration.

The diversity of student composition was viewed as advantageous in promoting sharing of knowledge and experience and in promoting the change of career to the teaching profession. It was seen as disadvantageous to the program in creating difficulties in teaching and learning. It appears that there are more advantages than disadvantages, and so the current enrolment policy should be sustained. Remedial courses in both language and education knowledge and opportunities to meet or teach real students should be provided for inexperienced candidates.

**Courses**

The opinions of stakeholders on the balance of theory and practice provided in the program differed according to their background, purposes, and expectations. Graduates/students, with only a little teaching experience or without any experience at all, thought that the program did not provide sufficient practice Graduates/students from other fields unrelated to education or language thought that the program did not provide them with a sufficiently strong educational background nor with sufficient theory. Graduates who were furthering their studies at doctoral level thought that the program did not provide them with a sufficiently strong theoretical background for their doctoral studies.

A broader focus is required. A narrow focus would run the risk of only satisfying one group of stakeholders. In order to satisfy both groups of stakeholders, the program should encourage instructors in every subject to emphasise both theory and practice in their courses. The instructors should let students choose types of tasks or assignments according to their interests and give them more opportunities to choose what they would like to learn based on what they feel is necessary for them.

**Scheduling**

Whether the program should be offered on weekends, on weekdays, or at both times is still controversial. The recommendation is that the program should weigh the advantages and disadvantages of those ways of scheduling the program before any new decision or change is made to the program. By using these strategies, I think the MATEFL will be able to work out a compromise in these controversial issues and, as a consequence, will make the program more effective.

**Assuring higher quality**

Recommendations are made to improve the quality assurance (QA) of the MATEFL program. Although QA did not exist during the first three years of the MATEFL program, we can see that it has had a powerful effect on both the program and the LITU since QA was introduced in 2001.

To ensure a higher quality program, the LITU should establish its own QA system specific to the MATEFL program based on the university QA system. In addition, the program should set up an effective database that is easily accessible in order to assist the collection of information that has hitherto been missing. The program should have a QA staff member responsible for compiling required information, conducting program evaluation every 4-5 years, and encouraging the utilisation of evaluation findings. In conclusion, it is expected that the recommendations identified above will help the program to meet the QA criteria; therefore, if these recommendations are realized, they should result in a more effective MATEFL program.

# How Do These Recommendations Overlap with the Literature?

The recommendations for improvement of the MATEFL program as identified above can be categorized into six groups: professional development; teaching and learning process; teacher education; evaluation utilisation; program management and organisational change. A summary of these categories and related recommendations is contained in Table 5.4.

**Professional development**

The recommendations arising from the evaluation findings emphasised the importance of professional development (PD) of the MATEFL instructors in order that they can take on their roles more effectively.

**TABLE 5.4**      **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

| Categories | Recommendations |
|---|---|
| **Professional development** | • Organising continuous in-house training courses, seminars, and conferences on the needed topics: teaching methodology, lesson planning, supervision skills, etc.<br>• Encouraging staff to study or attend courses, seminars, and conferences in the areas that are lacking or that they are interested in and providing them with whatever support they need: information on PD, financial support, etc.<br>• Raising awareness of self-development amongst staff.<br>• Promoting life-long and active learning by staff, encouraging staff to make a professional development plan and reflecting on their learning experiences.<br>• Encouraging staff to conduct research and use research findings in their work.<br>• Encouraging staff to learn from one another collaboratively.<br>• Providing learning resources. |
| **Teaching and learning process** | • Promoting student-centered learning; e.g. giving opportunities to choose tasks and assignments that students are interested in.<br>• Promoting autonomous learning ability in the MATEFL students and instructors.<br>• Organising and promoting extra-curricular activities. |
| **Teacher education** | • Seeking balance between theory and practice.<br>• Organising training courses, seminars, or workshops on topics related to the electives that could not be offered.<br>• Seeking part-time instructors.<br>• Allowing students to take elective courses in the other MA program or allowing credit transfer from other universities.<br>• Promoting ethical conduct among instructors and students by issuing documents, setting good examples, leading discussions, etc.<br>• Adding courses or content relevant to the Thai educational system. |
| **Evaluation utilisation** | • Improving course evaluation and utilisation of evaluation findings |
| **Program management** | • Increasing effectiveness in resource allocation.<br>• Seeking collaboration with other institutions.<br>• Improving the quantity and quality of learning resources.<br>• Improving the course and program evaluation process.<br>• Establishing networks in the TEFL areas.<br>• Monitoring the program regularly<br>• Organising regular meetings among the MATEFL administrators<br>• Asking the university to allocate more instructors for the LITU.<br>• Seeking qualified part-time instructors.<br>• Establishing a QA system specific to the MATEFL program. |
| **Organisational change** | • Promoting organisational change.<br>• Involving relevant people in the change process.<br>• Moving towards becoming a learning organisation. |

In this research, recommendations were made in regard to the promotion of PD in the organisation, PD methods, and knowledge or skills that need to be developed. The recommendations that emerged from comments of stakeholders derived from unsatisfactory teaching, imbalance of theories and practices in some courses, poor supervision skills, poor time management of instructors; a lack of experts, among instructors, in some disciplines; unsatisfactory administration. These comments justify the needs for PD in those areas.

The need for professional or staff development has been identified by White, et al. (1991, p. 61) as a key factor in successful organisations. These authors suggest that successful organisations are learning organisations and the potential to learn is present in all who work therein. Staff development is a way of ensuring that people learn and develop and that the organisation can grow and respond to a changing environment. So the recommendations on professional development are legitimated.

The recommendations for the MATEFL staff to participate in PD programs in teaching methodology, supervision skills, administrative skills, and time management are consistent with the goals and reasons for PD identified by Bailey, et al. (2001, p. 7).

Participating in PD programs that focus on new and effective teaching techniques, course design and integration of theories and practice in a balanced way as well as learner-centredness will enable instructors to acquire new knowledge and skills that are required of today's teachers and subsequently help them achieve the goal of PD in *staying abreast of a rapidly evolving field* (Bailey, et al., 2001, p. 7).

Engaging in PD programs in how to supervise research students will enhance instructors' supervision skills – skills instructors lack since the role of research supervisor did not exist before the establishment of the MATEFL program. Similarly, engaging in PD programs associated with aspects of administrative skills, especially those affecting the recently established

graduate program, will help administrators cope better with changes in their roles and responsibilities. *Keeping up with changes* (Bailey, et al., 2001, p. 7) is therefore an important reason for professionals to continue to learn.

The ability of instructors to juggle their job responsibilities in teaching both undergraduate and graduate courses, in teaching public courses, in supervising research, in administering, and in doing their own research studies is critical to work success. The heavy workload, both in the amount and in types of tasks, seems to be inevitable and compulsory. This contributes to negative attitudes towards the job. In some cases, it has led to the burnout of instructors. Therefore, the ability to manage their time effectively should be promoted in instructors. Participating in PD activities, especially in time management, will help instructors to *combat negativity in their work context* (Bailey et al., 2001, p. 7).

Citing another reason for the need for professional development, Bailey et al. (2001, p. 7) mention *an increase in income and/or prestige within the context of current jobs* which, although not obvious in the case of the MATEFL instructors, could be one of the reasons for their desire and necessity to participate in PD activities. All of the reasons above justify the need to promote PD in the MATEFL program.

**The promotion of PD in the MATEFL program**

Recommendations have been made on how to promote PD in the MATEFL program, most of which focus on the instructors. Raising the awareness of instructors regarding the necessity of PD is strongly recommended. This is consistent with the views of Fleming (1998, pp. 63-64) and Hughes (1998, p. 211) regarding adult learning: it should be voluntary and intrinsically motivating.

The recommendation that instructors should cooperate with others in their PD and learn from one another is consistent with suggestions by Fleming (1998, pp. 63-64) and Brown (2001). They suggest that effective

professional development should employ co-operative professional development practices to get broader perspectives, improved expertise, and greater support. A third recommendation was that staff should have a chance to take charge of their own learning, to be involved in designing PD plans and to make their own PD plan. Boud & Miller (1996b, p. 22) have identified a sense of personal responsibility for learning as a key principle of adult learning. Hughes (1998, p. 211) offers engagement and active involvement as important principles of PD.

There is a recommendation that staff should be encouraged to reflect on their practice in order to become critical learners. Gomez & Tabachnick (1992 cited in Freeman & Richards, 1996), Fleming (1998, pp. 63-64), McInerney & McInerney (1998, p. 18), Phifer (2002, p. 121), Ramden & Lizzio (2003, p. 232), and Ormrod (2006) regard the opportunities for critical and constructive reflection as an essential factor for effective PD.

A further recommendation is that the PD should be continuous and it should be constantly evaluated. Similarly, Fleming (1998) states that an effective PD cycle should be ongoing. Its activities, plans and progress should be regularly monitored and evaluated and evaluation should provide the new starting point and direction for future development.

The final PD recommendation was to improve learning resources – namely, the MATEFL program library and computers with an Internet connection. This is consistent with one of the effective PD principles proposed by Fleming (1998, pp. 63-64) who proposes that organisations should provide access to support materials, equipment and consultants.

The recommendations on the promotion of PD in the MATEFL program are consistent with many suggestions and principles of adult learning and professional development. As well as recommendations on what should be considered in organising a PD program, there were recommendations related to PD methodology. These will be considered in the next sub-section.

**Professional development methods**

There are many ways that instructors can learn to develop themselves professionally. There are recommendations for the MATEFL program to organise and to encourage and support staff to participate in training programs, workshops, seminars, together with the holding of conferences on topics that the MATEFL staff need to learn about and develop. These are concerned with formal means of learning. In addition, informal learning, learning collaboratively with others, learning from experience, conducting research, and reflection on their experience are other professional development means which should be encouraged.

The recommendations on a variety of learning methods or strategies, both informal and informal, are consistent with what has been said by many writers about PD methods. Ormrod (2006, pp. 13-14) advises that formal learning such as taking courses in teacher education will keep teachers up-to-date on the latest theoretical perspectives and research results related to classroom practice. Cline et al. (1990) propose formal means of teacher learning such as higher education courses, short courses (on-site/off-site), conferences, practical workshops/seminars, and distance learning.

Ur (1997, p. 318) points out that PD does not necessarily depend only on formal courses – teachers can advance in professional expertise and knowledge throughout their careers. The opportunities to learn both in formal and informal ways are identified by Beckett & Hager (2002, p. 5-6). They point out that lifelong learning:

> … assumes that it is up to each adult to identify and pursue opportunities
> for his or her own employability, and that this may include formal studies
> (the old recurrent or continuing education ethos), and also informal
> experiences.

'Informal learning' means that teacher learning can include learning from teaching or from experience, conducting research, working

collaboratively with colleagues or other professionals, and/or peer observation and support, to name just a few. As Anderson & Boocock (2002) and Fenwick (2003) point out, people in organizations tend to use a variety of formal and informal learning strategies.

Just as Hicks et al. (2007) believe that workplace experience continues to be a major contributor to learning in current times, so Zemke (1985) and Bassi et al. (1998) think that much of what people know about their work has been learned from their workplace experience. Formal and informal means of learning are also emphasised by Cline et al. (1990), Craft (2000, pp. 104-107), Brandt (2006, p. 212), and Ormrod (2006, pp. 13-14). In conclusion, the recommendations on encouraging and supporting staff to learn both through formal and informal ways are fully justified.

## Teaching and learning process

Apart from recommendations about professional development, recommendations were made with regard to the teaching and learning process in the MATEFL program. Student diversity and a shift in beliefs in learning seemed to influence the directions of the teaching and learning process and account for the need to encourage a student-centred learning approach and promote extra-curricular activities and autonomous learning skills in MATEFL students. These two challenges are consistent with the challenge of professionalism in teaching and learning in higher education which has been highlighted by Light & Cox (2001, p. 9):

> … responding to the increasing diversity of background, experience and needs which our students present and the conceptual shift in thinking about practice from teaching to learning, from delivering knowledge to developing and fostering independence of learning in which students develop the ability to discover and construct knowledge for themselves.

**Student-centred learning**

To react to the problems of learner diversity, unsatisfactory teaching styles, limited offering of elective courses, and low satisfaction with content knowledge gained from some courses, the recommendations emphasise the need for changes in teaching and learning in the MATEFL program and in the roles of MATEFL instructors and students. It is believed that if students have opportunities for choosing what they are interested in learning, how they would like to learn and what types of tasks and activities they prefer, those problems will be lessened. As stated by Cannon & Newble (2000, pp. 16-18), a student-centred learning approach promotes learners' responsibility, active role, intrinsic motivation, cooperative learning, flexibility, decision-making, and life-long learning. Furthermore, it promotes the teachers' role as facilitators. Therefore, it seems to respond well to the suggestions identified above.

To achieve the goals in promoting student-centred learning and quality teaching and learning, the roles of teachers need to be reconsidered and changed. The supreme importance of teachers in promoting student learning is underlined by Eggen & Kauchak (2001, p. 11). They state that the teacher is the most important factor, outside the home environment, that affects student learning and development. Therefore, the recommendation to redefine the role of teacher and to promote changes in teaching style are supported.

Changes in the roles of teachers, however, especially their teaching style, seem to be hard to achieve. As Charles, Senter & Blaine Barr et al. (1999) say, it is not easy to change one's teaching style. Even teachers who are committed intellectually to quality teaching may find it difficult to identify and make needed changes. Therefore, the need to help teachers to overcome their difficulties in changing their role and teaching style should be an additional recommendation.

In addition to changes in a teacher's role which will lead to the achievement of quality learning, students also need to change their roles and the way they learn. An autonomous learning skill is one quality that should be embedded in students.

**Promoting autonomous learning skills**

A lack of autonomy in the MATEFL students was identified as one weakness of the program and so the promotion of autonomous learning skills is recommended. Autonomy in learning is briefly defined by Holec (1981, p. 3) as 'the ability to take charge of one's learning'. According to Benson & Voller (1997, pp. 1-2), the word 'autonomy' has been used

> for a set of skills which can be learned and applied in self-directed learning and for the right of learners to determine the direction of their own learning.

The need to promote learners' autonomy or independence in learning is supported by Sheerin (1991, p. 3). She says that the traditional role of teachers in transmitting content and knowledge, selecting and directing activities fosters an insidious lack of independence and responsibility in the student which is liable to hinder learning because of lack of involvement and self investment in the learning process on the part of the student. Learning is more effective when learners are active in the learning process, assuming responsibility for their learning and participating in the decisions which affect it. Rogers (1969) notes that the autonomous learning ability gives teachers security in an environment which is continually changing.

According to the rationale provided above, the MATEFL students should be continually encouraged to be autonomous in their learning. Moreover, regarding MATEFL students as prospective teachers means that they need to possess autonomous learning ability as well. Indeed, teachers themselves need to be autonomous in their learning and should be able to cultivate autonomy in their students. Aoki (2000) states that teacher

autonomy involves the capacity, freedom, and/or responsibility to make choices concerning one's own teaching. Little (1995, p. 179) asserts that successful teachers have always been autonomous in the sense of having a strong sense of personal responsibility for their teaching, exercising their minds via continuous reflection and exploiting the freedom that this confers. Page (1992) & Voller (1997) maintain that if students are to learn to 'take control', the teacher may need to learn to 'let go'.

Strategies to promote autonomous learning in the MATEFL programs were suggested by the respondents. The MATEFL should provide sufficient learning resources for students and the MATEFL instructors should include in their courses activities or tasks which require students to employ autonomous learning skills. These are consistent with what Dam (1995) says about the autonomous learning environment where it is the teacher's responsibility to see to it that the curricular guidelines, objectives and demands are adequately covered and to introduce relevant examples of useful and meaningful learning activities for the participants/learners to choose from – individually, in pairs, or in groups – according to their individual goals.

Martinez (1995) says that becoming aware of one's own understanding of learner autonomy and of one's own beliefs about the nature of language learning is a prerequisite to fostering learner and teacher autonomy. Smith (2007) notes that teacher-learning is inevitably a largely self-directed process. To encourage the MATEFL students to develop their professional expertise in an autonomous and self-directed way, autonomy and self-direction need to be woven into the program via types of tasks or assignments that require students to exercise their autonomy and self-direction. Moreover, these qualities should also be part of the normal experience of the MATEFL instructors; otherwise, how can they meaningfully convey them as desirable qualities to their MATEFL students? Wallace (1991, p. 19) sums it up with the saying 'Practice what you preach'.

**Teacher education**

Based on the evaluation findings and recommendations, the MATEFL program − as a teacher education program − should consider the following elements of English teacher education in designing or improving the program effectiveness: combining theory and practice, instilling ethics, and increasing relevance to Thai education.

**Theory and practice**

There is a controversy among the MATEFL stakeholders over the desired proportion of theory and practice components. It has been recommended that the program should focus on both theories and practical applications and seek a balance between the two. This issue was also identified by Calderhead & Shorrock (1997, p. 195) as a long-standing dilemma in teacher education:

> Ideally, we may wish to have teachers who are not only competent actors in the classroom, but who are also practitioners capable of understanding what they are doing, why they are doing it and how they might have to change their practice to suit changing curricula, contexts or circumstances.

Therefore, students and instructors in teacher education programs have to find the balance of two quite contrary sets of expectations: an emphasis on understanding theory and an emphasis on action and performance.

Another issue that is questioned by the MATEFL stakeholders, particularly the graduates' employers, is the ability of the MATEFL students/graduates to apply EFL teaching and learning theories into practice. The program documents show that EFL theories are included in every course. Why, then, did the MATEFL students fail to demonstrate their application ability, especially in teaching? The causes of this failure and the correct ways to promote application of theoretical knowledge gained from those courses should be investigated.

To help clarify this issue, it might be worthwhile listing some of the subjects/courses taught in the MATEFL program which appear in the program document under the heading of language teaching theories or 'received knowledge', the terminology used by Wallace (1991). The courses are as follows: Introduction to Foreign Language Education, TEFL Methodology I and II, Language and Culture, and Psychology of Learning. Individual subjects such as Phonetics and Language Education, Comparative Grammar in Foreign Language Acquisition, Psycholinguistics and Sociolinguistics – although classified as linguistics and applied linguistics courses – are also related to and imbued with theories.

How can we relate these subjects to teaching practice or school experience? Wallace (1991) suggests a 'reflective model' as a means to encourage students to reflect on the learnt theories or 'received knowledge' in light of classroom experience or in the context of professional action (practice). Therefore, to help students link theories to practice, they should be encouraged to reflect on what they learn in each subject in relation to how it will be applied in professional practice.

Teaching practice (practicum) is another element of teacher education that should be evaluated. It is a valuable element that promotes practical application of what students have learned. There were complaints, especially by students with little or no teaching experience, of not having enough time in the practicum to cover all of the required components of teacher development. Ryan et al. (1996, pp. 355-377) point out that most work placements, or practicums, are included in university programs as a way of making experience of the real world of work available to students. There are numerous positive benefits: gaining insights into professional practice; developing competencies through participation; developing on-the-job performance; and integration into the work environment. Hughes (1998, p. 207) adds that the practicum experience can provide an invaluable resource for learning and an opportunity to apply theoretical knowledge to real-world practice. He points out that:

the goals of practicum programs frequently require that the practicum experience is an authentic experience of work and workplace learning. The more authentic the experience, the more the situation of the student in the workplace conforms to that of the employee.

It can be concluded that teaching practice or a practicum is an important component in a teacher training program like the MATEFL program and so its organisation and proper proportion of emphasis should be considered very carefully to increase the effectiveness of the program.

**Ethical standards**

Developing ethical standards is another issue that was identified by the MATEFL stakeholders. Ethics or ethical behaviour is described by Groundwater-Smith et al. (1998, pp. 298-299) as 'a range of values relating to morality' and what is considered to be 'the right thing to do'. Dickey (2006, pp.2-3) distinguishes professional ethics from morals and moral principles, which are the ideas of 'right and wrong' – largely developed through religious and parental teaching – with those from social values, a sense of 'good and bad', which are formed through impressions from friends and society at large (Dickey, 1998). Silva (1997, p. 359) says the combination of these plus formal teaching or established rules, develop ethics – a 'system or code of conduct'. Groundwater-Smith et al. (1998) present a code of ethics for teaching under a number of categories which reflect the broad range of teacher responsibilities including teachers' work with students, parents/caregivers/families of students, colleagues, community and society, and to themselves as professionals. The code is based on respect, caring, integrity, diligence, and open communication. Smith et al. (1998) emphasise that behaving ethically is a responsibility of all educators.

In the field of teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL), there are, however, no established ethical guidelines specific to EFL or ESL teachers. Basically, teachers follow the governmental codes of professional behaviour.

Most of the ethical behaviour in relation to MATEFL instructors and graduates/students as future teachers identified by the MATEFL stakeholders concerns their responsibilities to students such as being fair, responsible, honest, forgiving, understanding, generous, willing to impart knowledge the best they can, and being a role model for students. Only one, namely contribution to society, is concerned with teacher's responsibilities to the community and society. None of the stakeholders identified responsibilities in relation to students' families, colleagues, or professionals.

As Dickey (2006, p. 3) makes clear, codes prevent professionals from being judged by individualistic standards. As a result, it is important to develop codes of ethics for TEFL professionals in relation to students, parents/caregivers/families of students, colleagues, community and society, and to themselves as professionals, specific to the Thai context. In addition, the development process should involve members of this profession and the developed codes should conform to global standards.

**Relevance to Thai education**

One of the weaknesses of the MATEFL program is a lack of relevance to Thai education, as identified by graduates and students. Therefore, it is recommended that the program should include more knowledge about the Thai education system, especially English education. The need to take the milieu into consideration in MATEFL curriculum development is supported by Warhurst et al. (1998) who say that in curriculum construction, contextual factors like policy, history, and tradition, geographical environment, economic climate and community expectations should be acknowledged as part of the dynamics that shape the curriculum.

In addition, relevance to the educational and professional needs of the target population, and relevance to the needs of the community in which they will serve as professional educators should be considered as a necessary factor in planning a course, as outlined by Wallace (1991, p. 147). So the need to include more information about the Thai education system into

courses and to take the Thai context into account in developing courses are justified.

**Evaluation utilisation**

Arising from the stakeholders' opinions that the MATEFL program administrators did not really pay attention to the comments and feedback from students and relevant people, regardless of whether they came from formal or informal evaluation, the recommendation is that the program should take the evaluation findings very seriously and use them to improve the program. Keily & Rea-Dickins (2005, p. 289) state that learning from evaluation findings is what all evaluations should encourage. It is crucial in terms of decision-making, action and actual utilisation. If little or no change follows from an evaluation, then what were the reasons for doing it in the first place? The importance of evaluation utilisation was justified and emphasised by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981). Utility was prioritized together with three other evaluation standards – feasibility, propriety, and accuracy. Stufflebeam (1980, p. 90) explains that there is no rationale at all for doing an evaluation if there is no prospect for its being useful to some audience. Patton (1997, pp. 15-17) stresses that evaluators are challenged to take responsibility for use and evaluations ought to be useful. Keily & Rea-Dickins (2005, p. 37) emphasise that there is no justification for obtaining information on program design or implementation, or the underlying policy if the process and findings of the evaluation are not used.

Uses of evaluation findings have been identified by a number of authors. Patton (1997, p. 65) believes evaluation findings can serve three primary purposes: rendering judgement, facilitating improvements, and/or generating knowledge. Weiss (1988a, cited in Clarke, 1999) describes four ways in which evaluation information is used in the decision-making process. First, the information can serve as a warning that something is going wrong. Second, evaluation findings can provide guidance for improving a program.

Third, evaluation findings offer a new way of looking at a familiar problem. This is referred to as 'reconceptualisation'. Finally, evaluation can be used to mobilise support for a project or program.

Royse et al. (2001, pp. 391-392) emphasise that the ultimate goal of an evaluation should be to help the program improve service delivery and suggest four main issues to consider when thinking about increasing the chances that an evaluation report will be utilised: presenting the report in a manner that gets and holds the attention of stakeholders; incorporating the needs and concerns of the program staff and policy-makers; dealing with negative findings; and using the evaluation as a building process.

In summary, it is essential that the MATEFL program administration should be aware of the necessity of evaluation utilisation and employ every means possible to utilise evaluation findings to increase the effectiveness of the program.

## Program management

The recommendations regarding program management include the aspects of allocating and managing resources (learning, human, and budget), and improving the course evaluation system.

### Allocation and management of resources

The recommendations by stakeholders in relation to the improvement of resource allocation and management indicated their awareness of the role that resources play in effective programs, and of the need to solve the problem of insufficient resources.

#### *Sufficient resources leading to better quality*

The problem of obtaining additional fiscal and personnel resources seems to exist in the MATEFL program because of the financial constraints. If the MATEFL program would like to develop human or personnel resources

through a professional or staff development program, it needs to commit significant human and fiscal resources. At the same time, if the MATEFL program would like to improve learning resources (i.e., books, computers, etc.) for instructors and staff and also for students, a large amount of money will be needed. It may need to give up other projects in order to put aside the money for the personnel development plan.

White et al. (1991, p. 131) note that there will always be a trade-off to be made between having enough of the things which cost money – teachers and space – and the financial constraints under which the organisation must operate. So the ability of the program administrators to manage resources effectively is crucial to program success.

### Solving the problem of insufficient resources

One of the recommendations made by the MATEFL stakeholders to solve the problems of a shortage of human resources, in both quantity and quality as well as time and budget constraints, is to seek collaboration and build a network among TEFL professionals. Establishing collaboration and networking with other institutions is suggested by Sinlarat (2003) as one alternative to solve such a problem. He says it provides opportunities for benchmarking and sharing of problems and solutions, resources, and vision.

## Course evaluation

### Advantages of course evaluation

Another issue regarding program management is administering course evaluations. As has been noted, it is recommended that the program should take course evaluations more seriously and make relevant people aware of their importance as well as using them to improve lecturer's performance. The necessity and advantages of course evaluation by students as clients have been identified by Nikolic & Cobaj (2000, p. 231) who suggest that 'no one

can provide better feedback on overall course quality than students who can be the best teacher trainers'. Their insights and perceptions regarding teachers' lessons, classroom performance, and professionalism can assist us in building clearer and more objective images of the quality of our teaching and in identifying areas that need to be improved. Rosenberg & Brody (1974, p. 349, cited in Royse, et al., 2001, p. 3) support the idea that evaluation and client feedback are not only necessary for effective service delivery, but are an ethical requirement of the profession.

In addition to its specific advantage to the program, the advantages of course evaluation to the students are highly significant. Light & Cox (2001, p. 216) suggest that the most significant developments in the evaluation of teaching will come not from teachers thinking about their own courses as delivering quality or from students as consumers expressing their judgements about the quality of the courses provided for them, but by an integration of evaluation into the learning process. In this conception, evaluation is, itself, an important part of a student's learning and self-knowledge, helping them to explore the strengths, weaknesses, inhibitions and styles of their thinking, and working in relation to the constraints and opportunities of the course. So, according to the research studies cited above, the need to conduct course evaluation is justified.

### *Improving course evaluation*

Improving the MATEFL course evaluation mechanism is also recommended. Normally, course evaluations are administered twice in each semester, once in the middle and the other in the last part of the course. The questionnaire consists of both a quantitative part (using a rating scale) and open-ended questions. The completed questionnaires in the first evaluation are given directly to each instructor without being analysed. In the second evaluation, the completed questionnaires are given to a statistician to analyse and the results are then forwarded to each instructor approximately two to three months later.

The evaluation practice conducted in the MATEFL program does not comply with the general principles of evaluation formulated by Keily & Rea-Dickins (2005, p. 152). It fails to demonstrate a balance of quantitative and qualitative approaches; it does not seek internal and external evaluative data. The resulting information is not communicated effectively. Furthermore, staff involved in evaluation have never received any training on evaluation. Therefore, to improve the course evaluation process, those points identified above should be taken into account.

### *Organisational change*

To improve the MATEFL program based on the recommendations made by the program stakeholders and by me, it is certain that the program needs to implement changes in many aspects: policy on professional development, teaching and learning process on the part of both instructors and students, program management, some components of the program as a teacher education program, and the evaluation process.

Any interventions intended to generate positive changes and improvement of the program will inevitably affect relevant people – administrators, instructors, students, and staff. There was a recommendation to consider the needs of relevant people and involve them in the process of change. This is consistent with suggestions by Evan et al. (2006, p. 168) who recognized the need to 'address the concerns and interests of relevant people to make organisation interventions more effective'.

In addition, there is a recommendation to enhance the MATEFL program and the LITU to be more of a learning organisation. Generating change in an organisation, especially a learning organisation, is not an easy task. People are likely to be opposed to changes and prefer to stay in their comfort zone. Lack of a proactive role of the administration and no effective long-term planning were identified as factors that slowed the move toward being an effective learning organisation. These two factors are consistent with the ideas of Senge (1990, cited in Webber, 1999) regarding learning

disabilities – lack of being truly proactive and failure to see long-term patterns of change due to fixation on events. The solutions to these disabilities need to be explored.

Finally, there was a recommendation to increase communication amongst the MATEFL administrators and staff. The necessity of effective communication was emphasised by White et al. (1991, p. 120) as a means of resolving conflicts and in operating an organisation. They suggest that people in an organisation must be kept informed of what is happening and it is essential to communicate effectively with all concerned, both internally and externally.

In conclusion, the recommendations to implement changes in the MATEFL program in the aspects identified above are legitimated and consistent with current literature on the subject. To implement changes effectively, the program administration needs to take the many factors mentioned above into consideration.

## Reflections on the Process

This Impact Evaluation applies to an established program – a Master of Arts Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (MATEFL). The approach taken was that of an objective-based evaluation that sought to evaluate the outcomes of the teacher education program in relation to its goals and objectives. Data were collected using three questionnaires and interviews. The questionnaires were completed by the program graduates/students, staff, and graduates' employers. Interviews were conducted with a representative sample of graduates/students and staff.

The questionnaires were intended to collect data about whether the goals of the MATEFL program had been achieved and how well the goals of the MATEFL program met the expectations of the stakeholders. The real goals of the program, intended outcomes and qualifications expected from the MATEFL graduates, were determined through interviews with the

program developers. This resulted in 31 goals and those goals were used in formulating the questionnaires. Determining the real objectives or goals of a program is identified by Owen, with Rogers (1999) as one of the main tasks in setting up an objective-based evaluation. Therefore, this systematic process to find out the real goals of the program was verified and justified. Interestingly, when those 31 goals were classified according to the five standards of English teachers, most of the goals fell into the category of pedagogical skills (PED). That is to say, the MATEFL program placed emphasis more on instilling pedagogical skills in students than on other skills or knowledge.

In distributing questionnaires to graduates/students, the decision to use the telephone to introduce the researcher, to conduct an evaluation and to follow up was quite successful. The fairly high return rate of questionnaires from this group of stakeholders provided justification for this judgement. In administering questionnaires with program staff, I sensed some kind of power relationships between the respondent and me. I also sensed a feeling of insecurity amongst respondents as they answered some questions. As a result, some answers were over-positive or neutral.

With respect to the employers' questionnaires, relying totally on the graduates' decision whether they would forward the questionnaires to their employers or not, although ethical, resulted in a low response rate. Some graduates might have felt insecure about being evaluated by their employers and so they were not willing to cooperate. Some might have felt that the evaluation was an intrusion of their privacy and also of their employers' privacy. The number of responses from employers, therefore, might not have been sufficiently high to be truly representative of graduates' employers. A low response rate from employers is, however, quite common in any evaluation that involves them.

In interviews, I found that the promise of confidentiality, the lack of previous involvement of the researcher with the evaluated program, and the

friendly but humble approach that I took in the interviews, had a positive effect on obtaining information from interviewees.

In the evaluation process, opinions were sought from the program stakeholders, three of whom were the program establishers and administrators who were the employers as well as the program instructors as representative employees. Thus, any interventions arising from the recommendations are derived from the needs and interests of the employer and employees and so they should lead to effective learning conditions in the organisation.

## My Voice in the Evaluation

As the evaluator in this research, a MATEFL instructor (currently teaching the Instructional Media course starting from 2000, three years after the evaluation process), an administrator in charge of the Language Institute academic affairs and research, the Quality Assurance committee member, and the MATEFL program director (starting from 2005, five years after the evaluation process), I regard myself as a major change agent for making the program more effective. Taking the evaluation findings into consideration, I can generate change in the program in many ways using, as a starting point, my range of different roles.

As an instructor, I will retain student-centered learning activities in my class and emphasize the promotion of autonomous learning abilities even more amongst my students. In addition, I will take into consideration the program evaluation outcomes and recommendations and will utilize them to improve my course.

As an administrator who is in charge of the Language Institute's academic affairs and research, I will propose plans for continuous professional development for instructors, especially those involved in the MATEFL program, on needed aspects such as research, research supervision, teaching methodology, and lesson planning. More importantly, I will

brainstorm with other administrators and staff to identify strategies to raise awareness among staff on the benefit of self-development and reflective practice and strategies to help the Language Institute people be able to cope with changes better.

As one of the Quality Assurance committee members, I will work with the committee to produce QA reports that are more concrete and constructive . I will also encourage other administrators to make better use of the QA results and recommendations to improve the program.

As the MATEFL program director, I will propose to the Language Institute administrators both short- and long-term plans in relation to the MATEFL program. The topics of concern will be resources (quantity, quality and allocation), collaboration and networking, the program QA system, and program evaluation.

I strongly believe that with these strategies I will be able to generate and implement desirable changes that will make the MATEFL program a more effective program.

## Implications for Future Research

This study revealed several implications for further research. It found that the MATEFL program had an impact on career change and career advancement of the graduates. Further research on factors that influence the MATEFL graduates to change their previous job to become English teachers would be beneficial to the program. In addition, this evaluation – which was objective-based – looked at the goals of the program at the time the research was done. To improve the program to fit the future situation, it would be necessary to find the needs of society in the area of teaching English. Therefore, the program should conduct an ongoing evaluation or future research to determine required competencies for future EFL teachers in Thailand. The findings here can be used for identifying the program goals and as a basis for improving the program in the future.

Additionally, this research revealed a number of weaknesses in the program along with recommendations on how to strengthen the program in those weaker areas. The program should conduct action research studies to solve those problematic situations. Finally, the findings of this research should be provided to the MATEFL program administration to use as a basis for improving the program. After that, the stakeholders should attempt to evaluate the changes made in the revised program.

In addition, this research pointed out the need for professional development, especially in regard to the MATEFL staff. Each training program should be evaluated both formatively and summatively. Impact evaluation of each training should also be conducted. These evaluations are expected to improve the training program which will in turn improve the quality of the MATEFL staff and the MATEFL program.

This research project was intended to find out the impact of the program on the graduates. The ultimate goal of this evaluation is to gain information for the improvement of the MATEFL program. It suggests many ways to improve the program: strengthening the strengths, improving the weaknesses, and working out a compromise in the controversial aspects with the aim of assuring higher quality. Let this evaluation be a good starting point leading to the improvement of the program in the future.

# References

Adams, D. (1998) Defining educational quality: Educational planning. *Educational Planning. 11*(2), 3-18.

Alkin, M. (1990) *Debates on evaluation*. California: Sage.

Anderson, V., & Boocock, G. (2002) Small firms and internationalization: Learning to manage and managing to learn. *Human Resource Management, 12*(3), 5-24.

Aoki, N. (2000) *Aspects of teacher autonomy: Capacity, freedom and responsibility*. Paper presented at 2000. Hong Kong: University of Science and Technology Language Centre Conference.

Arends, R. I. (2001) *Learning to teach* (2nd ed.) New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Bailey, K. M., Curtis, A., & Nunan, D. (2001) *Pursuing professional development*. Scarborough, Ontario: Heinle & Heinle.

Barnett, R. (1992) *Improving higher education: Total quality care*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Bassi, L., Cheney, S., & Lewis, E. (1998) Trends in workplace learning: Supply and demand in interesting times. *Training and Development, 52*(11), 51-75.

Beckett, D., & Hager, P. (2002) *Life, work and learning*. London: Routledge.

Benson, P., & Voller, P. (1977) Introduction: Autonomy and independence in language learning. In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy & independence in language learning*. London: Longman.

*References*

Boag, C. (1989, July 18) What Makes a Great Teacher. *The Bulletin*, pp. 46-
    52.

Boud, D., & Miller, N. (1996) *Working with experience: Animating learning*.
    London: Routledge.

Brandt, C. (2006) *Success on your certificate course in English language
    teaching*. London: Sage Publications.

Brown, H. D. (2001) *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to
    language pedagogy* (2nd ed.) New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Brown, J. D. (1989) Language programme evaluation. A synthesis of existing
    possibilities. In K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum*.
    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calder, J. (1994) *Program evaluation and quality: A comprehensive guide to
    setting up an evaluation system.* London: Kogan Page.

Calderhead, J., & Shorrock, S. B. (1997) *Understanding teacher education:
    Case studies in the professional development of beginning teachers*.
    London: The Falmer Press.

Cannon, R., & Newble, D. (2000) A *handbook for teachers in universities &
    colleges: A guide to improving teaching methods* (4th ed.) London:
    Kogan Page.

Charles, C. M., Senter, G. W., & Blaine Barr, K. (1999) *Building classroom
    disciplines* (6th ed.) White Plains: Longman.

Chooto, N. (1988) *Program evaluation*. Bangkok: Thammasan.

Clarke, A., & Dawson, R. (1999) *Evaluation research*. London: Sage
    Publications.

Cline, T., Frederickson, N., & Wright, A. (1990) *Effective in-service
    training: A learning resource pack.* London: University College
    London.

*References*

Craft, A. (2000) *Continuing professional development: A practical guide for teachers and schools* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) London: Routledge Falmer.

Crystal, D. (1997) *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

Dam, L. (1995) *Learner autonomy 3: From theory to classroom practice*. Dublin: Authentik.

Dey, I. (1993) *Qualitative data analysis*: *A user-friendly guide for social scientists*. London: Rutledge.

Dickey, R. J. (1998) Ethics considerations for Asia ELT: Formulating standards. In *Proceedings of the 1998 Korea TESOL Conference*. Retrieved December 20, 2005, from http://www.kotesol.org/-publications/proceedings/1998/dickey-1.shtml.

Dickey, R. J. (2006) Ethical Considerations for Asian ELT. *TESOL Law Journal*. *1*, Retrieved August 12, 2007, from http://www.tesol-law.com/Vol_1_2006rd.php.

Eggen, P. D., & Kauchak, D. P. (2001) *Strategies for teachers: Teaching content and thinking skills* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) Boston: Pearson Education.

Evans, K., Hodkinson, P., Rainbird, H., Unwin, L., Fuller, A., Hodkinson, H., Kersh, N., Munro, A., & Senker, P. (2006) *Improving workplace learning*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Fenwick, T. (2003) Innovation: Examining workplace. Learning in new enterprises. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 15*(3), 123-132.

Fleming, R. (1998) Professional development essentials. In M. Beale (Ed.), *Leading Professional Development*. Melbourne: Hawker Brownlow Education.

Freeman, D., & Richards, J. C. (1996) *Teacher learning in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

*References*

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990) Teacher Preparation: Structural and Conceptual Alternatives. In W.R. Houston (Ed.) *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 213-33) New York: Macmillan.

Gaudart, H. (1994) Merging Theory and Practice in Pre-Service Language Teacher Education. In D.C.S. Li, D. Mahoney, J.C. Richards (Eds), *Exploring Second Language Teacher Development. Papers presented at the Second International Conference on Teacher Education in Second Language Teaching, held by the City Polytechnic of Hong Kong, March 24-26, 1993*.Hong Kong: City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.

Genesee, F. (1996) Evaluation. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds), *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages* (pp. 144-150) United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Groundwater-Smith, S., Cusworth, R., & Dobbins, R. (1998) *Teaching challenges and dilemmas*. NSW: Harcourt Brace & Company.

Harris, T. L., & Hodges, R. E. (1981) *A dictionary of reading and related terms*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Henrichsen, L.E. (1997) One size does not fit all: A taxonomic perspective on ESL/EFL teacher-preparation programs. In T. Woodward (Ed), *The Teacher Trainer*, 11(2), Summer. Kent: Pilgrims Publication.

Herman, J. L., Morris, L. L., & Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. (1987) *Evaluation's handbook*. (2$^{nd}$ ed.) Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hicks, E., Bagg, R., Doyle, W., & Young, J. D. (2007) Canadian accountants: Examining Workplace learning. *Journal of Workplace Learning,* 19(2), 61-67.

Holec, H. (1981) *Autonomy in foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

House, E. (1993) *Professional evaluation.* London: Sage.

*References*

Hughes, C. (1998) Practicum learning: Perils of the authentic workplace. *Higher Education Research & Development, 17*(2), 206-207.

Hurworth, R. (1996) Qualitative methodology, Some questions and answers about analysis of qualitative data in evaluation. *Evaluation News and Comments, 5* (2), 63-64.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1990) *Handbook in research and evaluation* (2nd ed.) San Diego, CA: EdITS.

Johnston, B. (1994) Teacher Education and the MA in ESL: The Students' Perspective. In D.C.S. Li, D. Mahoney, J.C. Richards (Eds), *Exploring Second Language Teacher Development. Papers presented at the Second International Conference on Teacher Education in Second Language Teaching, held by the City Polytechnic of Hong Kong, March 24-26, 1993*. Hong Kong: City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.

Kennedy, M. M. (1991) *An agenda for research on teacher learning*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Kiely, R., & Rea-Dickins, P. (2005) P*rogram evaluation in language education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

King, J.A., Morris, L. L., & Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. (1987) *How to assess program implementation*. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Lange, D. L. (1990) A blueprint for a teacher development program. In J.C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds), *Second Language Teacher Education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Language Institute of Thammasat University (1998) *Master of arts program in teaching English as a foreign language (MATEFL)* Bangkok: Language Institute of Thammasat University. Program Document.

*References*

Language Institute of Thammasat University (2001) *Language institute of Thammasat University self-assessment report (SAR) of 2001.* Bangkok: Language Institute of Thai University.

Lie, A. (1998, February) A continuing education approach to professional development of EFL instructors. *Thai TESOL Bulletin*, pp. 35-41.

Light, G., & Cox, P. (2001) *Learning and teaching in higher education.* London: SAGE.

Little, D. (1995) Learning as a dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System, 23*(2), 175-181.

Mark, M. M., Henry, G. T., & Julnes, G. (2000) *Evaluation: An integrated framework for understanding, Guiding, and improving public and non-profit policies and programs.* New York: Arnold.

Martinez, H. (2002) Fostering autonomy in the language classroom: Implications for teacher education. In *Conference Proceedings: The 4th Symposium of the Scientific Commission on Learner Autonomy in Language Learning. 13th AILA World Congress of Applied Linguistics Held in Singapore 16-21 December 2002.*

Maslow, A. H. (1943) A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, pp. 370.

McGregor, R. & Meiers, M. (1983) Evaluating English curriculum: Some approaches to the evaluation of English programs. Melbourne: Education Department of Victoria.

McInerney, D. M., & McInerney, V. (1998) *Educational psychology: Constructing learning* (2nd ed.) Sydney: Prentice Hall.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. S. (1997) *Research in education: A conceptual introduction.* New York: Longman.

*References*

Ministry of Education (2006) The strategic plan: English education reform in Thailand (2006-2010) Bangkok: Ministry of Education.

Morley, L. (2003) *Quality and power in higher education*. Berkshire: SRHE and Open University Press.

Nikolic, V., & Cabaj, H. (2000) *Am I teaching well?* Toronto: Pippin Publishing Corporation.

Office of the Basic Education Commission. (2005) Standards for English teachers. Bangkok: Educational Innovation Commission.

Office of the National Education Commission (ONEC) (1999) *National education act of B.E. 2542/1999*. Bangkok: Seven Printing Group.

Olshtain, E. (1979) Teaching reading in a foreign language. In D. Feitelson (Ed.), *Mother Tongue or Second Language?: On the Teaching Reading in Multilingual Societies*, pp. 97-111. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Ormrod, J. E. (2006) *Educational psychology developing learners*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Owen, J. M., with Rogers, P. J. (1999) *Program evaluation: Forms and approaches* 2nd ed.) St Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Page, B. (1992) *Letting go, taking: A guide to independent language learning by teachers for teacher*. London: CILT.

Patton, M. Q. (1987) *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. New Bury Park, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1997) *Utilization focused evaluation: The new century text* (3rd ed.) California: Sage Publications.

Phifer, S. J. (2002) *Setting up & facilitating student-centered classrooms*. Maryland: Scarecrow Press.

*References*

Pitayanon, S. (1996) *Human resource economics: Teaching and training in Thailand*. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.

Pitiyanuwat, S., Charupan, M., & Kovin, C. (2002) Teachers and teacher education in Thailand. In P. Suwanawongse, P. Jearakul, P. Teeravarapaug & S.A. Shaw (Eds), *Teachers and Teacher Education in Southeast Asian Countries*. Bangkok: SEAMEO.

Ramsden, P., & Lizzio, A. (2003) Learning to lead: Personal development as an academic leader. In P. Ramsden (Ed.), *Learning to Lead in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.

Richards, D. (1997) Program evaluation. TESOL. *Prospect.* 12(1), pp. 4-19.

Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992) *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (2nd ed.) Singapore: Longman.

Roberts, J. (1998) *Language teacher education*. London: Arnold.

Rogers, C. (1969) *Freedom to learn*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

Rossner, R. (1988) Selecting teacher educators-establishing criteria. In T. Duff (Ed), *Explorations in Teacher Training: Problems and Issues*. Essex: Longman.

Royse, D., Thyer, B. A., Padgett, D. K., & Logan, T. K. (2001) *Program evaluation: An Introduction* (3rd ed.) California: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Ryan, C. (1996) The delight and dangers of curricular revolution. In P. Medgyes & A. Malderez (Eds.) *Changing Perspectives in Teacher Education*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Ryan, G., Toohey, S., & Hughes, C. (1996) The Purpose, value and structure of the practicum in higher education: A literature review. *Higher Education, 32*, 355-377.

*References*

Scriven, M. (1991a) Beyond formative and summative evaluation. In M.W. McLaughlin & D. C. Phillips (Eds), *Evaluation and Education: At Quarter Century, 90ᵗʰ Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education,* (p.180) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Senge, P. M. (1990) *Learning organizations*. Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.solonline.org/res/kr/learningarg.html

Sheerin, S. (1991) *Self-access*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shinawatra, T. (2001) New paradigm for educational reform in higher education: Key issues in national development. 14 August 2001 Pitsanuloke. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.

Silva, T. (1997) On the ethical treatment of ESL writers. *TESOL Quarterly, 31,* 359-363.

Srisa-an, W. (2000) Innovation in teacher education in a borderless world. In C. Lertchalolarn & P. Sinlarat (Eds.), *Innovation in teacher education: Roles of schools of education in a borderless world* (pp.1-6) Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.

Sinlarat, P. (2003) Cooperation and teacher education network to promote education reform in Thailand and regions. In P. Sinlarat, C. Lertchalolarn & C Koven (Eds), *Thoughts on Reforming Teacher Education in Thailand*. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University

Smith, R. C. (2000) Starting with ourselves: Teacher-learner autonomy in language learning. In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath & T. Lamb (Eds.), *Learner Autonomy, Teacher Autonomy: Future Directions*. London: Longman.

Smith, R. C. (n.d.) *Teacher education for teacher-learner autonomy*. Retrieved October 23, 2007, from www.warwick.ac.uk/~elsdr/-Teacher_autonomy.pdf.

*References*

Srisa-an, W. (2000) Teacher and Teacher Education for the New Millennium. Paper presented at *Reforming Teacher Education for the New Millennium: Searching for New Dimensions International Conference* (July) Bangkok.

Stufflebeam, D. (1980) An Interview With Daniel L. Stufflebeam. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis.* 2(4), 90-92.

TESOL (2002) *TESOL/NCATE standards for the accreditation of initial programs in P-12 ESL teacher education*. Retrieved January 9, 2005, from www.tesol.orgls-tesol/bin.asp?CID=219&DID=2135-&DOC=FILE.PDF.

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) (2002) *Program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers*. Retrieved January 9, 2005, from http://www.actfl.org.

The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, (1994) *The program evaluation standards: How to assess evaluations of educational programs* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ungwattanakul, S. (1997) *Methods in English language teaching* (4th ed.) Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.

Ur, P. (1996) *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Ur, P. (1997) The English teacher as professional. *English Teaching Professional*, 2, 3-7.

Ur, P. (2000) *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Vajirakachorn, P. (2000) *A survey study of students' attitudes towards Master's Programs of the Language Institute, Thai University*. Independent

*References*

Study, Master of Arts Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Language Institute of Thai University, Thai University

Voller, P. (1997) Does the teacher have a role in autonomous language learning? In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds), *Autonomous and Independence in Language Learning.* London: Longman.

Wallace, M. J. (1991) *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Warhurst, J., Grundy, S., Laird, D., & Maxwell, T. (1998) Curriculum development. In E. Tlatton (Ed.), *Understanding teaching* (2nd ed.) Marrickville, NSW: Harcourt Brace.

Webber, A. M. (1999) *Learning for a change*. Retrieved July 4, 2007 from http://www.fastcompany.com/magazine/24/senge_Printer_Friendly.html.

Weir, C., & Roberts, J. (1994) *Evaluation in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

White, R., Martin, M., Stimson, M., & Hodge, R. (1991) *Management in English language teaching*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Wiess, C. H. (1998) *Evaluation* (2nd ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Woodward, T. (1991) *Models and metaphors in language teacher training: Loop input and other strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yorke, M. (1999) Assuring quality and standards in globalised higher education. *Quality Assurance in Higher Education*, *7*(1): 14-24.

Zeichner, K. M. (1983) Alternative paradigms of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(3), 3-9.

*References*

Zemke, R. (1985) The Honeywell Studies: How managers learn to manage. *Training*, 22(8), 46-51.

# Appendix A

## The Master of Arts Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (MATEFL)

### Degree Offered

Master of Arts (Teaching English as a Foreign Language)

M.A. (TEFL)

### Objectives

- To develop the quality and standards of English teachers at all levels.
- To offer a curriculum of effective English teaching theory and practice for those who are interested in this career.
- To help solve the problem of a shortage of qualified English teachers at primary, secondary and university level.

### Admission

- Applicants must hold a Bachelor's degree or equivalent in any field of study from a local or foreign institution that is recognized by the Thai University Council.
- Applicants may be graduates of the Graduate Diploma Program in Teaching English as a foreign Language from the Language Institute, Thai University.
- Applicants must meet the requirements in "Number 8: Admission" of Thai University's Graduate School under the 1985 Master of Arts Programs Section.
- Applicants also must successfully pass an English language entrance examination and an interview in English.

### Academic System

The M.A. Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language is a program in which English is the medium of instruction.

The academic year is divided into two 16-week semesters (first and second semesters) and one 8-week summer session. Courses are offered on weekends: Saturdays and Sundays (9:00-4:00 p.m.).

There are two options available:

**Plan A**  Plan A consists of course work and a thesis.

**Plan B**  Plan B consists of course work, a comprehensive examination, and an independent study instead of a thesis.

### Plan A: Thesis

Students can register for a thesis after they have completed at least 30 credits with a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.00.

### Plan B: Comprehensive Examination

Students who are qualified to take a comprehensive examination must have completed all credits required for graduation, including 3 credits from their independent study, and earned

a GPA of at least 3.00. The comprehensive examination will be offered for students in the first semester in which they have the potential to graduate.

Students must pass a foreign language test with a "P" grade as required by Thai University's Regulations for Graduate Students (1996) before they are allowed to defend their thesis or take the comprehensive examination.

The process of preparing and carrying out the thesis for Plan A students must follow the Regulations of Thai University concerning Master's Thesis Writing.

Students from other faculties may take courses in this program with permission of the Language Institute Graduate Committee.

## Duration of Study

The maximum study period must not exceed 14 semesters.

## Registration

Registration is under the requirements in "Number 10: Registration" of Thai University's Graduate School under the 1985 Master of Arts Programs Section.

## Grading System and Graduation

### Grading System

Academic performance is evaluated as follows:

| Grade | Grade point |
|-------|-------------|
| A | 4.00 |
| A⁻ | 3.67 |
| B⁺ | 3.33 |
| B | 3.00 |
| B⁻ | 2.67 |
| C⁺ | 2.33 |
| C | 2.00 |
| D | 1.00 |
| F | 0.00 |

Only credit courses with grades of S (Satisfactory) or at least C will be counted towards graduation. However, the GPA and cumulative GPA must be computed for a D or F in any particular course.

For Plan A, the thesis is given a grade of S (Satisfactory) or U (Unsatisfactory). The thesis with S is equivalent to passing, and can be counted towards graduation,

For Plan B, the comprehensive examination is given a grade of P (Pass) or N (Not pass). The comprehensive examination with P is equivalent to passing, and can be counted towards graduation.

The Foreign Language Test is graded P (Pass) or N (Not Pass).

Other requirements must comply with Thai University's Regulation "Number 11: Grading system' of the 1985 Graduate Studies.

## Graduation

Students who graduate from this program must have:

- earned 42 credits in either Plan A or B
- a cumulative GPA of not less than 3.00
- received P in the foreign Language Test
- received S for the thesis in Plan A or received P for Independent Study in Plan B

Other requirements must comply with Thai University's Regulations for Graduate Students.

## Numbers of Students

Accept 30 students each year.

**Remark:** At least 80% of students are expected to graduate each academic year.

## Place of study

The program is conducted at the Language Institute, Thai University. (Tha Prachan Campus)

## Library

Students can check out books from Thai University's Central Library and various faculty Libraries which have many books and journals.

Students can also use other libraries: such as any university's central library, the National Library, the British Council Library, the AUA Library and the Government Document Center.

## Budget

This program is self-supporting.

## Tuition fees

Approximately 35,000 baht/year (1,500 baht/credit)

## Curriculum

Total requirements                 42 credits

Course Structure:

*Plan A (Thesis)*

    7 Required courses     21 credits

    3 Elective courses       9 credits

  Thesis   12 credits

*Plan B (Non-Thesis)*

    9 Required courses     27 credits

    5 Elective courses     15 credits

## Course Numbers

The first two letters represent the Master's Degree Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

The course listings consist of three numbers:

The last number represents required and elective courses.

| | |
|---|---|
| 0-4 | represents required courses |
| 5-9 | represents elective courses |

The middle number represents course content:

| | |
|---|---|
| 0-2 | represents skills in the language |
| 3 | represents language teaching theory |
| 4 | represents linguistics and applied linguistics |
| 5 | represents learning language teaching |
| 6-9 | represents general courses or self study |

The first number represents the level of difficulty:

| | |
|---|---|
| 6 | represents basic courses |
| 7 | represents advanced courses |
| 8 | represents thesis |

## List of courses

### Required Courses for Plans A and B

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| TE 600 | English Proficiency Development | 3 credits |
| TE 605 | Academic Writing | 3 credits |
| TE 631 | Introduction to Foreign Language Acquisition | 3 credits |
| TE 632 | Teaching English as a Foreign Language Methodology I | 3 credits |
| TE 633 | Teaching English as a Foreign Language Methodology II | 3 credits |
| TE 641 | Phonetics and Language Education | 3 credits |
| TE 642 | Comparative Grammar in Foreign Language Acquisition | 3 credits |
| TE 660 | Research Methodology | 3 credits |
| TE 750 | Teaching Practicum (for Plan B students) | 3 credits |
| TE 790 | Independent Study (for Plan B students) | 3 credits |
| TE 800 | Thesis (for Plan A students) | 12credits |

### Electives

**Plan A:** Choose 3 courses

**Plan B:** Choose 5 courses

Plans A and B students can choose electives from the following courses or from the courses offered in the Master of Arts Program in English for Careers.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| TE 735 | Psychology of Learning | 3 credits |
| TE 736 | Language and Culture | 3 credits |
| TE 745 | Psycholinguistic Applications to Language Teaching | 3 credits |
| TE 746 | Sociolinguistics | 3 credits |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| TE 755 | Materials Development | 3 credits |
| TE 756 | Testing and Evaluation | 3 credits |
| TE 757 | Instructional Media | 3 credits |
| TE 758 | Computer-Assisted Instruction | 3 credits |
| TE 759 | Teaching English for Specific Purposes | 3 credits |
| TE 765 | Seminar in Foreign Language Acquisition | 3 credits |

## Academic Plan

### First Year (Plans A and B)

*First Semester*

    TE 600  English Proficiency Development

    TE 631  Introduction to Foreign Language Acquisition

    TE 641  Phonetics and Language Education

*Second Semester*

    TE 632  Teaching English as a Foreign Language Methodology 1

    TE 642  Comparative Grammar in Foreign Language Acquisition

    1 Elective

*Summer*

    TE 633  Teaching English as a Foreign Language Methodology 2
           (Prerequisite: TE 632)

### Second Year

*First Semester*

| **Plan A** | **Plan B** |
|---|---|
| TE 600 Research Methodology | TE 660 Research Methodology |
| 2 Electives | TE 790 Independent Study |
| | 1 Elective |

*Second Semester*

| Plan A | Plan B |
|---|---|
| TE 800 Thesis | TE 750 Teaching Practicum |
| | 2 Electives |

*Summer*

| Plan A | Plan B |
|---|---|
| TE 800 Thesis | 1 Elective |
| * Oral Defence | * Written Comprehensive Exam |

## Course Descriptions

### Required Courses

TE 600  English Proficiency Development

Development of the four language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing to enhance the learner's effective competency in the English language. Systematic study of English grammatical structures included.

TE 605   Academic Writing

Practice in the writing skills necessary to handle academic writing such as summarizing, paraphrasing, answering essay questions, and report writing. Extensive practice in organizing information and writing well-organized texts of various lengths.

TE 631   Introduction to Foreign Language Acquisition

Examination of some of the theoretical and practical issues involved in acquiring and teaching a foreign language. Study of recent theories of language learning and teaching, as well as an introduction to the practical issues involved in teaching a foreign language in class.

TE 632   Teaching English as a Foreign Language Methodology 1

Study of fundamental English teaching methods for the four language skills, with an emphasis on listening and speaking. Preparation of lesson plans and practical experience in peer teaching with classmates.

TE 633   Teaching English as a Foreign Language Methodology 2

(Prerequisite: TE 632)

Study of teaching methods and foreign language teaching theories and research, with an emphasis on reading and writing. Preparation of lesson plans and practical experience in individual teaching.

TE 641   Phonetics and Language Education

Study and practice of physiophonetics and phonological theory. Application of linguistic theory to language teaching of English learners at different proficiency levels.

TE 642   Comparative Grammar in Foreign Language Acquisition

Study of theories and analysis of English structure to acquire grammatical rules for teaching speaking and writing accurately.

TE 660   Research Methodology

Introduction to general principles of empirical research in language teaching, and an explanation of the simplest and most commonly used statistical procedures for the evaluation of quantitative data. Emphasis on conducting research into typical problems in language teaching and learning.

TE 750   Teaching Practicum (for Plan B students)

Training and practice in writing lesson plans, using activities for integrated skills instruction, and evaluation of students. Peer teaching with classmates, culminating in real practice in actual classrooms at different levels with feedback from teaching experts.

TE 790   Independent Study (for Plan B students)

In-depth investigation of topics related to teaching and learning English as a foreign language, with the aim of offering opportunity and challenge in self-directive, independent study under the supervision and guidance of an advisor. Completed research papers are presented in a course seminar.

TE 800   Thesis (for Plan A students)

**Electives**

TE 735   Psychology of Learning

Study of the interaction between psychological factors and linguistic behaviour. Analysis of language learning problems and application of theories of language learning to English language teaching.

TE 736   Language and Culture

Study of cultural factors which affect English as a foreign language teaching and learning. Practice of language appropriate to a variety of cultural situations. Includes presentations on body language, etiquette, levels of politeness, and concepts of time in various English-speaking cultures.

TE 745   Psycholinguistic Applications to Language Teaching

Psycholinguistic study and analysis of factors and problems in language learning and language development, with special attention to the practical application of psycholinguistic processes in teaching, developing, teaching materials and evaluating language learning.

TE 746   Sociolinguistics

Study of the relationship between language and society, especially language variation associated with different geographic, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups as well as different social situations. Implications for teaching English as a foreign language.

TE 755   Materials Development

Study of elements and steps of building up English lessons focusing on content and presentation using media and published materials devised to fit different contexts.

TE 756   Testing and Evaluation

To increase learners' awareness of the theory and process of testing and to make those involved in testing more critical of the tests they use or develop, and more able to evaluate, adapt, and improve them. Detailed consideration of the place of testing within teaching and the different purposes testing may have.

TE 757   Instructional Media

Study of forms, types and benefits of a wide variety of modern teaching equipment, resources and instructional media. Training and extensive practice in designing instructional media suitable for course content and learners' proficiency levels and in using those media in realistic classroom settings.

TE 758   Computer-Assisted Instruction

Study of methods and processes of using computers as instructional media. Training and practice in designing lessons, writing and testing computer programs for English language instruction.

TE 759   Teaching English for Specific Purposes

Discussion and analysis of text, vocabulary, and structure of English for specific purposes, including preparation of instructional materials and activities, as well as evaluation of teaching English for specific purposes.

TE 765   Seminar in Foreign Language Acquisition

Discussion of research studies on various topics of foreign language acquisition.

Emphasis on conducting research and presenting research findings on English

language instruction at different educational levels.

# Appendix B

## The Graduates'/Students' Questionnaire

**An Impact Evaluation
of a Masters TEFL Program
Operating at a Language Institute in Thailand**

## Graduates'/Students' Questionnaire

Which of the following currently applies to you?

☐ Graduated from the MATEFL program

Have not graduated yet *(please specify the reason):* _____

Dropped out (please specify the reason): _____

Were dismissed / retired from the MATEFL program *(please specify the reason)*:

_____

***If you have not graduated yet, dropped, or were dismissed, please go to
QUESTIONNAIRE 2***

Before you enrolled in the MATEFL program, you:

were unemployed / did not work.

were an English teacher.

did other jobs.

Holding an MATEFL, you are currently:

unemployed.

teaching English.

doing another job (please specify): _____.

furthering your study in (level) _____ (area) _____.

After you graduated with an MATEFL, you:

changed your job to be an English teacher.

changed your job to do something else.

did not change your job.

If you are teaching English (full-or part-time), at what level(s) are you teaching? *(Tick one or more responses.)*

Kindergarten        Primary         Lower secondary          Upper secondary

Lower vocational certificate        Higher vocational certificate

University     Other (*please specify*): _____

*Please go to QUESTION 7 and complete the remainder of the checklist.*

IF YOU ARE NOT TEACHING ENGLISH AT ALL, please state briefly the reason why you are not doing so. *(Please be as specific as possible.)*

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*This completes the checklist for <u>those not teaching English</u> this year.*
*Thank you for your participation.*

**If you are teaching English this year, please continue with the survey.**

Listed below is a series of items that describes aspects of teaching English as a Foreign Language.

On the left-hand side indicate the emphasis each aspect was given during your MATEFL course.

On the right-hand side I would like you, as a teacher, to evaluate each aspect according to its current importance to you in your present position (as a teacher).

**PLEASE RESPOND TO EVERY QUESTION**

| Emphasis in my TEFL Course (tick one) | | | Importance to my present position (tick one) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Little/None | ☐ | | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | **1. English proficiency** | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | **2. Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories** | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | **3. Knowledge of specific English learning/ teaching theories** | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | **4. Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning** | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |

| Emphasis in my TEFL Course (tick one) | | | | Importance to my present position (tick one) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Little/None | ☐ | **5. Knowledge of language testing and assessment** | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | **6. Knowledge of educational technology** | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | **7. An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning** | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | **8. An understanding of the organisation and structure of English language education in Thailand** | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | **9. Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning** | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | **10. An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning** | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | **11. Creativity in English language teaching and learning** | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | **12. An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning** | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | **13. An ability to communicate regularly in class in English** | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | **14. An ability to use a learner-centred approach in English language teaching** | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | **15. An ability to plan English language lessons** | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |

| Emphasis in my TEFL Course (tick one) | | | Importance to my present position (tick one) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **16. An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan** | ☐ Not important<br>☐ Slightly important<br>☐ Moderately important<br>☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **17. An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g., creating a comfortable atmosphere, utilising class time well, etc)** | ☐ Not important<br>☐ Slightly important<br>☐ Moderately important<br>☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **18. An ability to be a good role model in using English in my teaching** | ☐ Not important<br>☐ Slightly important<br>☐ Moderately important<br>☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **19. An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background, levels of proficiency, etc.** | ☐ Not important<br>☐ Slightly important<br>☐ Moderately important<br>☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **20. An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English** | ☐ Not important<br>☐ Slightly important<br>☐ Moderately important<br>☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **21. Development of interpersonal skills** | ☐ Not important<br>☐ Slightly important<br>☐ Moderately important<br>☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **22. An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English** | ☐ Not important<br>☐ Slightly important<br>☐ Moderately important<br>☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material** | ☐ Not important<br>☐ Slightly important<br>☐ Moderately important<br>☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **24. An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material** | ☐ Not important<br>☐ Slightly important<br>☐ Moderately important<br>☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **25. An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively** | ☐ Not important<br>☐ Slightly important<br>☐ Moderately important<br>☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **26. An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students** | ☐ Not important<br>☐ Slightly important<br>☐ Moderately important<br>☐ Very important |

| Emphasis in my TEFL Course (tick one) | | | Importance to my present position (tick one) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **27. A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Not important<br>Slightly important<br>Moderately important<br>Very important |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **28. High ethical standards of professional conducts** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Not important<br>Slightly important<br>Moderately important<br>Very important |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **29. An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Not important<br>Slightly important<br>Moderately important<br>Very important |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **30. An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must play** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Not important<br>Slightly important<br>Moderately important<br>Very important |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **31. An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Not important<br>Slightly important<br>Moderately important<br>Very important |

*Please continue over the page …*

In the light of your subsequent experiences, please use the spaces provided below to make any comments on your MATEFL year. Please be as specific as possible:

**8.1      Strengths of the program:**

_____.
_____.
_____.
_____.
_____

**8.2      Weaknesses of the program:**

_____.
_____.
_____.
_____.
_____

**8.3      What changes to the MATEFL course you undertook would you recommend?**

_____.
_____.
_____.
_____.
_____

Please indicate how satisfied, overall, you are with the MATEFL program
☐ Very satisfied ☐ Moderately satisfied ☐ Slightly satisfied ☐ Not at all satisfied

Please offer a brief explanation of your response:

_____.
_____.
_____.
_____.
_____

***Thank you for your participation***

# Appendix C

## The MATEFL Staff's Questionnaire

### An Impact Evaluation
### of a Masters TEFL Program
### Operating at a Language Institute in Thailand

## Staff Questionnaire

Which of the following activities applied to you during the first three years (1998, 1999, and 2000) of the MATEFL program? *(Tick one or more responses.)*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Instructor (full-time) | Instructor (part-time) | Program administrator |
| Program establisher | Other *(please specify)*: _____ | |
| Thai | Native speaker of English | |

Listed below is a series of items that describes aspects of teaching English as a Foreign Language.

On the left-hand side indicate the emphasis each aspect was given during the first three years of the MATEFL course.

On the right-hand side I would like you to evaluate each aspect according to its current importance to English teachers.

*PLEASE RESPOND TO EVERY QUESTION*

| Emphasis in the TEFL Course (tick one) | | | Importance to English teachers (tick one) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Little/None ☐ Small ☐ Moderate ☐ High ☐ | | **1. English proficiency** | ☐ Not important ☐ Slightly important ☐ Moderately important ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ Small ☐ Moderate ☐ High ☐ | | **2. Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories** | ☐ Not important ☐ Slightly important ☐ Moderately important ☐ Very important |

| Emphasis in the TEFL Course (tick one) | | | | Importance to English teachers (tick one) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Little/None | ☐ | | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | **3. Knowledge of specific English learning/ teaching theories** | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | **4. Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language learning and teaching** | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | **5. Knowledge of language testing and assessment** | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | **6. Knowledge of educational technology** | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | **7. An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning** | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | **8. An understanding of the organisation and structure of English language education in Thailand** | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | **9. Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning** | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | **10. An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning** | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | **11. Creativity in English language teaching and learning** | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |
| Little/None | ☐ | | ☐ | Not important |
| Small | ☐ | **12. An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning** | ☐ | Slightly important |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderately important |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | Very important |

| Emphasis in the TEFL Course (tick one) | | | Importance to English teachers (tick one) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Little/None ☐ | | **13. An ability to communicate regularly in class in English** | ☐ Not important |
| Small ☐ | | | ☐ Slightly important |
| Moderate ☐ | | | ☐ Moderately important |
| High ☐ | | | ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ | | **14. An ability to use a learner-centred approach in English language teaching** | ☐ Not important |
| Small ☐ | | | ☐ Slightly important |
| Moderate ☐ | | | ☐ Moderately important |
| High ☐ | | | ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ | | **15. An ability to plan English language lessons** | ☐ Not important |
| Small ☐ | | | ☐ Slightly important |
| Moderate ☐ | | | ☐ Moderately important |
| High ☐ | | | ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ | | **16. An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan** | ☐ Not important |
| Small ☐ | | | ☐ Slightly important |
| Moderate ☐ | | | ☐ Moderately important |
| High ☐ | | | ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ | | **17. An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g., creating a comfortable atmosphere, utilising class time well, etc)** | ☐ Not important |
| Small ☐ | | | ☐ Slightly important |
| Moderate ☐ | | | ☐ Moderately important |
| High ☐ | | | ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ | | **18. An ability to be a good role model in using English in my teaching** | ☐ Not important |
| Small ☐ | | | ☐ Slightly important |
| Moderate ☐ | | | ☐ Moderately important |
| High ☐ | | | ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ | | **19. An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background, levels of proficiency, etc.** | ☐ Not important |
| Small ☐ | | | ☐ Slightly important |
| Moderate ☐ | | | ☐ Moderately important |
| High ☐ | | | ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ | | **20. An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English** | ☐ Not important |
| Small ☐ | | | ☐ Slightly important |
| Moderate ☐ | | | ☐ Moderately important |
| High ☐ | | | ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ | | **21. Development of interpersonal skills** | ☐ Not important |
| Small ☐ | | | ☐ Slightly important |
| Moderate ☐ | | | ☐ Moderately important |
| High ☐ | | | ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ | | **22. An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English** | ☐ Not important |
| Small ☐ | | | ☐ Slightly important |
| Moderate ☐ | | | ☐ Moderately important |
| High ☐ | | | ☐ Very important |

| Emphasis in the TEFL Course (tick one) | | | Importance to English teachers (tick one) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Little/None ☐ Small ☐ Moderate ☐ High ☐ | | **23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material** | ☐ Not important ☐ Slightly important ☐ Moderately important ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ Small ☐ Moderate ☐ High ☐ | | **24. An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material** | ☐ Not important ☐ Slightly important ☐ Moderately important ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ Small ☐ Moderate ☐ High ☐ | | **25. An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively** | ☐ Not important ☐ Slightly important ☐ Moderately important ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ Small ☐ Moderate ☐ High ☐ | | **26. An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students** | ☐ Not important ☐ Slightly important ☐ Moderately important ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ Small ☐ Moderate ☐ High ☐ | | **27. A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession** | ☐ Not important ☐ Slightly important ☐ Moderately important ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ Small ☐ Moderate ☐ High ☐ | | **28. High ethical standards of professional conduct** | ☐ Not important ☐ Slightly important ☐ Moderately important ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ Small ☐ Moderate ☐ High ☐ | | **29. An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English** | ☐ Not important ☐ Slightly important ☐ Moderately important ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ Small ☐ Moderate ☐ High ☐ | | **30. An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must play** | ☐ Not important ☐ Slightly important ☐ Moderately important ☐ Very important |
| Little/None ☐ Small ☐ Moderate ☐ High ☐ | | **31. An ability to take on the different roles of a teacher of English** | ☐ Not important ☐ Slightly important ☐ Moderately important ☐ Very important |

*Please continue over the page …*

In the light of your subsequent experiences, please use the spaces provided below to make any comments on the first three years of the MATEFL program. Please be as specific as possible:

**Strengths of the program:**

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

**Weaknesses of the program:**

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

**What changes to the MATEFL course would you recommend?**

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

Please indicate how satisfied, overall, you are with the MATEFL program

☐ Very satisfied ☐ Moderately satisfied ☐ Slightly satisfied ☐ Not at all satisfied

Please offer a brief explanation of your response:

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

***Thank you for your participation***

# Appendix D
## The Employers' Questionnaire

**An Impact Evaluation
of a Masters TEFL Program
Operating at a Language Institute in Thailand**

## Employers' Questionnaire

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____ Tel. _____

Name of your school or institution: _____

Position: _____

You have been an employer of the MATEFL graduate for ___ years ___ months.

Listed below is a series of items which describes aspects of teaching English as a foreign language.

On the left-hand side indicate how much you expect in an MATEFL graduate in relation to each aspect.

On the right-hand side I would like you to evaluate the extent to which your subordinate, an MATEFL graduate, currently displays each aspect.

**PLEASE RESPOND TO EVERY QUESTION**

| How much you expect in an MATEFL graduate (tick one) | | | The extent to which your subordinate currently displays each aspect (tick one) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **1. English proficiency** | ☐ Little/None<br>☐ Small<br>☐ Moderate<br>☐ High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **2. Knowledge of general learning/teaching theories** | ☐ Little/None<br>☐ Small<br>☐ Moderate<br>☐ High |

| How much you expect in an MATEFL graduate (tick one) | | | The extent to which your subordinate currently displays each aspect (tick one) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **3. Knowledge of specific English learning/ teaching theories** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Little/None<br>Small<br>Moderate<br>High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **4. Knowledge of cultural factors which affect English language teaching and learning** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Little/None<br>Small<br>Moderate<br>High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **5. Knowledge of language testing and assessment** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Little/None<br>Small<br>Moderate<br>High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **6. Knowledge of educational technology** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Little/None<br>Small<br>Moderate<br>High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **7. An ability to apply educational technology in English language teaching and learning** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Little/None<br>Small<br>Moderate<br>High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **8. An understanding of the organisation and structure of English language education in Thailand** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Little/None<br>Small<br>Moderate<br>High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **9. Knowledge of research in English language teaching and learning** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Little/None<br>Small<br>Moderate<br>High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **10. An application of research knowledge and findings in English language teaching and learning** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Little/None<br>Small<br>Moderate<br>High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **11. Creativity in English language teaching and learning** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Little/None<br>Small<br>Moderate<br>High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | **12. An ability to solve problems in English language teaching and learning** | ☐<br>☐<br>☐<br>☐ | Little/None<br>Small<br>Moderate<br>High |

243

| How much you expect in an MATEFL graduate (tick one) | | | The extent to which your subordinate currently displays each aspect (tick one) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Little/None | ☐ | **13. An ability to communicate regularly in class in English** | ☐ | Little/None |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Small |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderate |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | High |
| Little/None | ☐ | **14. An ability to use a learner-centred approach in English language teaching** | ☐ | Little/None |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Small |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderate |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | High |
| Little/None | ☐ | **15. An ability to plan English language lessons** | ☐ | Little/None |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Small |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderate |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | High |
| Little/None | ☐ | **16. An ability to conduct an English language lesson according to a devised plan** | ☐ | Little/None |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Small |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderate |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | High |
| Little/None | ☐ | **17. An ability to manage an English language classroom effectively (e.g., creating a comfortable atmosphere, utilising class time well, etc)** | ☐ | Little/None |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Small |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderate |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | High |
| Little/None | ☐ | **18. An ability to be a good role model in using English in my teaching** | ☐ | Little/None |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Small |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderate |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | High |
| Little/None | ☐ | **19. An ability to cater for students from diverse interests, background, levels of proficiency, etc.** | ☐ | Little/None |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Small |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderate |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | High |
| Little/None | ☐ | **20. An ability to be a self-directed, motivated learner of English** | ☐ | Little/None |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Small |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderate |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | High |
| Little/None | ☐ | **21. Development of interpersonal skills** | ☐ | Little/None |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Small |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderate |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | High |
| Little/None | ☐ | **22. An ability to develop positive attitudes amongst students towards the learning of English** | ☐ | Little/None |
| Small | ☐ | | ☐ | Small |
| Moderate | ☐ | | ☐ | Moderate |
| High | ☐ | | ☐ | High |

| How much you expect in an MATEFL graduate (tick one) | | | The extent to which your subordinate currently displays each aspect (tick one) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **23. An ability to select appropriate teaching and learning aids and material** | ☐ Little/None<br>☐ Small<br>☐ Moderate<br>☐ High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **24. An ability to create appropriate teaching and learning aids and material** | ☐ Little/None<br>☐ Small<br>☐ Moderate<br>☐ High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **25. An ability to use teaching and learning aids effectively** | ☐ Little/None<br>☐ Small<br>☐ Moderate<br>☐ High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **26. An ability to impart knowledge effectively to students** | ☐ Little/None<br>☐ Small<br>☐ Moderate<br>☐ High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **27. A positive attitude towards the English teaching profession** | ☐ Little/None<br>☐ Small<br>☐ Moderate<br>☐ High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **28. High ethical standards of professional conduct** | ☐ Little/None<br>☐ Small<br>☐ Moderate<br>☐ High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **29. An awareness of the language learning problems of students of English** | ☐ Little/None<br>☐ Small<br>☐ Moderate<br>☐ High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **30. An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must play** | ☐ Little/None<br>☐ Small<br>☐ Moderate<br>☐ High |
| Little/None ☐<br>Small ☐<br>Moderate ☐<br>High ☐ | | **31. An awareness of the different roles (e.g., a needs analyst, a facilitator, a motivator, etc.) that a teacher of English must play** | ☐ Little/None<br>☐ Small<br>☐ Moderate<br>☐ High |

*Please continue over the page …*

Please use the spaces provided below to make any comments on your subordinate, an MATEFL graduate. Please be as specific as possible:

**Strengths of the MATEFL graduate:**

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

**Weaknesses of the MATEFL graduate:**

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

**What changes to the MATEFL program would you recommend?**

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

Please indicate how satisfied, overall, you are with the MATEFL graduate

&#9744; Very satisfied

&#9744; Moderately satisfied

&#9744; Slightly satisfied

&#9744; Not at all satisfied

Please offer a brief explanation of your response:

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

*Thank you for your participation*

# Appendix E

# The Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. Do you think if the program goals have been achieved? Why do you think so?

2. In the original questionnaire you were asked to consider a number of strengths of the program. Think of one of the strengths. Talk to me about it. Give me as much specific detail as you can.

3. In the original questionnaire you were asked to consider a number of weaknesses of the program. Think of one of these weaknesses. Talk about it. Give me as much specific detail as you can.

4. In the original questionnaire you were asked to consider changes to the program that you would recommend. Think of one of these changes. Talk to me about it. Give me as much specific detail as you can.

5. In the questionnaire there are 31 aspects of teaching English as a foreign language. Which aspect would you like to talk about it?

6. (Choose the aspects where the mismatch between program requirement and workplace requirement occurs, especially the ones with low emphasis / high importance.) Talk about these aspects.

7. Would you like to talk about any of these program elements or implementation strategies?