CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The results are presented in the following order:

1. The problems of the students across faculties
2. The comparison of the problems of the students across faculties
3. Ways to solve the problems.

The problems of the students across faculties

The problems in learning the foundation English course of the students at Nakhon Sawan Rajabhat University are shown in Tables 2 – 10.

Table 2: The mean scores and the standard deviation of the problems, related to instructors, of the students from the four faculties.

Faculty	$\overline{X}$	S.D	level
Humanities and Social Sciences	2.58	0.81	low
Education	2.73	0.87	moderate
Science and Technology	2.50	0.78	low
Management Science	2.70	0.79	moderate

Table 2 shows that the students from Humanities and Social Sciences and those from Science and Technology have instructor problems at low level. Whereas, the students from Education and Management Science faculties have instructor problems at moderate level.

Table 3: The means and standard deviation of instructor problems across faculties

No.	Problems	Faculties							
		Humanities and Social		Education		Science and Technology		Management Science	
		$\overline{X}$	S.D.	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	$\overline{X}$	S.D.
1	Failure to explain the objectives and course outline at the beginning stage	2.42	1.22	2.70	2.70	2.33	1.20	3.01	1.02
2	Lack of promoting self-access learning.	2.54	1.13	3.20	3.20	3.01	1.32	2.26	1.46
3	Lack of expressive activities.	2.39	1.45	3.35	3.35	2.49	1.01	2.50	1.84
4	Lack of punctuality.	2.65	1.01	3.26	3.26	2.14	1.00	2.72	1.75
5	Lack of teaching preparation.	2.42	1.25	3.33	3.33	3.03	1.45	3.00	1.54
6	Using inappropriate activities.	2.19	1.44	3.00	3.00	2.33	1.35	2.86	1.47
7	Failure to accept criticism.	2.17	1.42	2.38	2.38	2.16	1.56	2.80	1.22
8	Proceeding too fast to follow.	3.23	1.21	2.31	2.31	3.02	1.45	2.40	1.55
9	Full of over-explanation.	2.70	1.11	2.28	2.28	2.33	1.58	2.14	1.75
10	Speaking English too much.	2.63	1.02	2.24	2.24	2.96	1.55	2.20	1.46
11	Failure to take care of individual students.	3.34	1.51	2.57	2.57	2.61	1.14	3.00	1.81
12	Lack of encouragement.	2.67	1.63	2.34	2.34	2.41	1.56	2.78	1.44
13	Showing little interest in students' homeworks.	2.42	1.21	2.39	2.39	2.00	1.84	2.86	1.78
14	Using inappropriate assessment.	2.39	1.22	2.92	2.92	2.12	1.78	3.20	1.86

Table 3 shows that the students in Humanities and Social Sciences have instructor problems at low level in items 1-3, 5-7, and 13-14; and moderate level in items 4, and 8-12.

The students in Education have low level in items 7-12, and 13; and moderate level in items 1-6, and 14.

Those in Science and Technology have low level in items 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9, 12-14.; and the rest are at moderate level.

Finally, those in Management Science have low level problems in items 2-3, and 8-10; while the rest are at moderate level.

Table 4: The mean scores and the standard deviation of the problems, related to the learners.

Faculty	$\overline{X}$	S.D	level
Humanities and Social Sciences	2.66	0.83	moderate
Education	2.75	0.89	moderate
Science and Technology	2.31	0.70	low
Management Science	3.10	0.74	moderate

Table 4 shows that the students from Science and Technology have learner problems at low level. While those from the other faculties have learning problems at moderate level.

Table 5: The means and standard deviation of learner problems across faculties

No.	Problems	Faculties							
		Humanities and Social		Education		Science and Technology		Management Science	
		$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
15	I do not like to learn English.	2.86	1.78	2.59	1.25	2.96	1.44	3.96	1.02
16	I do not like the English teacher.	2.53	1.15	2.56	1.05	2.21	1.32	2.26	1.45
17	I do not like the English textbook.	2.75	1.44	2.57	1.03	2.11	1.00	2.50	1.84
18	I do not understand spoken English.	3.58	1.04	2.84	1.51	1.25	1.00	3.55	1.75
19	I cannot speak English.	2.42	1.22	3.33	1.54	3.03	1.45	3.00	1.54
20	I cannot understand when I read in English.	2.11	1.49	3.00	1.41	2.33	1.35	3.82	1.49
21	I cannot write in English.	2.17	1.44	2.38	1.55	2.16	1.32	2.80	1.22
22	I do not have good basic knowledge of English.	3.23	1.41	2.98	1.24	3.02	1.45	3.46	1.55
23	I do not have time to review my English lessons.	2.79	1.21	2.28	1.54	1.10	1.58	2.14	1.75
24	I am afraid to ask questions	2.20	1.82	2.99	1.89	2.96	1.45	3.49	1.25

Table 5 shows that the students in Humanities and Social Sciences have learner problems at low level in items 16, 19-21, and 24; moderate level in items 15, 17, 22, and 23; and high level in item 18.

The students in Education have low level of problems in items 15-17, 21, and 23; and moderate level in items 18-20, 22, and 24.

Those in Science and Technology have very low problems in items 18 and 23; low level in items 16, 17, 20, and 21; and moderate level in items 15, 19, 22, and 24.

Furthermore, those in Management Science have problems at low level in items 16, 17, and 23; high level in items 19 and 21; and very high level in items 15, 18, 20, 22, and 24.

Table 6: The means scores and the standard deviation of the curriculum and textbook problems of the students from the four faculties.

Faculty	$\overline{X}$	S.D	level
Humanities and Social Sciences	2.67	0.59	moderate
Education	2.76	0.79	moderate
Science and Technology	2.32	0.66	low
Management Science	2.83	0.74	moderate

Table 6 shows that the students from Humanities and Social Sciences, Education, and Management Science have curriculum and textbook problems at moderate level. While the students from Science and Technology have the same problems at low level.

Table 7: The means and standard deviation of curriculum and textbook problems

No.	Problems	Faculties							
		Humanities and Social		Education		Science and Technology		Management Science	
		$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
25	There are too many English classes.	3.58	1.54	2.56	1.27	2.33	1.42	2.80	1.02
26	The content is boring.	2.86	1.16	2.57	1.05	2.16	1.32	3.46	1.45
27	English is too difficult.	2.53	1.44	2.84	1.00	2.96	1.05	2.14	1.82
28	There is too much content to learn.	2.75	1.04	3.39	1.51	2.27	1.04	2.49	1.75
29	The content is *not* related to my major subject.	2.49	1.72	3.00	1.57	2.11	1.48	2.96	1.47
30	The exercises are too difficult.	2.11	1.49	2.38	1.41	1.25	1.35	2.26	1.49
31	The textbooks are poorly designed.	2.17	1.49	2.98	1.59	3.03	1.14	2.69	1.29
32	The textbooks lack interesting pictures.	3.23	1.41	2.28	1.24	3.02	1.45	3.55	1.55
33	The textbooks are too expensive.	2.79	1.49	2.59	1.54	1.10	1.57	3.08	1.75
34	Students are not given opportunities to choose textbooks of their own interest.	2.20	1.23	2.99	1.14	2.96	1.45	2.82	1.47

Table 7 shows that the students in Humanities and Social Sciences have curriculum and textbook problems at low level in items 27, 29-31, and 34; moderate level in items 26, 28, and 32-33; and high level in items 25.

The students in Education have low level in items 25-26, 30, and 32-33; and moderate level in items 27-29, 31, and 34.

The students in Science and Technology have very low level of problems in items 30 and 33; low level in items 25-26, and 28-29; and high level in items 27, 31-32, and 34.

The Management students have low level problems in items 27, 28, and 30; moderate level in items 25, 29, 31, 33, and 34; and high level in items 26 and 32.

Table 8: The means and the standard deviation of the administration problems of the students classified by faculties.

Faculty	$\overline{X}$	S.D	level
Humanities and Social Sciences	2.83	0.44	moderate
Education	2.76	0.68	moderate
Science and Technology	2.40	0.91	low
Management Science	2.67	0.37	moderate

Table 8 shows that the students from Science and Technology have low level of administration problems. Whereas, the remaining students have the problems at moderate level.

Table 9: The means and standard deviation of administration problems

No.	Problems	Faculties							
		Humanities and Social		Education		Science and Technology		Management Science	
		$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
35	There are insufficient English books in the library.	2.80	1.66	2.99	1.46	2.33	1.16	3.58	1.55
36	There is insufficient access to English lab.	3.55	1.59	2.56	1.05	2.16	1.32	2.86	1.26
37	There are insufficient audio-visual aids.	3.46	1.44	2.57	1.02	1.10	1.43	2.53	1.45
38	Classrooms are noisy.	2.14	1.12	2.84	1.51	2.96	1.04	2.75	1.84
39	Classroom facilities are in poor condition.	2.49	1.43	3.39	1.42	2.27	1.48	2.49	1.75
40	Classrooms in tall buildings are difficult to access.	2.96	1.29	3.00	1.41	2.11	1.52	2.11	1.47
41	Classrooms are hot.	2.26	1.49	2.38	1.47	1.25	1.14	2.17	1.49
42	There are too many students in each classroom.	2.69	1.41	2.98	1.24	3.03	1.45	3.23	1.52
43	There are very few English teachers.	3.08	1.49	2.28	1.54	3.02	1.57	2.79	1.75
44	There are insufficient native English teachers.	2.82	1.43	2.59	1.17	2.96	1.55	2.20	1.76

Table 9 shows that the students from Humanities and Social Sciences have administration problems at low level in items 38, 39, and 41; high level in items 35, 40, and 42-44; and very high level in items 36 and 37.

The students from Education have the same problem at low level in items 36, 37, 41, 43, and 44; and the remaining items are at moderate level.

The Science and Technology students have the problems at a very low level in items 37 and 41; low level in items 35, 39, and 40; and moderate level in items 42, 43, and 44.

Finally, the Management students have the problems at low level in items 37, 39-41, and 44; moderate level in items 36, 38, 42, and 43; and high level in item 35.

Table 10: The means and the standard deviation of the overall problems, related to the four areas, of the students classified by faculties.

Faculty	$\overline{X}$	S.D	level
Humanities and Social Sciences	2.69	0.62	moderate
Education	2.75	0.71	moderate
Science and Technology	2.38	0.59	low
Management Science	2.83	0.55	moderate

Table 10 shows that the students from Science and Technology have the overall problems at low level. Meanwhile, the others have the problems at moderate level.

The comparison of the problems of the students across faculties

The comparison of the problems of the students across faculties are shown in tables 11 – 15.

Table 11: The comparison of the instructor problems of the students across faculties.

	df	MS	F
Between group	3	151.252	.925
Within group	240	163.495	
Total	243		

At the significance level of .05 the F value (3, 240) in the standard table is 2.65. The F value shown in table 11 is .925, which is less than that in the standard table. This suggests that the students from all faculties have the instructor problems that are not significantly different at the level of .05.

Table 12: The comparison of the learner problems.

	df	MS	F
Between group	3	153.030	1.387
Within group	240	110.331	
Total	243		

At the significance level of .05 the F value (3, 240) in the standard table is 2.65. However, the F value shown in table 12 is 1.387, which is less than that in the standard table. This means that the students from all of the four faculties have learning problems that are not significantly different at the level .05.

Table 13: The comparison of the curriculum and textbook problems of the students from all faculties.

	df	MS	F
Between group	3	114.493	1.103
Within group	240	103.765	
Total	243		

At the significance level of .05 the F value (3, 240) in the standard table is 2.65. However, the F value shown in table 13 is 1.103, which is less than that in the standard table. This means that the students from all of the four faculties have curriculum and textbook problems that are not significantly different at the level of .05.

Table 14: The comparison of the administration problems of the students from all faculties.

	df	MS	F
Between group	3	132.893	1.271
Within group	240	104.532	
Total	243		

At the significance level of .05, the F value (3, 240) in the standard table is 2.65. However, the F value shown in table 14 is 1.271, which is less than that in the standard table. This means that the students from all of the four faculties have administration problems that are not significantly different at the level of .05.

Table 15: The comparison of the overall problems of the students from all faculties.

	df	MS	F
Between group	3	856.373	1.019
Within group	240	840.030	
Total	243		

At the significance level of .05, the F value (3, 240) in the standard table is 2.65. However, the F value shown in table 15 is 1.019, which is less than that in the standard table. This means that the students from all of the four faculties have the overall problems that are not significantly different at the level of .05.

Ways to solve the problems

The results concerning the solution of the students' problems in the four areas were acquired by way of personal interview with the sample group of students and teachers, whose names are unidentified for ethical reasons. Therefore, the identities of the students are coded as S1, S2, S3, and so on. Similarly, the identities of the teachers are coded as T1, T2, T3, and so on.

Instructor Problems

Ideally, the role of the teacher is to facilitate learning processes. Teachers should provide learners with a positive climate for learning by incorporating the major learning theories, as the situation requires. However, when problems occur, teachers need to find appropriate solutions.

Using Team Teaching

T1. suggests using team teaching as a way to solve teachers' problems. The idea behind team teaching is simply two heads are better than one. It is wise to use a regular Thai teacher and a native English-speaking foreigner who work together as a team in a single classroom to encourage students to learn and use English. The Thai teacher will know his or her students and the local curriculum better and the foreign language teacher will perhaps be better equipped to teach English. Both teachers should learn from one another and the students can benefit from both teachers.

T3. and T6. add that team teaching has many advantages:

- the foreign teacher will find it easier to communicate with the students, as the Thai teacher can explain directions in Thai;
- the Thai teacher knows the students and the curriculum. This contributes to students learning;
- the Thai teacher, by managing the class, allows more learning to take place;

- the Thai teacher will have a chance to improve his or her English;

- the foreign teacher may improve his or her teaching methods, which leads to long-term benefits for students.

Using Authentic Materials

As a result of the interview conversation with the whole group of teachers, they agree that TEFL/ESL teachers should teach a class using what is known as an authentic text, an original, unsimplified message intended for native English speakers. One of the more popular sources of authentic material is a daily newspaper.
The daily newspaper provides an abundance of timely information of general interest and since the writing is highly consistent, it is possible to talk with considerable precision about rhetorical patterns. The newspaper is especially suited for skimming and scanning exercises, understanding vocabulary from context, separating fact from opinion and critical reading. And best of all, in doing such activities, students are simultaneously building knowledge of the world that they can almost immediately put to use. Unlike most language textbooks, this information builds from day to day—what is learned in reading a story today can be applied to an updated version of the same story of tomorrow.

Using the Internet

T10. recommends using computers and the Internet for instruction and learning. The Internet is bringing learning to more homes. Information about every conceivable topic is now readily available to the public. Information is no longer the monopoly of schools, teachers, libraries, or books. Because of integrated workforce technology and technology-rich environments at home, the educational focus on the Internet has turned from teacher teaching to student learning. WebQuests are good examples on how to integrate technology by requiring learners to search for information by accessing the Internet (Dodge, 1997). Using the Internet as a learning tool is an unconventional way of learning since the Internet challenges conventional textbooks and teachers as the sole providers of information. WebQuests are similar to

online distance learning environments where students can work independently. Students do not require assistance from the school or the teacher during a WebQuest task.

Learner Problems

Students need to develop skills so that they can cope with future situations and become lifelong learners. They should learn to use higher order thinking and social skills necessary in today's fast moving world. Nevertheless, there are always problems that students will need to solve. Here are some views expressed by the interviewees about the ways to solve student problems:

Using Easy English

S1. explains that Thai students are being pushed too quickly up the Everest of complex and academic English without really mastering adequate basic English. One solution is therefore to have a greater amount of easy comprehension input – mainly through extensive, free, voluntary and lighter reading and extensive recreational listening, largely outside the classrooms. This can also improve writing and speaking.

Using Synonyms

T7. recommends that students use synonyms when they find new words. Writers often come up with fresh ways of saying the same thing. One of their most common devices is the use of synonyms — words with the same or nearly the same meanings. Recognising these synonyms is one of the most efficient methods you can use for guessing the meanings of unfamiliar words. If you know one of the words in the pair — *corruption* and *graft*, for example — you immediately know the meaning of the other as well, thereby saving a trip to your dictionary.

Using Explanations

This is one way to solve the problem of unfamiliar word as explained by S4. Writers know that most students are not experts on the subjects they find in the

textbook. For that reason, the writers usually explain technical or scientific terms. Very often, they do this immediately after the difficult word For example: *Encephalitis, a viral brain disease spread by mosquitoes, killed 2715 people in India last year*. Sometimes they add a separate sentence of explanation.

Curriculum and Textbook Problems

The group of instructors expressed their views about possible ways to solve the curriculum and textbook problems as follows:

Effective Curriculum Development

In her point of view, T6 maintains that theory and practice should provide useful information in designing a curriculum. Curriculum leaders should consider learning theories, learning styles, learners' unique ways of processing information, inquiry-based learning, blended means of delivery and presentation, and alternative assessments when setting standards and lesson plans for teachers. Curriculum and instruction complement one another. The curriculum should also set guidelines for teachers on instruction and assessment. It should offer choices in content, material, and alternative assessment. The EFL curriculum should encourage teachers to use positive reinforcement, provide student choices, and instruct teachers on effective principles of language teaching. The standards the English curriculum should successfully align curriculum theories with student needs.

In a similar point of view, T3. holds that a curriculum should focus on learners, the subject matter, and society. The planning committee should set goals and rational for instruction, define the objectives, decide on means of assessment, construct a breakdown of units of study for the course, and create lesson plans using various instructional models and activities. Curriculum developers require information on the needs of the students, the societal purpose, and the subject matter. Similarly, student needs assessments could provide background knowledge for teachers prior to planning new learning activities. In addition, teachers may need assistance on how to implement

the curriculum so that the content and goals of the lessons align with the standards set by the curriculum. Finally, evaluating the effectiveness of a curriculum program requires authentic assessment of student performance-based tasks.

T5. suggests that the courses should be relevant to the students' social and profession needs, provide enough facilities, and organise extra-curricular activities to make learning enjoyable.

Students Designing Their Own Curricula

An interesting point of view is given by T10. If teachers and parents genuinely believe that it is educators' responsibility to prepare students for a life of "meeting employers' needs," then teachers have to better examine what it is that they choose to teach students. That is, what should be in the curriculum to ensure that students have the knowledge to prepare them for a life of employment? Educators, parents, and employers all seem to agree on the types of skills they believe students should be developing. They know what students should learn to prepare them for productive and successful lives. But the traditional curriculum, divided up into separate subjects, neither engages students nor prepares them for productive lives. The answer to both problems is to have students design their own curricula. A number of research has shown that students who design their own curricula can improve their skills and strategies in thinking critically and creatively, solving problems, working collaboratively with others, communicating well, writing more effectively, reading more analytically, and conducting research to solve problems. No traditional curriculum, delivered as separate subjects, can provide students with the deep, diverse, and meaningful learning experiences that their own curriculum choices can lead to.

Administration Problems

Administration problems can possibly be solved in the following ways:

Reducing Class Size

According to T7., efforts to reduce class size should be taken seriously. A class size reduction fund should be established. Such a fund will help recruit more instructors, provide professional development for new and veteran teachers, and purchase educational resources. Class-size reduction funds will help create more manageable classrooms so that teachers could focus on teaching and spend less time on discipline, taking attendance and paperwork. Since the cost of class size reduction is enormous, public support for the level of funding needed to substantially reduce class size through expansion of college facilities and staff is called for.

Holding Staff Meeting

According to T2., administration problems can be solved if administrators and teachers meet with each other for two hours one evening each week. This meeting should be preceded by a late afternoon hour of exercise, then dinner together. Another device is that of beginning school in the morning at, say, nine o'clock instead of eight-fifteen. Teachers come at eight and have an uninterrupted hour for conference as a whole faculty or in committees. Students take responsibility for building and playgrounds before nine.

In the point of view of T9., it is essential that the staff of an individual school cooperate in setting up purposes and in planning ways to achieve them. It is also necessary that the administrators should find ways of working together for common ends. Although there are differences among staff members: home backgrounds, interests, needs and purposes; the major goals should be the same.

Conducting Prediction Study

Each semester, the administration should conduct prediction studies based on enrollment, statistics, attrition rate, percentage of passing, failing, and returning students in previous semesters, and total number of retiring and resigning students. The university should also have a long-term plan. All parties involved in student admission should be made aware of the large enrollments and staffing problems. The college may seek new financial resources and contributions.

Using Technology

To accommodate the large number of students, innovative methods of instruction can be introduced. T4. recommends the use of technology in the teaching of EFL courses to supplement classroom instruction. In addition, T8. also asserts that electronic media provide new opportunities for engaging college students in and out of the classroom. Electronic mail, teleconferencing, and Internet resources can increase instructor availability and extend class discussion.

Classroom Arrangement

Additionally, S5. expressed his view that the classroom should be designed and equipped to facilitate speech production. Round tables, or U shaped tables that provide teacher access in the middle, are the best seating arrangement. A close, friendly, non-threatening atmosphere should be established to induce a friendly coffee shop approach to the small group conversation. As in a coffee shop, the content should be current events that are relevant and interesting. The best source for such topics is the local English newspaper, just as in western countries.