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ABSTRACT

This study investigates the English as a foreign language (EFL) Pre-service teachers’ beliefs and practice; and their relationship; and examines the extent to which teacher education plays a role in promoting innovative teaching of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). It focuses particularly on the context of the school-based teaching practicum in basic education level in southern Thailand.

A sequential mixed approach employing quantitative and qualitative research methods was used for data collection in two stages. Stage One is based on self-survey questionnaire data from 166 Thai EFL pre-service teachers from three universities which explored their self-reported beliefs. In Stage Two, observation of English communication classes of 3 pre-service teachers were conducted in three practicum schools, in a nine-month teaching practicum course. Classroom practices were observed and documented providing further insights into their beliefs and practices regarding to CLT. Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the quantitative survey data. Content analysis was used to analyze the qualitative observation data.

Analysis of the findings indicated that majority of the participants held positive beliefs about CLT principles and the PST cases taught differently from many of their reported beliefs. Key findings of the study confirm that the Thai EFL pre-service teachers, taught to a limited extent, in accordance with their pedagogical beliefs. Findings showed that PSTs’ instructional decision-making was central to the deep-rooted core beliefs regarding ‘accuracy is as perfect learning’. Active experimentation and self-reflection helped bridge the gap between conflicting beliefs and enhanced their effort in innovative teaching. Factors that affect CLT adoption include students’ motivation to learn and the guidance from supervisor/mentor. Implications for EFL teacher education are that PSTs should be made aware of their personal beliefs and the possible contextual constraints they face. The study suggests the consideration in the localization of the ELT reform.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statement of the Problem
The teacher is the key determinant of success for any classroom-based curriculum reform, because s/he is the key decision-maker in determining whether or not a new pedagogy prescribed by policymakers is appropriate for his/her classroom context and how exactly this pedagogy should be implemented. Teachers make decisions on how each curriculum should be applied for classroom instruction in the light of theoretical beliefs they hold about teaching and learning (Freeman & Richards, 1996; Johnson, 1992). Teachers’ knowledge and beliefs are instrumental in the curriculum decision-making process in the sense that while knowledge is defined as factual information that has been agreed upon by scholars within a discipline, beliefs are personal and experiential and appear to influence what and how knowledge will be used. A key assumption in this study is that “acceptance of a new technique of a new curriculum innovation for the teachers to be adopted for implementation of classroom practice has to be accommodated within the teacher’s own framework of teaching principles” (Breen, Hird, Milton, Oliver, & Thwaite, 2001, p. 472). Understanding teachers’ instructional processes, in particular how they make instructional decisions to adopt or reject teaching principles requires an understanding of teachers’ classroom behaviours in relation to their beliefs and the perceptions underlining those behaviours.

Unlike experienced teachers whose developed schemata of ‘how to teach’ underpin their instructional decisions, teaching innovations may present a significant challenge for preservice teachers (PSTs) because they are in the initial stage of ‘learning to teach’ and naive in validating their personalised practice (Borg, 2006; Mak, 2011). As apprentices in practicum classrooms, PSTs might experience tension between contrasting views about teaching and learning. Their personal views may, therefore, affect acceptance of any specific pedagogical ideas (Lortie, 1987). If PSTs try an educational innovation which is incompatible with their perceptions of valuable or acceptable practice, they might discard a teaching resource and fail to welcome an educational reform (Orafi & Borg, 2009). Teacher education is located between preservice-teachers’ past experiences as students in classrooms and future experiences as in-service teachers and so has an important role
in improving instructional practices (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). If teacher education requires the novice teacher to teach in a way that differs from their school experience, recognition that their own well-established beliefs may impede development of learning to teach in a different way is required (Kennedy, 1999). Consequently, teachers should be encouraged to “revise, refine or change their perceptions or initial beliefs about teaching” because “the ability to change varies as they progress through the teacher education” (Kind, 2014, p. 12). Beliefs about teaching and learning should be acknowledged early during initial teacher preparation to ascertain any positive changes in the teacher’s knowledge structure (Gwyn-Paquette & Tchon, 2003; Richardson, 1996). Understanding the development of the beliefs of preservice teachers and the impact these have on practice can be achieved by exploring actual practices during teaching practicum (TP) periods (Cheng, Tang, & Cheng, 2012).

1.2 Understanding Preservice Teachers’ Thinking and Beliefs System

The core notion which underpins this study is: “Unless there has been much empirical evidence on teachers’ beliefs and attitudes, teacher education could not play an influential role in changing teachers’ practice in referring to their beliefs” (Tatto, 1998). Understanding teachers’ thinking processes i.e., how they gather, interpret, and evaluate data is a valuable means of determining teachers’ behaviour (Kagan, 1990, p.13). Hence, it is essential to understand the beliefs and principles that teachers operate from. Studies in language teacher education are prudent in understanding how teachers conceptualise their work along the lines of professional development (Gowrie & Ramdas, 2012; Wright, 2010). According to the constructivist theory of learning, teachers’ personal theories of ‘learning to teach’ are a central element of teacher development (Roberts, 1989). The cognitive state is claimed to occur when the teacher perceives that new things are not what they had expected them to be. Hence, teachers incorporate their prior knowledge into the new data when refining their conception (Knight, 2002). For the novice teacher, classroom practice and day-to-day interaction with students and colleagues have the potential to influence particular relationships among beliefs and principles, and, over time, consolidate the individual’s permutation of them (Clark & Peterson, as cited in Breen et.al, 2001, p. 98). This personal construct of teachers’ social validation is what
significantly determines their decision on what teaching approach is best suited to each particular practice (Hampton, 1994).

While teacher educators still do not have a crystal clear portrait of how the beliefs of novice preservice teachers are constructed during the course of teacher education, the findings of some promising studies are accepted as valuable evidence of how the change in beliefs and practice corresponding to the curriculum innovation is fostered. As suggested by Pajares (1992, p. 327) “little will have been accomplished if research into educational beliefs fails to provide insights into the complex relationship between beliefs, on the one hand, and teacher practices and teacher knowledge on the other.” Hence, further study by teacher educators that leads to better understanding of novice teachers’ beliefs and the complex role they play in teaching is valuable and essential to improving the PSTs’ practices and their on going professional growth.

1.3 Rationale, Motivations, and Justification

My interest in the topic of teachers’ beliefs and practices derives from my experience as a teacher educator of undergraduate-students in a teacher education programme at a teacher training institution in southern Thailand. From 2007-2010, I taught Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) classes and undertook the supervision of EFL PSTs on their school-based teaching practicum. Three main factors influenced this topic as a choice for study.

First, on commencing this role, I was inspired by the question of how teacher ‘beliefs’ influence classroom practice. Having monitored student teachers’ teaching practice in English classes, I observed that most exhibited satisfactory performance in preteaching aspects such as lesson planning and postteaching, including test construction and learning assessments. However, most observed classes included learning strategies in line with traditional rules and skill-based approaches using grammar-translation and audio-lingual teaching models embedded in rote memorisation and repetitive drills. My personal observations aligned with Thornbury (1998) who found that language teachers did not always enact communicative language teaching (CLT) principles even though they may profess a commitment CLT. In my case, I found that the teachers’ practices appeared to be inconsistent with top-down educational policy and that their actual practice might contradict pedagogical theory, as written in their lesson plans.
Second, a major challenge in southern Thailand is political unrest in Yala, Pattani, and Narathiwat provinces (see Appendix 21). For more than a decade, this limited access to EL learning facilities contributed to a shortage of qualified English language teachers (Unicef Thailand Case Study Report, 2014).

Third, student-teachers in the EFL education programme have common characteristics that should be taken into account as contextual factors that may impact on their learning on how to teach. These features include the use of their native language as classroom discourse; their limited use of English language in classroom interactions; and, limited exposure to realistic settings of English language use. The language teachers’ subject matter knowledge, for instance, their linguistic achievement and language command are important determinants of implementing classroom instruction (Lafayette, 1993; Pennington, 1989) and more influential than intended school policy (Kiplinger, 1997). Since teachers’ limited command of English language is related to an ineffective performance of language teaching (Al-Mutawa & Kailani, 1989; Cullen, 1994), effective use of CLT may require the teacher to have excellent communication skills in English.

Fourth, only a very few studies have investigated pedagogical innovation among EFL preservice teachers in Thailand. Examples of such studies include Naruemon (2013), Vibulphol (2004), and Weerawong (2006). As yet, no study has been undertaken that considers the situation where preservice teacher are facing difficulties in adopting innovative teaching of CLT in relation to the local educational factors.

Thus, the background to this study lies in the fact that considerable input to change teachers’ fundamental beliefs is required in order to encourage engagement with reform. The PSTs who participated in this study were educated during the initial development of the learner-centred approach in conjunction with communicative language teaching (MOE, 2005). Thus, EFL teachers familiar with grammar-translation and audio-lingual language teaching might hold beliefs consistent with these approaches when learning to teach. These, and PSTs’ experiences as learners, would be likely to influence their beliefs about how to teach the language. This study enriches understanding of teachers’ beliefs by pointing to correlations between PSTs’ beliefs and practices as they progress through the 1-year classroom-based teaching practicum at schools in the southern provinces of Thailand.
1.4 Study Context

1.4.1 Teachers’ beliefs and English teaching in Thailand.

In 2001, Thailand’s Education Ministry introduced a pedagogical approach to English language teaching (ELT) for all levels of English teaching from elementary to tertiary. The CLT approach was introduced and combined with the learner-centred approach which had been introduced earlier. This reform set students’ communicative competence as the prime learning goal. Students were to engage in autonomous learning with a reduced teacher-fronted role (OEC, 2007; Jarvis & Atsilarat, 2004) because it was claimed that learner-centred instruction better facilitated communicative competence in language classes (Prapphal & Opanon, 2002). The introduction of CLT into Thai EFL classrooms generated new hope for developing a workforce with English communication competence. However, most Thai EFL teachers do not appreciate this change from traditional teacher-centred, grammar-translation approaches (Khamkhien, 2010). Teachers are not clear about how to apply communicative language theory in practice (Yunibandhu, 2004; Saengboon, 2004) and, due to many limitations, are not confident in utilising learner-centred tenets (Saengboon, 2004). Furthermore, the exam-orientation of Thai education has created a perception in both teachers and students that the ultimate objective of teaching and learning is the passing of examinations (Manajitt, 2008). Standardised tests at every educational level are grammar- and reading comprehension-based (Jarurat, 2004). The discrepancy between the teaching curriculum and students’ expectation has, therefore, been a major problem in implementing CLT in EFL classrooms in Thailand. In addition, there is a lack of CLT training for teachers in mainstream teacher education. This lack of training creates negative attitudes as regards employing this unfamiliar theoretical concept in their classrooms (Prapaisit, 2003; Naruemon, 2013). This outcome is in line with findings in other EFL settings where teachers feel reluctant to adopt CLT as doing so requires them to change practices with which they are familiar to those with which they are not familiar. It is too laborious and difficult to implement this demanding obligation (Li, 1998; Wong, 2010; Urmston, 2003; Takayoshi, 2011). However, only a few research studies relating to teachers’ perception of and beliefs about CLT and the challenges they face can be found. Jarvis and Atsilarat (2004), for instance, examined Thai practitioner perceptions of CLT and student attitudes towards it in order to consider whether CLT was appropriate in the Thai context. The results showed that, while Thai
teacher-practitioners perception was positive towards CLT, they all struggled to implement CLT, even when they reported good-understanding of CLT’s principles. Similarly, Weerawong’s (2006) study, which investigated student teachers’ teaching behaviours in the EFL classroom, found evidence showing that practitioners employed many classroom practices which were incompatible with CLT and student-centeredness premises, as required by the school syllabus. The Thai EFL student teachers in Viboolphol’s (2004) study showed preference for adopting the traditional culture of learning and specified a belief that the teacher was the centre of the classroom. That view contrasted with their prepractice beliefs regarding students’ active learning. In the latest study of Thai EFL student teachers’ thinking about the constructivist student-centred approach, Naruemon (2013) found that several contextual factors hindered their enactment of communicative activities and influenced their rejection of constructivist student-centred theories, even when they had previously planned to adopt that approach. It is clear that, for Thai novice teachers, CLT practice seems to appear in name only. This situation creates several challenges and is apparently related to unsettled beliefs about this innovative concept. Thai EFL teachers’ understanding and thinking about CLT has been noted as a critical issue in the reform of EFL teacher education in Thailand.

1.4.2 The Teacher Education Context
This study focuses on Thai preservice EFL teachers’ beliefs about CLT and the extent to which they implement CLT during the initial stage of a 9-month long teaching practicum. The study participants are the third generation of PSTs enrolled in a 5-year programme of teacher education that was introduced as a part of all teacher education nationwide in 2003. This programme led to a new curriculum structure, with an additional final, fifth year of study that followed a practice-based syllabus. After 4 years of theory-based taught courses, PSTs enrol in the Teaching Practicum course. This requires full-time school-based practice in a primary or secondary school. The affiliated schools in this study are located in the southern border region of Thailand where the students speak mostly Jawi—their native language—and where English use is limited (Bax, 2010; Liow, 2009). In Thailand, the ordinary classroom discourse in English classrooms is usually conducted in Thai, with some English (Forman, 2005). Data were collected from participants who carried out their teaching practicum between May 2013 and February 2014. The study begins at the point
where teaching practice may be reasonably expected to combine school and teacher education influences, and when the preservice teachers may encounter difficulties that challenge their learning. While the impact of the teaching practicum on the development of PSTs’ beliefs is not the main consideration, factors involving PSTs’ engagement in classroom practice, are examined to explore possible variables that may influence their belief development.

1.5 Aim and Research Questions

Understanding how teachers interpret their theoretical beliefs about teaching innovations can be accomplished through a phenomenological study. This method identifies their thinking processes and relates these to experiences of teaching and learning. The background to this study is based on a reflection on the ‘bottom-up’ view of teacher change, a more practical assumption than a top-down model of change seen in traditional innovation models. A ‘top-down’ approach to teacher change is viewed as the transmission of information from educator or policymakers to teachers (Darling-Hammond, 1990). This study establishes EFL preservice teachers’ beliefs about teaching activities which they perceive as complementing CLT approaches and the extent to which personal knowledge and beliefs relate to their classroom teaching practices. The study’s overall objectives are:

- To investigate EFL preservice teachers’ initial beliefs about the intended national pedagogy of CLT.
- To explore EFL preservice teachers’ classroom practices and examine if their reported beliefs translate into observable traits in classroom practice.
- To investigate possible challenges that affect the way preservice teachers’ beliefs translated into practices.

This research sets out to investigate the specific PSTs’ beliefs about CLT and the extent to which their personal beliefs about CLT translate into actual practice in practicum classrooms. The study also examines difficulties teachers perceive in terms of factors that have an influence on their practice and beliefs. The research focuses on PSTs’ teaching during their 1-year practicum course, tracks the development of their beliefs, and analyses the impact that experiential learning gathered from their teaching practicum has on these beliefs. First, PSTs’ prepracticum beliefs about CLT are probed. Second, their classroom practices are examined to establish the relationship between reported beliefs
and observed practices. Finally, factors that might impact on PSTs’ stated beliefs and how these are enacted in classroom-based CLT practices are investigated. The study’s two main research questions are:

**Research question 1**: What are the stated beliefs of EFL preservice teachers about communicative language teaching before the start of their teaching practicum?
- How do these relate to PSTs’ personal profiles in terms of gender, languages, use of English, and level of English competence?

**Research question 2**: To what extent and in what ways did the PSTs interpret their stated beliefs about CLT into their classroom practice?

**Research question 3**: What challenges/difficulties were reported by the PSTs as the influences on their classroom practices?

### 1.6 Significance of the Study

The focus is on understanding the construction of PSTs’ beliefs and practice and investigating how learning to teach impacts these. The full-time teaching practicum is an early stage in teacher professional learning. PSTs must follow decision-making processes to accommodate their personal theories and practice. In order to understand their beliefs, PSTs require support from teacher educators and school-based supervisors. Enabling PSTs to realise the influences that their beliefs might have on their instructional practice is important. No extant research studies in Thailand investigate the relationship between ‘teacher thinking’ and ‘teacher doing’, especially those that start from the perspective of a new teacher and then look forward into the belief and knowledge acquisition which comes about through the experience of learning that comes with learning to teaching. No study focusing on EFL preservice teachers’ beliefs about communicative language teaching has been carried out in southernmost Thailand and only a very few studies investigating pedagogical innovation among EFL preservice teachers in Thailand exist (e.g., Naruemon, 2013; Vibulphol, 2004; Weerowong, 2004). Thus, the uniqueness of this study context contributes to the significance of this study. I anticipate that its findings will contribute to improvements in language teacher education in Thailand, particularly EFL teaching. In particular, its findings will inform teacher education stakeholders about the nature of the beliefs EFL teachers hold and how these influence instructional implementation. In general, I also hope this study will offer insights into TEFL teacher preparation programmes more generally.
1.7 Thesis Organisation

The thesis consists of eight chapters, as follows:

Chapter 1 introduces the background to the research problem, its significance, and the purpose of the study; it describes the context, research aims, and questions and indicates the significance of the study.

Chapter 2 describes relevant theories of learning, including the social constructivist theory of learning and Kolb’s experiential learning. It states initial reference of the study and summarises the application of the theoretical background to this study.

Chapter 3 discusses four main areas. It reviews the literature on: (i) teacher beliefs and preservice teachers’ education; (ii) understandings of CLT; (iii) English language teaching and English education in Thailand; and, (iv) teacher learning (TL), teacher education (TE) and teacher training (TT). It presents a critical debate about CLT pedagogy for EFL in the Thai context and highlights the way teachers’ beliefs mainly affect ELT.

Chapter 4 describes the methodology used to collect and analyse data. The justification for a two-stage mixed-method study using both quantitative and qualitative methods is provided.

Chapter 5 presents data from a quantitative survey that probes PSTs’ pre- and postpracticum beliefs.

Chapter 6 presents qualitative data collected via observation and a postobservation written questionnaire and follow-up interviews. It focuses on specific cases of PSTs which were purposefully selected from the survey phase.

Chapter 7 summarises the findings from chapters 5 and 6 and presents a critical discussion in the context of the relevant literature. This chapter also addresses the research questions once again.

Chapter 8 presents the study’s final conclusions, recommendations, and its implications for teachers, teacher educators, and stakeholders in English education development provision, and addresses the limitations of the study. Further areas of research related to this study are suggested. Finally, the author’s concluding remarks drawn from the study are presented.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

2.1 Introduction
Section 2.2 underlines the importance of exploring the interrelation of teacher cognition and action in teacher development. This study has its roots in two main theories. Social constructivism theories of learning are considered in section 2.3, while section 2.4 deals with reflective experiential learning and studies of teacher cognition in language acquisition.

2.2 Teacher Cognition in Language Education
The research framework also draws on previous studies on teacher cognition and teacher practice. The first enquiry is based on research on teacher knowledge (Shulman, 1986). Shulman defined pedagogical content knowledge or PCK as the knowledge required to teach school subjects. This is a central component of teacher knowledge. Grossman (1990) suggested that courses on PCK are essential as they will promote the professional development of teachers, especially their skills in subject teaching. Studies of teacher PCK marked the start of a tradition of research into teacher cognition based on the position that ‘teacher thinking, is equal to ‘teacher doing’ in the teacher role. Shulman and Elstein (1975, p. 55) commented that the “teacher role can be conceptualised as an active clinical information processor involved in planning, judging, diagnosing, prescribing and problem-solving”. Clark (1980) believes that teacher judgment, decision-making and planning underpin the cognitive information procession approach, which means that what teachers do is affected by what they think and what teachers think is a response to their experience. Kagan (1990, p.130) asserts that “The study of the thinking processes of teachers – how they gather, interpret, and evaluate data – is expected to lead to an understanding of the uniquely human processes that determine teacher behaviour.”
In language education, the shift from teacher behaviour to teacher cognition is illustrated in the studies of Borg (2005). Researchers and scholars present evidence for further enquiry focusing on teacher knowing and teacher doing in teacher education. (e.g. Breen et al., 2001; MacDonald et al., 2001; Mangubhai et al., 2004; Peacock, 2001; Sendan & Roberts, 1998; Urmston, 2003). The findings affirm the role teachers play in the complex area of classroom decision-making. The development of teacher cognition and its growth through teacher education and experience are keys to these studies. Kagan (1992) suggests that teachers think about all aspects of their work. As Mangubhai, Marland, Dashwood, and Son (2004) assert classroom experience has been shown to have a powerful influence on teachers’ practical knowledge and, hence, to adjust their practice. However, teacher’s instructional beliefs are not always fully realised in their work. Borg (2005) insists that this lack of congruence between teachers’ observed practices and their explicitly stated beliefs is due to the influence of social, psychological, and environmental factors which exist in schools and classrooms and which teachers may perceive as external forces (see Figure 2.1). Figure 2.1 shows the process and sources of teacher cognition and its relationship to the four factors that affect the reconstruction of existing beliefs. An important point to be considered in this study is that preservice teachers are unlike experienced teachers in that they seem are unskilled in the schemata development of teaching and may need assistance from teacher educators to redefine their theoretical beliefs (Urmston, 2003). The complex role of teacher knowledge and
2.3 Vygotsky’s Constructivism Theory of Learning: Ideal Beliefs and Actual Practice are Based on Social Validation

The constructivist concept is viewed by many researchers in cognitive psychology as equivalent to personal epistemology (Bell & Gilbert, 1995; Fosston, 1996). They maintain that a person constructs new knowledge or understanding of content through the interaction between what they already know and believe and the ideas and events they come into contact with (Cannella & Reiff, 1994). Bell and Gilbert (1995, p. 26) assert that “learning occurs when a person constructs a mental representation of an object, event and idea.” This assertion implies that all learning processes contain relearning and reorganising of prior representations. This idea relates to Dewey’s notion of reflection of learning that claims “there is no intellectual growth without some reconstruction, some reworking” (Dewey, 1938, p. 64).

Constructivism originated from Chomsky’s demolition of behaviourist theories of learning. He marked a significant transition in understanding language acquisition, arguing that the construction of knowledge is derived from external responses to mainly internal stimuli (Hakuta, 1986). Skinner thought this process should be no different with language. In his 1957 book, Verbal Behaviour, he explained that acquisition of language is nothing more than association, imitation, and reinforcement (in Reyes & Vallone, 2008). According to Chomsky, “Human beings are genetically endowed with a language system and language acquisition is the unfolding of this innate system” (1959, p. 31). Learning language takes place through cognitive processes in the sense that acquiring language knowledge is not by imitation but through insightful construction of meaning context.

Generally, constructivism comprises a family of theories based on the notion that we operate with mental representations of the world which is our knowledge, and which change as we learn. Two broad interpretations are found among contemporary educational researchers: Piaget’s cognitive constructivism and Vygotsky’s social constructivism or ‘theory of knowing’ (Fosston, 1996), embedded with exploration of how a person knows and learns. Two focal concepts of constructivism are apparent. First is the ‘cognitive principle;’, according to this principle, learners construct new knowledge when
they experience new information that is inconsistent with their prior knowledge. This cognitive state is familiar as it occurs when things are not what we expect them to be. Thus, when we are provided with new data, we assimilate it into our existing schema. As implied by Knight (2002), when students face new things, they struggle to make sense of new information. When new cognitive structures form, representing new ideas, our scheme is changed, and learning has occurred. “As we reorder our knowledge, we are involved in the process of inventing or at least reinventing which requires the reorganisation of old data and the building of new models of the learner” (Fosston, 1996, p.18). The study discusses social constructivism using the ideas of Green (1995) and Vygotsky (1978) on language acquisition. Green (1995) asserts that “language is used in a community setting and serves the needs of that community and out of this use of language; knowledge is constructed in the form of a social consensus.”

This view suggests that language used in a specific social interaction is relevant to that interaction only. Constructivists who recommend social processes view knowledge as having both individual and social components and hold there is no meaningful way in which these two components occur separately in learning. Vygotsky (1978) perceived learning as a complex interaction between psychological development and social interaction. As learners interact with more experienced participants, their learning ability will grow beyond their present level of development to a higher one (Roberts, 1989). Vygotsky’s model of zone of proximal development (ZPD) views learning as based on emergent abilities as well as those already developed and seeks not only to know what learners can do on their own but also what they can do in collaboration with others. Smith (2001) asserts a similar notion that learners not only repeat ideas when they imitate but are in the process of processing and converting information. For in-service or preservice EL teachers who are novices at learning and teaching language, “a social entity, the unconscious predominant experience of learning has been one of receiving and repetitive information” (Reyes & Vallone, 2008, p. 35).

This idea leads to the premise that preservice teachers encounter complex social classroom environments, so, as novices, they perceive new information as ‘challenges.’ In their first practice, they may rely on personal interpretation. In some situations, they are likely to teach as they were taught, not as they were taught to teach (Basturkmen, 2004).
Thus, teachers need to experience socially-constructed learning directly, and to be guided by a more experienced teacher or peer, in order to create fresh interpretative frames. Discussions on social constructivism and the study of language teacher cognition during social interaction in classroom practice suggest a premise that “knowledge and reality are based upon social consensus” (Schon, 1987, p. 78). This challenges the search for understanding of how initial teacher trainees process their knowledge construction while interacting with the reality of teaching in the classroom, both from the school agenda, and prescriptive teacher education and learners’ situated behaviour. A constructivist stance leads to focusing on how to understand active sense-making and knowledge construction, irrespective of whether the process is an individual or socially negotiated endeavour. Scholars propose a useful synthesis of cognitive and social constructivist perspectives, claiming that knowledge formation is an interrelated process of personal construction and social mediation (Reyes & Trina, 2008; Windschitl, 2002).

Taking the two notions in the framework of the study on teacher knowing and doing helps researchers to assess teachers’ acquisition of educational knowledge and beliefs with an awareness of social mediation through personal experiences. This study, hence, recognises social validation as critical to the personal learning process, that is, teachers develop their thinking through social mediation as well as personal construction and reconstruction. My perspective on constructivism is based on the assumption that the concept of ‘learning to teach’ is a synthesis of ‘internalisation’ and ‘socialisation.’ However, constructivism seems to exclude some significant aspects of human learning that are important to language teacher education (LTE). For example, skill learning and the affective and cognitive aspects of learning, especially in the classroom, are excluded (Bell & Gilbert, 1996; Roberts 1998). An adequate approach to LTE in this research framework considers affective, cognitive, and behavioural dimensions of the particular scope of learning to teach for preservice teachers.

2.4 Kolb’s Reflective Experiential Learning – reflection of teaching experience

Kolb develops a constructivist view of learning which sees it as the development of personal schema or cognitive aspects of thinking which are gradually confirmed or disconfirmed by experience. Hence, learning is the process of knowledge creation through the transformation of experience (Kolb, 1984). Experiential learning models
provide a flexible framework for formal and informal teacher training emphasising the direct experience of the individual. This is an essential part of the conceptual development of self. The experiential learning cycle can be entered at any point so long as it is ongoing. The main key to Kolb’s learning process is ‘reflection of experience’ that is, ‘rational analyses’. Reflection of experience is essential to conceptual development as it enables access to abstract theories used to explain cases and to provide terms with which to analyse experience (Roberts, 1998).

Within my research framework, I recognise Kolb’s emphasis on the social dimension of learning where teacher beliefs and personal theories are tested and validated by responses of others during social exchanges. ‘Reflection’ or ‘interpretation of experience’ is a rational analysis of an action or experience (Kagan, 1992; Mori, 1999). This analysis is a key element in teacher conceptual development but not the only key element. This line of thought leads to a second notion that ‘reflection’ always involves an occasionally irrational ‘emotional process.’ Finally, we must recognise the tacit nature of much of our knowledge: people do not know what they know (Eraut, 1994). Preservice teachers in particular might recognise what they know about teaching in the abstract; however, this abstraction might not always match with what they appear to learn through experience. Thus, the novice teacher is likely to engage in social exchange and self-reflection of experience. In this process they are either consciously or unconsciously reveal beliefs and making them available for reassessment. Hence, they can be capable of developing broader interpretations of their experiences (Eraut, 1994; Shulman, 1987). Kolb’s perspectives help us see that teacher beliefs emerge from a complex mix of social and individual influences: experiences as a pupil, development of craft knowledge through teaching experience, personality judgements, and public shared conversation (Richards & Lockhart, 1994). In short, the two perspectives are of studying how teachers know, and what they think and do.

2.5 Application of the Theoretical Background to this Study.

The Thai preservice teachers of English as a Foreign Language Teaching (EFLT) in this study have experienced English learning and English education for at least fifteen years. Thus, they have been, to a certain extent, exposed to the use of English for academic purposes during their teaching practicum which was their initial experience of professional development. The majority are Muslim, and are familiar with bilingual
culture where Thai, the school language, and Jawi, their native language, are used intermittently (see chapter 5 section 5.2). Thus, learning and using language in this multi-cultural environment may extend their scope of social interaction and validation as they are not limited to their typical social and cultural values. This experience of learning may influence their perception of the authentic status of English language learning in their context, especially for their teaching obligations. Social and cultural interaction in their school years and during their teacher training period possibly influences their learning to teach the system.

The three aspects of the theoretical framework in this study are interrelated. The first exhibits the principles of the social constructivism of teacher cognition (Vygotsky, 1978; Green, 1995). Second, experiential learning to teach in the classroom is as an interactive, dynamic, social element while teachers are negotiating their personal theory of teaching (Klob, 1984). In this sense, teachers, as social beings, implement classroom practice that encompasses immediate classroom situations. The final aspect of the framework refers to how the investigation of teacher behaviour shifts to teacher knowledge base categories, teacher cognition and also highlights the underlying rationale of how the relationship between teacher behaviour and cognition is promising for professional growth. The major argument of this theoretical framework is research cannot disregard ‘teacher beliefs’ conceptualization as it is needed to involve the concept of ‘experiential learning’ and the idea of ‘teacher as a social construct’, if one aims to understand the relationship between teacher behaviour and teacher beliefs.

The theoretical framework above shows that ELT teaching is dynamic, complex and contextual and that teacher beliefs and practices should emerge from a complex mixed validation of individual, social and contextual influences. In this study, pre-service teachers’ beliefs and practices; and contextual factors of communicative language teaching approach in a teaching practicum period in Thailand are the focus. This needs to take into account the intertwined contextual variables associated with the construction of teacher’s beliefs and practices and their relationship. These variables include English language teaching (ELT) and English teacher education, teacher beliefs and assumptions and teacher processes of learning to teach. This study draws attention to literature relating to the context of ELT in Thailand such as the background and development of English language teaching (ELT) and English education. Here, preservice teacher
education, the current situation of teacher preparation, and concerns of teacher training towards CLT are presented.

The preservice EFL teachers in this study are in the process of developing from English learners into EFL teachers along a formal practicum course through a teacher-training programme. As Vygotsky explained, how a social context is perceived, internalised, understood, and acted upon is a determining factor in a teacher’s professional development process (Vygotsky, 1994). Hence, influences that their particular teaching practicum situation has on these EFL PSTs may rely not only on the nature of the practicum setting, but also on how these PSTs personally and socially validate their understanding and awareness of that context and their interaction with it. Accordingly, this study is concerned with the professional development of practising language teaching. The literature on teacher education to be reviewed will focus on teacher professional development (TPD) of preservice teachers, in particular, on the stage of their experiencing ‘learning to teach,’ to the extent that ‘teacher personal exploration’ and ‘teacher reflection’ are effective as an integral part of TPD.
CHAPTER 3
LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Introduction
The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of the literature on teacher beliefs and practices on communicative language teaching (CLT). It targets the relationship between EFL preservice teacher beliefs and practices but does not aim to identify their causes or correlations as doing so is beyond the scope and framework of this research. This review draws attention to empirical research on language teachers’ learning to teach and how this and other forms of teacher professional development (TPD), i.e., teacher education (TE) and teacher training (TT) might impact TPD. A body of research concerned with understanding teachers’ personal system of learning to teach has focused on their beliefs and practices. Other important literature relates to Thai preservice teachers including research into their education, beliefs and practices regarding EFL and CLT. Studies which relate to English language teaching and English education in Thailand are also reviewed in the light of their relevance to and relationship with the introduction and application of CLT in Thailand, including the CLT concept and principles.

3.2 Teacher Beliefs and Preservice Teacher Education

3.2.1 Introduction.
The main objective of this study is to explore preservice teachers’ beliefs in relation to their classroom practices using the innovative teaching principles of CLT. The main themes in this chapter relate to three main issues: first, beliefs and classroom practice; second, preservice teachers’ beliefs and teacher education; and third, beliefs about communicative language teaching.
Researchers in language education considering teacher cognition state that teacher’s thinking and doing are guided by a set of beliefs, which are personal, systematic, dynamic, complex, unconscious, and conscious (Borg, 2005; Pajares, 1992; Richards, 1998). This perspective has led to interest in how teacher beliefs guide teaching practice, how they are formed, changed or established, and their relationship with teacher education. Teachers come into a classroom with existing beliefs and knowledge, all of which are
major influences on their instructional practices. This chapter will present the literature and research on teachers’ beliefs and CLT practices and its challenges.

**3.2.2. Teachers’ knowledge and beliefs.**

Teacher beliefs are defined from different theoretical perspectives as related to different psychological constructs. They are viewed as attitudes and values about teaching, students and educational processes (Pajares, 1992). Beliefs are either a form of personal knowledge consisting of implicit assumptions about learning, classrooms, students, and lessons (Kagan, 1992); or knowledge enabling an individual to meet goals in specific circumstances (Tobin & Lamaster, 1995). As a procedural construct, beliefs in relation to decision-making refer to statements teachers make about their ideas, opinions, and knowledge enunciated as evaluations of what should be done, and what is preferable (Basturkmen et al. 2004).

Beliefs and knowledge are intertwined. Beliefs exhibit the knowledge that is most worthy and has proven itself in action. They are formed from mediation between knowledge and action and between individuals and their performance. One explanation of belief and knowledge was proposed by Nespor (1987), who suggests that knowledge is based on objective fact whilst beliefs depend on effective evaluation. One distinction is that beliefs are unconsciously held and are often tacit and resistant to change, while knowledge is conscious and frequently changes (Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992). Pajares asserts that when beliefs change, “it is not argument or reason that alters them, but rather a conversion or gestalt shift” (1992, p. 311). Borg (2002) shows that beliefs are seen to not only describe conduct or organise knowledge and information, but also to play a role in the assessment and recognition or rejection of new information (Pajares, 1992). While the two constructs are different in many aspects, beliefs are regarded as a form of knowledge (Nespor, 1987). Similarly, Nisbett and Ross suggest that beliefs are often perceived as a form of knowledge as, when they are strongly held, they are part of a teacher’s decision-making process. Pajares (1992) maintains that beliefs play a role not only in defining behaviour and organising knowledge but also in the appraisal, acceptance or rejection of new information. Ernest (1998) points out that two teachers may have similar formal knowledge but may teach in a different way due to holding different beliefs about teaching and learning. In conclusion, beliefs play an instrumental role in making
decisions on teaching strategies, tasks, and content are applied in specific instructional contexts.

3.2.3 Defining teachers’ beliefs.
The fact that the success of development of teachers’ teaching and teacher preparation is correlated with an insight into teachers’ beliefs is supported by various studies in mainstream and language teacher education (Nespor, 1987; Johnson, 1994; Meijer, Verloop, & Beijaard, 2001). Nevertheless, the term ‘beliefs’ requires clarification to enhance understanding of the connection between beliefs and classroom practices. The study of teacher cognition has led to its being confused with terms such as ‘attitudes,’ ‘opinions,’ ‘conceptions,’ ‘perceptions,’ ‘practical principles,’ and ‘repertoires of understanding’ (Pajares, 1992; Borg, 2006b). Beliefs, based on a synthesis of research on the beliefs of teachers, have been identified as a ‘messy construct,’ (Pajares, 1992) acknowledged under a variety of terms such as attitudes and values on the educational process (Pajares, 1993), personal knowledge (Kagan, 1992), practical knowledge (Elbaz, 1981), orientation to teaching (Brousseau, Book, & Byers, 1988), preconceptions and implicit theories (Crawley & Salyer, 1995) and conceptions (Thompson, 1992). Pajares, 1992 stated that the researcher studying teacher beliefs might find it difficult to understand beliefs development systems due to the poor conceptualisation caused by this definitional problem (1992, p. 307). Researchers in this field have also described the same terms differently and given similar notions differing terms (Eisenhart et al., 1988; Pedersen & Liu, 2003). The definition and study of beliefs is complicated due to its psychological nature although it is regarded as one of the most valuable psychological constructs in teacher education (Mansour, 2009). Beliefs are broadly any simple plan, conscious or unconscious, concluded from what an individual states or does, preceded by the phrase “I believe that...” (Rokeach, 1968, p. 113). A ‘belief,’ in English language teaching, is a “proposition that may be deliberately or unintentionally held, is assessed in that it is approved as true by the person and is thus installed with emotive obligation, where it further serves as a guide to thought and conduct” (Borg, 2001, p. 186).

Therefore, there are some issues that need to be considered when teacher cognition is examined from viewpoint of the given definitions. First, differing terms have been used to define beliefs; second, there is no direct access to beliefs and, thus, they must be concluded from what the teacher states or does; third, unwillingness may be identified in
teachers as they do not want to air disliked beliefs as they are mostly held unintentionally (Kagan, 1990, p. 420); fourth, teachers may find it hard to reflect on their fundamental cognition as they lack applicable language; and, finally, beliefs study is contextual or teacher particular (Kagan, 1990). Researchers must take these issues into account when planning any study. Based on the aspects of beliefs mentioned above, this study integrates a definition of beliefs matching the research aims, exploits multiple methods that directly and indirectly uncover the beliefs data, applies stimulated recall questions in eliciting beliefs, and makes use of self-reflection to promote context-specific data.

3.2.4 Source of teachers' beliefs
Teachers' beliefs are slowly established throughout their lifetime (Lortie, 1975; Anning, 1988; Wilson, 1990). Teachers' personal theories and their previous learning experiences enhance the development of their preservice mental lives and thus strengthen their capacity to be a teacher. These beliefs are affected by several sources such as:

Experiences of language learning and teaching
Researchers in the field of teacher education have found a significant relationship between preservice teachers’ current instructional practices and those of their teachers (Nunan, 1989; Peacock, 2001). They propose that preservice teachers start developing their beliefs about teaching and learning from their early experience as young learners. In Language Teacher Education (LTE), researchers have found preservice language teachers enter teacher preparation courses with preexisting ideas and established beliefs about language. These involve personal experience at school, termed as an ‘apprenticeship of observation’ by Lortie (1975). Two kinds of memories are involved; memories as students and those of previous teachers. “Indelible imprint[s] on lives and minds of most teachers is the term given for these memories as they are powerful” (Johnson, 1999, p. 23)
Furthermore, preservice teachers’ beliefs about learning/teaching are likely to be influenced by experiences and preconceptions gained from teacher education programmes and teaching practice courses (Horwitz, 1985; Johnson, 1994; Richards & Lockhart, 1996; Tatzo, 1998). Johnson (1994) asserts that instructional practices of preservice English Second Language (ESL) teachers, are influenced by beliefs originating from experiences about learning and teaching whilst students rather than those arising from teacher training programmes. Teachers’ beliefs are thus mostly a reflection of their
past experience in school (Kennedy, 1989; Freeman, 1992; Johnson, 1996; Numrich, 1996).

**Teacher education**

There has been much debate on the impact of teacher education programmes on teachers’ beliefs and actions (Peacock, 2001; Kagan, 1992; Woods, 1996). Most studies show significant evidence of the impact of the teacher education programmes on shaping or creating teachers’ theoretical beliefs (Almarza, 1996; Borg, 2005; Cabaroglu & Roberts, 2000; Freeman, 1993; Richards, Ho, & Giblin, 1996; Philips, 2004). In language teacher education, studies on different language focuses conclude that teacher education plays a powerful role in student teacher classroom behaviour and teacher cognition (Almarza, 1996; Cabaroglu & Roberts, 2000; MacDonald, Badger, & White, 2001). Teacher training is claimed to be effective in shaping trainee teachers’ behaviour (Richards, Ho, & Giblin, 1996) and aspects of their cognition (Almarza, 1996; Spada & Lightbown, 1993). It is concluded that teacher education and personal experience of learning and teaching play an influential role in modelling student teacher behaviours and cognitions during their professional development.

**3.2.5 Teachers’ Beliefs vs. Teachers’ practices.**

The connection between teacher beliefs and classroom practice is by far the most prevalent theme in teacher cognition study, particularly when focusing on decision-making. Many studies pay attention to teacher experience and its link to beliefs and practices (e.g., Andrews, 2003; Elbaz, 1983; Philipps & Orafi, 2009; Woods, 1996). Teacher actions and their capacity to teach is driven by their beliefs depending on the context (Philipps, 2009).

**Relationship between practice and belief**

Johnson (1994), in his study of teachers’ beliefs on teacher-centredness, points out that teachers adopt this approach to “maintain the flow of instruction and to sustain authority in the classroom” (p. 449) although they favour a student-centred approach. Richards (1994) states that lack of suitable resources, student ability, and teacher acceptance of the curriculum lead to resistance to actions relying on beliefs. In their study of grammar teaching, Philipps (2009) found mismatches between beliefs and practices, and, for grammar activities, Altunbasak (2010) discovered incongruity between teachers’ espoused beliefs and their practice. These studies found that classroom factors such as
learner expectation and classroom management concerns affected what teachers believe theoretically and what they do in the classroom.

In many other situations, teachers may not translate their beliefs into actual instruction. Psychological and social elements are possible factors that cause practice to be mismatched with beliefs. These mismatches prevent teachers from translating their personal beliefs into their instructional judgement (Fang, 1996). Researchers state that beliefs are not necessarily reflected in classrooms, especially when teachers respond to unexpected challenges (Basturkmen, Loewe, & Ellis (2004). Several researchers note that teacher’s actual practices were not in line with their reported beliefs (Davis, 2003; Basturkmen, 2012) and some studies in EFL contexts find inconsistencies between preservice teacher beliefs and practices (Naruemon, 2013; Farrell & Kun, 2008; Vibulphol, 2004).

Since the interaction between beliefs and practices is complicated and not straightforward, dialectic and interactive (Clark & Peterson, 1986; Calderhead, 1991) the reasons for the gap between beliefs and practices are also complex. First, deeper core beliefs appear to outweigh other beliefs and are difficult to alter (Borg, 2003; Pajares, 1992; Richards, Gallw & Renandya 2001). For instance, teachers tend to provide controlled tasks for oral practice even they reported a belief in the value of pair-work (Ozsevik, 2010). Secondly, teachers’ beliefs may vary depending on how they are elicited. The reason for this variation is that teachers may draw on ideal practice when stating their theoretical beliefs (Borg, 2006). In other words, they may be referring to their ‘technical knowledge’ when called on to report beliefs on ‘practical knowledge’ (Eraut, 1994). This practice involves the distinction between ‘espoused theories’ and their ‘theories in use’ (Agyris & Schon, 1974). Thirdly, contextual factors might lead to change in beliefs or change in classroom practice without affecting beliefs (Phipps, 2009). Studies describe these contextual factors as, for example, an inflexible curriculum, a heavy workload, low support from school, and student-related factors, such as low motivation, low English proficiency and limited use of language (Borg, 1999; Freeman, 1993; Johnson, 1996; Richards, 1998).

From the literature above, it is concluded that in the examination of teachers’ beliefs, it is necessary for the researcher to consider to the sensitivity of data collection instruments in order that the complexity of beliefs and practices can be captured with reference to
actual rather than idealised practice. In practice, the fundamental prerequisite for exploring teachers’ beliefs is drawing inferences from belief statements and observing classroom behaviour (Pajares, 1992).

**Preservice teachers’ beliefs and teacher education**

Scholars in language teacher education assert preservice teachers enter teacher education programmes with preexisting ideas and personal beliefs about teaching and this set of beliefs directs their choices of instructional practices (Roberts, 1998; Kagan, 1992; Pajares, 1998). These schema derive from an ‘apprenticeship of observation;’ Lortie uses this concept to identify the process of watching teachers from primary school onwards. Teachers’ experiences as school learners positively and negatively influence their later beliefs and are well-established by the time of teacher training college entry (Kennedy 1991; Pajares, 1992).

These prior beliefs influence the construction of knowledge and beliefs during teacher education courses, and future teaching (Peacock, 2001). Richardson (2003) describes the nature of preservice teachers’ prior beliefs as ‘highly idealistic, loosely formulated, deeply seated, and traditional’ (p. 6). In many cases, traditional prior beliefs that preservice teachers bring to teacher education programmes are considered as blocking pedagogical reform such as that from grammar-translation to communicative language teaching in EFL. Thus, during the course of training and testing, teacher programmes should provide opportunities for critical reflection (Pennington, 1995) and constant support for evaluation of prior and existing beliefs (Pajares, 1992), which means teacher education programmes are obligated to survey preservice teachers and encourage them to acknowledge their pedagogical beliefs and ideas about teaching.

If teacher educators are aware of the importance of reflection on preservice teachers’ beliefs, this awareness will lead to improvement in not only teachers’ knowledge base and ideas about teaching but also their teaching preparation, and professional development.

**Teachers’ Beliefs and Teaching Practicum**

Preservice teachers with little experience of teaching practice are less adept in connecting their activities to the classroom context (Leijen & Kullasepp, 2013; Pajares, 1992). When students underestimate the complexity of teaching and perceive the difference between their teaching and established teaching standards, they experience a ‘reality shock’
A noticeable change in teacher beliefs oriented to innovation takes places after the first teaching experience (Ng, Nicholas, & Williams, 2010), if teachers are provided with the opportunity for critical reflection and reassessment of their existing theoretical beliefs (Guskey, 1998; Pennington, 1995). As asserted by Richards (1996), it is only when teachers become aware of their own tacitly held beliefs and routines that the gap between them can be minimised. In sum, in learning by doing, teachers who learn to reflect on their practice and beliefs about instructional decisions may change and adopt new practice. Thus, teacher training that incorporates thinking and reflection is effective in promoting standards for practice.

3.2.6 Teachers’ Beliefs about CLT in research on teaching.

CLT has received great attention and been discussed widely in language learning and teaching (Murdoch & Wilson, 2008; Blumberg, 2009; Naruemon, 2013). A number of studies have been conducted on its use by language teachers at primary and secondary levels in different contexts, for instance, the native English contexts in the United States (Schuh, 2004); in New Zealand and Australia (Adler, Milne, & Stringer, 2000); in Thailand (Nonkukhetkhong, Baldauf, & Moni, 2006; Prapaisit de Segovia &Hardison, 2009); and, in other EFL contexts such as China (Wang, 2007), Turkey (Yilmaz, 2007), and Libya (Shihiba, 2011). However, research into teacher beliefs about this approach in relation to classroom practice is rare. Most previous studies on CLT instruction have not provided enough explanation of why it is difficult to move classroom practice toward CLT in terms of teachers’ internal drive. In addition, these studies have focused only on the degree to which classroom practice reflects CLT, and the constraints and difficulties of its use. Fullan (2007) finds that teachers change their beliefs in the pedagogical concepts and theories for new methods of teaching without changing their practice.

As noted above, many studies have indicated that teaching involves not only teachers’ actions but also their thinking (Breen, 1991; Freeman, 1992; Borg, 1998a; Johnson, 1999). Thus, to understand teaching fully, it is necessary to study both teachers’ actions and their ‘reasoning teaching’ (Johnson, 1999).

3.2.7 Summary

This study considers that foreign language preservice teachers might hold certain beliefs about language learning and teaching which may affect their instructional practice in the
classroom. From the literature above, the key points of teachers’ beliefs to be addressed in this current research study centre on the following ideas:

- Teacher beliefs are personal, sometimes unconscious, and are crucial to understanding the nature and system of learning to teach.
- Teacher beliefs are formed prior to formal teacher education, seem to be resistant to change; and filter what teachers learn from teacher education.
- Teacher beliefs are affected by the integration of different experiences as young learners in school, as student-teachers in teacher education, and through experience of formal and informal language learning and teaching.
- Teacher beliefs influentially affect instructional practices and decision-making in classrooms.

These ideas lead to the assumption that the interaction between teacher beliefs and practices is highly complicated, interactive, dialectic and not straightforward. Reasons for the gap between beliefs and practices are complex and cannot be gained by noncomplex investigation.

In sum, this study was inspired by the received wisdom indicated above that the adoption of any teaching principle is associated with the teachers’ personal theories or beliefs, and that these function as filters which screen new knowledge that determines which components are accepted and integrated into a professional knowledge base. This study, thus, regards understanding of the ways in which of preservice teachers’ process pedagogical beliefs and accommodate pedagogical approaches during the early stage of teaching practicum is essential in promoting effective teaching innovation and development of appropriate pedagogical beliefs. To that end, this study investigates preservice teachers’ beliefs and how they affect teaching practice and benefit from awareness of the issues above.

### 3.3 Understanding Communicative Language Teaching

#### 3.3.1 Communicative language teaching: Origin and background.

CLT is an umbrella term for several approaches that emerged in the 1970s in response to unsatisfactory results produced by traditional approaches, i.e., grammar-translation (GTM) and audio-lingual methods (ALM) and their overreliance on rote-memorisation of language forms (Ellis, 1998). Since its initiation in Europe, CLT has been widely recognised among teachers and educators in language teaching as the broad principle of a
communicative approach that is accompanied by the implementation of activities and techniques that help to reinforce learner communication (Cook, 2008).

Carter and Nunan (2001)’s Handbook of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages asserts that the focus in language teaching has shifted from one that focused on English as a system to one that regards English as a tool for communication (Carter & Nunan, 2001, as cited in Persson & Fagurlan, 2006). Since its emergence, CLT has been a major source of inspiration for language teaching all around the world. However, as CLT is not a clear-cut method of teaching but broad principles for practice, many teachers and educators have experienced confusion and difficulties in its implementation. Its scope has been altered or extended in different contexts and uses and educators and teachers have used it in various ways (Li, 1998; Savignon, 1983; Wang, 2007). Despite these challenges, reports show that CLT approaches have not only been welcomed but also resulted in positive teaching and learning outcomes (Kleinsasser, 1993; Nunan, 1993). To date, CLT has been regarded as one of the most effective approaches to ELT, particularly, in a setting with learners’ communicative competence as its ultimate aims (Littlewoods, 1981).

3.3.2 CLT: An approach to language teaching.

Larsen-Freeman (2000) states that CLT broadly aims to adopt a theoretical perspective on the communicative approach by enabling communication, rather than to be a method with clearly defined classroom practices. CLT is characterised as a broad approach to teaching (Richards, 2003), and as such, is often defined as a list of general principles or broad features of language teaching/learning. For a teacher to implement CLT efficiently, it is best to understand that it is a set of principles and goals of language teaching because this concept of it enables the teacher to understand the kinds of classroom activities that best facilitate learning and the roles of teachers and learners in the classroom.

Berns (1984, p. 104) provides a useful set of principles for CLT which note the diverse cultural aspects of language use.

- A language is a social tool that speakers use to make meaning as speakers communicate about something to someone for some purpose, either orally or in writing.
- Diversity is recognised and accepted as part of language development and use in second language learners and users, as it is with first language users.
- A learner’s competence is considered in relative, not absolute, terms.
More than one variety of a language is recognised as a viable model for learning and teaching.

- Culture is recognised as instrumental in shaping communicative competence, in both first and subsequent languages.
- No single methodology or fixed set of techniques is prescribed.
- Language use is recognised as serving ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions and is related to the development of competence in each.
- It is essential that learners be engaged in doing things with language and they use it for a variety of purposes in all phases of learning.

In a similar way, the following aspects of language learning from Nunan (1991) are amongst of the most recognised CLT core principles:

- An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in a real-like context with the use of authentic texts.
- The provision of opportunities for students to focus on language use and the learning process
- An insertion of the learner’s own personal experiences as integral elements to classroom learning.
- An attempt to link classroom language learning with language activities outside the classroom.

Under this eclectic theoretical base, near genuine context, authentic texts, and student individuality are deemed as a beneficial form of instruction. In addition, fluency-based activities that encourage learners to develop their motivation to use language, practices and meaningful tasks with in pairs or groups for developing language functions, and promotion of collaborative relationships are instrumental components of CLT.

The latest applications of CLT methodology according to Johnson and Johnson (as cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 173) contain five core characteristics:

**Appropriateness:** The language used reflects the situations of its use and must be appropriate to those situations, depending on the setting, the roles of participants, and purpose of the communication.

**Meaning focus:** Learners need to be able to create and understand messages, that is, real meanings. Hence, there should be a focus on information sharing and information transfer in activities.
Psycholinguistic processing: CLT activities seek to engage learners in the use of cognitive and other processes that are important factors in second language acquisition.

Trial-and-error risk taking: Learners are encouraged to make guesses and learn from their errors. By going beyond what they have been taught, they are encouraged to employ a variety of communication strategies.

Free use of language: CLT encourages the use of “holistic practice” involving the simultaneous use of a variety of subskills, rather than practising individual skills one bit at a time.

In summary, the core focus of the CLT principle is placed on context-based, student-centred language teaching practice. It provides students with a comprehensive use of English and ample opportunities for communication that help them to assimilate actual language needs. Learning under CLT aims at achieving communicative competence within sociocultural and sociolinguistic aspects of a language with adequate proficiency (Richards & Rodgers, 2003).

3.3.3 Aiming for communicative competence.

CLT involves the intense development of procedures for the teaching of the four language skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication. The agenda is to teach learners how to communicate in the target language (Richards & Rodgers, 2002). The focus is not only on the structures of language (grammar and vocabulary) but also on its communicative functions. Teachers take a full account of what students must learn in order to use language as a means of communication, without stressing how to manipulate language structures (Littlewood, 1984). In this vein, teachers must provide learners with ample opportunities to use language for communication and develop their ability to take part in the process of communicating. Because the teaching methodology is based on the concept of learner-centredness, CLT requires teachers to play facilitative roles rather than being knowledge transmitters and class controllers (Harmer, 2001). Consequently, the learners contribute as much as they gain, and learn in interdependently (Candlin, 1980 cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2002, p. 77).

In short, CLT is premised on the theory that language is primarily a vehicle for communication. Its fundamental goal is communicative competence (Hymes, 1972) which is the knowledge and skills required for communication.
3.3.4 Characteristics of CLT.

Characteristic classroom practices based on CLT notions may meet objectives of each language teaching context. However, salient features can be set forth through classroom practice (i.e., teacher and students and classroom activities) (Harmer, 1998). This is the major theoretical assumption of CLT commonly asserted by linguistics scholars (e.g., Breen & Candlin, 1980; Brown, 1994; Celce-Murcia, 1991; Ellis, 2004; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Littlewood, 2003; Nunan, 2004; Thornbury, 1998; Widowson, 1990). Some of the important dimensions of communication relevant to CLT can be summarised as follows:

• CLT aims to achieve communicative competence as the goal of language teaching and emphasises mainly the interdependence of language and communication (Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Widowson, 1990).

• CLT regards language as a tool for communication which should be acquired and used in social interaction (Breen & Candlin, 1980; Widowson, 1984).

• The language taught is not merely its structure, but also meanings and functions (Nunan, 2004; Widdowson, 1983).

• CLT involves a high degree of unpredictability and purposeful use of language to promote genuine use for communication (Johnson, 2001; Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Errors are tolerated and seen as a natural outcome of the development of communication skills. They can be dealt with by focusing on them as they come up (Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Swan, 1981). ‘Fluency’ is given priority over ‘accuracy’ in the treatment of error correction (Thornbury, 1998).

• CLT reflects an interactive social relationship between teacher and learner and resembles the learner-centred approach, providing students with a greater sense of ‘ownership’ of their learning and enhancing their self-motivation to learn English (Brown, 1994). The teachers’ role means that they take note of student needs and advocate learner autonomy.

It is noted that different kinds of CLT-oriented classroom activities may be applied to each learning context and aim. This study adapts Karavas Doukas’ framework. This has five main CLT themes which are based on the assumptions interpreted and described above. The salient aspects of CLT-oriented classroom practice are summarised in the following section.
**Salient features of CLT**

1. **Place of grammar**

Grammatical knowledge holds a crucial role in EFL teaching as good command of language should be accompanied with good command of grammar. Before the arrival of CLT, EFL classrooms focused exclusively on mastering linguistic knowledge by testing skills in line with grammatical rules rather than communicative competence (Kumaravadivelu, 1993; Tyler, 2008). CLT theory excludes explicit attention to grammar, claiming natural language is simply too complex to ‘be taught’ so direct learning of language knowledge is impractical (Prabhu, 1987). CLT strongly recommends that explicit grammar teaching should be avoided (Ellis, 2004).

**Explicit grammar**

Explicit learning of grammar as direct or inductive instruction focuses on rule application where students need to internalise rules, generate examples, and put them into practice (Purpura, 2004). Explicit knowledge of grammar is learned when grammatical items are given to learners, and they learn them in a controlled process. A language learner with explicit knowledge knows facts about language and can articulate them (Brown, 2000).

**Explicit correction of grammar**

Explicit grammar is also obtained through the practice of error correction, which is thought to help learners come to a correct mental representation of a rule. Learner focus is on correcting their speech writing and their knowing the correct rules (Krashen, 1987). CLT opposes this unnatural language acquisition due to its overt concentration on rules. However, the approach is beneficial for learners when they have time to think of the rule and apply it, in particular in the context of a grammar exercise or a writing assignment. In my EFL context of Thai education, grammar-based exam and written exercises are perceived as the main indicator of overt use of grammar-focused instruction in EL classrooms.

**Implicit Grammar Instruction**

Also referred to as indirect instruction or deductive instruction, indirect learning of grammar is where students are exposed to examples from which the rules are inferred (Purpura, 2004). Implicit knowledge is unconscious, internalised knowledge of language that is easily accessed during spontaneous language tasks, written or spoken (Brown, 2000). Implicit knowledge is gained in the natural language learning process, as a child
who acquires their first language without conscious exposure to and application of rules (Brown, 2000). To sum up, implicit knowledge is gained through a subconscious learning process. This is illustrated by the fact that native speakers do not always ‘know’ the rules of their language (Krashen, 1987). CLT encourages the implicit role of grammatical knowledge as it is automatic, easily accessed, and contributes to communicative skills. However, it should be noted that CLT does not completely exclude explicit instruction. Direct and explicit grammar can be presented in the CLT classroom after communicative practices and when freer use of the target form is encouraged under a CLT-driven syllabus.

Briefly, when implementing CLT grammar instruction, meaningful input should be provided through context. Learners are provided with an opportunity to put grammar to use and relate grammar instruction to real life situations. This opportunity is best achieved if grammar instruction is treated in the same way as the teaching of the four other skills that are based on using English to know how not by deducing the rules of how to (Mora, 2003; Weaver, 1996).

2. Use of group work/pair work

The major principles of the communicative view of language and language learning are helping learners learn a language through authentic and meaningful communication, which involves a process of creative construction to achieve fluency. In this sense, CLT-based classroom activities include group work, task-based work, information-gap activities, and project work, through an analysis of realistic situations in an immersion-like atmosphere.

Stern (1992) defines CLT-based activities as using group/pair work involving learners in authentic communication. Learners must activate and integrate their communicative knowledge and abilities to use them for the communication of meaning (Littlewood, 1981). Activities involve variety of language, limited teacher intervention, and use of authentic material and focus on meaning over form. In group/pair work in a CLT classroom, students should have a desire to convey something with a communicative purpose (Harmer, 2007). Learning tasks must meet certain criteria such as being primarily focused on meaning, learners’ relying on their own resources, and having clearly defined outcomes other than the use of language (Ellis, 2009). “Hence, group/pair work tasks are activities that primarily call for meaning-focused language use” (Ellis, 2003, p. 3).
Collaborative learning

One of the keys to CLT is a joint intellectual effort by the classroom participants, i.e., student/s to student/s, or student/s and teachers. This is a CLT technique as it has the characteristic of working with others towards project completion (Glencoe, 2001). Students usually work in groups of two or more, mutually searching for understanding, solutions, meanings, or creating a product (Smith & MacGregor, 2008). Collaboration or cooperation is an essential component of contextual teaching and learning in the language classroom in the sense that it constructs a shared understanding of language use (Johnson, 2002). Collaborative learning can be instrumental in motivating learners to practise language skills and improve their linguistic knowledge. According to Gebhard (2000), the goal of group work is to provide opportunities for students to use English to communicate meaning, for example, collaboration on producing a paper. Johnson (2002) summarised the key characteristics of collaborative learning in a language class as follows:

The students are grouped and assigned to completing a task provided by the teacher.
The teacher assigns students to group or pairs to discuss tasks and asks them to work individually and with team members.
The students are encouraged to help one another to back up members of the group who possibly lack language or working skills. The results of discussion are valuable input for completing tasks.

According to Gerlach (1994), “Collaborative learning is based on the idea that learning is a naturally social act in which the participants talk among themselves”.

3. Error correction

Errors are seen as a natural outcome of the development of communication skills and are, therefore, tolerated. Learners who are trying their best to use language creatively and spontaneously are bound to make errors. Constant correction is unnecessary and even counterproductive. If errors of form are tolerated and seen as a natural outcome of the development of communication skills, students may have limited linguistic knowledge but still be successful communicators (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). Form-focused error correction may put learners on the defensive, and as a result, they tend to avoid using difficult structures and tend to focus on form rather than on meaning, all of which is detrimental to acquisition. Research points out a need for correction to be identified by students
themselves. It is essential to delineate the difference between accuracy practice and fluency practice since teachers employ dissimilar error correction techniques in the two contexts.

Richards (2006) states that fluency is natural language use occurring when a speaker engages in meaningful interaction and maintains comprehensible and ongoing communication despite limitations in his or her communicative competence. In contrast, the focus of accuracy activities is on creating correct examples of language use, on discrete syntactic, morphological, or semantic structures. During fluency practice, teachers should correct only errors that hinder communication, whereas in accuracy practice errors of specific grammar, function, vocabulary, and skills should be corrected (Carranza, 2007). Bearing this difference in mind, teachers should then decide ‘when’ and ‘how often’ to correct errors depending on whether on the spot or delayed correction would best support student motivation to use language fluently.

4. Teacher role

The arrival of constructivist learning encouraged teachers in CLT classrooms to go beyond the authoritative or controlling roles embedded in the behaviourist teacher-centred classroom. Teachers are required to enable learners to be able to take charge of their own learning, make meaning on their own, and eventually become independent learners. Generally, the “teacher is no longer the sole source of knowledge, the controller, and the authority, but rather a resource of knowledge and a facilitator of learning for the students to draw on” (Harmer, 2001, p. 57). Peretz (1988) asserts one of the key roles of the teacher is as a creator of an environment to motivate learners to actively learn and use language in the classroom. Breen and Candlin (1980, p. 96) advocate two major roles of the teacher: as facilitator and colearner to help language learners use the target language and to participate in activities and texts as users not learners. In addition, there are two roles that the teacher might play in a CLT classroom: first, teachers as resource of knowledge and organiser of the resource, and second, teachers as a guide within a classroom to provide guidelines for classroom practices (Littlewood, 1984). Normally, teacher roles are related to the functions they are expected to fulfil, the degree of control they have over how learning takes place, and the degree to which they are responsible for content (Richards & Rodgers, 1991, p. 24). In responding to the various functions in
second language teaching, Harmer (1998, p. 109) presents teacher roles in CLT classrooms as follows. These are the teacher as:

- An instructor, teaching new language points and training students in language skills.
- As manager, organising activities.
- A controller of everything that goes on in the classroom. The teacher control not only what students do, but when they speak and what language they use.
- A prompter to encourage students to participate or make suggestions about how to proceed in an activity.
- A assessor, giving feedback and advice, as well as correction and grading.
- A participant or cocommunicator in an organised activity such as debate or role play.
- A source of language and knowledge. Prior to any lesson planning, a teacher as ‘need analyst' might assess the needs of students to identify what they already know and what they want to know.

In this sense, a teacher as a need analyst can know their interests. Once they have been established, a syllabus and individual lessons can be designed to suit those needs (Nunan, 2000). In brief, the CLT teacher’s roles are varied, ranging from a teacher-dominant style as a lecturer and source of knowledge to the less directive figure of guide and facilitator (Holec, 1985).

5. Students roles and contribution to learning

The aim of CLT is to emphasise language learners’ “communicative proficiency” rather than “a mere mastery of grammar and structures” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 161). This aim caters to the learner’s actual communicative needs and allows more efficient interaction for learners. With CLT, learners are placed in communicative settings and acquire language knowledge and communicative competence through active participation and interaction, while the teacher changes from a knowledge-giver to an organiser, facilitator, and researcher.

One of the major issues in CLT is its emphasis on being learner-centred. This is the recognition of the centrality of the language learner to the teaching and learning process (Altman, 1980, p.1) Learners should be assigned an active contributory role as a negotiator and interactor, giving as well as taking knowledge (Nunan & Lamb, 1996, p .
15). The learner, as a negotiator, as described by Candlin (1980, as cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2002, p .77) and as a communicator, as termed by Larsen-Freeman (2000), takes the role of joint negotiator within group and classroom activities. Learners also actively engage in negotiating meaning, trying to understand and make themselves understood even when knowledge of the target language is incomplete. The implication here is that the communicative approach requires learners to take responsibility for their learning, becoming active agents in the process, contributing as much as they gain, and thereby learning independently. In completing CLT activities, learners have numerous opportunities to practise and produce language, and thus their motivation will be increased, and fluency improved.

3.4 English Language Teaching and English Education in Thailand

3.4.1 Status of ELT in Thailand: English as a foreign language (EFL)

The learning of a non-native language is generally found in either a second language context or a foreign language context. The context of English as a second language (ESL) in countries like the Philippines or Nigeria is considerably different from English as a foreign language (EFL) in countries like Japan, Thailand and Indonesia in terms of the degree to which English is widely used as a medium of communication, for example, in education, government, and business. ESL thus takes place within a relatively English-speaking environment. It is usually used alongside the first or another language (Richards & Rodgers, 2002, pp. 108-109). EFL is English taught as a school subject, but not used as a medium of instruction nor as a language of communication within a country (Richards et al., 1987, p. 108). EFL is thus a non-native language studied by students in countries where English is not commonly used in daily situations (Richards, 1985). That is, it is not used for communication in everyday life in EFL. Everyday communication is in the mother tongue, and English is largely confined to formal education. It is studied for examinations, especially for national university examinations, as in Thailand and Japan, and for higher education (Aksornkool, 1982; Sakui, 2004).

In EFL countries, English has little internal communicative function or social status (Nayar, 1997). While ESL students have many opportunities to use English inside and outside their schools, EFL students lack these opportunities. With virtually no supportive English-speaking community available outside the classroom they must depend largely on comprehensible input provided in class. It is true that ESL students are not very different
to EFL students at the very beginning of L2 learning (Krashen, 1997). However, ESL students can develop their communicative competence through input outside class.

The status of English language teaching concerning communication-based syllabuses in Thailand is like EFL contexts in Japan, China, and Vietnam (Khamkhien, 2010; Q.Wang, 2007; Zhang, 2009). Students of English spend at least 12 years learning in basic education (Grade 1-12) but do not reach an adequate standard of language proficiency, especially for communication.

3.4.2 Traditional pedagogy of ELT in Thailand: Rote learning and grammar-focused.

Over the last century, language teaching in Thailand used two major methodologies: grammar-translation (GTM) and audio-lingual methods (ALM). Thai EFL teachers often used a traditional approach combining GTM and ALM as well as direct translation from English to Thai or vice versa. Thai English classrooms were teacher-centred in that teachers played a role as the source of knowledge and knowledge transmitter. Grammar lessons were regularly conducted with the aim of promoting grammar competence for passing exams. English lessons would end with intensive study of grammar rules and written grammar exercises. Together with an examination culture and authoritative teachers, rote learning, obedient students, and passive learning were the dominant modes for most subjects including English (Naruemon, 2013). The exam system focused on discrete points of grammar with a smaller portion of the test on communication. Traditional teaching in Thai English classroom emphasised transmitting knowledge of grammar and vocabulary based on textbooks. Reading was considered as classic literacy in that teachers taught students to read by direct translation, and question and answer sessions were not held in English but in the students’ native language. The arrival of a national syllabus for CLT has brought a transition from the traditional teacher-centred method to more learner-centred methods and from traditional grammar-translation and audio-lingual to communication, shifting the learning focus away from accuracy and linguistic mastery. Most studies on teaching English in Thailand mention the inadequacy of input relating to natural settings and motivating tasks for language practice as the main cause of students’ inability to use English. Studies related to limited and low communication skills in EFL contexts portray the main limitations to learning for communication as the learning environment, the teacher, content knowledge, affective
factors, materials, and contextual factors (Naruemon, 2013). More specifically, the fear of making mistakes, lack of motivation to speak English, grammar-based learning, low exposure to English communication, and lack of autonomy (see section 7.4/chapter 7 for more details).

3.5 English Education in the Thailand Context

3.5.1 Preservice teacher education.
In Thailand, the Ministry of Education (MOE) has been responsible for the development of teacher education. Standardisation of teacher quality was one of the main national agendas relating to teacher education reform imposed in the National Education Act of 1999. Preservice teacher education in Thailand has always been the responsibility of government teacher-training institutes. Statistics recorded in 2006 showed there were 96 teacher education programmes available throughout the country. These programmes are administered by 56 faculties of teacher education in state-run universities and 40 faculties of education in teacher colleges known as ‘Rajabhat universities.’ An entrance examination is required for all those entering preservice teacher education programmes. Prior to 2005, entrants to teaching programmes had to complete a 4-year baccalaureate-degree programme. Since 2005, all teachers must obtain a teaching licence signifying professional training (Teacher and Educational Personnel Act, 2003). Under the supervision of the Ministry of Education, teacher training institutions are responsible for contributing to the systematic development of and planning of curriculum and strategies for preservice teachers in eight subject areas of Thai language, mathematics, science, foreign languages including English as a compulsory subject, social studies, religion and culture, art, health and physical education, and careers and technology.

According to the Teacher and Educational Personnel Act B.E. 2546 (Secretariat of the Cabinet, 2003), a candidate teacher must qualify with knowledge, professional experience, and ethical standards. Student teachers who obtain a Teacher Professional Licence are legally allowed to work in public schools. There have been several major changes in teacher education in Thailand. A compulsory requirement is to complete one full academic year of intensive classroom-based practicum including 210 hours of classroom teaching. A new route of a 5-year study programme of teacher education was introduced in 2003, requiring completion of a 5-year bachelor’s degree in teacher
education. This programme is unlike those in other areas of study that require 4 years of study to graduate.

The mission of the institutions and universities that offer this 5-year programme is a commitment to provide instruction as well as practice in teaching in accordance with the professional standards identified by the Teachers Council of Thailand Office of the Secretary to the Teachers Council of Thailand, 2007. The programme has been employed to solve the problem of a shortage of science teachers in the country. However, enrolment at universities is for students of curricula covering the major fields of science such as mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and computing and social sciences such as Thai, English, social studies, music, and the fine arts.

3.5.2 Current situation of teacher preparation.

In 2014, an alternative track was opened for graduates from teacher education programmes who complete a bachelor’s degree in fields other than teacher education or ครุศาสาตร์ (Karusart) to become accredited teachers. It is a policy that they must complete a 1-year postbaccalaureate diploma or Por Bundit programme (ป.บัณฑิต) in teacher training to obtain a teaching licence. Both the 5-year undergraduate and the 1-year postgraduate programmes must meet the standards of professional knowledge and experience set by the Teachers ‘Council 2006. The minimum is 30 credits in general education courses, 50 in pedagogy courses, 74 in subject-matter courses, and 6 elective courses plus 1 year of student teaching or professional practice for the 5-year bachelor’s degree programme.

The minimum is 24 credits in a pedagogy course plus 1 year of student teaching for the 1-year graduate diploma programme.

Teacher preparation in Thailand is offered with two curriculum models: a bachelor’s degree in Education (5-year programme) and a Certificate of Teaching Profession (4+1 year-programme). Universities offering the formal 5-year or the 4+1 programme must design a curriculum, course lists, and teaching methods for two elements under the standards of the Teachers Council of Thailand, these being teaching knowledge and teaching experience. The first standard includes nine aspects: (1) languages and technology for teachers, (2) curriculum development, (3) learning management, (4) ministration and management in the classroom, (7) educational research, (8) innovation and educational information and technology, and (9) being a teacher. The second standard focuses on teaching experience through practice teaching in a school for not less
than one academic year. Currently, the student teachers who graduate from this programme are approved by Teachers’ Council to receive their teacher’s licence and are eligible to become EFL teachers. In Thailand, student teachers accredited as licensed teachers are eligible for recruitment as a school teacher in basic education from elementary level upwards. At the postgraduate level, there are seven government universities offering diplomas and master’s degrees in TEFL.

3.5.3 Challenges in CLT application.
The prescription of a CLT syllabus for ELT in Thailand came with a debate over whether teacher trainers could learn its innovations and underlying principles within the short time allocated before transferring them to their fellow teachers. It is doubtful how well teacher trainers can effectively deliver CLT concepts to other teachers. One concern is on how newly trained local teachers can evaluate the suitability of CLT pedagogical principles and implement them in their daily classroom practice. There does not seem to be any report on how far English teaching has developed at this level. At the start of the CLT application, studies of classroom interaction and actual practices of CLT were minimal. One important study conducted by Coskun (2011) revealed more interaction between teacher and students in a CLT classroom when teachers provided enough waiting time for students’ responses and reaction to questions. This success in CLT application, however, was limited to a small group of teachers. It appears that most of the studies on CLT were experimental research, with no generalisability to the large population of EFL teachers.

According to a research report from the MOE, there have been a number of problems relating to teacher translation of CLT into classrooms. Two major challenges are listed below:

1. Thai EFL teachers are not familiar with the new English curriculum and rely on course books) Markmee & Taylor, 2001. (This situation indicates that a top-down policy has been carried out without consideration of teacher understanding of the innovative pedagogy of CLT and existing conditions and problems.

2. Teachers are not qualified to teach English for communication due to their low practical use of English in a natural setting and their lack of theoretical knowledge for language teaching) Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000. (According to Promsiri) 1996, teachers who have been teaching for 12-20 years in schools have had no pedagogical background in CLT despite their bachelor’s degrees in English education. The fact is that innovative
methodology was not implemented in the preservice teacher training syllabus when they were in college. CLT is probably known by only a few teachers who have sought to understand it from seminars occasionally held by the MOE, the British Council, and other organisations.

3.5.4 Concerns of teacher training towards CLT
Teacher training is a problem in countries where real information exchange and authentic communication situations are inadequate. The lack of communication in real situations with foreigners causes problems for both teachers and learners. Theoretically, CLT emphasises communicative competence and encourages successful interaction with real tasks. The ideal teachers of CLT should be fully competent with the language and have a good command of linguistic knowledge and teaching methodologies. However, practically, foreign language users, both teachers and learners, in EFL countries are unable to receive enough communicative practice since they have little opportunity to meet native speakers. This kind of language environment is inadequate for the sustainable development of foreign language teaching and learning in these countries. For EFL teachers, the lack of real communication situations makes it difficult for them to be native-like and their language quality is hard to depend on. Therefore, how to effectively carry out the CLT approach is not an easy task in countries with inadequate foreign language-speaking situations.

Within EFL in-service training over the past few decades no investigation has reported how Thai teachers have fully implemented innovation in their classrooms. Instead, there are plenty of reports pointing to traditional approaches or the grammar-translation method still having a great influence on ELT in Thai schools (Maurice, 1985; Waine, 1998). CLT practice seems to appear in name only as its implementation is different from what has been claimed. In Thailand, there are several challenges; these are mostly related to teachers’ acceptance and readiness to apply an innovative method of teaching (Weerawong, 2006; Naruemon, 2013). Teacher understanding of the core concepts of CLT has been noted as a critical issue in the reform of TEFL in Thailand (Weerawong, 2006). Many experts claim that these issues are complicated by the fact that teachers, even with training, generally do not change the way they teach but continue to follow old patterns (Lortie, 1975, as cited in Almara, 2015; Altman, 1984, as cited in Thomas, 1983). Some simply go back to traditional old ways of teaching or teach the way they themselves were
taught. Previous learning, knowledge, and beliefs about teaching have been found to be powerful determinants of teacher perceptions and practices, which often makes them resistant to change (Freeman & Richards, 1996, p.6). Furthermore, much of what occurs in teacher-education programmes is soon forgotten or thrown away when teachers return to schools (Richards, 1999).

3.6 Teacher Learning: Teacher Education (TE), Teacher Training (TT) and Teacher Professional Development (TPD)

In this study it is necessary to describe key terms in teacher learning such as teacher education (TE), teacher training (TT), and teacher professional development (TPD) before going on to discuss teacher learning. According to Widowson (1983) and Richards and Nunan (1990), teacher training deals with familiarising student teachers with techniques and skills to apply in the classroom, whereas teacher education involves teachers in ‘developing theories of teaching ‘understanding the nature of teacher decision-making and strategies for self-awareness and self-evaluation.’ TT is compulsory; however, TPD is seen to be a voluntary, ongoing, and bottom-up process since the starting point is the teacher’s own experience whereby new information is sought, shared, reflected on, tried out, processed in terms of personal experience and finally ‘owned’ by the teachers (Ur, 1997). In this study, the 1-year teaching practicum course is counted as the initial stage of self-directed TPD under the TT premise as an officially mandated programme set as a key element of TE. The goal is to promote the student teacher to achieve TPD as an essential component for completing TE with a higher skill-oriented and context-based foundation than the former teacher education programme which was more course-work-based provided (see section 3.4.2 for details of Teaching Practicum course of teacher education programme in Thailand).

This study is concerned with the professional development of practising language teachers and the literature on teacher education reviewed here will focus on the professional development of language preservice teachers, in particular on their initial stage of experience in learning to teach in school and classroom settings. It discusses the issue of teacher learning, explores the concept of teacher professional development, draws to some extent on the literature on teacher practice and pedagogical innovation, and addresses the question of what makes a teacher development programme successful in creating learning conditions and bringing about acceptance and application of CLT.
3.6.1 Teacher training for professional development.
Teacher-educators in English language teaching have paid much attention to the developmental aspects of teacher learning (Bailey et al., 2001) based on the premise that teacher learning is a process not a product of training (Bailey et al., 2001; Pitt & Britzman, 2003; Johnson, 1999). This process-based conceptualisation stems from a controversial dichotomy between teacher training and teacher development.
Teacher education through training is based on the presupposition that all teachers are instructed so that they can acquire predetermined skills through “imitation, recitation, and assimilation” (Pitt & Britzman, 2003, p.46). They can learn through training to receive discrete, decontextualised knowledge or skills to be mastered by the completion of the course. Thus, the outcomes of this teacher training are evaluated by teacher-educators on the basis of externally observable and often quantifiable teacher changes in competence or performance. Quantifiable changes are generally a one-time event and when training ends these are likely to end as well. Several limitations to this training-oriented approach have been found (Johnson, 1999; Richards, 1989). Richards (1989) points out that the training-oriented approach is rooted in the assumption that preservice teachers are deficient. Several studies have shown that traditional approaches to instruction, namely, lectures, and demonstrations focus on declarative and procedural information. Pitt & Britzman (2003) points out that the training-oriented approaches underestimate preservice teachers’ capability when it comes to “changing or constructing knowledge” (p.64). Preservice teachers’ spontaneous action is needed in context-specific, problem-solving situations (Gebhard & Oprandy, 1999) and, therefore, they need support from teacher-educators to gain awareness through various contextualised activities so that they can begin the “process of reflection, critique, and refinement”) Freeman, 1989, p (40).of teaching practices and the process of independent decision-making (Gebhard, 1984, 2005b). Gebhard (2005b) claims that the idea of development needs to go beyond the idea of improvement and equip teachers with “conceptual and analytical tools and direct them to continual growth and development” (Richards, 1989, p.83).

3.6.2 Teacher Learning
The term teacher development in this study was adopted from Lange’s definition (1990, p .250) of it as a “process of continual intellectual, experiential and attitudinal growth of teachers” which is vital for maintaining and enhancing the quality of teachers and
learning experiences. Henceforth, the term teacher professional development will be used to refer to this process of learning and growth in which practising teachers continually engage. The concept of teacher learning has gained much attention and exploration in language teacher education both in ESL and EFL contexts (Freeman, 2001). Richards and Farrell (2005) describe four different concepts of teacher learning: teacher learning as skill learning, as a cognitive process, as personal construction and as reflective practice. The first of these concepts views teacher learning as the “development of a range of different skills or competencies, mastery of which underlies successful teaching” (p.6). This view suggests that one can learn to teach by mastering one discrete skill or content at a time. The second concept of teacher learning relates to teacher development programmes to support teachers in exploring their own cognition with reference to classroom practice.

- **Learning to teach through exploration**

  1. **Teacher learning of personal construction through exploration**

Teacher exploration is seen as a crucial process of teacher learning, Fanselow, 1992; Gebhard & Oprandy, 1999. Gebhard and Oprandy (1999) contend that the more opportunities and freedom given to teachers to engage in exploratory activities, the more informed decisions they make, which, in turn, directs them to successful teacher learning cf., Bailey et al., (2001)and further career-long exploration (Gebhard, 2006; Gebhard & Oprandy, 1999). Preservice teachers have individual conceptions of learning and teaching and interpret and reinterpret their professional experiences to make sense of “what they say and do in the classroom” (Johnson, 1999, p10). This system is a social process of negotiation rather than an individual problem of behaviour.

Teacher learning must include the processes of exploration, interpretation, and negotiation through which teachers investigate the sources of their knowledge and beliefs, as well as their “personhood”. Mori, 2003, p .14. Gebhard (2005b) adds that in these processes teachers are recommended to explore and learn the affective side of teaching because they tend to base their interpretations of the professional experiences on beliefs cf., (Oprandy, 1999). Teachers are encouraged to explore their teaching beliefs and practices (Gebhard & Oprandy, 1999) and “the completeness of teachers ‘ understandings of themselves, their students, and the places where they work”. (Johnson, 1999, p.11) by making best use of various types of activities. It may be worth
mentioning here that research conducted by teachers to explore their own beliefs and practices, for instance, in the form of action research or diary studies is regarded as an invaluable opportunity for self-exploration and self-improvement (Bailey et al., 2001; Gebhard & Oprandy, 1999; Kumaravadivelu, 2001). Such opportunities are not usually given to preservice teachers in EFL contexts (Sato & Kleinsaser, 2004; Naruemon, 2013; Borg, 2003.)

2. Learning through reflection: Reflective teaching

In teacher education reflection is viewed in current approaches as a key to empower teachers’ exploration through multiple-activities (Schön, 1983; Zeichner & Liston, 1996). (Farrell, 1999, 2004; and Griffiths, 2000) commonly state that there has not been a single definition of teachers’ reflection, yet, researchers agree on its importance for professional development (i.e., Bailey et al., 2001; Richards & Lockhart, 1996; Richards & Farrell, 2005). According to Schön (1983), reflection, particularly reflection-in-action, is important when teachers encounter and spontaneously cope with uncertain, unique circumstances (see also Dewey, 1997).

In ELT, reflection is linked with future action (Gebhard, 2005b; Pennington, 1996; Stanley, 1998). Other widely accepted meanings relate to teachers’ continuous, deliberate consideration of attitudes, behaviours, beliefs, and practices (Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Zeichner & Liston, 1996) and their continuous examination of alternative actions (cf., Stanley, 1998). Murphy’s (2001) discussion of the purposes of reflective teaching was divided into three aspects of understanding one’s teaching: learning process deeply, expanding one’s repertoire of strategic options, and promoting the quality of learning opportunities one provides for learners in classrooms.

Sparks-Langer and Colton, (1991) highlight that the key to success for the teacher-educator in conducting reflective thinking is to study the teacher’s narratives with in-depth qualitative and interpretative methods. Technically, three elements of practical strategies for teacher reflection are summed up as follows: “This first is the cognitive element, which describes how teachers process information and make decisions. The second, the critical element, focuses on the substance that drives the thinking-experiences, goals, values, and social implication. The last element is teachers’ narratives that refer to teachers’ own interpretations of the events that occur within their particular contexts.” (Sparks-Langer & Colton, 1991, p. 37)
To sum up, the conceptual meaning of learning through reflection in this current study refers to the process of exploration that teachers engage in to gain awareness and understanding of their teaching beliefs and practices. Critical reflective thinking can help minimise the mismatch there might be between teachers’ stated beliefs and their classroom practices, and this helps how they act (theory in use) to be in accordance with what they express (espoused theory). Becoming reflective teachers enables teachers to expand their repertoire of strategic options and hence become more flexible, spontaneous practitioners.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction
The aim of this chapter is to describe the nature and design of the methods used to collect and analyse data. The rationale and justification for a three-stage mixed-method study using both quantitative and qualitative methods are provided. The chapter presents the two stages of data collection. Stage one involved a prepracticum survey and stage two involved class observation during practicum. The development and modification of the survey and observation instruments are included.

4.2 Background to the Research Design
A main objective of the study is to promote and enable reflective understanding of the EFL PSTs’ beliefs and practices about CLT in local classroom settings. The study aims to explore how a cohort of Thai-EFL PSTs perceive CLT and to examine how these PSTs inculcate CLT into their teaching while on school placement (‘practicum’). The study also investigates factors affecting PSTs’ beliefs about CLT.

4.2.1. Justification for the mixed method.
Selection of a research methodology aims to ensure answers are obtained appropriately for the context. A criterion for judging the appropriateness of a method derives from the research value and purpose (Patton, 2002). Pragmatically, researchers choose a combination of methods that work best for answering their research questions (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Combining quantitative and qualitative research develops a framework to validate quantitative findings by referring to information extracted from the qualitative phase. In addition, construction of qualitative indices may inform the analysis of quantitative data (Madey, 1982). Qualitative and/or quantitative methods are compatible with the pragmatic paradigm in that they are productive in advancing research study in a social and behavioural science field (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005). Hence, the application of mixed methods derives from the methodological reasoning stated above and is summarised as follows:

➢ Quantitative and qualitative methodologies, when combined, enable researchers to answer different, albeit related questions through consideration of a variety of
perspectives (Meehan, 2007). As stated above (see section 4.1.1), in this study, the nature of PSTs’ beliefs and practices to be explored are complex and so neither quantitative nor qualitative approaches can provide sufficient data when used alone; for this reason, the choice of mixed methods is warranted. The combination of a qualitative-quantitative mixed-method approach used in this research fits partly into the pragmatic paradigm, as it aims to observe and describe the quality of preconceived phenomena (i.e., teachers’ beliefs and teaching practices) in a naturally occurring context (i.e., the English language classroom at the initial stage of the teaching practicum) through self-survey data and observation data of individual cases of the preservice teachers.

- Quantitative and qualitative approaches combine to generate a general picture, exploiting gaps left by one or other method (Push, 2005). In this study, the quantitative survey data informs overall beliefs of PSTs during school placement and provides a mechanism for selection of subgroups for qualitative observation.

The main aim of this study is the production of new knowledge and exploration of existing relationships between the unobserved beliefs and observable practices of the participants using methods that gain information directly from participants. Hence, its multimethods complement each other.

- One practical reason for employing a mixed method in particular for this study is that quantitative methods facilitate qualitative research by providing a mechanism for screening subjects for a qualitative study. The survey data is used as a tool to identify the appropriate critical sample fit for the further observation case study.

- Qualitative research facilitates the interpretation of relationships between variables in order to explain underlying causes of the phenomenon. This study aims not only to identify how/to what extent the novice teachers are able to affirm their intended teaching beliefs but also to explain this phenomenon. In this sense qualitative data help to yield sufficient data and confirm the data (Jang et al, 2008)

For the specific reasons and justification stated above this study features a sequential mixed-methods design utilising multiple methods, i.e., quantitative and qualitative approaches, to answer its three research questions in order to meet its three objectives:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>What to find out</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What are the stated beliefs of preservice teachers about CLT before the practicum; how do these relate to PSTs’ personal profiles in terms of gender, languages, use of English and level of English qualification?</td>
<td>Teaching beliefs</td>
<td>Quantitative: Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent and in what way did the PSTs integrate their stated beliefs about CLT into their classroom practice?</td>
<td>Instructional practices</td>
<td>Qualitative: Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What challenges/difficulties were reported by the PSTs as the influences on their classroom practices?</td>
<td>Factors affecting the choice of practices</td>
<td>Qualitative: Written questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section discusses the overall research design.

### 4.3 Research Method Design

#### Overall design of the study

Figure 4.1, Table 4.1, and Table 4.2 below describe the design of the research tailored for each individual study (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The flow chart begins with the research questions that are outlined below (see Figure 4.1.). A pilot study was conducted to test the research instruments designed for the initial self-survey. The questionnaires were posted to the sample selected from the related universities offering English language teacher education. Data collected was input into SPSS version 15 to analyse the result for research question 1 and to identify the potential PST participants for phase two. Thereafter, details of the observation and postobservation written data were collected. The data from both sources were combined.

Figure 4.1 shows a flowchart providing an overview of the research procedures.
Figure 4.1. Stages of research design.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What the research questions explore?</th>
<th>Research Stage</th>
<th>Instruments and Procedure</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers’ beliefs about CLT</td>
<td>Stage One: Prepracticum</td>
<td>Self-report questionnaire survey</td>
<td>Numeric data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data screening frequencies (SPSS software V.15)</td>
<td>Cases (N = 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purposive selection of three participants from each group (N = 4) based on critical sampling criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers’ beliefs and their connection to teachers’ practices</td>
<td>Stage Two: During Practicum</td>
<td>In-class observation (Classroom transcription, documents, artefact description)</td>
<td>Text data: Codes, categories, and themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers’ perceived challenges to practices</td>
<td>Stage Two: During Practicum</td>
<td>(Postobservation written questionnaire)</td>
<td>Text data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Text+numeric data]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 Research Stages and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Stage</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage One: Prepracticum survey</td>
<td>December 2012-May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1 Literature review and finalised research questions</td>
<td>After ethical approval was given in December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 Instrument design (revisit)</td>
<td>January-February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3 Pilot study and instrument validation</td>
<td>February-March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 Survey data collection</td>
<td>April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5 Data 1 analysis: Statistical analysis and calculation for case selection</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for stage two: Observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Two: Classroom observation</td>
<td>June 2013-February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1 Class observation</td>
<td>First observation: July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second observation: August – September 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2 Data 2 analysis:</td>
<td>September 2013-April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3 Postobservation questionnaire</td>
<td>At the end of every observation of each case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4 Data 2 Analysis</td>
<td>(January-February 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March-June 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 Data Collection Stage One: Survey

Data collection began after ethical approval was granted by Durham University School of Education Research Ethics Committee. Contact was made with four institutions in southern Thailand.

#### 4.4.1 Participants.

The target population of this study is EFL PSTs in the southern region of Thailand. Section 4.3.1.1 provides the criteria for sampling, the participants, and the samples. For the first stage, the quantitative survey stage, a purposive sample was employed. At this stage
specific EFL PSTs who fitted into the following categories were selected: (1) those who had completed the fourth year of their teacher education programme in their institutions and (2) those who are starting their fifth year of the programme by enrolling in the teaching practicum course. This is a school-based internship for the entire academic year 2013 (May 2013-Feb 2014). The study was designed to survey the EFL PSTs enrolled in a teaching practicum course in the institutions in the lower part of southern Thailand (see Figure 4.2). Table 4.3 below shows the cities and the number of PSTs in English education enrolled in the teaching practicum course in the academic year 2013.

**Table 4.3 Four Institutions under Commission of Higher Education in Southern Thailand Offering a 5-year Bachelor’s degree in English Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of PSTs</th>
<th>Institution Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban-Yala</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>UNI 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban- Pattani</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>UNI 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban- Songkhla</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>UNI 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban- Songka</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>UNI 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>267</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since three out of the four institutions agreed to participate in this research study, the sample of the study included PSTs from three universities: UNI1, UNI2 and UNI3. The three universities are similar in relation to exposure to English communication that may affect their students’ incentives in learning English and their ability to learn and teach in the communicative mode. Uni 3 is located in the major city in the southern region. The use of English for business purposes such as tourism business and the import-export industry is therefore more common at UNI 3 than it is in the other two universities. The vast majority of the population is Muslim and the people in the study areas commonly use two ethnic languages – Thai and Yawi (Malayu dialect) in their daily lives. More details of the language profiles and characteristics of the PST participants are provided in chapter 5.
The stage one survey questionnaire captured PSTs’ beliefs about CLT. A purposive sample of PSTs who were undertaking a 1-year school placement (‘practicum’) as trainee English language teachers in schools in lower southern Thailand was selected. In nonrandom purposive sampling the researcher intentionally decides to include or exclude a subset or section of the wider population (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007; Bryman, 2008).

**Table 4.4** Distribution of Fifth-Year PSTs from Three Universities for the Stage One Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Invited</th>
<th>Responded</th>
<th>Percentage of possible sample</th>
<th>Percentage of total sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNI1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI 2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI 3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 227 PSTs in the English Education major enrolled in the teaching practicum course in the academic year 2013, (in three universities in the lower southern part of Thailand) who were invited to take part in this survey, 166 consented to participate in the stage one survey phase and returned completed questionnaires. Comparing the percentage sample with the possible maximum sample indicates that the sample is fairly likely to be representative of the population of PSTs taking an English education qualification in the lower southern Thailand. Based on Krejcie and Morgan’s (1970) determination of sample
size, a sample size which is sufficient to generate a 95% confidence interval that can be seen as representative of the whole population. In my study, the population size was 267 and so the sample size of 166 was deemed adequate. However, since the PST selection was nonrandom, it is not reasonable to generalise from it. Primarily, it is not the aim of this study to generalise the finding to the larger population and so the purpose of this section to prove that the determination of sample size was large enough. However, caution is required in drawing generalisations from this data.

The stage one survey was completed and returned by PSTs from three universities: UNI1, UNI2, and UNI3. In order to investigate any change of beliefs before and after the practicum, data from participants completing pre and postsurveys (that is, stages one and three) was required. Information about characteristics and profiles of the participants is shown later in section 5.2/ chapter 5.

4.4.2 Survey instrument: Beliefs questionnaire about CLT (BQ-CLT)

Originality and construction of survey instrument

The survey questionnaire instrument used in this study was developed originally by Karavas-Doukas (1996) in an effort to understand teachers’ attitudes toward a communicative approach to language teaching. His research focused on the degree of implementation of a communicative learner-centred approach in a Greek context in which English is a foreign language. Participants in Karavas-Doukas’s projects (1996) were teachers who gained minimal exposure to the genuine use of English in natural situations. In that sense, the nature of their exposure to English is similar to that of the in this study. In Greece, English is considered to be an important foreign language, and one that is needed for basic education, further study, and career prospects. Hence students learn English to pass exams rather than to achieve communicative competence. In Karavas-Doukas’s original survey instrument, a 5-point Likert-scale questionnaire was utilised to test the degree to which PSTs agreed with five principles of CLT; (1) place of grammar, (2) group or pair work, (3) error correction, (4) role of teachers, and (5) contribution of learners. Karavas-Doukas’s questionnaire instrument is widely used in both EFL and ESL study contexts that the focus on understanding teachers’ thinking and actions about instructions that promote learners’ communicative competences.
Initial modification of survey instrument

A number of types of validity can significantly contribute to the success of any research; content validity was highly applicable and necessary for the self-report questionnaire in this study. Content validity requires that the instrument used should cover the topic under examination literally and comprehensively (Gass & Mackey, 2007, p. 4). The modification of the survey instrument in this study was based on achieving validation of content. For that reason, this study the following modification methods were employed:

1. **Six-point scale self-report questionnaire**

In my study, the main adaptation involved points of response. A limitation of Likert-type scales is the difficulty of establishing a ‘neutral point’ and consequently a neutral score (Karavas-Doukas, 1996; Khoi Mai Ngoc, 2012). The neutral point on a Likert scale is not necessarily the midpoint between the extreme scores (Oppenheim, 1992) because a respondent can obtain a mid-range score by being uncertain about many items, or by holding inconsistent or strongly favourable and strongly unfavourable conceptions towards the attitudinal object in question. Hence my adaption was to modify the original 5-point scale to a 4-point scale by deleting ‘undecided.’ I also changed the rating point from four to six by adding ‘Slightly Agree’ and ‘Slightly Disagree’ to the scale. Consequently, the questionnaires’ questions offered respondents six rating points. These ranged from extremely favourable up to extremely unfavourable, namely ‘Strongly Agree’, ‘Agree’, ‘Slightly Agree’, Slightly Disagree’, Disagree,’ and Strongly Disagree.’ The reason for extending the scale was to offer an option to respondents who slightly disagreed or slightly agreed with any statement, and to avoid pushing them to either extreme (Oppenheim, 1992)

2. **Content validation of the English version**

In evaluating preservice teachers’ beliefs towards the use of the innovative concept of CLT, it was important to ensure that the questions in the self-report questionnaire fully represented the domain of beliefs towards those CLT concepts. Content validity pertains to the degree to which the instrument fully assesses or measures the construct of interest (Cook & Beckman, 2006). A good strategy for accounting for content validity of questionnaires can be achieved through other academics’ reflections on their contents and structures (Cohen et al., 2000; Gass & Mackey, 2007; Bryman, 2008). The development of a content valid instrument is typically achieved by means of a rational
analysis of the instrument by raters (experts) familiar with the construct of interest or experts on the research topic. Specifically, raters will review all of the questionnaire items for readability, clarity, and comprehensiveness and come to some level of agreement as to which items should be included in the final questionnaire. Content validity for this BQ-CLT survey instrument was established through review of it by a panel of experts and a pilot test. Once ethical approved had been given for this study’s research methods, the original version of Karavas-Doukas’ beliefs inventory about CLT was tried out with four experienced teachers of English language who either work or studied at Durham University. The primary aim here was to establish the content validity of the beliefs statements in terms of the comprehensibility of the original meaning of the concept in each statement that aimed to probe the novice PSTs on their beliefs about CLT. Based on these experts’ recommendations, the questionnaire was slightly modified. The first phase of the pilot study was conducted with four participants; two of the four participants were native speakers of English. They were working as English language lecturers in Durham University’ Language Centre. These native speakers were specialists in teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL). They had both gained some years’ experience in teaching English in EFL countries like Japan, Thailand, and Indonesia. The other two participants were EFL teachers from Taiwan and Turkey. They had approximately 5 and 8 years’ experience of teaching English in a technical college and secondary school respectively. Before asking them to complete the survey questionnaire, they were informed about the objective, background, and focus of the study and also the characteristics of the research samples i.e., that the respondents would be bilingual, infrequent users of English, and novices as regards their English language experience. When completing the questionnaire, the pilot study participants were asked to make notes on the statements they caused them difficulty. The focus of the pilot study was therefore to establish the clarity and comprehensibility of the questionnaire’s statements. In general, the responses from the four participants indicated that the statements in the BQ-CLT functioned well. The feedback from some participants led to slight modification of the words and wordings used in the following three beliefs statements, as shown below:
Statement 7

| Original | The teacher as ‘authority’ and ‘instructor’ is no longer adequate to describe the teacher’s role in the language classroom. |
| Reviewers’ comment/s | “Only mentioning ‘language classroom’ is too general for identifying the adequate role of the teacher” |
| | “Be specific on what type of language classroom is e. g. skill-based” |
| Modified | The teacher as ‘authority’ and ‘instructor’ is no longer adequate to describe the teacher’s role in the language classroom where English learning is aimed for communicative competence. |

Statement 18

| Original | For most students, language is acquired most effectively when it is used as a vehicle for doing something else and not when it is studied in a direct or explicit way. |
| Reviewers’ comment/s | Comment1: The phrase ‘doing something else’ should be specified in order to increase clarity. |
| | Comment 2: The word ‘vehicle’ might confuse the nonnative respondents. The word ‘instrument’ is clearer in this context. |
| Modified | For most students, language is acquired most effectively when it is used as an instrument for doing classroom activities and not when it is studied in a direct or explicit way. |

To validate the content of the questionnaire, it is needed to take into consideration the tendency of the PSTs in attempting to provide positive response to the CLT statements. This was possibly due to their awareness of the importance of the CLT methods taught to them during their formal teaching course in the college. One improvement made in response to this suggestion to increase the content validity of the questionnaire was to add background information that informed the respondents about the objective of the research and explaining that its purpose was to explore their personal perceptions; another solution was to put the words ‘I believe’ at the top of the questionnaire to make the respondents aware of the nature of the questionnaire and that it was asking about
beliefs not formal knowledge. No major revision involving conceptual meaning of the statements was required.

3. Construction of the translated version of the questionnaire

First translation version

The Thai version of the BQ-CLT questionnaire was developed to ensure its comprehensibility for the Thai EFL PST participants. The quality of a translation depends on a number of factors some of which, as Overly (1960, p. 90) says, may be beyond the researcher’s control. In those cases where the researcher and the translator are the same person the quality of translation is influenced by factors such as: the autobiography of the researcher-translator; the researcher’s knowledge of the language and the culture of the people under study (Vulliamy, 1990, p. 166); and, the researcher’s fluency in the language of the write-up. Translation of the original English version of Karavas-Doukas’ BQ-CLT into Thai was carried out by the researcher herself for two reasons; first, the researcher had long experience in translation work in both nonacademic and academic fields and had also been a teacher educator with the target participants of the study for many years. Second, there were Thai-English bilingual experts in the field who were available for content checking once the translation had been done.

All in all, four steps of content validation were employed in this study to ensure the quality of the translation. First, the Thai version was checked for readability and clarity by a linguistics expert. Second, backwards translations of the questionnaires were carried out by a bilingual individual with an English teaching background. Third, the prefinal version of Thai translation was again examined for comprehensibility before the final Thai version was produced.

Backwards translation

Backwards translation was applied in the questionnaire’s construction in order to minimise any misunderstandings, mistranslations, or inaccuracies in the intermediary forward version of the questionnaire. Backwards translation is accepted as one of the most common techniques used in cross-cultural research when aiming for linguistic equivalence between the original and translated version. The procedure was carried out through (i) the translation of items from the source language to the target language, (ii) independent translation of these elements back into the source language, and (iii) successive comparison of the two versions of the questionnaire’s items in the source
language until all ambiguities or discrepancies in meaning were clarified or removed (Ercikan, 1998, p. 545). Despite the benefits gained from this procedure, the back translation can be very time-consuming as the translation of the texts and consultation with experts takes time. Three English teachers who participated in the backwards translation stage in this study.

The first participant was a Thai teacher of English language who is experienced in the job of translation; this person translated the Thai version that the researcher had created back into English. This teacher independently translated the researcher’s Thai version into English without access to the original Karavas-Doukas’ CLT questionnaire. Each version i.e., the original English version and the one created through the backwards translation were put into a single document and sent out to two further experts in ELT for another round of content checking. Thereafter the backwards version was compared with the original source version to establish their linguistic equivalence. One of the experts was a professor in applied linguistics who had been teaching English and conducting academic research for 30 years; the other was a primary school teacher with 25 years’ experience in TEFL. Both were familiar with the classroom syllabus and the English pedagogy of the traditional grammar-translation for the current communicative approach. Appendix 6 shows the comparison of the two versions of the translation and includes beliefs statements 1- 24. In the following summary, the benefits gained from the experts’ feedback on the backwards translation are shown. The two reviewers provided no critical comments that required major change. The example below shows a comment made by a reviewer relating to theme three – error correction – in statement 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original statement</th>
<th>Translated statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“For students to become effective communicators in the foreign language, the teachers’ feedback must be focused on the appropriateness and not the linguistic form of the students’ responses”.</td>
<td>“To develop students to be effective English language communicators, teachers must give a response that reflects their appropriate use of language not the accurate use of language form.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question was raised in connection with the unequal meaning between the words ‘foreign language’ in the original statement and ‘English language’ in the translated version. The researcher did not make any change to the translated version due to the fact that it was not likely to lead to misunderstanding of the study’s context where English is
taught and used as a foreign language. So, without making a change, the researcher’s Thai version of BQ-CLT was then sent for content checking and proofreading in the final phase of the translation process.

**Finalised translation version**

After all the revisions had been made, the first revised questionnaire survey was sent to three university professors in Thailand for further validation. The two participants were familiar with developing surveys in the social science field and with the principles and methods of language teaching. In the validation process, they were asked to focus on the Thai version, with reference to the original English version. The first aspect was to check whether or not the beliefs statements included in the survey were the kind of beliefs possessed by Thai EFL preservice teachers. The second aspect was to check the clarity and the comprehensibility of the meaning of the statements in the Thai version that had recently been revised after backwards translation.

Overall, the reviewers were satisfied with the content validity of the survey and suggested no major changes. None of the beliefs presented in the survey were deemed invalid for Thai EFL learners. It was thought that the participants could interpret the statements in a way that was consistent with the objective of the survey questionnaire. Some minor changes in some statements were requested to get rid of some vagueness in concept meaning and to make the statements sound more understandable in Thai. Changes included rearranging words to create a better sounding structure in Thai and deleting unnecessary and redundant words. Finally, some noteworthy changes were made to two statements as explained below:

**Beliefs questionnaire about CLT (BQ-CLT):** The final version of the modified BQ-CLT

The final version of the modified questionnaire contained all of the original 24 statements in Karavas-Doukas’ beliefs inventory. The beliefs questionnaire about communicative language teaching (BQ-CLT) (see Appendix 4) was employed in this study to collect information about what teachers think they will do in the classroom.

Part one of the questionnaire collected participants’ background data, including their gender, languages spoken; and English use and proficiency.

Part two of the questionnaire was based on the characterisation of CLT and non-CLT features as originally developed by Karavas-Doukas (1998). Statements were presented using the Likert scale discussed above to assess how strongly teachers believe in/agree
with the five CLT principles (see Appendices 4 and 11) This approach enabled analysis of PSTs’ beliefs about CLT. The 24 statements were categorised under five subprinciples of CLT, namely role of grammar (statements 1, 3, 12, 15, and 17); group or pair work (statements 2, 9, 13, 21, and 22); error correction (statements 6, 10, and 14); teacher role (statements 7, 11, 16, 19, 21, and 24); and, contribution of learner (statements 4, 5, 8, 18, and 20). Some statements included duplicated content, and differing in wording to maximise internal validity. Statements were placed in random order to avoid bias. In terms of scoring and interpreting, higher scores corresponded to the strength of the respondents’ positive orientation towards CLT in terms of PSTs’ beliefs. Fourteen statements (numbers 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, and 24) were designed as ‘positive’ because they correspond to CLT teaching approaches, while the remaining 12 statements (1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, and 23) were designed to reflect non-CLT concepts i.e., traditional grammar-focused, teacher-fronted instruction, and students as passive, learners of language.

Hence, CLT-oriented statements were to be scored as follows: 1 for ‘Strongly disagree’ up to 6 for ‘Strongly agree.’ Negative statements referring to a traditional non-CLT view of English teaching were reversed in scoring so that 1 indicated ‘Strongly agree’ up while 6 indicated ‘Strongly disagree.’ The second part of the questionnaire was the main instrument for identifying CLT and non-CLT belief traits; it was based on Karavas-Doukas’ (1998) study about EFL teachers’ attitudes toward CLT and non-CLT or ‘traditional’ language teaching; that study was primarily involved with grammar translation and audio-lingual instructional strategies.

Statements were presented with Likert scale ratings inviting PSTs to report how strongly they agree/disagree with the five CLT principles. These ratings enabled estimation of PSTs’ beliefs about instructional strategies used when teaching English language to promote students’ achieving communicative competence. Twenty-four statements were categorised under five CLT subthemes (see Appendices 4, 9, and 11), namely place of grammar, use of group/pair work, treatment of error correction, teacher role, and contribution of learner.
4.4.3 Administration of stage one survey questionnaire.

Distribution

Prior to the start of their school placement or ‘practicum, PSTs attended an orientation session describing the purpose and expectations for the practicum itself. These sessions took the form of a one-day course held on PSTs’ university campuses right before the start of the practicum course. To maximise the questionnaire survey response rate, I planned that participants would complete the survey instrument in hard-copy form under examination conditions during the orientation session in order to ensure the likelihood that relevant data would be obtained from each individual. The questionnaires were brought to three universities of the two universities by me in person.

I visited UNI-1 and UNI-3 in April 2013 to distribute the survey instrument paper in person to 92 and 95 PSTs respectively. At UNI1, 88 out of 92 PSTs completed the survey instrument on the day. Four absentees completed the survey online via a Google form. At UNI3, the questionnaire was distributed to 95 PSTs. Of these, 41 questionnaires were returned on the day and a further 28 respondents completed and returned the survey online afterwards. This process yielded 69 responses from UNI-3. At UNI-2 the orientation session was changed at short notice. As a result, 40 PSTs received and completed the questionnaire (as a Google form) only via email. However, a challenge arose because no email accounts could be provided by UNI-2. Only 50% of the students could be reached by telephone and invited to join the survey via email. This problem led to significant attrition in the sample size, resulting in a mere seven participants responding to the survey instrument. Of the 227 potential PSTs respondents from three universities in lower southern Thailand, 166 PSTs completed the stage one BQ-CLT survey instrument, a response rate of around 73%
Table 4.5 Actual PST Respondent Numbers for the Stage One Survey Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>*Number of PSTs</th>
<th>Number of returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paper-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI 2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI 3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>166 = 73.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 above shows that the three universities in lower southern Thailand had 227 PSTs. The sample size is made up of the 166 PSTs who responded to the study’s questionnaire survey. The percentage of people who respond to a survey i.e., the ‘response rate’ is important as an adequate response rate ensures that the survey’s results are representative of the target population. For an educational survey, the class size of about 500 samples would require at least 65% response to be acceptable. The current study generated 166 respondents a 70% response rate which exceeds the minimum acceptance rate of 65% (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). Hence, the response rate of 166 out of 227 is considered sufficient to obtain an accurate result (see Appendix 19 for table of sample size estimation).

4.4.4 Data treatment: Statistical analysis of survey data.

The BQ-CLT questionnaire was designed to collect information related to what preservice teachers (PSTs) teachers think they will do in the classroom during an initial teaching experience. The first part of the BQ-CLT questionnaire (Appendix 4) collected participants’ profiling data on their gender, mother tongue, other languages they speak, their ability to use English, and their self-reported proficiency in English.

The main quantitative data gained from this tool was produced from the second part which included PSTs’ responses to the 6-point scale probing 24 beliefs statements about CLT under five themes. The total data from the 166 participants’ responses was entered into a data file and analysed statistically using the computer software program – Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 15. Statistical analyses carried out on the data included frequency; result percentages (%) for each of the beliefs statements and descriptive statistics were computed. The percentages of the responses were used to
describe the Thai EFL preservice teachers’ beliefs about language learning focusing their pedagogical orientation in relation to CLT.

4.5 Data Collection Stage Two: In-class Observation

4.5.1 Justification.
After the larger groups of 166 PSTs had provided data on what they believed about CLT, a subset of three PSTs was followed to capture how they have applied beliefs about CLT in their teaching practicum. While self-report questionnaire provided the whole picture as regards the ‘tendency’ of CLT application PSTs are likely to implement in their classrooms, the direct observation data were able to describe the current status of PSTs’ instructional practices. One of the roles of observational research is to describe what takes place in classrooms in order to delineate the complex practical issues that confront practitioners (Good, 2000). The aim of conducting observation in this study was to gain precise evidence to identify the relationship between teachers’ beliefs and teachers’ practices in terms of CLT instructions. The descriptions of instructional events that are provided by this method have also been found to lead to improved understanding and better models for improving teaching.

4.5.2 Participants.
Sampling
One of the main purposes of this study was to examine the extent to which the research subjects translated their stated beliefs about CLT into actual practices during their teaching practicum. Therefore, it was important to follow cases that held ‘robust’ tendencies in implementing the instructional practice in the way they had reported them. This critical case sampling selects certain cases “based on a specific purpose rather than randomly” (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003, p. 146). The process involves selecting a small number of critical cases i.e., cases that are likely to “yield the most information and have the greatest impact on the development of knowledge” (Patton, 2002, p. 236).

Fourteen of the 166 PST questionnaire survey respondents were deemed to be the most extreme critical cases, on the ground that they reported a level of CLT-oriented beliefs over 4.5. Their rating score signified highly positive beliefs towards the principles of CLT. Eleven of these PSTs were approached to see if they were willing to participate further in this research. They were informed that such participation was voluntary and their
informed consent to participate in the research was sought. For the pilot study, I next met seven PSTs whose practicum schools were easy to access. From these seven, four PSTs were purposively selected on the basis of convenience such as easy access to the site. One participant later withdrew from the project due to the political unrest situation that was taking place at that time around his practicum school. Finally, three PSTs participated in observation and postobservation stimulated recall stages of the project. Two of the PSTs were working in the lower-primary and higher-primary schools located in Yala urban city respectively. The other PST was doing her teaching practice in higher-secondary schools located in Pattani urban city which is about 40 km away from the researcher’s workplace in Yala.

**Samples: The three PSTs**

In the end three PSTs participated in this observation phase of this study. For ethical reasons they were given the pseudo names Anee, Budsaba, and Ceeham. The three participants were fifth-year university students studying an English Education Program. They were enrolled in the Teaching Practicum course for one academic year and were undergoing school-based teacher training in primary and secondary schools in Yala and Pattani provinces in the southernmost region of Thailand. The participants came from two state universities, UNI-1 and UNI-2. Both UNI-1 and UNI-2 are key institutions of teacher training in the regions; every year the universities admit many local students (mostly high school students) from the three southernmost provinces of Yala, Pattani, and Narathiwat. Their exposure to the use of English for communication in a real-life setting is very limited compared to that available to student teachers in major cities like Bangkok (Thailand’s capital city) or Phuket (a major tourist destination located on the Andaman Sea in the south of Thailand)

Two of the participants in this case stage were born, lived, and had finished high school in Pattani and Narathiwat – the two provinces in the deep south of Thailand; the other was a student who had been born and finished high school in Bangkok. For their teaching practicum placement, Anee and Budsaba went to primary and secondary schools in Yala and Ceeham was placed in secondary schools in Pattani. Each participant, having enrolled in the Teaching Practicum course (see Appendix 17 for details) at her own home university, was obligated to work as a teacher-trainee in the practicum schools for the full 2013 academic year (May 2013 - February 2014).
English proficiency and language profile

As stated above, two of the PSTs – Anee and Budsaba – were born and lived in one of Thailand’s three southern border provinces – one in Pattani and one in Yala where exposure to English is low. Ceeham was born in Narathiwat but had lived in Bangkok for 12 years before going to study at UNI-3 in Pattani province. Only Ceeham had regularly undertaken an extra, intensive course in reading and writing while in secondary school. In this course had become accustomed to using English for communication with her tutors who were American teachers; she had also had more opportunity to learn something of American culture where English is a native language. Budsaba rarely used English for genuine communication outside the classroom. Although Anee went to Malaysia approximately twice a year for family reasons she assessed her English ability as poor in speaking and in most English skills indicated ‘needs improvement’. While Budsaba’s skills are similar she perceived her English competence as very poor and as needing much improvement in all skill areas. Only Ceeham rated her ability to communicate in English as ‘good.’ She insisted on regarding herself as having a good command of writing and excellent reading skill. She claimed she frequently used English for communication particularly with her aunt who was a Thai national teacher of English language in a secondary school in Bangkok. Ceeham’s house and school were located not far from the business areas and tourism areas in Bangkok where she could often see foreign tourists. However, she reported she seldom interacted with English speakers, despite her aunt’s being an English language teacher at high school.

All three PSTs were defined as bilingual of Thai-Jawi (Malay dialect used in the three southern border provinces of Thailand among the group of Malay ethnics). A slight difference in the nature of bilingualism should be noted. Anee and Ceeham thought they had better command of Thai than of Jawi and they mostly spoke Thai for everyday conversations. Only Budsaba claimed to have fluent Jawi and standard Thai; she preferred to use Jawi for everyday interactions, mostly with family and friends who spoke primarily Jawi too. It is noted that Ceeham is the only one of the three cases who considered her language identity to be ‘almost’ bilingual in Thai-English with better Thai spoken command. However, Anee and Budsaba confessed that the quality of their genuine use of English skills was less than average. Ceeham was the only one of the three cases who was unable to use Jawi; but she could understand some basic Yawi. In this aspect, Anee and
Budsaba were identified as bilingual Thai-Jawi users, while Ceeham was assumed to be bilingual in Thai-English. It is noted that these language profiles came from the PSTs’ own self-assessments.

4.5.3 Methods and instrument.
Three methods were employed to collect data in the class observation stage of the case teachers’ practicum. First, their classroom teaching practice was observed using field notetaking with the aid of a voice recorder to capture and record all classroom behaviours. Second, the researcher collected artefacts relating to the particular PSTs’ teaching practices such as lesson plan, information sheet, worksheet, and other documents the PSTs believed would help the researcher to understand their classroom practice and the teaching context. The third method used to gather data was open-ended questionnaires; in the main, these used stimulated-recall questions. Here the classroom transcripts and the researcher’s marginal memos and comments were used as background information to stimulate a participant’s self-reflection about what was observed. In this part of the data collection process, the participants were expected to describe various aspects of their beliefs and practice (Mead & Mcmeniman, 1992, as cited in Meegan, 2007) and also their reflection on and justification of their observed practices (Mohamed, 2012).

The pilot study of classroom observation
The pilot study of classroom observation was undertaken during mid of June 2013 in the fifth week of the first semester of the PSTs’ teaching practicum. The objective of conducting a pilot study of classroom observation is to assess “the feasibility and usefulness of the data collection methods and revising them before they are used with the research participant” (Gass & Mackey, 2007, p. 3). The objective is to ensure the effectiveness of the research instruments used in this stage of data collection. I decided to conduct the pilot study with the selected participants. I followed the plan of collecting classroom data in three executive days – pre-while-post observation with each participant in their speaking practice lessons. The benefits gained from the pilot study were as follows:
-Instead of using field note-taking in paper and pencil form only, the researcher decided to use a computer for recording her field notes in MS Word.
The initial decision to use only a voice recorder was revised. In its place an iPod was used to make voice recording of classroom events and a smart phone was used to capture images of the teachers’ actions and some classroom activities. Generally, the pilot study helped to provide the researcher with a clearer picture of every aspect of the proposed classroom observation. Mostly, the important advantages gained from conducting the pilot study of class observation is that the researcher could examine the data-gathering process, in order to diminish and avoid potential problems, as well as any potential problem that might arise before carrying out the main study.

Procedures of observation

After the four potential participants had been purposefully selected invitations with an information sheet and permission letters were posted to schools and universities. Times and dates for classroom observations were negotiated by the researcher and the participants soon after the participants had indicated their willingness to participate in the observation and interview. The data collection procedure was divided into three stages: (1) data collection before class – preobservation, (2) in-class – w observation, and (3) after class – postobservation. The three classroom visits to observe each of the three participants were made over three consecutive days. On the first day, the participant completed a lesson plan sheet in order to provide the researcher with a brief description of the teaching procedure (lesson, topic, learning aim, activities) and information about students, class, text, material, and any relevant documents used (see Appendix 20). The observation of teaching practice was conducted on the second day. The researcher commenced the transcription of the observation data immediately after the second day’s observation. On the third day of the visit, the participant was given the transcription together with a stimulated-recall questionnaire (SRQ) (see Appendix 5) and was directed on how to respond to the questionnaire correctly. This meeting was for briefing/giving direction and explanation on how to answer the questionnaire. The participant was told to review the classroom transcriptions, recall her memories of the events, and then reflect on her interpretation of the events and her thinking at a particular point in time (Mackey & Gass, 2005). The participant was asked to return the questionnaire. Soon after theirs, subsequent observations will begin. Each phase of the data collection procedures is detailed below.
Induction on observation study: Meeting and briefing

Before commencing the observation study, the researcher met all three participants to build a rapport with them and to gain general information about their teaching practicum. The briefing was conducted to ensure that they had a clear understanding about the way in which the research would be conducted. The consent form was thoroughly reviewed by the participants to make sure that they fully understood the nature of the research study and the purpose of conducting classroom observation and to confirm that they were fully aware of all their rights as participants and understood ethical conduct. Generally, they were reminded that all information obtained was in connection with this study and that anything that could reveal their identities would be kept strictly and remain confidential and that nothing would be disclosed without their permission. Importantly, the participants had their anonymity and confidentiality of their information confirmed; they were also informed that their participation in the study would not affect their relationship with their practicum schools, universities, or teacher supervisors. Thus, they were free to give any information, especially anything that related to these schools, universities, the teacher education programme or any other educational offices involving the teaching practicum. The three PSTs were originally scheduled to be observed every other month starting in July 2013 i.e., 6 weeks after their teaching practicum began. This original intention was however reduced with each PST being observed twice in the first semester of the academic year 2013 (in July and September 2013) and once again in the second semester (at some time between November 2013 and January 2014). Table 4.6 below summarises the three phases of data collection for each set of classroom observation.
Table 4.6 Stages of Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation stages</th>
<th>Before class: Preobservation (Day 1)</th>
<th>On class: While observation (Day 2)</th>
<th>After class: Postobservation (Day 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Meeting and briefing</td>
<td>In-class observation</td>
<td>Meeting and briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection method/instruments</td>
<td>Record of lesson plan</td>
<td>Documents/Artefacts</td>
<td>Written questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field note-taking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Audio recording</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Before class: Pre-observation: (Day 1)**

On day one’s meeting, the researcher visited the participants’ practicum schools to collect the background information on the class to be observed; the participants had already been asked to fill out the Record of lesson plan—CO1 (see Appendix 20) which had given to them at the induction day’s briefing. The CO1 aimed to provide all the necessary information about the class to be observed. The important information covered everything the about the lesson plan (learning objectives, teaching plan in brief), level of students, class size, and especially the PST’s plan on implementation of CLT in the particular class to be observed. The participants were asked to return the form before day two’s visit. Prior to the start of the lesson observation on day two, the researcher reviewed all the information given in the CO1 and asked the participant some more questions if any more clarification was needed. One of the important purposes of the meeting was confirm the participant’s lesson plan and the schedule of classroom observation. Finally, the observation dates, places, and times were confirmed.

**On-class-While observation: (Day 2)**

The researcher’s role in the class observation study was that of a nonparticipant observer. Throughout the entire observation the researcher did not engage in any way with the PST or the students either in words or in action. On every classroom visit, the students told why the researcher had come to observe the class and that her focus on the teacher, not the students. This information was intended to comfort the students so that they could maintain their learning behaviours as normal. Thus, presence of the researcher in every lesson she observed did not seem to have any effect on the students. On the other hand,
the PSTs were informed that the focus of observation was on the students’ reaction to their teaching. This information was intended to help the PSTs to lower their anxiety and to support them in keeping to and implementing their teaching practices as planned. Some PSTs felt nervous being observed at the early sessions of the first observation because they had not been observed either by their supervisors or the school’s teacher trainer. Since they had been informed and assured by the researcher that the purpose of the observation was not a part of the official evaluation required for the completion of their Teaching Practicum course, no anxiety did not manifest itself in the subsequent observation. Moreover, the presence of the researcher did not have any effect on the PSTs’ teaching performance.

The accounts of the observations were collected through field note-taking, tape recording, and artefacts documenting. During each observation, the researcher as an observer and note-taker recorded all classroom events both actions and voice. A computer notebook was used to instantly record what the PSTs and students did and said, and an iPod was used to record any spoken discourse that took place in the classroom interactions and any other sounds that occurred during the observation. The audio taping was used to ensure all important data relating to classroom discourse, actions, and activities would be captured. Additional artefacts such as information sheets, worksheets, and other relevant materials were collected. These artefacts were used as tangible evidence of the observed teacher’s actual practice.

In total, I went to nine of the classes taken by the three PSTs. It should be noted that one PST suddenly changed her lesson plan before the observation began. This change was unexpected; however, the researcher was unable to reschedule another class observation because the class’ final examination nearing and the teaching practicum course was due to end soon. The planned communication-based lesson was replaced with a grammar-based lesson plan that aimed for linguistic mastery and grammar comprehension. The researcher decided to carry on with the observation as planned and to adjust the framework of the data collection and analysis to be based on the CLT principle of grammar teaching (Ellis, 2004; Karavas-Doukas, 1996) concept of grammar role, whereby the indirect and implicit role of grammar should be employed at all costs for a formal lesson on grammar. Therefore, the focus of data collection in this particular class is to identify the communicative language teaching of grammar. In addition, other aspects of
the CLT theme of classroom teaching were taken into consideration to identify the extent to which the PST utilised CLT aspects in this grammar instruction. Table 4.7 below summarises the transcripts from the nine observed lessons.

**Table 4.7 The Transcripts of the Lessons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSTs/Observation</th>
<th>Date of observation (Year 2013)</th>
<th>Class Level</th>
<th>Lesson (Observed)</th>
<th>Lesson (Planned)</th>
<th>Topic/Theme</th>
<th>Time Planned/Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>July 29</td>
<td>Primary year 6</td>
<td>Vocabulary &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>Vocabulary &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>Food &amp; Drink (a)</td>
<td>50/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
<td>Aug 22</td>
<td>Primary year 6</td>
<td>Vocabulary &amp; Dictionary Learning</td>
<td>Vocabulary &amp; Dictionary Learning</td>
<td>Personal Characteristic (c)</td>
<td>50/45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd</strong></td>
<td>Dec. 9</td>
<td>Primary year 6</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Telling Direction (a)</td>
<td>50/55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budsaba</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>July 17</td>
<td>Primary year 4</td>
<td>Vocabulary &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>Vocabulary &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>Holiday Camping (a)</td>
<td>40/45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
<td>Sept. 16</td>
<td>Primary year 5</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Vocabulary &amp; speaking</td>
<td>Daily Routine (b)</td>
<td>50/45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd</strong></td>
<td>Dec. 18</td>
<td>Primary year 5</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Vocabulary &amp; speaking</td>
<td>Personal Identity (b)</td>
<td>50/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceeham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>July 31</td>
<td>Secondary year 4</td>
<td>Vocabulary &amp; Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>Vocabulary &amp; Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>Life of Celebrities (a)</td>
<td>50/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
<td>Sept. 04</td>
<td>Secondary year 4</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Vocabulary &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>Where are you travelling? (b)</td>
<td>50/45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(a) A lesson relating to language skills.
(b) A structural lesson.
(c) A lesson relating to learning skills.

All the teacher’s and the students’ talk and actions were recorded and transcribed into words. In preparation for content analysis, each recording was played and replayed for verbatim transcription. For more accurate interpretation, information on the teacher’s and learners’ communicative acts was also included. The nonverbal elements were recorded in square brackets (for example, …[S6 is reading the note, holding it in her hand while presenting dialogue of role-play speaking]…), gestures …[Teacher points to the grammar formula and pattern of sentence structure shown on the board after asking Ss for the grammatical rules]…), the classroom atmosphere …(No student answers teacher’s question. Most of the Ss sit quietly. Some look down to read the information sheet and some look at the teacher…) and classroom interactions …[Many students raise their hands. T. promptly asks the two pairs of students who first raised their hands to stand up] …). The length of each stage/activity was recorded in minutes. Since the purpose of this study was to explore specifically how the teachers put CLT into practice student/s-student/s interaction and teacher-student/s interaction were carefully noted and recognised as the teacher’s successful attempt to provide opportunities for the students to use language for communication.

After class postobservation: (Day3): Hermeneutic inquiry process of data interpretation
The completing the postobservation questionnaire began on the third day of each visit. The SRQ written questionnaire was administered. Once each participant’s completed classroom observation had been completed and the researcher had finished the classroom transcription and attached the analytical memo and her initial comments on the observed classroom practices, the participants were asked to verify the contents of their classroom practice that had been observed, recorded and transcribed into a
‘classroom transcription’ that described the teachers’ and students’ actions and words, and also the classroom interactions between student/s-student/s and teacher-student/s. This current study employed Benner’s hermeneutic inquiry (1994) in describing PSTs’ experience of knowing, interpreting, correcting, and wholeness in relation to live stories and social contexts in the practicum school, and also any emerging forces that shape meanings of their teaching. According to Benner (1994), a hermeneutic inquiry is grounded in the belief that the researcher and the participants come to the investigation with fore-structures of understanding shaped by their respective backgrounds. Hence, in the process of interaction and interpretation, the researcher and the PST participants cogenerate an understanding of the phenomenon being studied. The complex process of data analysis involves moving back and forth between concrete data and abstract data, between inductive and deductive reasoning, between description and interpretation (Merriam, 1998). Koch (1995) referred to this process as entering into a hermeneutic circle of understanding that reveals a blending of meanings as articulated by the researcher and the participant’s coconstitutionality. The process started during the procedure of data collection along the 9 month-course of the three participants’ teaching practicum. The following steps present the process of observation analysis under member-checking hermeneutic inquiry, as followed by the researcher.

1. Researcher reads the observation transcription to obtain the overall picture of the classroom event.

2. Researcher reviews the transcript of classroom observation carefully line-by-line and episode by episode to produce a concept definition of the event in order to write interpretive summaries of each episode, and of each action. Important comments and analytical memos were noted.

3. Researcher returns the tentative interpretive summary to the participants for clarification or disagreement.

4. Researcher and the participants return to the transcription to resolve any disagreement.

5. Researcher writes a memo and a composite analysis for each text.

7. Researcher compares and contrasts text with the preset theme suggested by research literature on features of classroom events of English instruction and describes shared practices and common meanings.
During this process the PSTs were requested to show the extent of their agreement or disagreement to the researcher’s coding of the classroom activities and her comments; they were also able to offer some additional information to support their response. The participants had an opportunity to review and correct the contents of the classroom transcription. If necessary they could challenge some of the observer’s comments and interpretation of their teaching performance about anything which they did not agree with and could provide some information to support their opinion. This subsequent data provided valuable insights into the participants’ thinking about their practice which was unobservable to the researcher.

Stimulated recall (written) questionnaire (SRQ)

The stimulated recall questions were provided in the postobservation open-ended written questionnaire in order to gain two aspects of data; (1) the underlying reasons the PST participants gave to justify their actual classroom practices, and (2) the constraints and difficulties the PSTs themselves perceived as affecting their instructional decision-making around the observed practices.

Justification for using the stimulated-recall method

The stimulated recall method was applied as a strategy to help the researcher to pull out information from novice teachers who are believed to be inexperienced in recalling complex phenomenon relating to classroom practices and classroom interaction. Benjamin Bloom was accredited with using the term stimulated recall to describe this method for retrieving memories (Slough, 2001). Several studies about classroom practice and interaction (e.g., Plaut, 2006; Sime, 2006; Moreland & Cowie, 2007) gained insights from stimulated-recall inquiry when investigating beliefs and practices. According to Gass and Mackey (2000, p. 203), “Stimulated recall has been used to investigate various aspects of second language classrooms, its main contribution is to allow the researcher/s to view the classroom practices/instruction from the observant’s perspectives.” This study exemplifies this contribution based on the hermeneutic inquiry process in understanding that reveals a blending of meaning as articulated by the researcher and the participants’ coconstitutionality (Koch, 1995).

The SRQ in this study was designed to explore the Thai PSTs’ perceived challenges while on their teaching practicum in primary and secondary schools in Thailand. This study
applied Burns and Knox’s (2005) methods of stimulated recall in order to elicit the PSTs’ precise thoughts at particular points in a lesson and their responses to the researcher’s description and comments about their classroom practices. In particular, the stimulated recall method was used in this study with the more general purpose of facilitating the discussion and analysis of PSTs’ actions and rationales. All in all, this method provided the PSTs with the opportunity to verbalise their thoughts about their instructional decision-making. The step-by-step stimulated-recall method employed in this study can be summarised as follows:

**Step 1** After day 3 of postobservation when the researcher and the PSTs participants had completed hermeneutic inquiry, the researcher submitted the lesson transcripts to the PSTs so that they could comment on any parts of the transcript they wanted to discuss.

**Step 2** The researcher reviewed the PSTs’ responses and comments before selecting important parts of the lesson to be recalled and noted down the particular stimulated recall on each selected part. This so-called stimulated recall questionnaire (SRQ) would later be sent to the PSTs for questionnaire completion.

**Step 3** Participants were given about 7-10 days to review the SRQ along with the transcription so that they could identify what they wanted to comment on and what precisely they wanted to say.

**Step 4.** Participants returned the SRQ that contained their written comments on their thoughts and the reasons underlying each thought.

**Step 5.** If the written comments needed clarification, the PSTs were asked further stimulated-recall questions orally. The PSTs were then be invited to clarify their answers. The purpose of this follow-up stimulate recall was to allow the PSTs to recollect their instructional decisions and to explain precisely how they made those decisions.

The list of questions used with all PST participants in the postobservation phase is shown in Appendix 5.

**Justification of stimulated-recall in written questionnaire**

The justification for providing stimulated-recall inquiry in a written questionnaire (SRQ) is explained as follows: this study considered the strengths of a written questionnaire were more practical compared to interviewing in the study context. In the postobservation
pilot study where two participants had tried out both an interview and a written questionnaire, it appeared that they were more capable to provide answers in the written form than in spoken language especially when answering explanatory questions. The written questionnaire helped retrieve information about participants’ internal meanings and ways of thinking without being limited in their response time as would happen in an interview. The respondents could provide detailed information in their own words after a period of careful analysis of the classroom transcription and the researcher’s comments about the observed practices.

The PSTs responded more freely to the SRQ while providing some information about their internal meanings and ways of thinking. Such a free response is not always the case when answering interview questions in person. In particular in this study, the PSTs participants were the researcher’s students, so the written questionnaire was used to avoid the constraints that might possibly pertain during an oral interview, e.g., interviewees may try to show only what is socially desirable when confronting (discussing) face-to-face with an interviewer who is their superior. Thus, the most important benefit of using written questionnaires for stimulated recall inquiry in this study was that it helped eliminate the chance that the respondents could not recall important information that would needed when responding to the prompt questions found during a face-to-face interview. As previously shown in many studies, the advantages of written questionnaires include accuracy, clarity, and convenience (Marshall & Rossman, 1999).

Validation of the written SRQ

However, it is found that, in some cases and in some postobservation, that a stimulated recall question in written form could not assure the clarity of the students’ response. Some of the PSTs’ answers seemed to be general, unspecific, and unclear (e.g., “Yes I am very satisfied with the students’ performance of learning in this class”). Therefore, to validate the written-questionnaire data, this study included two modes of follow-up: a face-to-face interview via Skype and a follow-up question in written form via email. The former method was in cases where the latter mode was not able to clear up all of the PTS’s unclear answers.

One noted example of the incomprehensibility of answers provided by the PSTs occurred with the question: “What went well in your current lesson and how it like? In response to this question one PST just restated the question and stated briefly: “The pair work
practices of speaking went very well in this class.” In the follow-up questionnaire, the researcher highlighted the lack of clarity in this answer and added an eliciting question to stimulate the PST to give more specific, meaningful data. For example, the follow-up eliciting questions used in this study were: “Give more detail,” “Please clarify how the pair work went very well,” and “Please show students’ learning behaviour or action that support your answer”.

**Post observation meeting with evaluator fellow**

In the final stage, the postobservation meeting was then held. There the themes and categories identified by the researcher were presented to the research fellow. Initially, I planned to invite the PSTs’ school mentor to participate in this session but after the pilot study, it became clear that time conflicts would present a major challenge in completing this data interpretation. For that reason, two senior school teachers who had formerly participated in the content validation of the BQ-CLT translation session were invited. Both reviewers had over 30 years’ experience in EFL classroom teaching and had gone through the transition from the traditional method of teaching to the new approach of CLT. They had employed the CLT syllabus in their classroom practices for about 15-20 years before retirement. A briefing session was held between the researcher and each reviewer to review the method of data analysis and the focus of analysis. Beforehand, all the data relating to the coding of and comments on each observation and the classroom transcription were provided to the two reviewers so that they could verify the credibility of the interpretations (Pidgeon, 1998). Peer debriefing sessions were then organised to present the preliminary results in two open forums for teaching staff in the university. Finally, a confirmation audit was conducted by the researcher to verify that each finding could be traced back to the original data and that interpretations of the data were reasonable and meaningful (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 329). Any discrepancies identified in the process were resolved through discussions and with reference to the original records.

**4.5.4 Data analysis of observation data.**

The data collected in stage two was qualitative; it included field-notes observation data and written responses to the stimulated recall questionnaires and document data. All the data in the qualitative analysis was analysed through coding and manual analysis. The transcribed data and the written data were read and coded repeatedly to gain thorough understanding of the main ideas expressed there.
Precoding method

After each observation was completed on the day 2 of each single observation, the initial data analysis was carried out. First, the field notes which had recorded during in-class observation in the precoding stage were reviewed; comments and feedback the researcher had added on classroom practices as shaped into initial analytical memos. These field notes consisted of descriptive statements of what had happened in class during the time of observation. Data from the audiotape was simultaneously reviewed as part of this process of revising the data. At this stage, the transcriptions of the excerpts that portrayed the PSTs’ teaching practices was rechecked and finalised before coding. In the second cycle of data analysis, data coding was carried out to capture evidence signalling the emergence of CLT aspects in general and those that were specific to aspects of CLT (Karavas-Doukas, 1996) respectively. This process involved the ongoing nonlinear processing of the data to be focused on and illuminated (Merriam, 1998). A key element in coding data is to review, combine, and retrieve collected data and the researcher’s reflection on that information (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Focus coding for classroom practices

In order to illuminate the extent to with PSTs applied the principle of CLT or conducted five features of CLT in the classroom, the - ‘focus coding’ (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995) was used. This technique allowed for a thorough analysis of observation data with a particular focus on CLT implementation in the PSTs’ classroom practices. According to Richards and Morse (2007), the researcher the focus of the coding analysis technique is the field notes. Subjecting field notes to this technique enables fine-grained, line-by-line analysis that is based on topics that have already been identified as of particular interest. While coding, the researcher makes in-process memos to record and elaborate on any insights that occur during the coding process. Over time, “memos take on a more focused character.” The memo is integrated to clarify and link analytic themes and categories. Since codes are linkages that connect ideas or concepts with particular pieces of data, they can be considered heuristic devices (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 27).

To identify the relationship between the PSTs’ beliefs and their observed classroom practices regarding CLT the transcribed data from the classroom observation were first approached using the particular themes generated from the BQ-CLT survey. The
expressed beliefs which the selected three cases reported in beliefs questionnaire and written answers were set as the predetermined theme for further coding and for the observation data (see chapter 6 for more information).

The classroom observation data was also approached with the flexibility because flexible data analysis emphasises allowing the data to express the person’s actions (Li, 2013). This approach was used to uncover other CLT-based practices which might emerge during observation but which not had been characterised under the five particular themes of the CLT. In this way, the analysis of the data was also informed by the conceptual frameworks of CLT.

The analysis framework that was used was based on two frameworks of CLT analysis using two classroom observation schemes. These were: (1) the micro scale framework of analysis based on the five themes of CLT identified by Karavas-Doukas (1998), and (2) the macro scale framework of the broad principle of CLT. In coding the observation data, the classroom transcription and the PSTs’ written responses from the BQ-CLT in stage one were reviewed and evidence of the PSTs’ responses to their practices and the researcher’s analytical memo and comments on their practices were searched for. The analysis focused on five categories of CLT.

Appendix 8 (Start list of codes of the five CLT themes) presents the initial lists of the main features and the subfeatures of each theme to be focused on in the data analysis.

**4.6 Final Analysis of Research Data**

In the final analysis of the observation data and the postobservation data all the sources of data pertaining to the three PST participants were used. The survey was used to discuss their stated beliefs about CLT. The observation data was used to portray the extent to which they apply the principle of CLT in practice. After making a comparison between their stated beliefs and their observed practices, the effect of their stated beliefs in on their classroom practices was deciphered. The themes that emerged from the observation data were used to discuss the PSTs’ orientation to CLT. The postobservation data was analysed in order to provide insight into their construction of instructional decision-making or theory in use (Schon, 1991).
4.7 Quality of the Study

Trustworthiness of the study

The quality of quantitative inquiry is judged in terms of its validity and reliability (Cohen et al., 2011). Validity refers to the quality of the data collection procedure and how effectively it enables the research to measure what it set out to measure, while reliability refers to the accuracy and precision of the data collection procedure in terms of whether or not it enables the research to measure what it aimed to measure (Thorndike, 1997).

For qualitative inquiry, the concept of trustworthiness is applicable and should be addressed to ensure the research’s quality (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Trustworthiness is defined as that quality of an investigation procedure that makes it noteworthy for the readers (Schwandt, 2001). However, some studies adopt quantitative criteria which focus on the consistency of results, their replicability, and the generalisability of the research findings. This study ensures its trustworthiness by addressing those aspects of validity and reliability which correspond to the credibility to the internal validity, reliability, and confirmability of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000) as follows.

Credibility

Credibility refers to how accurately the study describes the phenomenon that it aimed to describe; credibility is fairly synonymous with internal validity in this sense (Shenton, 2004). This study employed different techniques to ensure that it accurately recorded the phenomenon under investigation, for example, methodological triangulation, member checking, and peer debriefing (for more details see section 4.9.5). The methods and strategies used for ensuring trustworthiness are explained below.

1. Triangulation

A significant method exploited used in this study to establish its credibility was triangulation. Triangulation refers to the use of multiple sources of data to enhance the rigour of the research (Bryman, 2008; Maxwell, 2012). The credibility of this study was achieved by collecting data from multiple sources (methodological triangulation), namely postobservation debriefing and documentation, classroom observations, and written questionnaire. The triangulation strategy is seen as an effective means of validating aspects of a qualitative study; triangulation helps to (1) compensate for the limitations of the individual data collection methods, and (2) helps to minimise the effects of possible
researcher bias in analysing and interpreting qualitative data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). In this study, triangulation is achieved in two ways: data collection and data analysis.

1.1 Triangulation of data collection

Triangulation of data collection was achieved through the technique of observing lessons in action and following these observations with the postobservation questionnaire where the PSTs and the researcher shared and reflected on their perception of classroom practices. In the postobservation, both general and specific recall of the classroom practices was prompted by the researcher and the PST participants. Recall was used in order: to clarify points of practice (e.g., “How well do you think the lesson went?”); to confirm or disconfirm understanding (“It appeared the students learned to memorise the rules. Do you aim for rote memorisation of grammar rules?”); and, to illustrate various notions of instructional decision-making (“I noticed you stopped the students’ interaction to correct grammatical errors? What are the reasons of that action?”).

1.2 Triangulation of data analysis

Triangulation was achieved in data analysis when the researcher returned the tentative emerging findings to all the PST participants for clarification of the analysis. This procedure was employed to gain benefit from the participants’ reflective feedback and develop mutual understandings of the phenomenon. The positive outcome gained from this method is that the PST participants were able to clarify the points of enquiry. In reality, the PSTs showed appreciation at having chances to engage in reviewing their teaching practices and to justify to the researcher’s comments. All the PSTs showed interest in the process of conducting this type of phenomenological research.

2. Member checking

The member checking technique was employed as a means of justifying the credibility in this study. The method encompasses requesting another person to interpret some of the data in order to evaluate the plausibility of the results and to indicate whether the findings are plausible. The member checking utilised in this study involved returning transcripts of the translation data to all the participants for clarification and modification (Bryman, 2008). This approach made sure that the participants’ stories were their own stories. The PSTs were therefore invited to make any changes to their lived stories wherever there were discrepancies between the researcher’s understanding and their own. The accuracy and completeness of the data gathered were maximised by the use of
audio recording, transcribing, translating, and analysing. After the nine observations were transcribed verbatim, the transcripts were double-checked by a team member who was an expert in EFL, prior to these being returned to the participants for either confirmation and disconfirmation; and for any modification of their observed actions. Confirmability is concerned with the degree to which the findings can be confirmed or corroborated by someone other than the researcher only. Establishing credibility helps ensure that the work’s findings are the result of the experiences and ideas of the informants rather than the characteristics and preferences or bias of the researcher (Shenton, 2004).

3. Peer examination

Peer examination was conducted during the process of developing the codes and categories used to analyse the observation data. A portion of the classroom transcripts was sent to two experts in EFL. They were invited to make comments on the codes already developed by the researcher. Episodes of classroom observation data including researcher’s analytical comments were also validated through data examination implemented by other experts in EFL in order to decrease any researcher bias in their interpretation. Any discrepancies that were uncovered resulted in a revision of the original codes (Dörnyei, 2007) and thus helped to increase the validity of the interpretation. In this study, various methods were employed to reduce the risk of misinterpretation.

4. Debriefing

Debriefing is a concurrent process of member-examining. It is achieved by discussing and analysing some of the raw data. Superiors, colleagues or peers participate in assessing the credibility of findings. This method was employed during the data analysis process when all interpretations and findings were discussed with the experts in the field. Moreover, valuable feedback and comments were also obtained from participating in a workshop in the U.K. and at educational conferences. Attending these helped in confirming and refining my observations and interpretations. This approach helped to enhance the interpretive validity (i.e., a valid description of events, behaviour, and situations in the settings under study) of the study.

Lastly, this study has credibility because it shows evidence of lengthy engagement in the area by accurately explaining what happened and without contamination through other components (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Data for this study was collected over a period of 9
months. The data collection spanned a full term from May 2013-January 2014. Before the questionnaires were distributed, the researcher contacted both the preservice teachers, university teacher, and school teachers in order to locate a suitable research site and manage the time available for the study.
CHAPTER 5
RESULT OF SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS

5.1 Research Aim and Research Questions
This chapter presents the findings on 166 preservice teachers ’beliefs about communicative language teaching (CLT) at the beginning of their school-based teaching practicum; these findings are based on data gained from the self-report questionnaire about CLT (Karavas-Doukas, 1986). The questionnaire investigates the beliefs CLT that the PSTs possessed prepracticum and identifies the extent to which they implemented classroom instruction in accordance to their reported beliefs during the course of their initial practicum . This instrument collected data on a range of variables that impact on PSTs ‘beliefs and practice . Data was collected from PSTs in three southern Thailand universities . The research design involved rating scales to establish PSTs ‘beliefs about CLT under five specific themes (see chapter 4) and highlighted changes in beliefs over the duration of the practicum course . Chapter 6 will explore stage two of this research project using qualitative-observation data gathered from the subsample cases that particularly relates to the classroom practice experience of three PSTs . Research questions addressed by the survey data are:

Research Question 1. What are the stated beliefs of EFL preservice teachers (PSTs) about Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) before the start of their teaching practicum?

Subquestion :What are the profiles of preservice teachers in terms of (i) gender, (ii) languages, and (iii) self-assessment English qualification?

All questions were addressed by the BQ-CLT questionnaire instrument . In its analysis of the survey findings, section 5.2 displays the PSTs ‘demographic data and language profiles; section 5.3 summarises the main statistical analysis, and section 5.4 portrays the findings on PSTs ‘beliefs under five CLT themes.
5.2 PSTs Profiles

Table 5.1: Demographic Data and Language Profile (N =166)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Frequency%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language command</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawi</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Thai and Jawi</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English ability (self-assessment)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the beginning of the academic year 2013 (May 2013-February 2014) teaching practicum course the self-report questionnaire about CLT was administered to fifth year English Language preservice teachers in three universities located in Thailand’s southernmost region. Participants were classified by gender, first languages, and their English proficiency as summarised in Table 5.1. From a possible 227 EL PSTs, the 166 73.13 who returned their completed questionnaire were deemed to constitute a valid sample.

The participants’ ages ranged from 21-23 years old which suggests not only that the PST participants in this study started their education in the early 1990s (1992-1993) but also implies that as students these PSTs might have experienced the student-centeredness approach to language teaching imposed by educational reform commencing in 1999 (OEC., 2007). CLT was introduced into English classes in 2001 (NEC, 2004). Hence, these PSTs might have learned and observed aspects of CLT during their upper-secondary education.
schooling years before entering teacher-education. Curriculum innovation has taken general language teaching down two tracks: ‘the meaning track’ and ‘the accuracy track’. The meaning track means that greater attention is paid to understanding, processing, and articulating ideas and concepts in a student-centered, creative, confidence-building way. The accuracy track deals with pronunciation, word and sentence formation, spelling, and other specific form-focused skills such as drill and cognates (Preece, 2009). Therefore, the PSTs in this study experienced the transition from a behaviourist grammar-based and skill-based approach to a constructivist ‘meaning-focused). Responses to the question asking: ‘What are your first languages?’ (First languages or L1) 47% of the PSTs stated that they habitually use two languages: Thai, the official school language and Jawi, their family language formally referred to as Pattani-Malay (Permsrirat, 2008). About 39% of participants stated Jawi was their first language. About 13.3% reported Thai was their only mother-tongue and everyday language. A few respondents opted ‘other’ languages, adding that their first language was Southern Thai, a dialect spoken by most Southerners living around the ten upper southern provinces. Appendix 21. (People in the southern border provinces of Pattani, Yala, and Narathiwat account for just 5% of Thai speakers as the majority of the inhabitants in these provinces Muslim-Malay ethnic.) Charakanokkul, 2010. (This 72% majority speaks Jawi mostly in their homes and uses both Jawi and Standard Thai in the formal secular situation. On the whole, the languages used in the southernmost provinces are Jawi, Southern Thai, Standard Thai and other Malay dialects. Jawi is the first language and mother tongue for most people in the area; in this way the area differs from other parts of the country, where the Thai language is widely used (Nookua, 2009). The Thai and Jawi-speaking PSTs seemed not to feel that either language was dominant. Bilingualism studies suggest language users possessing similar fluency in two languages and little interlingual interference are known as ‘balanced bilinguals’ (Lambert, 1998; Rosenberg, 1996). The PSTs in this study are competent in both Thai and Jawi. Thai-Jawi bilinguals choose language depending on the language in which their interlocutor speaks and the context. For example, they speak Thai when Jawi and Thai-speaking teachers participate together. About 45% revealed they preferred to speak Jawi to Jawi-speaking teachers when interacting with them privately outside the classroom. Context also influences choice of language. For example, the Jawi-speaking PSTs speak
Jawi among their group while participating in discussion activity but switch to Thai when preparing for presentation of work.

The data show 13.3% perceived Thai as their only first language. In the southern border contexts, being Thai monolingual is associated with their cultural identity as non-Muslim ethnic people who have grown up speaking only Thai (Herriman, 2005). Rationally, Thai monolinguals appear highly familiar and secure with Thai as the medium of classroom discourse in English classes in Thai primary and secondary schools (Premsrirat, 2008; Forman, 2007). Of the Thai monolingual group, 5.8% were from Muslim-Malay ethnic families and had not grown up in a Jawi-speaking family or community. Two of these used either standard Thai while six used Southern Thai. Socially and geographically, Muslim-Malay ethnic people speak Southern Thai while those in lower southern Thailand’s other regions speak standard Thai or local Thai such as Northern Thai and North-eastern Thai (see also Appendix 21 – Maps of southern Thailand) (Nookua, 2012). About 39% identified themselves as Jawi-dominant-Thai bilinguals. Their command of Thai was less well developed compared to their Jawi communication. About 19% pointed out that their spoken Jawi was better than their spoken Thai. Only 9% stated they could write in Jawi for religious purposes; however, it was not as good as their writing in Thai. Among the 85% whose language identity was attached to Jawi, about 56% did not know the Jawi script and could read and write in Thai only. Almost all preferred to use Thai and Jawi with schoolmates, friends, and family members of the same ages. The balanced Thai-Jawi bilinguals and Jawi-dominant bilinguals could switch instantly and effortlessly between Thai and Jawi. This code-switching between Jawi and standard Thai is common in everyday communication amongst Thai-Jawi-speaking people (Herriman, 2005). For Thai-Jawi bilingual PSTs, their language preference depends on who they speak with. In most English language classrooms, Jawi-speaking student-teachers, normally spoke Jawi with interlocutors who did not speak Thai and Thai with interlocutors who did not know Jawi. Jawi-speaking PSTs (72%) used Thai in schools and workplaces and Jawi in their homes and with their in-group community. Thai monolinguals living among the Thai-Jawi bilingual community might speak basic Jawi in informal situations but not in formal settings such as studying in the classroom (Suwannathat-Pian, 2008). This behaviour of language use reveals that people restrict their languages to certain uses. Jawi and Thai are used commonly by most people to create a unique identity of
cultures and languages known as a ‘stable bilingual’ society using these languages (Nookua, 2012).

Regarding exposure to English language, Thai-Jawi or Jawi-Thai PSTs learned English as a foreign language when entering primary schools in the same manner to Thai monolinguals. Thai monolinguals learned English as their first ‘foreign language. ‘Jawi-speaking children who learned Thai after knowing and using Jawi in their everyday lives perceive Thai as their second language, and English as a third language. Understanding Thai classroom instruction is a challenge for Jawi-speaking pupils when they first start secular schools (Charakanokkul, 2010). For Thai-Jawi bilinguals living in a country where Thai is used in wider society and imposed as the official language of classroom discourse. Learning English to accomplish the standard of achievement would be laborious. Students from the Thai-speaking community familiar with the Thai language since day one at school would have found using Thai as their classroom language is easier. Balanced bilingual PSTs perceived Thai and Jawi as their native languages and learned English as their first foreign language in the same way that the Thai monolinguals did.

English language in Thailand is recognised by students as a subject rather than a language. Students are exposed to English use only in classrooms (Fry, 2001). This limited exposure to English in natural communication means Thai students underachieve in communicating effectively in English (Punthumasen, 2007). About 94% of PSTs assessed themselves as average or under-average users of English. More than half needed to undertake intensive practice to accomplish Standard English use (see Appendix 7).

On the basis of the rubric of self-assessment of English proficiency (Brown, 2000, Appendix 5.1), only 10 (6%) PSTs evaluated their English qualification as ‘Good. ‘No one appraised, his/her English competence as ‘Very Good’’. Over 60 PSTs (37.3%) rated their English ability as ‘Poor ’ on the basis that their English communication was generally not effective. Eleven PSTs (6.6%) assessed their ability to use English as ‘Very Poor ‘indicating that they had no effective communication skills and made many errors. Half of the PSTs rated themselves as ‘Average.’. More than half revealed that intensive practice in speaking and writing is ‘a must do ‘in achieving standard communicative competence as a qualified English teacher. Some participants revealed they were not confident speaking English with Thai national English teachers or English native speakers. About 15% confessed they were not sure about using English in the classroom and 11% stated that
this reluctance was due to their poor spoken English. This data shows that teacher ability in the target language is an influential factor regarding language preference in teaching and that it may affect their use of the English language on practicum.

5.3 Analysis and Presentation of the Numerical Data

For analysis, negative statement scores were reversed to emphasise support/no support for CLT principles. For example, a participant strongly agreeing with the statement “Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged” would score 6. However, as that response expressed no support for CLT reversing this score to ‘1’ is consistent with low orientation towards CLT. Throughout the data, high scores indicate strong agreement or strong support for the CLT belief being measured whereas low scores imply low support for or disagreement with CLT.

PSTs’ responses to statements were analysed using frequency counts and percentages. The degree of the strength of response determined the probability of the respondents’ behaviour (Oppenheim, 2000). Responses yielding ‘slight’ degrees (Slightly Agree or Slightly Disagree) do not reflect strong support for CLT beliefs and so might result in a low or small possibility of CLT being applied in practice. Hence, for positively-phrased statements (statements 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24), only ‘Agree’ and ‘Strongly Agree’ responses were aggregated under ‘Positive beliefs toward CLT.’ For example, responses to the positive concept in statement 12: “Knowledge of the language rules does not guarantee ability to use the language,” revealed 16% of PSTs strongly agreed, and 51% of PSTs agreed with this statement. So, 66% of the PSTs held ‘clear’ positive beliefs towards CLT; 34% of PSTs who did not have definite ‘positive beliefs, producing an aggregation of 25.9% for %Slightly Agree,’ 2.4% for %Slightly Disagree,’ 4.8% for %Disagree,’ and 0.6% for %Strongly Disagree’ (see table 5.4). Conversely, for negatively phrased statements (1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23) ‘Slightly Agree’ and ‘Slight Disagree’ responses were aggregated with ‘Agree’ and ‘Strongly Agree’ and put under ‘Negative beliefs toward CLT.’ For example, the negatively phrased statement 1: “Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged” obtained no ‘Strongly Disagree’ responses and only 1.2% ‘Agree’ responses. This indicates that 1.2% of PSTs hold positive beliefs toward CLT. The remaining 98.8% PSTs with negative beliefs can be broken down as follows:
22.3 %‘Strongly Agree,’ 52.3 %‘Agree, 21.7 %‘Slightly Agree’ and 2.4 %‘Slightly Disagree’. These results suggest that most PSTs ‘beliefs align with grammatical correctness promoting language learning.

**5.4 Analysis of PSTs’ repracticeum Beliefs**

Detailed results from the prepracticeum survey of PSTs beliefs are presented at the statement level and thematically in Tables 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, and 5.8. In section 5.5 percentages are used to report response frequency.

**5.4.1 Descriptive Statistics for CLT scales**

To determine agreement with themes, mean levels of agreement were tabulated. The statements were categorised into five CLT principles. PSTs’ responses were scored as described above and entered into an SPSS (Version 15) database. Scores for each statement under each theme were summed to calculate mean scores.

Table 5.2 shows mean scores, standard deviation (SD), minimum, and maximum scores for each CLT theme together. CLT themes are presented in rank order of the mean scores from high (support for the theme to low) little support.

**Table 5.2: PSTs’ Beliefs about CLT’s Five Themes (N =166)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of CLT</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Role and Learning Contribution (S)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Group Work/Pair Work (U)</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Role (T)</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Correction: Fluency or Accuracy (E)</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Grammar (G)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data show most participants did not strongly agree with any CLT theme. The narrow range of mean scores (4.1-3.4) suggests PSTs neither hold strong agreement nor strong disagreement with any CLT theme. For each thematic mean, the SD is lower than 1.00, which means participants’ beliefs about CLT were consistent across the cohort.

Trends in the above table indicate PSTs held modest positive beliefs towards two CLT themes relating to Student Role and Learning Contribution and Use of Group/Pair Work. PSTs expressed negative beliefs about the Place of Grammar and Error Correction. Slight agreement with the Role of the Teacher contrasted with support for Role of Students.
This trend towards ‘low positive’ and divided beliefs about CLT themes is explored further to examine how and in what way PSTs ‘beliefs about each theme and subtheme vary or are shared across the cohort.

**Data presentation for analysis of the PSTs’ beliefs about five CLT themes**

For analysis, negative statement scores were reversed to emphasise support/no support for CLT principles. For example, a participant strongly agreeing with the statement “Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged” would score 6, but would be seen as expressing no support for CLT. Reversing this score to ‘1’ is consistent with low orientation towards CLT.

Throughout the data, high scores indicate strong agreement or strong support for the CLT belief being measured while low scores imply low support for or disagreement with CLT. PSTs’ responses to statements were analysed using frequency counts and percentages. The degree of the strength of response determined the probability of the respondents’ behaviour (Oppenheim, 2000). Responses yielding slight ‘degrees’ (Slightly Agree ‘or ‘Slightly Disagree’) do not reflect strong support for CLT beliefs so might result in a low or small possibility of CLT being applied in practice.

Hence, for positively-phrased statements (statements 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24) only ‘Agree’ and ‘Strongly Agree’ responses were aggregated under ‘Positive beliefs toward CLT.’ For example, responses to the positive concept of statement 12: “Knowledge of the language rules does not guarantee ability to use the language,” revealed 16 % of PSTs strongly agreed, and 51 % of PSTs agreed with this statement. So, 66 % of the PSTs held ‘clear’ positive beliefs towards CLT. The 34 % of PSTs who did not have ‘definite’ positive beliefs were an aggregation of 25.9 % ‘Slightly Agree,’ 2.4 % ‘Slightly Disagree, 4.8 % ‘Disagree,’ and 0.6 % ‘Strongly Disagree’ (see Table 5.4).

Conversely, for negatively-phrased statements (1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23) ‘Slightly Agree’ and ‘Slight Disagree’ responses were aggregated with ‘Agree’ and ‘Strongly Agree’ and put under ‘Negative beliefs toward CLT.’ For example, the negatively phrased statement 1: “Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged” obtained no ‘Strongly Disagree’ responses and 1.2 % ‘Agree’ responses. This aggregation gives 1.2 % of PSTs holding positive beliefs toward CLT. The remaining 98.8 of % PSTs with negative beliefs comprise 22.3 % ‘Strongly Agree,’ 52.3 % ‘Agree,’ 21.7 % ‘Slightly Agree,’ and 2.4 % ‘Slightly Disagree’. This finding
suggests most PSTs’ beliefs align with grammatical correctness promoting language learning.

In Table 5.3 - 5.7 below the first two columns present the summative scores representing positive beliefs towards CLT and negative beliefs towards CLT respectively. The columns shaded grey were the mean score and percentage under the particular rating scale aggregated into positive beliefs scores.
### 5.4.2 Analysis and Interpretation of PSTs ’Beliefs Data in five CLT themes.

**Table 5.3: PSTs’ Beliefs about Place of Grammar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1. Place of Grammar</th>
<th>Positive Beliefs towards CLT</th>
<th>Negative beliefs towards CLT</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement (Mean/SD)</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Grammar should be taught only as a means to an end. (5.25/0.72)</td>
<td>143 86.10 13.90 67 40.50 76 45.60 21 12.70 - 2 1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Knowledge of rules cannot guarantee language ability. (4.71/0.92)</td>
<td>110 66.30 24.70 26 15.70 84 50.60 43 25.90 4 2.40 8 4.80 1 0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*23. Direct grammar instruction is essential for learning to communicate. (2.50/1.08)</td>
<td>13 7.80 92.20 23 13.90 70 42.20 49 29.50 11 6.60 11 6.60 1 0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*15. CLT produces inaccurate learners (2.43/0.94)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>92.80</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>49.40</td>
<td>28.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*17. Mastery of grammar rules produces an effective communicator (2.31/1.13)</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*1. Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion of language performance (2.08/0.91)</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average frequency</th>
<th>48.67</th>
<th>117.33</th>
<th>35.70</th>
<th>77.84</th>
<th>38.90</th>
<th>5.34</th>
<th>7.70</th>
<th>0.52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of all statements (3.23/0.37)</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td>70.70</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>46.90</td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Symbolises negatively-phrased statements

Cells in grey represent the aggregation of positive beliefs towards CLT.
**Theme 1: Beliefs data about the place of grammar**

The great majority of the PSTs (93%) disagreed with the CLT notion, perceiving the knowledge of rules is an essential key to producing an effective communicator (statement 17). In the same vein a similar percentage of the PSTs devalued that CLT approach, in the capacity in producing fluent speaker who might possess inaccurate use of language (statement 15). This consistency of ‘negative ’beliefs toward the CLT role of grammar was confirmed with the great majority of the PSTs judging that grammatical accuracy is the most important competency of effective users (statement 1) and believing in direct instruction of grammar and grammatical corrections are needed for effective communicative learning (statement 23, 1). Data explicitly showed a salient pattern of beliefs that the PSTs positively responded both to the pro-CLT concept of grammar and the anti-CLT concept of grammar.

**Main interpretation**

The slight discrepancy of beliefs toward the CLT aspect of grammar teaching is apparently captured in the findings that a majority of PSTs responded positively to the CLT aspect of grammar’s role (statements 3 and 12) and showed favourable responses to the anti-CLT notion of grammar teaching (statements 15, 17, and 23). It seems the participants agreed to both the positive sides and negative sides of the grammar teaching concept, however with higher overall beliefs oriented to non-CLT aspects of grammar role. As shown in the table, on average, about two-thirds of participants seems to hold non-CLT beliefs compared to merely one-third holding CLT-oriented beliefs. Also, the average mean score of around 3 (see Table 5.2) suggests the PSTs in this study rather preferred the traditional concept of grammar instruction and its role. All in all, the PSTs preferred language classroom practices that embrace traditional, direct grammar teaching with explicit focus on the ‘structure of linguistic knowledge.

Holding inconsistent beliefs seems to be the salient aspect found in their belief regarding grammar role. The great example was the mismatch between their agreement regarding the indirect, implicit grammar role and their agreement regarding grammatical accuracy.
### Table 5.4: Beliefs Data about Use of Group/Pair Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 2 . Use of Group/Pair Work (Mean/SD)</th>
<th>Positive Beliefs towards CLT</th>
<th>Negative beliefs towards CLT</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Group work promotes cooperative learning and genuine interaction. (5.31/0.60)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.80</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>38.60</td>
<td>54.20</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Group work promotes skills of problem-solving and self-learning. (5.25/0.72)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.20</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>38.60</td>
<td>48.80</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*13. Group work wastes time. (3.04/1.31)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>78.30</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>31.30</td>
<td>22.30</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Students might use mother tongue during group work, so difficult and have little use. (2.89/1.27)

| Average frequency % of all statements | 94.50 | 71.50 |
| Cells in grey represent the aggregation of positive beliefs towards CLT. | 54.95 | 48.05 |

*Symbolises negatively-phrased statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25</th>
<th>141</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>84.90</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>31.90</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 2: Beliefs data about use of group/pair work

Among the four statements about Use of group/pair work, the most favourable responses to the CLT concept were obtained for statement 2 ($x = 5.31$). The vast majority of the participants (93%) reported agreement with the benefit of group/pair work in fostering cooperative learning and genuine interaction among language learners. No participant indicated disagreement and only a few (7%) of them slightly disagreed with this statement.

The high agreement is also reflected in the responses to statement 9 ($x = 5.25$), as less than 2% of respondents expressed uncertainty about group/pair work in organising classroom experience. Thus, participants acknowledged that group work activities can generate cooperative learning, allowing students to acquire problem-solving skills and promote natural communication. Responses to statements 13 ($x = 3.04$), and 22 ($x = 2.89$), show less agreement. Here, about 22% supported group/pair work, whereas almost 80% of the participants (98.3%) disagreed with its use due to their high concern about time limitation and difficulty in monitoring students’ performance.

Main interpretation

PSTs’ beliefs about CLT notions of group/pair work ranged from overwhelming ‘positive’ beliefs towards the strength of group work in promoting genuine interaction among the students to the slightly ‘negative’ beliefs towards constraints in organising group/pair work such as issues with time consumption and monitoring students’ performance. A very small majority of participants slightly support CLT principles about using group/pair work, while about 46% disagreed. This result indicates that the PSTs were divided in their beliefs about using group/pair work. Despite participants’ inconsistent beliefs towards the different aspects about using group/pair work in this BQ-CLT survey, they held overall positive beliefs towards CLT notion. Compared to their beliefs about the role of grammar, the participants held higher positive orientation to the use of group/pair work for CLT. Yet, as a group, the PSTs were divided in their beliefs about using group/pair work in CLT way.
Table 5.5: Beliefs Data about Error Correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 3. Treatment of Error Correction (Mean/SD)</th>
<th>Positive Beliefs towards CLT</th>
<th>Negative beliefs towards CLT</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The teachers’ feedback must be focused on the appropriateness over the linguistic form. (5.08/0.87)</td>
<td>137 82.40</td>
<td>29 17.60</td>
<td>52 31.20</td>
<td>85 51.20</td>
<td>23 13.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 2.40</td>
<td>2 1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Errors are a normal part of learning, much correction is not needed. (3.55/1.39)</td>
<td>53 31.30</td>
<td>113 69.70</td>
<td>7 4.20</td>
<td>45 27.10</td>
<td>41 24.70</td>
<td>35 21.10</td>
<td>25 15.10</td>
<td>13 7.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All grammatical errors should not be ignored in promoting perfect learning. (1.62/0.86)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbolises negatively-phrased statements</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>162</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average frequency and % of all statements</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>97.60</td>
<td>55.40</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cells in grey represent the aggregation of positive beliefs towards CLT
Theme 3: Beliefs data about treatment of error correction

The CLT-based statement 6 generated the highest mean score (x=5.08), from the majority of PSTs (82.40%) showing that they emphasised the ‘appropriateness of use’ over ‘accuracy of linguistic form’ if errors correction is required. In responding to statement 14, around 70% of participants indicated they did not perceive language errors to be a natural part of language study and that they might regard much correction as being necessary for enabling effective learning by eliminating this unusual element of learning. Statement 10 which addresses the opposing notion to statement 14 generated a low mean score (x=1.6), by the great majority of participants (97.6%). implying the PSTs as a group regarded grammatical errors is important to ensure flawless, perfect language learning.

The data shows discrepancy of beliefs about error correction was found between the two opposing aspects of much correction, i.e., statements 10 and 14 when they reported preference for the non-CLT notion about unselective correction of grammatical at one time and reported a disregard for the non-CLT aspect about much and frequent correction at another time. However, their reported beliefs about grammatical accuracy was to a greater extent matched with their previously professed support towards grammatical mastery in regard to the role of grammar (see section 5.4.2/1). Their endorsement to explicit, frequent correction and language accuracy as perfect learning were in accord with the great attention to the explicit role of grammatical accuracy they had reported formerly.

In sum, the PSTs in this study held ‘consistent ‘unfavourable beliefs towards the CLT principle of the grammar role and the CLT way of error correction, in particular the correction that relates to grammar knowledge. In comparison to their beliefs in other themes, the participants held slightly positive beliefs regarding the CLT view of error correction.
### Table 5.6: Beliefs Data about Teacher Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 4 : Teacher Role statements (Mean/SD)</th>
<th>Positive Beliefs towards CLT</th>
<th>Negative Beliefs towards CLT</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 . The textbook should be supplemented by the teacher to satisfy the individual needs. (5.33/0.78)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 . The teacher as a transmitter of knowledge is only one of the teacher’s many different roles. (4.76/0.95)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 . The teacher as ‘authority ’and ‘instructor ’is no longer the language teacher’s role. (4.69/1.09)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>% of All Statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*21. Students do their best when taught as a whole class by the teacher’s formal instruction. (2.67/1.14)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*11. Satisfying students’ needs is impossible in a large class size.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*19. The role of the language teacher is to impart knowledge. (2.03/0.83)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average frequency and % of all statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.62/0.40)</td>
<td>68.83</td>
<td>41.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Symbolises negatively-phrased statements

Cells in grey represent the aggregation of positive beliefs towards CLT.
Theme 4: Beliefs data about teacher role

The important findings gained from the data above is that of divided beliefs of the PSTs. The majority appear to agree with pro-CLT statements about the teacher’s role (statements 24, 16, and 7) and at the same time, agreed with anti-CLT statements about teacher roles (statements 21, 11, and 19). This finding indicates that the participants were divided in their beliefs towards the role of the teacher in a language course. Statement 21 shows the majority (86%) regarded the traditional teacher-fronted mode as being the best one for students ’best learning.

The PSTs responded differently to statements about learners ‘individual needs (statement 24 and statement 11). The responses to statement 24 show that the majority of participants (88%) endorsed the teacher role as a resource who was obligated to satisfy the different needs of the learners, while statement 11 exhibits a greater majority (92.8%) of those who disregarded the individual differences due to the problem of large class size. On average, almost 60% cling to the teacher role as the main source of knowledge and the teacher as authoritative instructor. CLT-based characteristics of the teacher were not endorsed by the PSTs in general as a small number of them (41%) regarded the teacher role as that of a facilitator. Similarly, organising small group learning and meeting students ’individual needs were not accepted by a majority.

The simple conclusion than could be drawn here is that the PST participants might regard both traditional and communicative aspects of a teacher’s roles in their teaching implementations.
Table 5.7: Beliefs Data about Student Role and Contribution to Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 5: Student Role and Contribution to Learning (Mean/SD)</th>
<th>Positive Beliefs towards CLT</th>
<th>Negative beliefs towards CLT</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The learner-centred approach encourages self-responsibility for language learning. (5.20/0.79)</td>
<td>142 85.60</td>
<td>24 14.00</td>
<td>64 38.60</td>
<td>78 47.00</td>
<td>19 11.40</td>
<td>2 1.20</td>
<td>3 1.80</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students’ needs. (5.10/0.88)</td>
<td>136 81.90</td>
<td>30 18.10</td>
<td>58 34.90</td>
<td>78 47.00</td>
<td>20 12.00</td>
<td>2 1.20</td>
<td>8 4.80</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Most students acquire language when it is used as a vehicle for doing something else and not when it is studied in a direct way. (4.71/0.92)</td>
<td>122 67.50</td>
<td>44 32.50</td>
<td>26 15.70</td>
<td>86 51.80</td>
<td>38 22.90</td>
<td>5 3.00</td>
<td>11 6.60</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training learners to take responsibility for their own learning is futile since learners are not used to such an approach. (3.23/1.47)

Students should not suggest the content and the activities they like. (2.43/0.99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>43</th>
<th>123</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.90</td>
<td>74.10</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>33.70</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average mean, frequency and % of all statements (4.13/0.50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>90.2</th>
<th>75.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.30%</td>
<td>45.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Symbolises negatively-phrased statements

Cells in grey represent the aggregation of positive beliefs towards CLT.
Theme 5 Beliefs data about student role and contribution to learning.

The data demonstrates that statements 8 and 20 which explore the core notion of student-centred’ self-learning a gnikam ‘contribution and students’ individuality was endorsed by the majority of the PST participants. It appears that only 14 %of PSTs expressed disagreement with the improvement of learner autonomy and 18 %did not substantively agree with adapting tasks and activities to suit individual needs. However, inconsistency of beliefs was found as, in the mean times, the great majority of participants, showed negative beliefs towards self-learning (statement 4) and individual needs satisfaction (statement 5).

The responses here contrasted with those for statements 8 and 20. The great inconsistency of beliefs could be simply described as follows. While the PSTs preferred the CLT role of students as autonomous learners, they did not agree with the students ‘individual need and students-centred notion. Also, the students ’role as language users was not endorsed by the majority of the PSTs.

Overall, about 54 %were more positive towards the CLT aspect of active and higher independent behaviour of learners in language classrooms. A smaller Number (46%) reported believing in the passive and teacher-dependent behaviour of students. Here, the PSTs were divided in their perception towards CLT student-centred tenets. It is noteworthy that many inconsistencies were found between the beliefs about the student’s role and the teacher’s role they had formerly expressed. It should be noted that statement 8 that obtained the highest mean score amongst all 24 statements underlines the notion that students should have self-responsibility in learning.

5.5 Summary

Despite some ‘slight ’agreement of beliefs, the Thai EFL PSTs in this study, as a group, they did not profoundly agree with any of the five CLT themes (Karavas Doukas, 1998). The PSTs neither had a strong agreement nor held strong disagreement regarding any of the five CLT themes. The Thai EFL PSTs had unpromising CLT-oriented beliefs with a mixture of both CLT and non-CLT concepts. They appeared to hold mildly favorable to favorable attitudes towards the communicative approach. The findings here are therefore similar to those relating to EFL teachers in previous studies (Karavas-Doukas, 1996).
A small majority held modestly positive beliefs towards two themes of CLT notions relating to use of group/pair work and students ’contribution to learning. In contrast, only a minority regarded the communicative aspect of grammar instruction and preferred the CLT-based treatment of error correction. PSTs ’beliefs towards each theme of CLT at the statement level reported internal inconsistency of beliefs. These unstable viewpoints were constantly found in the responses towards the paired-opposite statements associated with particular subconcepts of language teaching/learning. The greatest mismatch beliefs occurred with their beliefs towards teachers ’roles and students ’roles in that the PSTs agreed with maintaining the traditional figure of authoritative teacher while supporting the CLT concept of learner autonomy. An exception was found as to the significant consistency of beliefs that the PSTs held towards the non-CLT aspects relating to the method of grammar instruction and the treatment of grammatical errors. Grammatical accuracy was preferred by the PSTs. The PSTs in this study, as a group, were divided in their pedagogical beliefs in that they showed no consensus on each of the CLT concepts. The important issues from these main results will be discussed in full detail in chapter 7.
CHAPTER 6

RESULT OF OBSERVATIONS

6.1 Introduction

The previous chapter (chapter 5) described how the data collected from the PSTs’ self-report questionnaire - BQCLT were collected and analysed. This chapter presents the findings concerning the EFL preservice teachers’ (PSTs’) beliefs and classroom practices, with regard to five themes of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Data used to answer the study’s research questions are obtained from the self-survey questionnaire (self-rating scale and open questionnaire), classroom observations and written documents such as lesson plans, observation notes and the worksheets used during the nine selected observations of the three cases of the PSTs in their lessons. The five aspects of CLT studied are: Use of group/pair work, place of grammar, error correction, role of the teacher and role of the students. The PSTs’ stated beliefs were compared with data from classroom observations to uncover the extent to which these beliefs guided their implementation of classroom practices.

This chapter answers the second Research Question, ‘To what extent and in what way did the PSTs interpret their started beliefs about CLT into their classroom practice?’ and ‘What challenges/difficulties were reported by the PSTs’ as the influences of classroom practices? The findings ascertain PSTs’ application of innovative practices of CLT.

In presenting findings, features of practice in comparison with each PST’s CLT-based beliefs are described and the extent to which their classroom practices reflect their stated beliefs regarding the five themes of CLT is summarised.

6.2 Backgrounds to the three PST cases:

- The practicum course

Three PSTs were selected for the stage II observation phase of the study and they consented to participate in the study. All three were selected as critical cases to explore the extent to which their stated beliefs at the ‘agreement’ level towards CLT principles were translated into their theoretical conception and integrated into their actual
classroom practice. For ethical reasons they have been given the pseudonyms Anee, Budsaba, and Ceeham. Each participant was enrolled in the Teaching Practicum course (see Appendix 17 for more details) which is the requisite for degree completion of the teacher-education programme. The PSTs worked as teacher-trainees in the practicum schools over the whole academic year 2013 (May 2013-Feb 2014) and were required to conduct classroom research at their practicum school in the second semester.

- **Limited exposure to English communication**

The participants were from two state universities UNI-1 and UNI-2. Both UNI-1 and UNI-2 are key teacher training institutions in the Yala, Pattani and Narathiwat regions; therefore, every year the universities admitted many local students (mostly high school students) from these three southernmost provinces. Exposure to the use of English for communication in the real-life setting of these regions is very limited compared to the opportunities to use English found in major cities like Bangkok (Thailand’s capital city) or Phuket (the major tourist destination located along the Andaman Sea in the south of Thailand). Hence, the three participants have been following a teacher training course in this context for 4 years.

- **The practicum schools**

The PSTs were all placed their teaching practicum in the areas mentioned above. Anee was undertaking her practicum in a private primary school in the Yala suburban area. Budsaba was placed in a state-owned primary school in an urban city in Yala. Ceeham did her practicum in a government-run secondary school in Pattani (see Appendix 21: Map of Southern Thailand for the location). Each PST was responsible for nine periods of classroom teaching a week (45-50 minutes/teaching period). Other school duties were assigned to them depending on the schools’ needs. Common classroom teaching-related routines included writing lesson plans and preparing test and exam papers. For her classroom teaching, Anee taught only Primary Year 6 students and the purpose of most lesson was vocabulary learning and speaking. Budsaba was in charge of teaching Primary 4 and 5 children and the course was based on the coursebook’s notional/functional syllabus. Ceeham taught Secondary Year 4 (Grade 10) and Secondary Year 5 (Grade 11) students. (see Table 4.7 chapter 4 for detailed information on the students’ levels, and the
courses and lessons the three PSTs had to teach)

6.3 Place of grammar

6.3.1 Beliefs about the place of grammar
According to the three PSTs’ beliefs reported in the pre-practicum BQ-CLT beliefs survey about the role of grammar, they all believed in communicative teaching without the explicit teaching of grammar. They all mentioned the importance of implicit teaching of grammar in promoting skills for language communication.

Anee: “It’s better to encourage students to speak or practise using English, rather than always emphasising language patterns or grammar rules. However, it might be necessary to integrate grammar into a language lesson when the learners use incorrect grammar” (BQ/PST2, q1).

Budsaba: “Grammar is not the most important part of the linguistic knowledge that students need in order to learn to communicate well; as long as their oral expression is clear and understandable, grammar rules should come after notion of use” (BQ/PST2, q1).

Ceeham: “Formal teaching of grammar is sometimes needed for [grammar-based] exams, but for building up communication skill, it is not very helpful. Placing too much focus on form or structure will hinder students’ ability to communicate their ideas” (BQ/PST3, q1).

The three belief statements above show beliefs that the three PSTs have in common, summarised as two specific beliefs to be examined in their practice:
First, ‘direct instruction of rules is not essential for students to learn to communicate’; from this we infer that the PSTs believe in indirect presentation of grammar and in implicit knowledge of grammar in language teaching.
Second, ‘grammar should be taught only as a means to an end and not as an end in itself’; this echoes the PSTs’ preference for presenting grammar, if needed, with greater focus on notion of use and in a meaningful context. In sum, PSTs have positive beliefs about the CLT approach to grammar. Only one example from the three participants asserted the importance of grammar for exams. Table 6.1 below summaries the beliefs related to the place of grammar.
Table 6.1: PSTs’ beliefs regarding place of grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs regarding place of grammar</th>
<th>PSTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Implicit role and indirect knowledge of grammar</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grammar notions/functions precedes grammar rules.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formal teaching of grammar is needed for exams</td>
<td>Ceeham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.2 Grammar-based teaching practices

The place of grammar observed in the three PSTs’ classroom instructions varied throughout the nine observations. Two main roles for grammar were identified. First, two PSTs (Budsaba and Ceeham) were observed using a deductive approach, with explicit presentation of grammar rules. The second pattern was the incidental insertion of explicit, form-focused teaching of grammar when teaching vocabulary during pre-reading activities in reading lessons. Other salient features relating to grammar were identified in two PSTs’ grammar was not integrated into classroom practices when the purposes of learning were varied from accuracy to communication skills.

1. Teaching grammar for grammar: The explicit role of grammar

Grammar played a prominent role in three observed classes taught by two PSTs. Budsaba and Ceeham arranged a formal class of grammar, with overt rules-focused instruction in which students learned to analyse grammar and generate certain language just by applying grammar rules. Figure 6.1 shows an information sheet used in one of these lessons. It displays grammar rules and formulae given as the main source for Budsaba’s presentation of grammar translation. This was the first feature of ‘explicit’ presentation of grammar knowledge in her practice.
Figure 6.1 Information sheet used in Budsaba’s lesson

Present Simple tense is formed using the following formula:

Subject + verb + Object

Rule 1: To verbs which end with o, s, x, ch, ss and sh, add –es at the end of verb to put it in the third person singular form.

Rule 2: For verbs which end with ‘y’ and in which the letter placed before ‘y’ is not ‘a, e, i, o, u’ delete ‘y’ and add ‘ies’ at the end of the verb to get the third person singular form.

Rule 3: To the verbs to which rules 1 and 2 do not apply, put ‘s’ at the end of the verb to put it in the third person singular form.

PSTs’ focus on rules and form notion of language was identified in excessive use of classroom discourse about rules, form and formulae, as well as how to apply rules for accurate formation of a sentence. Table 6.2, below, displays the proportion of teacher discourse in three grammar-explicit lessons, indicating that Budsaba, in her second observation (C2/2), asserted the grammatical function twice, and once in her third observation (C2/3). Most teacher talk involved explanation of rules of form (24 turns in C2/2; 30 in C2/3 and 26 in C3/2). Some examples were given, but these were rarely found to be encompassed within meaningful contexts. They were more frequently associated with form, for example the two verbs ‘washes’ and ‘goes’ were used to show that the third person singular form is made by adding ‘-es’. Example rarely highlighted notions of use whilst presenting grammar. Table 6.2, below, exhibits the occasions teachers used classroom discourse for grammar instruction (for full detail, see Appendix 6).
Table 6.2: Occurrences of classroom discourse in teaching grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of teachers’ discourse</th>
<th>Budsaba</th>
<th>Ceeham</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>C2/</td>
<td>C2/</td>
<td>C3/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules/forms/terminology</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Next, what does rule number two say?” (Budsaba).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“To change the regular verb ‘run’ to the progressive form, put one more ‘n’, followed by ‘-ing’” (Ceeham).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples given with rules and forms</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“In sentence one, ‘I eat an apple’, the subject is ‘I’. “ Is the verb ‘eat’ in the correct form?”; “Tell me one example of the verb with -ing you can think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functions</td>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The present simple tense is used to talk about the actions we regularly do, and also when you describe yourself” (Budsaba).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last month, we learned about the daily routine, the everyday activities the people do as their habits, remember? (C2/3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When presenting grammar, these two PSTs’ instructional practices involved long, rigid, elaborate explanations of its intricacies. Accordingly, students were directed to memorise how sentences were formed so as to ensure they could produce accurately this particular grammar rule. The whole procedure of teaching and learning was centred on rote-learning.
techniques, such as memorising rules and formulae, analysing grammatical form and showing examples with attention to form (see Appendix 13 for example of coding grammar classroom). Grammar rules and examples were not presented in context and not integrated with their functions, so that students unconsciously used the taught grammar in context and for communication. Examples included talking about habits and routines and describing people’s continuous actions. Explicit prevalence of grammar or the deductive approach of teaching could be acceptable in EFL context whenever it is embedded with contextualization of meaning (Celce-Murcia, 1991). Hence, PSTs’ instruction of grammar using rules, and form and structure as the paramount of learning for language teaching show mismatch between their reported beliefs about the unimportance of grammar and their actual grammar instruction.

2. Teaching grammar for grammar: Grammar taught as an end in itself

In Budsaba’s two grammar lessons and Ceeham’s lesson, grammar was taught explicitly and students were not allowed to enter the practice stage involving a grammar exercise until PSTs ensured they were grounded in the rules and knew how to restructure the sentence correctly. PSTs put effort into helping students practise application of rules, with focus on form through written grammar exercises given at the end of each grammar lesson. Evidence of PSTs’ inattention to grammar function/notion-using grammar for communicative purposes – includes (1) instructions given in the work sheet (e.g. Fill in the verbs in Present Simple), and (2) the way the PSTs gave instructions and guidance about how to do the exercise. Grammatical form and literal meaning were underlined but with trivial attention to context and meaning. The Excerpt 1 below shows an example of Budsaba’s grammar-focused exercises in a ‘gap-fill’ task. Her instructions are also Shown:

Excerpt 1: Example of Budsaba’s grammar worksheet and classroom transcription

Exercise 1: Fill in the verbs in Present Simple.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cry/finish/eat/live/drink/go/speak/play/like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. He ...........chips for dinner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I............coffee three times a day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. She.......to New York once a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We...........Italian and English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. They.......in Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Muhammed ......tennis every weekend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Context:** During the practice stage, after a long and elaborated grammar presentation

**Turn**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Budsaba</td>
<td>Look at sentence one, guess what the missing verb is. When you have foods, do you eat, play or drink foods? He....what... chips for dinner? Which verb fits for the chips?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Eat [Teacher ignores a student’s answer of ‘fry’ in Thai]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Budsaba</td>
<td>Eat or Eats? The subject of the sentence is ‘He’, so the correct form of the verb is...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Eats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Budsaba</td>
<td>Oh, yes. The correct answer is the verb ‘eat’ with –s. Then you might like to have some drinks with your chips. Number 2, the missing verb is...? What with coffee?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Budsaba</td>
<td>Good, ‘Drink coffee’. “I drink coffee three times a day”, is it too much?. Look, ‘drink’ not ‘drink’ with –s. OK. I will let you do your own exercise. Any questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>[Silent]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Budsaba</td>
<td>The exercise is very easy. No difficult words in any sentence. So you can do it on your own. Review the rules any time you are not sure how to use the correct form of the verb in agreement with its subject, OK?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 1 shows that Budsaba’s instructions for the grammar exercise (‘Fill in the verbs in the Present Simple’) and the way she demonstrated the examples implies that students were directed to pay greater attention to form at the sentence level, that is, subject and
verb agreement in the present simple tense.

However, a balanced focus on meaning and form was observed when Budsaba underlined the ‘notion’ of use of the target grammar in trying to contextualise the sentence. She gave the context of each sentence to help students make meaning of texts (see #35, 39, 41). Whilst eliciting answers however, she overstressed the form of the verb in the gap by repeatedly showing the difference between singular and plural forms without attention to context (# 37- 42). Budsaba was less concerned about grammatical notion of use. Instead, she made students focus on grammar exercises to master accurate production of grammar forms. Her focus was on application of grammar rules (#43).

All three grammar lessons conducted by the PSTs ended with a form-focused grammar exercise. There is no evidence that they had attempted to teach grammar in use or helped students to contextualise meanings of the target grammar. In Ceeham’s grammar lesson, observed in C3/2, the grammar exercise required students to work in pairs on the accurate formation of sentences in the present progressive. Transcriptional data indicates that Ceeham’s instructions and those written on the exercise aimed towards accurate production of the target grammar by referring to its rules (Excerpt 2). In examples of students’ answers to the exercise (below) sentences show they were able to use the grammar in a meaningful context. Whilst checking and explaining these answers, Ceeham’s focus was still placed solely on form.

Excerpt 2: Examples of students’ answers to the grammar exercise in Ceeham’s class:

2. Tony is looking for a flat near his office.
3. It is raining outside.
4. My parents are coming back from Rome on Saturday.

Examples of Ceeham’s explanations:

“Well, look at the verbs in the sentence. ‘Tony is looking...’ perfect!”

“Here the verb ‘is’ is followed by ‘look’ with -ing. ‘It is raining’ is similar to the first sentence.”

“Next, the subject ‘My parents’ is plural, so needs ‘are’ and ‘come’ in -ing form.”
For most of the lesson, students learned intensively how to analyse grammar instead of being exposed to grammar notions. Practising using grammar for communication or even using the grammar point in context was rare. This leads to the conclusion that grammar was taught as an end in itself and that students learned grammar to master grammar rather than to use it communicatively.

3. Insertion of ‘explicit’ grammar for pre-reading comprehension

- Overt focus on form reflecting conflicting beliefs: Lack of clear knowledge of grammar instruction methods.

In one of Ceeham’s reading lessons, explicit presentation of grammar formula and form was given during vocabulary teaching in the pre-reading stage. Observational data in the Excerpt 3 below exemplifies that Ceeham’s insertion of grammar with explicit instruction of grammar occurred while she was teaching the words selected and extracted from the passage.

Excerpt 3: Ceeham’s insertion of grammar during vocabulary teaching.

**Context:** Soon after Ceeham asked each pair to check the answers with each other, she wrote all target answers on the blackboard and elicited the meaning of the words from the students. There were only four words that students could provide the answers. During teacher’s elicitation of meaning, she inserted the instruction of the certain type of grammar: passive voice.

**Turn**

(19)

Ceeham: Here are the words of each gap. Who know the meaning?

Come out and write the Thai meaning on the board.

[There were four answers given by four volunteer students]

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. stolen = ซอมบี้</td>
<td>5. victims = ผู้เสียหาย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent =</td>
<td>6. shake = เขย่า</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

120
3. Avenue = 7. Pretend= แกล้ง เสแสร้ง
4. tourists = นักท่องเที่ยว 8. Nabbed=

21 Ceeham  Are you sure you do not know what does ‘street’ mean?
Ss  Silent

23 Ceeham  Very easy, it’s the same as street or in Thai: Thanon
(street in Thai) {ถนน} [Ceeham then write down the Thai
word for ‘street’]
[T. gets Ss attention on the word form and explain the rule
and structural form of ‘passive voice’.

24 Ceeham  In this dialog, the tourist’s stuff was stolen by the
pickpocket. When describing someone was attacked or
robbed, in English expression we use the past participle
tense in passive form. Look, the form of Passive voice is
‘Subject + Finite form of to be + Past Participle.’
[Ceeham writes down the pattern of sentence structure
on the BB].

Subject + is/am/are + V2
Was/were

25 Ceeham  Subject in passive voice is not anymore a doer.

26 Ss  [Silent]

27 Ceeham  The one who stole the money pocket was not mentioned
in the sentence. See? Remember that exercise of the
passive voice you have done? We simply knew that the
active voice describes a sentence where the subject
performs the action stated by the verb. The passive voice
sentences are on the contrary; the subject is acted upon
by the verb. Can you repeat the structural form of passive
Subject plus verb to be plus third column of irregular verbs.

OK. Let’s check up the form of the words you filled in the gap. See which word is in passive form. Any one can tell?

Stolen

Nabbed

Right! For example, ‘Her purse was stolen. His money pocket was nabbed from his bag’. Here, ‘was stolen’ in passive voice.

Grammar rules and form were emphasised during the approximately 10-minute-long grammar instruction (#23-31). Grammar rules (#23, 25, 27-31) and a formula (#24) were presented, with smaller insertion of explanation of its meaning/notion of use (#23, 27). In the end, in responding to Ceeham’s command to scan the reading passage for the words in the passive voice, students showed they were able to give the right answers (e.g. ‘stolen’ and ‘nabbed’(#30), but did not show other use of language that verified their understanding of its meaning. Possibly, they could have identified words by referring to Ceeham’s explanation that “the structural form of the passive voice is the subject plus the verb ‘to be’ plus the third column of irregular verbs” (#28). They could also have used the grammar formulae she exhibited on the blackboard. Yet, according to Andrews et al. (2006), formal teaching of grammar out of context has no beneficial effect on either writing or reading. Ceeham overtly emphasised form and rules over the meaning of the words in context, particularly in the lesson that aimed at reading comprehension, indicating that she did not have clear knowledge of the appropriate approach to grammar teaching.

The post-observational notes show that Ceeham believed in the benefit of grammar knowledge for successful reading comprehension: “I gave them a review of grammar structure in brief to help them see what it means. I felt that understanding the meaning of the key words contained in the text would help them read the passage (Revision of
grammar about passive voice to underline the meaning of a person was threatened by someone).” Despite Ceeham’s efforts to help students understand the reading passage meaningfully her presentation of explicit grammar with overt focus on form over meaning was not helpful. This shows inconsistency between her perceived value of grammar and her grammar instruction in practice.

4. Grammar not needed

Anee was the only PST who did not constantly include grammar knowledge as an integral part of her three observed practices. Apart from the intensive drilling of language (vocabulary drill) that Anee arranged for students as the pre-communication activity in the first observation, her classroom practices in the latter two observed lessons centred on enhancing students’ independent learning through two activities: one that related to vocabulary and the other to speaking skills.

In a dictionary learning task in the second observation, Anee allocated almost 35 of 50 minutes’ class time to a ‘self-learning’ space where students’ learned to use the dictionary on their own under the teacher’s guidance. Students’ on-task learning embraced two CLT elements: (1) autonomous learning skills, exemplified when practising self-learning by building up vocabulary knowledge through dictionary learning, and (2) peer-to-peer learning, when students worked in pairs, building collaborative relationships in interactive learning. Here, students had an opportunity to acquire meaning free from teacher control- one of the key elements of CLT (Harmer, 2001).

In her third observation, Anee put hard work into building up a near-authentic setting using authentic material (a map of a local city) as well as assuming the facilitative role of co-communicator in her mission to foster the students’ use of certain expressions (giving and asking for directions) for interactive, meaningful communication. Excerpt 6.4 exemplifies this evidence. More details of this typical communicative learning activity are presented in Section II: Practices of group/pair work.

6.3.3 Beliefs and practice: to what extent are PSTs’ beliefs about grammar integrated into their practice?

Pre-practicum, all three PSTs reported beliefs about grammar in line with CLT, including that grammar is unimportant and should only have an implicit role in supporting language
learning ability. In practice, observation data indicated only one demonstrated beliefs about implicit role of grammar that were influential in guiding her actual instruction. The other two PSTs’ practices demonstrated application of explicit instruction of grammar to master grammar. Three key findings are:

1. **Grammar was treated as a main subject or as a foundation of communication: Practices inconsistent with beliefs.**

Two PSTs’ practices demonstrated salient teaching aspects not aligned with CLT beliefs in the implicit role of grammar they reported as supporting pre-practicum. In contrast, they applied grammar-based instructions in their grammar lessons, presenting explicit knowledge of grammar, such as excessive explanation of rules and overt focus on form; in addition, their failure to include grammar notions suggests that they actually believe in ‘teaching grammar for grammar’. In Budsaba’s case, her inattention to grammar notion whilst presenting grammar knowledge and giving instructions for grammar exercises indicates that she held a belief that grammar should be taught only as an end in itself. These observations indicate that the two PSTs believed direct delivery of explicit grammar knowledge was essential for language learning. Their stated beliefs about the importance of grammar notions, indirect, implicit instruction of grammar and unconscious use of grammar were not effective in guiding their practices.

2. **Less attention in grammar notion in explicit instruction of form-focused grammar: Lack of understanding of CLT method of grammar instruction.**

Ceeham was observed on one occasion integrating explicit teaching of grammar teaching with an aim for reading comprehension. However, her explanation of grammar form and structure was not inductive to meaning of the taught grammar. She noted in the post-observation questionnaire that her aim in teaching grammar during the lesson was to build students’ understanding of meaning of the key vocabulary for reading comprehension:

“knowing meaning some key words is more important than learning grammar for reading comprehension” (PoQ-3/1, q2).

Hence, she was not supposed to have clear understanding of practical methods of teaching grammar for meaningful learning.
3. A lack of grammar teaching reflected beliefs about the implicit role of grammar: one based on CLT notion, one was not derived from CLT beliefs.

Anee did not teach grammar knowledge. In Anee’s case, absence of grammar teaching in her observed classes was consistent with her core beliefs that “knowledge of linguistic rules does not guarantee the ability to use the language”. Since she did not deploy grammar instruction in any observation, another primary belief, that grammar should be taught only as a means to an end, could not be identified as an indicator for her classroom practice. Importantly, in Anee’s case, her exclusion of grammar was captured amidst her communication-based and student-oriented practices. Activities entailed active learning and meaningful, active practice of language. This is in line with CLT (Richards, 2003). In conclusion, Anee represents PSTs whose practices were consistent with beliefs about the implicit role of grammar knowledge. In contrast, Ceeham’s grammar teaching was not integrated with her reading comprehension as she assumed direction explanation of grammar was needed for understanding concept meaning.

6.4 Use of group/pair work

In CLT classrooms, interaction in groups or pairs is valued as a means of creating social interaction and natural use of the target language to achieve a certain communicative purpose (Jacobs, & Farrell, 2003; Ellis, 2003). This implies that interaction among students is instrumental to acquiring communicative competence (Nunan, 1991). In the following sections, aspects of practices that relates to the use of group/pair work and the classroom interactions are presented.

6.4.1 Beliefs about the use of group/pair work

Pre-practicum all three PSTs indicated beliefs in line with CLT principles. For example, Ceeham stated a preference for using group/pair work after students have gained team working skills as well as the ability to take responsibility for their own individual learning. Budsaba mentioned that tasks involving group and pair work could be used to promote peer-to-peer learning, for the benefit of less able students in particular; Anee specified advantages of peer correction in groups/pairs. The three PSTs held strong beliefs in line with the CLT concepts: (1) self-learning, (2) collaborative relationships in learning, and (3)
classroom interaction that entails the negotiation of meaning in near-authentic communication.

**Table 6.3 PSTs’ beliefs regarding place of grammar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs regarding place of grammar</th>
<th>PSTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implicit role and indirect knowledge of grammar</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar notions/functions precedes grammar rules.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal teaching of grammar is needed for exams</td>
<td>Ceeham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.4.2 Practices related to the use of group/pair work**

Observational notes from nine observed classes taught by the three PSTs show that a teacher-centred approach involving one-way teacher–whole class interaction was the dominant mode of instruction, in particular in presentation stages, when the topic and new language were introduced. In three classes, conducted by two of these PSTs, the teacher dominated the classroom with a monologue of classroom discourses aimed at transmitting knowledge about grammar and reading texts, creating a teacher-fronted style. Students’ chances to interact or initiate learning among themselves were rare. However, pair and group work were observed occasionally in observed classes by all three PSTs, and quite often in language learning activities.

**1. Employment of group/pair work activities for classroom learning**

**1.1 Use of group/pair work for peer-to-peer collaborative learning and self-learning**

Small group and pair work occurred in each observed class, enabling students to benefit from collaborative and autonomous learning. Peer-to-peer learning and self-control of learning were observed amidst students’ interactions when working in groups/pairs on two types of learning activity: a pre-practice vocabulary-learning activity, which occurred in five of the classes (three speaking and two reading), and grammar exercises (two grammar classes). An example found in Budsaba’s arrangement of group and pair work in a pre-communication and a practice activity. Table 6.4 shows Budsaba’s use of group and pair work for speaking practice.
Table 6.4: Budsaba’s use of group/pair work for speaking practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Examples of teacher’s instructions</th>
<th>What students did</th>
<th>Time (mins)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| C2/1   | Group work (pre-practice)       | Selection of group representative | “Well, select one member in your group to present the ‘Guessing words’ role-play. The representative should play the role of both speaker A and speaker B. I will select which picture each group will base their dialogue on.”  
“Help your friend rehearse the dialogue before doing the role play.” | Preparation of role play. Groups of six worked together to create a dialogue. They then nominated a pair to rehearse it.                                                                 | 8                        |
Budsaba’s instructions indicate that the group work task was intended as preparation for the role-play presentation in pairs. Students were divided into six groups and worked together to nominate one member as group representative and rehearse dialogue. Later pair work involved dialogue practice in which nominated students from each group presented the role play in the form of a dialogue drill. Another example of collaborative learning was evident in Ceeham’s use of group work to promote peer-to-peer learning during a vocabulary-learning activity prior to reading comprehension. Table 6.5 displays the observational data that characterizes Ceeham’s use of pair/group work.
Table 6.5: Ceeham’s use of pair/group work for vocabulary learning (pre-reading)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C3/1 Activity</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Examples of teacher’s instructions</th>
<th>What students did</th>
<th>Time (mins)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group work for peer-to-peer learning</td>
<td>Vocabulary learning</td>
<td>“Scan the reading text on your own. Then compare answers with your friend sitting next to you to share the words you know with each other. I’ll give you five minutes to help each other guess the meaning of the unknown words. Pick one word whose meaning you are not sure of, and come out to write it on the blackboard.”</td>
<td>Discussed with a partner, analysed texts, shared information, worked together to decide on the answers and selected a representative to write on the board.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C3/3 Activity</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Examples of teacher’s instructions</th>
<th>What students did</th>
<th>Time (mins)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group work for peer learning</td>
<td>Close listening</td>
<td>“Listen carefully for the word that goes in the gap in the dialogue. Work with your friend to find out the correct answer. I will nominate eight people to write down the words you got and another eight for their meanings.”</td>
<td>Analysed texts; discussed and identified specific answers.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both PSTs used group/pair work in vocabulary-learning activities. Students’ interactional behaviours observed during group work included use of interpersonal learning and self-
learning skills, such as analysing teacher cues, building up a dialogue, nominating group representatives, analysing texts, exchanging ideas, sharing information, negotiating for meaning and directly asking for the answer they needed. By doing this variety of tasks, they learned to cooperate and help each other to complete them by applying social, learning and language skills (Holec, 1998). In addition, teachers monitored from a distance and maintained a low level of control on students’ behaviour, which indirectly induced independent learning as students had time and space to work without the teacher’s direct intervention. Although they used their community language (Thai) in interaction with each other, which minimised exposure to and practice of the target language (English), each student took control of his/her learning, as well as learning from each other.

To conclude, PSTs used group/pair work as a means of learning in which students could help each other, doing practice activities and completing given tasks. This reflects the preference PSTs stated before the practicum for self-learning and collaborative peer-to-peer learning.

1.2 Use of group/pair work as a way of developing accuracy and linguistic mastery rather than meaningful communication.

Anee and Budsaba each taught a class in which there was a speaking practice activity that involved students working in pairs on role plays; however, this did not appear to cultivate communicative use of the target language, but aimed at improving accuracy of language use. Anee and Budsaba put effort into promoting students’ use of certain expressions to ask about the meaning of words and talk about foods, but the language used was tightly controlled, thus students only reproduced the exact language the teachers modelled.

Below, an excerpt of Anee’s classroom transcript illustrates how pair work was productive to accuracy rather than communicative speaking skills as noted in her lesson plan.

**Excerpt 4 : Anee’s use of pair work for dialogue drill**

**Context:** Anee gets students (in primary year 6) organised in pairs to perform the dialogue. After the first nominated pairs finish their role plays, two pairs volunteer to perform the dialogue. One student (S4) brings a slip of paper with him.

Model of dialogue used for dialogue practice.
A: What would you like to eat?  
B: I would like some pizza.

Turn  
(#)

17  Anee  If you are ready, let’s start.
18  S3  What – would – you – like – to – eat? [Speaking slowly with short pauses between words]
19  S4  I would like ... ice cream [Speaking fast and nodding his head down to read the note in his hand]
20  Anee  OK. Speaker B would like to eat ice cream. [Ss Applause]  
Who’s next? Anyone?  
[A pair of girls in the middle row raise their hands. The teacher gets them to the front. The pair bring a notebook with them]
21  S5  What – would – you – like – to – eat? [Speaking with short pauses between words]
22  S6  I – would – like ...[pauses]....ice...ssss sa cream.
23  Anee  Oh, I think you like ice cream not ice sa cream. Say it again.
24  S6  Ice sa ssss cream.

Students used words for foods from the list given by the teacher; none of the student pairs used their own words. Anee did not guide them towards alternatives, but focused intensively on repeating the words with the aim of achieving accurate pronunciation (#23-24). Students’ pronunciation of “ice cream” seemed not to cause miscommunication, thus correction may not have been necessary according to the tenets of CLT. This marked substantive evidence of Anee’s overt focus on accuracy of form over communicative use of language. Budsaba also (see Table 6.4) encouraged students to practise role plays to drill certain expressions carefully with the aim of achieving accuracy. Students’ awareness of meaning, however, seemed to be lost (Richards, 1998). Negotiation of meaning, an important part of CLT, was not required, as the language students used was prescribed by the teacher. Thus consciousness of meaning and purpose of communication was treated
as inferior to accuracy of form (Littlewood, 2004).

2. One way Teacher-whole class instruction

The most frequent mode of interaction used by PSTs in observed classes involved the teacher standing at the front, interacting with the students as a whole class. There were two variations on whole class teaching: less teacher-centred, with an assortment of student initiatives, and strongly teacher-centred, dominated by teacher talk and a didactic approach. These are described below.

2.1 Less teacher-centred instruction from the front to encourage active learning and communicative interaction.

The first pattern, less teacher-centred whole class instruction, involved the teacher inserting student-oriented features as well as CLT features. This was featured in introduction stages. Exceptions occurred in grammar lessons (one from Ceeham and two from Budaba) and one reading lesson (Ceeham). Generally, teacher–whole class interaction was deployed by PSTs in practices involving a sequence of interaction initiated by the teacher, with students responding then teacher feedback in the pattern of initiation-response-feedback or IRF (Sinclair & Coultham, 1975). PSTs used this interaction mode mainly in introduction stages when target topics and language were newly presented to students. They used this as a controlling device and a means of imparting knowledge (Lier, 2002), features often found in didactic teacher-centred language teaching (Waring, 2009).

Note, however, that PSTs were, in different ways, capable of making use of meaningful materials (such as food/drink flash cards, pictures of celebrities and city maps), as well as eliciting questions to prompt students’ active participation in learning. Student-directed learning was evident when, for example, teachers used schema-activation strategies to build up students’ understanding of the topic and to help them relate this to their own lives and background knowledge (see also Excerpt 13). This gave students a personal purpose for learning, and thus motivation to learn.

- Creating an immersion-like environment for near-natural communication.

The important point to note here is Anee’s use of teacher–whole class interaction, which embraced communicative elements that were not identified in other teacher-fronted
classes. CLT principles were more apparent here than in group or pair work. Anee was observed giving pairs a role-play speaking task. This time, contrary to her previous role-play practice, students’ use of the target language was not as mechanical, aiming at communication over accuracy.

The excerpt below (Excerpt 5) exemplifies the main features of CLT found in Anee’s use of whole class teaching: the creation of an immersion-like environment for near-natural communication, with the teacher as co-speaker, facilitating students’ interaction to help them develop speaking skills.

**Excerpt 5 : Anee’s whole class instruction for communicative practice**

**Context:** Anee posts a sketched map of a city on the blackboard. The map includes a main road, four sub-streets, a main traffic light and one arrow with the words ‘You are here’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>(#)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Anee</td>
<td>Suppose that you are here [T. uses stick to point to ‘You are here’]. Think, where would you like to go? Everyone could try. Suppose you are a traveller.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Rama Hotel. Train station. Yala Hospital. New Market. [T. nominates a student]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Anee</td>
<td>Fais, Where would you like to go?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fais</td>
<td>Ummm... I would go to ... [Some students shout different answers] ... Sanam Chang Park (A park in the city centre).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Anee</td>
<td>From here, go straight ahead, turn left and....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Turn left and go straight on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fais</td>
<td>Can I go this way? [Points to a road on the map]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Anee</td>
<td>Alright. Let’s try this way first then your way next time. Class, help Fais to go to the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Turn left and stop at.... the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ss+Fais</td>
<td>Go straight ahead, turn left and stop at the park [While Ss gives directions, T. draws a line following the direction that the Ss and Fais suggested]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Go straight ahead, turn left and stop

[T. points to the train station on the map and asks the whole class to give directions]

Now, I am a tourist. I am asking, “can anybody tell me how to go to train station?” You would say...

Go straight ahead... turn left... left not right... [Ss shout out different answers; some say the answer in their native language]

Well, it’s good that you’re helping me, but I can’t see which way is correct. Who wants to tell the tourist the right way?

Turn... left... Ummm... [pauses] ... Turn left...Go/Walk ahead...

OK. Any other way to go to train station, class?

Turn left. Walk ahead and... stop

From the beginning of the lesson, Anee attempted to facilitate a ‘real-life’ situation involving students in conversational interaction; this is in line with many elements of CLT, such as use of real-life tasks, settings and personalised topics. The excerpt above shows how she used the map of the local city to set up a story about a tourist asking for directions. At various points her students were given the opportunity to make choices, such as where to go, how to get there and which words they used (#20, 22, 26). Thus they were able to choose their personal context of use.

Anee attempted to involve every student (#20, 30, 32). To maintain a natural situation for communication of their ideas, she provided prompts, cues and elicitation to facilitate students’ generation of ideas and use of language.

- **Teacher–whole class interaction as an opportunity for communicative practice of language**

Another noticeable communicative element of this activity is Anee’s acting as a co-speaker. This is in addition to the role of facilitative organiser that she primarily played during the speaking practice. In the excerpt below (Excerpt 6), Anee interacts with the whole class and individuals to prompt language use practise. During this stage of the
lesson, students were tasked with practising speaking in pairs and with their other classmates.

**Excerpt 6: Classroom transcription of Anee’s speaking lesson**

**Turn #**

36 Anee OK? Who would like to play next? Who volunteers? [Many students raise their hands. T. asks two pairs of students to stand up].

37 S5 (as Speaker A) Excuse me, how to go to school?

38 S6 (as Speaker B) Start here. Go straight. Turn left. Go straight and stop at...

39 [Some students at the front give alternative directions in Yawi while S6 tries to give directions to S5]

40 Anee Alright, some of you have other ways to get there. Tell your friend in English.

41 Ss Turn right. Go straight ahead. Stop at the school. [T. nominates another pair to do the role play]

42 S7 (Speaker A) Excuse me, how to go to hospital?

43 S8 (Speaker B) Turn left. Walk ahead. Pass the market. Turn right...

44 Anee Well, can we try other directions. This time, I will get you all to help show the way to the tourist. Your friend (S9) will be a tourist who is sketching directions on her map. OK? Ameena, can you come here to be a tourist?

45 Ss Go straight ahead. Turn right. Traffic light. Turn left. Stop at hospital. [The whole class gives the directions out loud]

46 Anee Well, when you walk pass the traffic lights, say “pass”, and then say “turn right, pass traffic light, pass traffic light”. [When T. points to the traffic light indicator on the map, students say the words]

47 Ss Pass traffic light. Pass traffic light.
Anee: Are you sure that’s the right direction? Not that way, try again. Can anybody say this (points to the traffic light point) in English?

Ss: Pass traffic light and turn left.

Anee: Good. Now, think of some places in town which are not shown on the map. Choose the place you’d like to go to and tell how to get there, ok?

Ss: Any places?

Anee: Yes, any places you like. What about the Coliseum (a shopping mall in town)?

Ss: Go go. Go to Coliseum.

T. draws a map on the BB beside the poster of the city map used in the previous task. The map she draws includes the other places and a school, streets and a shopping mall.

Anee: As a tourist, I would stop you and ask you for directions: “Excuse me, can you tell me the way to the Coliseum?” [Pointing to the Coliseum on the map].

Ss: Turn left. Turn right. Go straight. Stop at Coliseum.

Anee: And... next, from here around train station. Go straight. Turn..... I think I have just walked the wrong way because you gave me the wrong directions, didn’t you? Try again to give me the right directions to the Coliseum.

Ss: Turn back/U-turn. Go straight and turn left.

Anee: Look carefully on the map, what’s the right way to the Coliseum; think. Listen! “Excuse me, I would like to go to the cinema; please could you show me the way?” [Teacher acts as a foreign tourist]

Ss: Turn back. Go straight ahead. Stop at Coliseum. [Some say “change, no, no, wrong way”]

Anee: I am lost. Help me to get to the Coliseum, can you?

Ss: Go straight ahead... Pass... traffic light. Turn right... Stop at Coliseum. [Some Ss say “Go to the cinema”].
Anee was observed playing the role of *facilitator* in organising students into pairs for the role-play tasks in #36-41. Here, Anee was cautious to intervene in students’ interactions and left pairs free to practise speaking. The nominated pairs were prompt to own the characters in the scene, i.e. a tourist asking for directions and a local person giving directions. At first, other students were not required to pay attention to the nominated pair presenting the role play (#38-39), but Anee then attempted to involve them (#40, 42, 52).

Acting as co-speaker in addition to activity organiser, Anee helped students become users of language, creating their own purpose for interacting with the teacher, thus achieving a real-life-like context for interpersonal communication (#44–62). Although the content and sequence of conversational interaction were pre-fixed, Anee’s students were free to personalise the context. Students initiated their own use of the lexis of giving and asking for directions in ways that were meaningful and purposeful. Table 6.6 summarises some communicative uses of language observed while students were doing speaking tasks in pairs.
Table 6.6: A summary of the communicative uses of language observed whilst students were speaking in pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicative features (Richards, 2006)</th>
<th>Examples of observed behaviours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Using meaningful and interactive material to provide meaning, or giving students choices in their replies to cues.</td>
<td>• The maps, which were the main material in the lesson, displayed various routes for students to choose from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allowing students to add something personal to their use of language.</td>
<td>• Anee called on the students to choose other places on the map to go to or give directions to. • Students were alert in giving each own choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creating characters who “are realistic in that they have some personality and relate to the learners’ experience in some way” (Slager 1976).</td>
<td>• The characters in the dialogue talked about places in the students’ own town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enabling students to use some words that they would use in the “real world.”</td>
<td>• Students spontaneously improvised some words, i.e. turn back; stop; change; no, wrong way; Can you...?. One student added ‘cinema’ as an extra location for her own conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encouraging students to speak to their peers in speaking tasks, rather than relying on the teacher for a model.</td>
<td>• Some students used their own words to talk about where to go and how to get there. Some talked about their likes and dislikes of certain modes of transport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A salient aspect of students’ communicative practice is that they had an opportunity to try out language they knew and chose to use, and to meet words the teacher gave them. Thus, the student and his or her interlocutor were able to arrive at an understanding, making meaningful use of the language (Richards et al., 2001). Communicative learning literature claims that in teacher-centred classrooms, students are ‘locked into’ the same pace of learning in the same activity, with little chance to talk or use language independently (Harmer, 1995). This was not the case in Anee’s use of teacher-led-whole class interaction; on the contrary, interactive communication between teacher and class, as well as between students, encouraged active learning and meaningful use of language. Salient CLT characteristics evident here are freer practice, near-authentic material, an immersion-like setting, students’ personalisation of learning and the teacher’s facilitative manner, all of which encouraged students’ communicative use of language in classroom learning. Near-authentic communication happened when language used was not totally predictable (Littlewoods, 2004).

This finding sheds new light on the effectiveness of teacher–whole class interaction in promoting CLT classroom activities. Anee’s notes affirm her respect for the CLT principle of creating interactive, communicative activities that help students to develop their language skills. “What I learned from this class is that creating motivation to learn is very useful. I can see why the teacher (school teacher) tried to set up situations using many materials and giving topics that the students seem to be familiar with. For different groups of students I would use this strategy, as the learning is very dynamic and the students enjoy speaking.” Her own observations, as well as her concern for the students’ interests, led Anee to develop beliefs in line with CLT.

To conclude, among the three PST practitioners, Anee’s was the only case in which group/pair work was used in a way that promoted meaningful use of language through communicative interaction in a real-life-like situation. This element of CLT was not observed in Anee’s previous uses of group/pair work, where she inserted self-learning and peer-to-peer learning in the vocabulary-learning activity as the pre-communication practice of language. This study found that a PST can effectively foster students’
communicative use of language through the teacher interacting with the whole class (or individuals) from the front.

2.2 Strongly teacher-centred whole class teaching: teacher as explainer, students as listeners

The second type of teaching was strongly teacher-centred, with teacher-fronted transmission exploited for explaining content and demonstrating language use. This instruction placed the teacher as explainer and students as listeners, originating from PSTs’ concern to impart grammar knowledge. Excerpt 7 and Excerpt 8 below, exemplify Budsaba and Ceeham’s excessive use of teacher talk about grammar rules and structure in their classes on the present simple and present progressive tenses respectively. Students had no opportunities to interact to practise using the target grammar in context. The only opportunity provided was responding to teachers’ questions, usually to repeat factual information such as grammar rules.

Excerpt 7: Budsaba’s teacher-centered mode of grammar instruction with an overt focus on rules, formula and form (Time: 25 minutes)

Turn

(#)

1 Budsaba Class, can anyone tell me what tense or verb we use to talk about daily routine?

2 Ss [Silent]

3 Budsaba In English, we use this: ‘Present simple tense’ [points to the written words on the BB] when we want to talk about activities we perform daily. This is similar to when referring to an action or event that takes place habitually. The sentence structure of the present simple tense is...[T. points to the BB, where the verb forms of the present simple are shown]

4 Ss Subject plus verb one and the complement

5 Budsaba [T. underlines the title ‘Present Simple’ written on the BB].
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Sentence structure of the Present Simple Tense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject +V1 + ส่วนขยาย</th>
<th>Subject +V1 + complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ประโยน์ (Subject)</td>
<td>กรรม (Verb)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budsaba You should remember the sentence structure of the present simple tense; here, subject, verb one, and complement.

7 Ss [Silent. Many Ss take notes while listening to T’s explanation]

8 Budsaba The subject is a doer, doing some action. Tell me some actions in the present simple form. [Most students keep silent; only two students answer]

9 S1 Eat

S2 Write

10 Budsaba OK! The verb is then followed by the complement. Look at the subject of the sentence we have in English.

[Budsaba points to the verbs written on the board]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walk เดิน</th>
<th>Sleep นอน</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eat กิน</td>
<td>Wash ล้าง</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Budsaba The verbs; walk, sleep, eat, wash and sit, here, are in regular form. Repeat after me: walk

12 Ss Walk [T. reads the rest of the words for Ss to repeat afterwards]

13 Budsaba In the present simple tense, if the subject is singular you have to make the verb singular in agreement with the singular subject by putting ...what?

14 Ss [Ss silent, many holding the pen in preparation for taking notes]

15 Budsaba Add –s to make the verb singular. [T. writes –s after the verb ‘walk’ on the board]. For example, he walks and
she….? [T. adds -s after the verb ‘eat’]

16 Ss [Silent]

17 Budsaba She eats. He studies...and.... [T. rubs out the letter ‘y’ from ‘study’ and writes ‘ies’]. If the verb ends with the letter ‘y’, you need to change it to ‘i’ and then add ‘es’ afterwards. How do you know when to put -s or when not to put -s after a verb?”

Excerpt 8: Ceeham’s teacher-centred mode of instruction of grammar exercise

**Context:** During the practice stage in Class 3/2, Ceeham showed the formulas and pattern of the present progressive tense on the blackboard and gave students a grammar exercise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 Ceeham</td>
<td>Read and review the rule for the present progressive. Look at the sample sentences shown in the hand-out. I will give you an exercise about the present progressive. [Ss get the hand-out and read]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Ceeham</td>
<td>I think you can see the sentence pattern and form of the present progressive. Next, do Exercises A and B in Worksheet 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Ss</td>
<td>[Read in silence]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Ceeham</td>
<td>Students, read the instructions out loud. Whole class all together!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Ss</td>
<td>Column B, put ‘is, am, are’ to put the sentence into the ‘present progressive form’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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All right, tell me what you have to do with the two exercises.

Add ‘ing’ to the verb. Change the given sentence to be in the present progressive tense.

In A and B, change the verb form from the present simple tense to the present participle and in B, choose which form of ‘to be’ is right for the sentence. For example, number 1, Da is....and swim in –ing form. Understand?

On our own or in pairs, teacher? Can I work in a group?

You should work on your own, it’s individual work. Class, check carefully the subject of the sentence before choosing the auxiliary verb.

Budsaba and Ceeham’s modes of instruction during grammar teaching involved extensive teacher talk, with the teacher initiating any response from students. Students rarely initiated language use, other than on one occasion in Budsaba’s class, when two individuals gave their chosen answers (see Excerpt 7); and once in Ceeham’s class, when a student asked to work with a friend on the grammar exercise. However, Ceeham did not allow this request. This exemplifies her disregard for students’ individual needs and consequently infers her authoritative manner of teaching that teacher is the centre of classroom learning. Another notable example of one-way teacher talk was observed in one of Ceeham’s lessons on reading comprehension (see Excerpt 8 above). Most of the time, Ceeham talked and students listened; teacher-whole class interaction occurred chiefly to translate parts of the reading passage to aid students’ comprehension of the content in their native language. Ceeham occasionally used questions to promote students’ learning, but she only asked closed questions with answers that students could retrieve from the reading passage without profound comprehension of the text (e.g. Who is the first speaker? What does Ramon say next?).}

In Anee’s reading class, she asked questions intermittently but students’ responses were
rare due because she did not wait long before giving the answer herself. Her students had no opportunity to think and try out possible answers and just sat in silence. She used direct translation (to Thai) for almost every line of the reading passage. Anee aimed to ensure that all content would be totally comprehensible reached by the learners. All teacher talk and one-way instruction indicates dominance of the teacher-as-explainer and students-as-listeners in classroom interactions. When the main classroom activity comprises the teacher asking questions to which students provide no response, all classroom language originates from the teacher. Scrivener (1994) underlines that the more teachers talk, the less opportunity exists for learners to use language they are learning. PSTs’ use of teacher-fronted instruction in their learning activities indicates their preference for teacher authority. In practice they did not organise classroom learning around group/pair work. To conclude, teacher-centred, one-way teacher-class interaction was used intensively by PSTs with the aim of achieving linguistic competence and direct comprehension of content.

6.4.3 Beliefs and practice: to what extent are PSTs’ beliefs about group/pair work integrated into their practice?

Pre-practicum, all PSTs reported strong positive beliefs in line with CLT concepts regarding use of group/pair work. They demonstrated belief that group/pair work promoted communication skills through self-learning, collaborative relationships for peer-to-peer learning, and negotiation of meaning in student–student interaction. Anee asserted peer-correction as one element of peer-to-peer learning. Budsaba and Ceeham indicated uncertainty about using group/pair work with young learners because they might not have sufficient team-working skills or linguistic input. Ceeham was the only PST who specified that communication practice in group/pair work should be done under teacher control to practise accurate use of language.

In addition to teacher-fronted whole class instruction that dominated most of their teaching practice, the three PSTs occasionally used group/pair work for similar learning benefits. In general, when PSTs gave students pair work tasks, they tried to promote collaborative learning, to motivate students and encourage faster learners helping slower
learners. The most noticeable CLT elements of pair and group work observed were that students had purposeful tasks to (1) exert their own learning far from teacher’s close control and (2) interact for interpersonal communication. PSTs were aware of CLT principles regarding self-learning and collaborative relationships in learning, and tried to help students benefit from interpersonal communication via group/pair work tasks. This implies that PSTs’ beliefs about self-learning and collaborative relationships in learning were integrated into their practice.

PSTs reported belief in the communicative value of negotiation of meaning during group/pair work. In practice, however, negotiation of meaning for communication was not observed. Pair work given to students was for tightly controlled speaking practice aiming for accuracy rather than communicative use. Only one used classroom interaction between teacher and students to effectively promote near-natural language use when students in speaking practice were using words not all prescribed by the teacher. Two PSTs failed to enable communicative learning and tended to tightly control students’ use of language to develop accuracy. One PST appeared to be guided by her beliefs about the use of group/pair work to promote an important aspect of communicative language use—negotiation of meaning.

In classes aiming to teach academic knowledge of grammar, PSTs focused intensively on knowledge delivery to ensure content was received and comprehended by students through one-way, teacher-fronted whole class instruction. Thus, whole class instruction was identified as the dominant mode of instruction in a majority of lesson observations. To conclude, a key feature of CLT, negotiation of meaning, was not observed in students’ interactions in group/pair-work tasks led by PSTs. This represents inconsistency between their practice and stated beliefs. There was only one incident in which students’ interaction in pair work enabled freer use of language and meaningful use of oral communication with the near-authentic mode of communication. In Anee’s case, her beliefs about using pair work for communicative use of language did not influence her practice in the early period of the practicum, when she was observed promoting mechanical use of language. The influence of her beliefs became apparent later, during the fifth month of the practicum, after Anee had observed one of her teacher educators
using authentic materials to create a context in which students personalised a purpose for communication and were motivated to speak to each other.

6.5 Theme 3: Error Correction

6.5.1 Beliefs about error correction
Pre-practicum, the three PSTs held negative beliefs regarding the CLT approach to error correction. All three believed it necessary to correct all language errors to avoid fossilisation. Anee believed that the teacher is obliged to correct errors to nurture accuracy. Ceeham believed that explicit and immediate correction was necessary for accurate use of language. Budsaba mainly aimed for grammar-focused correction, thus seeming not to correspond to a CLT tenet, although he did ascribe to the CLT notion of promoting self-correction. The beliefs reported by PSTs from their BQ-CLT responses are summarised in Table below:

Table 6.7: PSTs’ beliefs regarding error correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs regarding error correction</th>
<th>PSTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher should correct grammatical errors for perfect learning.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Much correction is useful for perfect learning and is needed to prevent fossilisation of errors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explicit and immediate correction is necessary for students’ accurate use of language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.2 Practices regarding error correction
This section examines PSTs’ teaching practices, to examine the extent to which their beliefs about error correction are evident when they teach, and if they treat error correction in line with CLT principles.

The salient features of treatment of error correction observed are not in line with CLT. Two non-CLT practices observed relating to error correction are: explicit form-focused error correction and teaching by rote, creating an error-free environment so there were no errors to be corrected. However, one PST (Anee) implemented a communicative style of correction, by having students correct themselves and each other, with a focus on
meaning and communication. This is discussed in detail below.

1. **Error-free learning – preventing errors through accuracy-focused instruction**

Of nine lessons aiming to improve communication skills three comprised speaking practices, three grammar lessons, two focused on reading comprehension and one on vocabulary. In all but two lessons language was not used as a means for students’ communication but was treated as a habit, with errors to be avoided at all cost (Brown, 1994). PSTs’ instructional practices were dominated by a teacher-centred approach in which the teacher exerted authority and students learned by rote. Students were rarely given chances for self- or trial-and-error learning. PSTs were focused on mastering students’ accuracy excessively rather than enhancing their ability to use language for communication. Two classes taught by Anee stood out because her practices incorporated CLT and non-CLT elements. In her first observation, however, her treatment of error correction appeared highly focused on accuracy. She created an error-free environment through use of the cognate’s technique, that is, mechanical drilling for vocabulary teaching, so learners were drilled in sound patterns of words in the lockstep sequence (see Excerpt 4). During practice, students drilled the structural pattern of dialogues line by line. Language was produced mechanically under teacher control, and students were not permitted to use their own language or negotiate meaning by reproducing accurate languages which were totally known. In this way, students’ chance to make trial-and-errors in learning was absent.

Another example occurred in one of Budsaba’s classes. The lesson aimed to promote speaking ability, asking about names of objects; however, the focus of learning relied on accuracy of form rather than meaning. Budsaba directed students in excessive repetition of accurate pronunciation and/or spelling of words, so that students responded spontaneously to prompts in a restricted step-by-step pattern (see Excerpt 10 section 2.2). By concentrating solely and almost excessively on form, awareness of meaning seemed to be lost (Richards, 1998). In Budsaba and Ceeham’s observed classes, particularly grammar lessons, students rarely made language errors. Teachers implemented rote learning and a teacher-centred approach in explaining grammar rules (see Excerpt 7).
The nine lessons involved teacher-initiated and student-response sequences of interaction as well as control practice activities. For example, in two grammar classes, Budsaba gave a monologue of grammar rules and structures, attempting to impart these to students, who she treated as knowledge recipients. Students were rarely encouraged to talk; when they did, this was to repeat grammar rules and examples as commanded. Frequently they did this by reading the information sheet in their hands (see also section 6.2.2 Grammar-based teaching practices). Error-free learning environments found in PSTs’ classroom practices were embedded with teacher-led, rote-learning methods based on accuracy. Students did not have opportunities to use language on their own. Absence of errors did not mean that students had mastered the target language, but that their use of language items was teacher-limited to make them feel confident they had mastery.

2 Explicit, immediate accuracy-focused error correction

When students did make language mistakes, PSTs’ focus remained on accuracy over meaning. Two types of accuracy-focused error correction were observed, discussed below.

2.1 Explicit correction of all grammatical errors for the purpose of grammar mastery

In the practice stages of some lessons, PSTs’ treatment of error correction involved explicit focus on form over meaning, so communicative aspects of the target language were overlooked. Excerpt 1(section 6.1.2) shows Budsaba’s correction of language errors students made in their grammar exercise on subject and verb agreement in present simple sentences. Her concern was for students to find the correct verb form. For example, she said “Eat or Eats? The subject of the sentence is ‘He’ so the correct form of the verb is...” (#37) and reminded students to “Review the rules...how to use the correct verb form in agreement of its subject”(#43). She worked on the verb form, making explicit form-and-rules focused correction. Students paid less attention to context and meaning of the verb and other words in each sentence.

Similarly, Ceeham’s approach to error correction was form focused, although error correction arose only once in her classes, when checking students’ answers from a pair-work written grammar exercise. Ceeham’s written corrections, displayed in Excerpt 9, demonstrate her non-CLT treatment of errors.
Excerpt 9: Ceeham’s correction of students’ answers to grammar exercises

**Context:** Ceeham set a time of about 10 minutes before checking and correcting students’ answers.

**Turn**

(35) Ceeham I need a volunteer to write down the answers on the board, come up to the BB and show your answer to your friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swimming</th>
<th>Running</th>
<th>walking</th>
<th>ridding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eating</td>
<td>Studying</td>
<td>leaving</td>
<td>working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crying</td>
<td>Playing</td>
<td>Getting</td>
<td>jogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>going</td>
<td>flying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The answers written by students on the BB are:

The corrections made by Ceeham are shown in italics below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riding</th>
<th>Swimming</th>
<th>Running</th>
<th>walking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridding</td>
<td>Eating</td>
<td>Studying</td>
<td>leaving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>Crying</td>
<td>Playing</td>
<td>Getting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joging&gt;jogging</td>
<td>Sending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting&gt;Meeting</td>
<td>Going</td>
<td>Flying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38 Ceeham For the verb ‘ride’, its progressive form is r-i-d-ing, only one ‘d’, not double ‘d’. And for the verb ‘meet’ in progressive form, only one ‘t’ is needed, for ‘meeting’

[T. then T. then reads out the rule for how to make the progressive form, which is written on the board]

40 Ceeham Sentences in the present progressive form begin with the subject then auxiliary verb and then the verb with ‘ing’

[T. then asks SS to repeat this rule]

42 SS Subject plus is, am, are plus verb – ing [in chorus]
Ceeham paid more attention to *accuracy* than *comprehension* while correcting students. The exercise required students to identify correct sentences with reference to rules of form. Ceeham’s treatment of error and her explanation for each correction were about rules of forming the progressive form of verbs. She underlined the lexical item of the progressive form of a verb and ended the correction without teaching context of use or meaning. These two cases demonstrate treatment of corrections were not carried through in terms of meaning appropriateness but were based on form accuracy and grammatical correctness.

### 2.2 Accuracy-focused correction, interrupting fluency of communication practice

During dialogue practice, Budsaba conducted an immediate, form-focused correction which caused a breakdown in students’ communication. The following excerpt demonstrates this.

**Excerpt 10**: Immediate, form-focused correction by Budsaba, causing a breakdown in students’ communication

**Context**: Budsaba called pairs of students to practise a dialogue discussing the name in English of something in a picture.

**Turn**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>What’s this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Flashlight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>What is it mean in Thai?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Budsaba</td>
<td>Oh, what is or what does?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Budsaba points to the sentence ‘What does it mean?’ written on the BB].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Budsaba</td>
<td>To ask about the meaning, the correct words are ‘What does it mean’. ‘Does’ not ‘Is’. Try again!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>What does it mean? (Utterance was made at a slower pace and with stress on the word ‘does’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td>/Fai-shai/ (Flashlight in Thai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Budsaba calls the next pair to come to the front to practise the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dialogue]

41  S7  What’s...?
42  S8  Silent

[Some other students answer ‘Sleeping bag’]

43  Budsaba  What’s...? It’s sleeping... what?
44  S8  Sleeping bag
45  S7  What does this mean?
46  Budsaba  Oh. What does...what?
47  S7  What does...it means?

Budsaba’s corrections interrupted the students’ stream of interaction during dialogue practice (#37, 39, 45, 47, 50). In turn 46, for example, she interrupts students’ conversations, saying “Oh. What does...what?”. She means to correct the word ‘this’ in “What does this mean” (#45) despite the fact that this is meaningful in context and communicative. This indicates Budsaba’s concern for accuracy over fluency of communication or the meaning of the message. Her intolerance for students’ errors interrupts the students’ fluent practice of speaking skills, and discourages trial-and-error learning.

3. Students’ self-correction and peer correction for self-learning

A CLT-oriented approach to error treatment was observed in one lesson. Anee integrated students’ self-correction and peer-correction in language learning, in mid-practicum in two lessons: one was a self-discovery task of vocabulary learning and the other was a speaking practice activity. On both occasions, Anee did not immediately correct students’ errors, but guided them on how to correct language errors through their own efforts and by collaborating with peers. The excerpt below (Excerpt 11), shows Anee’s promotion of self-correction and peer-correction.

**Excerpt 11 :Anee’s implementation of self-correction and peer-correction of errors .**

**Context:** Anee instructed students to carry out dictionary work in pairs, looking up target words about people’s personalities. While students were doing the task, Anee monitored. She was stopped from time to time by students who asked questions.
Is this correct, teacher – ‘police’ means ‘officer’?

It’s not the word you are looking for. Check its spelling and look up the right word in the dictionary again [Teacher reads out the spelling of the word to S1].

I have got ‘friend’ for Puean (Thai for ‘friend’). Where is the word with ‘ly’?

Check the word form carefully to make sure you get the correct meaning. A different form or spelling of a word might refer to a different meaning, be careful.

Is this answer correct, teacher?

Quite close. Share the answers you have got with your friend and check for the best answer.

A pair of students calls for the teacher’s help from the other side of the classroom

Teacher, please. What does ‘Bossy’ mean?

What does the dictionary say?

In the dictionary, it says <Bossy> means ‘เจ้าชาย(Choa-Chai)’ (Boss).

Not that word. The word is ‘Bossy’ but you’re looking at ‘Boss’. It’s not the same. Go check it up again.

There is no <Bossy> in my dictionary

[T. then looks for the word in her dictionary and points the word out to her].

It’s here <Bossy>. Check the meaning carefully!

[T. leaves S4 and turns to the whole class to ask for the meaning of ‘Bossy’. When no one can respond, the teacher explains the below]

Different forms of a word will convey different meanings. Make sure you
Anee provided corrective feedback (#31) and prompted students to self- or peer-correct (#35). After S4 asked what “bossy” meant (#36), students were observed talking with peers and checking dictionaries. Anee demonstrated tolerance of students’ learning errors, not giving correct answers even they asked for these, but guided them to find answers for themselves (see #37, 39, 41-42). After Anee’s guided feedback, students were observed working in pairs, trying to recheck incorrect words and grasp meaning through discussion and dictionary use, finally acquiring the target answer (#43). Similarly, in a speaking class, Anee assumed the role of facilitator and co-speaker, setting up a near-natural practice in which students gave directions around their town. Anee provided some prompts, cues and support to promote students’ self- and peer-correction (see #48, 56, 58 in Excerpt 6, Section 6.2). For instance, when a student gave the wrong directions, she asked, “Are you sure? Not that way. It should be the other direction, try again” (#48). She added, “Can anybody else say this?”(#48), to encourage peer-correction. A CLT tenet found in Anee’s approach to error correction is focus on appropriateness of use and communicative use of language, with no explicit focus on accuracy as observed in her first observation (see Excerpt 4). In addition, her treatment of errors included and encompassed important features of fluency-focused instructions. These included students’ learning associated with communication strategies that aimed to achieve communication and practice. Language use requires learners to produce language that is not completely predictable and is meaningful within context (Richards, 2006). These instructional practices demonstrate Anee’s approach to error correction, in which she helped students to identify mistakes and understand language for themselves. These trial-and-error efforts enable learners to organise and comprehend new linguistic forms and functions by finding solutions to their communication dilemmas by utilizing all the resources appropriate to a situation (Smith, 1982).
6.5.3 Beliefs and practices: to what extent did the PSTs’ beliefs about error correction guide their classroom practices during the practicum?

Observational data indicate that two PSTs’ classroom practices supported their non-CLT pre-practicum beliefs about error correction. One PST had a CLT approach to error correction in her classroom instruction during the practicum course. Teacher-centred rote learning was the main teaching approach used to promote learning for accuracy. Error free learning was identified as a salient feature of classroom environments. This is due to accuracy focused instructions that affected learning practices directed towards reproduction of accurate language.

These data indicate that PSTs’ non-CLT beliefs about ‘accuracy use of language is as perfect learning has strong impact on actual classroom practices during their initial practicum course. Explicit error correction for grammatical correctness was also prominent in PSTs’ teaching practice. Form-focused correction without effective integration of communicative language use meant that students focused learning on practising accurate grammatical forms in grammar exercises and accurate (rather than fluent) use of language in speaking practice. In observations of two PSTs’ speaking classes, teachers tended towards immediate error correction, causing communication between students to breakdown during dialogue practices. PSTs’ approaches to error correction indicate excessive focus on accuracy over fluency, and reflect stated beliefs about the importance of explicit and immediate correction for accurate language use and that the teacher should correct grammatical errors for perfect learning. Thus, two PSTs’ pre-practicum beliefs were integrated into their practice.

A main finding is that most observed classes were characterised by a largely error-free environment, with students instructed to reproduce accurate language. This arises from PSTs’ accuracy-focused beliefs and highly lack of CLT-based beliefs about fluency and meaning-focused learning. In CLT, fluency and accuracy are two key complementary principles. Fluency is often given prominence over accuracy to keep students meaningfully engaged in using language for communication (Brown, 1994).

In conclusion, PSTs’ non-CLT beliefs about error correction influenced their treatment of error correction and usual classroom practices. However, one PST’s practice contradicted
her stated beliefs about error correction. She used important features of CLT, including self-correction, peer correction and indirect error correction, with greater focus on fluency and meaning than on accuracy. The CLT elements of her practice of error correction, however, imply influence of her beliefs about implicit instruction of grammar and the CLT-oriented role of teacher and students.

6.6 Theme 4 Role of teacher

6.6.1 PSTs’ beliefs
Survey data indicate that common concepts and beliefs about CLT teaching as reported by PSTs are:

- The authoritative teacher as imparter of knowledge is no longer the main role in the language classroom;
- Teachers have different roles dependent on different learning activities;
- Teachers should cater to the widely differing needs of individual students.

PSTs’ held positive theoretical beliefs towards CLT concepts relating to the teacher’s role as more than a ‘knowledge transmitter’. PSTs used different terms to define the facilitative teacher. Aneé asserted the belief in the teacher as a resource of knowledge and an organiser:

“Language teachers should be aware to provide some extra tasks or other relevant content to extend the students’ scope of learning. An organiser is another of the teacher’s main obligations in facilitating effective learning activities” (BQ/PST1, q4).

Budsaba saw the teacher as a tutor to suit different ‘levels’ of learning ability:

“Teachers should play other roles beyond only imparting knowledge. If possible, teachers should provide tutorial lessons for the low-ability learners and add supplementary lessons for able students” (BQ/PST2, q4).

Ceeham noted the teacher as a learning helper, or the so called coach of self-learning, regarding the individual nature of learning:

“Besides the primary job of transferring knowledge, a good teacher should find out the best method of teaching for each student’s nature of learning” (BQ/PST3, q4).

PSTs focus specifically on students’ individuality in learning, asserting this notion as the key for assuming any CLT role as a teacher. From the PSTs’ statements above, roles specified or referred to as the CLT teachers can be summarised as follows:
Table 6.8: PSTS’ Beliefs about teacher roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs about teacher roles</th>
<th>PSTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different roles: Knowledge transmitter in introduction; conductor (or activity organizer) in practice; facilitator (co-learner) in production (Richards, 1985) Teacher assumes responsibility for analyzing and catering for students’ individuality of learning under teacher as ‘need analyst’ (Richards and Rodger, 2014)</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Activity organiser</td>
<td>Anee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tutor for different levels of students</td>
<td>Budsaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coach of learning (skill)</td>
<td>Ceeham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.2 Teacher roles in practice

Observation notes demonstrate that teacher roles played by PSTs categorize into two pattern: one orientated towards the CLT aspect as facilitator; and one clinging to the traditional figure of “teacher as transmitter and controller”. PSTs’ teaching roles are less controlling in speaking lessons than in those of grammar or reading. They occasionally used facilitative teacher aspects, for example: in introducing new language and topics with reference to students’ personal backgrounds; and as need analyst, when the teacher regards students’ individual differences and considers assessment of needs and background knowledge as integral to students’ learning to achieve learning goals (Harmer, 2001). The need analyst teacher facilitates students’ self-learning and collaborative peer-learning in group/pair work under the role of activity organiser. However, these roles were less frequent than the authoritative transmitter of knowledge which was played in most classes.

1. Facilitative teacher who is no longer the ‘knowledge transmitter’

1.1 Coach of learning and resource

Only Anee adopted a facilitative role in two observations, after she had taken an authoritative stance as knowledge transmitter and controlling conductor in her speaking lesson early in the practicum. During the second observation, she relaxed her grip on students’ learning and integrated her beliefs about students’ self-learning, reported pre-
practicum. In the dictionary learning session, she took on roles as monitor and knowledge resource as well as knowledge transmitter, a role she had played previously in speaking lessons. Excerpt 11 section 6.3.2 shows Anee as coach of self-learning skill and resource of knowledge. Another role, facilitator, occurred when prompting students to correct their mistakes.

Anee’s post-observation questionnaire noted:

“I plan to coach them how to learn rather than just tell them what and how. This is to improve their English skills for lifelong learning, so that they can have their own research anywhere anytime when the teacher is not available” (PoQ-C1/2, q3).

This shows her adoption of the facilitator roles derived from her high regard for student-centred concept and lifelong learning.

1.2 Teacher as co-speaker

Anee played the facilitator role extensively in the third observation, which took place near the end of the practicum. She acted out the co-speaker role neatly, joining in with students as an interlocutor in the role-playing activity, to help keep flow of interaction and complete speaking practice. Other CLT features she successfully adopted into her practicum classrooms include pair work for meaningful practice of language, and students’ self-correction. Data show Anee assumed other facilitative aspects under different sub-roles, including need analyst, guide, less controlling organiser, coach of learning, learning advisor, and co-speaker (see Excerpts 5, and 6 and Table 6.6).

In subsuming multiple sub-roles, she managed classroom instruction in alignment with CLT methods. In this study, Anee represents the exception among PSTs; her beliefs about CLT teacher roles were implemented in her classroom. She integrated her beliefs about the CLT teacher playing different roles and sub-roles into practice.

2. Teacher as authority: knowledge transmitter and controller

Budsaba and Ceeham reflected traditional teaching. Both adopted the knowledge imparter role, especially when lessons emphasised mastery in linguistic knowledge and grammar. Budsaba played the didactic teacher role in her two grammar lessons. Data in Figure 6.1, Excerpt .1, 2, 7 & 8 highlight how each lesson was dominated by teacher monologue on grammar rules and their applications in chalk-talk style, with rare student
involvement. These PSTs assumed a highly authoritative manner, subsuming three sub-roles when aiming for developing students’ grammar competence. First, they played ‘grammar translator’ when presenting new target grammar by exerting long, elaborate explanations of the intricacies of grammar, trying to promote students’ memorization of rules for linguistic mastery (Excerpt 1 in Section 6.1.2). Second, their modelling of sentences used the sub role ‘demonstrators’ of language usage, exhibiting how to generate language from grammar. Third, they played complete ‘authoritative directors’ in dictating students’ language production through accuracy-focused grammar activities (see Excerpts 1 and 2 in Section 6.1.2). Other roles played included monitor, corrector, assessor and sole source of knowledge. This latter students relied on at all costs to learn. The ‘knowledge imparter’ habit was in addition to Ceeham’s roles of storyteller and text translator in her two reading classes. Ceeham utilized the role of the informative transmitter of knowledge, teaching through teacher-narrated and student-listened sequences; she chose this to ensure that all content was received by learners. The excerpt below (Excerpt 12) exemplifies Ceeham’s storyteller role directly.

**Excerpt 12 : Ceeham’s role of storyteller in teaching reading**

**Context:** After a vocabulary development session, Ceeham entered the reading activity comprehension using questions to promote students’ ability to read for information in the text.

**Turn**

(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Turn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ceeham</td>
<td>So, can you tell me now, what the conversation is about? ①②③④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>[Read the title of the passage in low voice]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ceeham</td>
<td>(Repeat the title of passage and translate to Thai) OK. Who’s the first speaker? ①②③④</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>[silent]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ceeham</td>
<td>Students. Looks! It’s Maya. Who says…….’(Next speech)? ①②③</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>[Few students answers ‘Ramon’] ①②</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All right. You hear two persons: Maya and Ramon saying what...

Pick-pocket

Maya is worried about being...?

[Silent]

Maya is being pick-pocketed. She is talking with Ramon about how the pickpocket steal tourists’ money pocket in the crowd likes in the cities. The pickpocket will pretend that he is drunk and approach to you, hug you. What happen after that?

The tourists are being pick-pocketed.

And you will lose what? Who’s the second speaker?

How does he say....? What does he mean?

[Only few students answer, most students are in silent]

See what Maya says at the end of the dialog. Here she said she..... [T. interpreted sentence by sentence and intermittently stressed some key words in the passage] What Maya’s stuff was stolen?

Money pocket. [Most students read the dialog in the worksheet to scan for the answer]

OK. After she told Ramon her money pocket was stolen. Ramon replied that

[Ceexah continued translating the sentence to Thai].

This extract shows two aspects of knowledge transmission played in teaching reading. Firstly, Ceexah posed closed questions, probing for basic factual information which was easy to identify by pupils with a little knowledge of English. Basic questions, for example, “Who started the conversation? Who’s the second speaker?” might clarify the story sequence and encourage prediction about the story; however, here this did not encourage comprehension of ideas.
Second, Ceeham did not allow sufficient wait time for students’ self-analytical thinking, but, supplied the answer herself. On average, four seconds of waiting time was given, and most content was stated by the teacher in the end. Ceeham, as the transmitter for storytelling and text translation, hindered students’ textual analysis. This PST’s didactic instruction using typical grammar translation implies the teacher is a knowledge transmitter with a directive and controlling manner; this contrasts with the multiple facilitative roles Ceeham stated were her preference pre-practicum. Ceeham played the role of teacher as knowledge imparter and storyteller, using direct translation to ensure that all text content and details were delivered to students. These observed roles of teaching do not match her stated beliefs that “teachers should play other roles beyond only imparting knowledge”. These two PSTs did not provide varied tasks and contents according to students’ individual learning styles. This indicates that the roles of resources and catering to individual learning were not taken seriously in practice.

3. Assortment of less controlling roles

3.1 Facilitator of students’ peers- learning (group/pair work activities)
As mentioned in section 6.2, PSTs used group/pair work to vary their routine to support students’ peer-to-peer collaborative learning. They also played different, less controlling role whilst facilitating and monitoring students’ interactions during group/pair work (Table 6.4, Excerpt 4 & section 6.6). Students worked individually on their own and in pairs with each other, without direct control or explicit teacher intervention. In these situations, the teacher role became guide, monitor and helper. When students asked for answers, PSTs tried to push them to their group and attempt self and peer correction, or to consult course books. Students learned by doing, not by relying on the teacher. Hence PSTs subsumed the role of corrective feedback; they acted as facilitators in supporting students’ self-learning skills.

3.2 Schema activator/Motivator: facilitator of students’ motivation in learning – Common facilitative roles found in three PSTs.
A common role PSTs played when introducing language is Schema activator. In this role, teachers present the topic and key vocabulary that PSTs were observed motivating students personally, driving learning by using material to contextualize content and
meaning, and questioning students about their relevant personal experiences and background knowledge. An example was evident in Ceeham’s reading lesson about celebrity life as Excerpt 13 shows:

**Excerpt 13: Ceeham’s role of schema activator/Need analyst**

**Context:** At the beginning of the class in the introduction stage, Ceeham used pictures and questions to prompt the students’ schemata and experiences about the topic and content.

**Turn**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(#)</th>
<th>Ceeham</th>
<th>Ss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Have you ever read the stories about the famous actors or singers you knew? Give me some famous works of these celebrities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes [Each student state the names of their famous singers and actors]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OK! Name me the most favourite Singer you like.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nam Cha/Bee (The famous Thai singers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lovely. So, What is Bee famous song? Can you name me one?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Smile/Love beat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Good. And... this...do you know who is she? [T. shows the picture of a famous world singer; Shakira]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shakira [Class answer in Choral]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Right, can you tell me some of her famous songs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>‘Waka Waka’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Do you like listening to the song ‘Waka Waka’? Can anyone sing the song?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>[A group of student in the back sing the song aloud. The whole class are clapping their hands]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Well, if you like her works, you will be interested to know more about her lives, for example, where was she born or where is she from, right? The passage to read today's is about the celebrity's lives. Look at the title.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ceeham used pictures of celebrities, and questioning techniques to build students’ schemata by motivating interest in topic content. Ceeham built up interactive participation between teacher and students, and stimulated students’ personal interests and initiative to learn about the target topic. Students became highly motivated to participate in this activity. In this role, PSTs used typical schema activation helping students construct new knowledge based on personal background knowledge and interests (Richards et al., 2000).

6.6.3 Beliefs and practice: to what extent did PSTs’ beliefs guide their practices regarding teacher roles?

Five findings relate to teacher roles PSTs played:

- Budsaba and Ceeham acted as knowledge transmitters, being didactic and controlling. These roles occurred when implementing instruction in grammar lessons and during reading comprehensions. This demonstrates a mismatch with their stated beliefs that CLT involves more than knowledge transmission.

- PSTs’ roles aligned with traditional ‘knowledge transmission’ rather than roles specified pre-practicum. Specifically, Budsaba did not assess or analyze students’ individual abilities and was not observed allotting learning styles to students. Lesson content and tasks were imposed solely by PSTs and with reference to the course book, without student choice. The “Teacher as learning skills coach” was not seen in Ceeham’s practice, whose main role was directive in conducting story-telling and direct translation.

- PSTs attempted to relax class control and empower students’ self-learning and peer-to-peer learning through group/pair work. However, this was less frequent than the controlling role. PSTs retained authority in imposing what and how to learn.

- PSTs expressed strong agreement with addressing individuals’ needs pre-practicum, but in practice, did not enact this individuality in practice. They occasionally implemented need analysis when helping to connect background ideas with new topics and motivating students’ to learn. However, integration of students’ personal needs using the ‘need analyst’ role was absent in pre-speaking practice lessons. Only Anee used need analyst regularly when presenting target content and topics.
• Anee was the only PST to show gradual development in experimentation with less controlling roles, even stretching to facilitative roles during the three observations. The preferred roles of ‘activity organizer’ and ‘resource’ stated pre-practicum were observed extensively when promoting self-learning and communicative language use. This implies her stated belief about CLT teacher roles was consistent with roles she played in classroom practice.

6.6.4 Conclusion
There is evidence that PSTs played facilitative roles apart from controlling transmitter of knowledge. Thus, playing contrasting roles, that is, an authorative teacher and facilitator according to lesson content (Richards, 1995) was not applicable. One PST assumed a CLT teacher role consistent with her beliefs. Two PSTs’ teacher roles in classrooms did not match their beliefs. This leads to the conclusion that PSTs’ stated practices regarding teacher CLT roles reflected their beliefs only to a limited extent.

6.7 Theme 5: Students’ roles and contribution to learning

6.7.1 PSTs’ beliefs
Pre-practicum survey data indicate that PSTs held beliefs strongly aligned with common CLT concepts regarding students’ roles and contribution to learning as follows:

• Students’ contribution to learning is acquired most effectively by using language, not by directly study of explicit language;
• Tasks and activities can be negotiated and adapted to suit students’ needs rather than be imposed upon them, allowing students to suggest appropriate lesson content and activities;
• Training learners to take responsibility for their own learning.

The observed PSTs specified students’ active participation in learning activities was important. Each noted additional ‘features’ they believed typical of language students. Anee considered students’ needs and varied abilities:
“Good students must be very prompt to participate in any classroom activities. The teacher, then, should plan well for topics and tasks which best fit to students’ levels and personal interest” (BQ/PST4-Q2, q4).

Budsaba pointed out students’ self-learning as the best method for practice in language learning:

“It is essential for students to actively participate in all learning activities. Students have to try to learn by themselves for best learning” (BQ/PST2, q5).

Ceeham noted self-determination and self-responsibility of learning:

“Self-determination and self-responsibility are important qualities for language students in achieving language ability. If they’d like to be good at speaking, they should be active to participate in all skill practices” (BQ/PST2, q5).

Roles PSTs specified or referred to as CLT teachers are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.9: PSTs ‘Beliefs about student roles’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs about student roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being language users;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well-engaged and participatory in classroom activities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take control of their own learning (self-learning);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have position to suggest lesson content and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.7.2 Students’ roles in practices.

Lesson observations indicate that the three PSTs’ classrooms were mostly teacher-centred; students were passive learners, doing most learning activities under teacher control. Their classrooms were places for teacher delivery of language knowledge content for mastery in linguistics rather than communication. The primary student roles as learners of language appeared as sub-roles, including ‘grammar analyst’ and ‘passive recipient’.

1. As learners of language: the grammar analyst

1.1 Students as grammar analysts

Students as the grammar analysts was found in two PSTs’ lessons. Budsaba and Ceeham’s grammar instructions were based on teacher-fronted transmission, and learning centred
on overt presentation of rules and application. This reflected that students were directed to learn to analyze grammar points and, ultimately, be competent in grammar. PSTs dominated classroom interaction by giving monologues about grammar. Students’ responses included reading the rules and examples provided. Since no communicative activities were involved, there was no chance for the students to interact to ‘use the language’.

As grammar analysts, students learned by memorizing rules, then building up examples of target grammar points by referring to the rules. They were ‘traditional’ language learners, since they never tried using grammar in actual speech. Throughout grammar lessons, no other mode of learning was apparent.

1.2 Students as passive recipients of knowledge

The passive recipient role was observed in all three PSTs’ students. In this role students showed little initiative and lacked active participation in learning. Passive learning roles include: (1) silently listening to teacher’s presentation of rules and how rules should be applied; and (2) responding to teacher’s commands and answering to teachers’ questions when the teacher called/prompted them to do.

In Ceeham’s reading classes showed no evidence that students had meaningful hands on experience, even in while reading activities. Ceeham dominated reading by telling the story, directly translating content into students’ native language. Ceeham’s students became spoon-fed passive learners, receiving decoded text by the teacher. Passive listening may block students from ‘incorporating new forms into [their still] developing communicative competence’ (Richards and Rodger, 2001).

2. Students had no opportunity to suggest content and tasks to suit their learning needs

Since all content and tasks were planned, designed and imposed by PSTs acting as the sole ‘source of knowledge’ and ‘authority’, diverse individual learning needs were ignored. Students were not given opportunities to select content, topics or tasks. Occasionally, group/pair work was arranged to supplement teacher-fronted didactic learning. PSTs met individual needs on these occasions by providing learning tasks in groups and pairs that indirectly induced individual and collaborative learning (Slavin, 1987).

When students used one another as resources by working collaboratively and in teams,
their engagement increases (Knapp, Turnbull, & Shields, 1990). One PST’s consideration of students’ background knowledge occurred in an introduction activity involving word cards naming foods and drinks, and pictures of well-known celebrities (see Excerpt 13). This seems to activate students’ background knowledge about the target topic. These instances accommodate students’ diverse needs and background knowledge (Kagan, 1986).

Integration of students’ personal interests with background knowledge was observed infrequently. Students usually learned teacher imposed content and topics. Lack of teacher consideration for students’ individuality was found, with the exception of Anee’s observed classes. This proves that students had no involvement in selecting what to learn and how to perform their classroom learning in contrast with PSTs reported beliefs.

3. Students as passive learners, had control of their own learning only whilst working in groups/pairs

Students could control their learning when group/pair works were assigned. Usually they were under teacher guidance with detailed directions on what and how to complete tasks.

PSTs acted as guides and helpers in facilitating student group/pair work. Students worked together generating interactive learning. This learning constituted students’ contribution to their learning. For example, in Budsaba’s implementation of speaking practice, she used role-playing in pairs in which students worked sequentially; firstly, in a group for pre-practice, and later, in pairs. Students were allowed time to create a collaborative relationships at least twice: first, when they cooperated in pairs to write a script; and second, when rehearsing dialogue before presenting a role-play. Budsaba did not intervene while students were working but helped as required. This indicates that students were free from teacher control, could work independently and with team members.

4. Students as language users being active in learning.

Two of Anee’s classes generated student behavior as self-learners and language users. Students had active roles to play while interacting with the teacher and other students in practicing giving directions. Excerpt 5 and 6 shows students were active ‘users of
language. ‘when enabled to use language meaningfully in communicative activities. These were facilitated and co-participated in by Anee, who assumed ‘facilitator’, ‘prompter’ and ‘co-speaker’ roles.

Other examples occurred when a pair of students was unable to maintain interaction in role-playing. In this instance, classmates assumed “speaker” roles to keep the role-play going. Students improvised words aside from word lists taught by the teacher. In the Thai EFL context English is unusual, so students usually demonstrate little willingness to use English for communication. Thus, this finding is rare evidence for meaning-making initiated by students for communicative learning (Pattapon Kamlaithip, 2010). However, opportunities for students to exhibit ‘language user’ were infrequent. Students interacted with language items and analyzed the language system, but rarely had learning tasks that supported active learning. PSTs’ may have believed they should adopt ‘controller’ to exert authority alongside ‘knowledge transmitter’, so most learning activities targeted linguistic mastery and accuracy of form. Anee’s students’ role as active participants in learning was atypical.

6.7.3 Beliefs and practices: to what extent were PSTs’ beliefs about students’ roles and contribution to learning guiding practice?

Observational data indicate that students’ roles and contribution to learning found in the three PSTs’ classroom practices during the teaching practicum were consistent with roles they stated as personal preferences pre-practicum. Aspects of students’ roles inconsistent with their stated beliefs are discussed below.

First, students as ‘learners of language’ are inconsistent with stated beliefs about students’ as ‘users of language’. Students rarely assumed active roles. They assumed sub roles such as grammar analysts (in grammar lessons), recipients of knowledge (in reading lessons), and imitators of language use (in controlled practice of mechanical use of speaking skills). PSTs attempted to enable students to focus on language, not to use English for communication. Apart from lesson introductions when teachers aimed to present new language or content and treated students as good listeners (Richards, 1985), students were receivers of knowledge and/or passive recipients, consistent with the predominant teacher role as transmitter of knowledge.
Secondly, students infrequently took control of their own learning. Responsibility for learning was rarely given to students, remaining mainly with teachers. When students worked in groups or pairs they exercised self- and collaborative learning. PSTs’ consideration of students’ individual needs and personal interests of learning were found occasionally when introducing a new topic/language, and in some speaking practices when the activity adopted a purposeful communication situation and meaningful language use. Anee was the exception: she constantly promoted students’ self-learning into her practices. Budsaba and Ceeham only occasionally integrated this aspect. Thirdly, lesson topic, content, tasks and all learning processes were imposed by the PSTs. Students were unable to voice their own interests, state their preferred mode of instruction, classroom activities, and choose materials or learning assessment (Tudor, 1993). Students lacked a substantive position to suggest content and tasks. This was not aligned with PSTs’ pre-practicum beliefs.

In conclusion, PSTs’ stated beliefs regarding students’ self-learning and being language users guided their practice to a limited extent. Only one PST exhibited practice consistent with her pre-practicum beliefs. Their beliefs about students’ engagement in learning were absent in practice. The simple conclusion is that stated beliefs about students’ roles did not effectively impact on actual teacher roles.

6.8 Summary

Table 6.10 below portrays the relationship between beliefs and practices of the three PSTs. There appear the PSTs did not integrate their CLT-based beliefs into practices while their practices that relied on non-CLT tenets matched with their non-CLT beliefs.
Table 6.10: PSTs ‘practices and beliefs’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>CLT Features</th>
<th>Anee</th>
<th>Budsaba</th>
<th>Ceeham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Place of Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implicit role of grammar</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grammar notion/function precedes grammar rules.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on ‘fluency’ and appropriateness over ‘accuracy’.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use of Group /Pair Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-responsibility learning (associated with theme 5)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborative learning (i.e. peer learning)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student/s-students near-genuine interaction for communication</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Error Correction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implicit/indirect correction.</td>
<td>−</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• selective and delayed correction</td>
<td>−</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meaning-focused correction (grammatical error is not a focus)</td>
<td>−</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Role of teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• facilitator of learning.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘resource of knowledge’ beyond being and one-and-only ‘source of knowledge’.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need analyst.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' role and contribution</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User of language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in choice negotiation of learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-directed in learning</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B = Stated beliefs + displays the CLT-orientation
P = Observed Practice − displays the non-CLT orientation
R = rares practices +/− displays the mixture of both concepts with the greater CLT orientation
NG = Not Applicable −/+ displays the mixture of both concepts with the greater non-CLT orientation

Cells in grey-shade display marked consistency that identified between beliefs and practices
CHAPTER 7

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

7.1 Introduction to the Chapter

This chapter presents the thesis’ key findings and discusses their implications for the research questions. The findings of the study are presented in three main sections, each of which addresses one of the three main research questions. To help guide the finding and discussion, this chapter begins by revisiting the research questions that the study seeks to answer. The findings are next interpreted with reference to the literature reviewed in chapters 2 and 3. Finally, the main contributions of this study are outlined. Section 7.2 considers PSTs’ beliefs about CLT. Section 7.3 portrays the relationship between PSTs’ beliefs and practices, and discusses how and to what extent the PSTs integrate pedagogical beliefs into their practices. Section 7.4 emphasises and then offers a justification for any consistencies and inconsistencies between beliefs and practices and explains the reasons underlying the PSTs’ adoption or rejection of CLT. Section 7.5 summarises factors that impact on the divergence between PSTs’ stated beliefs, their classroom practices, and their application of CLT. In presenting the data, each section will begin with a brief summary of the findings or discussion; this summary serves as the focus of that section and it is followed by an interpretation and discussion of the findings, with reference to the theoretical perspectives and literature reviewed in chapter 2 and 3 respectively.

7.2 PSTs’ pre-practicum beliefs about Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Research question 1 - What are the stated beliefs of EFL Preservice teachers about Communicative language teaching (CLT) before before the start of their teaching practicum?

Summary of the main Findings

As a group, Thai EFL PSTs in this study did not profoundly agree with any of the five CLT themes (Karavas Doukas, 1998). A small majority held modest positive beliefs about CLT (notions relating to use of group/pair work and students’ contribution to learning. A minority
regarded the communicative aspect of grammar instruction and the CLT-based treatment of error correction positively. Their views about each aspect of CLT at the statement level showed inconsistencies. PSTs were divided in their pedagogical beliefs, demonstrating no consensus about CLT concepts. Three salient characteristics inherent in PSTs’ pedagogical beliefs are highlighted:

| 7.2.1 Thai EFL preservice teachers held a mixture of beliefs and are not strongly convinced about CLT |
| 7.2.2. Thai EFL PSTs’ stated beliefs were inconsistent, within and across themes. |
| 7.2.3. Thai EFL PSTs held Consistent non-CLT beliefs regarding grammar accuracy and accuracy-focused treatment of correction. |

**7.2.1 Thai EFL preservice teachers held a mixture of beliefs and are not strongly convinced about CLT**

Prior to their initial teaching practicum, the PSTs held negative beliefs about the place of grammar and error correction. They were in slight disagreement about CLT aspects of the indirect, implicit role of grammar and meaning-based and delayed error correction. This finding illustrates the hybrid perspective or mixed beliefs about language teaching in CLT and non-CLT approaches (Ellis, 2004). There are two notable findings about the PSTs’ mixed beliefs:

- **PSTs ‘Negative’ beliefs about the place of grammar and error correction**

  Regarding the place of grammar, a majority of participants believed it would be difficult to manage effective instruction of grammar in the complex strategies of teaching language for communication. They respected direct instruction of grammar as effective for accomplishing communicativeness. A small number of participants regarded the implicit role of grammar positively.

  Regarding beliefs about Treatment of Error correction, a majority of participants held negative beliefs. PSTs respect ‘accuracy of form’, reflecting concern for achieving perfect linguistic mastery as an essential key for improving communicative competence. This contradicts the CLT notion that linguistic knowledge is the supporting instrumental component of communicative language learning (Nunan, 1998).
PSTs held relatively consistent respect for mastery of linguistics and correspondingly endorsed explicit error correction to maintaining grammatical accuracy for perfect learning. While their standpoints about much and immediate correction for grammatical accuracy was consistently not oriented to CLT notion, their core belief about the role of grammar lacks internal consistency that they did not stated believing in every aspects of grammar instruction in CLT way. This is discussed next.

- **EFL PSTs’ ‘inconsiderable’ positive beliefs about use of group/pair work and students’ contribution to learning**

PSTs held positive perceptions about use of teacher roles, group/pair work, use of group/pair work and students’ contribution to learning. A small majority of participants supported the CLT teacher role. Use of group/pair work for communication and CLT-based student roles were endorsed by a small majority. Moreover, despite their collective beliefs aligned to CLT, PSTs expressed agreement with anti-and pro-CLT statements about many concepts. Superficially, this is treated as inconsistency of beliefs. A possible explanation is discussed in 7.4

7.2.2. **Thai EFL PSTs’ stated beliefs were inconsistent, within and across themes.**

PSTs’ beliefs towards the five sub-theme of CLT aspects were inconsistent. It is noteworthy that these unstable viewpoints were found in responses towards paired-opposite statements. The PSTs collectively held conflicting beliefs showing agreement to both CLT conceptual statements and non-CLT conceptual statements presented in Karavas -Doukas’ BQ-CLT (1998). Salient patterns of inconsistencies were found as follows:

7.2.2.1 **Inconsistency in beliefs about using group/pair work, teacher roles and the roles of students.**

*Authoritative teacher v.s. Use of group/pair work for communication.*

Beliefs about the use of group/pair work could not be considered separately from reciprocal beliefs about teacher role and students’ contribution to learning. PSTs’ pedagogical orientations were towards the teacher as an authoritative figure delivering whole class instruction. They showed preference for the teacher as knowledge imparter and as a sole source of knowledge (see Tables 5.6 and 5.7). PSTs underrated the use of group/pair work for communicative learning. Their slight support for the CLT role of the teacher indicates
they were not convinced that ‘small group work can replace the formal whole-class instruction by a competent teacher’. Examples of contradictory relationships between these beliefs are:

- Agreement that group/pair work promotes skills of self-learning and so useful for language learning but also that a whole class of formal teacher instruction can make students do their best; and that training students to take responsibility for their learning is futile.
- Disregard for students’ autonomous learning and preference for the teacher as the center of the classroom indirectly undermines use of group/pair work for enhancing students’ self-responsibility.

**Authoritative teacher vs. autonomous learners**
PSTs’ beliefs about teacher roles and students’ contribution to learning did not correspond. This discrepancy was noted via modest agreement with the concept of learner autonomy and slight agreement or disagreement with the facilitative CLT teacher role. PSTs showed preference for traditional teacher authority, but simultaneously respected the students’ CLT-based role as independent language users. Beliefs data show participants lacked consistency in beliefs by agreeing with self-learning and student’s individual difference and disagreeing with these concepts elsewhere. This was marked in their contradictory views about students’ needs satisfaction. PSTs’ expressed strong agreement with ‘tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students’ needs’ (Statement 20/Table 5.8). However, they reported agreement with ‘students should not suggest for the content and activities they like’. CLT-based concepts relating to students’ role as language users and relevant features such as ‘self-learning (Thanasoulas, 2002), self-directed learning’ (Candy, 1991) and ‘self-responsibility in learning (Holec, 1983) which subsume learner autonomy were not understood. This indicates that PSTs preferred to promote students as active, autonomous learners, yet resisted reducing teacher authority and control. Examples of these inconsistent beliefs are:

**Student-oriented vs. teacher-centred**
‘Tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students’ need’ and that ‘students’ should not suggest for the content and activities they like’. 
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**Teacher control vs. students’ self-learning**
Learner-centered approach encourages self-responsibility for language learning and that training students to take responsibility for their own learning is futile since they are not used to such an approach.

**Strength vs. weakness in using group/pair work**
The four statements about group/pair work described advantages and disadvantages of interactive activities (see Table 5.5). PSTs expressed agreement with advantages of group/pair work as useful for communicative learning, and associated disadvantages. Time consuming and excessive use of student mother tongue were two constraints associated with group/pair work. Two explanations could be drawn from the findings, that is, (1) the PSTs would be aware of advantages and disadvantages in using group/pair work and/or (2) their beliefs were not firmly established so were changeable.

**7.2.2.2 Inconsistencies in beliefs about the role of grammar role and how to teach communicative grammar.**
PSTs’ beliefs about grammar in language teaching show inconsistencies. PSTs hold contradictory viewpoints about the role of grammar (Implicit vs. Explicit), learning attributes of grammar (function-focused v form-focused) and method of grammar instruction (Direct V.S. Indirect). For example, most PSTs responded favorably to opposing statements about how to teach grammar. They agreed that ‘direct, explicit instruction of grammar is essential for communicativeness’ (Statement 23/Table 5.4), and simultaneously agreed that ‘grammar should be taught as a means’ (Statement 3/Table 5.4). Second, participants responded positively to opposing statements about learning attributes of grammar rules. PSTs believed that ‘knowledge of rules does not guarantee language ability’ (Statement 13/Table 5.4), and agreed that ‘mastering in grammar rules produces an effective communicator’ (Statement 17. Table 5.4). Data indicate (section 5.4.2) that PSTs were convinced that explicit correction of grammatical errors show respect for linguistics inaccuracy. This does not align with CLT (Ellis, 2004).

These discrepancies suggest PSTs neither held clearly defined beliefs about the value of grammar nor possessed conclusive opinions about the role of grammar. PSTs’ knowledge about role and place of grammar in language teaching was not defined, yet showing lack of
clarity about to what extent and how grammar should be applied in particular in the lesson that aims for students’ communicative competence. This leads to the plausible conclusion to the uncertainty of their effectiveness in teaching grammar under CLT-based syllabus.

7.2.3. Thai EFL PSTs held Consistent non-CLT beliefs regarding grammar accuracy and accuracy-focused treatment of correction.
Consistencies indicating PSTs’ preference for non-CLT-oriented roles of grammar and treatment of error corrections were found. Most PSTs held negative beliefs about CLT-based error correction. A minority supported the CLT notion of meaning-oriented correction and implicit, selective correction of grammatical errors. This matches their non-CLT oriented beliefs about place of grammar. PSTs also reported disagreement with the statement – ‘All grammatical errors should not be ignored to promote perfect learning’. This indicates consistency in their views about grammatical accuracy. This consistency demonstrates that their beliefs inclined towards a non-communicative role of grammar, with PSTs secure about explicit and form-focused correction.

In sum, the group of Thai EFL PSTs held conflicting beliefs showing agreement with both CLT and non-CLT concepts presented under each particular of five CLT themes in BQ-CLT survey (Karavas-Doukas, 1998). The PSTs’ beliefs about certain features of language teaching lacked internal consistency and coherence and this pattern of beliefs was found under each theme and sub-themes about CLT.

It should be noted at this point that the PSTs’ agreement with two opposing statements (one, for example, dealing with the merit of CLT-based instruction of grammar, and the other with the merit of grammar-based). Does not necessarily imply a lack of understanding or and fluctuated attitude on part of the respondent. According to Karavas-Doukas (1996), language teachers could well respond to both statements as they took into consideration the contexts, in which, for example, both communicative approach of grammar teaching and the grammar-based teaching have an important role to play. However, this causes the problem of data analysis. The question raised from this phenomenon is that ‘Is the PSTs’ similarly endorsed of both concepts due to the lack of clarified understanding of CLT principle or is it because they were aware of the contribution that both could have for effective learning of language towards communicative competence. Thus, the study considered the observation
data on teacher’s actual actions and their underlying reasons reflected on their actions could uncover the depth of teachers’ beliefs and how the two opposing practices would be integrated into their classroom routines. At this point, the simple conclusion to be drawn is that PSTs, as a novice, do not have certain beliefs to a particular theme of CLT.

7.3 Relationship between Teacher Beliefs and Teacher Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question 2: To what extent and in what ways did the PSTs interpret their stated beliefs about CLT into their classroom practice?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main findings: Teachers’ beliefs about CLT did not always influence teachers’ practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The importance of teachers’ beliefs for teaching practices has been discussed. Some research reveals connections between beliefs and practice, yet others claim no direct connection (Levitt, 2002; Wilcox-Herzog, 2002; Pajares, 1993). This study presents evidence regarding the relationship between EFL PSTs’ beliefs and practices, but even more evidence implying inconsistencies between them. Findings demonstrate that EFL PSTs did not teach according to their CLT-oriented beliefs. Classroom observations revealed that PSTs integrated beliefs about CLT with their instructional practices to a limited extent. The most frequent aspect of language learning activities found in observed classes was rote and memorization, in which learners use language in controlled drills. Most tasks were embedded in reproduction of accurate language imposed in a course book and teacher directed. Communicative use of natural language based on students’ own initiative was found in the final observation of one PST. Only one activity utilised aspects of CLT. Observed PSTs agreed strongly with CLT, yet, their teaching was largely didactic. This implies that their beliefs did not guide classroom practice.

7.3.1 Summary of the non-CLT practices that mismatched with stated CLT beliefs.

With regard to Doukas’s five communicative learning themes (1996), the characteristics of non-CLT classroom practices were found in each theme and can be characterised variously. The important characteristics of these themes are summarised as follows:

**Theme 1: Place of grammar**

The place of grammar knowledge was explicit with excessive focus on linguistics and least attention to use. Grammar-related practices that imply these characteristics are:
-Teaching of grammar for mastering grammar
-Grammar taught as an end in itself not as a means to communication.
-Explicit grammar taught in the pre-reading.

**Theme 2: Use of group/pair work and teacher-student/s interaction**
Classroom interaction was more teacher-led rather than student-initiated with student/s-student/s interaction. Salient practices relating to use of group/pair work are:
-Group work as a means towards grammatical accuracy.
-Students’ interactions in group/pairs did not enable near-natural communication but focused on peer-to-peer collaborative learning in their native language.

**Theme 3: Error correction**
There is evidence that PSTs’ accuracy-focused correction interrupted fluency of communication practice. Error correction was prompt, with focus on accuracy over fluency. These classroom practices demonstrate this:
-Error-free learning – avoidance of error through accuracy-focused instruction (All)
-Explicit, spontaneous error correction that focused on grammar (Budsaba and Ceeham)
-Explicit, spontaneous error correction that caused breakdown of communication practice (All)

**Themes 4 and 5: Roles of teacher and students**
Teachers’ roles were authoritative, didactic and controlling. This led to students as passive recipients of knowledge not users of language. Roles of teacher and students in the three PSTs’ observed classes were:
-Teacher as demonstrator and controller of language use
-Teacher as authority: knowledge transmitter and sole source of knowledge (Budsaba and Ceeham)
-Students as learners of language, using sub-roles such as grammar analyst (All except Anee’s second and third observations)
-Students lacking involvement in content and task planning. (All)
In overall, PSTs’ instructional practices resembled a didactic approach based on a behaviorist philosophy of teaching (Brown, 2000).
7.3.2 Salient aspects of the relationship between beliefs and practices.

Study found that the extent to which the PSTs integrate their CLT practices into actual practices was in small. Rather, most of their practices demonstrated various aspects of traditional non-CLT practices. In the following sections the relationship between the PSTs’ beliefs and practices are grouped into two important and salient areas, starting from those practices which were most likely not influenced by their CLT-oriented beliefs. To a lesser extent, one PST was seen to interpret her reported beliefs about CLT into real observable practices. However, there were some CLT-based practices that were commonly implemented by the PSTs.

1. Practices not guided by beliefs:

There appear to be three distinct ways in which the PSTs’ practices are guided, to a certain extent, by the CLT-based beliefs they stated before implementing their actual teaching.

1.1 Teacher’s enactment of error-free environment of classroom learning.

All observed classes were selected on the basis of learning objectives focusing on communication competence. However, in all but two, languages were not used as a means for communication but were pre-taught and mechanically produced (Richards et.al, 2003). Most classroom practices were in line with traditional language learning focused on mastering grammatical accuracy. Students’ chances to use language were limited to mechanical production, memorizing dialogues and performing controlled drills, minimizing chances of making mistakes. Errors were reduced in this accuracy-focused learning (Brown, 1994), so learning was under teacher control.

Learners’ errors were considered as undesirable. Making errors was treated as misconduct, and an unwanted outcome. According to the behavioristic perspective, ‘the reason behind making errors lies in inadequate teaching methods which if it had been “perfect” they would never be committed’(Brown, 2000). Hence, error is a symptom of ineffective teaching or evidence of failure.

To avoid students’ failure, learning through repetition and accurate reproduction were necessary, with oral responses extensively enforced with little variation. “No errors” does not imply students’ language mastery but lack of opportunity for learners to apply trial-and-error (Richards, 2006). In contrast, CLT regards errors as inevitable and not a sign of failure.
Errors constitute evidence that students are working towards the correct rules and self-making of language meaning (Ellis, 2004). Thus, errors a means for the learner to form and test hypotheses about how the target language works (Nunan, 1989). Avoidance of language errors was typical of EFL classroom practices (Amara, 2015; Nishimura, 2000). Error-free environments were the salient characteristic of most English classrooms in Thailand (Chanyanuvat, 2017; Weerawong, 2006). PSTs’ classrooms in this study were typical of error-free classrooms.

1.2 Beliefs about implicit role of grammar became explicit instruction in practice.

PSTs’ reported beliefs in this study aligned to CLT at low positive level with mixture of both CLT and non-CLT beliefs and this inconsiderable CLT beliefs exerted little influence on their practice. These included beliefs about role of grammar knowledge relating to how grammar should be presented to learners and about the facilitative teacher role. These beliefs were incompatible with other beliefs or classroom factors. The relationship between teachers’ beliefs and practices remarkably found in this study is that when a teacher held conflicting beliefs – positive to CLT in one side and negative to CLT in other one side; they might not practice their teaching in according to their CLT-oriented beliefs.

One of the great example was found in the aspect of grammar role. Mismatch about grammar: Implicit, indirect instruction of grammar v.s. Explicit, direct correction for grammatical accuracy At before the practicum, the two observed PSTs reported believing in the implicit instruction of grammar(see section 6.1 The place of grammar), but opposing convinced in implicit correction of errors in specific to grammatical errors. In practice, they applied grammar-based instruction with direct method by presenting explicit knowledge of grammar in three lessons originally designed to teach communication skills. Neither grammar nor communicative aspects of grammar were sufficiently incorporated into instruction. The PSTs' grammar-based instruction featured excessive explanation of rules and focus on accuracy of form including the explicit and direct correction on grammatical errors. The way PSTs taught grammar and treated errors in grammar suggests they preferred ‘teaching grammar for mastering grammar’. CLT-based beliefs about grammar were not influential. PSTs were driven by deeper beliefs that ‘students’ grammatical accuracy is the perfect learning’, so used direct delivery of explicit grammar knowledge.
1.3 Use of group/pair work not effective to meaningful communication

One of the notable mismatches found between the beliefs of using group/pair work to promote meaningful communication and the PSTs’ practices that actually promote group/pair work for achieving linguistics accuracy over language use in the classroom. One of the important evidences that show the ineffectiveness of CLT-based beliefs about using group/pair work was found in two PSTs. Firstly, when Budsaba asked the students to rehearse the dialogue before practicing the role-play to ensure all the words to be spoken were accurate (see Excerpt 10); secondly when Budsaba and Ceeham stopped the flow of students’ speaking practices in order to correct some minor mispronunciation of the students’ utterances merely for ensuring accuracy (see Excerpts 9 and 10).

One PST, Anee once appeared to use group/pair work activities in promoting communicative use of language in which the students negotiated meaning. In Anee’s case, her beliefs about group/pair work enabled ‘negotiation of meaning’ during the fifth month of the practicum. In addition, whenever group/pair work was arranged, two PSTs were observed urging students’ interaction to promote either linguistics knowledge focusing on form accuracy, or scripted speaking practice that was highly controlled for accurate utterances. This implies PSTs’ beliefs about ‘CLT for meaningful communication’ were not powerful enough to outweigh their appreciation for promoting accuracy in learning. Non-CLT beliefs regarding accuracy-focused learning of language use guide their practices, in particular when arranging group/pair work for practicing students’ language skills.

2. Practices informed by beliefs: An attempt to experiment with CLT practices (influenced by reflective observation)

PSTs selected as participants for observation strongly agreed with CLT principles except for their agreement with the non-CLT theme about treatment of error corrections. PSTs’ practice of error corrections corresponds with their beliefs that this should be accuracy-focused and explicit. To a lesser extent, their practices integrate their beliefs into practice. CLT themes and aspects they preferred pre-practicum that were seen in practice are described. First, use of group/pair work was frequently used to promote students’ self-learning and collaborative relationships. Students had opportunities to practice interpersonal communication, despite using their native language. Second, self-correction and peer-
correction were enabled for self-acquisition of language. Third, teacher assortment of less controlling roles as resource, co-speaker and organiser empowered students as language users active in self-learning. There appear one PST arranged near-communicative activities for real-life use of language. This study uncovered the CLT practices commonly held by all the PSTs and some of the CLT practices was held by some of the the PSTs. Onlyone PST held hybrid pedagogical beliefs.

2.1 Common CLT practices: Peer-to-peer collaborative learning in learners’ native language.

Establishing peer-to-peer collaborative relationships was the only CLT aspect incorporated with group/pair work and implies consistency with stated beliefs. CLT elements of pair and group work observed in the three cases’ practices were students having purposeful tasks to exert self-learning outside teacher’s close control and interacting for interpersonal communication in their native language. PSTs were aware of CLT principles regarding self-learning and collaborative relationships in promoting language learning and tried to help students benefit from interpersonal communication via some tasks in groups or pairs. This implies that PSTs’ beliefs about self-learning and collaborative relationships in learning were integrated into their practice. This is despite exclusion of negotiation of meaning. The use of group/pair work does not ensure communicative competence but promotes collaborative learning. However, working in group or in pairs in CLT does not mean putting students into groups to complete a task (Ellis, 2003; Jacobs, 1998). Group was used for completing grammar exercises (two PSTs) and controlled drills (three PSTs).

2.2 Uncommon CLT practice: enactment of trial-and-error practice for near-natural communication.

A salient feature of PSTs’ instructional practices that emerged in this study is the teacher’s enactment of error-free environment. Anee used a hybrid of practices mixing traditional, behaviourist and the communicative, constructivist approaches. She inserted communicative activities starting from self-learning skills to speaking (Section 6.2.2/2).
7.4. Explaining inconsistencies between beliefs and practices

**Research question III:** What challenges/difficulties were reported by the PSTs as influences on their classroom practices?

### 7.4.1 Practices relating to grammar are overridden by beliefs about ‘accuracy’

This study verifies the relationship between teachers’ beliefs and practices is non-linear or causal (Richardson, 1996) for three reasons. Analysis of the notions underlying the pattern of connection between beliefs and practices is based on the basis that “development of teachers’ beliefs system is socially situated and socially mediated, nonlinear, reciprocal, multi-facet and without an end” (Golombek and Johnson, 2004, p. 323). Significant aspects of the ways in which the PSTs in this study developed their ‘learning to teach’ process during their initial stages of novice teaching were identified. This is practices relating to grammar are overridden by beliefs about ‘accuracy’. It appears that PSTs’ beliefs about grammar instruction were overridden by beliefs focused on accuracy. Pre-practicum PSTs showed agreement with explicit and immediate correction to prevent fossilisation of errors and. PSTs were observed conducting error corrections consistent with their preference for the accuracy-focused belief. PSTs insisted on unselective treatment of grammatical errors for pursuing grammatical ‘accuracy’ competence (section 6.3, p 157). For example, Ceeham agreed with the implicit role of grammar, and endorsed ‘explicit and immediate correction was necessary for accurate use of language’. She was observed exploiting direct instruction of grammar in a speaking class and inserted grammar explanation in a pre-reading stage in a reading lesson. Ceeham also implemented grammar-focused correction in addition to explaining rules and form. Post-practicum, accuracy was reflected as her teaching aim:

“Grammar seems to be difficult because there are many foreign-linked rules and some exceptions they need to remember”. Students would not create accurate language even if they had good basic grammar, so the teacher must help them (PoQ-C3/2, q10)

Budsaba was convinced about self-correction but did not teach this way. Her justification for teacher- not students’ self-correction relates to accuracy:

“There’s no way they could figure out by themselves how to make a correction since they (students) had got a little knowledge of basic grammar. They still made the same mistakes with an easy exercise (referred to the one in Excerpt 1). It’s a waste of time to let them try self-correction.” (PoQ-C2/2, q3)
In her opinion, the teacher promotes students’ grammatical accuracy for perfect learning. PSTs seem uninterested in letting students operate trial-and-error. PSTs’ beliefs about accuracy dominate other beliefs and drive practice more than beliefs about the communicative role of grammar.

7.4.2. Overall classroom practices are driven by core beliefs that ‘accuracy is perfect learning’

Pre-practicum, PSTs reported positive beliefs for CLT concepts including the use of group/pair work for practicing near-authentic communication, CLT roles of the ‘facilitative’ teacher including co-learner, need an analyst, coach of learning and resources and students as active users of language. Observations reveal these aspects were not realized in practice. Instead, teacher roles as a controller, director and corrector were found. Students were spoon-fed learners in most classes as self-learning was not promoted. Group/pair work for classroom activities did not promote student/s–student/s interaction in the CLT way, that is, natural use or practice of target languages was rare, while negotiation of meaning occurred in one class only (section 1.1 – Excerpt 6).

Classroom interactions were dominated by teacher-initiation and student/s–response, dominates activities, learning by rote outputs based on accuracy. Accuracy-oriented practice included repetitive drills of vocabulary and substitution drill of dialogue and grammar exercises that emphasised form. Accuracy-focused treatment of correction contributes to this picture. Hence, PSTs’ beliefs about accuracy seem instrumental in impacting their classroom implementation. For example, Budsaba’s reflection after one observation exemplifies her beliefs about accuracy as she justified using controlled drill and playing the controller teacher role:

“The activity (a controlled drill) is for their improvement of accuracy, I as an evaluator should closely monitor and help them produce accurate language.” (PoQ-C2/1, q9)

Budsaba justified her use of immediate, explicit correction that emphasised accuracy of form and the corrector and sole source of knowledge teacher roles:

“Students are supposed to learn how to use English for communication correctly. If a mistake is ignored, the students might learn the wrong example” (PoQ-C2/1, q10)

Anee integrated freer practice of communicative activity was concerned about accuracy. She justified her allowance of scripted practice as follows:
“The kids complained that the dialogue was long and words used are difficult to remember. It’s better to allow them to read the note. Otherwise, they would feel embarrassed to make mistakes and would not participate well in skill practice activities. Their concern about not making a mistake might slow down their learning.”
(PoQ-C1/1, q2)

These post-observation reflections reveal accuracy as a reason why PSTs would not integrate CLT teacher roles, students’ learning contribution and group/pair work in practice. This suggests that the way beliefs interact and compete in influencing teachers’ classroom teachings is central to core beliefs (Clark & Peterson, 1986). The core belief regarding accuracy prevailed over other beliefs, and impacted teaching in ways which conflicted with non-core beliefs.

Other beliefs including those about grammar role, error correction, roles of teacher and students were oriented towards CLT concepts and matched with each other. However, these did not guide PSTs’ practice. A characteristic of PSTs’ beliefs and practices is that their teaching practice aligned with their non-CLT beliefs about ‘accuracy’. PSTs’ core belief is rooted to “accuracy is perfect learning”.

### 7.4.3. PSTs synthesize internalisation and socialization in their process of learning to teach

PSTs synthesize internalisation and socialization in their process of learning to teach. Vygotsky’s social constructivism theory illuminates PSTs’ learning to teach in this study. PSTs have personal and social experiences in context (Vygotsky, 1978). When data collection was complete, the practicum schools and teacher training college were two major units through which EFL PSTs experienced a broader social life. By attending teacher training college and the teaching practicum, the PSTs developed pedagogical beliefs about language teaching and learning relating to the innovative teaching and were integrated into their practices. PSTs’ individual efforts derived from social validation, in particular, social life at their practicum schools. PSTs’ acquisition of ‘learning to teach’ knowledge is a synthesis of internalisation and socialization.

- **Internalisation of the culture of learning in each context.**

PSTs reflected many features of the traditional – teacher centre approach and grammar-based methods. These echo so-called Thai learning culture applied in English language teaching for decades.
PSTs endorsed transmitting linguistics knowledge more than facilitating language use. This reflects that learning in Thai EFL classrooms is knowledge accumulation, not construction. Many teaching aspects reveal PSTs’ paid greater attention to teaching grammatical knowledge and vocabulary knowledge rather than emphasizing language function or meaning. Language learning in Thai ELT is learned not for meaning but mastery of grammar and extending vocabulary. PSTs processed their knowledge construction while interacting with classroom teaching, the school agenda and teacher education, as well as their learners’ situated behaviours (Schon, 1987). According to Vygotsky, an individual develops knowledge socially (Vygotsky, 1994 in Zhang, 2013). PSTs’ internalisation of ‘learning to teach’ differed depending on the teaching context they assimilated. Regarding grammar, two major positions were found: one was influenced by traditional language teaching and the other aligned with CLT principles.

Budsaba and Ceeham justified the grammar-based exam orientation preferred by school and students as reasons driving her intensive grammar-based instruction. Grammar-based exam orientation was instrumental in teaching intensive grammar. Budsaba justified her focused grammar exercises thus:

“Since the exam will test grammar in this way [gap-fill tests on the accuracy of form in different contexts at the sentence level], they should practice in this way so that they could pass the exam.” (PoQ-C2/2, q15)

Ceeham revealed that the school norm to get students passing the exam overshadowed the CLT syllabus:

“The lesson syllabuses are mostly skills-based and so I didn’t plan to teach grammar but it was the teacher’s suggestion (school teacher trainer) to have more grammar lessons to prepare for students’ exams. Our concerns are that if they might not do well in the exam if they are not strong in grammar” (PoQ-C3/2, q11).

Thus, despite PSTs’ agreement that explicit grammar instruction was not part of the CLT syllabus, they were unlikely to enact this belief. Instead, they employed practices aligned with a specific culture of learning. A similar finding arose in Japan: when teachers’ personal beliefs clashed with the school culture or community beliefs, these ideals became inferior to situated beliefs (Sato & Kleinsasser, 2004). Mohamed (2006) reports PSTs in the Maldives were reluctant to apply beliefs in classroom teaching due to school policies. These PSTs reduced grammar teaching in contrast to their beliefs that grammar should be taught.
Socialisation of learning to teach with new situated beliefs about teaching

PSTs’ is socially mediated through cultural aspects. Their development of teaching cognition depends on social contexts in which they engage. The post-observation SRQ report showed how PSTs mediated their thinking about language learning and teaching. PSTs’ mediated ‘thinking’ about classroom teaching and learning which boosted dialogic processes of (re) organising their teaching knowledge (Johnson & Golombek, 2003; Nagame, 2004). Accordingly, PSTs exploited teaching strategies to meet students’ expectations learning and school norms.

Ceeham shows how social contexts affected a teacher’s decision to adopt or eject declared beliefs. The new knowledge she gained about the status of English language in the school context led to her reconstructing new data for language teaching. In an observed lesson aimed at teaching communication, Ceeham pointed to the conflict between educational policies that aim for communicative competence and students needing to show mastery of grammar for their exam. This conflict was clear to students, she became aware of it and taught intensive deductive grammar, focusing on linguistics accuracy:

“Most students are eager to get a good mark and sometimes feel that practicing skills might not be helpful. As a teacher, I plan to improve the students’ ability in language skills, but the students, especially the ones who are planning to take the university entrance exam, prefer grammar classes and reading to oral skills.” (PoQ-C3/2, q10).

Teachers internalised how English language was perceived and treated in the school, what teachers and students should do in classrooms/school, and how language should be taught. PSTs appeared reluctant to integrate CLT principles they believed were their preferred pedagogies due to mismatch between their ideals and reality. Their use of group/pair work is another example. Mediation of learning culture and contextual factors affected how PSTs perceived organising pair/group work for language learning so this was less beneficial. They preferred teacher-fronted classroom interaction and teacher dependence, in part because of time limitations and large class sizes. PSTs referred to students’ behaviors of learning as incentives driving their use of teacher-directed classroom interaction.

Budsaba experienced classroom interaction with students. She convinced claimed preference for the “teacher as facilitator” role in which students direct their learning.
reality, she assumed “teacher as controller and transmitter of knowledge” and pushed students to behave exactly as she directed. Budsaba’s students did not develop interactive habits apart from passively receiving grammar knowledge and analysing language provided by her. They lacked active roles for self-acquisition of language. However, in the post-observation questionnaire, Budsaba seemed unaware of the teacher role she played:

“My role in this class was not only to teach the content (of grammar) but as a facilitator. The teacher’s job in this class is to help the students complete doing the grammar exercises correctly as planned. (PoQ-C2/2)”

She affirmed students’ passively receiving knowledge as she expected:

“Students should be active by carefully listening to the teachers’ instruction in doing an activity (cognate for the vocabulary learning). They did quite a good job today. But I expected them to pay attention to my direction so that they could move on with the learning more quickly and correctly” (PoQ-C2/1)

Budsaba did distinguish between intention and practice. She viewed her language teaching practices in terms of what she thought she should do. She was not aware of teaching in accordance with her beliefs, partly because of perceived constraints/challenges. Budsaba revealed students’ conservative attitude towards learning:

“The kids preferred to sit and prepare to listen to teacher’s lecture and note down whatever information was delivered. When I assigned them speaking tasks, they complained they learned nothing.” (PoQ-C2/2, q4)

For students, a ‘good teacher’ talks to the whole class while they listen. Some students like the teacher to show them how to speak while they jot down the dialogue, although they didn’t say it at all. This is what ‘learning’ means to them. It is the old-fashioned attitude that is difficult to deal with. (PoQ-C2/2, q4)

Budsaba distinguished between her beliefs about content, pedagogy and practices. The challenges she provided for her justification, do not explain how her non-traditional beliefs did not influence her traditional practices. Investigating how conflicting beliefs influence practices is warranted.

Espoused theories V.S. theories in use

Teachers may hold contradictory beliefs: deep and surface (Kaplan, 1991) or core and peripheral (Borg, 2009; Brownlee, J. M., 2001). Surface beliefs are not a component of
person’s notion of teaching, but the beliefs the person thinks s/he should hold. Surface beliefs are associated with superficial practices. For Budsaba her beliefs about the importance of grammatical mastery and use of language accuracy she expressed about error corrections outweigh pedagogical beliefs and affect her practice more strongly than CLT-based beliefs she supported in responding to the pre-practicum survey. Deep traditional beliefs play an instrumental role in determining practice. Budsaba’s beliefs can be characterised as primary and peripheral beliefs (Borg, 2009; Green, 1971). Budsaba was not aware of that her contradictory beliefs presented in her teaching.

Inconsistencies between practices and beliefs are often attributed to situation constraints (Basturkmen et.al, 2004; Oskamp 1991). PSTs referred to constraints or challenges directly. Budsaba justified her actions and identified challenges that hindered the application of her declared beliefs. She unconsciously realised how her actions appeared compatible with her intended beliefs. This study asked PSTs to recall contextual factors to retrieve underlying reasons for their actions (see Appendix 5 and Appendix 14). Argyris and Schon (1974) explained how teachers’ actions and beliefs exist side by side by highlighting a distinction between ‘espoused theories’ and ‘theories in use’, and that teachers may remain unaware of incompatibility between the two. Espoused theories are beliefs persons are aware of having and communicate to others. These beliefs reflect technical knowledge. ‘Theories in use’ are persons’ actions based on practical knowledge. The two sets of beliefs may or may not be compatible and possibly, a person may not be aware of this incompatibility (Basturkmen, 2003). Budsaba’s reflections show she believed she had performed the CLT role of teacher even she did the contrary. Budsaba was unaware of this conflict while interacting with challenges which filtered her intended beliefs. Budsaba’s actions were guided by the credo that conflicts are better ‘managed’ than ‘resolved (Lampert, 1985).

7.4.4. Reconstruction of concrete experiences: espoused beliefs became practical within the experiential learning cycle.

Watzke (2007) pointed out that change in teacher’s pedagogical knowledge due to a disagreement between teaching contexts and technical beliefs bringing about situational decision-making. However, as teachers accumulate teaching experiences, they conceptualize pedagogical knowledge over time, making it accessible to decision making in classroom
teaching practice (Dawn, Harkin & Turner, 2013). Anee gradually developed her CLT-based beliefs practically. Basturkmen (2003) suggests teachers may, in some situations lessen inconsistency between espoused beliefs and beliefs-in-use by re-construction of pedagogical knowledge. Anee demonstrated important CLT features in paired students’ interactions. First, students exhibited a desire to communicate. Second, their expression was driven by personal needs to communicate. And third, in terms of linguistics input, they were free to make their own meaning. Anee’s students came close to how people would meet, interact, and talk in real-life.

Experiential learning theory posits that experience is integral to learning, followed by reflection, reconceptualization and active experimentation (Kolb, 1998). Thus learning is cyclical, and experiences serve as a means of learning (Dawn, Harkin & Turner, 2013). The teacher is a mediator who reflects and connects ideas, then plans how to apply those ideas in new situations. Kolb positions experience as a means of learning, which factors into future experiences. Kolb rebukes ‘learning as a transmission of knowledge’ and treats learning as a process not an outcome. To Kolb, learning occurs via transformation of experience and situates concrete experience as a means to an end. Anee used reflection on experience to reconsider practice and change or improve it. Anee reflected on her CLT-based promotion of near-natural interaction among students:

“I never expect my students will enjoy doing speaking practice but they did. They were very enthusiastic in doing speaking activity unlike at when learning reading or grammar, they seem to be bored. I think of having a more extra activity to let them speak and enjoy learning. I felt I really satisfied with the class and found I enjoy teaching speaking a lot.” (PoQ-C1/3, q1)

Anee reflected on concrete experience and conceptualized learning for the Primary Year 5 students then actively applied this to her students. She became aware of effective practice for helping students focus on intended learning goals. A consequence was the telling direction activity using the interactive authentic map. Anee also referred to her school’s teacher guidance to implement teaching practices without concern for students’ inability to learn.

“The teacher (school supervisor) also told me to make the lesson fun to motivate them to do the practice with joy. I observed her using cartoon and map in one class and that really work.” (PoQ-C1/3, q6)
“I once observed the class of my teacher trainer (her school’s teacher trainer); she used the real city map to teach speaking, and the students could use language well likes in a natural situation. She (school’s teacher trainer) advised me to use materials to help stimulate the student’s interest.” (PoQ-C1/3, q12)

Use of pair work in Anee’s classroom practice arose from communicative activity based on purposeful tasks and real-like settings. Collaborative learning was found in Anee’s utilisation of group/pair work as well as the communicative interaction with near natural use of language. Anee’s use of group/pair work indicates her experimentation. Ceeham claimed she was not interested in formal teaching of grammar:

“My students dislike grammar. Some of them told me not to teach grammar as they had learned a lot in their previous elementary school. Some had no other choice but just consent to learn as they realised it is needed for the exam”

“Teaching grammar lesson was good to secure them to get a good mark from the exam. But I found they were not motivating to learn it if it is all about grammar. Vocabulary learning might not make them feel exhausted. I decided not to teach only grammar for the whole class anymore.” (PoQ-C3/2, q3)

Ceeham learned from students and bridged the gap between espoused theories and theories in use. Encountering her students’ demotivation for grammar, she reconsidered alignment of ‘what she should do’ with ‘what goal to meet’ than planned for experimenting with a new routine. She shows how a teacher’s past experiences might trigger a better lesson.

Two PSTs’ beliefs were improved by considering what would help her students to learn the intended objective. Teachers’ sense of responsibility and students’ eagerness or demotivation to learn plays respectively as an internal drive and external influence. This affects PSTs in re-conceptualizing their knowledge of teaching. Kolb’s experiential learning theory (KELT) illuminates how PSTs learned to plan and implement teaching, and the “cumulative effect” of previous teaching experiences.

This leads to the conclusion that the PSTs recognised a process whereby they conducted teaching, reflected on what went well and what could have gone better, re-conceived “what could be”, and then posited how they would teach next time. Anee put re-conceptualizations
into action. The social aspect of learning to teach enables EFL PSTs to (re-)construct teaching beliefs and professional identities (Wenger, 2005).

In sum, while a Vykotsky’s social constructivist approach may enrich or deepen teachers’ learning, Kolb’s constructivist ELT explains how PSTs may learn from accumulation of teaching practice experiences. This study illuminates the ‘learning to teach’ process of the PSTs through the lens of two cycles of learning theories. The findings affirm that the PSTs have socially and culturally interacted with what they faced during their teaching practicum course and that this social interaction and mediation has influenced them to reconstruct their ‘learning to teach’ system.

7.5 Summary of chapter
This chapter presented the key findings of the study. It showed the complexity of issues related to teachers’ beliefs and practices and discussed the ways in which various mismatches between them exist within the ‘learning to teach’ systems of the teachers regarding CLT. Some PSTs are aware of these conflicts while others seem to ignore them and so engaged in classroom practices that did not align to CLT. To a limited extent, PSTs’ beliefs about CLT are reflected in their actual classroom practices. The tensions around their teaching, to a certain extent, influenced their ‘beliefs in use’, and these guided their actions and these rather than their intended beliefs guided their classroom actions. Significant aspects of how the PSTs mediated their practices about CLT and accommodated their system of learning to teach were exposed: (1) Beliefs which are not comparable to other beliefs did not influence their classroom practices in reality; (2) Teaching instruction relating to grammar entailed accuracy over communicative use; (3) Most practices in the classroom appeared to be directed by core beliefs that accuracy is essential for perfect learning of a language; (4) PSTs’ internalisation as well as the socialisation process of ‘learning to teach’ tended to justify students-related factors as the main influence of their instructional decision; (5) PSTs reconceptualised their pedagogical beliefs when they gained positive effects from the apprenticeship of observation and clinical dialogue from experienced trainers. Individual ways of learning to teach were variously identified.
CHAPTER 8
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATION

8.1 Overview on Research Study
The present study investigated beliefs about language learning of preservice. EFL teachers in Thailand during an initial teaching practice course. Two methods of data collection were utilized. First, in a quantitative survey phase, a BQ-CLT, beliefs questionnaire about CLT (Karavas-Doukas, 1996) was employed to elicit the preservice teachers’ reported beliefs about five CLT themes regarding, place of grammar, and use of group/pair work, error correction, Teacher role and student roles. Second, in a qualitative observation phase, three preservice teachers were selected from the participants of the survey group to investigate relationships between professed beliefs about CLT and observed teaching practices. Each participant was observed three times over the period of 16 weeks. The reported beliefs elicited from the surveys obtained in the survey phase and from the post-observation written questionnaires were used to discuss how the PSTs believe about CLT. The observation data were used to discuss their actual classroom practices and their underlying beliefs that were evident in their classroom practices at the beginning of teaching practicum. In this chapter, a summary of the main results and answers to the research questions are portrayed in 8.2 and 8.3. Next, implications of the study are presented in 8.4 Conclusion of the research are delineated in 8.5 and the limitations of the study are discussed in 8.6. Lastly, concluding remarks are addressed in 8.7

8.2. Teachers’ beliefs

Research Question 1: What are the stated beliefs of preservice teachers (PSTs) about Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)?

8.2.1. Overviews of the main result about PSTs’ Beliefs
Data show that at the end of their four-year formal teacher education course and pre-practicum, these Thai EFL PSTs participants held low positive beliefs about innovative practices characteristic of CLT.
The PSTs held mixed and inconsistent beliefs towards CLT themes (section 7.2.2 p 187). Inconsistent beliefs were found in relation to the role of grammar. PSTs responded favourably to both opposing statements about how to teach grammar. PSTs hold consistent beliefs about accuracy-focused treatment of error correction. Most showed slight negative beliefs towards CLT error correction. PSTs’ theoretical beliefs favored linguistics mastery and were less supportive of CLT principles of language teaching. Thai EFL PSTs exhibit limited positive perceptions about CLT principles. These may arise because PSTs lacked practical knowledge to deal with the complex nature of teaching using CLT. Their stated beliefs lacked internal consistency and coherence. This finding is similar to Karavas-Doukas (1998).

8.2.2 Unclarified knowledge about how to teach in a CLT way.
PSTs’ pedagogical beliefs imply preference for non-CLT principles. These are traditional grammar-translation features relating to explicit knowledge of grammar, rules, linguistics accuracy and formal instruction. This shows a strong inclination towards old-fashioned didactic pedagogy. PSTs also showed slight support for use of group/pair work and student-centred autonomous learning, suggesting a possible change towards innovative pedagogy. The finding that PSTs hold negative beliefs about the CLT-oriented role of grammar is compatible with other studies (Andrews, 2003; Borg, 2001; Chia, 2003). Thai EFL PSTs in this study did not perceive the implicit role of grammar effective in promoting communicative learning and this is no different to the previous studies that found teachers’orientation to grammar over communicative skills (Andrew, 2003; Burgess & Etherington, 2002; Schulz, 2001). These studies suggest teachers believe that formal grammar lessons can be provided to obtain fluency-focused practice (Spada & Lightbown, 2008). Tsai’s (2007) study of non-native Taiwanese teachers found they did not value the immediate need to communicate in, but appreciated grammar and micro-language skills such as reading. Thus, accuracy as a primacy concept seems to guide teacher beliefs about which type of grammar instruction effectively supports language ability.

Debate about the balance between linguistics accuracy and fluency in language teaching is on-going. Language teachers remain unclear about guiding principles and how approaches to grammar teaching apply in communication-oriented lessons (Ellis, 2003). This study parallels
studies in other ESL contexts (Peacock, 2001; Philp, 2007; Mohamed, 2006). Teachers’ misunderstandings about CLT were a common phenomenon to EFL and ESL contexts. Hence learners’ exposure to the target language might not an important indicator for understanding of the communicative aspects of grammar teaching. Studies in other EFL Asian contexts found that teachers prefer communicative meaning-focused of instruction and linguistics mastery (Pennington and Richards, 1997; Liao, 2004). Similar to this study, Nonkukhetkhon, Baldauf and Moni (2006), found that Thai EFL novice teachers report understandings and perceptions of CLT features and varied views about communicative activities. Studies in Thailand on classroom instructions in communication-based lessons show evidence of integration of traditional rote-learning, a teacher – dominant approach and accuracy-focused practices with little evidence of the communicative aspect of activities (for example, Naruemon, 2013; Nonkukhetkhon et.al., 2006; Weerawong 2006). PSTs in this study were not settled in their theoretical beliefs about language learning, and had unclarified knowledge and/or misunderstandings about CLT. Resistance in adopting innovative approach of teaching may arise because PSTs gained familiarity with the traditional grammar-based approach as high school students. Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) note that when faced with a new situation, misinterpretations and/ or misunderstandings occur. Teacher beliefs and pedagogical practices are known to be sometimes consistent (Johnson, 1992) but inconsistent at other times (Fang, 1996). Consistencies and inconsistencies coexist (Basturkmen et al., 2004), depending on contextual factors (Johnson, 2006). Lack of coherence is apparent between PSTs’ beliefs they stated in association with the contextual classroom factors specifically, time allocation and classroom management. This shows that the factors relating to classroom management impacts their responses regarding group/pair work, showing their concern about maintaining teacher control. Possibly, the PSTs may lack clear understanding and knowledge of instructional strategies and how these relate to others. Teachers committed to CLT may be unable to connect classroom aspects together, nor being able to associate them with theoretical foundations. Therefore, despite PSTs’ positive views about some CLT principles, their negative views about the role of grammar, error correction and the teacher role influence their decision-making
processes in the classroom (Karavas-Doukas, 1996). Their poor levels of understanding and mixed levels of support for CLT aspects adversely impacts attempts to apply CLT in practice.

8.2.3 PSTs’ beliefs are comparable to those of EFL and ESL teachers

Inconsistencies between beliefs and erratic beliefs are commonplace in novice teachers’ belief systems (Brog, 2003). Studies reporting this in the EFL context with Asian teachers include Karavas-Doukas (1998); Nunan (2003) and Richards (1996). Other researchers, for example, Viboolpol (2004) and Naruemon (2013) find EFL teachers in the Thai contexts hold superficial beliefs about language teaching and unclear understanding of the prescribed student-centred approach.

In Brazil, Korea, Malaysia and Mexico less opposition between CLT and direct transmission non-CLT language teaching is observed (Clark & Peterson, 1986). This may arise because teachers have inaccurate perceptions and/or misunderstandings about educational practice, holding conflicting beliefs without noticing inconsistencies. Professional development programs should extend formal teacher training beyond an emphasis on acquiring academic skills and subject content knowledge, paying attention to understanding teachers’ personal beliefs that underpin decision-making about teaching practice.

In summary, Thai PSTs in this study reported inconsistency in theoretical beliefs showing they lacked coherence in how they perceived CLT. The participants in this study are similar to EFL and ESL contexts in which teachers lack accurate perception and through understandings of innovative principles. Success or failure in adopting CLT should be investigated, without excluding conflicting beliefs novice teachers hold.

8.3 Beliefs and Practices

| Research Question 2: To what extent and in what ways did the PSTs interpret their stated beliefs about CLT into their classroom practice? |
| Research Question 3: What challenges/difficulties were reported by the PSTs as the influences on their classroom practices? |

8.3.1 Weak influence of CLT-oriented beliefs

Data show that PSTs expressed views about CLT principles under five themes (Karavas-Doukas, 1996). In practice, PSTs did not value the importance of this innovative method.
They do not use instructional practices that indicate an understanding of CLT in practice. This study provides insights into PSTs’ misconceptions about CLT. For example, they showed attachment to accuracy-focused grammar translation. PSTs made only limited attempts to apply CLT-oriented beliefs they stated they held pre-practicum into actual practices in classroom teaching. (see 7.3. The relationship between teacher beliefs and teacher practices.)

PSTs’ lack of self-confidence and enthusiasm for risking this innovative approach was apparent. This was despite acknowledgement of the curriculum requirement and learned knowledge that the practicum school required CLT. PSTs incorporated only a few elements of CLT while neglecting key features, although all believed in students’ self-learning, communication-based and meaning–focused language teaching.

An evidence base regarding complexity in the connection between preservice teachers’ beliefs and practices exists. Inconsistencies between beliefs and practices related to how grammar should be and is taught; and the roles of teachers, students and their relative contributions to learning. PSTs played the CLT-based teacher role, managing learning and teaching through students’ self-directed learning and in communication. In reality, data show classroom practices were teacher-dominant, grammar-oriented and accuracy-focused.

**8.3.2 Experimenting with CLT methods**

This study has shown that the teaching practicum course had limited impact on how PSTs act in the classroom. PSTs needed individual support to attempt CLT implementation. Currently, teacher education and professional development in Thailand involve one year of school-based teaching practicum, and is not theory-based. This practice should be expanded to include individual mentoring sessions, involving clinical supervision (Gaies and Bowers, 1990) to support self-reflection on instructional decisions. Without additional support, Anee was unable to undertake this instruction herself. Supervision could be customised to help PSTs cope with the constraints or challenges they encounter within the teaching workplace. Such mentoring would make ideas meaningful.

This study contents that the novice teachers need evidence of improvement in ‘learning to teach’ to build their self-confidence. Teaching practicum should address how a PST’s adjustment or reorganisation of instructional decisions will impact on practices and
subsequent beliefs. Where evidence of improvement is not available, novice teachers are likely to revert previous instructional routines. A PST who experimented with CLT in this study was encouraged to develop her teaching performance in response to the positive reactions of students. This was obtained indirectly through the apprenticeship of observation and clinical dialogue that helped refine instructional decision-making, and through direct experimentation in utilising challenging strategies for innovative teaching. If teachers see positive results their actions have on students, they will gain from these experiences, building satisfaction. This creates an internal drive to improve and achieve greater success.

8.3.3 Effect of non-CLT beliefs

PSTs behaved in accordance with their non-CLT stated beliefs relating to accuracy-focused aspects of teaching and learning. PSTs had unclarified understandings of CLT aspects of teaching. Most CLT-oriented beliefs include ‘freer’ practice of language skills, autonomous learning and reduced teacher control conflict with non-CLT-oriented beliefs about accuracy-focused correction. Observations indicate conflicting beliefs impede PSTs’ application of CLT, as the strategies they were observed using include teacher–control based practices of speaking and accuracy-focused activities.

It is worth considering carefully why teachers were unable to enact their beliefs. First, beliefs will not affect practices when mismatched with other beliefs they also hold. Second, teaching instruction that involves grammar was dominated by beliefs about accuracy. Third, overall practices are driven by beliefs that ‘accuracy is perfect learning’. Fourth, PSTs’ approach to learning to teach synthesised internalisation and socialisation. Fifth, PSTs’ practices and beliefs were not in concord, due to a tacit gap between espoused and applied theories (Argy and Schon, 1974). Lastly, some PSTs re-conceptualized pedagogical beliefs in actions. Positive effects from the apprenticeship by observation and clinical dialogue with an expert were instrumental factors.

8.4 Implications

The research findings presented in this current study can inform stakeholders in the teacher professional development to better educate and train language teachers for innovative change in pedagogy. It is noted that the findings and the contribution of the research are
specifically based on and related to preservice teachers’ development situation in the Thai EFL contexts. Since this current study investigated a small size of population and samples, it is noted that data cannot be generalized to the large population of the Preservice teachers in EFL. The current research findings aim for educational implication for the Thai EFL teachers in the Deep South of Thailand, where the limited exposure to learning facilities and genuine use of English for communication are the salient nature of language and learning profiles. However, many of proposed implications and suggestions may be relevant to other educational contexts and to teacher professional development in general. Important implications for modelling effective programs for teacher education and training for preparing Thai EFL preservice teachers to become real CLT-based teachers can be drawn from the findings of this study.

8.4.1. Enhance effectiveness of Teacher education in promoting an innovative pedagogy
As similar as research studies in the ESL context (Phipps, 2009); and in Thai EFL context (Naruemon, 2013), this study discovers the difficulties teachers face in implementing change and overall lack of success of teacher professional development programs directed at innovations. In the current study, PSTs’ lack of clarified understanding of CLT principles and their ineffectiveness in applying CLT beliefs in action were evident, implying teacher education is ineffective in preparing teachers for teaching practicum. EFL PSTs in this study appeared to be aware of the value of CLT but lacked sufficient pedagogical content knowledge – PCK (Shulman, 1986) needed to teach using CLT principles. They also lack refined conceptions about the desired benefits of this innovation. PSTs’ slight agreement with the importance of teaching English using communicative principles suggests their teacher education program does not provide efficient grounding in essential knowledge and appropriate practical attitudes about the prescribed CLT pedagogy. The quantitative phase findings suggest most PSTs taught in the four-year coursework phase in the five-year teacher education program in Thailand were less well-trained in the application of CLT principles. PSTs lacked the personal, practical knowledge required for their initial practicum in school. In Observation, their classroom practices were embedded with
traditional didactic Grammar - translation, as rule-based rote-learning and grammatical accuracy seem strongly implanted within their framework of instructional decision-making. Other studies found empirical evidence the influence of teacher education on teachers’ beliefs and knowledge (Borgs 2009; Graber, 1995; Johnson, 1996; Urmston, 2003). This study was congruent with weak intervention on PSTs’ prior cognition (Kagan, 1992; Richardson, 1996). Progress can be made by undertaking these steps. The study has shown that the design of teacher development programs can affect, to some extent, the level of impact it has on teachers. Theoretically, coursework and learning activities provided at before the practicum can implant content knowledge, but the motivation to an innovation, teacher educators are likely to need further support at an individual level to encourage them to attempt implementation and put the ideas gained from the theory into practice. Identifying challenges and notions of instructional decision-making Mismatch between teachers’ beliefs and practices can be explained in terms of reconstruction of teaching knowledge when confronting challenges in context. Reconstruction of teaching beliefs in this study was complex. PSTs deal with challenges relating to cognitive, affective, contextual and experiential factors which compete for influence over their instructional decisions. Teacher educators can raise PSTs’ awareness of these and illustrate ways in which factors may inform pedagogical decisions. This helps PSTs make sense of their teaching and appraise available options. Teachers were in some situation, unaware of the underlying reasons for conflicting beliefs they hold (Borg, 2009; Phipps, 2009). As found in this study, the PSTs, at the post-observation discussion affirms her use of controlled practice with accuracy-focused as the communicative activities suitable for communication-based syllabus. Teacher education programs should include tasks and activities which encourage PSTs to make explicit and understand the underlying reasons behind their instructional decisions, and identify aspects of their teaching at odds with their beliefs. This is likely to be more effective if the program enable the student teachers to develop their practices than reiterating perceived deficiencies. Of course, preservice teachers must confront contextual constraints. The teacher may know what s/he should do, but competing beliefs may prohibit these impacting teaching as would like. According to the PSTs’
reluctance to apply CLT appeared in this study, it is suggested that the teacher education program, at prior to the practicum phase, should acknowledge the student teachers to aware of possible factors they might have while implementing classroom practices. This knowledge will play as the comprehensible, meaningful inputs for their own ways of ‘learning to teach’. The possible unfavorable factors found in this study for example, less able students, passive learners and demotivation of learning and time limitation as reported as PSTs’ challenges in this study are the great example of these meaningful inputs. Teacher supervisor can help the preservice teachers address tensions between competing beliefs by offering practical suggestions as to how they might overcome or accept them. One of the proposed strategy, as evident in this study is viewing transcripts of genuine classroom events and some comments and verbal assessments from the expertise. Thus, identifying challenges and notions on teaching, would allow the PSTs to ‘develop an understanding of their thinking and the ability to verbalise and think through what they are doing’ (Almarza, 1996, p. 75).

8.4.2. Help novices understand their pedagogical beliefs
Teacher education should help PSTs build awareness of their tacit beliefs. This should involve tasks and activities to elicit teachers' beliefs at the start of their teacher education program, encourage them to rationalise and understand why they hold such beliefs, and help them explore ways in which beliefs influence their practices. It is apparent that formal teaching knowledge they received from teacher education program and prescribed syllabus given by the practicum school were not the instrumental sources of PSTs’ beliefs in this context. An investigation on PSTs’ sources of knowledge will identify what teacher education strategies would be effective in adjusting PSTs’ well-established beliefs towards innovative approaches rather than traditional approaches (Orafi and Borg, 2009). Teacher education programs must take seriously personal constructs within PSTs’ cognitions. Understanding teacher beliefs should be on the basis that “development of teachers’ beliefs system is socially situated and socially mediated, nonlinear, reciprocal, multi-facet and without an end” (Golombek and Johnson, 2004, p.324). The teacher educator must seek to understand about how student teachers’ sub-beliefs work and coexist with reference to contextual factors. In Thailand, the coursework-based syllabus of the teacher education program might have hindered student teachers’ abilities in closing the gap between their personal theory and
prospective practice (see Appendix 16 for more information about courses provided in the teacher education programme). Exploration of student teachers’ pedagogical beliefs has not been a matter of teacher knowledge’s component, in any course of teacher professional development offered by the program neither in learning course work nor practicing field-based practicum. Thus, the recommendation to be proposed by this study is that, teacher education program should assist the student teachers to aware of their own deep-rooted beliefs, in particular, the ones that are not aligned with the innovative pedagogy. Chapter seven has portrayed, accuracy learning is deep-rooted in the PSTs’ beliefs in this study as a perfect learning in their beliefs and this indicates the culture of learning embedded in the Thai EFL classroom. PSTs should have the opportunity to judge the new theories, perceive the value of theories and entertain new theoretical notions. Though they would either accept or reject the proposed theories, this teachers’ learning process is considered as constructivist approaches to teaching and learning (Johnson 2009), that positively affect the teachers’ acquisition on how to integrate new and traditional ideas about how to teach.

In the practicum phase, teacher education should help PSTs become aware of their beliefs to help them direct teaching techniques and methodologies. They may have uncertainties in their teaching during their initial year resulting from tensions between their beliefs and foreign language learning. Recommended strategies are reflecting on beliefs, meta-cognition and prospective practices. Teacher education should prompt reflection on PSTs’ beliefs by questioning existing beliefs about language teaching and learning and exploring beliefs that conflict with good practice and/or personal teaching experiences, apprenticeship of observations. For the best practice of ‘beliefs’ investigation, teacher educator should recognise the importance of PSTs’ feedback with actions that result in improvement in their ability to ‘learn to teach’

**8.4.3 Training Preservice teachers to Become Reflective Practitioners**

To reduce the degree of discrepancy, teacher educators need to equip novice teachers with the ability to engage in the ongoing reflective thinking process, to become reflective practitioners (Schön, 1991). First, PSTs are required to constantly monitor how far their actions reflect their beliefs and keep reflecting these beliefs on how it was formed and systemized (Williams and Burden, 1997). Reflective thinking may allow PSTs with
opportunities to evaluate their teaching, decide what changes they should make and monitor the effects of these changes (Richards and Lockhart, 1996; Farrell, 2007b). When teachers become reflective practitioners, they can make their tacit or implicit knowledge explicit by rethinking about their action and gain insight into the rationale behind their teaching (Johnson, 1999). By questioning their own practices, the teachers especially, the amateur ones may unlock the impact of their pre-existing beliefs on their teaching (Farrell, 1999) and gain more experiential knowledge (Wallace, 1991) that will consequently lead to improvement. Of the key of success in conducting reflective thinking is to study the teacher’s narratives with in-depth qualitative and interpretative methods (Sparks-Langer and Colton, 1991). Thus, some techniques for reflective thinking that are recommended for language teachers includes case investigation (LaBoskey, 1993) and narrative writing (Nagamine, 2007) and conducting action research (Daniels, 2002; Farrell, 2007b).

The findings data in this study were enriched with empirical evidence of the episodes of actual classroom events that part of data were gained from the PSTs’ own reflection and analysis of their teaching performance. The recommended strategy is to promote reflective practice is that the teacher supervisor should provide ‘reflective’ post-practicum activity by engaging the PSTs more in the reflective thinking process. Conventionally, in Thailand, the post-observation meeting between supervisor and PSTs are not engaged with enriched data from teaching practices.

Discussion on classroom performance was not encompassed around in-depth or comprehensive because the assessment data were mainly based on the classroom teaching and management in general gained from the rating scale evaluation form (see Appendix 17). The statements composed in this checklist evaluation form were mostly holistic concepts of classroom teaching; such as the appropriateness of the content, appropriateness of materials, appropriateness of voices, tones and language used, the validity of test and exam. Half of the statement relates to other classroom aspects, i.e. time management, use of information technology and learning assessment. There was a part of evaluation statement that relate to teaching practices, however, spotting on the clarity, appropriateness of content and activities; and the compatibility between lesson plan and teaching procedures (see Appendix 17). The feedbacks that based on the rating scale checklist with the holistic
concepts of classroom practices are limited in their ability to capture the complex nature of teachers’ practices and mental lives (Borg, 2003). In this study, the PSTs’ responses to the BQ-CLT positive, implying the positive tendency of CLT practices to occur at the level of awareness. This led to the assumption that the PSTs had become aware of how communicative teaching and learning would be acquired in communication lessons. However, this result was not affected to PSTs’ practice at the equivalent level of their awareness. This shows that the assessment of PSTs’ professional development should not highly rely on the summative assessment of general classroom behavior because it did not mirror PSTs’ complex traits of classroom teaching nor retrieve the teaching aspect of the particular innovative pedagogy. As CLT pedagogy is still the contemporary acceptable approach of teaching and learning in the Thai English classroom; and in case, the evaluation form of professional on-field teacher-training of preservice teachers is accounted the main assessment tool of a learning situation as it happens, thus, the supervisor or inspector are recommended to incorporate assessment tools that reflect related concepts and theories mirror important aspects of PSTs’ pedagogy. Inspection on classroom performance can be added to reflective data to teaching log that Thai PSTs are required to complete during their practicum course. These reflective assessment tools and model will be beneficial for supervisor/mentor teachers as well as preservice teachers in providing them with a framework and guidelines for developing high quality professional on-field training. This is essential to evaluate the extent to which teachers implement new strategies. Additional practical ways in which PSTs’ engagement with reflective data can be incorporated into supervision and evaluation process include ensuring supervisors use transcription of classroom observation data with verbal commentary. These data can form the basis for group analysis and discussion with an experience teacher and other supervisors. Supervisors should arrange post-observation meetings to conduct clinical dialogue in analysis and discussion on specific aspects of teaching through observation and reflective feedback with a mentor, PSTs can gain an understanding of their practice from an external perspective and, as a result, learn from their own teaching experiences in a way that may not be possible to self – reconstruction of meaning alone. The findings of this study, therefore, stress the value of mentoring and collaborative dialogue in gaining better understandings of teachers’ beliefs
and actions. Critical reflective thinking can help teacher and educator minimise the mismatch between PSTs’ stated beliefs and their classroom practices. Thus, becoming a reflective practitioner is also beneficial to teachers continuing professional development, and promotes experiential learning.

**8.4.4 Reform of teacher education towards practice-based program.**

This study replicates some previous studies that reveal teachers’ lack of experiential learning was an indicator of resistance to communicative learning activities (e.g. Hongboontri, 2008; Prapaisit, 2003; Nannapat Wanchai, n.d.) due to contextual and teacher-related constraints. Teacher education should provide real-life activities of language teaching so PSTs can gain near genuine experiences and be exposed to challenges. Studies show about less than 25% of teachers’ interactive thinking draws on theoretical knowledge and considerations on standard theory of teaching (Clark and Peterson 1986; Phelps, 2009; Forzani, 2009). By knowing theory, teachers can make sense or imagine the picture of practical situations, but this does not guarantee their ability to encounter the actual situations. Knowing theory helps teachers gain conceptual guidelines for the practices, but is not practical in all contexts of teaching.

This study suggested the teacher education program restructure the curriculum to be practice-based and provide opportunities for practices-based learning since the early point of the process of teacher learning program. For EFL Thai preservice teachers who owned robust and rigid beliefs in their low positive beliefs towards CLT, they need high-quality opportunities to practice applying the theory intensively and repeatedly. However, these practice-based opportunities, are often delayed due to an intensive emphasis on theory-based coursework and challenges with finding high-quality placements in the field. As seen in the example of the current five-year curriculum year 2013 used in Rajabhat University in the southern Thailand, the first courses about English language teaching that incorporate teaching practice was first introduced to the students in the second semester of their third year of study (see Appendix 17). In addition, critical skills and knowledge learned through coursework should be practised repeatedly in increasingly complex settings. Hence, teacher education should embed practice-based opportunities with campus-based coursework prior to full field-based practice in school.
8.4.5 ‘Learning to teach’ with context-specific based approach
Although the benefits of CLT on learners’ communicative competence are accepted, debates about its pedagogical and cultural appropriateness remain. In Thailand, CLT is offered within the foreign context, impacting the whole culture of teaching (Holliday, 1996). Implementation of CLT should realize cultural values relating to the roles and status of teachers and students. Findings from this study reveal PSTs’ limited ideas and superficial understanding of CLT, and resistance to adopt an innovation which challenges a traditional learning culture. PSTs’ motivation for adopting CLT when experiencing unanticipated difficulties and tensions was low. An implication is that effective implementation of innovative pedagogy depends on PSTs’ abilities to cope with constraints and limitations. Language learners learn best in teaching and learning environments that are harmonious with their learning styles and expectations (Naruemon, 2013). Integration of cultural differences between social contexts in which teaching and learning take place may help. This study suggests teacher education recognizes the problems with CLT, realises the contextual challenges and adapt CLT accordingly. Situation analysis would identify constraining factors that hinder application of theory-driven principles. Case-studies encompassing discussion and analysis of specific contexts of an aspect of classrooms, constraints, tension including justification of actions in the classroom could be provided.

8.4.6 Move beyond a simplistic model of CLT- challenging the traditional culture of learning and top-down policy in Thai context
PSTs could identify the incongruence between the innovative CLT methods and the standard examinations. They preferred to teach traditionally, in ways that they and their students valued as worthwhile. Tensions were revealed when applying CLT in classrooms influenced by the exam-oriented culture of learning. Thai policymakers need to investigate the relationship between the CLT-oriented syllabus and the non-CLT examination (Viboolphol, 2014). In fact, the English language is perceived as a learning subject not as valuable tools for communication, especially the upper-secondary students grade 10-12 (ages 16-18) who considered that the grammar knowledge and passing the exam are needed for a good grade. They do not strongly consider communicative competence is needed for gaining such success. A recommendation proposed to the policy makers is that new assessment systems
should free the EFL teachers and students from the exam-orientation effect. Otherwise, the
EFL PSTs might not be able to see the value of CLT and lessen their demotivation in trying out
CLT method. Changing English pedagogy could not be attained without a political and
educational advocate (Mak, 2011).

Alternatively, policy maker might consider localising method of English language teaching in
Thailand context where English is still subject to learn not a mean of communication
(Vibulphol, 2004). Consequently, teacher educators should encourage PSTs to create
teaching methods that are meaningful to the local context. By demonstrating CLT, teacher
educators can show PSTs methods for implementation from which their own methods can be
created. In the current context in which learners are from ethnic minorities speaking other
languages than Thai, learning foreign languages is challenging on the comprehensibility of
instructions. Hence, special policies for foreign language education for minority groups are
required. Some research findings portray Yawi- speaking ethnic minority students as low
achievers in English language learning and have low motivation to learn English. Bourdieu’s
(1977) notions of cultural and linguistic capital within the context of power relations among
ethnic groups claims a positive relationship between local curriculum and learners’ learning
achievements. Local policy on ELT as well as exploration of students’ views about English
teaching and learning relating to the issue of language used as a medium of teaching in the
classroom and problems perceived as challenges should be investigated. Hence CLT can be
localised to suit Thai teachers and learners.

It is noted that this final implication seems far from the initial research objectives. However,
this recommendation emerged from evidence demonstrating PSTs’ socialisation of learning
to teach. PSTs tended to teach in ways compatible with students’ learning efficiency and
culture of learning, such as a grammar-based exam orientation. The curriculum reform was
far from being implemented at the local school level. For better practical solution of
increasing effectiveness in improving teachers’ knowledge and practices, this study expects
the top-down process of reform would involve the bottom – up information into the
framework of reform of English education in Thailand.
8.5 Implications to particular context of Thailand’s EFL teacher education

From the list of implication portrayed above, the study implications that seem realistically to be applicable to the context of Thai EFL can be summarised at two levels as follows:

- **At the teacher education college level:**

  More comprehensive and realistic input of teaching knowledge

  It is necessary that the coursework and learning activities provided at teacher training college should implant content knowledge as well as positive beliefs about CLT innovation. Teacher educators are, therefore, recommended to firstly improve the course procedures and remedy the weak areas of the reflective approach to PSTs’ teaching knowledge and also their pedagogical beliefs. They can do so, first, by encouraging examination of the PSTs’ beliefs (e.g., beliefs and attitudes towards language teaching and learning, and CLT). For those Thai PSTs who show deep-rooted beliefs oriented to traditional approaches to language teaching rather than towards CLT innovation, teacher educators should strongly engage the PSTs and encourage them to reflect on their beliefs. It is suggested that PSTs should be encouraged to Question their existing beliefs as a means of illuminating their conflicting beliefs. Providing reflective activities in this context would also help them to improve not only their thinking about teaching but also their practices.

  Second, teacher educators need to find ways to make PSTs aware of those conflicting beliefs which appear to impact teaching practices and to help them to find the new way to accommodate and judge the value of new theories. In addition to addressing these cognitive factors, teacher educator needs to promote the PSTs to aware that other possible factors, e.g., affective, contextual and experiential factors should form an integral part of the procedure/course of teacher training. This teaching knowledge base will act as comprehensible, meaningful inputs for their own ways of ‘learning to teach’ and in more realistic ways. One of this study’s recommendations is that the first year of the teacher education curriculum should be restructured to be practice-based those Thai EFL PSTs who hold rigid ‘traditional’ beliefs and some misunderstanding about EFL teaching approaches would get opportunity to gain more practical knowledge about teaching earlier on.
In sum, awareness of PSTs’ beliefs and their possible influences in teaching may help them to make sense of their work of teaching and apprise them of the various options applicable to them. Furthermore, discussion of such challenging factors can help them to understand how to cope with them and how balance them in their real practices. Teacher education programmes have to integrate investigation of beliefs as a major component in the teacher training course. Implementation of this recommendation seems to be most practical in my study context, as it can be done at the course syllabus level and requires merely instructional decision change on the part of the teacher educator.

- **At the practicum level**
A remarkable finding that seems to be very beneficial for the development of the PSTs’ beliefs and practices around CLT innovation in this context is that the reconstruction of new theoretical beliefs can be derived from the PSTs’ reflection and analysis of their teaching practices. Hence, a strategy that might be very applicable and possible for the Thai EFL context is the introduction of a teaching supervision method that engages the PSTs sufficiently in the process of self-reflection. First, the summative evaluation checklist used for assessing the PSTs’ classroom practices should be replaced with the more CLT-related aspects. Second, classroom observation should be integrated with reflective assessment tools. Here, collaborative dialogue and clinical supervision between teacher supervisor and the PST practitioners are recommended. The main purpose is to help the PST to access reflective thinking processes that enable them to reflect on their own beliefs and, finally, to become the self-directed reflective practitioners who are able to improve their ability to ‘learn to teach’ in the long run.

### 8.6 Conclusion
The study shows the teaching practicum course, had limited impact on PSTs’ practice. Currently, awareness of understanding teachers’ development of beliefs or personal theories and its connection to teacher’s instructional decision-making towards practices is not a concern in Thailand. Yet these PSTs were expected to teach English in a way which contradicted their experience as school learners. Unsurprisingly, therefore, they struggled to implement CLT, even though their beliefs indicated they favoured this. Thai PSTs need
individual support to attempt implementation and reflect on their own learning. Because novice teachers need reflective evidence of improvement in ‘learning to teach’, and it is essential that teacher preparation program could address how teachers’ adjustment or reorganisation of the instructional decision will impact on their practices and subsequent beliefs. As presented above, four main implications are addressed in this study under researcher’s hope for the collaborative discussion among stakeholders in Thai English education: Preserviceteacher, teacher educators, mentors, school teachers and administrator, and policy makers. The research implication presented in this current study can inform stakeholders who take part in teacher professional development to better prepare and encourage language teachers for innovation change in pedagogy through teachers’ cognition development.

8.7 Limitations

There is limitation on generalizability, applications to practice, and utility of findings that are the result of the ways in which this study was initially designed to study. It is noted that the findings and the contribution of the research are specifically based on and related to preservice teachers' professional development situation in the Thai EFL teachers in the deep south of Thailand where the limited exposure to learning facilities and seldom use of English for communication are the salient nature of language and learning profiles. First, employment of mixed-method approach to data analysis brings in some limitations to the study. Besides the positive side that the qualitative –descriptive data help enriches the quantitative, statistical data are concerned with the credibility and trustworthiness of the result. The advantage of the mixed method used in this study is that triangulation, verification and rich description of the data enhance the validity of the analysis that makes it possible for others to judge to the extent that the findings may be applicable to their own contexts. For the Stage two-qualitative observation study, the sample size was reduced from the larger one for the purpose of the research objective to follow the extreme critical case. This is a serious challenge for this design as the researcher may not have enough statistical power to support their research (Plack, Driscoll, Marquez, Cuppernull, Maring & Greenberg; 2007) and so Stage two-qualitative Observation study limited the ability to generalise results to the wider population. Thus, many of proposed implications and suggestions may be
relevant to other educational contexts and to teacher professional development in general. Third, the stage two- qualitative study involved a sample case of three Preservice teachers selected and studied in depth; each preservice teacher was diverse in their language profile and added a level of complexity to the research. However, the case of three PSTs were all females and so data related to making participants in Stage one was confirmed in Stage two as there were not male PSTs volunteered to participate in this stage. Nonetheless, limiting the study to three samples, the study was more manageable, and the richer-case study data provided greater depth and insights into teacher’s beliefs and practice.

For a further study, the research involves the self-report perception and the researcher observed the practice of the pre-service teachers. Ultimately, it was the PSTs’ beliefs that were the focus of the research. The similar nature of research study could be conducted with participants from other groups of teachers. It was essential for the management of the project to target a specific group and work within these limitations.

### 8.8 Concluding Remarks

This study explored the beliefs and practices of Thai English Foreign Language (EFL) preservice teacher with regard to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) – the current innovative syllabus of English language teaching in Thailand. It was highlighted in the literature that the initial years of teaching training are an important phase of ‘learning to teach’. Clinical in these years was the ability to facilitate learning within the framework of national policy in promoting communication-based syllabus in English curriculum. Teacher education and experiential learning in the early years should provide the foundations for learning to teach in EFL to be more communication-oriented. Anee’s classroom practices with CLT integration after the experiential of learning was evidence of teacher’s reconstruction of meaning in teaching through constructivist socialisation. Support and collaborative relationship are extended to all those who took part in this study. PSTs of EFL are encouraged to exert critical thinking and reflect on their daily classroom practice and what influences their instructional decision-making in order that the way in which they conduct every practice match the values and beliefs that promote better learning for the EFL learners.
In concluding this research, three comments implied from the research’s objective are provided: First, this study provides a chance to illuminate EFL preservice teachers’ beliefs about CLT and language learning and teaching aspects, could be practically achieved, by investigating their practices. This study presented the realities of three Thai EFL PSTs by underlining the challenges, tensions and classroom contexts they encounter when undertaking teaching practicum in the school. Their participation in the research project provided them with opportunities to reflect their pedagogical beliefs and actual practices. Second, this study explored factors that affect PSTs’ beliefs and the enactment of these beliefs into daily classroom practices. The study underlined factors that motivate EFL PSTs’ ability to teach according to the school syllabus and provide significant, insightful data about the approach to teacher professional development and support for ongoing development for the novice teachers who not familiar with the innovative syllabus and new to EFL education system. Third, this study provides direct implications for preservice teachers, teacher educator, school teacher and administrator and policy-maker at local and national levels for the most practical way of teacher professional development in EFL.
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Dear Student Teacher:

I am Shenita Kaweian; a doctoral student in Education, School of Education, Durham University, U.K. I am undertaking the research study on the topic: ‘Think and Do: A study of preservice teachers’ beliefs and practices about Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context’ as part of my Doctor of Education degree at Durham University, United Kingdom. The research is ultimately aimed to promote English language education in Thai and so forth, the teachers’ ability in employing the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach along with Student-centered-ness approach in English language classroom.

My research focus is to investigate the consistency between ‘teacher beliefs’ and ‘teachers’ practice’. In doing so, I will ask student teacher to (1) complete self-report questionnaire and (2) answer an interview about their English learning and teaching. Also, (3) I will enter English class to conduct classroom observation on teachers’ practice using teaching observation sheet, video recording and stimulated recall interview.

I would like to invite you to participate in my research project to kindly provide data and information mentioned above. In the stage of observation, I may like to enter two English Classes conducting by two different teachers. For each student teacher, I need to make pre-observation and post-observation interview before and after classroom visit. The pre-observation interview is for information about teacher’s education background and history of learning and teaching English Classroom observation itself will take about 40-50 minutes
to last. Then, I will conduct a 30 minute-interview. The whole stage will take approximately about 1.30-2 hours.

After the completion of Classroom observation, I may need to have follow-up contact for any clarification of the data collected. This mean I may need to meet each you for one more time after the classroom observation have finished. With this work, I may need to collect some lesson planning and students’ work in each class.

All data gathered will remain confidential. Participation is voluntary but your kind voluntariness would be much appreciated. All participants in this pilot study will be able to withdraw and students will be able to withdraw from the project at any time and unprocessed information provided will not be used.

Your sincerely,
Shenita Kaweian
Appendix 2: Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

Research Project: Think and Do: A study of preservice teachers’ beliefs and practices about Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context

Name of Researcher: Shenita Kaweian

☐ “I certify that I have been invited to participate in this research project which is now being conducted in the school of education Durham University, U.K by: Shenita Kaweian (Doctoral research student) and I certify that I am voluntarily giving my consent to participate in this study.”

I also certify that:

☐ I have read the Participant Information Sheet.
☐ I have had an opportunity to ask questions and to discuss the study.
☐ I have been asked if I would like to receive a summary of the research findings.
☐ I have received enough information about the study.
☐ I have been informed by the researcher and understand that you are free to withdraw from the study at any time and without having to give a reason for withdrawing and without affecting your position in the University?
☐ I have informed that the information I may provide will be kept confidential.
☐ I have received satisfactory answers to all of your questions.

Student Teacher’s name (IN BLOCK LETTERS): ..................................................

Signed..................................................................................Date:........................................
เรื่อง ขออนุญาตสังเกตการสอนในชั้นเรียน งานวิจัยปริญญาเอก

สิ่งที่ส่งมาด้วย
1. จดหมายขออนุญาตและตอบรับ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏยะลา

2. Letter of Certification: Doctoral Student status: Ref. 000123827
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- เข้าสังเกตการสอนในชั้นเรียนของนักศึกษาฝึกสอน ในภาคการศึกษาที่ 1 และ 2 ภาค รวม 3 ครั้ง ต่อคน ในชั้นเรียนที่สอนภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อการสื่อสาร โดยกำหนดตามเวลาที่นักศึกษาฯ สะดวก และได้รับการเห็นชอบจากอาจารย์ที่ดูแล และอาจารย์ประจำฝ่ายแล้ว

- ขอเก็บข้อมูลเอกสารที่เกี่ยวกับการสอนได้แก่ แผนการสอน ใบงาน และเอกสารอื่นใดที่เกี่ยวกับการสอนในชั้นเรียน

ขอเรียนมาเพื่อขออนุญาตลงพื้นที่ ณ โรงเรียนเพื่อทํารายการวิจัยดังกล่าว

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

(นางชณิชา กาวเอี่ยน)

EdD Program, School of Education
Durham University, U.K
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Appendix 4: Beliefs Questionnaires about CLT – BQ-CLT used for Stage one self-survey

Questionnaire about Communicative Language Teaching

“Thank you for your participation in this project. This questionnaire is designed for research purpose only. Your answers will not be shared with your teacher mentor nor supervisor and all information will be kept confidential.”

There are two parts in this questionnaire. Questions in Part 1 is for your answer about yourself. In Part 2, there are 24 statements about teaching approach toward communicative competence with 6 scales of opinion for you to rate.

Part 1: Demographic and education background questions

1.1 Sex: □ Male □ Female

1.2 Age: _____________

1.3 What is/are your native(first) language(s)?
   □ Thai                □ Jawi (Southern Thai Malayu)
   □ Both Thai and Jawi □ Other/s

1.4 How do you assess your English proficiency?
   (See Rubric of English proficiency in page 5)
   □ Very good
   □ Good
   □ Average
   □ Poor
   □ Very poor

1.5 How many years have you been studying English?
1.6 Did you take extra hour learning English after school?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

1.7 From question 4, if yes, please give detail of the study.

1.8. Have you ever communicated with foreigners in English?

☐ Yes  ☐ No (please go to question 1.9)

1.9 If yes, how? And how often?

1.10 In what way did you often use your English communication? (for example, writing diary in English 200 words a day).

Part 2 Questionnaire: Beliefs about CLT

2.1 Please tick the box that indicates your level of agreement with each of the statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree = SA</th>
<th>Agree = A</th>
<th>Slightly Agree = SI-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Disagree = SI-D</td>
<td>Disagree = D</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree = SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance (actual language used) should be judged. |
| 2. Group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students. |
| 3. Grammar should be taught only as a means to an end and not as an end in itself. |
| 4. Since the learner comes to the language classroom with little or no knowledge of the language, he/she is in no position to suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for him/her. |
| 5. Training learners to take responsibility for their own learning is futile since learners are not used to such an approach. |
| 6. For students to become effective communicators in the foreign |
language, the teachers’ feedback must be focused on the appropriateness and not the linguistic form of the students’ responses.

7. The teacher as ‘authority’ and ‘instructor’ is no longer adequate to describe the teacher’s role in the language classroom where English learning is aimed for communicative competence.

8. The learner-centred approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential.

9. Group work allows students to explore problems for themselves and thus have some measure of control over their own learning. It is therefore an invaluable means of organising classroom experiences.

10. The teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make. If errors are ignored, this will result in imperfect learning.

11. It is impossible in a large class of students to organise your teaching so as to suit the needs of all.

12. Knowledge of the rules of language does not guarantee ability to use the language.

13. Group work activities take too long to organise and waste a lot of valuable teaching time.

14. Since errors are a normal part of learning, much correction is wasteful of time.

15. The communicative approach to language teaching produces fluent but inaccurate learners.

16. The teacher as transmitter of knowledge is only one of the many different roles he/she must perform during the course of a lesson.
17. By mastering the rules of grammar, students become fully capable of communicating with a native speaker.

18. For most students language is acquired most effectively when it is used as an instrument for doing classroom activities and not when it is studied in a direct or explicit way.

19. The role of the teacher in the language classroom is to impart knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing, and modelling.

20. Tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students’ needs rather than imposed upon them.

21. Students do their best when taught as a whole class by the teacher. Small group work may occasionally be useful to vary the routine, but it can never replace sound formal instruction by a competent teacher.

22. Group work activities have little use since it is very difficult for the teacher to monitor the students’ performance and prevent them from using their mother tongue.

23. Direct instruction in the rules and terminology of grammar is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively.

24. A textbook alone is not able to cater for all the needs and interests of the students. The teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks as to satisfy the widely differing needs of students.
Part 3: Open-ended questions of Beliefs about five CLT themes

Write freely your views about each five themes/aspects of CLT in briefs.

1. Do you think grammar is important to language communication? In teaching students to achieve communicative competence, how and in what extent do you teach grammar? Describe how/when you will integrate grammar in your lesson that aims for communication.

2. What do you think about using group/pair work for teaching English for communication. How would group/pair work should be used to support learning English communication?

3. What is your idea/s about error correction? In your communication lessons, how do you deal with students’ errors or mistakes while learning? What is your focus of error correction? In brief, tell how and when you make corrections on students’ errors.

4. What are the roles of the teacher in teaching English for communication? Explain the CLT role of the teacher in your beliefs? Give examples (e.g., what teacher should do in the classroom) and describe the situation.

5. What are the roles of the students and learning contribution of the students in learning communication courses? Explain the CLT role of the students in your beliefs? Give examples of the learning behaviours and/or describe situations.

A. Reflection on teaching performance
1. How well do you think the lesson went?
   - How did this return out differently from what you planned? And what differences between your lesson planning and teaching in the class?
2. Describe the teaching strategies you feel most and least competent using in the class?
3. What challenges do these students encounter in their learning and how do you modify instruction to cope with this challenges?
4. How might you change the methods and lesson plan you used today if you were with a different set of students (e.g. different ages, level (weaker or stronger))?
5. What are some of the difficulties you have faced personally when attempting communicative teaching in your classroom? (and do you think those difficulties can be overcome)
6. Briefly describe how do you access your teaching performance in overall in this class? (To what extent do you satisfy with your teaching outcome and your students’ learning outcome in overall?).

B. Reflection on the practice about the five features of CLT

Role of Grammar
At Turnxxx, I observed that you teach/did not teach grammar in this class. (Place of grammar), why are you teaching/giving… (brief description of the teaching event)? Tell me the reason why are you doing that way.

Use of group/pair work
At...(Turn#), I observed you used [individual work, group work, pair work, teacher-fronted lecture and class work] for [dialog drill, vocabulary learning, cognate, Q&A lecture, self-directed learning]

Error Correction
I observed you [rarely, often, always] made correction on students’ errors at Turn(#)xxx, please explain the underlying reasons of your treatment of error correction in this class?
Role of Teacher
I observed you played the role of [the observed role of the teacher and her behavior for the focus of learning/teaching, activities]. Please explain why did you behave in that way and how this role beneficial for student’s learning?

Students Role and contribution to learning
I observed your students were treated as [the observed role students in brief] in participating/learning [focus of learning, tasks and activities], please explain why did you manage them to behave in that way and how this students’ role and behavior beneficial for their learning?

Some relating questions
- Tell me more about what it was like to use that [Theme or aspect of practice] in this class with this group of students.
- What is your focus when you were doing... [brief description of the practice]...?
- Tell me what you thought about your [specific practices e.g. grammar instruction, group/pair work, error correction, role of teacher, students’ performance] in today’s classroom? (students responses/interactions/participation or overall performance)
- How do you satisfy or not satisfy with your use of that [features/activities] in this class?
- What challenges did you face using this [xxx]? How did you overcome that challenges?
Appendix 6: Backward translation of BQ-CLT for content validation and sample of a Reviewer’s feedback

Please tick ✓ if the two conceptual meanings equally match.

Please identify if the statement under ‘Backward translation’ Column contains similar conceptual meaning to the statement under ‘Original version’. Tick ✗ if the two meanings in each row are not equal. Two versions of each statement should be equivalent to their concepts.

Write ‘uncertain’ if you are not sure. Please give your comments and suggestions for further improvements.

Profile of reviewer

Area of expertise: …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

Years of job experience in ELT: ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample of a reviewer’s comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version</th>
<th>Backward translation</th>
<th>✓ or ✗</th>
<th>Your comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance (actual language used) should be judged.</td>
<td>Grammar Error Correction is the most important measurement to evaluate the extent that language use is realistic.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>That &gt;&gt;&gt;to which the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2. Group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students. | Group work is an important activity that teachers can use to create an opportunity of co-operative relationships among learners and also promote real social communication. | ✓ | ....create opportunities for interactive communication.... |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interaction among group members.</td>
<td>Grammar should be taught only as a means to an end and not as an end in itself.</td>
<td>Grammar should be taught to help bringing the learners to accomplish language use for communication purpose, not just end at understanding ‘grammar’ point itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Grammar should be taught</td>
<td>Because students attend language class with little or no prior knowledge. So, students are not in the position to request to have any lesson/activities they think beneficial to them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Since the learner comes to the language classroom with little or no knowledge of the language, he/she is in no position to suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for him/her.</td>
<td>Training students to take responsibility for their learning is no any good if students are not familiar with that method of learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Training learners to take responsibility for their own learning is futile since learners are not used to such an approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. For students to become effective communicators in the foreign language, the teachers’ feedback must be focused on the appropriateness and not the linguistic form of the students’ responses.</td>
<td>To develop students to be effective English language communicators, teachers must give response that reflect their appropriate use of language not the accurate use of language form.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The teacher as ‘authority’ and ‘instructor’ is no longer adequate to describe the teacher’s role in the language classroom.</td>
<td>Teachers’ roles as ‘Authority’ and ‘Instructor’ is no longer enough to explain the roles of teacher in today’s language classroom.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The learner-centred approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential.</td>
<td>Learner-centered teaching method of language teaching help promote students’ responsibility and self-discipline. Also, with this method, students can develop their full potential of abilities in language learning.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Group work allows students to explore problems for themselves and thus have some measure of control over their own learning. It is therefore an invaluable means of organising classroom experiences.</td>
<td>Group work allows students to search for their own problems and are able to control their own self-learning. For this reason, group work is a valuable tool of enhancing classroom learning experience.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make. If errors are ignored, this will result in imperfect learning.</td>
<td>Teachers should correct every grammar mistakes, students make. If the error is ignored with no correction, it will affect the language learning of students to be incomplete.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It is impossible in a large class of students to organise your teaching so as to suit the needs of all.</td>
<td>It is impossible for a large class to implement teaching instruction to meet the needs of each student.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Knowledge of the rules of language does not guarantee ability to use the language.</td>
<td>Knowledge of language rules does not guarantee the competence of language use of learners.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Group work activities take too long to organise and waste a lot of valuable teaching time.</td>
<td>Group activities require too much time to organize and practice and it wastes the valuable instruction time.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Since errors are a normal part of learning, much correction is wasteful of time.</td>
<td>Because error is a normal part of learning, so too much correction is a waste of time.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The communicative approach to language teaching produces fluent but inaccurate learners.</td>
<td>Approach of communicative language teaching will create the fluent learner who are not accurate in grammar.</td>
<td>✓ .....who is not grammatically accurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The teacher as transmitter of knowledge is only one of the many different roles he/she must perform during the course of a lesson.</td>
<td>Teacher as a knowledge transfer is only one of many roles that he or she should take during the teaching course.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. By mastering the rules of grammar, students become fully capable of communicating with a native speaker.</td>
<td>Making students proficient in grammar rules will enable students to communicate perfectly with native speakers</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. For most students, language is acquired most effectively when it is used as a vehicle for doing something else and not when it is studied in a direct or explicit way.

(หมายเหตุ : ไม่มีคำแปลตรงสำหรับ explicit จะต้องอธิบายความว่า ชัดเจน ตรง เจาะจง)

For most students, they can effectively develop their language use when the language is used as a medium for communication in natural setting, but not when it is learned in a direct way in a control setting.

19. The role of the teacher in the language classroom is to impart knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing, and modelling.

19. The role of the teacher in the language classroom is to deliver content knowledge through various activities, such as, explanation, writing, and modelling

20. Tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students’ needs rather than imposed upon them.

Tasks and activities teachers will conduct in the classroom should be asked for students’ involvement in adaptation to meet students’ needs rather than solely determined by teacher.

21. Students do their best when taught as a whole class by the teacher. Small group work may occasionally be useful to vary the routine, but it can never replace sound formal instruction by a competent teacher.

Students can exercise their full capacity when teachers use the whole class instruction. Small group teaching may be occasionally useful to create non-routine classroom environment. But
22. Group work activities have little use since it is very difficult for the teacher to monitor the students’ performance and prevent them from using their mother tongue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>teacher.</th>
<th>it cannot replace the usual teaching led by capable teacher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. Direct instruction in the rules and terminology of grammar is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group work activities have little use since it is very difficult for the teacher to monitor the performance of the students. Also, it is difficult to stop students from using their mother tongue.</th>
<th>'Direct instruction' that teacher directly teach explicit grammar rules and terminology is needed if students want to learn to communicate effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24. A textbook alone is not able to cater for all the needs and interests of the students. The teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks as to satisfy the widely differing needs of students.//

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Using textbook alone cannot fulfill all the needs and interests of the students. Teachers must provide extra supplement which includes materials and exercises in order to cover the various needs of students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| ✓ | ✓ |
### Appendix 7: Assessment scale of English proficiency
(Brown and Yule in Mukminatien, 2000: 39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description of Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>Pron: Many wrong pronunciations&lt;br&gt;GA: No mastery of sentence construction&lt;br&gt;Vo: Little knowledge of English words&lt;br&gt;Flue: Dominated by hesitation&lt;br&gt;IC: Message unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Pron: Frequent incorrect pronunciations&lt;br&gt;GA: Major problem in structure&lt;br&gt;Vo: Frequent errors of word choice&lt;br&gt;Flue: Frequent hesitation&lt;br&gt;IC: Disconnected idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Pron: Occasional errors in pronunciations&lt;br&gt;GA: Several Errors in structure&lt;br&gt;Vo: Occasional errors in word choice&lt;br&gt;Flue: Occasional hesitation&lt;br&gt;IC: Ideas stand but loosely organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Pron: Some errors in pronunciation&lt;br&gt;GA: Minor problems in structure&lt;br&gt;Vo: Minor errors in word choice&lt;br&gt;Flue: Minor hesitation&lt;br&gt;IC: Clear and organized ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Pron: No errors/minor errors&lt;br&gt;GA: Demonstrate mastery of structure (few errors)&lt;br&gt;Vo: Effective/appropriate word choice&lt;br&gt;Flue: No hesitation&lt;br&gt;IC: Well organized and clear ideas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 8: Start list of codes of the five CLT themes

1. Place of Grammar: Inductive or deductive instruction
   - 1.2 Explicit or implicit instruction
   - 1.3 Meaning over form
   - 1.4 Functional grammar and contextualization

2. Use of Group work/Pair Work: purposeful interaction with the focus on fluency over accuracy.
   - 1.5 Fluency or accuracy
   - 1.6 Self-directed learning and collaborative learning
   - 1.7 Teacher-student/s interaction
     - a. One-way = Whole class teacher-fronted approach
     - b. Two-way = communicative approach

3. Error Correction:
   - 3.1 Form focus or meaning focus
   - 3.2 Selective or unselective correction
   - 3.3 No errors correction.
     - a. Rote - learning under tight control
     - b. Trial – and - error Learning or Free-error Learning,

4. Teacher Role
   - 4.1 Facilitator of learning: Role of teacher is varied with three major roles.
     - a. Knowledge transmitter at the presentation stage
     - b. Director or guide at the pre-practice stage
     - c. Facilitator or co-communicator at practice stage
   - 4.2 High authority as knowledge transmitter and controller of learning behaviours.
   - 4.3 Resource of knowledge or source of knowledge

5. Students’ role and contribution to learning
   - 5.1 User of language
   - 5.2 Autonomous learner
   - 5.3 Joint negotiator(Engagement in making choices of learning.)
# Appendix 9: Coding of the main five CLT themes into practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Sub-themes and features of Classroom Practices coded from the statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Grammar</td>
<td>*1. Much/Unselective Grammatical correction. Inductive approach, Implicit grammar instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. No grammar teaching or Implicit grammar instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.12. No grammar teaching or Implicit grammar instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*15. Explicit grammar instruction. with focus on rules.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*17. Explicit, direct grammar instruction with a focus on rules and terminology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*23. Explicit, direct grammar instruction with a focus on rules and terminology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of group/pair work</td>
<td>2. Use of group/pair work to enable co-operative learning and genuine interaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Use of group/pair work to promote self-learning and problemsolving tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*13. Whole-class teacher-centered mode of classroom practice. Interaction. (for *13 &amp; *22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*22.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of Error Correction</td>
<td>6. Errors Correction focusses on ‘appropriateness of use.’ (includes ‘meaning’ and ‘concept’)</td>
<td>Preferred delayed and infrequent correction. The correction that interrupt the fluency is avoided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*10. Much and unselective correction focusses on linguistics accuracy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Role</td>
<td>7, 16 Teacher plays different facilitative roles beyond knowledge transmitter. Teacher is no longer being authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. CLT role role of teacher as need analyst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed analysis of classroom practices based on five CLT themes

The observation data were coded in reference to the CLT framework (Brown, 2007; Celce-Murcia, 1991; Ellis, 2004; Littlewood, 2003) as well as the student-centred approach (Harmer, 1998; Tudor 1996) and based on the learning objective aiming to learners’ communication competence.

**Theme 1 - Role of grammar**

According to CLT principle, grammar knowledge is considered essential to achieving language ability, however, the role should be implicit and the instruction of grammar should be indirect and informal (Ellis, 2004). Coding excerpt data regarding grammar would be carried out when the PST included grammar instruction in their lesson. The focus coding is the CLT-driven teacher may downplay grammar as significant to language development. Teaching grammar will be by implicitly transmitted to students through the inductive approach paying great attention to ‘meaning’ over ‘form’ or ‘rules’. An explicit, deductive method of grammar instruction is unlikely to be adopted in communicative functional-notional environments. However, the ‘form-focused’ instruction of grammar, if embedded in the communication practice in context and the comprehension of communicative intent, the meaning-focused grammar teaching would be upgraded with the high level of ‘accuracy’ bridging the gap of
low accurate and high fluent competent of the communicative approach (Brown, 2007; Celce-Murcia, 1991). So, in the occasion that ‘grammar knowledge’ is considered as a scaffold for the best comprehensive communication, grammar role was identified as can be taught in CLT way.

The characteristics of explicit and implicit grammar instruction (Housen & Pierrard, 2005)

- Rules and terminology are presented since the very beginning.
- Extensive explanation of rules focusing on grammatical features (Form/usage).
- Practice is deductive application of rules by applying the rule into target examples and/or new examples. Controlled practice first and then the guided-practice and/or free practice might be given.
- Grammar form is presented in isolation and the focus of learning and practice in on ‘form/Usage’ over ‘meaning/Use’..
- Context, function of grammar always comes after long explanation and/or application of rules.
- Instructional practices requires a teacher-fronted, transmission style of teaching. Teacher is the strict authority and students are as passive receivers memorising the rules and application of rules.

Characteristics of Implicit grammar instruction are:

- Learning grammar is inductive that the examples are presented at the beginning without explanation of its grammar rules.
- Examples are presented in contexts. Students are encouraged to drill and/or repeat the examples until they comprehend the concept and function of the target grammar (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).
- Focus of learning and practice on ‘Meaning/Use’ over ‘Form/Usage’..
- Grammar form is presented in context.
- Practice involves Speaking or Speaking and listening over reading and writing.
- Instructional practices require the high facilitative role of the teacher with the active role of students in exerting self-discovery of meaning.(Celce-Murcia, 1991)
Theme 2 - Use of group/pair work
In analysing the excerpt of transcription relating to group/pair work, classroom interaction between the teacher and student/s and between the student/s and students/ were the focus. First, the excerpt of the transcript that shows students’ cooperative learning relationship, in which learners share knowledge and experience, helping each other collaboratively with communication tasks. The second attribute to find is the near-genuine communication that language learners experience when interacting with each other to gain competent communication skills. Because non-CLT features of teaching and learning methods can possibly evident, if the practices are based on supporting the acquisition of meaning and function of use, rather than linguistics knowledge, the excerpt was identified as CLT aspect of using group/pair work. The teacher as a co-participant or an interlocutor is expected to facilitate students’ successful responses during interactive ‘language production’ activities.

Theme 3 - Error correction
Since CLT notion prefers the delayed and selective treatment of error correction and the focus of correction on meaning over form, the coding of this data was when the PSTs correcting language errors. CLT-oriented classrooms regard ‘errors’ as normal in natural communication, so toleration of form errors and linguistic inaccuracies are acceptable when fluency of communication is achieved, and meaning is conveyed. The CLT-based correction is applicable if only the focus is on ‘appropriateness’ of language use or ‘meaning’ without interrupting any communication flow. So, interrupting any students’ practices that are not supporting to the meaning and communicative use is considered as not aligned to CLT.

Theme 4 & 5 – Teacher role and students’ role and contribution to learning
For coding aspects of Teacher CLT roles and Role of students’ and contribution to learning, the teacher and students’ roles and behaviours were identified either in isolation or in conjunction. Support for CLT roles of teacher could be spotted on when the teacher acts as a ‘facilitator’ of knowledge and students, responsively ‘negotiating’ knowledge and meaning. A highly facilitative teacher tends to apply the CLT lesson plan to help learners develop their language competence and enable them to enhance learning strategies. Students are prompted to develop self-learning skills to build on their own meaning in every phase of the
classroom learning process. In this sense, the CLT-oriented teacher is concerned to coach learners to develop their ‘self-learning skill’ and create motivating and meaningful tasks to encourage students’ self-acquisition of language. CLT learner-centered classrooms feature a researcher as a ‘coach of learning how to learn’. This “help[s] learners deepen their understanding of language learning and develop their ability to play an active and self-directive role in their language study” (Tudor, 1996, p.34).

The secondary scheme of data analysis involves investigating the emerging aspects of classroom practices oriented to CLT and not aligned to CLT evident in the observation
Appendix 10: Classroom transcription conventions

A. Transcription Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Teacher’s talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Students’ talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>A student with order number of appearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[text]</td>
<td>Contextual information/non-verbal communication/Additional notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((Text))</td>
<td>Researcher’s comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Utterance&gt;</td>
<td>Utterance in English language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-P-E-L-L</td>
<td>Spelling the letters of word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highlight</strong></td>
<td>Errors/Response to Error/Correction of Error/Feedback or Prompts made by the teacher or students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Black board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Code of practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InG</td>
<td>Inductive grammar instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeG</td>
<td>Deductive grammar instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Pair work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Whole class interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Ss/s</td>
<td>Teacher-Students/s interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss/s-Ss/s</td>
<td>Students/s-Students/interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn</td>
<td>Content Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cx</td>
<td>Context Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Meaning Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
<td>Form Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT</td>
<td>Knowledge transmitter = Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Interlocutor (Co-communicator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1/1, C1/2, C1/3</td>
<td>P1’ observed class 1^{st}, 2^{nd}, 3^{rd}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 11: Coding scheme of classroom transcription

- **Form A: Coding scheme of basic principles of CLT**

  This form aims to be a tool to evaluate the CLT features evident in the observed classroom.

  **The overall classroom practice is assessed by six basic principles of CLT**

  | Yes | No |
  | PRINCIPLE 1: Lesson Objective underlying CLT concept would aim to develop the learners’ ability and the skills to communicate through language. |

  | Yes | No |
  | PRINCIPLE 2: Teach communicative competence: grammatical competence which includes the ability to use grammar appropriately. [Whereas grammatical competence implies the ability to use the linguistic items correctly, communicative competence, in addition involves the appropriate use of grammar. Definition: Appropriateness is the ability to use language that is suitable for the particular situation.] |

  | Yes | No |
  | PRINCIPLE 3: Practice functions and forms in context-rich environments. [Language teaching which practices linguistic items in meaningless situations is literally meaning-less. CLT, as opposed to traditional language teaching, is bound to be context-rich or meaningful simulation. Meaning is expressed through functions and manifests itself in forms. Definitions:]
  - Function is the purpose for which a language utterance is used in speech or writing.
  - Form is the means/structure by which a language utterance is used/organized in speech or writing. |

  | Yes | No |
  | PRINCIPLE 4: Make sure CLT classroom provides ample opportunity to create communicative situations upon genuine or near-genuine needs, through information gaps by genuine or near-genuine partners. |
An information gap occurs in a situation where information is known by only some of the interlocutors.

**Principle 5: Treatment of error correction is given priority to ‘fluency’ (plus appropriacy) over ‘accuracy’**.

As opposed to traditional methods, CLT regards fluency as the basic aim of language teaching, and thus fluency practice should precede accuracy practice. Consequently, during fluency practice errors should be left uncorrected, as a rule.

Definitions:
- Accuracy is the ability to use grammar and construction of the language correctly.
- Fluency is the ability to use the language spontaneously and effectively.
- Appropriacy is the ability to use the language with suitable situation or language used by suitable words.

**Principle 6: Adopt a learner-centered method and attitude into classroom practice**

A learner-centered attitude means that the teacher regards student’s need and advocates learner autonomy.

The teacher’s role changes in the different stages of the language teaching operation.
- T. acts as an informant in the presentation stage.
- T. acts as a conductor in the practice stage.
- T. is rather a guide and a co-communicator in the production stage.

In overall, teacher takes the role of facilitator of knowledge formation not transmitter of knowledge.

### Form B: Code scheme of classroom activities: CLT & Non-CLT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature of activity</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Degree of communicative effectiveness of learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities that are strictly form focused or teacher-directed.</td>
<td>- Teacher explanation/instructions</td>
<td>Non-communicative learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Drills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Substitution or Chain drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Extended corrections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities that are still focused on linguistics form but are oriented towards meaning</td>
<td>- Q &amp; A Practice</td>
<td>Pre-communicative language practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Making up sentences with vocabulary words.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities that make use of taught structures or content that selected by the teacher. Mostly, interaction procedure is pre-planned and controlled by the teacher.</td>
<td>- Information exchange in accurate repetition</td>
<td>Communicative language practice. (Controlled practice/accurate reproduction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Class survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Using grammatical structures to describe pictures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities that are primarily meaning-focused, but the situation is set by the teacher. Improvisation of language may occur.</td>
<td>- Summaries; reading of authentic material; structured role plays; listening to authentic conversations</td>
<td>Structured communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities that strongly focus on communicating messages and the corresponding language is spontaneous without predetermined language pattern. Improvisation of language is usual.</td>
<td>- Discussion</td>
<td>Authentic communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Problem-solving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Content-based tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unconstrained role-plays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coding schemed of CLT activities is used to figure out the degree to which language activities in the classroom can be assessed communicative in five features ranging from strong version of CLT, weak version of CLT and to non-CLT version. Classroom practices which embraces activities categorized under feature (5) fall under the strong version of CLT, whereas classrooms that employ activities under feature (2) through feature (4) could be considered as implementing a weak version of CLT. Classroom practices conducted with activities in category 1 is considered as non-communicative language approach.
## Appendix 12: Example of coding Anee’s employment of strong version of communicative practices in her third observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature of activity</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Degree of communicative effectiveness of learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| □ 1. Activities that are strictly form focused or teacher-directed. | -Teacher explanation/instructions  
-Students analysed language to understand its formation rather than its meaning and use.  
-Drills  
-Substitution or Chain drill  
-Extended corrections | Non-communicative learning |
| □ 2. Activities that are still focused on linguistics form but are oriented towards meaning | -Q & A Practice  
-Making up sentences with vocabulary words. | Pre-communicative language practice. |
| □ 3. Activities that make use of taught structures or content that selected by the teacher. | ☑ - Information exchange in accurate repetition using Q & A Practice  
-Class survey  
- Using grammatical structures to describe pictures (Mostly, interaction procedure is pre-planned and controlled by the teacher) | 3. Communicative language practice. (Controlled practice/accurate reproduction) |
| □ 4. Activities that are primarily meaning-focused, but the | -Summaries  
-Reading of authentic material;  
☑ Structured role plays | Structured communication (Semi-controlled practice) |
situation is set by the teacher. Improvisation of language may occur.

- Listening to authentic conversations for independent reproduction of language

| 5. Activities that strongly focus on communicating messages and the corresponding language is spontaneous without predetermined language pattern. Improvisation of language is usual and expected. |
| - Discussion |
| - Problem-solving |
| ✓ Content-based tasks |
| ✓ Unconstrained role-plays |

5. Authentic communication
Appendix 13: Example of coding of classroom observation:
Budsaba’s explicit grammar lesson

Code of coding
T = Use of Terminology
Fn = Function focus (includes meaning and context)
Fo = Form focus (include Structure focus)
R = Rules explanation
Ex = Giving examples

(In case of more than one focuses were evident, the + symbol is put on to 
indicate the mixed focus, e.g. T+ Fn refers to Terminology and function are 
stated at that individual turn of teacher’s talk.)

A. Information about Class and Lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level: Grade 4/Primary Year4</th>
<th>Class size = 37</th>
<th>Time = 50 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic = Daily routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Aim = Student are able to listen, speak and read about daily routine of the classroom situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major aim of the Core English course: 1. Communication skill 2. Problem solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About Students: All of Ss were Islamic ethnic who use Jawi as their first language and learned to speak Thai when entered the elementary school. Budsaba thought that their Thai language was not as competent as their Yawi language. All the times, Budsaba who is the bilingual Jawi-Thai speaker mostly used Thai as for the classroom discourses with little English (see in [xxxx ]). Most students talked to each other in their native Yawi with very some words in Thai. When they talked to the teacher, they used most Thai and some Yawi.

Main interpretation

1. Function of the target grammar was presented within 34 turns of classroom discourses

2. 32 Turns of classroom discourse and practices incorporated an explanation of rules with an intensive focus on ‘form’. Terminology, rules and examples were displayed on the board. Budsaba’s focus of instruction was excessively on Rules, forms and terminology. The function of grammar was occasionally highlighted with great attention on the accuracy of form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Initial Transcription of observed practices</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Episode 1  Presentation stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B  Can you tell me what we have studied last time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ss  Subject and verb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B  We have learnt about the daily routine; the everyday activities we do as habits. Remember? What tense or verb we use to talk about daily routine?</td>
<td>Fu+R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ss  [Silent]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B  In English, Present simple tense is used to talk about the actions we regularly do, and also when you describe yourself. The sentence structure of present simple tense is... T+ Fo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Teacher points to the BB]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Sentence structure diagram" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B  You should remember the sentence structure of the present simple tense. Look, subject, verb one and the complement. R+Ex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ss  [Ss are taking note while listening to Teacher’s explanation]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B  Subject is a doer, do some action. Tell me some action in present simple form. R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>B  OK! The verb will be followed by the ‘complement’. Let’s get back to the ‘Subject’ of the sentence. Ex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Budsaba writes on the BB a chuck of personal pronoun]</td>
<td>Ex+F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

274
11 B. points to herself when saying ‘I’. T. points to a student when saying ‘you’. T. points to everyone in the classroom when saying ‘we’. T. points to outside classroom where some students walking pass the classroom then says ‘They’. Budsaba says Thai meaning after every words.

12 [B. points to the verbs written on board.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walk เดิน</th>
<th>Sleep นอน</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eat กิน</td>
<td>Wash ล้าง</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 B The verbs; walk, sleep, eat, wash and sit,...here, are in regular form. In present simple sentence, if the subject is singular you have to make the verb singular to correspond to the singular subject by putting –s after Verb.

14 [Ss listen quieting, many are taking note while some are]

15 B He walks...s..s and...[T. puts –s after the verb ‘walk’ on the board]. She Ex+R eats...s..s. [T. then put –s after the verb ‘eat’].

16 B He studies...and.... [T. rubs off letter ‘y’ and put ‘ies’ after the verb]. If the verb ends with letter ‘y’, you need to change ‘y’ to ‘i’ and then add ‘es’ afterwards.

17 B How do you know when to put –s or when not to put –s after the Verb? If subject is singular, put –s or –es after verb, remember.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18   | [B. asks Ss to write some example of singular verb. Three students get to the BB and write down a regular verb each.]
|      | **|  |
|      | eat → eats | Ex+R |
|      | wash → washes |  |
|      | go → goes |  |
| 19   | Look, ‘Wash’ ends with ‘sh’, its singular form is.....put[T. corrects the errors] ...—es. And...for the verb ‘go’ ends with letter ‘o’, you have to put ‘-es’ to make it singular form. That’s correct. |
|      | eat → eats | T+R |
|      | wash → washes |  |
|      | go → goes |  |
| 20   | Present Simple Tense is used for the actions that currently happened. |
|      | [B. gets Ss to read the rules aloud, Ss read it in choral] |
| 21   | For talking about present action or daily routine, we use ‘Present simple tense’. The sentence begins with subject then verb and following with agreement or complement. When subjects are ‘He, she and it’, you must add ‘s’ or ‘-es’ to get the verb agreement with subject’ |
| 22   | *I like you to could remember the rules well so that you can write up the present simple sentence correctly. |
|      | [B. gets Ss to read it aloud sentence by sentence in choral.] |
| 23   | [Read aloud in choral with slow pace] “Present Simple Tense is used to tell the daily routine and the current actions. The sentence structure is; subject, verb one and complement. I, you, we, they, use with the verb without —s. Rule of adding —s is.....subject is ...........” |
| 24   |  |
| 25   | [T. models an example of the present simple sentence on the BB] |
### Main Findings:
Explicit, direct instruction of grammar using grammar-translation and rote-memorization

---

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tell me, do an addition –s needed for the verb ‘go’?</td>
<td>Ex+R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Yes/no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>In this sentence, ‘We’ is a plural subject. Do you think ‘–s’ should be added to the verb ‘go’? And... Is ‘–s’ needed for the verb ‘go’ when the subject is ‘He’?</td>
<td>R+F+Ex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>[B. writes down another sentence model]</td>
<td>I eat apple.</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Does the verb ‘eat’ should be with –s or without –s?</td>
<td>R+F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Ex+R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>If the subjects of the sentence are ‘I, You, We, They’, it is no need to add ‘–s’ to its verb, ok?</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R+F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>[B. repeats the grammar rules from the beginning through the end]</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I’d like you to get back home. Read and review the rules well. Before leaving, make sure you have copy down all the rules and diagram on your notes. You have 10 minutes left before the class end.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

We go to the zoo.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Transcript of Stimulated recall questions and answers with Ceeham’s third observation</th>
<th>Purpose/meaning/coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-observation stimulated-recall questions and Ceeham’s responses</strong></td>
<td>Recall and elicit reflection on grammar-translation practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 During your teaching, I observed you always taught in Thai and when teaching grammar, you always translated and explains the rules and how to use grammar in Thai. Can you tell me why did you teach in this way?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceeham: I have planned to use English for teaching before entering the classroom. But when teaching students in the real classroom, I could not use English at all. You would see that they did not understand what I said. It better uses the language they easily understand me.</td>
<td>The departure of the plan. Students’ ability in English use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 In the lesson plan you have given to me, the lesson seems to be a speaking practice but in reality, all the lesson were all about grammar. Why did you do not teach according to the lesson plan?</td>
<td>Recall and elicit reasons on grammar-translation practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceeham: Actually, the course book includes grammar section in each lesson. I taught grammar because it is a background knowledge, the learners should be grounded before learning communication.</td>
<td>Grammar knowledge is as pre-requisite for learning communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ceeham: For this lesson, grammar seems to be difficult for them because there are much foreign – linked rules and some exceptions they need to remember. Students would not create accurate language even if they had good basic grammar, so the teacher must help them. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3: What's about in the class that you aim to teach English for communication?</th>
<th>Elicit beliefs about teaching communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceeham: I see my students do not at all love doing communication practice activity but reading an article or doing exercise in the paper. I have once used English in instructing them to do practice or learning activity but it totally failed. I think giving written exercise of conversation better helps them learn how to communicate correctly as well as practice speaking.</td>
<td>Student’s motivation to practice communication The accuracy-focused task is essential background prior to learning to speak.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4 Why and what the challenges you have found when changing your plan?</th>
<th>Elicit factors/reason influencing instructional decision-making.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceeham: Time limitation and how to complete the total lessons provided in the school’s syllabus. But if I do not teach them extra grammar, they might have a problem when taking the exam. This is a dilemma I have to deal with.</td>
<td>Time, school' syllabus, exam-orientation culture of learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q5 I saw you asked the students to work individually for grammar exercise, and you often asked and prompted them for the answer one by one. What was it for and how the students benefit from this if you have organized group/pair work activity instead of teacher-led mode? | Recall and elicit reflection on the teacher-led mode of teaching grammar. |
For working in a pair, they possibly can help each other find out the best answers of the task but we can not guarantee the result. Students were not good in grammar and need teachers’ guide. I tried to involve everyone in this grammar exercise but it’s rather impossible for this big size class (38 students).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For working in a pair, they possibly can help each other find out the best answers of the task but we can not guarantee the result. Students were not good in grammar and need teachers’ guide. I tried to involve everyone in this grammar exercise but it’s rather impossible for this big size class (38 students).</td>
<td>Pair/group work was not suitable for grammar teaching and learning. Accuracy-focused and teacher as the main source of knowledge. Students’ low ability to learn. Large class size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 What was your purpose of error correction, which I observed you corrected the grammar form for accuracy and the students rarely corrected it by themselves? Describe how this aspect benefits the students’ learning.</td>
<td>Recall and elicit reflection on the teacher-led mode of error-correction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should show them the accurate way of using grammar and then asked them to do it themselves in later after they were mastery in grammar.</td>
<td>Teacher as the main source of knowledge and accuracy-focused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7: What was the roles of the students in learning grammar in this lesson? Please explain why those roles were applied in this lesson?</td>
<td>Recall and elicit about roles of students and teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expected the students to learn to memorize rules and use grammar correctly. It’s better that they should carefully listen to my explanation and do what I have guided them to do.</td>
<td>Rot-learning and accuracy-focused learning. Students as passive receivers of knowledge. Teacher as knowledge imparter and a guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8: What went well in this lesson?</td>
<td>Elicit for other relating reflection about classroom practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through the grammar seems to be boring and difficult topics for them, whenever, I ask the question, they always responded to me. Another reason why this class was very motivating to learn and do grammar exercise</td>
<td>Student’s motivation to learn Culture of learning (grammar-based exam orientation).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
might be because they realized how important the lesson is for passing the exam.

**Q10: What were some big challenges in teaching this lesson?**

One problem in teaching in English is my own self. (How come?) I think my spoken English is rather good. But when using it for teaching, I felt uncomfortable to use English as a medium of teaching. It is not working for me to keep the lesson go on as planned. So I did not use English at all. My teacher supervisor always asks me to try to speak English more. I think I will try to use more English in some lesson about communication but not when teaching grammar or reading.

Elicit for other relating reflection about classroom practices.

Classroom interaction in English is for communication lesson only. Classroom interaction in English is not suitable for teaching grammar and reading.
Appendix 15: School-prescribed lesson structure: Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP)

Analysis of the lesson structure of the three PSTs’ nine observed classes revealed that they employed the typical PPP or 3Ps lesson model whereby the classroom instructional practices progressed through three sequential stages: Present, Practice, and Presentation. First, the teacher introduces the topic and presents new words or structures, gives examples, explains how the language is formed and demonstrates how the language is used. Second, in the practice stage, students are encouraged to practise using words or structures in a controlled way with the aim of achieving accuracy of form. In the final phase, students use language they have practised in more meaningful ways in order to improve their linguistic fluency and usage.

In the Presentation – Practice – Production model input of a particular structure is typically followed by controlled, semicontrolled (also known as less controlled) and guided-control (also known as freer) practice. A key feature of PPP is the movement from controlled and structured language to less-controlled and more freely used and created language (Holliday, 1994). The PPP sequence and structure model of teaching has been used widely for most school subjects in Thai schools including EFL classes (Prasomsuk, 2015). In this study the three PSTs’ typical PPP instructional practices were:
Appendix 16: Thailand’s strand and standard of learners’ quality regarding English language
Learning Area of Foreign Languages

Rationale of teaching and learning foreign language

In the present global society, learning foreign languages is very important and essential to daily life, as foreign languages serve as an important tool for communication, education, seeking knowledge, livelihood and creating understanding of cultures and visions of the world community. Foreign languages enable learners to be aware of diversity of cultures and viewpoints in the world community, conducive to friendship and cooperation with various countries. They contribute to learners’ development by giving learners better understanding of themselves and others. The learners are thus able to learn and understand differences of languages and cultures, customs and traditions, thinking, society, economy, politics and administration. They will be able to use foreign languages for communication as well as for easier and wider access to bodies of knowledge, and will have vision in leading their lives.

The foreign language constituting basic learning content that is prescribed for the entire basic education core curriculum is English, while for other foreign languages, e.g., French, German, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Pali and languages of neighbouring countries, it is left to the discretion of educational institutions to prepare courses and provide learning management as appropriate.

What is learned in foreign languages?

The learning area for foreign languages is aimed at enabling learners to acquire a favourable attitude towards foreign languages, the ability to use foreign languages for communicating in various situations, seeking knowledge, engaging in a livelihood and pursuing further education at higher levels. Learners will thus have knowledge and understanding of stories and cultural diversity of the world community, and will be able to creatively convey Thai concepts and culture to the global society.

The main strand and standard of learners’ quality regarding foreign language for basic education
Strand 1: Language for Communication

Standard F1.1: Understanding of and capacity for interpreting what has been heard and read from various types of media and ability to express opinions with proper reasoning.

Standard F1.2: Endowment with language communication skills for exchange of data and information; efficient expression of feelings and opinions.

Standard F1.3: Ability to present data, information, concepts and views about various matters through speaking and writing

Strand 2: Language and Culture

Standard F2.1: Appreciation of the relationship between language and culture of native speakers and capacity for use of language appropriate to occasions and places

Standard F2.2: Appreciation of similarities and differences between language and culture of native and Thai speakers, and capacity for accurate and appropriate use of language

Strand 3: Language and Relationship with Other Learning Areas

Standard F3.1: Usage of foreign languages to link knowledge with other learning areas, as foundation for further development and to seek knowledge and widen one's world view.

Strand 4: Language and Relationship with Community and the World

Standard F4.1: Ability to use foreign languages in various situations in school, community and society.

Standard F4.2: Usage of foreign languages as basic tools for further education, livelihood and exchange of learning with the world community
Appendix 17: Curriculum structure of Bachelor of Education Program in English B.E. 2549 (2006)

Philosophy and Objective

The Bachelor of Education degree curriculum aims to produce teachers with professional knowledge, capability, quality, morals and ethics, according to the National Education Act of 2542 B.E. and its Amendments (Second National Education Act B.E 2545 (2002), together with the criterion and conditions set down by the Teaching Profession Council.

The general objective of the Bachelor of Education degree curriculum of the Faculty of Education is to produce graduates on the following qualifications:

1. A personality and behavioral conduct, appropriate for the teaching profession as is required of a good role model.
2. Consciousness of both social and self-development, a democratic mindset, and the ability to work with others effectively.
3. The knowledge and capabilities, which are integral parts of the teaching profession, according to the professional standards, and the ability to analyse and resolve teaching-related problems effectively.
4. Abilities to use Thai and the foreign language communicatively, as well as the ability to use up-to-date information technology.
5. Eagerness to actively want to learn, continual pursuit of knowledge to enhance self-development, and the ability to apply the knowledge gained to ease learner receptiveness and production in the classroom.

Curriculum structure

1. General education  
   1.1 Language and communication 12 credits
   1.2 Humanities 6 credits
   1.3 Social sciences 6 credits
   1.4 Science and mathematics 6 credits
2. Professional teacher training 129 credits
   2.1 Teaching profession 50 credits
      2.1.1 Compulsory 36 credits
      2.1.2 Electives 6 credits
   2.2 Teaching specializations 79 credits
      2.2.1 Compulsory 50 credits
      2.2.2 Electives 5 credits
   2.3 Practical teaching experience 14 credits

3. Electives 6 credits
   Total 162 credits

Courses details about Language Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course number</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2105325</td>
<td>Principles and Methodology in Teaching English as a Foreign Language</td>
<td>3(3-0-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2105442</td>
<td>Method and Approach in Teaching English</td>
<td>3(2-2-5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Practical teaching experience 14 credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course number</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1104403</td>
<td>Teaching practice 1</td>
<td>1(90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104404</td>
<td>Teaching practice 2</td>
<td>1(90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100506</td>
<td>Practicum 1</td>
<td>6(360)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100507</td>
<td>Practicum 2</td>
<td>6(360)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Description

1. Courses relating to EFL teaching pedagogy

2105325  การสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ 3(3-0-6)

**Principles and Methodology in Teaching English as a Foreign Language**

Examine the development of principles, methods of teaching and trends in teaching and learning English. Study varieties of English Language Teaching approaches. Integrate and demonstrate teaching approaches in teaching four language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing by practicing writing lesson plans. They will be applied in teaching demonstration; peer-teaching, microteaching and language activities focusing on learner centered styles.

2105442  พฤติกรรมการสอนภาษาอังกฤษ 3(2-2-5)

**Method and Approaches in Teaching English**

The course is designed to examine how to differentiate approaches and methods that can be used appropriately in ELT. The course is also required students to demonstrate their teaching based on approaches and method learned. The teaching demonstration such as peer teaching, micro teaching includes classroom observations, teaching material analysis. The course also provides students how to prepare the lesson plan and the teaching materials relevant to various language activities according to learner-centered approach.

2. Courses relating to teaching practicum

1100403  ฝึกปฏิบัติวิชาชีพครู 1 1(90)

**Practice teaching 1**

A two-week practice of pre- classroom teaching in the school. Practices focuses on planning classroom teaching tasks under the role of teacher assistant; studying behaviors of students in the classroom; school administration and services and general management for classroom teaching; participating in school activities and planning academic projects.

1100404  ฝึกปฏิบัติวิชาชีพครู 2 1(90)

**Practice teaching 2**

A two-week practice of pre- classroom teaching in the school. Practices focuses on planning classroom teaching tasks under the role of teacher assistant; studying behaviors of students in the classroom; school administration and services and general
management for classroom teaching; participating in school activities and planning academic projects.

Practicum 1

A practice of teaching in the school by integrating all knowledge in teaching in performing duties of classroom teachers under school supervision. Practices include evaluating of teaching performance in order to improve classroom teaching practice; reporting problem and solution in teaching practice as an approach to classroom-based research implementation and participating in educational seminars after the practicum.

Practicum 2

A practice of teaching in school, integrating all knowledge in teaching. Practices include writing lesson plans for students as the center, managing process of learning; creating teaching materials, innovation; using techniques and strategies in learning to teach. Teacher trainees are required to collect data about problems in classroom teaching in order to conduct a classroom research.
Appendix 18: Statements in evaluation form used by the mentor in assessing trainees teachers’ performance of classroom teaching at practicum school (Teaching Practicum I)

1. Introduction relates to the lesson and appropriate with the time provided.
2. Conduct the classroom teaching as planned in the lesson plan.
3. Words and gestures used in the classroom is communicative and interesting.
4. Imparting content knowledge is clear and comprehensible.
5. Provide a chance for learners to participate in collaborative learning.
6. Promote analytical thinking by using questioning technique.
7. Use Information technology e.g. internet and email.
8. Provide efficient guidance for improving learning ability.
9. Able to control the classroom.
10. Apply Student-centered approach to classroom teaching.
11. Use appropriate incentives and motivation.
12. Use material aids suitable for learners’ levels.
13. Able to choose the up-to-date topic and content.
14. Able to use IT to extend a scope of knowledge.
15. Use teaching methods e.g. Collaborative learning or CIPPA model.
16. Teach in accordance with lesson objective and competency aim.
17. Manage time appropriate for each stage of teaching.
18. Assess students’ learning right to the learning objective and activities.
19. Assess students’ learning ability by using suitable method.
20. Provide fair and just assessment to each student.
### Appendix 19: Table for Determining Sample Size from a Given Population (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$S$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$S$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$S$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$S$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**—$N$ is population size.

$S$ is sample size.
# Appendix 20: Example of Lesson Plan sheet at pre-observation

**Class Observation (CO1)**

## From 1: About your class and lesson  
(ข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับบทเรียนและชั้นเรียน)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class level:</strong></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of students:</strong></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time:</strong></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration:</strong></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textbook:</strong></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any extra book designed by you?</strong></td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson:</strong></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic:</strong></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Objective:</strong></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any communicative activity to have in this class?</strong></td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If yes, please note what is it about?</strong></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Teaching Plan (in brief) OR Please provide the lesson plan you have prepared. 
(โปรดอธิบายแผนการสอนโดยภาพรวม หรือแนบแผนการสอนที่ท่านได้เตรียมไว้):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THANK YOU!**
Appendix 21: Maps of Southern Thailand

Map of 14 provinces in southern Thailand

Map of Thailand and 4 southern border provinces