

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iii
ABSTRACT IN ENGLISH	iv
ABSTRACT IN THAI	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
LIST OF FIGURES	xviii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 The Development of International Programs in Non-English Speaking Countries	1
1.2 Thailand's Requirement for International University Programs	2
1.3 The State of Thailand's International Programs	4
1.4 English as an International language of Commerce and Education	7
1.5 Thailand's Issues with Learning English	8
1.6 Constructionism to Remediate Students' English	11
1.7 Developing a Case Study: Chiang Mai University's International Programs	12
1.7.1 ASEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY (AEC) 2015	13
1.7.2 College of Arts, Media and Technology (CAMT) International Program	14

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	Page
1.7.3 English Proficiency of Software Engineering (SE) Students	15
1.8 Scope of the Study	19
1.9 Aims and Objectives	20
1.10 Definition Terms	21
1.11 Thesis Structure	22
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	24
2.1 Constructionism	24
2.2 English Teaching in Thailand	29
2.2.1 Software Engineering Students' Writing Skills	31
2.2.2 Significance of Learners Errors	32
2.2.3 Identification of Errors	33
2.2.3.1 Error Analysis	34
2.3 Learning Techniques and Ideas	38
2.3.1 Cognitive Learning	38
2.3.2 Cone of Experience	39
2.3.3 The Learning Pyramid	41
2.3.4 Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	Page
2.4 Knowledge Workers	45
2.5 Overview of Theoretical Perspective	48
2.5.1 Constructionism	49
2.5.2 Intelligent learning environment (ILE)	50
2.5.3 Cognitive Learning (Learning Strategies Design)	53
2.5.4 Cone of Experience and the Learning Pyramid (Designing Learning Activities, and Materials)	53
2.5.5 The Integration of Four Theories	55
2.5.6 Error Analysis (Assessment)	56
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	58
3.1 Conceptual Framework	59
3.2 The Samples	61
3.3 The Stages of Remedial Framework Development	61
3.3.1 The Preliminary Study in Year 2008 – 2009	62
3.3.2 1st Implementation in Phase 3: 2010	64
3.3.3 Refining the framework (2011)	73

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	Page
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	85
4.1 Initial Finding of Sample Groups	85
4.2 The Three Stages Development of the Remedial Framework during the Academic Year 2008 - 2011	87
4.3 Sample groups' Quality	88
4.4 Experimental reports	90
4.4.1 The Preliminary Study 2008/2009	90
4.4.2 The 1 st Implementation During 2010	95
4.4.3 The Refined Construcionism Framework 2011	107
4.4.4 Tracking the English learning rate of target groups 2008 – 2011	120
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION	148
5.1 Thesis Conclusion	148
5.1.1 Discovery of the Research Problem	149
5.1.2 Approaches to the Framework Construction	150
5.1.3 Implementation of the Framework, 2008 - 2011	151
5.1.4 New Knowledge and Limitations of the Thesis	154

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	Page
5.1.5 The Areas for Further Development and Research	157
5.1.6 The Novelty of the Thesis and Body of Knowledge	158
5.1.7 The Future Research	159
REFERENCES	160
APPENDICES	172
Appendix A Data Collection Letters	173
Appendix B Data Collection Materials in The Preliminary Study (2008/2009)	180
Appendix C Data Collection Materials in the 1st Implementation (2010)	187
Appendix D Data Collection Materials in the Refined Remedial Framework (2011)	197
CURRICULUM VITAE	220

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.1	Examples of Thai higher education institutes which set up international programs and initiatives	7
2.1	The Proposal of Common European Framework for CMU Grading System	44
2.2	Theoretical aspects of constructionism and their and practical implementation in the remedial framework	50
2.3	Comparison of the four learning theories to passive and active learning, and concrete versus abstract learning experiences	54
2.4	The four learning theories and their contribution to the remedial framework	55
2.5	The proposed three-layer remedial framework and its relationship with the five key learning theories	56
3.1	The classification of SE Professional Domain Knowledge	76
4.1	The preliminary paired t-test result	91
4.2	23 students' satisfaction level according to eight issues in the CAMT questionnaire	97
4.3	Paired t-test analysis results showing the difference between pretest and posttest scores of 23 students	98
4.4	ANOVA results on vocabulary, sentences, and writing	99

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

Table	Page
4.5 ANOVA results on presentation criteria (content, language use, presenting)	101
4.6 Paired t-test analysis of students' long term retention (3 week posttest)	103
4.7 Ranking long term retention of the 23 students according to quality level derived from the 'learning process value'	104
4.8 The classification of fifteen companies used to gather SE domain knowledge requirements to the course	108
4.9 The classification in using English in the workplace	109
4.10 The ranging of English skills in daily used are presented using mean score	109
4.11 The frequency level of each written task recommended by SE professionals	111
4.12 The number of language errors in the pretest and posttest, and the corresponding level of improvement for 23 students enrolled on the 2011 course	113

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.1	Thailand's international student numbers 2001 – 2010	4
1.2	The Number of international programs in Thailand from 2004-2008	6
1.3	Software engineering students' initial English scores from CAMT 2008 – 2011	16
1.4	The average scores of Software Engineering students from 2008 – 2011	17
1.5	Frequency of errors of SE students written English paragraph 2010-2011	19
2.1	The levels of error analysis	37
2.2	Cone of Experience	40
2.3	Cone of Learning	41
2.4	The Learning Pyramid	42
2.5	Six Levels of Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)	43
2.6	The integration of constructionism and ILE	52
3.1	Conceptual Framework of the Thesis	59
3.2	The stages of remedial framework development in year 2008 – 2011	62

LIST OF FIGURES (CONTINUED)

Figure		Page
3.3	A 3D framework representation of the remedial framework in this research in 2010	67
3.4	Construction zone showing classroom layout and student placement in the remedial framework	71
3.5	The process of learning activities within the remedial framework (2010)	72
3.6	Categorization of software engineering knowledge areas into English types	75
3.7	Comparison of traditional Thai classroom layout to the setup of the remedial framework	77
3.8	The three key steps to create the refined remedial framework to improve written English using constructionism and error analysis	78
3.9	The four elements of constructionism utilized in the remedial framework	80
4.1	The three stages development of the remedial framework from 2008 to 2011	87
4.2	The four groups of SE university students to represent the different English quality levels	89

LIST OF FIGURES (CONTINUED)

Figure		Page
4.3	Number and type of English errors in SE students' written paragraphs (2008)	93
4.4	Number and type of English errors in SE students' written paragraphs (2009)	93
4.5	Comparison of means for vocabulary, sentences, and writing in the pretest, 1 st posttest and 2nd posttest	100
4.6	Equation to calculate average retention rate and subsequent comparison of calculated long term retention rate to the learning pyramid	103
4.7	Equation to calculate learning process value	104
4.8	Number of written English errors in SE students' paragraph (2010)	106
4.9	A visual comparison of errors between pretest and posttest	117
4.10	Paired t-test results showing statistically significant differences between pretest and posttest scores of 23 students. Note that only those t-values that are significant at the 95% CI and above are shown	119
4.11	The four stages of tracking SE students' learning rates throughout their enrollment at CMU	122

LIST OF FIGURES (CONTINUED)

Figure		Page
4.12	The comparison of an experimental group year 2008 to 2011	125
4.13	Software Engineering Students Academic Year 2008	126
4.14	Average, Min and Max SE Students (Control-quota) 2008	127
4.15	Average, Min and Max SE Students (Control-direct admission) 2008	128
4.16	Average, Min and Max SE Students (Experimental Group) 2008	129
4.17	Software Engineering Students Academic Year 2009	130
4.18	Average, Min and Max SE Students (Control-direct admission) 2009	131
4.19	Average, Min and Max SE Students (Control-admission) 2009	132
4.20	Average, Min and Max SE Students (Control-quota) 2009	133
4.21	Average, Min and Max SE Students (Experiment Group) 2009	134
4.22	Software Engineering Students Academic Year 2010	135
4.23	Average, Min and Max SE Students (Control-admission) 2010	136
4.24	Average, Min and Max SE Students (Control-direct admission) 2010	137
4.25	Average, Min and Max SE Students (Experiment Group) 2010	138
4.26	Software Engineering Students Academic Year 2011	139

LIST OF FIGURES (CONTINUED)

Figure		Page
4.27	Average, Min and Max SE Students (Control-quota) 2011	140
4.28	Average, Min and Max SE Students (Control-direct admission) 2011	141
4.29	Average, Min and Max SE Students (Control-admission) 2011	142
4.30	Average, Min and Max SE Students (Experiment Group) 2011	143