



Education Quarterly Reviews

Tran, Bhuson, and Pa-alisbo, Mark Anthony Cenas. (2021), A Study of the Implementation of English Program Policy in Secondary Schools under the Secondary Educational Service Area Office 7. In: Education Quarterly Reviews, Vol.4, No.2, 180-191.

ISSN 2621-5799

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1993.04.02.209

The online version of this article can be found at:
<https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/>

Published by:
The Asian Institute of Research

The *Education Quarterly Reviews* is an Open Access publication. It may be read, copied, and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

The Asian Institute of Research *Education Quarterly Reviews* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of education, linguistics, literature, educational theory, research, and methodologies, curriculum, elementary and secondary education, higher education, foreign language education, teaching and learning, teacher education, education of special groups, and other fields of study related to education. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Education Quarterly Reviews* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of education.



ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide

A Study of the Implementation of English Program Policy in Secondary Schools under the Secondary Educational Service Area Office 7

Bhuson Tran¹, Mark Anthony Cenas Pa-alisbo¹

¹ St. Theresa International College, Nakhon Nayok, Thailand

Abstract

Recognizing that English skills are vital for international communications, for the economic development of the country, and for Thailand to compete with other nations, the Thai government has formalized the teaching of English in its Basic Education Curriculum. In 1999, the Ministry of Education reformed and decentralized the Thai educational system with the National Education Act B.E. 2542 (A.D. 1999). In 2001, the Ministry of Education issued an English Program Policy allowing qualified schools to teach certain subjects under the Basic Education Curriculum in English as an alternative mode of instruction. This mixed method research investigated the implementation of the English Program Policy of three Secondary Schools under the Secondary Educational Service Area Office 7. Instruments used was opinionnaire surveys adopted from the Office of Basic Education Council (OBEC) English Program Educational Standard Educational Institution Self-Assessment Questionnaire and the English Program/ Mini English Program Implementation Student Questionnaire and selected validated questions from studies by Chantarasiri, and Senachit. Respondents were administrators from the Secondary Educational Service Area 7 Office and from the three selected schools with English Program, and teachers and students from the mentioned schools. The data analysis from this study showed that the level of implementation of the English Policy among administrator was Very High, while the level of implementation among students was High. There was no significant difference in the level of implementation among administrators and teachers, and the study found no significant difference in the level of implementation among teachers when compared by the number of years in the position.

Keywords: English Program, Public Policy Implementation

1. Introduction

In today's rapid advancement of technology and innovation, the explosive growth of internet access, the phenomenal emergence of new online commercial and social communications platforms, and lower costs of mobile devices have paved the way for a world of borderless communication. Language skills, especially in English, the international language used for communications as well as to exchange knowledge and technologies, have been an important focus of the Thai government to raise Thai peoples' proficiency in foreign languages in

order to participate in world trade, technology exchanges, research and innovations, good diplomatic relationship, and to remain competitive with other nations, especially among ASEAN members. In order to compete with other nations, One of the Thai government's strategies is to ensure that Thailand remains economically and technologically competitive in the international arena. The first strategy of the 12th National Economic and Social Development Plan aims to improve foreign language skills, especially in English, among the working age population (Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board, 2016). Aligning to the 12th National Economic and Social Development Plan, The Ministry of Education issued its 12th Education Development Plan (2017-2021) aimed to raise the standard of teaching and learning English.

The teaching of English Language in Thailand began in the early 19th Century, but was only available to the elites. It was only in 1921 that the teaching of English was added formally to the school curriculum for class levels after Prathomsuksa 4 (grade 4 equivalent) through the Compulsory education Act (Taladngoen, 2019). Later on, in 1999, the Ministry of Education issued the National Education Act B.E. 2542 (A.D.1999) to reform and decentralized the Thai education systems. The National Education Act B.E. 2542 (A.D.1999) enforced education for all and mandated that all learners must have “a knowledge and skill in mathematics and language, and the emphasis on a correct usage of Thai language (National Education Act B.E. 2542, Chapter IV section 23.4). This was a great influence in the teaching and learning of English in Thailand such that English was taught as a primary foreign language and was a mandatory subject for primary and secondary school students (Taladngoen, 2019). In 2001 the Ministry of Education issued the Directive of the Ministry Education No. BEID 165/2544, Policy, Guidelines, and Method for English Program, a policy allowing schools to use the English Language to teach certain subjects of the Basic Core Curriculum as an alternative mode of instruction is often referred to as the English Program or EP/Mini English Program or MEP). For convenience, we shall refer to these programs as English Program. This program must be accessible to all students and must preserve the institutions of the Nation, Religion, and Monarchy as well as the Thai identity. (Ministry of Education, 2001)

Since English Program Policy originated from the Ministry of Education, it is a public policy, and due to the decentralization of administration by the National Education Act B.E. 2542, the implementation of the English Program Policy will vary from school to school depending on their capabilities and resources with supervision and assessments form their Secondary Educational Service Area Office.

This study employed Chandarasorn's (2011) Management Model of public policy implementation to study the implementation of English Program Policy in three Secondary schools under the Secondary Education Service Area 7. The factors of implementation - formation of organizational structures, administrator Management capabilities in running the program, management of teachers capabilities, financing and budget planning, planning and management of facilities and classrooms, and curriculum planning were looked at to 1) determine the level of implementation of the English Program Policy among administrators and teachers 2) compare the level of implementation of the English Program Policy among administrators and teachers, and 3) compare the level of implementation of the English Program Policy among administrators by the number of years in the position 4) make suggestions for improvements.

1.2 Related Literature

Recognizing the importance of acquiring English skills for Thai people, the Thai government together with departments with roles and responsibilities related to education spent many efforts to develop the most effective programs for learning and teaching English. In 2001, the Ministry of Education issued a Directive “1065/2544” allowing qualified schools to use English as the mode of instructions to teach the Basic Education Curriculum.

A public policy is a guideline of activities by a government with goals or objectives to solve a problem. The public policy process begins from the establishment of the policy, implementation of the policy, and ends with the assessment of the policy. Fowler (2004) defined public policy as a political system addressing problems through a continuous and active process charged with values, while Chandarasorn (2011) refers to it as an operational mechanism, planning, projects, or operation guidelines organized by the government to solve a problem, and Yavapapas (2014) says that it is a choice that the government makes as a part of their duties to solve a problem,

alleviate problems, and/or prevents problems. A public policy has a sequence that begins with its establishment, implementation, and assessment or termination. Fowler (2004) has further broken this sequence down to six steps – issue definition, agenda setting, policy formulation, policy adoption, implementation, and evaluation. Similarly, Yavaprapas (2014) defined the policy process as policy setting, policy implementation, and policy assessment.

Implementing a public policy is a process of adopting a directive or sets of direction to apply to a series of activities to achieve the predetermined objectives and is dependent on various levels of personnel and organization to achieve its goals. According to Sabatier and Mazmanian (1980), public policy implementation is the execution of basic policies, laws, government orders, cabinet resolution or judgment of the court to achieve results. Yavaprapas (2014) views policy implementation in two ways. First, the implementation of policy is a continuous, non-stop process with each phase containing interrelated step that are neither temporary nor ad hoc. Secondly, public policy implementation is a process to carry out the policy towards the successful achievement of its goals. Chandarasorn (2011) described implementation of policy as the study of how much organizations can are able to lead and stimulate their administrative resources and important mechanisms to do their work as prescribed by the policy. In particular, his Management Model for public policy implementation is based on the basic concepts of organization theories. The model focuses on the capabilities of an organizational belief that the success of their policy implementation depends on how closely the organizations align their execution to reach the expected outcomes. Hence, this model tried to study the problems of policy implementation and develop solutions to for organizations to overcome organizational management issues such as insufficient funding, lack of qualified personnel, hiring delays, and delay in setting up various systems. As such, the success of the policy implementation depends on 1) Organization structure is suitably organized 2) Capable and knowledgeable personnel in techniques of management 3) Proper financial planning and readiness of funding 4) Proper planning and readiness of facilities and 5) Proper planning and readiness of equipment. Thus, the implementation of the English Program Policy is dependent on the 1) formation of organizational structures 2) administrators management capabilities in running the program 3) management of teacher's capabilities 4) financing and budget planning 5) planning and management of facilities and classrooms, and 6) curriculum planning.

Anh (2009) in her study on Educational Administration of the English Program of the Basic Education Institutes in Chiang Mai Province described the problems of implementation of English Program Policy that in most schools in her study, the English Program organization structure was not clearly separated from the school's general administration structures, hence it did not cover all of the necessary functions and clarity of responsibilities were not clearly defined. In terms of teachers, Thai teachers did all of the operational planning for foreign teachers to follow, also there was not enough coordination and sharing of responsibilities between the Thai and foreign teachers resulting in too much work for the Thai teachers. There were too many excess activities for Thai teachers and students resulting from foreign teachers' insufficient knowledge of the English Program as well and the lack of coordination among the Thai and foreign teachers to integrate the subjects in the curriculum and teaching methods. And issues with funding were contributed by the complicated and slow bureaucratic financial processes. Senachit (2016) in her study of the implementation of teaching of English Program in schools under the Primary Education Service Area Office Songkhla Province found inadequacy of the number of foreign teachers. Due to budget constraints, schools could only offer standard teacher salary to foreign teachers for whom many found inadequate. Moreover, the high turnover rate foreign teacher because of the short one-year contractual period caused interruptions or discontinuity in teaching and learning. Some schools do not have adequate number of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, or IT resources for the English Program due to either limited financial means or the lack of land to build facilities. Learning resources, especially computers, networking equipment and English media are insufficient in some schools. Lastly, her study surmised that the lack of or limited funding was the major factors effecting the implementation of English Program Policy.

2. Methods and Materials

This study used a Mixed Research method. The schools under the Secondary Educational Service Area 7 office studied in this research were Prachinratsadornamroong School, Nakhon Nayok Wittayakhom School, and Nawama Rachanusorn School. Respondents were one (1) administrator from the Secondary Educational Service Area 7 Office, six (6) and administrators from the three schools under the Secondary Education Service Area 7, 38 English

Program teachers and 171 secondary education English Program students from the mentioned schools. Convenience sampling was used to determine the sample size of administrator. For teachers the sample size was determined with total population sampling while simple random sampling was employed to determine the sample size of students.

Administrators and teachers responded to Opinoinnaires adopted from the official survey questions English Program Standard School self-assessment questionnaire (2014) from the Ministry of Education's Bureau of Academic Affairs and Educational Standard English Program Educational Standard Educational Institution Self-Assessment Questionnaire and from selected validated questions from Chantarasiri (2014), and Senachit (2016). Students answered the opinoinnaire adopted from selected survey questions from the Ministry of Education's Bureau of Academic Affairs and Educational Standard English Program Implementation Student Questionnaire. Both versions of the opinoinnaire had questions in Thai and English.

The administrator opinoinnaire had 3 parts while the opinoinnaire distributed to teachers and students had 2 parts. The first part of the administrators and teachers opinoinnaire gathered demographics profiles of the respondents. The second part of the administrators and teachers opinoinnaire collected data on the degree of implementation of English Program Policy on the following factors: 1) formation of the organization structures 2) administrators' management capability to run the program 3) teachers' competency 4) financing and budget management 5) management of facilities and classroom, and 6) curriculum management. The third part contained open ended questions on challenges and suggestions for improvement in the implementation of the English Program Policy. Administrators and teachers were asked to rank the scale of implementation on a scale of 0 to 5 with 0 represented 0% implementation or no implementation, 1 represented the level between 10%-20% or very low level of implementation, 2 represented the level between 21%-40% or low level of implementation, 3 represented the level between 41%-60% or moderate level of implementation, 4 represented the level between 61% - 80% or high level of implementation, and 5 represented the level between 81%-100% or very high level of implementation.

The first part of student opinoinnaire collected demographic profiles of the respondent. The second part opinoinnaire used the Likert Scale framework to gather their level of implementation of English Program Policy with the following factors: 1) teacher capabilities 2) students' capabilities 3) curriculum and lesson planning, and 4) learning material and resources. Students were asked to rate their level of agreement on their school implementation on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 represented Highly Disagree, 2 represented Disagree, 3 represented Neutral, 4 represented Agree, and 5 represented Highly Agree.

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the quantitative data. For the qualitative data, the responses were analyzed with the Qualitative Data Analysis (QDA) process to summarize key information.

3. Results

3.1 The Level of implementation of English Program Policy

3.1.1 The level of implementation of English Program Policy among administrators and teachers is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: The Level of Implementation of English Program Policy by administrators and teachers

Factors of implementation	\bar{X}	s.d.	Implementation %	Description
1) Formation of organization structures	4.142	0.699	82.84%	Very High
2) Administrator Management capabilities in running the program	4.271	0.455	85.41%	Very High

3) Management of teachers' competencies	4.065	0.528	81.30%	Very High
4) Financing and budget planning	4.006	0.578	80.11%	High
5) Planning and management of facilities and classrooms	4.264	0.501	85.28%	Very High
6) Curriculum Planning	4.280	0.443	85.60%	Very High
Level of implementation of EP Policy	4.170	0.412	83.40%	Very High

Scale of implementation percent: 81%-100% means Very High, 61%-80% means High, 41%-60% means Moderate, 21% to 40% means Low, 10-20% means Very Low, 0% means no implementation.

From Table 1, The level of implementation of the English Program Policy among administrators and teachers was very High (83.40%). Of the 6 factors, 5 factors were Very High and 1 was High. The level of implementation of Curriculum planning was the highest (85.60%) while financing and budget planning (80.11%) was the lowest.

3.1.2 The level of implementation of English Program Policy according to students is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: The Level of Implementation of English Program Policy by Students

Factors of implementation	\bar{X}	s.d.	Description
1) Teachers' capabilities	4.041	0.706	High
2) Students' capabilities	4.026	0.678	High
3) Curriculum and lesson planning	3.953	0.678	High
4) Learning material and resources	4.056	0.720	High
Implementation of EP Program	4.019	0.610	High

Scale: 4.50 to 5.00 means Very High; 3.50 to 4.49 means High; 2.50 to 3.49 means Moderate 1.50 to 2.49 means Low, 1.00 to 1.49 means Very Low

From Table 2, students level of agreement on the implementation of the English Program Policy was High (\bar{X} = 4.019) for all factors. The level of implementation was learning materials and resources was highest (\bar{X} = 4.056) and curriculum and lesson planning (\bar{X} = 3.953) was the lowest

3.2 Comparison of the level of the implementation of English Program Policy

3.2.1 The comparison of the level of the implementation between administrators and teachers is shown in Table 3.

Table 3 : The comparison of the level of the implementation between administrators and teachers

Implementation of EP Policy	Administrators (n=5)		Teachers (n=38)		t	p
	\bar{X}	s.d.	\bar{X}	s.d.		
Formation of organization structure	4.257	1.050	4.121	0.632	0.469	0.232
Administrators' management capacity to run the program	4.270	0.440	4.271	0.463	-0.004	0.877
Teachers' capacity	3.953	0.660	4.086	0.508	-0.606	0.773
Financing and budget management	3.821	0.450	4.039	0.597	-0.916	0.319
Planning and management of facilities and classrooms	4.020	0.544	4.309	0.488	-1.415	0.943
Curriculum planning	4.074	0.553	4.318	0.417	-1.352	0.520
Level of EP Policy implementation as a whole	4.065	0.563	4.190	0.384	-0.732	0.667

p = 0.05*, p = 0.01**

From Table 3, the comparison of the level of implementation as a whole between administrator was not significantly different ($p=0.667$, $p > 0.05$). The level of implementation was higher among teachers ($\bar{X} = 4.190$) than administrators ($\bar{X} = 4.065$). Factor wise, the comparison of the level of implementation among teachers were higher than administrators in all factors except formation of organization structure. The highest level of implementation among teachers was on curriculum planning ($\bar{X} = 4.318$) and financing and budget management ($\bar{X}=4.039$) were the lowest. The highest level of implementation among administrators was administrator's management capacity to run the program ($\bar{X}= 4.270$) and financing and budget management ($\bar{X}=3.821$) were also the lowest.

3.2.2 Comparison of the level of the implementation of English Program Policy among administrators by years in the position is displayed in Table 4

Table 4: Comparison of the level of the implementation of English Program Policy among administrators by years in the position

Factors of implementation	Less than 5 Years (n=2)		5-10 Years (n=2)		More than 15 Years (n=3)		F	p
	\bar{X}	s.d.	\bar{X}	s.d.	\bar{X}	s.d.		
	1) Formation of organization structures	3.000	1.414	4.900	0.141	4.667		
2) Administrator Management capabilities in running the program	3.940	0.792	4.255	0.177	4.500	0.250	0.962	0.456
3) Management of teachers' competencies	3.500	1.273	3.935	0.092	4.267	0.374	0.740	0.533
4) Financing and budget planning	3.375	0.530	3.875	0.177	4.083	0.382	2.020	0.248
5) Planning and management of facilities and classrooms	3.500	0.707	4.000	0.410	4.380	0.295	2.208	0.226
6) Curriculum Planning	3.565	0.615	4.065	0.262	4.065	0.262	1.835	0.272
Level of EP Policy implementation as a whole	3.480	0.891	4.175	0.092	4.383	0.206	2.283	0.218

$p = 0.05^*$, $p = 0.01^{**}$

From Table 4, As a whole the comparison of the level of the implementation of the English Program Policy among administrators and teachers by the number of years in position yielded no significant different with $F_{2,4} = 2.283$ and $p = 0.218$ ($p > .005$). The level of implementation among administrators with years in office highest was among those with more than 15 years in the position over those with 5-10 years and less than 5 years in that order. Considering by factors, the highest level of implementation among administrators with over 15 years in the position was the formation of organizational structure while the lowest level was in curriculum planning.

3.3 Challenges with the implementation of English Program Policy and suggestions for improvement.

Administrators were given open ended questions on the challenges of the English Program and their

recommendations some responded as follows:

3.3.1 Challenges with organization structures and suggestions for improvements

Respondents were asked the question *Challenges with organization structures and suggestions for improvements?* ¹The English Program structure is according to the main administrative structure of the school. ²There is not enough staff in EP. Recommendation is for funding to hire more staff to manage EP. ³There are only a few numbers Foreign Language Teachers and they have several special assignments resulting in their not being able to continuously function in their work. Recommendation is to set funding of supervisory staff or teachers from other subjects to help look after EP. ⁴Teachers responsible must make sacrifices and dedicate themselves. ⁵Recruitment for English Program

3.3.2 Challenges of administrators in managing the English Program

Respondents were asked the question *Challenges of administrators in managing EP/MEP and suggestions for improvements?* ¹ The administrator's work has many dimensions, hence the following up and giving of assistance are not at a very deep level. Recommendation is to develop existing teachers. ² The challenge is in the English skills of administrators. Recommendations are to stress on English skills as part of the recruitment for Administrators.

3.3.3 Challenges in EP/MEP teachers' competency factor and suggestions for improvements

Respondents were asked the question *Challenges in EP/MEP teachers' competency factor and suggestions for improvements?* ¹ It is difficult to find foreign teachers with the right qualification. Recommendation is government and the Secondary Education Service office to provide information for qualified teachers or they help with teacher exchange. ² There should be a lot more development in teaching and learning competencies of teachers, especially Thai teachers.

3.3.4 Challenges in Budget Management for EP/MEP and suggestions for improvements

Respondents were asked the question *Challenges in Budget Management for EP/MEP and suggestions for improvements?* ¹Our school should receive support from the Secondary Education Service Area Office. ² Our school should receive support from the Secondary Education Office, especially funding for hiring foreign teachers of which the costs of hiring could be high. ³ Funding remains a great necessity for purchasing of educational resources, research and field studies, as well as for various aspects of development.

3.3.5 Challenges in the management of Facilities and Classroom for EP/MEP and suggestions for improvements

Respondents were asked the question *Challenges in the management of Facilities and Classroom for EP/MEP and suggestions for improvements?* ¹It is very necessary to have sound Labs and established network with international schools abroad.

3.3.6 Challenges in the Curriculum Management in EP/MEP and suggestions for improvements.

Respondents were asked the question *Challenges in the Curriculum Management in EP/MEP and suggestions for improvements?* ¹ Teachers have little knowledge of Academic affairs, but have a lot of work to do. Recommendation is training, development, program drives, follow up and assessment.

4. Summary of findings

4.1 The level of implementation of English Program Policy

The level of implementation among administrators and teachers was Very High. Considering by factors, the highest level of implementation among administrators and teachers was curriculum planning while the lowest level was financing and budget management. The level of implementation among students was High. Among students factor wise, the highest level was learning materials and resources while the lowest level was curriculum and lesson planning.

4.2 Comparison of the level of implementation among administrators and teachers

The comparison of level of implementation of English Program Policy among administrators and teachers as a whole was not significantly different and the level of implementation was higher among teachers than administrators. By factors the highest level among teachers was curriculum planning while the lowest was financing and budget management. Among administrators, the highest level was administrators' management capacities to run the program while the lowest level was also financing and budget management.

4.3 Comparison of the level of implementation among administrators by number of years in the position

The comparison of the level of implementation as a whole among demonstrators by years in the position yielded no statistical difference. Administrators with more than 15 years in position was highest. Factor wise, the level of implementation was highest among those with 15 years in position in all factors except the formation of organization structure where those with 5-10 years in position were highest.

5. Discussion

5.1 The Level of implementation of English Program Policy

The Very High level of the implementation among administrators and teachers and the High level of implementation among students implied that the schools under this study satisfied the expectations by the Ministry of Education as mentioned by Chandarasorn (2011) in his description of the implementation of public policy.

The highest level of implementation among administrators and teachers on the factor curriculum planning indicated that the schools have satisfied the guidelines of the English Program Policy (Ministry of Education, 2011) and concurs with a research by Hallinger and Lee (2014) on the impact of educational reform on instructional leadership that one of the roles of the administrator is instructional leadership whose key responsibilities among other is to coordinate and control academic programs and must be shared with teachers and other administrators.

The lowest level of implementation among administrators and teachers on financing and budget planning concurred with the finding in a study by Senachit (2006) on the implementation of English Program of schools under the Primary Education Area Office Songkhla province that shortage of foreign teachers and the insufficient number of classrooms, learning facilities and materials, and IT learning resources were due to the lack of funding and budget constraints which is supported by the administrator comments, *"Our school should receive support from the Secondary Education Service Area Office"* and *"Our school should receive support from the Secondary Education Office, especially funding for hiring foreign teachers of which the costs of hiring could be high."* This finding also aligned with the finding in a research by Anh (2009) on the educational administration of English Program in Basic Education in Chiang Mai Province that the slow and complicated bureaucratic financial process contributed to the schools funding issues.

Among students, the highest level of implementation of Learning materials and resources indicated that their schools have satisfied the conditions to support teaching and learning of the English Program (Ministry of Education, 2014). This also concurred with a criterion in Chandarasorn's (2011) management model of public policy implementation regarding proper planning and readiness of equipment. The lowest level of implementation among students on curriculum planning and management confirmed Anh's (2019) finding that there were too many excess activities for Thai teachers and students resulting from foreign teachers' insufficient knowledge of the English Program as well and the lack of coordination among the Thai and foreign teachers to integrate the

subjects in the curriculum and teaching methods. Moreover, since the English Program curriculum must be in line with the Basic Core Curriculum 2008 and that their development is the responsibilities of local service area offices and the schools (OBEC, 2008), thus there would be variations in the curriculum's congruency and quality control as discussed in Sanonguthai (2014) study on The State of Thai Schools in Response to the ASEAN English Language Policy. Lastly, this challenge is supported by an administrator's comment "Teachers have little knowledge of Academic affairs, but have a lot of work to do."

5.2 Comparison of the level of implementation among administrators and teachers

The comparison of the level of implementation among administrator was not significantly different indicated that both parties had good perspectives about the English policy as discussed in Piriyasattaya (2018) study on the implementation of the policy on promoting English Learning and Teaching in Chiangmai, Thailand. The findings of highest level of implementation of curriculum among teachers and the lowest level on financing and management among teachers and administrators are already discussed in section 5.1, the Level of implementation among administrators and teachers. For the highest level of implementation among administrators on the administrators' management capability to run the program indicated administrators' perception that he or she successfully apply their management capacity to run the English Program which concurred with the explanation of the Self-Efficacy theory by Hoy and Miskel (2013).

5.3 Comparison of the level of implementation of English Program Policy among administrators by years in the position.

Over all, there was no significant difference when comparing the level of implementation among administrators by the years in the position is supported by a study by Iskak (2019) on the 21st - Century professional leadership standards of Secondary school administrators in Nakhon Nayok, Thailand that found no significant difference in the level of leadership standards among administrators' demographic profiles. The administrators with over 15 years in the position highest level of implementation on the formation of organization structure indicated that these administrators assessed very high on the criteria in Ministry of Education English Program Standard School self-assessment questionnaire (2014) and satisfied the condition that there is a suitable organization structure in the Management Model of public policy implementation (Chandarasorn, 2011). Conversely, administrators with less than 5 years in the office level of implementation on formation of organization structures could be supported by the responses, "*The English Program structure is according to the main administrative structure of the school*" concurred with the finding by Anh (2009) that English Program organization structure was not clearly separated from the school's general administration structures, hence it did not cover all of the necessary functions and clarity of responsibilities were not clearly defined. Also, "There are only a few numbers Foreign Language Teachers and they have several special assignments resulting in their not being able to continuously function in their work" concurred with Senachit (2016) finding that found inadequacy of the number of foreign teachers.

6. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study and from the comments from administrators, this researcher propose the following recommendations

- 6.1 Formation of organization structure – schools should ideally create an independent organization structure for English Program and clearly specify the roles and responsibilities of each functions. Administrators should to develop existing department heads with potentials and delegate some responsibilities to free up workload. If possible and allocate more budget to invest on hiring and professional developments of personnel.
- 6.2 Administrator management capability to run the program – Administrators should further develop themselves with the available leadership and development and English proficiency programs. Administrators should build a network with other schools to share best practices in the implementation of English Program Policy. Schools should develop a program to identify and retain potential administrators. Schools should invest in administrator IT and Media Education development.

- 6.3 Teachers' competencies – Schools should find ways to recruit quality teachers. If budget is a constraint, develop Thai teachers in the areas to join and teach in the English Programs. For existing foreign teachers, school should find ways to increase retention as well as provide adequate training about Thai cultures and the Thai way of life so that they may meet the students' needs more effectively. The Secondary Educational Service Area office should provide schools more support in English Program pedagogy, curriculum design and leaning materials.
- 6.4 Funding and budget management – The central government should reduce the complications and redundancy of the funding allocation process. The Area offices should assist the schools with their budget planning strategies, especially on funding for teachers and personnel. Schools may wish to collaborate with parents and communities to find sources of funding.
- 6.5 Management of Facilities and Classrooms – School should continue to maintain their very high level of implementation on facilities management and classrooms. On budget planning in this area, consider practical ways to adequately allocate budgets to maintain the proper ratio of students to classrooms, and leverage the lowering costs of IT technologies for laboratories and learning facilities. Schools may wish to reach out to large corporations to help fund learning facilities.
- 6.6 Curriculum planning – Schools should train foreign teachers on the mechanisms and goals of the Basic Education Curriculum and involve them in curriculum design. Schools should provide professional development training for teachers for better efficiencies and effectiveness of curriculum. Lastly, schools should find practical ways to include technologies in their instructions.
- 6.7 Recommendation for further research
This researcher hopes that the findings in this research may be beneficial to other researchers and suggest that perhaps there could be more researches on students', parents, and the community's perspectives on the English Program.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to give his sincerest gratitude to his research advisor, Dr. Mark Anthony Pa-alisbo and co-advisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Somjate Waiyakarn for the technical assistance in improving the manuscript. This author would also like to also thank the research committee, Dr. Pragob Kunarak, Asst. Prof. Dr. Vichian Puncreobutr, Dr. Annop Photisuk, Dr. Nongnuch Suwanarужи, and Dr. Panida Klosawakdi for their constructive comments and suggestions.

References

- Anh, Younghee (2009). *Guidelines for Education Administration for English Program of the Basic Education Institutes in Chiang Mai Province* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from ThaiLIS database
- Baker, W. (2012). English as a lingua franca in Thailand: Characterisations and implications. *Englishes in Practice*, 1(1). Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/3830294/English_as_a_Lingua_Franca_in_Thailand_Characterisations_and_Implications
- Bureau of Academic Affairs and Educational Standards, Office of Basic Education Commission, Ministry of Education (2014). *English Program Educational Standard Educational Institution Self-Assessment Questionnaire*. Retrieved from: <http://tu.obec.go.th/english/2013/index.php/en/2012-08-08-10-26-04/65-english-program>
- Bureau of Academic Affairs and Educational Standards, Office of Basic Education Commission, Ministry of Education (2014). *English Program/ Mini English Program Implementation Student Questionnaire*. Retrieved from: <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKewjY8IzTt7fvAhVQ4zgGHTA5BXYQFjAEegQIDBAD&url=http%3A%2F%2Ftu.obec.go.th%2Fenglish%2F2013%2Findex.php%2Fen%2F2012-08-08-10-26-04%2F65-english-program>

- x.php%2Fth%2Fcomponent%2Fattachments%2Fdownload%2F17&usg=AOvVaw0r8Jl7KBMqaSDIHg888eSS
- Chantarasiri, P. (2014). The Study of the Current State of English Program Instruction In Suratthani Province Through the Perspectives of Teachers in the Program. *An Online Journal of Education*, 9(1), 118-132. Retrieved from <https://so01.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/OJED/article/view/28611>
- Chandarasorn, V. (2011). *An Integrated Theory of Public Policy Implementation* (5th ed.). Bangkok, Thailand: Phrikwan Graphics.
- Fowler, F. C. (2004). *Policy Studies for Educational Leaders An Introduction* (2nd ed.). New Jersey, USA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Hallinger, P. & Lee, M. (2013). Mapping instructional leadership in Thailand: Has education reform impacted principal practice? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 2014, 42(1), 6–29. Retrieved from <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.879.7548&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Hoy, W.K. & Miskel, C.G. (2013). *Educational Administration Theory, Research, and Practice* (9th ed.). SINGAPORE: McGraw-Hill Education (Asia)
- Iskak, H. (2019). The 21st-Century Professional Leadership Standards of Secondary School Administrators in Nakhon Nayok, Thailand. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 8(5), 175-178. Retrieved from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1229288>
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Current Perspectives on Teaching World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1). Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255669551_Current_Perspectives_on_Teaching_World_Englishe_s_and_English_as_a_Lingua_Franca
- Ministry of Education (1999). *National Education Act of B.E. 2542 (1999)*. Retrieved from: http://web.krisdika.go.th/data/outside/outside21/file/NATIONAL_EDUCATION_ACTB.E._2542.pdf
- Ministry of Education (2008). *The Basic Education Core Curriculum B.E. 2551 (A.D. 2008)*. Retrieved from http://academic.obec.go.th/images/document/1525235513_d_1.pdf
- Ministry of Education (2011). Directive of the Ministry Education No. BEID 165/2544, Policy, Guidelines, and Method for English Program. Retrieved from: <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwjMjML-wrfvAhU2xzgGHU7nD0gQFjACegQIAxAD&url=http%3A%2F%2Ftu.obec.go.th%2Fenglish%2F2013%2Findex.php%2Fth%2Fcomponent%2Fattachments%2Fdownload%2F190&usg=AOvVaw0m56tyDjT4W Gw99jJV6gwh>
- Ministry of Education (2016). *The Education Development Plan of the Ministry of Education issue 12 (B.E. 2560 – 2564)*. Retrieved from: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/oyoof2nzluy9e78/%E0%B9%80%E0%B8%A5%E0%B9%88%E0%B8%A1%E0%B9%81%E0%B8%9C%E0%B8%99%E0%B8%9E%E0%B8%B1%E0%B8%92%E0%B8%99%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%81%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%A8%E0%B8%B6%E0%B8%81%E0%B8%A9%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%82%E0%B8%AD%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%81%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%B0%E0%B8%97%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%A7%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%A8%E0%B8%B6%E0%B8%81%E0%B8%A9%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%98%E0%B8%B4%E0%B8%81%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%A3%20%E0%B8%89%E0%B8%9A%E0%B8%B1%E0%B8%9A%E0%B8%97%E0%B8%B5%E0%B9%88%2012%20%28%E0%B8%9E.%E0%B8%A8.%202560%20-%202564%29%20.pdf?dl=0>
- Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board (2016). 12th *National Economic and Social Development Plan (2017-2021)*. Retrieved from: http://www.nesdb.go.th/nesdb_en/ewt_w3c/ewt_dl_link.php?nid=4345
- Piriyasattaya, C. 2018. The Implementation of the Policy on Promoting English Learning and Teaching in Yupparaj Wittayalai School and Montfort College in Mueang District, Chiang Mai. *Political Science and Public Administration Journal*. 9(2), 187-208. Retrieved from: <https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/polscimujournal/article/view/118374>
- Sabatier, P., & Mazmanian, D. (1980a). The implementation of public policy: A framework of analysis. *Policy studies journal*, 8(4), 538-560. Retrieved from: <https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/33366842/Implementation.pdf?response-content>
- Sanonguthai, S. (2013). Ready or Not? The State of Thai Schools in Response to the ASEAN English Language Policy. *Thammasat Review*, 16(2), 128-142. Retrieved from: <https://sc01.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/tureview/article/view/40757/33771>
- Sawangsaeng, S. (2012). Development of Management Model for English Program. *EAU Heritage Journal Social Science and Humanities*, 2(1), 141-153. Retrieved from: <https://www.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/EAUHJSocSci/article/view/28607/24628>

- Senachit, T. (2016) *An Implementation of the Teaching English Program (Mini English Program: MEP) : A Case Study of Primary Education Service Area Office Songkhla Province* (Master Thesis, Prince of Songkhla University). Retrieved from: <http://kb.psu.ac.th/psukb/bitstream/2016/12073/1/418248.pdf>
- Taladngoen, U. (2019). English Language Policy and English Language Teaching Practice in Thailand: A Perfect Match or A Mismatch?. *MANUTSAT PARITAT: Journal of Humanities*, 41 (1), 17-25. Retrieved from <http://ejournals.swu.ac.th/index.php/hm/article/viewFile/11896/9900>
- Yawaprapas, S. (2014). *Public Policy* (10th ed.). Bangkok, THIALAND, Chula Press