

CHAPTER FOUR

THE ANALYZED RESULTS OF VOCABULARY TAUGHT IN FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION LEVEL IN MAHASARAKHAM PROVINCE

We will analyze if the in service teachers in Mahasarakham Province teach and use vocabulary in their classrooms according to the appropriate order of base lists' proportion for teaching, that are Base List One, Base List Two or The Offlist, and Base List Three in this chapter. We will also analyze the factors affecting the choice of which vocabulary to teach from the lists of vocabulary planned in their lesson plans of each level of fundamental education from Prathomsuksa 1 to Mattayomsuksa 3. We will start by looking at each participated teacher from the following profile.

4.0 The Participated Teachers' Profile

Following is the participated teachers' profile in this research study.

Table 2 The participated teachers' profile

Teaching level	Textbooks	Years of experience
Prathomsuksa 1	Say Hello	5
Prathomsuksa 2	Projects: Play & Learn	19
Prathomsuksa 3	Projects: Play & Learn	7
Prathomsuksa 4	Aha! English	1
Prathomsuksa 5	Smart Kids	28
Prathomsuksa 6	Smart Kids	none
Mattayomsuksa 1	Go For It	6
Mattayomsuksa 2	Your Turn Best	2
Mattayomsuksa 3	Super Goal	7

Note: All textbooks are approved by the Ministry of Education (2009)

From Table 2, we can see the wide range of textbooks used in column 2 and experience in teaching in column 3. The names of textbooks in use are *Say Hello, Projects: Play & Learn, Aha! English, Smart Kids, Go For It, Your Turn Best* and *Super Goal*. All textbooks are approved by the Ministry of Education (2009). Years of experience in teaching reach as much as 28 years of experience to none.

4.1 Material

The materials used in this phase of study are the participated teachers' lesson plans from their textbooks of choice that has been approved by the Ministry of Education. In the lesson plan contains what the teacher intends to teach and how to teach so it also contains the teaching vocabulary and the wording of delivering the lesson. These words are the source of information as the focus of this study.

4.2 Methodology

Following are the methodology for comparing the vocabulary taught and used in class to the vocabulary lists of the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies of Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, edited by I.S.P. Nation by using The Range Program.

1. Scan and edit the lesson plan and save the vocabulary taught and used in class as Text (txt) files
2. Double click on the RANGE icon in the Windows explorer
3. Open the File menu in RANGE and choose the heading Open
4. Select the target vocabulary file, which is now in Text (txt) files to run the program over
5. After selecting the file, go to the File menu again and choose Save
6. Click the button Process Files which is below the file list in the RANGE window. The program will automatically check the target vocabulary file to the three base word lists equipped in the program.
7. Look at the results file which will be named by the name chosen plus _range.txt by using a word processor

Repeat these steps for each level of lesson plan from Prathomsuksa 1 to Mattayomsuksa 3.

4.3 Results and Discussions

Following are the numbers and percentage of vocabulary taught and used in class from lesson plan of Prathomsuksa 1 to Mattayomsuksa 3 classified by the three base word lists equipped in the Range Program with ranking order of which list is taught the most in the fifth column.

Table 3: The numbers and percentage of vocabulary taught and used in class from lesson plan of Prathomsuksa 1 to Mattayomsuksa 3 classified by the three base word lists equipped in The Range Program with ranking

Teaching level	Base list	No. of words	Percentage	Ranking
Prathomsuksa 1 (of 213 words)	One	90	42.25	1
	Two	22	10.32	3
	Three	19	8.92	4
	Offlist	82	38.50	2
Prathomsuksa 2 (of 414 words)	One	228	55.07	1
	Two	75	18.12	3
	Three	28	6.76	4
	Offlist	83	20.05	2
Prathomsuksa 3 (of 249 words)	One	77	30.92	1
	Two	62	24.90	3
	Three	35	14.06	4
	Offlist	75	30.12	2

Prathomsuksa 4 (of 288 words)	One	161	55.90	1
	Two	68	23.61	2
	Three	32	11.11	3
	Offlist	27	9.38	4
Prathomsuksa 5 (of 349 words)	One	158	45.27	1
	Two	59	16.91	3
	Three	37	10.60	4
	Offlist	95	27.22	2
Prathomsuksa 6 (of 385 words)	One	123	31.95	2
	Two	74	19.22	3
	Three	33	8.57	4
	Offlist	155	40.26	1
Mattayomsuksa 1 (of 483 words)	One	348	45.14	1
	Two	159	20.62	3
	Three	78	10.12	4
	Offlist	186	24.12	2
Mattayomsuksa 2 (of 215 words)	One	111	51.63	1
	Two	55	25.58	2

	Three	24	11.16	4
	Offlist	25	11.63	3
Mattayomsuksa 3 (of 701 words)	One	307	43.79	1
	Two	144	20.54	3
	Three	76	10.84	4
	Offlist	174	24.82	2

From the results shown in Table 2, most teachers choose to teach and use vocabulary belonging to Base List One, The Offlist, Base List Two and Base List Three or in the order of 1, 3, 4 and 2 as shown in column five. The only teachers of the three levels which are Prathomsuksa 4, Prathomsuksa 6 and Mattayomsuksa 3 do not follow this order which is the appropriate proportion of vocabulary levels that should be taught. Therefore, we can say that six out of nine teachers teaching in Mahasarakham Province teach and use vocabulary in their classrooms according to the appropriate order of base lists' proportion.

Interestingly, the profiles of the teachers teaching in Prathomsuksa 4, Prathomsuksa 6 and Mattayomsuksa 3 are all inexperienced teachers with years of teaching experience ranging from just only 2 years to no experience at all. From the observation of the textbooks used in teaching, there will mostly be a vocabulary list that should be taught for each level at the appendix part of the book. From interviewing each participant, these lists are the main and mostly sole factor affecting the choice of which vocabulary to teach. How these teachers miss the appropriate proportion of vocabulary levels that should be taught might be from their inexperience in teaching and/or the inefficient vocabulary list provided by the book they use. These books are all claimed to be approved by the Ministry of Education of Thailand so the possibility in missing the appropriate proportion of teaching is more likely to fall on their inexperience. However, there is no research studying the vocabulary list that appears in these books so a definite conclusion for the cause of error cannot be firmly made.

The amount of vocabulary taught and used in class is also worth mentioning. From Table 2, we can see the amount ranging from just 213 words for teaching the whole term to up to 771 words. This suggests that each teacher participating in this study gives different amount of attention to vocabulary teaching in their classrooms. From an applied linguist's point of view, these varying figures caused concern. The figures imply that there is no standard in maintaining the appropriate amount of attention to vocabulary teaching in the Fundamental Education Level in Mahasarakham Province, Thailand.

In the next chapter, we will discuss on these findings in more depth along with suggestions of what needs to be done in order to improve the vocabulary teaching standard in the Fundamental Education Level in Mahasarakham Province, Thailand.



มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏมหาสารคาม
RAJABHAT MAHASARAKHAM UNIVERSITY