

Course Evaluation: Allied Health Sciences Students’ Perspectives on the Listening and Speaking Skills Course

Karuna Naphon

Chulalongkorn University Language Institute

Abstract

This study explores the opinions of Allied Health Sciences undergraduate students toward the Listening and Speaking for Allied Health Sciences course. The 157 students who registered for the course in semester 2, academic year 2015, were asked to complete questionnaires adapted from Watanapokakul’s (2013) study. The students were encouraged to answer open-ended questions in the questionnaire and six students participated in a focus-group interview. The results show students’ positive attitudes toward the course content and exercises, the speaking assessments, the teaching method and materials, and the course evaluation and grading. However, it is suggested that the course book and supplementary audio be improved, and that feedback from the instructors is needed. Research findings and implications are discussed.

Keywords: course evaluation, ESP, English for Allied Health Sciences

การประเมินผลรายวิชา: มุมมองของนิสิตคณะสหเวชศาสตร์ ที่มีต่อวิชาทักษะการฟังและการพูดภาษาอังกฤษ

กรุณา นาผล

สถาบันภาษา จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยชิ้นนี้นำเสนอทัศนคติของนิสิตคณะสหเวชศาสตร์ที่มีต่อรายวิชาทักษะการฟังและการพูดภาษาอังกฤษสำหรับคณะสหเวชศาสตร์ ผู้วิจัยใช้แบบสอบถามที่ปรับจากแบบสอบถามจากงานวิจัยของ สาธิตา วัฒนโกคากุล (2556) ผลจากแบบสอบถามและการสัมภาษณ์กลุ่มเจาะจง พบว่านิสิตมีทัศนคติในเชิงบวกต่อรายวิชาดังกล่าว ทั้งในด้านเนื้อหาและแบบฝึกหัด การประเมินทักษะการพูด วิธีและสื่อการสอน และการประเมินผลและตัดเกรดของรายวิชา อย่างไรก็ตาม ปัญหาที่พบจากการ ศึกษาคือ รูปแบบของหนังสือเรียนที่ไม่กระตุ้นความอยากเรียนของ นิสิต และสื่อสำหรับฝึกทักษะการฟังนอกห้องเรียนที่มีอยู่ยังไม่เพียงพอ ผู้วิจัยได้อภิปรายผลการวิจัยและเสนอแนะวิธีในการ ปรับปรุงและพัฒนาวิชา

คำสำคัญ: การประเมินผลรายวิชา ภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อวัตถุประสงค์เฉพาะ ภาษาอังกฤษสำหรับคณะสหเวชศาสตร์

Introduction

Background of the course and motivation of the study

Listening and Speaking for Allied Health Sciences is an English course provided by the language institute at a university in Thailand for sophomores from the Faculty of Allied Health Sciences. There are six instructors teaching six sections, scheduled on the same date and time of the week, of second-year students, mixed departments in each section. The course book of this subject is an in-house material. It has been compiled and adjusted by the course instructors. This course has been offered for more than 10 years and evaluated each semester using a questionnaire formatted to be applied for all the classes in the university. This questionnaire focuses primarily on the course outcomes and overall teaching ability of the instructors, which allow limited room for specific course adjustments. Throughout the years, there have been some course revisions and adjustments based primarily on the course instructors' experience and, about six years ago, there was once a course revision based on a discussion between the course instructors and the instructors from the Faculty of Allied Health Sciences. While research studies have pointed out the importance of students' opinions as part of course evaluation (Gainey, 2007; Mohamed et al, 2015; Tokmak, Baturay & Fadde, 2013; Watanapokakul, 2013), the opinions of the students studying this course have never been taken into consideration before. Therefore, the researcher conducted this course evaluation from the students' perspectives.

Literature review

Course evaluation is a process to systematically collect data from sources to study the strengths and weaknesses of the course (Nation & Macalister, 2010; Zohrabi, 2012). The main objective of course evaluation is to ensure that the students have acquired knowledge and skills, the teaching strategies are useful, the specific content-related materials are relevant and interesting, and the resources are adequate (Zohrabi, 2012). Course evaluation has been done for a long time and in various approaches, beginning with merely evaluations that were quantitative in nature and changing over time to

be more qualitative in nature (Zohrabi, 2012). Descriptive research using descriptive statistics can be one approach for course evaluation (Wongsothorn et al., 1980). The use of descriptive statistics with quantitative and qualitative data, including interviews, learner diaries, post-lesson comment sheets, open-ended questions, etc., is another choice (Blair & Noel, 2014; Ozer & Kahramanoglu, 2012; Tutkun, Erdogan & Demirtas, 2014). There have also been some other evaluation approaches for course evaluation. For example, Stufflebeam et al.'s (2002) CIPP model, which focused on Context, Input, Process, and Product, was widely used (Gainey, 2007; Mohamed, Asmawi, Ab Hamid, & bin Mustafa, 2015; Tokmak, Baturay & Fadde, 2013). The results from all the studies mentioned above, no matter what design/approach used, generally pointed to great benefits in conducting course evaluation. However, it can be up to the individual curriculum coordinators or teachers to take into account all relevant factors and decide what part of the course to evaluate, when to do it, and for what purposes (Zohrabi, 2012).

Among the approaches of course evaluation, Watanapokakul's (2013) self-developed questionnaire investigating 110 veterinary students' opinions on the content, teaching methods and materials, and course assessment and evaluation of the English for Veterinary Profession I course, which focuses on listening and speaking skills, was well developed to cover all the relevant aspects of the course. In the study, Watanapokakul used multiple-choice items in the questionnaire and performed a focus-group interview with 12 students to express what they liked and did not like about the course. The data from the questionnaire was analyzed using percentages and the interview results were grouped by content and described. The results of the study showed the details of the course's strengths and aspects to be improved. As Watanapokakul's study was on a similar course (an ESP listening and speaking course) as in this study and her questionnaire was designed to cover all the aspects in the course, the researcher, therefore, conducted this study by adapting Watanapokakul's (2013) questionnaire to be context-specific for the course for Allied Health Sciences students in order to explore the students' opinions in

four major areas: the course content; the speaking assessments; the teaching methods; and the course evaluation (midterm and final listening exams) and grading, as part of the course adjustment in the future.

Theoretically, this study is important as the course evaluation is a critical part for the course administrator/designer/instructor to assess whether the course works (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998). Practically, the results in the four specific areas from this study would be further beneficial for the course instructors to adjust and improve the course contents, the administration or format of the speaking assessments, the teaching methods, and the course evaluation and grading.

Methodology

In order to investigate the opinions of Allied Health Sciences sophomores in the second semester of academic year 2015 toward the Listening and Speaking for Allied Health Sciences course in four major areas: the course content; the speaking assessments; the teaching methods; and the course evaluation and grading, the research methodology was designed as follows:

Participants of the study and basic assumptions

This study was conducted on the total population of 157 second-year students who enrolled in the Listening and Speaking for Allied Health Sciences course in semester two, academic year 2015 and attended the class regularly. Two weeks before the last week of the course, all the six course instructors were informed about the course evaluation research. Then, on the last day of class, they were given the consent forms (Appendix 1) and the questionnaires (Appendix 2) for the students in their section. After the students finished the final listening exam on that day, the section instructor asked the students to read the consent form and, if they agreed to participate in the research study, complete the questionnaire. The course consisted of five units: 1) Pronunciation Practice; 2) Listening Strategies; 3) Oral Presentation Skills; 4) Healthy Eating; and 5) Physiotherapy. Midterm and final exams

were both listening exams. Four speaking assessments were done during the semester: 1) a 2-minute pair presentation; 2) an 8-to-10-minute group presentation; 3) a 6-to-8-minute group role-play (physiotherapy); and 4) a 6-to-8-minute final group role-play (integrated knowledge). The students signed the consent form and answered the paper-based questionnaire anonymously and voluntarily. It was stated clearly in the consent form that there would be no other effect on their learning progress or outcome and the results of the study would be for the benefit of the course in the future.

Data collection

Questionnaire and a focus-group interview were used in this study. The detail of each tool is as follows:

Questionnaire

The questionnaire (Appendix 2) used in this study was adapted from the self-developed questionnaire by Watanapokakul (2013) whose study was on the students' opinions on the English for Veterinary Profession I course, which shares the same basic objectives of listening and speaking skills as the course in this study. The self-developed questionnaire was well designed to cover all the relevant aspects of the course including the content, the teaching method and materials, and the assessment and evaluation. The researcher reviewed the self-developed questionnaire and decided to maintain all the parts but adjusted the details to be in line with the course for Allied Health Sciences. For example; instead of asking for opinion on the content as a whole, each unit of the course in the current study was evaluated individually; three different departments of the students were also considered (no different fields of study for veterinary students); or the course book in the current study was not evaluated whether it was 'beautifully designed', but whether it was motivating the learners and whether the illustrations were sufficient. Three experts then evaluated the questionnaire items with 0.7-1.00 of the Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC). The questionnaire was in Thai in order to avoid any language barriers. In addition, three students who were taking the course were asked to read the questionnaire to make sure that the questions

and statements were clear. Based on the suggestions from the experts and the students, the researcher finally adjusted some items (e.g. adding more description for each assessment so that the students could remember which was which, changing some multiple-choice items to be semantic differential items for the expressions toward each speaking assessment).

The questionnaire was divided into five parts as follows:

- *General background information and opinions toward English language learning* included gender, age, GPAX, department, Experiential English II (a pre-requisite basic English course prior to the course in the study) grade, the respondents' preferences of the English language learning methods, the most important English skill perceived necessary for a career in the field, and the respondent's belief in how to learn English. Multiple choices were used for all the questions.

- *Course content* focused on the benefits and practicality of the content, the benefits of the exercises, and the level of difficulty of each unit. Semantic differential items, multiple choice questions, and open-ended questions were used in this part.

- *Course speaking assessments* referred to pair presentation, group presentation, role-play (physiotherapy), and final project role-play. Semantic differential items and open-ended questions were used in this part.

- *Teaching methods and materials* included the benefits of the activities used in class, the format of the course book, and the supplementary audio files. Semantic differential items, multiple choice questions, and open-ended questions were used in this part.

- *Course evaluation and grading* explored students' opinions on the listening exams, the speaking assessments' feedback from the assessors, and the grading and assessing policy. Semantic differential items, multiple choice questions, and open-ended questions were used in this part.

The criteria for the semantic differential items used in all the parts were:

strongly difficult	_____1_____	_____2_____	_____3_____	_____4_____	easy
	(1 - 1.5)	(1.51 - 2.5)	(2.51 - 3.5)	(3.51 - 4)	
strongly interesting	_____1_____	_____2_____	_____3_____	_____4_____	boring
interesting	(1 - 1.5)	(1.51 - 2.5)	(2.51 - 3.5)	(3.51 - 4)	

Figure 1: Arithmetic mean values for semantic differential item interpretation and examples of interpretation

The arithmetic mean values as shown above were used in interpreting the qualities of all the aspects evaluated.

The questionnaires were distributed to 157 students right after they finished the final listening exam. The students consented to be respondents of the study and signed a consent form before answering the questionnaire. All of the 157 questionnaires were returned.

Focus-group interview

Six students from the researcher's section (two from each of the three departments: the Department of Medical Technology (MT); the Department of Physical Therapy (PT); and the Department of Nutrition and Dietetics (ND) volunteered to join a focus-group interview. These six students then gathered for the interview at the language institute two weeks after the students completed the questionnaire. The interview questions were generally based on the course components assessed in the questionnaire (i.e. What do you think about the course content? What do you think about the use of Blackboard? What do you think about the assessments (in terms of topics / grouping policy)? What do you think about the listening exams?), a question was raised from an informal discussion with other instructors during the semester (i.e. a point of concern that the score may not reflect the true language ability of the students and whether we should add some impromptu elements to the tasks), and some immediate questions were based on the students' answers during the

interview. The interview, with all the six students at the same time, was recorded and analyzed by the researcher.

Data analysis

For the returned 157 paper-based questionnaires, the data was coded and processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 22.0) program. Arithmetic means and standard deviations were used to analyze the data from the semantic differential items (see the arithmetic means detail for interpretation in the Questionnaire section above), percentages were used to present the data from multiple-choice items, and content analysis was used for the answers from the open-ended questions. The results from the focus-group interview with six student volunteers were categorized using content analysis and described.

Results

Results from the questionnaire

The results from each part of the questionnaire are presented as follows:

General background information and opinions toward English language learning

Table 1: Background information of the students

Topic	Description	N	Percent	Topic	Description	N	Percent
Gender	Male	38	24.2	Department	Nutrition and Dietetics (ND)	30	19.1
	Female	118	75.2		Physical Therapy (PT)	48	30.6
	Missing	1	0.6		Medical Technology (MT)	79	50.3
	Total	157	100.0		Total	157	100.0

Age	17-20	119	75.8	Exp Eng II grade	A	5	3.2
	more than 21	37	23.5		B+	14	8.9
	Missing	1	0.6		B	33	21.0
	Total	157	100.0		C+	43	27.4
GPAX	1.51-2.00	3	1.9	C	45	28.7	
	2.01-2.50	16	10.2	D+	10	6.4	
	2.51-3.00	68	43.3	D	5	3.2	
	3.01-3.50	60	38.2	Missing	2	1.2	
	3.51-4.00	10	6.4	Total	157	100.0	
	Total	157	100.0				

All of the students were Thai. From Table 1 above, female students were about 75% of the total population. Most students were 17-20 years old (75.8%). They were from MT, PT, and ND at 50.3%, 30.6% and 19.1%, respectively. About 80% of the total had a GPAX of 2.51-3.50, while more than half of the students (56%) got C and C+ grades for Experiential English II, a pre-requisite basic English course focusing on the four English skills that they studied in the previous semester. This suggested that they were at an intermediate level of English proficiency.

For the multiple-choice questions asking for the students' perceptions about their English skill competency and the importance of English (questions no. 6-8, Appendix 2), listening was perceived by 40% of the students to be the skill that needs improvement most, followed by writing, speaking, and reading at 31%, 27%, and 18%, respectively. Approximately 92% of the students felt that English is necessary for their job, especially speaking and listening skills, and 36% of the total thought that English should be a compulsory course for 12 credits (four courses) for their degree.

As for their opinions toward English language learning (multiple-choice questions no. 9-11, Appendix 2), 75% of the students like learning English because they think it is useful for their future career, they would like to contact with foreigners, and they like practicing speaking skills. On the other hand, 25% of the students who do not like studying English said that it is because they still cannot get good grades no matter how hard they try. These students do not like learning grammar and writing, nor do they like learning listening skills, and they did not like their high school English teachers. The

students think that their English skills can be better if they have more opportunities to use the language in real-life situations, listen to English songs and watch English movies, and read novels/magazines/articles/journals in English. In class, they would learn English better if they realize that the content is practical, get feedback immediately from the instructors, and ask questions when they do not understand.

Course content

The questions were on the qualities of the course content and exercises in general, the level of difficulty of each unit and opinions of the students on what is good and what should be improved in each unit.

Results from the semantic differential and multiple-choice items

Table 2: The overall qualities of the course contents and exercises

Qualities of the contents	Means	S.D.	Interpretation
Interesting	1.90	.696	somewhat interesting
Various	2.13	.680	somewhat various
Easy to understand	2.05	.696	somewhat easy to understand
Practical	1.69	.765	somewhat practical
Beneficial for future career	1.68	.802	somewhat beneficial for future career
Qualities of the exercises	Means	S.D.	Interpretation
Interesting	2.27	.748	somewhat interesting
Fun	2.24	.788	somewhat fun
Various	2.24	.754	somewhat various
Easy to understand	2.16	.721	somewhat easy to understand
Helping practicing English speaking skill	2.03	.780	somewhat helping practicing English speaking skill
Helping practicing English listening skill	2.05	.846	somewhat helping practicing English listening skill
Promoting the learner's self-study	2.18	.783	somewhat promoting the learner's self-study

According to Table 2, the students perceived that the overall contents were somewhat interesting, various, easy to understand, practical, and beneficial for their future career. In terms of the exercises, they perceived them as somewhat interesting, fun, various, easy to understand, helping practicing speaking and listening skills, and promoting the learner's self-study.

From the multiple-choice items to rate the level of difficulty of the content in each unit, more than 87% of the students thought that they were all at an appropriate level.

Results from the open-ended questions

The answers from the open-ended questions, not compulsory, on what the students liked and other comments for each unit are described as follows:

Unit 1 - Pronunciation Practice: Out of 130 students who wrote comments, 82% said that they liked the practical aspect of the unit where they could practice enunciating the sounds in class with the instructors. Some others said that, once they knew how to pronounce English sounds more clearly, they could be more confident in speaking and could further improve their listening skills as well. However, about half of 31 students who responded to what should be improved said that they still needed more exercises with a variety of accents.

Unit 2 - Listening Strategies: There were 99 students who expressed their opinions on what was good in the unit. Sixty-two percent said that they liked the practical aspect of the unit and 16% said that the dialogues were fun, various, and related to real situations in their working life. However, 14 out of 33 students who wrote comments on what should be improved said that they needed more exercises and 6 students felt that the speakers spoke too fast.

Unit 3 - Presentation Skills: Eighty percent of 116 students who responded said that they liked the practical part of the unit where they had opportunities to practice giving presentations and get feedback from the instructors. The content was very useful. About 9% said that this helped boost their confidence in giving presentations as well. Eight students out of 14 who

shared what they would like to improve, however, thought that they needed even more time to practice as there were a couple of presentations throughout the course and they felt that some parts of the presentation were too patterned; students should have had more room for creativity in terms of the style of presentations.

Unit 4 - Healthy Eating: Half of 86 students who responded said that the content about super food was interesting and useful. Twenty-three percent said the exercise where they had to search for information and give a presentation in groups was interesting, fun, and promoted self-study skills. Students also stated they learned a lot of new vocabulary (8%). However, with only one super food article in this unit, nine students out of 16 who wrote some suggestions thought that there should have been more articles, examples, and information.

Unit 5 - Physiotherapy: Forty-two percent of 98 students who wrote the answer said that they learned a lot of vocabulary from this unit. Twenty-one percent said that the content was practical and could be applied to their work. Fourteen percent learned something more about physiotherapy as they were from different departments. On the other hand, more than half of 28 students who commented on what should be adjusted said that the content was difficult to understand because they had no background knowledge on physiotherapy at all.

Speaking assessments

Eight qualities in semantic differential items and an open-ended question were rated for each of the four speaking assessments. The results are presented below.

Results from the semantic differential items

Table 3: Qualities of the four speaking assessments

Qualities	1) Pair presentation			2) Group presentation		
	Means	S.D.	Interpretation	Means	S.D.	Interpretation
Interesting	2.05	.687	somewhat interesting	1.96	.754	somewhat interesting
Difficult	2.54	.712	somewhat easy	2.43	.744	somewhat difficult
Fun	2.19	.788	somewhat fun	2.00	.832	somewhat fun
Practical	1.97	.740	somewhat practical	1.98	.828	somewhat practical
Promoting team-working skills	1.68	.700	somewhat promoting team-working skills	1.59	.707	somewhat promoting team-working skills
Promoting the use of English	1.67	.711	somewhat promoting the use of English	1.64	.708	somewhat promoting the use of English
Promoting self-study	1.60	.669	somewhat promoting self-study	1.56	.654	somewhat promoting self-study
Allowing the learners to apply knowledge from other subjects to the project	1.74	.673	somewhat allowing the learners to apply knowledge from other subjects to the project	1.73	.694	somewhat allowing the learners to apply knowledge from other subjects to the project

Qualities	3) Role-play (physiotherapy)			4) Final role-play		
	Means	S.D.	Interpretation	Means	S.D.	Interpretation
Interesting	1.82	.823	somewhat interesting	2.06	.872	somewhat interesting
Difficult	2.35	.726	somewhat difficult	2.17	.802	somewhat difficult
Fun	1.82	.815	somewhat fun	2.06	.915	somewhat fun
Practical	1.81	.804	somewhat practical	1.84	.873	somewhat practical

Promoting team-working skills	1.55	.713	somewhat promoting team-working skills	1.71	.870	somewhat promoting team-working skills
Promoting the use of English	1.53	.637	somewhat promoting the use of English	1.55	.654	somewhat promoting the use of English
Promoting self-study	1.51	.606	somewhat promoting self-study	1.53	.636	somewhat promoting self-study
Allowing the learners to apply knowledge from other subjects to the project	1.57	.644	somewhat allowing the learners to apply knowledge from other subjects to the project	1.55	.644	somewhat allowing the learners to apply knowledge from other subjects to the project

From Table 3, the students thought that all of the speaking assessments in the course were somewhat interesting, difficult, fun, practical, promoting team-working skills, promoting the use of English, promoting self-study, and allowing the learners to apply knowledge from other subjects in preparing for the assessments. Only the pair presentation was rated as somewhat of an ‘easy’ task.

Results from the open-ended questions

The students also made comments and suggestions on each speaking assessment. Three students commented on the pair presentation on a medical/technological breakthrough. One from PT said that the topic was not that interesting, a second one from ND expressed that the 2-minute presentation was too short, while the third student from ND felt that the limited time made him/her feel excited and fun.

Although most students rated the group presentation on a super food as somewhat promoting team-working skills (see Table 3), a few students from

MT commented that working in groups was problematic in delegating tasks equally to all the group members.

For the role-play (physiotherapy) on the causes, symptoms, treatments, and preventive measures of the given condition, four (two from ND and two from PT) out of ten students who gave comments said that the topic was too difficult. A few students from PT and MT said that they found some problems in managing everyone to have an equal role.

The last assessment, the final role-play on two given conditions, seemed to be the most problematic, according to the students. Although the qualities of the assessment were perceived as good as presented in Table 3, 15 (one from ND, two from PT, and 12 from MT) out of 38 students who wrote comments said that time management was a significant issue in preparation for this assessment. This is because the students had to work with other students from different departments and that was difficult for them to see each other for the project. Moreover, because of the unequal number of students from each department, some students needed to work with more than one group. Hence, 12 students (two from ND and 10 from PT) found the assessment unfair to students from ND as they needed to role play more than once, in a different role each time, and it was unfair to the students from PT as they needed to play the same role three times.

Teaching method and materials

Table 4: Qualities of the teaching method and materials

Qualities of the teaching methods	Means	S.D.	Interpretation
Motivating the learners	1.97	.707	somewhat motivating the learners
Fun	1.92	.751	somewhat fun
Various	1.98	.747	somewhat various
Easy to understand	2.03	.625	somewhat easy to understand
Promoting the learners' speaking skill	1.78	.703	somewhat promoting the learners' speaking skill

Promoting the learners' listening skill	1.85	.741	somewhat promoting the learners' listening skill
Promoting necessary skills for the learners' future career	1.73	.701	somewhat promoting necessary skills for the learners' future career
Format of the course book	Means	S.D.	Interpretation
Motivating the learners' interest	2.69	.759	strongly demotivating
Sufficient illustrations	2.67	.866	strongly insufficient
Qualities of the audio supplementary	Means	S.D.	Interpretation
Appropriate for the objectives of the course	1.80	.582	somewhat appropriate for the objectives of the course
Appropriate for the learners' proficiency level	1.89	.588	somewhat appropriate for the learners' proficiency level
Sufficient	2.15	.841	somewhat sufficient

The students rated the teaching methods as somewhat motivating the learners, fun, various, easy to understand, and promoting the learners' speaking and listening skills as well as skills necessary for the learners' future career. Activities or what they liked best in class were online pronunciation games, group work, practicing speaking, listening, giving presentations in class, and the instructors who are supportive. However, some students commented that more feedback was needed from the instructors. They also suggested that more exercises and content for other departments besides Physical Therapy be added.

For the format of the course book, students found it strongly demotivating and insufficient in illustrations (see an example of a page from the course book in Appendix 3). Some comments on this point were that the course book should be in color with clearer illustrations and that it should be better formatted. It was also noted that more content for all the departments should be added.

The students found the supplementary audio on Blackboard appropriate for the objectives of the course and their proficiency level. Also, the quantity of the supplementary audio was sufficient. However, 58% of the students said that they listened to some of the files provided, only 22% listened to all the files, and 20% did not practice listening using the supplementary audio at all.

Course assessments and grading

Table 5: Perceptions on the midterm and final listening exams

Perception	Midterm listening exam		Perception	Final listening exam	
	N	Percent		N	Percent
Difficult	23	14.6	Difficult	68	43.3
Quite difficult	75	47.8	Quite difficult	53	33.8
Appropriate	54	34.4	Appropriate	31	19.7
Quite easy	2	1.3	Quite easy	3	1.9
Easy	2	1.3	Easy	1	.6
Missing	1	.6	Missing	1	.6
Total	157	100	Total	157	100
Perception	Listening time(s)		Perception	Speed of the speakers	
	N	Percent		N	Percent
Once	3	1.9	Too fast	65	41.4
Twice	82	52.2	Appropriate	87	55.4
More than twice	69	43.9	Too slow	3	1.9
Missing	2	1.3	Missing	2	1.3
Total	157	100	Total	157	100
Perception	Length of the exams		Perception	Frequency of the assessor's feedback	
	N	Percent		N	Percent
Appropriate	103	65.6	Always	40	25.5
Too short	53	33.8	Sometimes	114	72.6
Missing	1	.6	Never	2	1.3
Total	157	100	Missing	1	.6
			Total	157	100

From the multiple-choice item results in Table 5, about 48% of the students felt that the midterm listening exam was somewhat difficult, while 34% thought it was appropriate. On the other hand, 43% and 34% of the students thought that the final listening exam was difficult and somewhat difficult respectively, with only 20% saying it was appropriate. The fact that the students got to listen to the audio tracks twice for the exam was considered appropriate by 52% of the students. However, 44% of them thought listening twice was not enough and 41% said they should get to listen to the tracks for three times for some parts of the exam. In terms of the speed, 55% of the students thought that the speakers in the exam spoke at the right pace as in daily life conversations, while 41% of the students thought that they spoke too fast. The length of the exams, which was 30-45 minutes, was considered appropriate (66%). When asked about the students' opinions on feedback from the speaking assessors, 73% of the students said they got feedback sometimes while 26% got feedback for all the speaking assessments. Almost all the students (96%) said that they would like to get feedback from the assessors.

Table 6: Qualities of the feedback

Qualities of the feedback	Means	S.D.	Interpretation
Beneficial	1.31	.519	strongly beneficial
Practical	1.34	.515	strongly practical
Agree with the assessors	1.38	.526	strongly agree with the assessors

From Table 6, the students strongly agreed that feedback from the assessors was beneficial and practical, and strongly agreed with what the assessors told them.

Table 7: Assessment criteria, score components, and teacher swapping policy for assessments

Did you study the criteria for each assessment?	N	Percent
Always	90	57.3
Sometimes	58	36.9
Never	8	5.1
Missing	1	0.6
Total	157	100

Did you understand the assessment criteria?	N	Percent
I understood it very well.	67	42.7
I understood some points.	83	52.9
I understood a few points.	4	2.5
I did not care.	2	1.3
Missing	1	0.6
Total	157	100
How did you find the score components and grading system?	N	Percent
Appropriate	138	87.9
Inappropriate	18	11.5
Missing	1	0.6
Total	157	100
How did you find the policy to swap teachers for the assessments?	N	Percent
Appropriate	141	89.8
Inappropriate	11	7
Missing	5	3.1
Total	157	100

From Table 7, in preparing for the assessments, 57% of the students said they studied the assessment criteria every time while 37% said they did so sometimes. Fifty-three percent of the students stated that they understood some parts of the criteria described while 43% fully understood the criteria. Eighty-eight percent of the students thought that the score components and grading system of the course were appropriate. Only 12% said that they would like to adjust some parts, for example, they would like the midterm and final exams to be for both listening and speaking skills, and not just listening only. Ninety-five percent of the students said that swapping the teacher to assess each speaking assessment was an appropriate policy. However, three students stated that they were concerned with whether or not the instructors had the same standards.

Results from the focus-group interview

Six student volunteers, two from each department, joined the focus-group interview. Five of them were female. Half of them got a C+ grade for

the basic English course, one got a B grade, and two got a B+ grade. They can be considered intermediate to upper-intermediate Thai EFL learners. Some interview questions were in line with the questionnaire in general, some arose from the questionnaire results, and some were produced based on the students' answers during the interview. The interview was conducted in Thai to avoid any language barriers. The results from each question are presented below.

Table 8: Questions and answers from the focus-group interview

Remark: The answers from the students presented here were translated by the researcher.

<p>Question 1: What do you think about the content of the Listening and Speaking for Allied Health Sciences course?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It's more directly related to daily life and work compared to the two fundamental English courses we studied in year 1. (6 students, 100%) - In the future, speaking and listening skills, which are the focus of the course, will be more useful than writing and reading. (5 students [2 ND, 2 PT, 1 MT], 83.33%) - The content was more focused on PT and ND; it should focus on MT as well. The role of MT students assigned in the role-play was as the patient only, which did not seem to use any knowledge in the MT field. Therefore, the course should add something about MT, e.g., how to interact with the patients when asking for blood tests or how to report blood test results. (4 students [1 MT, 2 PT, 1 ND] 66.67%) - The PT 'lay-term' vocabulary words (e.g. saying 'grip the weight and lift your arm in front of you so that it is horizontal' instead of saying 'perform a resisted anterior glide to the glenohumeral joint') were appropriate. Students from other departments could understand them too. (1 PT student, 16.67%)
---	---

	<p>- In real life, those who work in ND field need to ask for background information, e.g., daily routines and eating habits from the patients. Questions related to these aspects should be added. (2 ND students, 33.33%)</p>
<p>Q1 Interpretation: Overall they saw the benefits of the course content. However, more MT-related content and how to ask for patient’s background information may be added.</p>	
<p>Question 2: We post all the audio tracks on the course Blackboard (BB) site for students to listen to. Do you think this works? Do you need the answer key for the exercises as well? Do you need anything more on BB?</p>	<p>- For the answer key, it doesn’t matter because we practiced listening and got the answers in class already, but on second thought, posting the answer key online would be good, too. (6 students, 100%)</p> <p>- For the audio tracks on BB, it’s a good idea (4 students [2 MT, 2 PT], 66.67%), but I don’t think everyone would listen to them. (1 PT student, 16.67%)</p> <p>- For more materials on BB, please no. It’s difficult to use. No notifications for updates. Sometimes the BB app is broken, too. (6 students, 100%) I found a problem when submitting my work through BB in another course; my work was gone! (1 MT student, 16.67%)</p>
<p>Q2 Interpretation: The use of BB for the course audio tracks and answer key was a good idea. More functions of BB in the course may not be necessary.</p>	
<p>Question 3: What do you think about the speaking assessment rubrics included in the course book?</p>	<p>- Overall they are OK. We know what we are to be assessed on. (6 students, 100%)</p> <p>- I like it. It was not too stressful when doing the assessments. [Researcher follow-up question: It was not too stressful because of the rubric? Was it too easy?] ...Well, no. Maybe because we were comfortable working in groups. The rubric was appropriate. (2 students [1 PT, 1 MT], 33.33%)</p>

	- I like it when the instructors gave comments after each assessment. (2 students [1 PT, 1 MT], 33.33%)
Q3 Interpretation: The students thought it was a good idea to let the students know the rubrics so that they could be prepared.	
Question 4: What do you think about the given topics for the role-plays ?	- The topics should be well selected so that students from all departments can really apply what they learn to show in the role-plays. (6 students, 100%) To me, I found ‘post-operational heart’ difficult as I haven’t studied about it yet. (1 PT student, 16.67%) Alzheimer’s was difficult for me to apply the PT knowledge to. (2 PT students, 33.33%) - Talking about the final role-play, it was unfair for some students who needed to perform more than once. It was hard to work with people from other departments as the class schedules were all different. (6 students, 100%)
Q4 Interpretation: Some topics (diseases/conditions) were difficult for the students as they had not studied about them yet.	
Question 5: About the final role-play, our intention was to integrate the content knowledge from all the fields. That is why we group three students from each department together. But from the questionnaire and your answer earlier, it seemed to be problematic. What if you could group yourselves freely – it doesn’t have to be people from all the departments in one group – but you still need to put in the information from all the fields of study, do you think it will be	- We are not sure. It must be good that we can get to work with whom we want but we are not sure if we can find the correct information related to other fields of study. ...We now understand the ‘integration’ goal of yours, but we found the grouping problematic. ...We can’t think of any suggestion right now. (6 students, 100%) - The grouping can be even more problematic next year since we will have a new department; Radiological Technology (RT). (1 MT student, 16.67%)

better?	
<p>Q5 Interpretation: The students understood the purpose of the instructors for the final role-play's grouping policy. However, whether to group freely or as assigned, or in other patterns, should be considered carefully and the most suitable grouping pattern has not been suggested yet.</p>	
<p>Question 6: After talking to some instructors, we sometimes feel that the scores do not reflect the students' real proficiency level. For example, the scores of students in a group were about 16-18 out of 20, which were pretty high, but when I gave comments at the end, some students who did a good job in the role-play didn't seem to understand what I said. I needed to repeat and finally spoke in Thai. It clearly showed that the students were very well-prepared, but might not be able to do the task in real life without preparation. So, would you agree if we add an impromptu task to somehow prove the real proficiency level?</p>	<p>- Umm. We see your point. And yes, we think it should be OK to add something impromptu. (6 students, 100%)</p>
<p>Q6 Interpretation: They understood the point of concern raised and seemed to agree with the idea of adding an impromptu element to the task.</p>	
<p>Question 7: Any comments/suggestions on the midterm and final listening exams?</p>	<p>- The difficulty level was appropriate; not too difficult or too easy. (4 students [2 PT, 1 MT, 1 ND], 66.67%)</p> <p>- The time allowed for midterm was too short. (6 students, 100%) Maybe we felt that way because we didn't know clearly how much time we had before taking the exam. For the final,</p>

	<p>we felt better because we learned something from the midterm so we were mentally prepared for that. So, the instructors may tell the students clearly before the exam how much time the students will have. (3 students [1 PT, 1 MT, 1 ND], 50%) [Researcher interrupting: You had a bit more time for the final as we could see the problem from the midterm.] Well, then you can set the time allowed just like the one for the final exam and let the students know. (6 students, 100%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The audio equipment in class was good. (6 students, 100%) - I get used to American accent more. British accent is more difficult for me. (1 MT student, 16.67%)
<p>Q7 Interpretation: Overall level of difficulty was appropriate. However, the students thought that the time given for each part in the exams should have been communicated to students more clearly.</p>	
<p>Question 8: Other comments, if any.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ideally, I would like English class to be separated for each department so that we can focus more on technical content. (1 PT student, 16.67%) - The language institute may work cooperatively with the faculty about what the students have learned so far so that the topic for the assessments can be matched with what the students know. (2 students [1 PT, 1 MT], 33.33%) - I like studying dialogue/conversation. I know it may not be related, but I would love to learn some idioms used in daily life conversation as well. (1 PT student, 16.67%)

Discussion and Implications

The results of the study with the 2015 second-semester, second-year students from the Faculty of Allied Health Sciences showed a number of strengths of and concerns about the Listening and Speaking for Allied Health Sciences course.

The most important finding was that the course was perceived as beneficial for the students. They felt that the content and exercises were somewhat appropriate and useful for them and that all the content units were practical and could be applied in their future careers. This was confirmed in the open-ended questions as the majority of the students wrote that they liked the practical aspect of each unit where they had opportunities to practice the skills with the instructors in class. Also, in the focus-group interview, the students noted the benefits and relevance of the subject content to their field of study. The usefulness and relevance of the course content to their field of study were also noted in previous studies (Gainey, 2007; Watanapokakul, 2013). Secondly, the students' opinions toward the speaking assessments from the questionnaire were positive in that all assessments promoted the use of English, team working skills, and self-study skills. It was also perceived, as expressed in the focus-group interview, that knowledge in the students' field of study can be applied to the assessments. Moreover, in terms of teaching methods, the students were rather positive. They felt that what the instructors did in class promoted the skills needed for their future career and motivated them to learn. This was in line with their opinions from the background knowledge section that said they would learn best if they saw the importance and relevance of the subject to their lives. With these points, the task-based assessment applied in the course can be considered an appropriate approach. However, the course coordinator may consider applying other approaches, for example, project-based or problem-based, in the course as well. These approaches allow the students to apply their content knowledge in completing projects or solving problems. The learners' experience in their field of study,

in this case their content knowledge, can be enhanced and integrated as crucial elements in classroom learning (Nunan, 2004).

Swapping instructors for the speaking assessments was another issue with which most students agreed. From both the questionnaire and the focus-group interview, the students strongly perceived the benefits and needed feedback from the assessors. Therefore, the course coordinator can point this out and encourage all the course instructors to give constructive feedback to students in all assessments. The idea of swapping instructors for assessments is also applied in an English course for Veterinary Sciences students. Evaluations from this course showed that the students were positive about it and valued the feedback from the assessors as well (Watanapokagul, 2013).

However, some weaknesses and concerns arose from the results. Some students still needed additional exercises and examples to practice listening. Moreover, from the focus-group interview, it was suggested that the course coordinator work cooperatively with the content instructors from the Faculty of Allied Health Sciences in order to add or adjust some content and assessment topics so that the course will be more suitable and better serve the students' needs.

In terms of the assessments, a few students wrote in the open-ended question that the role-play (physiotherapy) and the final project role-play were quite similar. In addition, the results from both the questionnaire and the focus-group interview showed that the grouping for the final project role-play seemed to be the most problematic. The course instructors would like to integrate knowledge from all three departments so three students from different departments could be grouped randomly to work together. With the unequal number of students from each department, however, some students from PT and ND needed to work with two to three different groups and the highest score given would be used for them. A number of students openly expressed that this grouping arrangement made it difficult for everyone to see each other as they had different learning schedules and was unfair for students who needed to work with different groups and perform the task more than

once. The course coordinator, therefore, should find ways to balance between the course learning objectives and the practical management of the course. In addition, from the interview, the course coordinator may consider adding some ‘impromptu’ tasks to the assessment to see the actual language proficiency, especially in terms of fluency of the students (Nation & Macalister, 2010). From an informal discussion with the course coordinator and one instructor after the interview, an impromptu element of an assessment can be when the students can be prepared for the roles in the role-play but do not know exactly what role they will need to perform in the assessment and who they will be working with in the group. The role and the group members will be assigned on the assessment date, for example.

Although swapping the instructors in assessments was preferable, one point of concern raised by some students is whether the instructors have the same standard in assessing the students. The current version of speaking assessment rubrics is numerical rating scales (Luoma, 2004) where the criteria and score levels for each criteria are listed, but no detailed descriptors of each score level are described (Appendix 4). Currently, the course coordinator reviews each assessment’ scores given by all the assessors and investigates further by discussing with the assessor when there is any outstanding, especially too low, point. There has not been an assessment training before. Regarding this, a teacher training on how to assess the students’ performances should be conducted as different instructors may interpret the rubric differently and the training can reduce rating variability (Davis, 2016; Fulcher, 2015; Joe, Kitchen, Chen & Feng, 2015).

For the course book, the students strongly showed that the format of the book was not motivating at all and the illustrations were unclear. Therefore, if possible, it is advisable that the book should be in color with clearer illustrations.

In addition, almost half of the students found the exams difficult for them as the recorded speakers spoke too fast, not enough time was given to answer the questions, and listening to the audio tracks twice was not enough.

However, the speakers in the exams were asked to speak at the speed as if they were to discuss the allied health sciences issues in the situations in the dialogues, for example, colleague-to-colleague discussion, physiotherapist-to-patient conversation, a talk given at a conference, etc. This could be implied that the students might not be exposed to enough listening practices. Asking the speakers to speak more slowly for the exam just to help the students will not be an option. To help the students, the instructors may find more supplementary listening or suggest resources/websites (such as www.ted.com, which is a source of video clips used in class and a great website to see a number of professional presentations, www.bangkokpost.com/learning, or www.bbc.co.uk), and encourage students to practice English listening skills more outside the classroom (such as joining activities at the Self-Access Learning Center at the language institute). This can work quite well as the students realized that, based on the questionnaire results in part one, in order to be better, they need to practice not only on materials the instructors use in class. Also, based on the interview, exam specifications should clearly state the time policy so that students can be prepared. In terms of the number of times in listening to the exam tracks, from an informal discussion about this, the course coordinator and some instructors perceived that listening for two times was a standard for them as it is what all the courses in the language institute have been doing. However, theories and related studies about listening exam administration can be studied more and the listening exams can be analyzed in order to investigate whether the exams were actually too difficult to understand or get the details from listening twice.

One interesting point from the focus-group interview was about the use of Blackboard for supplementary audio. All the interview participants found that Blackboard was not that user-friendly for them and they have encountered some technical issues in other courses. Similar issues were also found in previous studies (Kasim & Khalid, 2016; Little-Wiles & Naimi, 2011). Nowadays, there are a variety of Learning Management System (LMS) and applications for course management and learning objectives. The course

coordinator and instructors may ask for opinions from more students, consider the institute's information technology support, and study more about Blackboard or other LMSs in order to fully understand the system and any challenges that may occur so as to apply the system properly and to its full potential.

Conclusion

The students' opinions toward the Listening and Speaking for Allied Health Sciences course were positive in terms of the course content and exercises, speaking assessment, teaching method, and course evaluation and grading. However, the students had strong opinions that the course book should be more motivating for the students to learn from and that the more supplementary audio should be added. Also, they realized the virtue of feedback and would like to get it from the instructors after all the assessments. The results of the study should be communicated to the course coordinator and instructors so that some effective adjustments to the course will be made.

Limitations and recommendations for further research

This study was conducted on a voluntary basis, which is beneficial in that the students could express their opinions freely and anonymously, ensuring honest opinions. However, the focus-group interview in future studies should take into account the possibility that students from different departments/interests/background may not be willing/confident to express honest opinions when they are together. Moreover, it would be better if we could use judgmental sampling when selecting respondents for the interview. For example, a student who raises some interesting points can be invited to an interview for more detail. Apart from that, some interesting answers/concerns from the questionnaire are worth further examining and managing, for example, how to administer the final group role-play to seem fair for students from all the departments, and how to identify 'best practice' of teaching methods and incorporate the methods from different instructors in each unit. It is also important that students representing all English proficiency levels from all the sections can be invited to join the interview.

This study mainly focused on the students' opinions toward the course. Apart from some suggestions and concerns as discussed above, it would be better if, in future studies, some needs analyses with all stakeholders in the field, e.g. doctors, nutritionists, physiotherapists, radiologists, patients, etc. can be conducted in order that speaking and listening courses for Allied Health Sciences students will be designed and/or updated to better serve the stakeholders. Further research may also include a follow-up study on the course after some adjustments suggested in this study have been made. Other types of data collection methods, e.g., learner diaries, post-lesson comment sheets, reflecting dialogues between students and educators/teachers (Freeman & Dobbins, 2013) or conducting a focus-group interview with more participants. Course evaluation studies for other subjects provided by the language institute should also be conducted on a regular basis and in cyclical process (Zohrabi, 2012).

References

- Blair, E., & Noel, K. (2014). Improving higher education practice through student evaluation systems: Is the student voice being heard?. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(7), 879-894.
- Davis, L. (2016). The influence of training and experience on rater performance in scoring spoken language. *Language Testing*, 33(1), 117-135. doi:10.1177/0265532215582282
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St. John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in ESP: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freeman, R., & Dobbins, K. (2013). Are we serious about enhancing courses? Using the principles of assessment for learning to enhance course evaluation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(2), 142-151. doi:10.1080/02602938.2011.611589
- Fulcher, G. (2015). Assessing second language speaking. *Language Teaching*, 48, 198-216. doi:10.1017/S0261444814000391

- Gainey, J. (2007). Kan Pramoen Phon Laksut Rai Wicha Waiyakon Lae Thaksa Kan Khian (Grammar and Writing Skills) [The evaluation of Grammar and Writing Skills course]. *Pasaa Paritas*, 23, 91-102.
- Joe, J., Kitchen, C., Chen, L., & Feng, G. (2015). A prototype public speaking skills assessment: An evaluation of human scoring quality (ETS RR-15-36). *ETS Research Report Series*. doi:10.1002/ets2.12083
- Kasim, N., & Khalid, F. (2016). Choosing the Right Learning Management System (LMS) for the Higher Education Institution Context: A Systematic Review. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies In Learning (IJET)*, 11(06), 55-61. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v11i06.5644
- Little-Wiles, J., & Naimi, L. L. (2011). Student Perceptions of and Experiences in Using the Blackboard Learning Management System. *Global Education Journal*, 4, 147-155.
- Luoma, S. (2004). *Assessing Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mohamed, A., Asmawi, A., Ab Hamid, M. R., & bin Mustafa, Z. (2015). Descriptive Analysis of Context Evaluation Instrument for Technical Oral Presentation Skills Evaluation: A Case Study in English Technical Communication Course. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 1643(1), 536-540. doi:10.1063/1.4907491
- Nation, I.S.P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. New York: Routledge.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ozer, B., & Kahramanoglu, R. (2012). Assessment of professional teaching knowledge courses taught at faculties of education according to teachers' opinions. *Mevlana International Journal of Education*, 2(1), 48-63.
- Stufflebeam, D.L. (2002). CIPP evaluation model checklist. Retrieved from http://www.wmich.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/u350/2014/cippc_hecklist_mar07.pdf on January 22, 2017.

- Tokmak, H. S., Baturay, H. M., & Fadde, P. (2013). Applying the Context, Input, Process, Product Evaluation Model for Evaluation, Research, and Redesign of an Online Master's Program. *International Review of Research in Open & Distance Learning*, 14(3), 273-292.
- Tutkun, Ö. F., Erdoğan, D. G., & Demirtaş, Z. (2014). The Opinions of Students toward Curriculum of Distance Education Non-Thesis Master. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 6(2), 307-318. doi:10.15345/iojes.2014.02.005
- Watanapokakul, S. (2013). Khwam Khithen Khong Nisit Khana Sattawapaetsat Thi Mi To Rai Wicha Pasa Angkrit Samrap Sattawapaet Nueng Khong Sathaban Phasa Chulalongkon Mahawitthayalai [The opinions of Veterinary Science students toward the English for Veterinary Profession I course, Chulalongkorn University Language Institute]. *Pasaa Paritas*. 28, 18-41.
- Wongsothorn, A., et al. (1980). *Kan Pramoen Phon Rai Wicha EAP Writing Khong Sathaban Phasa Pi Kan Sueksa 2523 (research report)* [The evaluation of EAP Writing course of the Language Institute, Academic year 1980 (research report)]. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Language Institute.
- Zohrabi, M. (2012). Preliminary aspects of language course evaluation. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 16(1), 123-144.

Appendix 1

ใบยินยอมเข้าร่วมการวิจัย (Consent Form)

การประเมินผลรายวิชา Listening and Speaking for Allied Health Sciences ของสถาบันภาษา จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย โดยมีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อสอบถามความคิดเห็นของนิสิตที่มีต่อบทเรียน การเรียนการสอน และการประเมินผลต่าง ๆ ในรายวิชา เพื่อนำข้อมูลไปใช้ปรับปรุงการเรียนการสอนของรายวิชาดังกล่าวต่อไป

1. ก่อนที่จะลงนามในใบยินยอมให้ทำการวิจัยนี้ ข้าพเจ้าได้รับการอธิบายจากผู้วิจัยถึงวัตถุประสงค์ของการวิจัย วิธีการวิจัย และมีความเข้าใจดีแล้ว
2. ผู้วิจัยรับรองว่าจะตอบคำถามต่าง ๆ ที่ข้าพเจ้าสงสัยด้วยความเต็มใจ ไม่ปิดบังซ่อนเร้นจนข้าพเจ้าพอใจ
3. ข้าพเจ้ามีสิทธิ์ที่จะบอกเลิกการเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัยนี้เมื่อใดก็ได้ และเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัยนี้โดยสมัครใจ และการบอกเลิกการเข้าร่วมการวิจัยนั้นไม่มีผลต่อคะแนน หรือเกรดของรายวิชาภาษาอังกฤษใด ๆ ของสถาบันภาษาที่จะพึงได้รับต่อไป
4. ผู้วิจัยรับรองว่าจะเก็บข้อมูลเฉพาะเกี่ยวกับตัวข้าพเจ้าเป็นความลับ จะเปิดเผยได้เฉพาะในรูปที่เป็นสรุปผลการวิจัย การเปิดเผยข้อมูลของตัวข้าพเจ้าต่อหน่วยงานต่าง ๆ ที่เกี่ยวข้องต้องได้รับอนุญาตจากข้าพเจ้า และจะกระทำได้เฉพาะกรณีจำเป็นด้วยเหตุผลทางวิชาการเท่านั้น
5. ข้าพเจ้าได้อ่านข้อความข้างต้นแล้ว และมีความเข้าใจดีทุกประการ และได้ลงนามในใบยินยอมนี้ด้วยความเต็มใจ

ลายเซ็น _____

ชื่อตัวบรรจง _____

วันที่ลงนาม _____

Appendix 2

แบบสำรวจความคิดเห็นของนิสิตคณะสหเวชศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

เกี่ยวกับรายวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ Listening and Speaking for Allied Health Sciences (5500211)

โปรดทำเครื่องหมาย หรือ ลงใน หรือเติมข้อความลงใน _____ ตามความเป็นจริง

ข้อมูลของท่านจะเป็นประโยชน์อย่างยิ่งต่อการปรับปรุงบทเรียนและวิธีการเรียนการสอนรายวิชานี้ในปีการศึกษาถัดไป

ตอนที่ 1 ข้อมูลส่วนตัวและความคิดเห็นโดยทั่วไปเกี่ยวกับภาษาอังกฤษ

1. เพศ: ชาย หญิง

2. อายุ: _____ ปี

3. เกรดเฉลี่ย: ต่ำกว่า 1.00 1.01 – 1.50 1.51 – 2.00
 2.01 – 2.50 2.51 – 3.00
 3.01 – 3.50 3.51 – 4.00

4. หลักสูตร โภชนาการ กายภาพบำบัด เทคนิคการแพทย์

5. เกรดรายวิชา Experiential English II: A B+ B C+ C D+ D

6. ท่านประเมินความสามารถทางภาษาอังกฤษของท่านในแต่ละด้านต่อไปนี้ได้อย่างไร

การฟัง	<input type="checkbox"/> ดีมาก	<input type="checkbox"/> ดี	<input type="checkbox"/> ปานกลาง	<input type="checkbox"/> ยังต้องปรับปรุง
การพูด	<input type="checkbox"/> ดีมาก	<input type="checkbox"/> ดี	<input type="checkbox"/> ปานกลาง	<input type="checkbox"/> ยังต้องปรับปรุง
การอ่าน	<input type="checkbox"/> ดีมาก	<input type="checkbox"/> ดี	<input type="checkbox"/> ปานกลาง	<input type="checkbox"/> ยังต้องปรับปรุง
การเขียน	<input type="checkbox"/> ดีมาก	<input type="checkbox"/> ดี	<input type="checkbox"/> ปานกลาง	<input type="checkbox"/> ยังต้องปรับปรุง

7. ท่านคิดว่าวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ (ตอบได้มากกว่า 1 ข้อ)

<input type="checkbox"/> จำเป็นต่อการประกอบวิชาชีพของท่าน	<input type="checkbox"/> ไม่จำเป็นต่อการประกอบวิชาชีพของท่าน
<input type="checkbox"/> ควรเป็นวิชาบังคับ 12 หน่วยกิตของคณะ	<input type="checkbox"/> ไม่ควรเป็นวิชาบังคับ 12 หน่วยกิตของคณะ
<input type="checkbox"/> ควรเป็นวิชาบังคับ 6 หน่วยกิตของคณะ	<input type="checkbox"/> ไม่ควรเป็นวิชาบังคับ 6 หน่วยกิตของคณะ

8. โปรดเรียงลำดับทักษะภาษาอังกฤษที่จำเป็นต่อการทำงานของท่าน

(โดย 1 = ใช้มากที่สุด, 2 = ใช้ปานกลาง, 3 = ใช้บ้าง, และ 4 = ใช้น้อยที่สุด)

การฟัง การพูด การอ่าน การเขียน

9. ท่านชอบหรือไม่ชอบเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ เพราะเหตุใด (เลือก ชอบ หรือ ไม่ชอบ ได้ข้อใดข้อหนึ่งเท่านั้น แต่เลือกเหตุผลได้หลายข้อตามความคิดของท่าน และโปรดเรียงลำดับตามความสำคัญของเหตุผล โดย 1 คือ เหตุผลที่สำคัญที่สุดมาเป็นอันดับแรก, 2 สำคัญรองลงมา, 3 สำคัญรองลงไปอีก, ... เรียงตามเลขไปเรื่อย ๆ)

ชอบเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ

- | | | |
|-------|--|--|
| เพราะ | <input type="checkbox"/> ชอบผู้สอนตอนเรียนชั้นประถม | <input type="checkbox"/> ชอบเรียนไวยากรณ์ / การเขียน |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> ชอบผู้สอนตอนเรียนมัธยม | <input type="checkbox"/> ชอบเรียนการอ่าน |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> สามารถทำคะแนนสอบได้ดี | <input type="checkbox"/> ชอบเรียนการพูด |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> อยากติดต่อกับชาวต่างประเทศ | <input type="checkbox"/> ชอบเรียนการฟัง |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> คิดว่ามีประโยชน์ต่อการทำงาน | <input type="checkbox"/> อื่นๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____ |

ไม่ชอบเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ

- | | | |
|-------|--|---|
| เพราะ | <input type="checkbox"/> ไม่ชอบผู้สอนตอนเรียนชั้นประถม | <input type="checkbox"/> ไม่ชอบเรียนไวยากรณ์ / การเขียน |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> ไม่ชอบผู้สอนตอนเรียนมัธยม | <input type="checkbox"/> ไม่ชอบเรียนการอ่าน |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> ไม่ชอบท่องศัพท์ | <input type="checkbox"/> ไม่ชอบเรียนการพูด |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> ไม่เห็นประโยชน์ของการเรียนรายวิชานี้ | <input type="checkbox"/> ไม่ชอบเรียนการฟัง |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> คะแนนสอบไม่ดี แม้ว่าจะพยายามทบทวนสิ่งที่จะสอบอย่างเต็มที่แล้ว | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> อื่นๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____ | |

10. ท่านคิดว่าการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษให้ได้ดีต้อง (ตอบได้มากกว่า 1 คำตอบ ไม่ต้องเรียงลำดับความสำคัญ)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> ไปเรียนในประเทศที่ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นหลัก | <input type="checkbox"/> ไปเที่ยวประเทศที่ต้องใช้ภาษาอังกฤษสื่อสาร |
| <input type="checkbox"/> เรียนภาษาอังกฤษกับอาจารย์ฝรั่ง | <input type="checkbox"/> หาโอกาสใช้ภาษาอังกฤษบ่อย ๆ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ฟังเพลงภาษาอังกฤษบ่อย ๆ | <input type="checkbox"/> ดูหนังที่พูดภาษาอังกฤษและไม่มีภาษาไทยกำกับบ่อย ๆ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> chat กับเพื่อนที่พูดภาษาอังกฤษบ่อย ๆ | <input type="checkbox"/> ท่องจำคำศัพท์ภาษาอังกฤษให้ได้จำนวนมาก |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ดูสารคดีที่พูดภาษาอังกฤษ | <input type="checkbox"/> ดูข่าวช่องต่างประเทศ เช่น CNN, NBC |
| <input type="checkbox"/> อ่านนวนิยาย/นิตยสารภาษาอังกฤษ | <input type="checkbox"/> อ่านวารสาร/บทความภาษาอังกฤษ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> เรียนโรงเรียนนานาชาติ / หลักสูตรนานาชาติ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____ | |

11. ท่านคิดว่าท่านจะเขียนได้ดีเมื่อ (ตอบได้มากกว่า 1 คำตอบ ไม่ต้องเรียงลำดับความสำคัญ)

- เป็นเรื่องที่สามารนำไปใช้ได้ในชีวิตจริง
- เรียนทฤษฎีก่อนแล้วจึงปฏิบัติด้วยการทำแบบฝึกหัด
- ลองปฏิบัติด้วยการทำแบบฝึกหัดแล้วเฉลย / ปฏิบัติในสถานการณ์จำลองก่อนแล้วจึงเรียนทฤษฎี
- นั่งฟังบรรยายอย่างเดียว ปฏิบัติอย่างเดียว
- ทำงานเป็นกลุ่ม ทำงานเดี่ยว
- ผู้สอนเรียกตอบเป็นรายคน อาสาตอบคำถามเมื่อผู้สอนถาม
- ผู้สอนแก้ไขภาษาที่ผิดให้ทันทีเมื่อทำผิด ทำการบ้านสม่ำเสมอ
- อ่านสิ่งที่จะเรียนมาก่อนเข้าชั้นเรียน ถามคำถามผู้สอนเมื่อไม่เข้าใจบทเรียน
- อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____

ตอนที่ 2 บทเรียน

1. ท่านคิดว่าเนื้อหาบทเรียนและแบบฝึกหัดต่าง ๆ โดยรวมในวิชานี้...

เนื้อหา	มาก	ค่อนข้าง	ค่อนข้าง	มาก	
2.1.1 น่าสนใจ	—	—	—	—	ไม่น่าสนใจ
2.1.2 มีความหลากหลาย	1	2	3	4	ไม่มีความหลากหลาย
2.1.3 เข้าใจง่าย	—	—	—	—	เข้าใจยาก
2.1.4 นำไปใช้ได้ในชีวิตจริง	—	—	—	—	ไม่สามารถนำไปใช้ได้จริง
2.1.5 เป็นประโยชน์ต่อการทำงานในอนาคต	—	—	—	—	ไม่เป็นประโยชน์ต่อการทำงานในอนาคต
2.1.6 น่าสนใจ	1	2	3	4	ไม่น่าสนใจ
2.1.7 สนุก	—	—	—	—	น่าเบื่อ
2.1.8 มีความหลากหลาย	1	2	3	4	ไม่มีความหลากหลาย
2.1.9 เข้าใจง่าย	—	—	—	—	เข้าใจยาก
2.1.10 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนฝึกทักษะการพูดได้อย่างดี	1	2	3	4	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนฝึกการพูด
2.1.11 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนฝึกทักษะการฟังได้อย่างดี	1	2	3	4	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนฝึกการฟัง
2.1.12 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนค้นคว้าหาความรู้ด้วยตนเองมากขึ้น	1	2	3	4	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนค้นคว้าหาความรู้ด้วยตนเอง
ข้อคิดเห็น/เสนอแนะเพิ่มเติม _____					

2. สำหรับเนื้อหาแต่ละบทที่ท่านคิดว่า... (ขอความกรุณาผู้ตอบแบบสอบถามโปรดตอบให้สมบูรณ์ที่สุด)

2.2.1 **บทที่ 1 Pronunciation Practice** โดยรวม ยากเกินไป เหมาะสม ง่ายเกินไป

สิ่งที่ท่านชอบในบทนี้ _____

ข้อเสนอแนะเพิ่มเติม _____

2.2.2 **บทที่ 2 Listening Strategies** โดยรวม ยากเกินไป เหมาะสม ง่ายเกินไป

สิ่งที่ท่านชอบในบทนี้ _____

ข้อเสนอแนะเพิ่มเติม _____

2.2.3 **บทที่ 3 Oral Presentation Skills** โดยรวม ยากเกินไป เหมาะสม ง่ายเกินไป

สิ่งที่ท่านชอบในบทนี้ _____

ข้อเสนอแนะเพิ่มเติม _____

2.2.4 **บทที่ 4 Healthy Eating** โดยรวม ยากเกินไป เหมาะสม ง่ายเกินไป

สิ่งที่ท่านชอบในบทนี้ _____

ข้อเสนอแนะเพิ่มเติม _____

2.2.5 **บทที่ 5 Physiotherapy** โดยรวม ยากเกินไป เหมาะสม ง่ายเกินไป

สิ่งที่ท่านชอบในบทนี้ _____

ข้อเสนอแนะเพิ่มเติม _____

ตอนที่ 3 การสอบเก็บคะแนนระหว่างภาคการศึกษา

1. กิจกรรม Pair PowerPoint Presentation on medical/technology breakthrough

	มาก	ค่อนข้าง	ค่อนข้าง	มาก	
3.1.1 น่าสนใจ	—	—	—	—	ไม่น่าสนใจ
	1	2	3	4	
3.1.2 ยาก	—	—	—	—	ง่าย
	1	2	3	4	
3.1.3 สนุก	—	—	—	—	ไม่สนุก
	1	2	3	4	
3.1.4 นำไปใช้ได้ในชีวิตจริง	—	—	—	—	ไม่สามารถนำไปใช้ได้จริง
	1	2	3	4	
3.1.5 ส่งเสริมการทำงานเป็นกลุ่ม	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมการทำงานเป็นกลุ่ม
	1	2	3	4	
3.1.6 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนใช้ภาษาอังกฤษมากยิ่งขึ้น	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนใช้ภาษาอังกฤษมากยิ่งขึ้น
	1	2	3	4	
3.1.7 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนค้นคว้าหาความรู้ด้วยตนเองมากขึ้น	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนค้นคว้าหาความรู้ด้วยตนเอง
	1	2	3	4	
3.1.8 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนนำความรู้จากวิชาอื่นมาประยุกต์ใช้	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนนำความรู้จากวิชาอื่นมาประยุกต์ใช้
	1	2	3	4	

ข้อเสนอแนะ _____

2. กิจกรรม Group Presentation on Superfood

	มาก	ค่อนข้าง	ค่อนข้าง	มาก	
3.2.1 น่าสนใจ	—	—	—	—	ไม่น่าสนใจ
	1	2	3	4	
3.2.2 ยาก	—	—	—	—	ง่าย
	1	2	3	4	
3.2.3 สนุก	—	—	—	—	ไม่สนุก
	1	2	3	4	
3.2.4 นำไปใช้ได้ในชีวิตจริง	—	—	—	—	ไม่สามารถนำไปใช้ได้จริง
	1	2	3	4	
3.2.5 ส่งเสริมการทำงานเป็นกลุ่ม	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมการทำงานเป็นกลุ่ม
	1	2	3	4	
3.2.6 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ มากยิ่งขึ้น	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ มากยิ่งขึ้น
	1	2	3	4	
3.2.7 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนค้นคว้าหา ความรู้ด้วยตนเองมากขึ้น	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนค้นคว้าหา ความรู้ด้วยตนเอง
	1	2	3	4	
3.2.8 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนนำความรู้จากวิชา อื่นมาประยุกต์ใช้	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนนำความรู้จาก วิชาอื่นมาประยุกต์ใช้
	1	2	3	4	

ข้อเสนอแนะ _____

3. กิจกรรม Role-play (Physiotherapy)

	มาก	ค่อนข้าง	ค่อนข้าง	มาก	
		ต่ำ	สูง		
3.3.1 น่าสนใจ	—	—	—	—	ไม่น่าสนใจ
	1	2	3	4	
3.3.2 ยาก	—	—	—	—	ง่าย
	1	2	3	4	
3.3.3 สนุก	—	—	—	—	ไม่สนุก
	1	2	3	4	
3.3.4 นำไปใช้ได้ในชีวิตจริง	—	—	—	—	ไม่สามารถนำไปใช้ได้จริง
	1	2	3	4	
3.3.5 ส่งเสริมการทำงานเป็นกลุ่ม	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมการทำงานเป็นกลุ่ม
	1	2	3	4	
3.3.6 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ มากยิ่งขึ้น	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ มากยิ่งขึ้น
	1	2	3	4	
3.3.7 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนค้นคว้าหา ความรู้ด้วยตนเองมากขึ้น	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนค้นคว้าหา ความรู้ด้วยตนเอง
	1	2	3	4	
3.3.8 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนนำความรู้จากวิชา อื่นมาประยุกต์ใช้	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนนำความรู้จาก วิชาอื่นมาประยุกต์ใช้
	1	2	3	4	

ข้อเสนอแนะ _____

4. กิจกรรม Final Project Role-play

	มาก	ค่อนข้าง	ค่อนข้าง	มาก	
3.4.1 น่าสนใจ	—	—	—	—	ไม่น่าสนใจ
	1	2	3	4	
3.4.2 ยาก	—	—	—	—	ง่าย
	1	2	3	4	
3.4.3 สนุก	—	—	—	—	ไม่สนุก
	1	2	3	4	
3.4.4 นำไปใช้ได้ในชีวิตจริง	—	—	—	—	ไม่สามารถนำไปใช้ได้จริง
	1	2	3	4	
3.4.5 ส่งเสริมการทำงานเป็นกลุ่ม	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมการทำงานเป็นกลุ่ม
	1	2	3	4	
3.4.6 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ มากยิ่งขึ้น	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ
	1	2	3	4	
3.4.7 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนค้นคว้าหา ความรู้ด้วยตนเองมากขึ้น	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนค้นคว้าหา ความรู้ด้วยตนเอง
	1	2	3	4	
3.4.8 ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนนำความรู้จากวิชา อื่นมาประยุกต์ใช้	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนนำความรู้จาก วิชาอื่นมาประยุกต์ใช้
	1	2	3	4	

ข้อเสนอแนะ _____

ตอนที่ 4 วิธีการเรียนการสอน

1. ท่านคิดว่าวิธีการเรียนการสอนในรายวิชานี้

	มาก	ค่อนข้าง	ค่อนข้าง	มาก	
	1	2	3	4	
4.1.1 กระตุ้นความสนใจของผู้เรียน	—	—	—	—	ไม่กระตุ้นความสนใจของผู้เรียน
4.1.2 สนุก	—	—	—	—	น่าเบื่อ
4.1.3 มีความหลากหลาย	—	—	—	—	ไม่มีความหลากหลาย
4.1.4 เข้าใจง่าย	—	—	—	—	เข้าใจยาก
4.1.5 ส่งเสริมทักษะการพูดของผู้เรียน	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมทักษะการพูดของผู้เรียน
4.1.6 ส่งเสริมทักษะการฟังของผู้เรียน	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมทักษะการฟังของผู้เรียน
4.1.7 ส่งเสริมทักษะที่จำเป็นต่อวิชาชีพ ในอนาคต	—	—	—	—	ไม่ส่งเสริมทักษะที่จำเป็นต่อวิชาชีพ ในอนาคต

วิธีการเรียนการสอน/กิจกรรมในห้องที่ท่านชอบ _____

สิ่งที่ควรปรับปรุง _____

2. รูปแบบของหนังสือเรียน

	มาก	ค่อนข้าง	ค่อนข้าง	มาก	
4.2.1 หนังสือเรียนทำให้อยากเรียน	—	—	—	—	หนังสือเรียนไม่ทำให้อยากเรียน
	1	2	3	4	
4.2.2 ภาพประกอบเพียงพอ	—	—	—	—	ภาพประกอบน้อยเกินไป
	1	2	3	4	

ข้อเสนอแนะเพิ่มเติม _____

3. ท่านคิดว่าบทเรียน สื่อการฟัง (ไฟล์เสียงต่าง ๆ) และคลิปวิดีโอที่ใช้ในวิชานี้

	มาก	ค่อนข้าง	ค่อนข้าง	มาก	
4.3.1 เหมาะสมกับเนื้อหาและวัตถุประสงค์รายวิชา	—	—	—	—	ไม่เหมาะสมกับเนื้อหาและวัตถุประสงค์รายวิชา
	1	2	3	4	
4.3.2 เหมาะสมกับผู้เรียน	—	—	—	—	ไม่เหมาะสมกับผู้เรียน
	1	2	3	4	
4.3.3 ปริมาณเพียงพอ	—	—	—	—	ปริมาณไม่เพียงพอ
	1	2	3	4	

4. ท่านได้เข้าไปฟังไฟล์เสียงต่าง ๆ ที่อยู่บน Blackboard ของวิชานี้เพื่อฝึกทักษะการฟังเพิ่มเติมหรือไม่?

- เข้าไปฟังทั้งหมด
 เข้าไปฟังบางไฟล์
 ไม่เคยฟังเลย

ตอนที่ 5 วิธีการประเมิน

1. ท่านคิดว่าข้อสอบทักษะการฟังกลางภาค

- ยาก ค่อนข้างยาก เหมาะสม ค่อนข้างง่าย ง่าย

ข้อเสนอแนะ/ความเห็นอื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____

2. ท่านคิดว่าข้อสอบทักษะการฟังปลายภาค

- ยาก ค่อนข้างยาก เหมาะสม ค่อนข้างง่าย ง่าย

ข้อเสนอแนะ/ความเห็นอื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____

3. ท่านคิดว่าระยะเวลาที่ใช้สอบ (ประมาณ 30-45 นาที)

- นานเกินไป เหมาะสม สั้นเกินไป

ข้อเสนอแนะ/ความเห็นอื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____

4. ท่านคิดว่าผู้บันทึกเสียงพูด

- พูดเร็วเกินไป
 พูดด้วยความเร็วเหมาะสมตามบริบทในบทสนทนาในชีวิตจริง
 พูดช้าเกินไป
 ข้อเสนอแนะ/ความเห็นอื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____

5. ท่านคิดว่าจำนวนครั้งที่ให้ฟังในแต่ละตอน (2 ครั้ง)

- ควรให้ฟังครั้งเดียวเหมือนสถานการณ์ที่อาจเจอในชีวิตจริง
 น้อยเกินไป ควรให้ฟังตอนละ _____ ครั้ง
 เหมาะสมแล้ว
 ข้อเสนอแนะ/ความเห็นอื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____

6. ข้อคิดเห็นที่ได้จากผู้สอนที่ทำการประเมินท่านตอนสอบ Pair PowerPoint Presentation, Group Presentation, Role-play, และ Final Project

6.1 ท่านได้ข้อคิดเห็นจากผู้ประเมินในการสอบ

- ทุกครั้ง บางครั้ง ไม่เคยได้เลย

6.2 ท่านอยากได้ข้อคิดจากผู้ประเมินในการสอบ

- ทุกครั้ง ไม่อยากได้

6.3 ท่านคิดว่าข้อคิดเห็นจากผู้ประเมินในการสอบที่ท่านได้ (หากท่านไม่เคยได้เลย ให้ข้ามข้อนี้ไป)

	มาก	ค่อนข้าง	ค่อนข้าง	มาก	
6.3.1 มีประโยชน์	—	—	—	—	ไม่มีประโยชน์
	1	2	3	4	
6.3.2 สามารถนำไปปรับใช้ได้จริง	—	—	—	—	ไม่สามารถนำไปปรับใช้ได้จริง
	1	2	3	4	
6.3.3 ท่านเห็นด้วยกับสิ่งที่ผู้ประเมินบอก	—	—	—	—	ไม่เห็นด้วยกับสิ่งที่ผู้ประเมินบอก
	1	2	3	4	

ความเห็นอื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____

7. เกณฑ์ที่ใช้ในการประเมินท่านตอนสอบ Pair PowerPoint Presentation, Group Presentation, Role-play, และ Final Project

7.1 ท่านศึกษาและทำความเข้าใจเกณฑ์ที่ใช้ในการประเมินที่ผู้ทำ course syllabus ในหนังสือ

- ทุกครั้งที่มีการสอบ บางครั้งที่สอบ ไม่เคยเลย

7.2 ท่านเข้าใจเกณฑ์ที่ใช้ในการประเมินท่านในการสอบแต่ละครั้ง

- เข้าใจเป็นอย่างดี เข้าใจบ้างแต่มีบางเกณฑ์ที่ไม่แน่ใจ/ไม่เข้าใจ
 ไม่ค่อยเข้าใจเป็นส่วนใหญ่
 ไม่สนใจว่าเกณฑ์เป็นอย่างไร เพียงทำตามที่อาจารย์ผู้สอนบอกเท่านั้น

8. การประเมินผลการเรียนรายวิชา

8.1 ท่านคิดว่าวิธีการประเมินผลที่ใช้ในปัจจุบันในรายวิชานี้โดย **การสอบ** ฝึกกลางภาคและปลายภาครวม 50% สอบเก็บคะแนน ทักษะ**การพูด**ระหว่างภาครวม 45% และคะแนนการเข้าห้องและให้ความร่วมมือห้องเรียน 5% และนำคะแนนมาตัดเกรด แบบอิงกลุ่ม (T-score)

เหมาะสม (หากเลือกข้อนี้ ให้ข้ามข้อ 8.2 ไป) ไม่เหมาะสม

8.2 ถ้าท่านเลือก **ไม่เหมาะสม** ท่านคิดว่าวิธีการประเมินควรเป็นอย่างไร (เลือกเฉพาะที่ต้องการให้มี และเลือกได้มากกว่า 1 คำตอบ)

- มีสอบกลางภาคและปลายภาค (ทดสอบทั้งสองทักษะ)
- มีสอบเก็บคะแนนระหว่างภาค (ทดสอบทักษะการพูดเป็นหลัก)
- คะแนนการเข้าห้องและให้ความร่วมมือห้องเรียน

และนำคะแนนรวมมาตัดเกรดแบบ (เลือกได้เพียง 1 คำตอบเท่านั้น)

- อิงกลุ่ม (T-score)
- อิงเกณฑ์ (เช่น 85-100 ได้เกรด A, 80-84 ได้เกรด B+ เป็นต้น)

9. ท่านคิดว่าวิธีการประเมินทักษะการพูดโดยผู้สอนประจำกลุ่มในการสอบครั้งแรก และเปลี่ยนผู้ประเมินในการสอบครั้งต่อ ๆ ไปโดยผู้สอนที่ไม่ใช่ผู้สอนประจำกลุ่ม

เหมาะสม ไม่เหมาะสม

ข้อเสนอแนะ/ความเห็นอื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____

ขอขอบคุณในความร่วมมือนในการตอบแบบสอบถาม
























คณะผู้สอนรายวิชา LIS SPK AL SCI

Appendix 3

Example of a page with illustrations from the course book

Appendix I

Verbs used in instructions

bend down		put your head down put out your tongue	
breathe in breathe out		raise your leg	
close your eyes		roll onto your back /front	
curl up		sit sit up	
do this		slide your hand down your side	
Follow my fingertip with your eyes		take off your coat	
keep your knee straight		stand straight stand up	
let your wrist go limp		take off your shirt	
lie on your side/back lie down on the couch		tilt your head back	
look straight ahead		touch your shoulder with your chin	
open your mouth		turn your head to the left turn on your side	
point to the finger that moves			
pull my hand/arm as hard as you can			
push against my hand as hard as you can			

Karuna Naphon is a full-time lecturer at Chulalongkorn University Language Institute. She holds an M.A. in Teaching English as a Foreign Language from Thammasat University.