Framework of Reference for English Language Education in Thailand – (FRELE-TH) Based on the CEFR: Revisited in the English Educational Reform

Kulaporn Hiranburana, Graduate School of Human Sciences, Assumption University

Pramarn Subphadoongchone, Chulalongkorn University Language Institute

Supong Tangkiengsirisin, Language Institute of Thammasat University

Supakorn Phoochaeoensil, Language Institute of Thammasat University

Jaroon Gainey, Chulalongkorn University Language Institute

Juthamas Thogsongsri, Chulalongkorn University Language Institute

Piyaboot Sumonsriworakun, Chulalongkorn University Language Institute

Monnipha Somphong, Language Institute of Thammasat University

Pattama Sappapan, Language Institute of Thammasat University

Pimsiri Taylor, Language Institute of Thammasat University

Abstract

This article introduces the Framework of Reference for English Language Education in Thailand – (FRELE-TH), which is based on the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001) to be a shared basis for reflection and communication among the different partners and practitioners in English language education in Thailand, including curriculum or syllabus planning, and textbook and course materials development. The student's significant involvement in the process is particularly emphasized. Some suggested activities and examples of the possible use of the FRELE-TH are also included.

Keywords: language reference framework, CEFR, educational reform, English language education

กรอบอ้างอิงการศึกษาความสามารถภาษาอังกฤษสำหรับประเทศไทย (FRELE-TH) อิงตาม CEFR: ย้อนพินิจเพื่อการปฏิรูปการศึกษาภาษาอังกฤษ

กุลพร หิรัญบูรณะ บัณฑิตวิทยาลัยมนุษยศึกษา มหาวิทยาลัยอัสสัมชัญ
ประมาณ ทรัพย์ผดุงชนม์ สถาบันภาษา จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย
สุพงศ์ ตั้งเคียงศิริสิน สถาบันภาษา มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์
ศุภกรณ์ ภู่เจริญศิลป์ สถาบันภาษา มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์
จรูญ เกนี่ สถาบันภาษา จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย
จุฑามาส ทองสองสี สถาบันภาษา จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย
ปิยบุตร สุมนศรีวรกุล สถาบันภาษา จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย
มนนิภา สมพงษ์ สถาบันภาษา มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์
ปัทมา สัปปพันธ์ สถาบันภาษา มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์
พิมพ์ศิริ เทเลอร์ สถาบันภาษา มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์

บทคัดย่อ

บทความนี้มุ่งเสนอกรอบอ้างอิงความสามารถภาษาอังกฤษสำหรับประเทศไทย (Framework of Reference for English Language Education in Thailand: FRELE-TH) ซึ่งอ้างอิงตาม CEFR (สภายุโรป, 2544) เพื่อเป็นพื้นฐานร่วมกันที่ผู้เกี่ยวข้องกับการเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษจากภาคส่วนต่างๆสามารถใช้ในการพิจารณาและแลกเปลี่ยนข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับการสอนภาษาอังกฤษในประเทศไทย โดยครอบคลุมแง่มุมต่างๆเช่น การวางหลักสูตรหรือการกำหนดเนื้อหารายวิชา รวมทั้งการพัฒนาแบบเรียนและสื่อการสอน โดยเน้นให้ผู้เรียนมีส่วนร่วมอย่างสูงในกระบวนการต่าง ๆ ดังกล่าว นอกจากนี้บทความนี้ได้ให้ข้อเสนอแนะในการจัดกิจกรรมและตัวอย่างประกอบที่อิงจาก FRELE-TH ซึ่งสามารถนำไปใช้ในการจัดการเรียนการสอนได้

คำสำคัญ: กรอบอ้างอิงมาตรฐานด้านภาษา การปฏิรูปการศึกษา การศึกษาภาษาอังกฤษ CEFR

Introduction

It has been a great challenge for the FRELE-TH, which is an adaptation of the CEFR with plus (+) levels (A1, A1+, A2, A2+, B1, B1+, B2, B2+, C1, C2) to encourage the partners, practitioners and also stakeholders and in particular learners in English language education to reflect on the actual use of English in communication in real life situations for the design of curricula, textbooks, course materials, tests and teacher education, not to mention the development of English standards for professionals, which can be benchmarked according to regional and international standards.

The FRELE-TH was developed based on the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001) by the team members from the Chulalongkorn University Language Institute and the Language Institute of Thammasat University. The project was given a grant by the Thailand Professional Qualifications Institute TPQI) as part of the establishment of professional standards for Thailand, which will be benchmarked with reference to regional and international standards, particularly regarding AEC integration and international communication, with the growing size of a flow workforce across national borders. The rationale behind the development of the FRELE-TH lies in the principle of CEFR's inception in 2001 that the CEFR does not offer ready-made solutions but must always be adapted to the requirements of particular contexts (Council of Europe, 2001).

Given these fundamental aims, the Council encourages all those concerned with the organization of language learning to base their work on the needs, motivations, characteristics, and resources of learners.

In order to meet these objectives, the development of the ten-level reference framework of the CEFR was a result of the adaptation of the CEFR to make it relevant to English use in local and international communication in Thailand. It is a fact that English is one of the two working languages in the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), and it has also become the key to success, not only in education but for job applications and work promotion,

according to Pitsuwan (2014). However, the majority of ASEAN people, including Thai people, do not have satisfactory proficiency in English. More importantly, despite the number of years that Thai students spend on English learning in formal education, they are not able to use English in communication. They can guess the meaning of unknown words using contextual clues but rarely use compensation strategies, such as gestures, when they cannot figure out a word during a conversation in English (Pawapatcharaudom, 2007). Even after at least eight or nine years of studying English, Thai tertiary students do not seem to be able to communicate effectively in English (Thonginkam, 2003). A study of Thai learners' performance on English standard tests has shown that their performance is not satisfactory (Prapphal, 2003). This low proficiency of Thai users and learners of English has been reviewed in the EF Proficiency Index (2015), in which Thailand is ranked 62 out of 70 countries (EPI score of 45.35).

In fact, the stipulation of the CEFR to be used for schools as the main principles of enacting English language teaching and learning as part of the English language reform policy in Thailand (Ministry of Education, 2014) was announced in 2014. It sets forth using the CEFR in the design of language curricula, the stating of learning goals, the development of teaching and learning, the testing and assessment of learning outcomes, as well as the development of the teaching profession. Additionally, the framework was used by the Ministry of Education for setting English proficiency targets for students; for example, by the end of the primary level, students should have level A1 proficiency. The results of the reform policy however have not proven that the students can meet the targets. It has been found that the students cannot use English in communication, not to mention its use as a tool for knowledge research (Prasongporn, ONEC 2017). Furthermore, the success of English language education requires the collaboration of all stakeholders, and teachers and students as the key agents should realize their important roles. They should not be thought of as empty glasses to be filled with

theoretical frameworks and skills. Students are actually the masters of their learning, and they should be empowered to be responsible for their own learning as part of lifelong learning.

Some of the factors affecting the failure of English teaching and learning are unqualified and poorly trained-teachers, poorly-motivated students, and rare opportunities for student exposure to English outside of class time (Dhanasobhon, 2006, ONEC 2017). Some other problems involve the lack of opportunities for students to use English in their daily lives and unchallenging English lessons (Wiriyachitra, 2002). Most of the teachers in a study of English teaching problems in Thailand (Noom-ura, 2013) were reported to rate at a moderate level the problems of their teaching and to rate at a high level the problems involving students. This study shows that teachers are concerned about problems connected with their strategies regarding the teaching of listening and speaking, and writing and with the assessment of these skills, and they would need professional development related to the teaching and assessment of these skills. More importantly, teachers' perceptions have revealed that students' lack of patience practicing English and their minimal exposure to English outside the class and lack of responsibility for their own learning (Wiriyachitra, 2002) are crucial causes of their failure in English.

In order to meet the needs of the Thai learners and users of English, it is necessary to make the framework comprehensible and applicable to the audience. Additionally, the framework needs to address not only the functions and forms but also the strategies of language use. The FRELE-TH based on the CEFR (2001), the derived framework, maintains the structure and three components of the CEFR: communicative activities, communication strategies and communicative linguistic competence with their sub-components as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Structure and components of the FRELE-TH

Communicative activities	Reception	Listening	
		Reading	
	Interaction	Speaking	
		Writing	
	Production	Speaking	
		Writing	
Communication strategies	Reception	Identifying clues and making inferences	
	Interaction	Turn-taking	
		Cooperating	
		Asking for clarification	
	Production	Planning	
		Compensating	
		Monitoring and repair	
Communicative language competence	Linguistic	Range	Vocabulary
			General linguistic
		Control	Grammatical accuracy
			Vocabulary
			Phonological
			Orthographic
	Sociolinguistic	-	
	Pragmatic	Precision	
		Coherence	
		Fluency	

Structure and Components of the FRELE-TH

The FRELE-TH, similar to the CEFR, offers two scale types to describe English proficiency levels: global and illustrative scales, and their descriptors. It begins with the global scales (see Appendix A), in which an overview of the language proficiency at all levels is presented. This is followed by illustrative scales (see an example in Figures 3.1 and 3.2), which consist of three aspects represented in separate tables: communicative activities, communication strategies, and communicative language competence.

Communicative activities or 'Can Do' descriptors cover reception, interaction, and production. Reception involves listening comprehension and reading comprehension. Interaction involves spoken interaction and written interaction, and production involves spoken production and written production.

Communication strategies include the strategies that Thai users of English can apply as they perform communicative activities. These communication strategies include reception strategies in identifying clues and making inferences; interaction strategies in turn-taking, cooperating, and asking for clarification; and production strategies in planning, compensating, and monitoring and repair.

Communicative language competence refers to the knowledge that Thai users of English need to have in order to perform communicative activities. This involves linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, and pragmatic competence. Linguistic competence covers "range" (linguistic and vocabulary) and "control" (grammatical accuracy, vocabulary control, phonological control, and orthographic control). Sociolinguistic competence refers to the knowledge and skills needed to cope with the social dimension of language use. Pragmatic competence, on the other hand, is concerned with the language user's knowledge of how messages are organized, structured, and arranged. It also focuses on the user's knowledge of the functional use of linguistic resources. Pragmatic competence in this framework includes precision, coherence, and fluency. The FRELE-TH can be useful for a model of English and English use and English learning and can be influential in English language education, as it is based on the CEFR, which incorporates scales that "have obvious value in measuring and assessing learning and achievement" (Alderson & Banerjee, 2002, p. 81).

Moreover, in order to help Thai learners and users to better understand the framework, the FRELE-TH adopted and adapted more exponents from the EAQUALS (North, 2007, 2008), the Threshold Level (Trim & Trim, 1980; van Ek & Trim, 1990), the Core Inventory of General English (North, Ortega,

& Sheehan, 2010), the English Profile Program (Salamoura & Saville, 2010), and the Word Family Framework (West, 2015). The FRELE-TH also offers examples of language functions, discourse markers, topics, vocabulary range, and grammar and some exponents and micro-skills, all of which are appropriate to English use in the local, regional and international context of Thai communication. (see an example of Level A1 exponents in Appendix B). A word family list based on the Word Family Framework (West, 2015), classified according to the FRELE-TH 10 levels, is provided in a separate appendix (see an example of the Word Family List in Appendix 3.)

FRELE-TH Equivalency

The FRELE-TH follows the CEFR using the plus (+) levels from the Swiss Project (Goullier, 2007) to make sure that Levels A (Basic User) and B (Independent User) in the derived framework are not too high for Thai learners and users to achieve in their performance. Figure 2 shows the equivalency of the CEFR and the FRELE-TH. The FRELE-TH standard levels are equivalent to the CEFR and the CEFR with the plus levels.

Figure 2: FRELE-TH Equivalency

FRELE-TH	CEFR Proficiency Level (with plus levels)	CEFR Proficiency Level	Standard Level
A_1	A_1	A_1	Basic user
A_1+	A_1+		
A_2	A_2	A_2	
A_2+	A_2+		
B_1	B_1	B_1	Independent user
B_1+	B_1+		
B_2	B_2	B_2	
B_2+	B_2+		
C_1	C_1	C_1	Proficient user
C_2	C_2	C_2	

This adaptation would seem to violate the expectation of some people with the belief that all of the CEFR descriptors at a particular level need to apply to everybody at the level concerned. This belief is prone to criticism because of the fact that the CEFR encourages "users to adopt activities, competences and proficiency stepping stones that are appropriate to their particular context, yet can be related to the common scheme and thus communicated more easily to colleagues in other educational institutes and to other stakeholders" (North, 2004, p.10). He gives an illustration of the Swiss adaptation by having both A1 and A2 sub-divided into four sub-levels, stating that finer levels can make sense for pedagogical reasons (North, 2004, p.48) to show that the CEFR is a flexible framework allowing levels and categories to be merged or sub-divided as appropriate. A similar practice is seen in the CEFR-J descriptors for listening where Level A splits into three: A1.1, A1.2, and A1.3 to make the framework fit the context of English use in Japan (Negishi et al, 2013, p.156-163).

The FRELE-TH framework yet maintains the salient and criterion features of all the overall CEFR descriptors. These overall FRELE-TH descriptors were reviewed and improved to make them more comprehensible and relevant to Thai learners and users of English (see Appendix A). This can be seen in the following sample of global descriptors for A1, B2 and B2+. A1 is the lowest level of basic users (A1, A1+, A2, and A2+). The FRELE-TH description at the A1 level has taken into consideration the fact that Thai learners and users of English at this level begin with words, phrases, and simple expressions with 'Can Do' statements' on familiar topics and immediate surroundings. The other exemplification levels are B2 and B2+ (known as Vantage) with 'Can Do' statements specified for independent users. B2 and B2+ illustrate distinguishing characteristics that are useful for pedagogical purposes. Moreover, for practical purposes, the FRELE-TH global scale itself can be used for the design of the specifications of the high-stakes standardized tests of English proficiency, the results of which can be

benchmarked with those of the international standards. In this way, students' or users' performance and progress can be measured and tracked to be calibrated with other international standards for educational or professional purposes. The development of standardized English proficiency tests based on the FRELE-TH for local use and calibrating the results with the CEFR levels and international standards can be done using a number of methods, which are the focus of examination institutions, but is not the main aim here, which is for enhancing the teacher's ability in designing effective classroom activities and evaluations.

For pedagogical purposes, an example of the FRELE-TH illustrative scales of communicative activities is given in Figure 3.1 Speaking (Interaction) and 3.2 Speaking (Production). The example shows the descriptors for Level A1 with 'Can Do' statements that can be used for curriculum/syllabus design, course materials development, and test specifications so that learners are given relevant tasks to meet their needs. As you can see at Level A1, the lowest level, learners and users can engage in several speaking interaction activities. They use simple expressions, including basic greeting and leave-taking expressions, as well as asking simple questions about well-being in conversation. In the information exchange and transactions, learners and users at this level ask basic questions about familiar concrete things and answer simple questions, with some pictures or visual supports; they can understand simple numbers in prices or telephone numbers and use simple isolated words and phrases sometimes with gestures such as pointing to items when they are making a purchase. As regards speaking production activities, learners or users of English at this level can provide basic personal information about themselves, their family, and their living place, using short, simple words, isolated phrases, and basic short sentences. It is expected that A1 learners or users will not be able to engage in discussion.

Figure 3.1: The FRELE-TH Illustrative Scales, Speaking (Interaction) Level A1

SPEAKING (INTERACTION)						
Overall Speaking (Interaction)	**Conversation**	**Discussion**	**Information Exchange**	**Transaction**	**Telephoning**	**Interview**
Can understand and respond to very simple expressions delivered very clearly and slowly with some repetition and rephrasing on a predictable topic.

Can understand and respond to very simple direct questions about personal details.

Can understand, follow, and respond to very short, basic, and clear instructions.

Can understand and repeat very simple phrases. | Can use basic greeting and leave taking expressions.

Can ask how people are doing.

Can ask and answer basic personal questions about personal details using isolated words or short phrases if the other person speaks very slowly and clearly. | | Can ask for information about familiar concrete objects using very basic questions using isolated words and phrases.

Can answer short basic questions which are delivered clearly and slowly using some simple isolated words and phrases.

Can produce short, simple answers responding to short, simple questions based on pictures telling a short story. | Can use and understand simple numbers in prices or telephone numbers in everyday conversations.

Can buy things in shops where pointing or other gestures can support what is said. | Can give his/her name when answering the phone.

Can understand and answer very short basic telephone expressions as well as very simple questions. | Can answer very basic, familiar questions using short, simple isolated words or phrases. |

Figure 3.2: The FRELE-TH Illustrative Scales, Speaking (Production) Level A1

SPEAKING (PRODUCTION)			
Description	Arguing a Case	Presentations	Summarizing
Can give basic personal information about himself/herself in short, simple words, phrases or basic sentences.			
Can describe himself/herself and his/her family using short, simple words, phrases or sentences.			
Can give a simple description of where he/she lives.			
Can use simple words or isolated phrases for very familiar objects.			

In curriculum, syllabus and course design, these 'Can Do' descriptors are beneficial in defining outcomes and course specifications and course objectives. They help course designers and teachers to relate the content of the curriculum, syllabus, and course to the real-world needs through context-appropriate adaptation (North, 2014, 10). Based on a needs analysis of learners and users, for example, young learners in their use of English at home, at school, or in their surroundings are likely to yield the tasks and activities provided in the 'Can Do' descriptors. To illustrate, according to the Basic Education Core Curriculum A.D. 2008 (OBEC, 2008), primary school students need to correctly and appropriately use English for creating interpersonal relationships, exchanging information, and expressing feelings and opinions, and also for seeking knowledge and to broaden their worldviews and to appreciate socio-cultural diversity and values and to develop positive attitudes. In order to meet the requirements of the OBEC curriculum, based on the 'Can Do' descriptors, an example of the specification of units 1 and 4 in a

grade 2 coursebook called "Small World" is presented in Figure 4: Small World Grade 2, Units 1 and 4. In these units, the main tasks are derived from the 'Can Do' statements relevant to Level A1: greeting, giving information about oneself, and describing one's living place and situation are made more specific for the young learners' or students' context. The functions, vocabulary, and key expressions are based on the exponents of Level A1 (see Appendix B).

Figure 4: Small World Grade 2 Specifications of Course Materials

Units	Lessons	Functions	Vocabulary	Key Expressions	Games and Activities
1. Let's meet up	Lesson 1: Good morning	• Greeting and asking about well-being • Giving instructions about parts of the body	• Good morning • Good afternoon • Good evening • Friend • Father • Mother • Teacher	• How are you? • I'm great. • Nice to meet you. • Who's she/he? • This is …… • He's my friend.	1. Game 'Introducing yourself.' 2. Sing 'Nice to meet you.' 3. Draw a picture of your friend.
	Lesson 2: Getting to know you	• Asking about age, phone number and living place	• Number (1-10)	• What's your telephone number? • My telephone number is … • How old are you? • I'm … years old. • Where is your house? • My house is …. • Where do you live? • I live in …	1. Write your telephone number. 2. Point the picture and ask about age. 3. Game: Hot ball
4. Welcome to my house	Lesson 1: What a lovely house!	• Asking for and giving information about location of things around the house	Sofa Spoon fork knife glass plate small, bottle box big round square	Where is the………? It's in/ on / under……..	1. Listen, read and match things in the house 2. Listen, draw and write things students hear 3. Guessing game 4. Listen, point and say about the location 5. Sing 6. Say and write

Units	Lessons	Functions	Vocabulary	Key Expressions	Games and Activities
	Lesson 2: Home sweet home	• Identifying things around the house	Bookcase Lamp Television Bed Chair Table Rug Wardrobe	What's this? What's that? This is………………. That is……………..	1. Listen, point and talk more about the things in the house 2. Pictionary game 3. Sing
	Lesson 3: My dream house	• Identifying rooms in the house	Bedroom Bathroom Kitchen dining room living room	Where is…………………? She/He is in the………..	1. Listen, point and say about rooms in the house 2. Matching game 3. House project

Additionally, the employment of the exponents (see Appendix B) of the functions/communicative tasks and activities, the discourse markers, the related topics and sub-topics as well as grammar and the vocabulary range is also specified. The course material specification is obviously useful to teachers and course materials designers as it contains functions (from 'Can Do' statements) and vocabulary that are appropriate to the Thai context of English use at the 10 levels of the FRELE-TH. This vocabulary range plays an integral part in the FRELE-TH collating a word family list (see an example in Appendix C.) which serves as a collection of word families in alphabetical order for English language learning suitable for the Thai situation. For example, Thai beginners of English should know the word "ant" and be able to derive the noun "anger" from the adjective "angry," and the adjective "friendly" from the noun "friend," which are quite common and relevant to their everyday life. For teachers, the topics and related vocabulary can be provided to students at the beginning of the course in order to give priority to what they are interested in learning and doing in class activities.

Micro-skills are also useful as a self-assessment checklist, both in Thai or in English (see an English version in Figure 5) to make learners aware of the skills to be acquired in the completion of the tasks and activities. Learners are also geared towards self-regulation and goal setting and monitoring, which

are beneficial in language learning. For this reason, it is crucial to provide learners with opportunities for self-evaluation and reflection, as this will help them to work towards goal setting which is an effective strategy for learning (Stern, 1992)

Figure 5: Self-monitoring/ Self-assessment Checklist Level A1

"Can Do" Statement Speaking Interaction Level A1

Name of student:_____   Teacher : _____

Language Skills: Speaking Interaction/Production	I can do it.	I need more study.
I can use basic greeting and leave-taking expressions.		
I can ask how people are doing.		
I can ask and answer basic personal questions about personal details.		
I can describe myself and my family using short simple words, phrases or sentences.		
I can describe where I live.		
I can use and understand simple numbers in prices or telephone numbers in everyday conversations.		
I can buy things in shops where pointing or other gestures can support what is said.		
I can produce short simple answers responding to short simple questions based on pictures telling a short story.		

Apart from the communicative activities, communication strategies are also important in the design of course materials specification. For instance, in these units, young learners are required to use gestures such as pointing to things and asking questions or making statements to accompany their verbal communication in playing games and doing activities. The use of these gestures reflects the communication strategies in the FRELE-TH descriptors, an example of which can be seen in Figure 6, and this will be discussed in greater detail.

Figure 6: Communication Strategies Level A1

LEVEL	RECEPTION	INTERACTION			PRODUCTION		
	IDENTIFYING CLUES AND MAKING INFERENCES	TURN-TAKING	COOPERATING	ASKING FOR CLARIFICATION	PLANNING	COMPENSATING	MONITORING & REPAIR
A1	Can understand frequently-used routines and patterns spoken or written in simple words, phrases, short sentences, and instructions in very specific and familiar situations.	Can occasionally start a very simple dialog using only short memorized expressions in familiar specific situations.	Can sometimes use gestures to indicate when he/she is following a conversation.	Can use mostly gestures to signal if he/she cannot follow a conversation.		Can only use gestures such as pointing to identify familiar everyday objects.	

It is noticeable that the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001) had no descriptors for communication strategies level A1 until the recent issue of the Companion Volume with new descriptors (Council of Europe, 2017), which has included the descriptors of the new level, Level Pre-A for Compensating, and Monitoring and Repair. The FRELE-TH, as can be seen in Figure 5, at the outset, incorporated descriptors for the communication strategies that learners and users at Level A1 can employ to do the activities or tasks in their reception, interaction, and also in production. In reception, learners and users can understand frequently-used routines and patterns spoken or written using simple words, phrases, short sentences, and instructions in very specific and familiar situations. In their interaction with another party in familiar situations, they can use short memorized isolated words or expressions to begin a simple dialog. Sometimes in order to show that they are still listening, they use gestures to indicate that they are following the conversation. If they are lost, they use some gestures such as shaking their head to show that they are not following the conversation. In production, they can use gestures in situational

contexts, including pointing to identify familiar objects, for example, when they want to buy something and cannot think of the words. These communication strategies are useful and necessary for curriculum and course design. The inclusion of communication strategies at this level, probably reflects the common view of the significance of 21st century skills in lifelong learning (Nomnian, 2013), stating that teachers of English need to not only develop learners' English proficiency, but also train learners in learning strategies and life skills for the 21st century in order to enhance learner autonomy and develop learners to be legitimate global citizens.

Figure 7: Communicative Linguistic Competence Level A1

LEVEL	LINGUISTIC		SOCIOLINGUISTIC	PRAGMATIC		
	RANGE	CONTROL		PRECISION	COHERENCE	FLUENCY
A1	*Vocabulary*: Can use a very basic range of frequently-used words, short phrases, and expressions on everyday topics to communicate and describe personal information, colors, simple numbers, simple objects, routine activities, etc. *General Linguistic*: Has very basic and limited isolated words and short phrases concerning concrete everyday	*Grammatical accuracy*: Can occasionally produce one-word answers or very short phrases with a very limited level of accuracy and many grammatical errors. *Vocabulary:* Can control a very limited words, phrases and short sentences dealing with everyday situations. *Phonological*: Can pronounce very limited words and phrases dealing with everyday	Can use very basic and very frequently-used words and phrases limited to isolated tasks in very specific situations of greeting, saying farewell, as well as thank you, sorry, and please.	Can communicate basic personal information in a very simple way using a limited range of vocabulary without flexibility.	Can use *"and"* or *"then"* to join simple phrases.	Can pronounce very limited words and phrases dealing with everyday concrete situations and requiring effort to be understood. Can speak using very short phrases and isolated words.

| LEVEL | LINGUISTIC | | SOCIOLINGUISTIC | PRAGMATIC | | |
	RANGE	CONTROL		PRECISION	COHERENCE	FLUENCY
	situations.	concrete situations and requiring effort to be understood. *Orthographical*: Can spell mostly short, simple words and phrases dealing with everyday objects or write one-word answers with spelling mistakes.				

Figure 7 shows the communicative linguistic competence that learners and users need to have in order to do the tasks or activities mentioned earlier and also to be able to use the strategies appropriate to Level 1. These FRELE-TH linguistic components serve as a point of orientation for the assessment criteria for developing bands or scales which are refined to be appropriate to the situations for the rating performances of particular groups of learners or users.

Normally, the whole range of the FRELE-TH descriptor scales for Communicative linguistic competence and communication strategy could be used as a starting point in developing assessment grids or a rating scale for projects linking high-stakes tests to the FRELE-TH framework in measuring the proficiency level of mixed groups of learners and users. In assessing lower-ability groups of young learners like the ones in Small World as part of the classroom assessment, however, it can be expected and more practical if the rating scale covers a specific range of learner ability group. The rating scale does not have to link to the descriptors at all levels; that is, the rating scale can contain only the descriptors relevant to speaking interaction, in this

case, focused on one level, Level A1, including possibly the levels above and below. An example of a rating scale for young learner performance in Small World is suggested in Figure 8. This would also be the case recommended for presenting the CEFR descriptors as assessment criteria (North, 2014, p.170, 175) as follows:

> *...Rather than showing all levels ... or a range of levels, the grid can be focused just on the level that has been set as the standard, adding the levels above and below as points of reference...*

This perspective is also reflected in the work of Fulcher and Davidson (2007). They state that classroom assessment is criterion-referenced, which is linked to the agreed criteria that if met, learners are ready to proceed to the next learning activity. The demand to conform to external large-scale testing, which shows where learners are with regard to their peers and learners in other places, is not necessarily the most appropriate model for the classroom learning environment. Studies in motivation and achievement have revealed that low-stakes classroom activities contribute to higher intrinsic motivation than high stake activities (Cauley & McMillan, 2009). This is so perhaps because low-stakes assignments can serve as a formative assessment to help teachers to find out whether the learners understand the course material and can attend to their learning.

Figure 8: Assessment Grid or Rating Scale for Small World Learner Speaking Performance

Asking for and giving information about things in the house and their location	Score	Range	Accuracy	Interaction	Fluency	Coherence
	4-5	Use very basic phrases and groups of ready-made expressions to communicate and describe personal	Produce very basic sentence structures with a low level of accuracy, having many	Occasionally begin a simple dialog using mostly memorized expressions. Show a sign of	Use short, simple ready-made expressions in predictable routine situations with a number of	Use very basic single-word connectors, i.e. *and*, and *but*, to link ideas in narration

Asking for and giving information about things in the house and their location	Score	Range	Accuracy	Interaction	Fluency	Coherence
		information, routine activities, requests, etc.	systematic grammatical errors.	following a conversation but only with the help of the other speaker, and use gestures to show that he/she is lost.	pauses, false starts, and reformulations.	and description.
	2-3	Use a very basic range of isolated frequently-used words, short phrases and expressions.	Occasionally produce one-word answers or very short phrases with a very limited level of accuracy and many grammatical errors.	Sometimes use gestures to indicate when he/she is or not following a conversation or using pointing to identify familiar objects.	Pronounce very limited words and phrases dealing with everyday concrete situations and requiring effort to be understood.	Can use "*and*" or "*then*" to join simple phrases.
	0-1	Words rarely meaningful	Full of errors and grammatical errors	Only use of gestures with few isolated words	Production of sounds with little meaning	Listing with no connectors

So far, the application of the FRELE-TH has been presented in the course curriculum and course design of materials and activities, and also the development of self-monitoring or self-assessment checklist and assessment grids or a rating scale. In order to illustrate the application of the FRELE-TH for the design of activities based on the descriptors of the criteria level and plus level, in this case, Levels B2 and B2+, an example of the design of tasks or activities in English for business communication or meetings is given in Figure 9. This illustration shows that the strong B+ activity requires learners and users of English to do a more challenging task and this can be assigned when learners are able to achieve the task at Level B2 so that they can extend their knowledge and skills to engage in more authentic, real-world situation.

Figure 9: Example of Speaking Tasks Designed from the Descriptors Speaking Interaction for Level B2 Compared to that for Level B2+

FRELE-TH B2 (CEFR Level B2)	FRELE-TH B2+ (CEFR Level B2+)
Speaking Task	**Speaking Task**
You are one of the candidates at the best hotel contest. You are given about 5 minutes to present your hotel as the best hotel in Bangkok. In your presentation, you have to make your arguments and justify your position.	You and your group are members of the organizing committee of a going green exhibition. You and your colleagues need to choose the best hotel to organize a press conference and also the venue for this special project. You have to evaluate, speculate and negotiate with others and convince them by structuring arguments from different sources towards the final decision.

Discussion and Conclusion

Considering the FRELE-TH descriptors, it is appropriate for teachers of English, learners, course designers, test writers and assessors to apply them to facilitate their design of main English activities. For the course objectives, the FRELE-TH based approach can assist course designers and teachers with the analysis of the main needs profiles of the students, relevant to their context. With the 'Can Do' descriptors, the needs analysis is based on what students can do in English rather than on merely what grammar or linguistic descriptions they need to know. This real-world relevance is emphasized in North's (2014, p.108) suggestions for the practice of the CEFR, on which the FRELE-TH is based.

> *...Needs analysis should also determine the type of activity that occurs in the classroom. Some of that at lease reflects relevant real world activity for the group concerned. What sorts of tasks should we be using in the classroom?*

At the classroom level, the FRELE-TH also helps teachers identify suitable topics in which the 'Can Do' statements can be used and also the competences that students are required to have in terms of linguistic elements. What is important is that the FRELE-TH also describes the strategies that students are likely to use in enabling them to achieve communicative tasks. As

can be seen from the example of course materials provided at Level A1, the 'Can Do' descriptors include greeting, giving information about oneself, describing the living places, and the language and vocabulary needed, such as the use of the conjunctions "and" and "but" and other strategies used to facilitate communication. This helps orient teachers to be well prepared for the class activities in need of skills for the relevant level.

From the perspectives of learners and students, 'Can Do' descriptors are crucial for the learning and teaching process as they are "primarily a communication tool that allows learners to be treated as partners" (North, 2014, p.109). At the outset, 'Can Do' descriptors can be used to encourage students to negotiate their needs and priorities of objectives, learning communicative tasks and other activities, including self-study activities. They also serve as signposts to students of their learning progress. In terms of evaluation and accountability, they can be employed as evidence of achievement by means of self-monitoring and self-evaluation. In the Thai context, it is uncommon to have students as partners in the design of course content and materials. They normally rely on the "spoon-fed" material offered by teachers. This can lead to serious problems in English language learning, such as lack of motivation and a low level of perseverance in practicing, no goal-setting, and hence, less responsibility and less English exposure in their learning. In fact, these problems were spelled out by teachers of English in Thailand, as found in their Thai students learning English (Noom-Ura, 2013). These internal factors can contribute to failure in learning a language. Many researchers emphasize the importance of goal-setting in language learning (Naiman, Frohlick, Stern & Todesco, 1978; Oxford, & Shearin, 1994), as there is a significant relationship between goal setting and student language achievement (Moeller, Theiler, & Wu, 2012). It is important that learners participate in setting their goals (Azevedo, Ragan, Cromley, & Pritchett, 2002). In order to yield better results, goals should be particularly specific, measureable and challenging. More importantly, teachers normally set goals

or outcomes for classroom learning and these can be different from the students' personal goals, leading to students' lack of understanding why they are involved in the learning process (Dornyei, 2001). The FRELE-TH based on the CEFR offers English teachers to create the opportunity for students to participate in setting their goals or outcomes for learning by employing 'Can Do' descriptors. Additionally, students are encouraged to monitor the progress of their learning. Therefore, in this standard-based approach, students become active agents in their learning of English. In this era of Educational Reform towards Thailand 4.0, we strongly propose that students be encouraged to be responsible for their learning, to take the roles of co-partners or, more appropriately, be the master of their learning so that they can develop their goals for learning, self-efficacy, learning strategies, and English competency.

Therefore, this article has introduced the FRELE-TH based on the CEFR and has discussed ways in which the framework can be used as a point of orientation for the design of curricula, syllabi, course materials, and rating scales for the development of tests, both for high-stakes and low-stakes in the classroom, and for student self-monitoring and self-evaluation towards goal setting in their learning. From this perspective, students will be able to do tasks and activities that are more relevant to real-world situations and at the same time their performance can be assessed and be related to international standards. In this way, the learners or participants in those programs will likely be aware of their performance benchmarked with international standards to give them motivation for their learning and using English to satisfy their personal needs.

References

Alderson, C & Banerjee, J. (2002) Language testing and assessment (Part2) *Language Teaching*. 35, 79-113.

Azevedo, R., Ragan, S., Cromley, J., & Pritchett, S. (2002) *Do different goal-setting conditions facilitate students' ability to regulate their learning*

of complex science topics with River Web? Retrieved from ERIC database (ED482509).

Cauley, K. M. & McMillan, J. H. (2009) Formative assessment techniques to support student motivation and achievement. *Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 83 (1), 1-16.

Council of Europe (2001) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment*. Council of Europe, Language Policy Unit: Strasbourg www.coe.int/lang-CEFR

Council of Europe (2017) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment, Companion Volume* with New Descriptors.
https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/168074a4e2

Dhanasobhon, S. (2006) *English language teaching dilemma in Thailand*. Retrieved December, 2017, from
http://www.curriculumandinstruction.org/index.php?lay=show&ac=article&Id=539134523&Ntype=7

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge Teaching Library.

EF Proficiency Index. (2015) www.ef.com/epi.

Fulcher, G. & Davidson, F. (2007) *Language Testing and Assessment.* New York: Routledge.

Goullier, F. (2007) Impact of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages and the Council of Europe's work on the New European educational area, in Council of Europe (2007) *The Common European Framework of References (CEFR) and the Development of Language Policies: Challenges and Responsibilities*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 29-37, available online:
www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Publications_en.asp

Ministry of Education, (2014) *The Guidelines on English language teaching and Learning Reforming Policy.* Bangkok: Chamjureeproducts Ltd.

Moeller, A. J.,Theiler, J. M., & Wu, C. (2012) Goal setting and student achievement: a longitudinal Study. *The Modern Language Journa*l, 96 (ii), 153-169.

Naiman, N., M. Frohlick, H. H. Stern, &Todesco, A. (1978) *The good language learner*. Toranto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Negishi, M. Takada & Tono, Y. (2013) A progress report on the development of the CEFR-J in Galaczi, E.D. and Weir, C. J. (Eds) *Exploring Language Frameworks: Proceedings of the ALTE Kraków Conference July 2011*, Studies in Language Testing volume 36, Cambridge: UCLES/ Cambridge University Press, 135-163.

Noom-ura, S. (2013) English-teaching problems in Thailand and Thai teachers'
professional development needs. *English Language Teaching*. 6 (11), 139-147.

Nomnian, S. (2013) Review of English Language Basic Education Core Curriculum: Pedagogical Implications for Thai Primary Level Teachers of English. *Kasetsart Journal (Social Sciences)* 34, 583 – 589.

North, B. (2007) *The CEFR Common Reference Levels: validated reference points and local strategies* presented at The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and the development of language and policies: challenges and responsibilities organized by the Council of Europe Language Policy Division, Strasbourg, 6-8 February 2007.

North, B. (2008) *EAQUALS Bank of Descriptors – as Levels*. EAQUALS/ ALTE Portfolio Descriptor Revision Project. The European Association for Quality Language Services: Email: info@eaquals.org Internet: www.eaquals.org

North, B. (2014) *The CEFR in Practice 4.* Cambridge U.P: Cambridge.

North, B., Ortega, A., & Sheehan, S. (2010) *A Core Inventory for General English*. British Council: EAQUALS.

Office of the Basic Education Commission. (2008) *Basic education core curriculum B.E. 2551 (A. D. 2008)* Bangkok: Ministry of Education.

Office of the Education Council. (2009) *Proposals for the second decade of education reform*. Bangkok: Office of the Education Council.

Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. The Modern Language Journal, 78 (1), 12-28.

Pawapatcharaudom, R. (2007). *An investigation of Thai students' English language problems and their learning strategies in the international program at Mahidol University*. Bangkok: King Mongkut's University of Technology North Bangkok, 2007.

Pitsuwan, S (2014*) Dr. Surin Pitsuwan, Opening Keynote Speaker; Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages* (TESOL) International Convention *2014*, Portland, *Oregon*, USA.

Prapphal, K. (2003) English Proficiency of Thai Learners and Directions of English Teaching and Learning in Thailand. *Journal of English Studies*, 2003 - tci-thaijo.org

Prasongporn, P. (2017) *English Education at Primary level in Thailand*. Retrieved December 2017 from https://www.nier.go.jp/06_jigyou/symposium/i_sympo27/pdf/E03.pdf

Salamoura, A, & Saville, N. (2010) Exemplifying the CEFR: criterial features of written learner English from the English Profile Programme In I. Bartning and M. Marten (Eds) *Communicative Proficiency and Linguistic Development: Intersection between SLA and Language Testing Research: Eurosla Monograph Series 1* European Second Language Association pp. 101-132.

Stern, H. H. (1992) *Issues and Options in Language Teaching.* Oxford: OUP.

The Council of Europe. (2001) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Strasbourg: Language Policy Unit.

Thonginkam, N. (2003) failure of the English language education in Thailand. Galaxy,2 (1) 6-15.

Tono, Y. & Negishi, M. (2012) The CEFR-J: Adapting the CEFR for English language teaching in Japan. Framework & Language Portfolio (FLP) *SIG Newsletter*, 8 September 2012.

Trim, J.L. and Trim, J.L.M. (1980) *Systems Development in Adult Language Learning*: a European unit/credit system for modern language learning by adults / prepared for the Council of Europe. Council of Europe: Strasbourg.

van Ek, J.A. & Trim, J.L.M. (1990) *Threshold 1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waystage. (1990) https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Waystage_CUP.pdf

West, R. (2015) Keeping it in the family. *English Teaching Professsional*, 97.

Wiriyachitra, A. (2002). English-language teaching and learning in Thailand in this decade. *Thai TESOL Focus*, *15*(1), 4-9.

Appendix A

Global Scale

The global scale outlines ten levels that cover English learning relevant to Thai learners and users. The salient features are italicized.

Level	Descriptors
A1	The learner/user - *can recognize familiar vocabulary and basic expressions concerning himself/herself, his/her family, and immediate concrete surroundings.* - *can understand and respond to very simple expressions delivered very clearly and slowly, with some repetition and rephrasing on a predictable topic.* - can give basic personal information about himself/herself in short, simple words, phrases, or basic sentences. - can understand frequently-used routines and patterns spoken or written in simple words, phrases, short sentences, and instructions in very specific and familiar situations. - can use a very basic range of frequently-used words, short phrases, and expressions on everyday topics to communicate and describe personal information, colors, simple numbers, simple objects, routine activities, etc. - *has very basic and limited isolated words and uses short phrases concerning concrete everyday situations.*
A1+	The learner/user - can understand simple spoken English carefully articulated at a very slow speed with frequent, long pauses. - can understand very short, simple phrases or sentences in written English. - can identify familiar or very basic words or phrases in texts. - *can understand and respond to daily routine expressions provided that they are carefully articulated at a very slow speed with repetitions.* - *can describe people, familiar things, and places using basic verbs and common adjectives.* - *can write mostly very simple isolated words and phrases or sometimes sentences without connecting ideas using very limited vocabulary.* - *can guess the main idea of short spoken and written phrases and sentences on everyday, familiar topics.* - *can use very basic phrases and groups of ready-made expressions to communicate and describe personal information, routine activities, requests, etc.* - *has very limited vocabulary to communicate in routine situations.*
A2	The learner/user - can understand simple spoken English delivered clearly at a very slow speed with frequent pauses. - can understand very short, simple written English. - can construct the meaning of familiar texts. - can ask and answer simple questions and respond to simple statements on very familiar topics - *Can give a simple description or presentation of people, living or working conditions, daily routines, likes/dislikes using simple phases and sentences.* - *can write mostly simple sentences without connecting ideas using very limited vocabulary.* - can find the main idea of short spoken and written phrases and sentences on everyday topics. - can guess the meaning of unfamiliar words using simple clues, e.g. affixes and word roots. - *can deal with survival situations using a limited repertoire of basic language in predictable situations.* - *can use basic sentence patterns and groups of ready-made expressions to communicate and describe personal information, routine activities, requests, etc.* - *has adequate vocabulary to communicate in survival situations on familiar topics.*

Level	Descriptors
A2+	The learner/user - can understand simple spoken English delivered clearly at a slow speed. - can understand speech on everyday topics, containing daily life vocabulary and expressions. - can understand short, simple written English about everyday topics. - *can engage in structured, short conversations with adequate help of the other interlocutor.* - can produce written texts using simple sentences and simple connectors with limited vocabulary. - can find the main idea of short spoken and written texts on everyday topics. - can guess the meaning of unfamiliar words using contextual clues. - *can deal with everyday situations using a repertoire of basic language in predictable situations.* - *can use short everyday expressions to communicate and describe personal information, routine activities, requests, etc.* - *has sufficient vocabulary to communicate in routine, everyday situations on familiar topics.*
B1	The learner/user - can understand the main points of clear speech on a familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc., including short narratives**.** - can read factual texts on subjects related to his/her field and interest at a satisfactory level of comprehension. - *can exploit a wide range of simple language for conversations on familiar topics, express personal opinions and exchange information on topics that are familiar, of personal interest or pertinent to everyday life**.*** - *can write straightforward, connected texts on a range of familiar subjects within his/her field of interest, by linking a series of shorter discrete elements into a linear sequence.* - can understand key words and phrases in conversations and use them to follow the topic. - can guess the meaning of occasional unknown words from the context and deduce sentence meaning provided that the topic discussed is familiar. - *can work out how to communicate the main points he/she wants to get across in a range of contexts, limiting the message to what he/she can recall or find the means to express himself/herself though with some hesitation and circumlocutions on familiar topics.*
B1+	The learner/user - can understand straightforward speech on a range of subjects related to his/her field and personal interest, provided that the speech is clearly articulated with a generally familiar accent and at a speech rate. - can read and understand factual texts on subjects related to his/her field and interest, provided that the information given is exclusively or mainly offered explicitly. - *can communicate with some confidence on familiar routine and non-routine matters related to his/her interests and professional field, but may have some difficulty in expressing exactly what he or she would like to communicate.* - *can reasonably fluently sustain a straightforward description of a variety of familiar subjects within his/her field of interest, presenting them as a linear sequence of points.* - *can write straightforward connected texts on a range of familiar subjects within his/her field of interest and employ appropriate rhetorical organization.* - can make use of clues such as keywords, titles, illustrations, typographical devices (e.g. bolding, italicizing, paragraphing), pauses, tones of voice, discourse markers, and rhetorical and organizations to come up with the meaning of unfamiliar words, identify the main idea and supporting details of a particular text or speech on familiar topics, as well as distinguish facts from opinions. - *has a sufficient range of language to describe unpredictable situations, explain the main points in an idea or problem with reasonable precision and express thoughts on abstract or cultural topics such as music and films.*

Level	Overall Descriptors
B2	The learner/user - can understand the main ideas of complex speech on concrete and abstract topics including technical discussions in his/her field of specialization. - can read with a large degree of independence, using a dictionary and other reference sources selectively when necessary. - *can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with speakers quite possible and can take an active part in discussion on familiar contexts, accounting for and sustaining his/her views.* - *can write at length about topical issues, even though complex concepts may be oversimplified, and can correct many of his/her mistakes in the process.* - *can identify unfamiliar words from the context on topics related to his/her field and interest.* - *has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to his/her field and on most general topics. Can vary formulation to avoid frequent repetition, but lexical gaps can still cause hesitation and circumlocution.* - *has a sufficient range of language to be able to give clear descriptions, express viewpoints and develop arguments without much conspicuous searching for words, using some complex sentence forms to do so.*
B2+	The learner/user - can understand standard spoken language, live or broadcast, on both familiar and unfamiliar topics normally encountered in personal, social, academic or vocational life. - can read with a large degree of independence, adapting the style and speed of reading to different texts and purposes, and using appropriate reference sources selectively. - *can engage in extended conversation fluently, accurately, and effectively on a wide range of general, academic, vocational or leisure topics, as well as provide feedback and follow up on statements and inferences by other speakers.* - *can write clear, detailed texts on a variety of subjects related to his or her field of interest, synthesizing and evaluating information and arguments from a number of sources.* - can express himself/herself clearly and without much sign of having to restrict what he or she wants to say. - *has a good range of vocabulary for matters connected to his/her field and most general topic, to express himself/herself clearly and without much sign of having to restrict what he/she wants to say. Can formulate ideas in different ways to ensure people understand exactly what he/she means* - *has a good range of language to be able to give clear descriptions, express viewpoints and develop arguments without much conspicuous searching for words.*

Level	Overall Descriptors
C1	The learner/user - can understand both extended structured and not clearly structured speech stated at a normal or fast speed on abstract, complex, and unfamiliar topics related or not related to his/her field, and grasp main ideas, but details need to be occasionally checked if spoken with an unfamiliar accent, using colloquial expressions. - *can understand in detail a wide range of long and complex texts, related or not to his or her areas of specialty but with the need to reread some difficult parts.* - *can express himself/herself fluently and spontaneously, almost effortlessly, on most topics, both abstract and complex.* - *can express himself/herself with clarity and precision, relating to the addressee flexibly and effectively.* - is skilled at using contextual, grammatical, and lexical cues to infer attitude, mood, and intentions, and to anticipate what will come next. - *can select an appropriate phrase from a fluent repertoire of discourse functions to preface hi/hers from a broad range of language to express him/herself clearly, without having to restrict what he/she wants to say.* - *has a good command of a broad lexical repertoire allowing gaps to be readily overcome with circumlocutions; little obvious searching for expressions or avoidance strategies.* - *has a good command of idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms. Can select an appropriate formulation from a broad range of language to express him/herself clearly without having to restrict what he/she wants to say.*
C2	The learner/user - has no difficulty in understanding any kind of spoken language, whether live or broadcast, delivered at a fast natural speed. - *can understand and express ideas precisely and naturally on the full range of matters with reasonable accuracy, using a wide range of modification devices.* - *can understand authentic and connected speech which is lexically and structurally complicated, delivered at a natural pace.* - can understand all text types written in different genres, including narrative, descriptive, directive, expository, and argumentative. - *can draw implicit and explicit meanings from the text.* - *can appreciate literary works.* - *has a remarkable command of a very broad lexical repertoire, including idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms; shows awareness of different levels of meaning.* - *has a strong knowledge of grammatical elements and structures that can help enforce greater competence and confidence in spoken and written language.* - can express thoughts fluently and effectively using correct prosodic features of speech such as stress, rhythm, and intonation. - can use cohesive devices in a variety of organizational patterns in written language to produce coherent and cohesive texts.

Functions, Discourse Markers, Topics, Vocabulary Range, Grammar and their Exponents, and Micro-skills for Level A1

Functions	Exponents
Greetings and leave taking Asking how people are Saying sorry Asking for and giving personal information Understanding and using numbers in prices and telephone numbers Writing a greeting card Answering the phone Asking and answering simple questions Understanding simple instructions	**Greetings and leave taking** -Hello/Good morning/Good afternoon/ Good evening. -Fine. Thanks/Thank you. -Bye/Good bye. **Asking how people are** -How are you? **Saying sorry** -Sorry. -Excuse me. **Asking for and giving personal information** -What's your name? -How old are you? -What's your address? -My name is Jane. -I am a girl. -I am seven years old. -I live in Bangkok. **Understanding and using numbers in prices and telephone numbers** -It's five baht. -My telephone number is 02-2233758. **Writing a greeting card** -Happy birthday. **Answering the phone** -Jim speaking -Mum is not home. **Asking and answering simple questions** -Have you got a cat? Yes, (I have). -Is your mum at home? No, she isn't. -Do you want some milk? Yes, please. **Understanding simple instructions** -Draw a monkey. -Listen to the story.

Functions	Exponents
	-Look at the picture. -Read the story. -Write a word on the line. -Write yes or no.

Discourse Markers	Exponents
Coordinating conjunction to join words and phrases: "and" or "then"	**Coordinating conjunction to join words and phrases: "and" or "then"** -I like to run and jump. -I like ice cream and cake. -I go to school. Then I play with my friends.

Topics	Subtopics/Examples
Body Family Food Animals School Colors Home Numbers Everyday signs Time, days, and dates Everyday activities	**Body**: head, shoulder, etc. **Family:** brothers, sisters, parents, etc. **Food:** milk, ice cream, etc. **Animals:** dogs, a monkey, etc. **School:** a teacher, games at school, lectures, homework, etc. **Colors:** green, yellow, white, etc. **Home:** living room, pet, puppy, bedroom, etc. **Numbers:** five, seven, etc. **Everyday signs:** no parking; no smoking; keep left, etc. **Time, days, and dates**: 10 o'clock, Monday, January 5, etc. **Everyday activities:** playing in the garden, riding a bicycle in the park, going to the beach, watching TV, playing games, etc.

Grammars	Exponents
Present simple Present continuous Prepositions of place: behind, between, in, in front of, next to, on, under Preposition of time: in (the morning/the afternoon/the evening), at (night) Personal pronouns Demonstratives: this/that/these/those Possessive adjectives Common adjectives Simple questions and responses Simple instructions	**Present simple** -She is a teacher. -I am seven years old. -I like chicken. **Present continuous** -The boy is running. -He is standing. **Prepositions of place: behind, between, in, in front of, next to, on, under** -The monkey is in the room. -The cat is on the table. -He sits on the beach. **Preposition of time: in (the morning/the afternoon/the evening), at (night)** -I go to school in the morning. -I go home in the evening. -I sleep at night. **Personal pronouns** -Where is he/she/it? -Where are you/we/they? -Where am I? **Demonstratives: this/that/these/those** -What's this/that? -(This/That is) my house. -These flowers are white. **Possessive adjectives** -That is my book. -This is her cat. **Common adjectives** -The book is red. -She is happy. -He is big. **Simple questions and answers** -Are you happy? Yes, (I am). -What color is it? (It is) blue. -Do you like cake? No, (I don't.) -How old is he? (He's) two years old.

Grammars	Exponents
	-Where do you live? (I live) in Bangkok. **Simple instructions** -Draw a cat. -Listen to me. -Look at the picture. -Read the story. -Write a word next to the number. -Write yes or no.

Vocabulary Range	Exponents
Body Family Food Animals School Colors Home Clothes Familiar places Days of the week Months of the year Time and dates Numbers and prices Everyday activities	**Body:** arm, eye, ear, face, foot, hand, head, hair, leg, mouth, nose, shoulder, stomach, etc. **Family:** baby, brother, boy, girl, father (dad, daddy), grandmother, grandfather, mother (mum, mummy, mom, mommy), sister, etc. **Food:** apple, banana, bread, breakfast, cake, chicken, dinner, egg, fish, fruit, ice cream, lunch, mango, milk, orange, rice, water, sandwich, soup, etc. **Animals:** ant, bat, bird, cat, chicken, cow, dog, duck, elephant, horse, lion, monkey, mouse, pig, rabbit, tiger, etc. **School:** bag, board, book, classroom, desk, eraser (rubber), friend, pen, pencil, ruler, teacher, etc. **Colors:** black, blue, brown, gray (grey), green, orange, red, white, yellow, etc. **Home:** bath, bathroom, bed, bedroom, chair, clock, door, garden, house, kitchen, room, table, television, tree, wall, window, etc. **Clothes:** bag, dress, hat, shirt, shoe, skirt, sock, t-shirt, etc. **Familiar places:** beach, farm, garden, house, mountain, park, school, sea, shop, zoo, etc. **Days of the week:** Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday **Months of the year:** January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November, December

Vocabulary Range	Exponents
	Time and dates: afternoon, evening, midnight, morning, night, 9 o'clock, January 1, etc.
	Numbers and prices: 1-100, ten baht, etc.
	Everyday activities: buy, color, cry, dance, drink, eat, go, go shopping, have, have a picnic, have a shower, have breakfast, have dinner, have lunch, jump, look, paint, play, ride a bicycle, run, say, see, sleep, sing, sit, swim, stand, throw, walk, write, etc.

Micro-skills

Listening	Recognize very familiar vocabulary and basic expressions concerning myself, my family and immediate concrete surroundings.
	Understand very simple, isolated words and short simple sentences about familiar topics only when people speak very clearly and very slowly with some repetition and rephrasing.
	Understand the days of the week and months of the year.
	Understand times and dates.
	Understand numbers and prices.
	Understand basic greetings and leave taking.
	Understand simple personal questions when people speak very slowly and clearly.
	Understand basic instructions only when accompanied by gestures in familiar situations.
	Recognize flight numbers in short, clear and simple messages at international airports.
Speaking	Respond to very simple expressions of communication delivered very clearly and slowly with some repetition and rephrasing on a predictable topic.
	Respond to very simple direct questions about personal details using isolated words or short phrases if the other person speaks very slowly and clearly.
	Respond to very short, basic and clear instructions.
	Understand and repeat very simple phrases.
	Use basic greeting and leave taking expressions.
	Ask how people are.
	Ask for information about familiar concrete objects using very basic questions using isolated words and phrases. Answer short basic questions which are delivered clearly and slowly using some simple isolated words and phrases.
	Produce short simple answers responding to short simple questions based on pictures

	telling a short story.
	Use simple numbers in prices or telephone numbers in everyday conversations.
	Use simple phrases to buy things in shops where pointing or other gestures can support what is said.
	Give my name when answering the phone.
	Answer very short basic telephone expressions as well as very simple questions.
	Give basic personal information about myself in short, simple words, phrases or basic sentences.
	Describe myself and my family using short simple words, phrases or sentences.
	Name some simple words or very isolated phrases of very familiar objects.
	Describe where I live.
Reading	Recognize the letters of the English alphabet.
	Identify and understand short basic words, phrases and simple sentences about familiar objects and topics accompanied by pictures.
	Understand words and phrases on everyday signs.
	Understand very basic and familiar information in simple forms about personal details.
	Understand very simple familiar notices and instructions only when they are supported by pictures.
	Understand very short simple words and basic phrases conveying basic routine messages such as greeting cards.
Writing	Write the letters of the English alphabet.
	Spell my names and some short simple words.
	Recognize and copy simple words, phrases and short sentences from materials.
	Write very short simple phrases about myself and my family. Complete basic forms and write notes including times, dates, and places.
	Write one-word answers as a response to reading very short sentences.
	Write short simple words and phrases in a greeting card. Write notes including times, dates, and places.
	Complete basic forms with the most important information about myself and write the most basic personal information about myself.

Appendix C: FRELE-TH Word Family List

FRELE-TH Vocabulary Range

Level A1	Can use a very basic range of frequently-used words, short phrases and expressions on everyday topics to communicate and describe personal information, family, colors, simple numbers, simple objects, and routine activities. Has very basic and limited isolated words and short phrases concerning concrete everyday situations.
Level A1+	Can use very basic phrases and groups of ready-made expressions to communicate and describe personal information, routine activities, requests, etc. Has very limited vocabulary to communicate in routine situations
Level A2	Has adequate vocabulary to communicate in survival situations on familiar topics
Level A2+	Has adequate vocabulary to communicate in routine, everyday situations on familiar topics
Level B1	Has enough language to get by, with sufficient vocabulary to express himself/herself with some hesitation and circumlocutions on topics such as family, hobbies and interest, work, travel, and current events, but lexical limitations cause repetition and even difficulty with formulation at times.
Level B1+	Have a sufficient range of language to be able to give clear descriptions, express viewpoints and develop arguments without much conspicuous searching for words, using some complex sentence forms to do so.
Level B2	Have a sufficient range of vocabulary to vary formulation and avoid repetition when expressing himself/herself on matters connected to his/her field and on most general topics
Level B2+	Can express himself/herself clearly and without much sign of having to restrict what he or she wants to say.
Level C1	Has a good command of a broad lexical repertoire allowing gaps to be readily overcome with circumlocutions; little obvious searching for expressions or avoidance strategies. Good command of idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms.
Level C2	Has a remarkably good command of a very broad lexical repertoire including idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms; shows awareness of different levels of meaning.

Word Family	A1	A1+	A2	A2+	B1	B1+	B2	B2+	C1	C2
Angel						angel *nC* heavenly creature		angel *nC* good person	angelic *adj*	
anger/angry			angry *adj*	anger *nU*	anger *vT*	angrily *adv*				
Angle					rectangle *nC* triangle *nC*	angular *adj* rectangular *adj* triangular *adj*		angle *nC* approach		
Angler										angler *nC*
Anguish									anguish *nU*	
Animal	animal *nC*								animal *adj*	
anate/animation							animate *adj*	animation *nCU*	animated *adj*	
Ankle						ankle nc				
Anniversary							anniversary *nC*			
Announce			announce *vT*			announcement *nC*	announcer *nC*			
Annoy				annoy *v*	annoyed *adj* annoying *adj*				annoyance *nCU*	
Annual			annual *adj*				annually *adv*			
anonymous							anonymous *adj*	anonymously *adv*	anomymity *nU*	
Another	another *det, pron* one more	another *det, pron* a similar, different one		another *det, pron* in addition						
Answer	answer *vIT* reply, respond	answer *nCU*		answerphone *nC* see also @phone[1]				answering *adj*		
Ant		ant nC								

Kulaporn Hiranburana is an Assistant Professor and former Director of the Chulalongkorn University Language Institute (CULI), Thailand. She is at present a Senior Lecturer at Assumption University. Her areas of interest include discourse analysis, business communication, English at the workplace, testing and language assessment in English for specific purposes, and cross-cultural communication.

Pramarn Subphadoongchone is Deputy Director for Research at the Chulalongkorn University Language Institute (CULI). He read his PhD in Applied Linguistics and TESOL at the University of Leicester, UK and received training in language assessment at WestEd – San Francisco Summer Institute, USA and at Lancaster University, UK. He has taught EAP courses to undergraduate students and supervised postgraduate students in the MA/PhD programme in English as an International Language. His areas of research interest include language socialisation, critical literacies, text ethnography, teaching EAP/ESP, and epistemology and ontology in language assessment.

Supong Tangkiengsirisin is an Associate Professor in Applied Linguistics and Director of the Language Institute of Thammasat University. His research interests focus on second language writing, discourse analysis, genre-based analysis, and ESP.

Supakorn Phoocharoensil is Assistant Professor and Vice Director for Administrative Affairs (Prachan Campus) and Graduate Studies at Language Institute of Thammasat University. Having received his Bachelor's and Master's degrees in English from the Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, Dr. Phoocharoensil obtained his Ph.D. in English as an International Language from Chulalongkorn University. He is currently teaching various undergraduate courses in English for Specific Purposes, as well as MA. and Ph.D. courses in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. His areas of research interest include second language acquisition, interlanguage syntax and pragmatics, English collocations and formulaic language, linking adverbials, and corpus linguistics. He had his research articles published in a number of international peer-reviewed journals, e.g. The Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics, The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, The International Journal of Communication and Linguistic Studies etc.

Jaroon Gainey graduated with a Bachelor's degree majoring in English and a Master's degree in Linguistics from the Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University. Currently, she is an Assistant Professor at Chulalongkorn University Language Institute. Her academic interests lie in teaching English and linguistics.

Juthamas Thongsongsee has been teaching English at the Chulalongkorn University Language Institute (CULI) for over 15 years. She has extensive experiences in teaching both general English and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) for Chulalongkorn University students and general public. She obtained a B.Sc. in Nursing from the Police Nursing College, an M.A. in Applied Linguistics from Mahidol University, and an M.Ed. from The University of Melbourne, Australia. She holds a doctorate in TESOL &

Applied Linguistics from Bristol University, UK. She specializes in teaching ESP particularly in medical and science disciplines, material development, and teacher training. Her research interests lie in ESP, teacher identity, professional development, programme evaluation and intercultural communication.

Piyaboot Sumonsriworakun received his Master of Arts in English from Chulalongkorn University. His areas of interest lie in second language acquisition (SLA), teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL), corpus linguistics, sociolinguistics, phonetics, and phonology. Currently, he is a full-time lecturer in the Division of English for Science and Technology at Chulalongkorn University Language Institute (CULI), where he teaches a variety of courses such as Experiential English, English for Academic Purposes (EAP) (Architecture), and English for Veterinary Profession.

Monnipha Somphong is currently a full-time lecturer at the Language Institute Thammasat University. She earned Bachelor of Arts (First Class Honours) and Master of Arts degrees in English from Chulalongkorn University and graduated with a Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Sydney. Her research interests include the areas of error analysis, English grammar learning, and teaching English reading comprehension.

Pattama Sappapan is an instructor at the Language Institute, Thammasat University. She holds a Ph. D. in Linguistics from the University of Wales, U.K. Apart from the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, her academic interests include autonomous learning, reading strategies, reading strategies, as well as other related fields in ELT.

Pimsiri Taylor is a faculty member at the Language Institute, Thammasat University. She holds a doctorate of education from the University of Nottingham where she specializes in adult language teaching and learning. Dr. Taylor has worked as an ELT practitioner in various settings, including both compulsory and post-compulsory education. Her research interests include English for specific purposes, English as a lingua franca, as well as teacher professional development. She is currently investigating the roles of English and internationalization in higher education in the ASEAN context.