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In analyzing and studying contemporary policy issues, important historical and political context is often ignored. Actually, there have been four major periods of educational reform in Thailand, the evolution of which are described and analyzed in this paper. This paper is based on having had the experience of...
working on educational issues in Thailand over the past five decades, with direct involvement in reform activities during the second and fourth phases described in the study. The paper includes an analysis of educational reform during each of these four historical periods, with the primary emphasis being on the current period of reform, inspired by the 1997 Constitution and the 1999 National Education Act.

The methodology for the paper involves the use of multiple research methods, drawing upon extensive and diverse research resources in both Thai and English concerning the evolution of education and educational reform in Thailand and participation observation by the researcher during his more than 10 years of doing fieldwork in Thailand. Both qualitative and quantitative data are utilized in assessing the status of reform program progress.

The paper is interdisciplinary in its approach focusing on the complex relationships among economics, politics, culture and implementation of educational reform. A recent symposium at Harvard University, synthesized in the book edited by Harrison and Huntington (2000), Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress postulates the importance of culture in promoting progress and reform. Both Thai culture in general and political culture in particular have had an important impact on the implementation of educational reform in Thailand.

The paper concludes with an assessment of the future prospects for continued implementation of the current educational reform initiative in Thailand, emphasizing Thailand’s remarkable capability of being eclectic and selective in its attempt to balance the global with the local (see Friedman 2000). Major
human resource development issues facing Thailand are summarized and current challenges facing educational reform in Thailand are identified.

Traditional Thai Education (Prior to Reform Eras)

Thailand has a long tradition of literacy and education dating back centuries, primarily as the result of the Sangha (Buddhist order). Young men could spend time at Buddhist monasteries and in the process could study both Thai and Pali, the language of Theravada Buddhism. The complex and logical Thai writing script dates back to 1292. Thus, the widespread presence of monasteries and learned monks created an important traditional system of education in ancient Siam. The epigraph at the beginning of this paper indicates the remarkably progressive nature of Buddhist epistemology (see Thomson 2000). Keith Watson (1980: 69-70) provides an apt description of traditional Siamese education:

The Buddhist monks were expected to be adept at Pali grammar, fine arts, law, medicine, astronomy and arithmetic. They regarded reading and writing and the provision of knowledge to others as a religious act, a form of merit making. Whereas parents gave life, monks imparted a way of life and knowledge which made that life worth living. Both teaching and learning were therefore social and religious assets. Accordingly wherever the monks settled and
establish monasteries, they also established schools. As in Ceylon, the Buddhist monasteries in Siam became centers of learning and culture, and bikkhus had to master all subjects that had to be taught to everyone from prince down to peasant.

**Educational Reform, Phase I, 1868-1910: The Fifth Reign, the Visionary Reforms of King Chulalongkorn (King Rama V)**

Once they have acquired a literate education, goodness, beauty and prosperity will be with them to the end of their days.

From 1871 decree of King Chulalongkorn (Wyatt 1969: 67).

King Chulalongkorn, the fifth king the Chakri Dynasty, ruled Siam from 1868-1910. The quotation from the King’s decree indicated above demonstrates the King’s visionary and progressive view of education. He recognized that human resource development is critical to a nation’s economic success and prosperity; that education needed to have an important moral dimension; and finally that there was an important element of creativity and aesthetics also as an important element in education. This decree was also visionary in that it spoke directly to the issue of standards.
His visionary leadership resulted in reforms that transformed Siam from a traditional into a modernizing society that eventually became modern Thailand. Central to his major reforms was the creation in Siam of a modern educational system with the capability to serve the entire Kingdom. The King frequently relied on his brothers to assist him in carrying out key reforms. There was often resistance to reform among older and conservative factions within the royal system. Among his brothers who played a key role in both administrative and educational reform was his younger half-brother, Prince Damrong Rajanubhab. Prince Damrong served as Director of Public Instruction from 1880 to 1892 and later was Minister of Interior. He also authored an important paper titled “Opinions on Education” which influenced the monarch. This important paper also anticipated the education for all thrust of the current reform movement.

It is important to note that King Chulalongkorn early on, even before his first trip abroad, was committed to creating a modern-type school system in Siam (Wyatt 1969: 65). Professor Wyatt aptly states a major rationale for his commitment to such reform:

If the Thai did not reform and innovate, they knew that they stood little chance of maintaining their independence and their identity. (Wyatt 1969: 379).

Education was seen as important in training individuals to staff the various ministries associated with the creation of Siam’s modern administrative system.
Also, over 100 years ago, there was already awareness of Siam’s central location in Asia and Southeast Asia, in terms of trade and commerce. Thus, there was the need to have individuals with skills in both commerce and English.

During the early phase of the modernization of Thai education there was some important innovations and policies related to bilingual education. One of the first schools (Suankularb) anticipated modern immersion schools by providing half a day’s instruction in Thai and a half a day in English. Eventually, the policy became that English could only be taught after a student had completed their primary education in Thai.

Interestingly elements of the educational policy debates and discourse mirror during the reform period of King Rama V mirror contemporary concerns and issues. There was the issue of the over concentration of educational resources in the Bangkok area and how to provide quality educational services to the more remote areas. For example, in 1911, 71 percent of school-age boys had access to education in Chantaburi Province, a rich-resource province in the nearby Southeast, while access rates in the remote Northeast, Udorn, were only 13% and 9% in Pattani in the remote South (Wyatt 1969: 374). There was also the complex issue of how to finance education across the country. Prince Damrong, for example, opposed a local education tax, and wanted to have all monasteries become schools.

The reforms of King Chulalongkorn and Prince Damrong had a triadic dimension requiring the collaboration of the Ministry of Public Instruction, the Ministry of Interior (because of its role in promoting education in rural areas, being responsible for provincial education after 1909), and the Buddhist Sangha, with its monasteries and monks. Interestingly the current reforms involve on October 1 of this year, the merging of the Ministry of University Affairs, the Ministry of Education, and the Office of the National Education Commission.
Another complex issue was that of modernization versus Westernization. By 1898 King Chulalongkorn realized that educational modernization could be achieved without adversely affecting Siamese identity and eventually could serve to strengthen national identity and solidarity in ways responsive to both local traditions and to the challenges presented by the West (Wyatt 1969: 384). With remarkable prescience, the king was addressing precisely the key issue addressed by a major recent symposium at Harvard summarized in an anthology titled, *Culture Matters* (Harrison and Huntington 2000). With respect to the issue of modernization versus Westernization, it is fascinating to compare the reform strategies of King Rama V in Siam and the Meiji Emperor in Japan (see Keene 2002).

In terms of the accomplishments and legacy of the King, eventually modern education became a reality throughout the Kingdom of Siam. By 1911, 29 percent of the male age group were receiving education. By the year 1935, modern education had been extended to every commune of the Kingdom (Wyatt 1969: 373).

In reflecting on King Chulalongkorn and his educational reform, the Cornell historian Wyatt (1969: 385) aptly describes the King’s heroic leadership:

If there is a single thread running consistently through this long period, it is the insistent presence of the king, who was his country’s most devastating critic, its gadfly prophet, its guiding spirit through a revolutionary epoch in world history.
He was in Sidney Hook’s phrase, an event-making man,’ who took his generation and country by the ear and flung them outward into the world. His rare understanding of both what it meant to be modern and what it meant to be Thai and the skill with which he manipulated the power at his command meant for his country the preservation of its independence and the creative shaping of its modern identity. Many kings have been remembered for less; few could be thanked by their country for more.

To conclude, King Chulalongkorn (Rama V) was a great and visionary reformer whose policies transformed traditional Siamese education into a modern secular system.

Education Reform, Phase II, 1973-1980: The Student “Revolution” and Its Aftermath

Background on Thailand and its Politics

Prior to 1939 and from 1945-1949, Thailand was known as Siam. Siam was one of the few developing countries never to have been colonized. A first major turning point in Thai politics was in June, 1932, when the absolute monarchy was transformed into a constitutional monarchy. Though Thailand was ostensibly a “democracy” from 1932 to 1973, in fact the Thai military for much of this period dominated Thai politics frequently in an authoritarian manner. Civilian leaders were often deposed by military coups d’état. The three major Thai political leaders during this period of military dominance were Field Marshall Plaek

During Thanom’s rule, gatherings of more than five individuals for discussions of politics were prohibited, reflective of his government’s repressiveness. The early seventies saw the beginnings of Thai student political activism with the growth in power and influence of the National Student Centre of Thailand (NSTC). The concentration of many of Thailand’s leading universities in one city, Bangkok, facilitated the mobilization efforts of the NSTC.

An Account of the Actual Events of October, 1973

The spark which ignited the October student uprising was the arrest on October 6 of student leader Thirayudh Boonme and 10 other activists for distributing leaflets urging early promulgation of a permanent constitution. The students were accused of being engaged in a plot to overthrow the government. Three days later on October 9, approximately 2,000 students gathered at Thammasat University for a Hyde Park style rally to attack the government. The government in response offered to grant bail to the arrested students, but the NSTC and student demonstrators demanded the unconditional release of the students. By October 13, the demonstrations had dramatically escalated with approximately 80,000 protesters completely packing Rajdamnern Avenue from end to end. Much in evidence among protestors were the Thai flag and pictures of their beloved majesties, the King and Queen.
On early Sunday morning, October 14 (5:30 am), the government announced that the student detainees were being unconditionally released and that a new constitution would be promulgated within a year. However, by this point, the demonstrations had continued to escalate dramatically. By 6:30 am, a series of tear gas explosions sparked an escalation of violent confrontation between the demonstrators and the Thai police and military with hundreds of innocent people and demonstrators being killed. Many buses were hijacked and key buildings such as the National Lottery and Revenue Department were burned down. This was the biggest demonstration in Thai history and the violence involved was unprecedented. Also, students were joined in their protests by thousands in all walks of life. Prior to this critical incident, Thailand had been famous for peaceful coups d’état.

After a meeting with the King, the three military leaders (popularly known as the “three tyrants”) agreed to tender the resignation of their government. At 19:15 the King announced that Professor Sanya Thammasakdi would be the new prime minister of an interim government in a transition to genuine democracy. On the next day, October 15, it was announced that the three military leaders (Field Marshall Thanom Kittikachorn, Field Marshall Praphat Charusathien, and Colonel Narong Kittikachorn (son of Thanom)) had gone into exile. With their departure the mood dramatically changed. People from all sectors of society volunteered to help clear away all the debris in Bangkok.

Political and Educational Implications of the October Uprising
This critical incident in October, 1973, along with the political changes introduced in 1932 (see Charnvit 2000), are the two most pivotal incidents in modern Thai political history of the 20th century. There is debate as to whether the 1973 incident should be called a student revolution or perhaps more appropriately an uprising (see Charnvit and Thamrongsak 1998). Did it fundamentally change the course of the future of Thai politics? Certainly the immediate changes in the period, 1973-1976 were dramatic in moving Thailand toward genuine democracy and paving the way toward the 1997 Constitution, the most democratic and politically progressive in Thai history (Klein 1998).

Immediately in the aftermath of the October student uprising, a major educational reform movement emerged (see Sippanondha, et al. 1974; MOE 1973). Among key leaders of this reform were Thai educators such as Dr. Sippanondha Ketudat, Dr. Ekavidaya Na Thalang, the late Dr. Kaw Swasdipanich, and the late Dr. Kowit Vorapipatana (see Oonta 1985: 10-16). Key elements of the reform can be described as follows:

- The need for unity in the administration and management of education. At the time, the Ministry of Interior (MOI) was responsible for most primary education (all that outside Bangkok); the Ministry of Education was responsible for most secondary education; and the Ministry of University Affairs was responsible for tertiary education. This resulted in administrative inefficiencies and redundancies. There were also criticisms of the MOI’s handling of rural primary education. Eventually through the leadership of Dr.
Sippanondha the unity of primary and secondary education was achieved when the MOE was given responsibility for rural primary education and the Office of the National Primary Education Commission (ONPEC) was established.

- The need to address issues of inequity and inequality in the Thai educational system. The cry for greater social justice was certainly a major motif of the student uprising. Following 1973, there was much greater awareness of major inequalities and inequities in Thai society and the educational system.

- The need to have a more open and relevant curriculum. The previous curriculum under the military dictatorship had been rigid and restrictive. The 1973-1976 democratic era (see Morell and Chai-anan 1981), was a golden era in terms of freedom of expression and gave great impetus to the local Thai venacular publishing industry. As a result of such changes, a novel such as Letters from China (Botan 1982) could be used in the classroom as basis for discussing subtle and complex intercultural relations between Thais and Sino-Thais. There was also an outpouring of leftist Marxist type writings which proved threatening to the right wing elements in Thai politics (see Chit 1998).

- There was increasing attention to the need for policy research and related data to inform educational decision-making (see
Sippanondha and Fry 1981; Fry and Rung 1982). With support from external agencies such as the Ford Foundation, the Thai educational research data base, particularly related to issues of inequality and inequity, was greatly enhanced.

Interestingly the October 14 uprising remains an issue even today. The Thai Ministry of Education in 2001 commissioned one of Thailand’s leading poets, Naowarat Pongpaiboon, to write an account of the students’ revolution and its aftermath to be titled “The October 14, 1973 Incident” so that Thai students will have a chance to study this important part of their modern political history. Ironically, one of the editors for the publication is Dr. Suvit Yodmani, son-in-law of Field Marshall Thanom, and he strongly objects to alleged inaccuracies and distortions in the draft of the book. Thus, the publication of the book has been delayed.


In the early and mid-90s, another attempt at educational reform emphasized Thailand’s need to adapt to the challenges of globalization and internationalization. By the early ‘90s the Thai economy was becoming increasingly internationalized. During this period there were even intense debates about the proper Thai word for “globalization” (see Chai-anan 1994; Wirat 1998). The basic premise was that for Thailand to be internationally competitive, it needed to internationalize its educational system to prepare its young people for an increasingly intercultural global era. With Thailand’s economic success, it also even became a new “donor country” able to provide educational assistance to neighbors such as Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, and
Myanmar as part of its globalization thrust. The Thai corporate sector, with its expanded international scope was certainly supportive of this new initiative. The Thai Farmers Bank, for example, supported a Commission on Thailand’s Education in the Ear of Globalization, which published in 1996 a report titled Thai Education in the Era of Globalization: Vision of a Learning Society. This Commission was chaired by Dr. Sippanondha Ketudat, who had been earlier actively involved with the educational reforms of the 1970s. The Commission was comprised of a who’s who of prominent Thai educators, intellectuals, and philanthropists. Key motifs of the Commission’s reform agenda were:

- Movement toward a learning society.
- Reform of learning
- Increased diversity of educational options
- Enhanced skills and knowledge of the labor force to strengthen international competitiveness.
- Reform of the educational management system
- Decentralization
- Enhanced private sector role in education
- Reform of higher education
- Quality assurance
- Mobilizing greater resources in support of education
Actually many of these themes are also present in the current reform initiative. The following statement in the Commission report (1996: 36) stresses the need for an integrated holistic approach to realize educational reform:

Education reform in Thailand will require a genuine sense of commitment and a true spirit of collaboration among concerned parties. It requires a considerable amount of untiring effort on the part of parents and families as the core closest to child rearing and development; of teachers and schools as the group that could systematically influence a child’s behavior and ability; of community and local religious leaders as the forerunners in pioneering grassroots educational initiatives; of businessmen, industrialists and the private sectors as the segment with sufficient intellectual, experiential, and financial resources to become a new partner in education; of mass media agencies as the social institution most capable of raising public awareness toward educational issues; and of the government sector as the organization most important in accelerating the reform process. It is cooperation, management skills and concerted efforts among these sectors that will determine the future of Thai children.... And the future of Thai society in becoming a truly learning society.

The current “international education boom” in Thailand

Reflective of the Commission’s emphasis on Thailand’s globalization and internationalization context, the past decade has seen a dramatic international education boom despite the Asian economic crisis of 1997. In fact, ironically the crisis may have contributed to the boom, as more Thai students chose the less expensive option of getting an international education in Thailand itself. M.L. Pairyada Diskul, chairperson of the International Schools Association of Thailand has stated that at least 75 billion baht a year is spent on overseas studies by Thai students There are currently 58 international
schools registered in Thailand and 64 new operators have sought licenses from the Office of the Private Education Commission to open international schools this year (Srisamorn 2002: 1). Jennifer Sharples and Colin De’ Ath (1997) wrote a book focused entirely on describing international schools in Thailand.

The internationalization of higher education is another important development. Mahidol University, for example, back in the late ‘80s opened an English-language International College (college within a college concept). Enrollments for that college have dramatically increased over time. Other prestigious public universities such as Chulalongkorn, Thammasat, Kasetsart, and Chiang Mai (see Tomita, et al. 2000) have established regional international programs to serve both Thai students who want an international education, but also students from the region. Assumption University, one of Thailand’s major private universities and its first English language university, under the dynamic leadership of Dr. Brother Prathip Martin Komolmas, has opened a new state-of-the-art world class campus at Bangna in the southeastern area of Bangkok. Assumption attracts students from around the region and world. 70 percent of its graduate students are international. Another notable English language emphasizing science, technology, and management is the Asian University of Science and Technology located in the eastern seaboard region. Thailand is also home to the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT), a major quality international technology and science oriented university, frequently referred to as the “MIT of Asia.” Clearly Thailand has the potential for becoming a major regional hub for international education.

**Education Reform, Phase IV, 1997-present: Crisis as Opportunity**

Thailand’s current educational reform initiatives stem from the shock of the Asian economic crisis and subsequent political reforms such as the new October 1997 Constitution, which mandated educational reform and decentralization. Thus, Thailand as part of its strategic path to economic recovery, initiated new education sector reforms, which are currently being implemented.

The Asian economic crisis, which had its inception with the floating of the Thai baht on July 2, 1997, interestingly inspired a move toward genuine democracy in Thailand. A new constitution, Thailand’s most democratic ever, was approved in October, 1997, by a government beleaguered by the economic crisis (see Klein 1998; Parichart et al. 1998; Thanet; Likhit 1992). Despite granting the new constitution, the government of General Chaovalit Yongchaiyudh fell in December, 1997. Both educational reform and decentralization were
mandated by the new constitution. Thus, Thailand as part of its strategic path to economic recovery, initiated a new education reform initiative, which is a major focus of this paper.

In the education sector, the reform movement currently under way is the most comprehensive and far-reaching in Thailand’s recent history. Problems relating to equity, quality and financing have long been recognized as plaguing the education system. But until recently, policy proposals had been confined to specific issues, and reform has been perfunctory at best. With the drafting of the new National Education Act (1999), there is a shift in philosophical underpinning which calls for a major overhaul of the education system.

The current economic crisis compounds the urgency of reform, and indeed, and reform of the education system is critically vital for Thailand’s long-term recovery.

Thailand’s Changing Economic Landscape

It is important to recognize the nature of Thailand’s changing economic landscape as background for assessing the current educational reform initiative. Professor Sirilaksana Khoman (1998), former Dean of the Faculty of Economics at Thammasat University has written extensively about both the economic crisis and important structural changes in the Thai economy (see also Pasuk and Baker 1998). Table 1 provides basic current data related to the changing economic landscape.

The alarming slump in Thai export performance which actually immediately preceded the economic crisis led to a careful reassessment of Thailand’s international competitiveness. Krugman’s (1994) powerful message that the key
to a country’s standard of living is crucially dependent on the productivity of its labor force is being increasingly recognized by Thai policy makers. It is hard for Thailand to compete with neighbors such as Bangladesh, Cambodia, Vietnam, and China with much lower labor costs in traditional industries such as textiles. Of particular concern is the need to have a larger percentage of high quality secondary graduates to enable Thailand to be able to move up the industrial scale in terms of producing higher value-added products.

The economic crisis also promoted some fundamental rethinking of Thailand’s past development style which had featured conspicuous luxury consumption of expensive foreign imports as part of a increasingly influential materialistic “prestige society.” His Majesty King Bhumibol has called for greater self-reliance and frugality. In a major speech on December 5, 1997, several months after the outbreak of the crisis, he proposed his philosophy and ideal of “setakit popieng” (the “economics of having enough”), emphasizing a Thai Buddhist form of “voluntary simplicity” (H.M. King Bhumibol 1997). The Crown Princess, H.R.H. Maha Chakri Sirindhorn, has called for looking back in history to the example of King Chulalongkorn and his creativity in dealing with the daunting crises of his time (Anuraj 1997: 3). The well-known social critic and intellectual, Dr. Prawes Wasee (1998a) has recommended a number of measures to shift Thailand’s development strategy to become more balanced, with an emphasis on social and spiritual development, and environmental and cultural preservation.

Table 1: Key Economic Indicators: Thailand’s New Economic Landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Indicator</th>
<th>Kingdom of Thailand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>62.6 million (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density</td>
<td>120 people per sq. km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP (PPP)* US $ billions</td>
<td>413 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita (PPP)</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% urban</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% rural</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of economy industrial</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of economy agricultural</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of economy service</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of exports (X)</td>
<td>$68.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of imports (M)</td>
<td>$61.8 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports/Imports</td>
<td>110.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X+M)/GDP (non-PPP)</td>
<td>101% of GDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini coefficient for income distribution**</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of poverty</td>
<td>14% (8.7 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of informal economy***</td>
<td>Huge, but unmeasured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data are normally for 2000 unless otherwise noted.

*PPP denotes Purchasing Power Parity, which adjusts GDP, based on differential costs of living in various countries. This measure is considered a more reliable indicator of a country's economic situation and status.

**The Gini coefficient measure's inequality of income distribution. Its value ranges from 0 (perfect equality) to 100 (perfect inequality).

***It has been estimated that the Thai informal economy is extremely large. Thus, the formal official statistics significantly underestimate the real size of the Thai economy (see de Soto 1990).
Rationale for the Current Reform

Rie Atagi (2002) in her consulting report to ONEC and the ADB on major policy issues related to educational reform indicates that Thailand is not obtaining an adequate return for its investments in education. Basically she argues that despite Thailand’s relatively high percent of government budget spent annually on education, Thailand lags behind internationally on many major indicators of educational quality and human resource development. I have synthesized and complemented her data in Table 2:

Table 2: Thailand’s International Ranking on Various Indictors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Indicator</th>
<th>Thailand’s ranking</th>
<th>Number of countries ranked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of national budget spent on education</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International competitiveness</td>
<td>#33</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>#50</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of government</td>
<td>#39</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic capability</td>
<td>#15</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector efficiency</td>
<td>#44</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic infrastructure</td>
<td>#40</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational capability</td>
<td>#44</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic competitiveness</td>
<td>#38</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness in Science and Technology</td>
<td>#39</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness in Management</td>
<td>#40</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor competitiveness</td>
<td>#48</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projected economic growth for 2003 | #13 | 13 countries in the region
---|---|---
Rank in International Science Achievement (TIMSS) 1999 | #25 | 38
Rank in International Mathematics Achievement (TIMSS) 1999 | #27 | 38
Public Institutions Index Rank | #42 | 58
Integrity of Legal System | #8 | 9 countries of Asia-Pacific region
Corruption Perceptions Index | #64 | 85


**Major Current Educational Problem Areas**

To enhance its quality of life and standard of living a nation must improve the productivity of its people. The primary means for doing this are education and human resource development broadly defined. During the period, 1960-
1990, the productivity of the Japanese people increased dramatically, primarily as the result of having a quality K-12 basic educational system that ensured that nearly all Japanese had a good solid educational foundation, giving them solid potential for trainability. Indicated below are the major issues and challenges currently facing education and human resource development in Thailand:

- **Lack of unity and coordination of diverse and fragmented Education/HRD efforts**

  Human resource development and education in Thailand remain fragmented with a multitude of institutions and organizations involved, with little overall coordination. Dr. Rie Atagi (2002), for example, identifies 11 different pilot projects currently being conducted related to learning reform, ICT in education, and the decentralization of educational administration and management. Her list is not exhaustive, as there are also numerous other important pilot projects going. No single agency has responsibility for coordinating these diverse pilot projects.

- **The problem of overcentralization, particularly in the areas of budget and personnel**

  Too much of the Thai educational budget is spent on a highly centralized bureaucracy.
  The Thai Ministry in Bangkok is significantly larger than Monbusho in Tokyo or China’s central educational agency, even though it is serving far fewer students. There over 400 individuals with doctorates working at the Ministry in Bangkok.
• **Persistent of traditional learning modes**

Though many Thai teachers and educators have adopted progressive, innovative teaching approaches emphasizing active learning (for example, Rung Aroon School), still many students learn by traditional methods emphasizing memory and passive learning that is teacher-centered. Several years ago, Dr. Manthana Sangkhakrit, currently a Deputy Education Permanent Secretary of the MOE, organized a conference that enabled school children to have a voice in reflecting on their educational experiences. Many children were amazingly candid in assessing and criticizing the educational system. The following recent quotation from a fourth grade student reflects the persisting problem of persisting traditional learning modes:

Students should enjoy studying and have fun at school. I really agree with the idea that academic studies should go hand in hand with other activities. Going to school should not produce stress at home. I sometimes think school is teaching me to be a “tape recorder”. Many exams and lessons are based on memory. People know what they are studying but don't really know how to apply what they have learned to real life. Passing tests and getting good grades are the only things that concern them….It is time for a revolution in our education system. Old values should be replaced, or things will just be passed on as they are to the next generation.

May Sripatanaskul, Grade 10, Triam Udom Suksa School (*Bangkok Post*, July 6, 2001) (see also Archer 2001).

• **Neglect of science and related R & D development**

Given the changing nature of Thailand’s changing economic landscape discussed above, it is imperative that Thailand strengthen its R & D capability. The Royal Golden Jubilee
Persisting equity and access issues

The major progress in this area is the requirement of the Constitution and the NEA to make nine years of education compulsory and to guarantee 12 years of free education to all Thais. With the near achievement of universal primary education, the access and equity issue is now most pertinent at the secondary level where considerable regional disparities continue to exist. The northeast of Thailand, the most disadvantaged and the region with the largest population tends to lag significantly behind on all major socioeconomic indicators. Many schools in the most disadvantaged areas still face teacher shortages. The existence of extensive coaching schools for the elite in urban areas such as Bangkok further exacerbates educational regional disparities. Table 3 provides empirical data for several provinces from each major region of the country, indicating major disparities. Table 4, based on standardized examinations at the end of high school shows important regional disparities in academic achievement. Finally, in Table 5 there is a list of the groups most educationally disadvantaged, based on a recent book by H.R.H. Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn (2002).

Table 3: Regional Economic and Educational Disparities in Thailand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Province</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>GPP per capita (Baht)</th>
<th>Teacher to Classroom Ratio</th>
<th>Ratio of Advantage (Proxy for Educational Quality)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Bangkok Central 254,791 1.45 4.53
Chonburi Central 229,241 1.03 0.89
Phuket South 173,206 1.57 2.08
Phattalung South 29,442 1.16 1.33
Tak North 39,265 0.83 0.34
Mae Hong Son North 33,970 0.65 0.19
Buriram Northeast 22,805 0.96 0.37
Amnatcharoen Northeast 21,644 0.82 0.32

Source of data: Pocket Thailand in Figures 2001; Fry (1999a,b)
*This synthetic indicator is based on success on the standardized university entrance examination (For details on its calculation see Fry 1999a).

Table 4: Academic Achievement by Region (Last Year of High School)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percent of students needing improvement in English</th>
<th>Percent of students needing improvement in mathematics</th>
<th>Percent of students needing improvement in physics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (Central)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (South) Islamic region</td>
<td>29.3*</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>52.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. South</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. South</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Central</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>67.8*</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>%HA</td>
<td>%D</td>
<td>%N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Central</td>
<td>30.3*</td>
<td>72.5*</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. North</td>
<td>25.6*</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. North</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>62.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Northeast</td>
<td>25.6*</td>
<td>75.9*</td>
<td>53.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Northeast</td>
<td>34.9*</td>
<td>72.5*</td>
<td>52.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Northeast</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>75.7*</td>
<td>49.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. South</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lowest performing regions on the performance indicator.

Table 5: Those Most Disadvantaged Educationally in Thailand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Those in remote areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Those in poverty and without the financial resources to study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Those with mental disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Those with physical health problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Those with physical disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Orphans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Children of migrant labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Street children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Child labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Those of school age who are unable to study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Those incarcerated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Refugees or those without citizenship
13. Those illiterate in Thai
14. Those living in groups not supportive of education
15. Those “overly intelligent”

Source: H.R.H. Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn, Kaansygsaa khong Phu Doi Ogaat [Education of the Disadvantaged]

- **Overemphasis on bricks and mortar relative to investing in people (teacher learners; researchers)**

In her work on educational reform Atagi (2002: 23) mentions the large amount of funds devoted to new buildings and land. Dr. Silaporn Buasai of the Thailand Research Fund laments that in terms of funding for research "buildings and offices come first." The key to improving both national productivity and the quality of education is to give high priority to an investment in people, teacher learning, and creative innovative research.

- **Inadequate utilization of ICT for improving human resource development**

Friedman (2000) in his important work on globalization argues that those countries which do not adequately train their people for the new knowledge economy will be left behind and won't be able to compete effectively in the global economy. In Latin American under the visionary leadership of Figueres, Costa Rica developed a mandate to ensure that all secondary students in that country would have access to the Internet. With over 12,000 Thai schools having
receivers to utilize Thai-Com satellites, Thailand has great potential in this arena (see Sirin et al. 1999).

- **Inadequate development of international capabilities**

Many Thais are not adequately interconnected with the global knowledge system, largely because of language limitations. With Thailand’s rapidly increasing internationalization, Dr. Rung Kawedang (Gearing 2000: 220), emphasizes that it is important for Thais to become at least tri-lingual. It is also important to give greater attention to the teaching of regional languages such as Chinese, Japanese, and Vietnamese.

**Key Elements of the Current Reform Process**

The following are the key elements of the current reform process:

- **Provision of 12 years of free education (education for all) and 9 years of compulsory Education.** A voucher system will be used to implement the system of free education (Sirikul 2002), which will begin in October of this year.

- **Establishment of administrative unity and a re-engineering of the structure of**
the Ministry of Education. On October 1, the Ministry of Education, Ministry of University Affairs, and the Office of the National Education Commission will be merged into a single Ministry.

- Reform of higher education, providing public universities with autonomy in terms of both budget and governance.

- Decentralization of education, with the establishment of approximately 300 Local Education Areas (LEAs), with greater curricular, budget, and personnel authority at the local level.

- Emphasis on the utilization of local wisdom and knowledge.

- Promotion of the new student and learner-centered model of pedagogy, emphasizing active learning.

- Emphasis on a holistic approach to reform (whole system, whole school, whole teacher, and whole student) (see Figures 1 and 2).

- Promotion of national, master, and lead teachers as part of a growing network of
educational innovators in support of the new pedagogy.

- Approval of the system for issuing teacher licenses; transformation of the Teachers’ Council into the Teaching Profession Council

- Establishment of the Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment (ONESQA) as a public organization. ONESQA has the mandate to provide an external evaluation of all schools at all levels over the next six years.

- Promotion of innovative teacher-learning with an emphasis on site-based training.

- Greater and appropriate utilization of ICT to promote student and teacher learning.

- Emphasis on life-long learning.

- Emphasis on diversity of learning approaches and learning sources (all for education).

**Reflections, Concerns, and Challenges**

While there is clearly widespread support for the educational reform initiative at all levels of Thai society, there are still important pockets of resistance. There are those in public universities who feel threatened by a new system that may provide them less job security.
Some in higher education do not feel happy about coming under the same administrative structure as “lower level P-12” schools. Some students have already protested. They are rightly concerned that, for example, that these changes may mean that public universities will necessarily increase their tuition so that it more accurately reflects the cost of instruction. Since many students at selective Thai universities are from higher SES backgrounds, greater tuition at public universities would actually result in a more equitable system.

Within the Ministry of Education, there are some stakeholders whose personal interests are threatened by the restructuring of the Ministry and related decentralization initiatives.

There is also the issue of persisting inequalities and inequities with respect to providing quality education for all, including those in remote areas. Will there be a genuine commitment to target block grants, both as a means to provide genuine budgetary decentralization and to reduce regional disparities? Interestingly, in Latin America, Chile has sunk money into revitalizing its 900 worst primary schools (Rosenberg 2002: 31), thereby using the fruits of Chile’s growth to help the poor.

There is also the issue of an integrated approach to reform. Both Dr. Prawes Wasee (1998a) and Dr. Sippanondha Ketudat emphasize the critical need for genuine reform across many sectors (see Figure 3). Piecemeal reform can be inefficient and often can result in adverse unanticipated consequences.
Hargreaves and Fink (2000:3 cited in MacLean 2001: 191; cf. Astiz et al. 2002) present three key criteria for assessing the ultimate success of educational reform in a country:

- Does it have depth: does it improve important rather than superficial aspects of students’ learning and development?
- Does it have length or duration: can it be sustained over long periods of time instead of fizzling out after the first flush of innovation?
- Does it have breadth; can the reform be extended beyond a few schools, networks, or showcase initiatives to transform education across entire systems or nations?

These crucial questions pose major challenges facing the political and educational leadership of Thailand.
Figure 1: A Holistic Approach to Educational and Learning Reform

Figure 2: Pedagogy of the Whole Person: Software of the Mind
In its first reform era, King Chulalongkorn (Rama V) demonstrated dynamic leadership in overcoming crises facing Siam that enabled the nation to implement major reforms in many sectors, including education, that paved the way for the emergence of modern and independent Thailand. In the second reform era, Thai students displayed great courage as they put their lives on the line to create a more democratic and just Thai society. In the third reform era, Thailand made

**Conclusion**

In its first reform era, King Chulalongkorn (Rama V) demonstrated dynamic leadership in overcoming crises facing Siam that enabled the nation to implement major reforms in many sectors, including education, that paved the way for the emergence of modern and independent Thailand. In the second reform era, Thai students displayed great courage as they put their lives on the line to create a more democratic and just Thai society. In the third reform era, Thailand made
bold steps that has given it the potential to become a major regional hub for international education, an area in which Thailand appears to have an important comparative advantage. In the current fourth critical reform era the challenge is to implement the reforms expeditiously in accord with the Constitution and NEA so that all Thai children, the future of the country, will have the opportunity to realize fully their potential and creativity.
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http://www.kanchanapisek.or.th This is the Golden Jubilee Network Web-site with information on the various innovative projects of H.R.H. Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn

http://www.onec.go.th/english_ver/english_ver.htm This is the official English language version of the Web-site of the Office of the National Education Commission. It provides extensive information on Thai education and Thai educational reform.

http://www.moe.go.th/moe.html This is the official English language version of the Web-site of the Ministry of Education with extensive information on Thai education and the Ministry's activities and initiatives related to educational reform.

http://www.moe.go.th/nu/reform.htm This is the official Web-site of the Ministry of Education on educational reform in Thailand.