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ABSTRACT

In 1999 the Thai Government introduced wide-ranging educational changes through the National Education Act. One major reform involved instructional reform. This required changes in teaching styles from traditional rote learning to one closely supporting students' learning, or what can be termed a learner-centred approach.

This thesis investigates the implementation of this policy of instructional reform in Thai secondary schools. It addresses questions related to the policy implementation process, and the impacts of the policy at the school level.

This research derived data from two main sources: the Department of General Education (the governmental unit whose duty it is to oversee public secondary schools in Thailand), and two public secondary schools (one in Bangkok and the other in another province in central Thailand). To gain insights into the level of implementation three qualitative methods were employed. These included document analysis, school observation, and in-depth interviews.

Amidst some supportive elements and outcomes, it was found in this research that schools were left to implement the policy with inadequate support and complicated obstacles. Many teachers and school administrators had neither clear knowledge nor experience about how to initiate such a policy successfully and how to cope with problems created by the different approach to teaching. Although most policy people have goodwill towards the nation educational
situation, they did not understand all of the difficulties faced by the teachers implementing the policies in schools. Many teachers and administrators at the school level believed they were left alone encountering problems.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Recent years have witnessed rapid changes in many aspects of society. The world economy has been transformed and new skills are needed by society. Labour markets have changed. According to Carnoy (1995), the new labour markets require workers who are innovative, have good decision making skills, and an ability to handle job changes. There also is an increase of female workers and informal labour forces (Carnoy, 1995, p. 213).

Many nations have realised the ineffectiveness of their education systems in relation to changing societal needs. Each nation needs to develop its educational plan promptly to prepare suitable human capital for the new labour market. In response to this, there has been an emergence of national educational reform in many countries.

Thailand, a small country in southeastern Asia, (its profile is in Appendix A) is not an exception. The National Education Act was proclaimed in 1999. To achieve the necessary reforms, all aspects of education were targeted. Nine major reform targets were identified: key educational principles, rights of everyone to receive and provide basic education and the duty of parents and the state to provide that opportunity, the structure of the educational system, strategies for teaching and learning, administration and management of the educational sectors, the achievement of specified standards and quality assurance procedures, personnel management and development policies, improved educational
resources and investment, and the introduction of new educational technologies (Office of National Education Commission [ONEC], 2000a; Sub-committees on learning reform of the National Education Commission, 2000a, 2000b).

Connected to the need for a different workforce because of economic modernisation and social change, improvement of teaching and learning is at the heart of this education reform attempt, and is also the focus of this research. The major reforms to teaching and learning in The National Education Act called for the adoption of greater learner focused approaches in classrooms. In this study instructional and learning reform is studied in the context of public secondary schools, educational institutions that educate ninety percent of the youth of the nation (Sub-committees on learning reform of the National Education Commission, 2000a).

Secondary schools were chosen for this study as a result of their larger size and complexity because of curricular content (Bennett, 1992; Curtis-Rouse, 1994). These constraints often inhibit teachers and obstruct changes to their teaching styles.

This chapter explores the traditional education system and history of education reform in Thailand. In addition, it outlines the research questions, provides an overview of the research approach used in this study, introduces key Thai terms used in this thesis, and provides an overview of the structure of this thesis.
Before considering the recent change introduced in teaching and learning, an outline of the traditional education system is presented to provide readers with an understanding of the traditional Thai education system. Education in Thailand was informal system from the Sukhothai Period (AD.1238-1378), through the Ayuttaya Period for another four centuries, through to the initial Bangkok Period of the 19th century (Jumsai, 1951; Ministry of Education [MOE], 1998; and United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation [UNESCO],1998). Within this informal system, education existed on two levels: education provided by the Royal Institution of Instruction (Rajabundit), to princes and sons of nobles, normally taking place in palaces and private residences; and that provided by Buddhist monks to commoners, normally taking place in Buddhist temples. For girls, education was arranged at home and mostly involved housework knowledge. However, during this long period there were some minor developments. For example, during the reign of King Narai the Great in Ayutthaya period, the first textbook of the Thai language, the Chindamani, was written and used widely until approximately the end of the 19th century. Even in 1871 when the first westernised school was established in the palace for the elite class. This did not involve formal large-scale education changes. Education in the nation still remained as community education (Careonwongsak, 1996) that focused on writing, reading, and religion (UNESCO, 1998, p. 3).
In 1887, the Department of Education was established by King Rama V, making it the first formal centralised educational agency set up to oversee the kingdom's education and religious affairs. The establishment of the Department brought about a series of educational changes. From a decree regarding the organisation of provincial education in 1889, public schools were established in traditional monastic institutions where informal education had been provided for centuries and this was a significant turning point in the nation’s education system (UNESCO, 1998, p. 3), as the informal community education provision was replaced by formal governmental management. The establishment of schools in provinces is considered as the first education reform in this formal education system (Careonwongsak, 1996). Three years later, the Department became a full-fledged ministry. In 1898, the first educational plan was launched. In 1916, the first university, Chulalongkorn University, was established. In 1921, there was the proclamation of the Compulsory Primary Education Act. The Act required every child in the nation to study at least four years of primary school. Along with the change from a traditionally absolute monarchy to a constitutional monarchy system in 1932, the first National Education Scheme was devised whereby equity was emphasised. Then there was another major reform in 1960s when the National Education Development Plan was, for the first time, set up in relation to the National Economic and Social Development plan (Careonwongsak, 1996). The set up of the education plan referred to a significance of education for the nation’s economic and social development as it was the first obvious official planning of national human resource development through education in accordance with the nation’s economic and social development. The third major
reform occurred when the education system was divided into two sub-systems, formal education, and non-formal education (Careonwongsak, 1996). Formal education means education for students who are able to attend schools in the regular school system. Non-formal education is an education for less fortunate students who cannot complete their schooling in the regular school system. However, until now only the first reform of provincial educational institutes brought ‘real’ changes (Careonwongsak, 1996).

Despite these three reforms, the pedagogy in Thailand was largely unchanged. Traditionally, as in many Asian countries, the teaching method mainly used in classroom was rote learning requiring students to memorise words and phases from their textbooks without understanding. Until recently there was no nationwide discussion and calls for action for an alternative teaching method to optimise the learning capacity of Thai citizens for the changing world. The recent educational reforms advocated a learner-centred approach in which a teacher’s role changes from one of transmitting knowledge to learners to one of facilitating learners to construct knowledge for themselves (a further description of the term is discussed in detail in Chapter 4).

It was interesting to investigate how well and to what extent schools were able to manage themselves and assist teachers for to implement effectively the policy the reform, because schools themselves had been controlled by a bureaucracy for more than a century. As a result, this research focused on the impacts of the instructional reform policy implementation that required teachers to change their
teaching styles from distant rote learning to closely supporting students’ learning in Thai public secondary schools.

The research issues

In 1999 the Thai government introduced wide-ranging educational changes through the National Education Act. This thesis investigated the implementation of policy of instructional reform in Thai secondary schools. It addressed questions related to the policy implementation process and the impact of the policy at the school level.

A key question answered in this thesis was how secondary schools implemented the reforms. To get the answers about how the schools implemented the reforms, the following foci were used:

- Whether the schools experienced any factors impacting their implementation of the policy.

- How the school implementation was progressing.

To get the answers about the progress the implementation, two further issues were also raised:

- Which stage the schools had reached in their implementation.

- Whether there were any positive or negative outcomes.

In answering these questions it was also possible to determine:
• Whether schools’ implementation and situations were realised and understood by the central and provincial agencies or not.

• Whether there were differences in policy implementation between a school in Bangkok and in a rural province.

• How the desired instructional reforms were introduced to schools and to teachers.

• Whether teachers could change their pedagogy.

• Whether school administrators could facilitate their teachers for the change.

• How the implementation of instructional reform might be optimised.

*The application of Thai terms in this thesis*

There are two different frameworks for Thai terminology used in this thesis. One is the duplication from the original documents. These terms are already translated. They are presented in documents written in English. These terms are presented in this thesis as any English words (e.g. Sukhothai, Ayuttaya). The other framework is the transformation of the terms from Thai to English using the romanised phonetic system as in Appendix B. These terms are presented in italics such as Khruu Kaennam.
Terms used in this study

*Implementation* is used to indicate the undertaking of a plan or policy.

*Instructional reform* means to change teaching patterns from a limited traditional rote learning approach to a learner-centred approach.

*Learner-centred approach* is a composition of instructional and learning elements for learner-centred teaching and learning. These elements include several factors from school management to classroom level practice. Further details of the term is discussed in Chapter 4.

*Learner-centred teaching* is a pedagogy used in teaching and learning that can range from a constructivist approach to traditional approach depending on selection, adoption, and adaptation of individual teachers regarding factors contributing to individual student’s learning. In classroom observation, the researcher examined learner-centred approach not by considering teaching technique alone but by looking at overall setting of the class, as guided by APA’s fourteen learner-centred psychological principles. Further discussion on the definition of learner-centred and the guideline is presented in Chapter 4.

*Level of implementation* refers to the Ministry of Education 3As’: Awareness (A1), Attempt (A2), and Achievement (A3). In this study, *Awareness* is a measurement of the degree to which school staff, particularly teachers, acknowledge the existence of the instructional reform policy. This acknowledgement includes an ability to specify sources of information they use
to learn about a learner-centred approach. *Attempt* considers whether teachers try to use a learner-centred approach in classrooms. *Achievement* is a stage in which teachers demonstrate that they can apply the principles of learner-centred approach frequently and successfully in their teaching.

*Policy people* are persons in the Ministry of Education whose work deals with the formation of policy, plans and strategies. They may convey or reinterpret policy to the final implementers, the schools themselves. They range in authority from the Minister in the central agency to educators who work in the local agencies. These local agency educators include directors, supervisors, and planning officers.

*Public secondary schools* refer to government secondary schools. These schools are for students of *Mathayom 1* to *Mathayom 6*, the equivalent to Grade 7 to Grade 12 in the New South Wales education system.

*The central agency* refers to the Ministry of Education, Thailand.

*The central agencies* involves the central agency (the Ministry of Education), and the Office of National Education Commission (ONEC).

*The Department* refers to the Department of General Education, Ministry of Education, Thailand.

*The local level agencies* include the provincial agencies as well as *Sahawidthayaakhed* assigned by the Department of General Education, Ministry of Education.
Public secondary schools refer to government secondary schools of which staff are employed by the government. Also the government funds its administrative expenses.

Lower secondary level is Mathayom 1 to Mathayom 3, equivalent to Grade 7 to Grade 9 in the New South Wales education system.

Higher secondary level is Mathayom 4 to Mathayom 6, equivalent to Grade 10 to Grade 12 in the New South Wales education system.

School administrators are staff who conduct administrative work within a school including principals, assistant principals, and for some larger size schools, other administrative staff who have no teaching duty.

Principals are those who have the highest management authority in schools. At times they are referred to as school managers.

Assistant principals are those who have the second highest management authority in schools. In small schools, there are normally assistant principals for academic management and student disciplinary. In larger schools, these assistants work varies from administration, facility management, academic management to policy planning. In smaller schools some senior teachers take on additional administrative roles.
Thai terms used significantly in this research

Khruu Kaennam, translated as spearhead teachers, are teachers who are assigned by the Ministry of Education to amicably impart knowledge and mentor five other teachers in implementing the new teaching approach. Some of them are Khruu Haengchaad, and Khruu Tonbaeb.

Khruu Haengchaad, or teachers of the nation, are teachers who are honoured by the ONEC according to their superb practices as well as their innovative ideas in training and professional development (Office of Education Reform [OER], 2000, p. 148).

Khruu Tonbaeb, or master teachers, are teachers who honoured by the ONEC according to their superb learner-centred teaching approach and happily learning. By this, it means the approach comprises clear teaching procedure and can be an example to their peer teachers. They are required to amicably supervise their peers for four months (OER, 2000, p. 148).

Sahawidthayaakhed is a small selection of schools grouped by the Department of General Education. This educational zoning was applied for the purpose of not merely academic but also management assistance among its five or six member schools (Division of Policy and Planning, 2001, p. 12). Each school is expected to assist other schools in the implementation of new policies.
The research approach

This section introduces initial information about methodological approach used in this study. The information presented here includes four facets of the methodological approach: theoretical guidelines, methods, ethical considerations, and limitations. Further discussion of the methodology is presented in Chapter 5.

Theoretical guidelines

This research was guided by various theoretical approaches. Four approaches dominated: pragmatism, interpretivism, grounded theory, and case study. (Refer to G. Marshall (1998), Pragmatism refers to a theory that seeks truths through concrete experiences and languages rather than abstract philosophical system, and that use-value or outcomes determine truths. Interpretivism is a theory, which views that there is no sole social’s reality. Instead, social reality is unambiguous as individual interprets his/her own social reality based upon his/her own paradigm [Miles & Huberman, 1994]. Grounded theory is an inductive approach, which develops theory through systematic data gathering, and careful analysis rather than deductively setting an assumption then testing it. The definition is a mixture of definitions of G. Marshall [1998, p.265], and Strauss A. & Corbin, [1998].) Case study is defined in three ways: process of investigation that focuses on a particular bounded system or case, unit of study itself which is the case, or the research reports and outcomes that describe and analyse the case as a whole (Merriam, 1998, p. 27). These four approaches underlay the whole research process: the formulation of the research questions, the data collection, and the
data analysis. Whereas pragmatism was fundamental to the focus of the research (the research main inquiry, the expected findings, the analysis facets), interpretivism and grounded theory were involved with the method (processes of data collection, and data analysis).

In addition to pragmatism, three models of change and change implementation are utilised in the context of the research. They are the Interactive Factors Affecting Implementation of Fullan (1991), the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) of Hall and Hord (2001, 1987), and the model that integrated elements of both models. Further explanation of these models is presented in the Chapter 2.

Methods

This research obtained data from two main sources: the Department of General Education (in the Ministry of Education), and public secondary schools. Data collection in the Ministry did not involve sampling but was dependent upon the availability of policy personnel. On the contrary, the two schools were selected according to their locations. One was from a metropolitan area (Bangkok) and the other from a non-metropolitan area. The selection of these schools also was in accordance with the safety and convenience of the researcher and the school itself.

To gain insight of the implementers, three qualitative methods were employed. They included document analysis, school observation, and in-depth interviews. To gain comprehension to how the policy, the strategy to stimulate the school level implementation, and the information of school implementation were conveyed
from and to the central unit, ten of the Department of General Education’s policy people had in-depth interviews with the researcher. Five of these people were from its central unit, the other five policy staff worked in two provincial units. They also provided to this research policy documents. In the two schools, the researcher observed and collected documents from each school for a period of four weeks, and in the last week conducted in-depth interviews with two school administrators and five teachers. The application of these multi-methods and multi-informants also provided triangulation for the research validity and reliability.

Ethical Considerations

Furthermore, a code of human research ethics was strictly implemented throughout the research conduct by the researcher. Prior to the data collection, the project was approved by the University of Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee. The approval included consent forms and subject information sheets. Its conduct was granted permission by the Director General of the Department of Education in Thailand. At the study sites, before undertaking school observation, classroom observation, or interviews, consent forms, and subject information sheets were presented, discussed, and signed by authorised participants. Furthermore, the researcher was throughout the research conscious of ethical issues such as confidentiality, anonymity, deception, and others. Further detail of ethical issues is presented in Chapter 5.
**Limitations**

There were three limits to this research: the small size of the sample used, language and cultural constraints, and the use of outdated findings. As, this research investigated the real-time implementation of the instructional and learning reform, it gained data from two schools and a number of policy people. Its findings might or might not necessarily be able to represent the whole population of the Thailand’s public secondary schools. The more essential point was that the study committed to present valid and reliable findings of how these two schools implemented the policy. In addition, the research was undertaken in a Thai context—in the Thai language, in the Thai education system, in Thailand, and by a Thai researcher—with no intention to be a cultural comparative study. Thai culture, although un-obviously discussed as a comparison to those of the west, was presented for the clarification. Some readers from different cultural backgrounds, who did not recognise the existence of cultural and language discourses might find some points difficult to understand. Lastly, by the time this thesis is submitted, its findings regarding the implementation of the instructional and learning reform policy might be out of date for the policy people and the schools to use. However, the indirect ramifications involving implementation of change could be useful as it was indefinite and had never before been studied in Thai context at the school level.
Plan of this thesis

The thesis comprises ten chapters. Beginning with this Chapter 1, the Introduction presents both conceptual and methodological aspects of the study as well as introducing its organisation for readers. Then the conceptual aspects are discussed further in the literature review as well as the methodology in the Methodology chapter (Chapter 5). The literature review section is a group of three chapters: the second, the third, and the fourth. Chapter 2 presents studies about change and reform from both theoretical and practical perspectives in a western context. Chapter 3 similarly mentions these facets of education but in the Thai context. Chapter 4 examines pedagogical aspects rather than policy implementation and management as the other two literature review chapters (Chapter 2 and 3) do. Afterwards, the methodology of this study is discussed in Chapter 5. In the Methodology chapter, various issues involved with the “how to” of this research are presented. These issues include theoretical guidelines of the research conduct as well as the analysis, the method, and its creditability, ethical concerns, and limitations.

The second half of the thesis commences with Chapter 6, which is a discussion of Thai education reform, that is, how, the reform is designed and planned in documents from the national level to the departmental level. This chapter is included to provide the reader a tentative framework of the reform for a better understanding of, first the school level implementation and second further discussion of the findings in later chapters. The next chapter, Chapter 7, presents
the implementation at the school level. It includes characteristics and findings of both schools. These findings are analysed in Chapter 8 and 9. Chapter 8 discusses the findings regarding different perspectives in order to discover how each different stakeholders of this change comprehended the implementation whereas Chapter 9 is presented according to the policy practicality. Then the essentials of the research are summarised in Chapter 10, the reflections.
CHAPTER 2: EDUCATION REFORM LITERATURE – THE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

This chapter aims to provide a framework for understanding educational change and reform. In order to achieve that, several studies on a variety of concepts of change as well as recommended principles and elements for the introduction of educational changes in real settings are discussed. The literature concerning reform in practice is further categorised into those involving matters at a national level and others on the matters at an institutional level. Finally some models for understanding school level change are outlined.

Change: conceptions, principles, and elements

Conceptions of change

How we view change is important as it determines our means of introducing change. When a change is viewed as an event, a way to achieve it is chosen and announced and then it is assumed that the change simply happens (Fullan, 1993; Stiegelbauer, 1994). This conception of change is outdated and impractical and nothing may actually change.

If change is viewed as a process the focus shifts to an implementation of a designed plan. To have successful change requires a study of the processes of change and its contexts and the ways in which people work together to implement
that change. However, this is still a problem because implementers tend to attach themselves to a particular innovation once it is institutionalised or routinised and thus they tend to resist any new innovations introduced to them in the first instance. As a result, Fullan (1993) and Stiegelbauer (1994) proposed that to achieve change in an organisation as a whole was necessary to change the mindsets of implementers as to how they changed could be perceived as a continuous learning process. Stiegelbauer (1994) and Hall and Hord (2001) also included learning as an important element in the process of adopting an innovation.

Three phases of change were presented in Stiegelbauer’s change model. They are initiation, implementation, institutionalisation or continuation (Stiegelbauer, 1994, p. 6). In other words, for a change to be occur, users have to go through three phases beginning with making a decision as to whether to adopt the change or not. Often, in an educational setting, changes are mandated and it is not really acceptable for anyone to not make the change. However, frequently the change may be adopted in words only, spoken or written, but not in reality. Some may choose to implement the change wholly or partially, whereas others may justify how their current practices reflect the desired change already. If adoption takes place to any extent, then comes the second stage of the usage of the innovation. Later, if the usage is successful, the innovation may be integrated into routines or developed further.
Instead of phases, Hall and Hord (2001) viewed the implementation of an innovation as consisting of six levels (excluding their nonuse level). These are a level at which potential users seek information about an innovation; a level at which users plan to use it, a level at which users apply the innovation temporarily, or apply it mechanically; a level at which the users either use of the innovation autonomously or apply it according to impact of the innovation on those with whom it is used; a level at which users combine their attempts of implementation with others, sometimes called integration; and a level at which users reexamine the quality of their usage of the innovation (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 236).

Within the various phases of Stiegelbaurer or levels of change of Hall and Hord, one commonality can be identified. It is that a use of an innovation begins with individuals. In other words, changes have to go initially through personal meanings that an individual has or what Fullan called the subjective meanings of individuals. Then the change has to be accepted by groups of people, and begin to acquire an objective meaning. Groups can refer to either institutional group such as teachers working in the same school or social groups such as friends or close colleagues. This concept of subjective and objective change also appears in the writings of Fullan (1991), Rogers (1995), and Schien (1997).

What an individual perceives as the meaning of a change or reform is crucial to any introduced changes (Evans, 1996; Fullan, 1982, 1991; Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 10; Roger, 1995; Schien, 1997). Change goes through a subjective process then an objective one. Rogers (1995) claimed that idea adoption was a subjective process
through which the idea was confirmed. When any innovation is introduced, it will be conveyed mentally by an individual through stages of change (Rogers, 1995, p. 36). According to Schien, to change a group culture it is necessary initially to change the subjective meanings of the individual group members (Schien, 1997). Similarly, Evans (1996) stated that for the successful implementation of a reform to occur it was necessary to change the subjective realities of implementers (p. 16). Evans (1996) further claimed that the meaning of change was often perceived subjectively in relation to loss, being incompetent, confused, and in conflict. According to central change agents, change involves the substitution of a new or better approach. To accept the substitution, implementers have to go individually and continually through a cognitive and emotional grief process (Evans, 1996, p. 60). If the meaning of change was not clear, Fullan (1991) indicated that this can result in ‘false clarity’, or the mistaken recognition of superficial change as real change, or ‘painful unclarity’ in which users’ subjective of meanings of the proposed change did not occur.

Although subjective realities are “the essence of change” (Fullan, 1991, p. 36), both subjective and objective meanings are important (Stiegelbauer, 1994, p. 3). Accordingly, whilst subjective meaning is important to initiate change, objective meaning lies on personal being and professional life, and responsibilities that also are critical for human beings.

Objective meanings should be also acknowledged in any change initiation process. A key concept associated with the objective meaning of change is the
acceptance of shared values within the organisational culture. Rogers (1995) mentioned the importance of culture in the diffusion of innovations by noting that communication occurred in a situation where people’s patterns of interaction were similar (p. 36). A social system where culture is shared can operate as a facilitator or an obstacle to the success of an innovation (Rogers, 1995, p. 37).

Prior to introducing a change to Thais, both meanings of change have to be well learnt and understood. As an individual, Thai people are highly subjective. They might not know how to think analytically or critically. But they do know how to feel. Such a value as saving face and avoiding embarrassment is highly regarded by Thais (Wheeler et al., 1997, Redmond, 1998). If the change is initiated without considering the users’ feelings or faces, particularly those of ones who are in higher positions and seniority, or to introduce it to them in a hard way that might embarrass someone, the innovation is considered as nothing but an intrusion. As Redmond (1998) comments:

…[For Thais] to change is to challenge, to challenge is to be opposed, and to be opposed ultimately involves serious loss of face. (p. 66)

To avoid hurting of an individual’s face or feelings, Thais usually use ‘the middle way’ by compromising and negotiating. As Redmond (1998) also states “[For Thais] consensus is confidence; harmony is heaven” (p. 41). In other words, they know well how to share so that each stakeholder is minimally affected.
While conceptions of change provide a framework of thinking about change, principles of change offer some essential notions about the process, especially those that are often neglected or destructive to change implementation. Some principles can be drawn from longitudinal studies about school level implementation of change by Fullan (1993), and Hall and Hord (1987, 2001). These principles develop three themes: the nature of change, some suggestions to introduce and support change, and the essentials of change.

The nature of change is mentioned in four principles. First and foremost, as discussed in the beginning of this chapter, change is not an event, it is a process (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 4). Change involves people’s mindsets that cannot altered by flashed promotion. Consequently, change is usually not a short-term event but can take a long time to bring about. Secondly, change is not simple, and unpredictable. Policymakers and users alike should expect uncertainty that can be perverse sometimes. Thirdly, change exists in different forms e.g. products such as new computers or processes such as new teaching approaches, single change or bundle of changes, small change and large scale change (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 8). Fourthly, problems are ordinary in change (Fullan, 1993, p. 21). As problems will happen anyway, implementers should make the most of them by learning from them, not by ignoring or denying them. Ignorance and denial of problems do not solve problems but also create mistrust and misunderstanding among different parties.
Some principles suggest how to introduce and support change properly. The necessity of planning for change implementation is a key principle. Premature planning (or planning in which visions and strategies are determined before using them) obstructs shared visions and can be irrelevant to users as they may not relate to what they encounter in the real settings (Fullan, 1993, p. 21) or what they perceive about what matters most in bringing about the change (Fullan, 1993, p.21) or what it is (e.g. product or process, single or bundle, small or large). Also both strategies initiated from authorities who mandate changes along those which are utilised by users of the change are vital (Fullan, 1993, p. 21). Top-down change cannot respond to real time problems. Bottom-up change often fails because of the chaotic settings it involves. However, what people should consider is that everyone involved in a change should not be differentiated instead viewed as being in the same level (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 10). The differentiation causes only misunderstanding and mistrust between policymakers and practitioners (Hall & Hord, 2000, p. 11-12). Moreover, even though change is complicated and involved with problems, with continuous efforts of communication, training, even coaching, and time, change can be also be achieved successfully (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 14). At an organisational level, the best organisations learn not only from within themselves but also from outside the organisation (Fullan, 1993, p. 21). Individuals involved in change implementation can also learn from their own experiences and, more importantly, from the shared experiences of others. Implementers should know that development of an innovation and using it require their different orientations (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 6). In an educational context, the school is often the first place where change occurs, although it is possible for
change to occur within an individual classroom. This point should be acknowledged by authorities advocating or mandating specific changes (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 4). Thus existing school conditions have an impact on process of change (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 15).

Essential principles associated with the successful implementation of change are the importance of change efforts at a personal level, team efforts of change implementation, monitoring and evaluation or the following up of the change and leadership. As discussed in the initial part of this chapter, change cannot occur without personal change (Fullan, 1993, p. 21; Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 7). To facilitate change within a more inclusive level it is necessary that individuals work as a team which can encompass both individual and group attempts of collaboration (Fullan, 1993, p. 21; Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 15). For successful change to occur interventions both in forms of actions and events are vital (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 9). These interventions or evaluation can be formal or informal, long or short, as a series or single event, to rectify or verify, as long as they provide information back to implementers as to what they are doing right and appropriately or what needs to be adapted and abandoned. The feedback helps implementers keep their actions on track. Sometimes challenges associated with change, including pains due to change, even are alleviated by suitable interventions (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 15). Moreover, without leadership from institutional level administrators, institutional change cannot be supported and facilitated (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 13).
Elements for successful change

In addition to principles of change, elements for successful change have been identified. These specify what successful change, particularly education change, is composed of. A number of articles proposed that successful change needed a variety of tenets including time, people, assessment, and supportive rules and policies. Time is widely recognised as a critical factor (Fullan, 1982, 1991; Lieberman, Darling-Hammond & Zuckerman, 1991, p. x; McBeath, 1997). Too short a time provided for a change brings about only hasty implementation of the change that will likely result in failure. People are at the heart of change (Fullan, 1993; Stiegelbauer, 1994). If they do not change, any innovations introduced to them will fail. Appropriate monitoring and assessment are also important (Fullan, 1997; Hall & Hord, 2001; Stiegelbauer, 1994) as these provide feedback to change facilitators as to develop appropriate strategies for successful implementation of the change for any changes in the future. In addition, successful change needs supportive rules because rules can burden reform and officials those in a position to negotiate and interpret change implementation (Angus, 1998). However, many studies proposed the operation of several of these elements in combination and simultaneously.

To successfully achieve educational change, Fullan (1991) proposed at least three components: materials, approaches, and belief. Materials are educational resources and technologies. Approaches refer to strategies and activities to achieve change. Belief means underlying assumptions or theories of the change.
However, using these components involves other three difficulties: a difficulty to decide who will be assigned to produce the materials, approaches, and have a decision on what beliefs should be held, tension and dilemma between fidelity of using the change as intended and mutual-adaptation or users’ adaptation of the usage of the change, and a uncontrollable definition of what the objective dimensions of the change are.

Darling-Hammond (1992) suggested that educational change could be by finding a way to facilitate and support collegial planning (including parents), providing adequate budgets and resourcing for the implementation process, and introducing the concept of the change process and change implementation within initial and continuing efforts of the continuing professional development of teachers. Eisner (1999) viewed schools as a living systems. As a result, in order to change schools it is necessary to consider five dimensions of school reform and a school: intentional, structural, curricular, pedagogical, and evaluative. An intentional dimension refers to aims or objectives of schooling and the change. A structural factor involves working structures and routines. A curricular factor means the content as well as the organisation of the curriculum. A pedagogical factor involves teaching practice. An evaluative factor is the educational assessment of the school and its staff. In other words, the aims and philosophy, the organisational structure, the content of subjects taught, the methods of teaching, and methods of assessment should be supportive of a particular innovation introduced, and of course, to one another. However, these dimensions have to be considered together. Otherwise the change will be superficial and temporary.
Educational Reform

Generally, educational reform exists in two major patterns; structural change, and contextual change. Structural changes vary from a large-scale restructures of the system itself to small-scale transformation within schools. The large-scale changes may include marketisation (e.g., Anderson & Dixon, 1993; Angus, 1993; Crump, 1993; Fraser, 1997; Marginson, 1997, 1998; Reid & Thomson, 1998; Whitty et al., 1998), administrative decentralisation (e.g., Anderson & Dixon, 1993; Whitty et al., 1998), curricular transformation (e.g., Ahmad, n.d.), assessment reform (e.g., Chapman & Mahlck, 1997), and curricular decentralisation (e.g., Shimahara, 1997). The small-scale alterations range from inclusion of community involvement in school management (e.g. Anderson & Dixon, 1993; Angus, 1993; Crump, 1996; Glenn, 1992; Marginson 1997, 1998), commercialisation of school management (e.g. Marginson, 1997), pedagogical change in schools (e.g. Lee, 1997), and even classroom transformation (e.g. Chapman & Mahlck, 1997). The research reported in this study could be considered as part of a large-scale reform concerned with major changes to the way in which teachers were involved in the ways in which students learnt across the nation of Thailand. But because of the methodological approaches adopted, the research focused upon implementation at the level of two individual schools.

Between nations the reform of educational systems is contextually different with implications for authority and practice (Whitty et al., 1998). Across the international spectrum there are some convergences. The first is that most reforms
are initiated by governments through ministries or departments of education (e.g. Chapman & Mahle, 1997; Marginson, 1997). Often, reforms emerge as part of political agendas such as the ‘New Right’ (e.g. Crump, 1993; Whitty, et al., 1998, p. 33). The second congruence is the greater level of autonomy of individual public schools, that is, the decentralisation of at least some administrative responsibilities to the individual school level (e.g. Anderson & Dixon, 1993; Crump, 1993; Marginson, 1997; Thomas, 1994, p. 1855; Whitty et al., 1998, p. 39).

Issues at macro level reform implementation

Education reforms have existed for decades in countries such as Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Nonetheless, several studies indicated the failure in the implementation of some reform policies. Although various factors had an influence on policy implementation, such as scale and complexity, level of commitment, contextual suitability, contextual stability, project outcomes, leadership functions, decision-making participation, available expertise, political strategies, cost-benefit ratios (Thomas, 1994), three factors were widely discussed as contributing to the failures. These are direction of the implementation, the prescriptiveness of the policy, and the time allowed for implementation.

Direction of the implementation

Policy is implemented in two distinctive directions: from a central or national level to the institutional level, or from institutions to a central office. However,
researchers found that either direction of policy implementation could accomplish reforms. With reference to studies involving policy implementation in the context of both developing countries (e.g. Chapman & Mahlck, 1997) and developed countries (e.g. Stiegelbauer, 1994), implementation of initiatives from a central source were unsuccessful as have those from a school level, often called “grass rooted reform” (Angus, 1998, p. xi). Due to this fact, the integration of the two opposite poles (the implementation that includes both empowerment at a local level as well as the hierarchical approach) was proposed. The inclusion of the institutional level in a policy implementation approach was recommended by Caldwell (1997), Crump (1993, p. 303), Fraser (1997), Fullan (1993), Hargreaves (1997), Hargreaves and Fullan (1992), Lee (1997), McBeath (1997), Stiegelbauer (1994), and Wonycott-Kytle & Bogotch (1997) among others.

Chapman and Mahlck (1997) found that the implementation of central initiatives in developing countries was unsuccessful because some practices had shifted from the intended goals, and some “did not work at all” (Chapman & Mahlck, 1997, p.7). In most instances these change or reform initiatives involved policies being developed and implemented at the central level with little, or no, input from the “grass rooted” level. In a study of these failures, seven problems were identified. Firstly, there was little communication about policies from authorities to local implementers. Secondly, policies were unclearly explained to school practitioners. At best, they might try to use it. At worse, they might not do anything. Thirdly, policies were considered by teachers to be not applicable to their classroom context. Fourthly, the expected action was so demanding that teachers refuse to
implement the reforms. Fifthly, there was not enough support for the particular change. Sixthly, information used for policymaking generally was quantitative and lacking of school level reality. Lastly, unanticipated impacts can bring about failures of change (Chapman & Mahlck, 1997, pp. 5-7). These problems may be re-categorised into problems of communication, problems with the policy itself, problems with the teachers, and problems with the system as a whole.

Stiegelbauer also provided some reasons for unsuccessful change in centralised systems, such as the inability to “match to the environment, lack of follow-through, lack of definition, [and] lack of practice and training in the innovation” (Stiegelbauer, 1994, p. 1). As the innovation is initiated from a central unit, instead of schools where change expected to occur, the innovation does not fit with the school context, is not proposed continuously, has little meaning to implementers in the schools, and provides little practicable approach and training. In spite of having less capacity to dictate change (Chapman & Mahlck, 1997, p. 3), the central office is still important for change as the policy initiated from the central unit’s policy could ensures that the national identity is maintained (Whitty et al., 1998, p. 38).

While the top down approach is problematic for change initiation, the opposite approach, “humanistic and user-centred environments” (McBeath, 1997, p. 51), is considered an alternative way to achieve system change. The problem is the change that is initiated from the bottom up alone does not bring about large-scale changes. For example, in the United Kingdom, there were several attempts to
initiate change from school level up; nonetheless, the whole public education system remained unchanged (e.g. Angus, 1998, p. xi).

There is another way to prevent failure and that is by integrating the two approaches: implementation that includes both empowerment as well as a hierarchical approach. Hierarchical communication should occur both up and down, and within levels (e.g. Crump, 1993, p. 303; Lee, 1997). Crump (1993) supported the idea of policy implementation at the school level (Crump, 1993). Fullan (1993) pointed out that the problems of policy application were not that of policy formation but in the implementation itself. He suggested that the central government focused on the creation of schools as learning organisations rather than improving the policy (Fullan, 1993, p. 3). This would lead to schools being able to interpret and integrate central policies into their local contexts.

Nonetheless a paradox often occurs because of the conflict between the two approaches in the implementation process (Crump, 1993, p. 308). An obvious example is a conflict in implementation of curriculum policy. If the curriculum is produced by the central agency, it might contain unity of content but not be valid for the local contexts. If schools create their own curriculum, the content would be suitable to students’ real life but it might be so diverse that it would not contribute to citizenship of the country. Conducting changes in the education system such as restructuring and altering some attitudes of working such as creating schools to be teachers’ learning places can reduce problems (Hargreaves, 1997).
Another solution may be a request for the central administration and each school system or other units that exist above the school level reconsider their statuses to become at least at the same level of school implementers (Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 10), or even “the servant of the local schools” (Fraser, 1997, p. 120) so that they plan and make decision with considerations of local schools. In other words, they should view schools as the center to change. These agencies should have two major roles: providing necessary services and ensuring basic standards (Fraser, 1997, p. 120).

Prescriptiveness of policy

Policy created from central agencies is normally thought of then written in detail so as to provide guidelines to practitioners. However, such prescribed policy is inflexible and non-natural, and it is discussed as another cause of implementation failure. Although educational policy from a central source may be well-planned (Crump, 1993, p. 303; McBeath, 1997, p. 51), these well-planned policies are often perceived as problematic (Fullan, 1997). They are inflexible, and often ignore the reality of the schools (Fullan, 1997). In reality social organisations, including schools, do not operate in a rational manner (Evans, 1996, p. 14; Fullan, 1997, p. 206; Wise, 1979, 1983). Schools involve a great deal with unpredictable (Fullan, 1991b, p.207), emotional and psychological issues regarding diverse values and interests (Waite, 2002, p. 163). Popkewitz (2000) also criticised social administrations that focused on rules or reasons rather than the pragmatic reality or practical situation (Popkewitz, 2000, p. 19).
Well-planned policy is considered as hyperrational, prescribing too many actions with the policy using logical arguments instead of focusing on the processes within which people work, which does not instigate change (Fullan, 1991, 1997; Wise, 1979, 1983). Fullan (1991) explained the reasons that policies did not bring about change was because they were not seen as being meaningful by implementers (p. 34), and they did not acknowledge the overloaded work of teachers caused by the prescriptiveness of the policy (Fullan, 1997, p. 207). Some teachers blame these problems as a way to avoid implementation. In short, these prescriptive policies are inflexible, and ignorant of the reality of the school context.

Effective plans are those that use the understanding and experience of implementers, are flexible, and are planned in practical way rather than theoretical way (Fullan, 1991, p. 193). They are “classroom-friendly, well defined, practical, and relevant to teachers’ need and interests” (Stiegelbauer, 1994, p. 4). Another suggestion for effective policy planning was also provided by Porter (1997) who suggested three points for policy planning in developing countries. The first is that policies should not be prescriptive, otherwise, implementers will not use it. The second suggestion is to recognise that policy processes, from policy making to adoption and implementation are involved with organisational and political factors. The third recommendation is that to stimulate implementation, researchers as well as policy analysts are needed to take an active role (Porter, 1997, p. 36).
Some studies in the literature discussed the amount of time needed for policy implementation. Often the duration of time for the implementation of a major policy initiative is too short for the expected long-term usage of the policy. In Stokes’ research (1997) on practitioners’ viewpoints of the limited time reform policy for the longevity change, she found that the short-term policies had negative effects on practitioners. When the school was left to fend for itself after the policy together with support attached to it was withdrawn the school became “vulnerable to the tradition-reinforcing institutions (Stokes, 1997, p. 371). Although participants similarly had negative experiences from the short-term policy, in a study of Stiegelbauer (1994), there was a distinctive outcome. Left-alone-implementers can manage themselves by establishing a particular project in collaboration with other schools and external supporters. In addition, she also recommended that change monitoring should occur as well as the continuation of the old project rather than the creation of new one (Stiegelbauer, 1994, p. 7-8).

Many problems in implementation of policy as presented emerge a theme that there is ignorance, if not negligence, of what concepts and principles of change suggested, that is a vitality of implementers’ subjective reality. Consequently, it is essential to know, at this stage, issues that school level practitioners, particularly teachers and school managers, the subjects of most education reform, have normally and towards an innovation.
Issues at school level implementation of change

*Teachers*

In many nations and states around the world, teachers often are devalued and their voice often is neglected from policymakers. However, a plethora of studies argued against this ‘aristocratic’ practice. Instead, they claimed that teachers were the key to educational reform (e.g., Hargreaves & Fullan 1992, p. ix). Campbell and Neill (1994), Sarason (1990), Hargreaves (1997), and Crump (1993) emphasised the importance for teachers to be involved in school reform. Because of the nature of teachers’ work Campbell and Neill (1994) noted the importance for a school as well as the government knowing the way teachers’ time was spent when attempting to implement changes (Campbell & Neill, 1994, p. 7).

One way to understand teachers is to consider their work and life in schools (Goodson, 2000). Working and living in a school as a teacher are not as easy as it seems. First of all, teachers do not solely teach, they also have to do other types of work. Individually, teachers are involved professionally with five major types of work: teaching (including to assessment); preparation (including marking); professional development; administration; and other activities such as arranging sport events or being a class consultant (Campbell & Neill, 1994). Their work also involves various psychological effects such as pressure (e.g. Huberman, 1983; Fullan, 1991), self-defeat (e.g. Sarason, 1990, p. 138), and a fear of failure being demonstrated to their colleagues (e.g. Bennett, 1992, p.50). Huberman (1983) depicted four daily presses for teachers: the press for responding immediately
and concretely to overwhelming amount of spontaneous interchanges, the press for doing so many things—often with different orientations—at the same time, the press for coping with and improvising to unpredictable conditions within the classroom and school, and the press for getting involved personally with students (pp. 482-83). Fullan (1991) argued that these presses can have a negative effect on teachers in that they limited teachers’ knowledge-seeking to their own experiences gained more from their day-to-day coping rather than from beyond their own classrooms (pp. 33-34). Sarason (1990) mentioned that the self-defeat of teachers resulted in a decrease of teaching satisfaction and often led to teacher burnout (p. 138). The psychological effects also have an impact upon ways in which teachers interact with their colleagues. Bennett (1992) noted that teachers’ fear of failure caused them to avoid discussion with their colleagues about classroom issues (p. 50). In addition, teachers feel uncomfortable to discuss their teaching with their principals (Sarason, 1995, p. 75). To alleviate these negative psychological impacts in teachers, Crump (1993) suggested teachers’ self esteem needed to be increased through the development of greater responsibilities for teachers at the school level, improving career opportunities, and by upgrading professional as well as administrative skills (p. 298). Sarason (1990) also recommended that teachers and other staff should be considered as important as students in the education process. To attain these staffing techniques are required: recruiting the best students into teacher students; education programs; continually training them; and rewarding them in a variety of ways. Training and rewarding are critical for teachers. For example, training can be done in the form of providing sabbatical leave for teachers (Sarason, 1990). Teachers can also be
rewarded by better salaries and the acknowledgement of the essential work that they undertake with students.

Teachers not only have difficulties in controlling their work and often overcoming personal depression, they also have to cope with problems related to the teaching culture within a school. Most schools have two teaching cultures that can impact negatively on the professional working and living environments for teachers (Hargreaves, 1992, p. 232). These are individualistic cultures where teachers are in ‘isolation’ and ‘balkanisation’. Isolation occurs when teachers focus solely upon their classrooms and their conversations with teaching colleagues are not related to work or professional issues. Balkanisation creates a culture that has groups compete with one another, whilst within the same group there is loyalty. Isolation is found in many primary schools whereas balkanisation can be found in many types of schools, particularly in secondary schools where academic subjects divide groups of teachers (Hargreaves, 1992, pp. 223-224).

Few schools are fortunate enough to have a collaborative culture (Hargreaves, 1992, p. 227): a culture where teachers share their experiences and values, including intellectual and professional ones. Whatever the pattern exists in a school, to achieve school change teachers’ culture needs to be in a collaborative form (e.g. Everard & Morris, 1996; Fullan, 1995; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992, p. 17; Stiegelbauer, 1994, p. 12; Wonycott-Kyte & Bogotch, 1997).

It is difficult to develop and foster a collaborative culture in a school. Hargreaves (1992) identified another cultural form which he termed ‘contrived collegiality’.
This is a culture that forces collegial support and partnership through a bureaucratic mandate rather than through true collegiality (Hargreaves, 1992). A contrived collegiality culture may introduce collegial relationships, however it may or may not instigate genuine teacher collaboration (Hargreaves, 1992, p. 230), depending on leaders’ level of commitment to foster the collaboration and the complexity of problematic culture of schools.

A culture of teaching is a key to educational change (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992, p.16). Together with changing teaching culture to one of collaboration, Fullan (1995) also noted another necessity for real reform: the roles of teachers should be transformed. The following paragraphs discuss how this may occur, but it is necessary to consider three things about teachers before introducing change in a school (Stiegelbauer, 1994). Firstly, teachers do not respond in the same way to change initiatives. Secondly, their work is such that they value practical outcomes. Thirdly, the more they understand the purposes of particular changes, the more likely they will apply them (Stiegelbauer, 1994).

Atagi (2002) and Evertson and Murphy (1992) presented a number of dimensions that teachers took into account when challenged to change learning concepts as well as teaching practice. These are subject content, the learning milieus, and students (Atagi, 2002, p. 52), and “nature and structure of knowledge, values about what is worth knowing, nature of the learner, and repertoire of strategies to be used” (Evertson & Murphy, 1992, p. 304).
Hargreaves (1997) argued also that teachers should be allowed to be self-regulating, to develop a continuous record of learning, to create strong professional communities, to apply evaluation strategies both from within and outside school, to undertake research into their practices within a school itself, and to create professional learning support among schools.

**Leaders**

Leaders are important as they influence their groups’ culture. Leaders create parts of the culture (Schien, 1997). Schien listed three suggested actions involving a culture of an organisation for leaders. They are how to “get at the deeper levels of a culture…assess the functionality of the assumptions made at each level, and …deal with the anxiety that is unleashed when those levels are challenged” (Schien, 1997, p. 27). In school context, nevertheless, leaders (as regarded in this research as principals or schools managers), are important not only their attitudes towards a change of culture in the workplace but also in their roles as preparers, promoters, and mediators of change. Crump (1996) and Peterson (1997) pointed out the importance of leaders in the preparation of teachers for national reform initiatives. Evans (1996) confirmed that leaders’ capacity to help teachers achieve acceptance of newly introduced policy was important. Fernandez (2000) stated that behavioural support of principals for teachers increased the positive self-concept of teachers. Leaders are also the main agent negotiating among different groups of interest within the reform process (Hall & Hord, 2001).
Principals also have to deal with difficulties. As a mediator among policy people and teachers they have to cope with a tension between professionalism and tight bureaucratic control and that they have to create harmony among conflicting values and interests within schools (Waite, 2002). Caldwell (n.d.) indicated that after the introduction of the educational reform project, School of the Future in Victoria, Australia, which empowered school level administration, principals had to cope with lessen bureaucratic interference but increased workload, lower job satisfaction. Although it was also found that these principals had high confidence in obtaining successful reform, their confidence in attaining more resources and teacher job satisfaction was low (Caldwell, n.d.).

Several suggestions were made about what leaders should be and do to promote change. A leader is needed as a change facilitator to provide appropriate interventions to situations of change within schools (Hall & Hord, 1987, 2001). These interventions include resource provision, professional development opportunities, monitoring as well as evaluation, consultation and support, vision sharing and development, and the creation of a supportive context for change (Hall & Hord, 2001). Hall and Hord (2001) also pointed out that the principals’ role was as a change facilitator who must understand both the content of the innovation and the people that the innovation was to be introduced to.

Firestone and Corbett (1988) listed four leadership tasks to facilitate school change. These are gaining resources, shielding the program from external interference, heartening and emboldening staff members, and adjusting
procedures to support the needs of the program (Firestone and Corbett, 1988, p. 330). Additionally, Gorton (1987) suggested principals must have clear ideas of what kind of values to focus upon, who should lead, developing relationship with informal leaders, and lastly, presenting and announcing the values clearly when introducing changes. Dimmock (2000) included leadership and management as key factors in achieving a learning-centred school. The leadership styles needed are educational, technological, structural, moral, cultural and symbolic, resource, political, and strategic as well as transformational (Dimmock, 2000, p. 252). Gorton (1987) stated that principals should understand the existing culture of schools and develop the existing culture if needed but noted that this was not an easy task (Gorton, 1987, p. 128).

In conclusion, there are three main points discussed in this section: that teachers and principals play major roles towards success of school level change, that they have to cope with difficulties, and ways they can improve or be improved to achieve change. However, schools alone cannot implement change in the long run, especially a change which is initiated by the central agency. District level agencies, community, government and other agencies, are factors that influence school level implementation more so than teachers and school managers and characteristics of the change itself (Fullan, 1982, 1991). In addition to support from school administrators, continually support from district educational agencies and school boards is also required for change at the school level (Stiegelbauer, 1994, p. 4). However, as they are not the main subjects of this research, details of their nature, and of their work and the problems they encountered and caused are
not discussed in this thesis.

Models for studying school change

For further comprehension of how a school operates in change, three models are proposed. One model is the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) (Hall & Hord, 1987, 2001). The model was developed from the research of Hall and Hord research based their work on systems of change at the school level. A series of actions among groups of staff, change and facilitators, and the external system are included in the figure. (See Figure 1.)

Figure 1. The Concerns-Based Adoption Model by Hall and Hord (2001).

The figure demonstrates activities happening during a change process. A change facilitator, in connection to the resource system outside a school, interact and influence teachers for change by providing probing of problems and intervention in various forms as well as gaining feedback from teachers in forms of concerns,
use, and the innovation itself. The concern can be referred to as the subjectivity of change users who have in their thoughts themselves (awareness, informational, personal), the task (management), and the impact of the change (consequence, collaboration, refocusing) (Hall and Hord, 1987, 2001). The individual’s approach to change can be divided into eight levels: nonuse, orientation, preparation, mechanical use, routine, refinement, integration, and renewal (Hall and Hord, 1987, 2001). Hall and Hord defined persons who operate at the levels of nonuse, orientation and preparation as ‘nonusers’. At the other levels persons can be considered ‘users’. Nevertheless, the model is only applicable to one school working contexts. Firstly, it views schools only as passive units to external policy. This is also demonstrated in their use of the word adoption. Secondly, the model simplifies the complexity of the resource system in that it focuses mainly on change facilitators. In addition the amount of teachers’ time that may be involved in the implementation of change is not adequately acknowledged. Lastly, the model excludes external factors other than resources such as parents, peer teachers outside a school, media, and those who might affect teachers’ and change facilitators’ of perspectives of the innovation.

Despite being less demonstrative, another model presented by Fullan (1991) provides a more feasible approach in that it includes elements of change and stakeholders influencing schooling rather than just depicting school environments during change adoption. The model is called Interactive Factors Affecting Implementation. It points out (but does not demonstrate as the does the CBAM model) nine elements, which impacts upon school-level implementation of
educational change (Fullan, 1991, p. 68). These factors are categorised into three main groups: change characteristics, local characteristics, and external factors. Characteristics of change include the need for the change, and the clarity, complexity, and practicality/quality of the change. ‘Need’ means the vitality of the change in the situation and to implementers. ‘Clarity’ refers to whether the change is communicated to the site in a way that allows it to be perceived by the implementers in the way in which the policymakers intended. ‘Complexity’ considers whether a change involves any dilemmas or problems for the implementers and to what extent these problems exist. ‘Practicality and/or quality’ refers to positive points and negative points of the change introduced. The second group factors or local characteristics comprise the social and political units that influence schooling both from inside and outside. They include district level agencies, the community, the principal, and the teachers. The last factor that is defined as the external factors is government and other agencies.

*Figure 2. Factors affecting Implementation of change (Fullan, 1991 p. 68).*
These two models provide frameworks for further studies of change at the school level. Despite some flaws, the CBAM model was used as an initial framework to determine the culture of each school, and to look at the social organisation and interaction of change within schools. However, in looking at the implementation of education changes, the model of factors of implementation by Fullan (1991) provides a useful and more appropriate approach, at least to this research, by considering the whole education context influencing school level change. Additionally it provides a realistic approach to change by creating an awareness of the characteristics of change itself, and the characteristics of change agents at different levels of the system.

Therefore, a third model, which is the amalgamation of the two models, is proposed.

*Figure 3.* The integrated model of Hall and Hord’s (2001) CBAM and Fullan’s (1991) factors affecting implementation of change.
The activities occurring in a school between change facilitators and teachers in this model still are maintained. In addition, these school level activities occur within the influences created by the community, district level agencies, and government and other agencies—outside groups that also provide resources through the change facilitators and sometimes to teachers.

The literature indicated that change involved processes and various factors, which made change complex. To introduce change into a school, which is a complicated social organisation comprised of a unique profession with its own culture, is a double difficulty. Although a change facilitator plays an important part in stimulating change in a school, for successful implementation to occur it is necessary to have support from other organisations from the community to policymakers.

Nevertheless, much of the literature presented in this chapter is drawn from western contexts which may not be similar to those of other parts of the world, especially in Asia where a number of developing countries with different cultural historical and economic background are located. Consequently, the education system in Thailand is to be explored in the next chapter in order to determine to what extent the western literature on change is relevant to the Thai context.
CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW—CONTEXT OF THAILAND

The previous chapter discussed reform and changes in the international context. This chapter moves its focus back to the Thai context. The literature is categorised into three main groups: that concerning change and Thai culture, that providing general information about education in Thailand, including readings about the system as a whole and schools in particular, and other studies conducted recently regarding the instructional reform which is the focus of this thesis.

Change and Thai Culture

Generally, Thailand today is an amalgamation of three cultures (Fry, 2002, p. 52) Thai-Buddhist, Confucian, and Western (Fry, 2002; Sengprachaa, 1989). The exception is in southern Thailand, particularly the four southmost provinces, where there is a mingle of the three cultures with an Islamic culture. Confucian and Western (particularly ‘pop’) culture have dramatically influenced urban areas. However, Buddhism has been nationally and historically identified in Thai society, culture, and politics (Suksamraan, 1983, p. 4). Despite religious differences, Thais live largely in Buddhist ways (Sengprachaa, 1989, p. 63). Thai-Buddhism is the dominant underpinning of Thais in many matters.

Several Buddhist doctrines are supportive to change and learning. One Buddhist principle called Anidcang is that the most certain thing that happens is uncertainty. Furthermore, the doctrine of Buddhism in Thailand has the ultimate aim of
enlightenment that could be fulfilled through learning individually, not collectively. Also there is the belief that individuals should not believe anyone or anything unless they can prove and learn by themselves (Amornwiwat, 1998, p. 66).

Traditional social practices indicate otherwise. Controlled under an Absolute Monarchy together with a Feudalist system for more than six centuries, Thais are accustomed to maintain the status quo. They tend to be unquestionable followers, attach to rules and norms, authority and are social dependence (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2001). However, they are not ‘dumb’ or depressed. Thais stick very closely to the rules and interpret them literally. Often they use the rules for and in their own interests. They rarely let themselves get depressed. They prefer to look on the bright side of any situations. They like fun, and are happy and optimistic. They are happy as they are able to rationalise their beings. “Your typical Thai does not look at life; she lives it. Life is not something to be legislated, but to be indulged in” (Redmond, 1998, p. 20).

Although their background and habits would not make them good change initiators (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2001, p. 394), they can be ideal change implementers, although not originally creative but they are adaptively creative. At first they may be confused but after they have a clear understanding of what they have to do, they can do things cleverly and surprisingly creatively.

Several books described the Thai cultural way of life. However, few of them analysed it, fewer criticised it. One of the critical books was written by Redmond
(1998). This non-academic book discussed Thai perspectives on different aspects of culture. The writer interpreted Thai ways deep down to those that underpinned historical and moral influences. Unfortunately, often his judgment of Thai culture appeared to be exaggerated and unfair, due to his application of unequal criteria—examining Thai culture at its worst in comparison to western’s ideal society. His writings on Thai concepts on status quo and change illustrate this.

They thus become patrons of accepted virtue, paragons of institutional charity, subscribers to the official cult…. [it is rather due to] the popular conception of justification by karma, in which the powerful and wealthy are good because power and wealth are desirable and so represent the rewards of former goodness. (Redmond, 1998, p. 17)

The concomitants of this version of moral order are the absence of anger, the stoic surrender, and even the collusion of the lower classes. They do not rebel unless pushed beyond limits, and even then only to regain the comfort of those limits. Challenge, change, and a critical attitude are disturbances in a system whose best state is Maj Mii Araj – nothing happening. You may convince them that the system seems unjust, but they shrink from what we Westerners regard as the imperative response: Change it! They know that stability is not to be given up that lightly. (Redmond, 1998, p. 18)

Education in Thailand

The system

The education system in Thailand at the time that this research study was undertaken was similar in structure to other government units. Its administrative management and personnel management was centralised. Nonetheless, at the
time this thesis is published, the system would already be restructured. The new structure of the Ministry of Education would consist of five commissions: the Office of Basic Education Commission, the Office of Vocational Education Commission, the Office of Higher Education Commission, the Office of Educational Council, and the Secretariat of the Ministry).

The Thai education administrative system involved several governmental units. These units can be grouped into two types according to their duties towards the national level policy process as either policy formation units or policy implementation units.

Three units were responsible for education policy formation in the national level; the Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board (ONESDB), the Office of the National Education Commission (ONEC), and the Budget Bureau. They were all under the Office of the Prime Minister (ONEC, n.d., p. 19). The Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board (ONESDB) was responsible for overall national economic and social development including the education sector whereas the Office of the National Education Commission (ONEC) was responsible for policy making, planning, monitoring and evaluation of education at all levels (ONEC, n.d., p. 19). Sapianchai (1987) illustrated the policy process as one where problems were analysed, then this analysis was delivered to the Office of National Education Commission and/or the cabinets for consideration and possible adoption. Afterwards, the policies, including this instructional reform, were mandated [or reinterpreted] for implementation by
ministries which had educational institutes under their authority. The major ministries responsible for the national level implementation of education policy were the Ministry of Education (MOE), the Ministry of Interior (MOI), and the Ministry of University Affairs (MUA) (ONEC, n.d., p. 20). The Ministry of Education was responsible for most schools in the state. The Ministry of University Affairs oversaw universities as well as demonstration schools associated with each university. The Ministry of Interior supervised educational institutions in two local units: Bangkok Metropolitan Authority, and Municipalities (ONEC, n.d., p. 20). In this thesis only the Ministry of Education is discussed in more detail as it has direct authority over public secondary schools.

In the year 2001, when the data for this research was collected, the Ministry of Education comprised sixteen departments (or equivalent); two of them were state run but freely administrated. Fifteen of the sixteen were responsible for different educational aspects of the nation whereas one of them, namely, the Permanent Secretary was the coordinator of policy and resources and also the direct authority over the regional level bureau and provincial level agencies but with no management power over those same level units. One of these fifteen was the Department of General Education who had direct authority to every public secondary school in the nation, mostly through its provincial agencies. For illustration please consider Appendix C.

Similar to other civil servants, educational personnel management has been conducted centrally for a century. Personnel management includes the recruitment
of staff, promotion, through to their retirement. However, there is a different in educational personnel management structure in that teachers are not under the Office of Civil Service Commission. Distinctively, teachers’ personnel management is separately managed under Teachers Civil Service Commission which is a part of the Ministry of Education. Although both commissions have provincial agencies, they are hardly empowered to have any decision making power.

The centralised personnel management is good in that it ensures the standard of the teachers recruited. However, most of these teachers have little local knowledge. Also, as promotion relies on central personnel bureaucratic rules not performance, there is little reinforcement for teachers to actively work to improve themselves. There are also problems after recruitment especially for schools in remote areas as teachers would like to move away as quickly as possible. This movement of teachers causes at least three school level management problems: loss of skilled personnel resources, no qualified teachers to teach some subjects, and a lowering of morale among other staff. The loss to schools involves not only human resources alone but also time and financial resources associated with the professional development of teachers.

*Problems within the system*

There are problems in Thai public secondary schools management regarding problems at the ministerial level (Bunsaeen, 1979; Sidthi, 1976; Wichaidid, 1976). Kaathorng (1984) and Sriiwichai (1981) also found that the system created
problems for school managers’ decision making. They similarly noted problems caused by the bureaucratic system creating inertia due to complex bureaucratic regulations (Kaathong, 1984; Sriiwichai, 1981). In addition, Sriiwichai reported that the overly bureaucratic habits of officials, complex and time-taking communication systems, and lack of correct, complete, and up-to-dated data were problems that existed in the educational system (Sriiwichai, 1981).

Along with these studies, Atagi (2002) also pointed out the problematic system as an obstacle of the recent reform (p. 62). In 1989, Thiirawethin conducted a study of the Ministry of Education its working performance, its policy decision making, its policy implementation process, its resource management. He collected data using a multitude of methods including document analysis, in-depth interviews of twenty-three policy people, observations at sites and several meetings, and survey, and found problems existed in those aspects. He categorised problems into those due to the internal organisational structure, those involving the bureaucracy, and those caused by the political milieu at the ministerial level and outside. The structural ones included the bulky structure, the segmentation and non-coordination among its several departments, its personnel administration, and lack of control over and centrifugal forces within some departments. Problems due to the bureaucratic system were associated with the lack of coordination between the educational administrative system and the political administrative system, the non-monopoly to provide education, the powerless Office of Permanent Secretary over other departments’ plans and funding and to provincial agencies. The problems of ‘extra-bureaucratic’ were the political interference from politicians
towards inefficiency of resource management, decision making, as well as implementation process (Thiirawethin, 1989, p. xxiv).

The report presented an excellent analysis and quite brave criticism. Its author illustrated in-depth views of the problems that had occurred and cleverly categorised them. However, a few comments can be made on the report. Firstly, the sample of the study could not apply to the whole Ministry as the study focused mainly on the central part of the Ministry—the Secretariat unit. Other units were analysed superficially. Secondly, the report’s executive summary in Thai and in English were not identical. The English version presented only problems and recommendations, the sections on policy decision making, process, and resource management were not translated and presented. Thirdly, some findings of the study are now outdated. Some problems do not exist anymore. At the time of this current study, there were no educational laws, and no other department, except the Office of Primary Education that have provincial agencies. Despite these defects, the report still presented important facts about the Ministry that are worth considering.

Policy implementation and reform at the national level

Sapianchai (1987) systematically studied policy implementation and reform in the 1980s. He evaluated policy implementation as “rather good” and the reform “has achieved considerable success implementation” (Sapianchai, 1987, p. 7). Three successful changes mentioned were a restructuring of schooling years, an improvement of the curriculum, and the introduction of equity and equality
policies (Sapianchai, 1987, p. 7). In fact, the reforms of the 1980s were successful quantitatively, but not qualitatively. The structure of schooling years changed from 7-3-2 (normally seven years of primary schools, three years of lower secondary schools, and two years of high schools) to 6-3-3 (normally six years of primary schools, three years of lower secondary schools, and three years of high schools). This was a superficial change. His mention of curriculum improvement referred to the central unit improvement of the curriculum, but did not mention schools’ implementation of the new curriculum. Also equity and equality he depicted were in terms of distribution, but not context. Still unchanged was the administration system, especially educational laws and the budgeting system. Reasons for the failure of implementation of the reforms were due to a lack of well-planned implementation policies and the need for a change in the political climate of the whole public system (Sapianchai, 1987).

Kriangsak Carernwongsak (1996) studied three historical educational reforms. The historical reforms are presented in details in Chapter 1. The first was the emergence of the central education system during the reign of KING RAMA V. The second was when the first national economic and social development plan for public system extension was introduced. The third was when the educational system was separated into formal education and non-formal education. He concluded that curricula changes were slow, the pedagogical patterns were unchanged and some groups of people were excluded, (Carernwongsak, 1996, p. 24).
The school

There is scarcity of updated research on secondary school management and leadership in Thailand, and only limited policy documents are available. Despite this the contents of these readings can provide some contextual comprehension of Thai public secondary school management, as they are fairly similar to what is happening currently in these schools. They have been categorised into three sections. These are schools differentiation and comparison, school management, and school planning and staff’s attitudes.

Schools: differentiation and comparison

Tangsirichaipong (1989) studied the relationship between different secondary schools in terms of sizes, types, and locations, and educational resources, teaching efficiency as well as school administration efficiency. It is found that large schools have more resources than middle and small schools whereas the location of schools within the country has an impact upon the amount of resources available. Schools in the central and northern regions have more resources than northeastern region. In relation to teacher efficiency, the smaller the size, the more efficient they are. Also schools located in central Thailand are more efficient than those in northeastern region. Southern region schools are also more efficient than northern ones. In regard to school administration efficiency middle sized schools are found to be administered more efficiently than large schools. Schools located in Bangkok, central Thailand, the southern region, and northern region are
administered more efficiently than in the Northeastern part.

Secondary schools throughout Thailand have a similar structure. Every secondary school has a principal and, depending on size, up to four assistant principals who are concerned with academic affairs, students’ discipline, administration, and service (Bunsaeen, 1979; Hiran, 1978; Junlaprom, 1977; Saisuk, 1978; Sidthi, 1976; Ummaadmanii, 1977; Wichaidid, 1976). Some schools have instead of an assistant principal concerned with students’ discipline a students’ affair division (Saisuk, 1978). Some schools additionally have advisory committees (Bunsaeen, 1979; Sidthi, 1976; Ummaadmanii, 1977; Wichaidid, 1976). Most schools do not have job descriptions for the staff, nor do they have an organisational chart to show how the different departments relate to each other (Sidthi, 1976; Ummaadmanii, 1977).

School management

Research conducted by Sukchaata (1980) showed that principals spent their working time in the following activities; community relationships (13.66%), student affairs (15.74%), personnel work (21.67%), administration work (22.11%), and academic work (26.81%). The introduction of an innovation such as learner-centred instruction would be classified as academic work. Given many roles undertaken by principals they find it necessary to delegate some of their duties to academic assistants, headteachers and teachers whom they trust (Saisuk, 1978). Often this delegation could involve the implementation of new policies.
Although principals stated that they did a great deal on academic management, teachers showed no consensual agreement with this. In Saisuk’s (1978) study, managers viewed the academic management process, teaching schedules and pedagogy, and academic assignment for teachers as being performed by them whereas teachers’ comments indicated that they believed that principals were only concerned with these issues to a very limited extent (Hiran, 1978; Junlaphrom, 1977).

In comparison with other management activities, principals also conduct evaluation less than others. Thiankaaw’s thesis presented that school managers conducted evaluation in medium level, while undertook activities such as decision making, planning, organisation management, communication, influencing, and coordinating to a high level (Thiankaaw, 1982).

Problems existing in the school management can be placed into three groups (Thiankaaw, 1982): those due to the political preference of principals, those due to lack of leadership personality, and those related to principals shortage of administrative skills. Some principals prefer the political aspects of the role to practical aspects of administration. They use powerful groups in the school to support their decisions, and use personal relationships (Rabob Ubpatham) to promote staff who support them. Some principals do not have leadership personality. They are not confident in decision making, make decisions based upon how the decision would affect them personally, hardly listen to other staff members, and have no real understanding of subordinates’ concerns and their
work. Some principals do not have administrative skills. They lack skills to gain information to make decisions, overlook the importance of planning, have no plan for practice, distribute duties inadequately and ambiguously, have no standards for evaluation, and do not monitor staff practice.

In reality, Thai principals do not manage their schools on their own. Sriiwichai (1981) pointed out most secondary principals decided by using information from subordinates. Few of them, particularly, in some large schools allowed the subordinate group to participate in considerations and provided input and then made a decision themselves (Sriiwichai, 1981).

School planning

Planning was introduced in every Thai public secondary school only recently. Public secondary schools were recommended to produce three kinds of plans in relation to one another: five year plans, annual educational development plans, and annual practice plans. However, each school, literally, had to submit at least its annual practice plan to provincial authorities (Division of Policy and planning, 1998, p. preface). These three kinds of plans should be relevant to one another. The annual practice plan should be consistent with the annual educational development plan. As well the annual development plan has to be linked to the five-year plan. Procedures of secondary schools to produce these three plans are recommended in a handbook for planning units in schools produced by the Planning Policy unit of the Department of General Education. The handbook provides every detail of planning: rationale, benefits, and examples in details.
although the recommendations are appropriate in practice planning in schools is not an easy task. The Unit of Educational Supervision (1992) reported real situations that obstructed good planning in schools. These include insufficient comprehension about planning by teachers, resistance from staff who are not involved in planning, planning by few staff entailing impractical plans, low concerns about the likelihood of projects be implemented successfully, and the real impacts of policy making, no continuous and effective monitoring and evaluation system, and poor plan formulation due to the planners lack of knowledge and the fact that needs assessment is rarely conducted.

Leadership and change

The acceptance of new ideas in Thai public secondary schools is positively correlated to the opinion of the schools leaders toward the change. The ability to receive information of leaders, the social structure within the school, the ability to receive information of the leaders, and the social structure within schools, especially those that support curriculum management at different level all have an impact upon the successful adoption of changes (Thammakooson, 1983).

Staff: working attitudes

When compared to public primary and higher education institutions, Trisattayapan (1986) found that the bureaucratic attitude of academic staff in public secondary schools was at a medium level whereas their job satisfaction was the lowest. Also, bureaucratic attitudes are found to correlate positively with job satisfaction in
secondary schools (Trisattayapan, 1986). This finding may refer to attitudes towards the bureaucratic system held by academic staff in Thai public secondary schools affects their job satisfaction.

*Implementation of change in schools*

To make Thai schools implement a change is not an easy task. Wheeler et al. (1997) discussed school level implementation of change in Thailand. They spent sixteen months conducting a pilot project in collaboration with the Ministry of Education. This study involved six public primary schools, and two public lower secondary schools in northern Thailand from May 1993. Many interesting results were obtained from this study. Four dilemmas in Thai school policy implementation were noted. The first was teachers’ lack of judgmental feelings towards central initiatives versus their mistrust of unconfident supervisors. As teachers could not rely on supervisors, it was not surprising that they felt left alone using an unfamiliar initiative. The solidarity often caused them to abandon the implementation. The second was supervisors’ workload. They had to do bureaucratic duties, look after a large number of schools of which the contexts were different, and occasionally undertake academic presentations in needs of schools and other educational agencies in the area. The heavy workload further lessened supervisors’ dependability in teachers’ perception. The third was incongruity between existing tests (that emphasises academic achievement which is the outcome of teaching), and student learning (that, instead, orients teachers towards the process) (Wheeler et al., 1997, p. 201). The last illustrated tensions between decentralisation and control. Although there was support from the
Ministry to facilitate the schools’ attempt to participate more in the community and vice versa, to some extent the ministry still would not like ideas of schools to be too ‘participative’. As a result, schools and supervisors found a way out by ignoring the cause of the problems, and instead looked at consequences and alleviate the situation. They also noted a juxtaposition of the Ministry that had to support locally as well as nationally (Wheeler et al., 1997, p. 201). For successful education policy implementation in Thailand, they asked for strong commitment from powerful persons in the Ministry to support participation as well as for budgeting matters (Wheeler et al., 1997, p. 180).

There are also some cultural factors that hinder change at the community level, at the local level, and in the Thai society as a whole. In Thailand, rural people value schools highly and devalue themselves by thinking that they are sufficiently knowledgeable or educated to participate in school planning and development (Wheeler et al., 1997, p. 175). This fact, however, they tends to devalue of local knowledge as well as shows reluctance to participate in the schooling process (Wheeler et al. 1997, p. 175). Furthermore, educational cultures found at a local level could obstruct school development. The traditional model of staff development that is short term with traditional style of teaching–prescribed, centrally developed materials, and no monitoring (Wheeler et al., 1997, p. 176) is ineffective and inefficient. As there was no conforming activities to urge teachers to interpret the training meaningfully, these knowledge and materials would not be used. Although it has evaluation at the end of each training, it is so traditional that supervisors pay little attention to observations, feedback, and support but only
talk to some teachers or principals. This ignorance of detail causes teachers’ non-
realisation of the importance of the program that can bring them to abandon
implementation (Wheeler et al., 1997, p. 177). Not only do cultures in these Thai
educational organisations hinder the change, but also Thai culture hinders it, in
particular saving face and avoidance embarrassment. It entails an idea that any
people in superiority must know right answers (Wheeler et al., 1997, p. 197) as
well as avoidance of discussion on individual problems and concerns (Wheeler et
al., 1997, p. 199). This belief is found in both teachers and supervisors. They have
a view that they must have only right answers to their subordinates, that are
students, for teachers, and are teachers, for supervisors (Wheeler et al., 1997, p.
197). The fear of embarrassment obstructs individual creativity and learning
opportunities for intellectual development. The consistent of lack of intellectual
development can cause intellectual insensitivity and resistance to initiation and
change which cannot get along well to this rapid changing world.

In addition to Wheeler et al., Hallinger & Kantamara (2001) also conducted a
study to investigate change in school level through an analysis of cultural factors.
They studied successful change in three schools using a case studies method
within a year of the termination of a seven-year-long project “Basic and
Occupational Education and Training (BOET)” by the Ministry of Education
(Hallinger & Kantamara, 2001, p. 387). The researchers presented significant
norms reflecting each dimension of Hofstede’s national cultural difference
framework, and assessed the impact of these norms on school change, and the
strategies of leaders to achieve successful school change (Hallinger & Kantamara,
The framework comprises four facets: “Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism-Collectivism, [and] Masculinity-Femininity” (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2001, p. 390). “Power distance” refers to the extent of expectation and acceptance by less powerful members of an organisation in a nation about unequally distributed power (Hofstede, 1991, p. 28). “Uncertainty avoidance” is the extent of a society’s feelings of threat regarding uncertainty and ambiguity of situations and the extent of a society’s attempts to avoid these threats, including the provision of greater career stability, the establishment of formal rules, non-tolerance of deviant behaviours and ideas, beliefs in absolute truths and expertise’s attainment (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45).

“Individualism” pertains to societies where there are such loose ties between individuals that there is an expectation for everyone to take care of themselves and their families (Hofstede, 1991, p. 51). “Collectivism”, on the contrary, reflects societies which have strong integration and cohesion that allows members to have continual lifetime protection in lieu of unquestioning loyalty (Hofstede, 1991, p. 51). “Masculinity” refers to societies which have clear distinctions of roles between social genders, whereas “Femininity” means societies which have overlapped roles between social genders (Hofstede, 1991, pp. 82-83).

The researchers found that staff in the Thai education system had a high degree of power distance—they expected and accepted the unequal distribution of power. They are likely to avoid uncertainty as they tend to focus more on procedure of innovation than its aims and outcomes. Thai educational staff are highly collectivist. Lastly, Thai educational society has a feminine type of culture—there
is ambiguity of roles between male and female. These cultural values make them less likely to question authority, more likely to accept the status quo, desiring strong group attachment, and social harmony in exchange for a lower level of effectiveness of a change.

To achieve change there is a need to strategically apply techniques to articulate these values (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2001). To establish closer relationship and reduce power distance, principals should use strategies such as listening to staff more. To confirm staff certainty to the implementation of new initiatives despite obstacles or time constraints, successful principals show seriousness of change and expecting slowness of change but at the same time show persistence to introduce change. In respect to the collectivistic nature of the society, principals must gain support from informal leaders and groups in order to introduce change activities. With reference to the feminine nature of society principals need to demonstrate sincerity, and be willing to compromise and negotiate in order to achieve conflict resolution (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2001).

Recent studies on Thai Educational Reform in schools

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) through the Office of the National Education Commission (ONEC) funded the National Pilot Project to undertake nationwide action research of school-level learning reform. There were seven researchers recruited for the project—four domestics and three overseas. Each of three international researchers was assigned for one of these three aspects: school reform policy, teacher education, and information technology. Each of the four
Thai specialists were assigned to each of the following four elements of the project: evaluation, decentralised management, assessment, and research and reform implementation (Wiratchai, 2002, p. 5). At the end of the project, every researcher produced a separate report. Generally, methodology used for these reports involved secondary analysis of 250 pilot schools' reports regarding their own progress on learning process development and quality assurance, and forty-four teams of local researchers' reports on whole school personnel development and learning process.

Among these seven reports, three reports were concerned with school teaching and learning development: the national policy for school change policy, evaluation of learning developed by schools, and evaluation of how schools have changed. These reports were written by Rie Atagi, Sumon Amornwiwat, and Nonglak Wiratchai respectively.

The Atagi’s study, which was concerned with the national level policy for school change, gathered data from secondary sources such as available documents as well as primary ones including in-depth interviews with key educators in addition to observation conducted during site visits to some of the participating schools. Being a non-domestic researcher, Atagi made realistic comments and criticism. At the same time, she presented important insights, especially about the stagnation of the reform caused by conflicts of interests among the units involved.

Evaluating the progress of the reform up to March 2002, Atagi (2002) found that as a whole the current Thai education reform was still in a stage of policy
formation. (She applied a sequential cycle of policy making of Palumbo [1988] that comprised five stages: agenda setting, policy formation, implementation, evaluation, and termination [Palumbo, 1988 cited in Atagi, 2002, p. 35].) She found that users’ awareness of the policy was distributed successfully to every stakeholder. To relation to learning reform, she reported that it was fairly progressive at the policy level, but still needed support in at the local and level (Atagi, 2002, p. 36). She also identified a few significant problems that caused delays in the implementation of the overall reforms. These were deficiency of cooperation among different agencies, and delays in legitimising some aspects of the reforms, particularly policies involving structural changes and decentralisation of the school education system. These problems brought about confusion as well as uncertainty to the direction of the reform policy (Atagi, 2002, p. 39).

The next two reports, written by two Thai educators, gathered data from the same forty-four groups of local researchers using similar procedures: however, there were differences in perspectives and findings. The instruments included questionnaires, reports, notes, and documents from meetings and presentations. Although the reports utilised the same instruments, the researchers had different perspectives towards how to present the findings. Amornwiwat chose to present the best cases, and mostly presented optimistic findings. Mostly positive points were presented and criticisms were omitted instead mutated into recommendations. This style of writing, common in Thai research literature represents a Thai value—social harmony. (Rarely does the research make any critical comments, instead only presenting facts. Negative outcomes are presented
separately under the heading of recommendations. As negative points are not presented clearly and discussed, some important points are weakened.) On the contrary, Wiratchai presented both positive and negative points clearly. Due to this fact, it is not surprising that some findings from these two researchers are not in parallel to each other.

Amornwiwat (2002) evaluated the project from three aspects: professional development, learning approach development, and learner quality. Personnel development used involved more than just sending representatives to train teachers and administrators. These personnel developments within schools involved affective activities such as faith building among administrators, supervisors, and local researchers. These developments produced several outcomes. For instance academic centers, learning clinics, and learning networks were established. The development of learning content and activities was presented using models developed by some best practice schools. Best practices included developmental activities involving administration and management, school curricular management, the development of moral values as well as discipline, wisdom enhancement, and the development of amicable supervision systems (Amornwiwat, 2002, p. 3).

Differences in the learning content and activities in large schools in urban area and medium and small schools in rural areas were presented. In the first mentioned schools, practices were similar due to close contact with authorities. In other words, large urban schools had greater academic support from high
authorities in central units which located nearby. The policies and practices in these schools were more likely to be similar to what was intended by the policy developers. Medium as well as small schools’ learning activities were likely to be diverse and more in tune with local needs rather than the ideas contained in the policy documents. Although her research on learner quality was not completed, she made some reference to learner quality from behaviours including those involving greater learner participation in activities, behaviours involving the development of a capacity to plan and conduct teamwork, behaviours regarding the development of aptitudes and interest in challenging individual students to attain their potential, and other behaviours of development of respect and moral as well as cultural values (Amornwiwat, 2002, pp. 3-4).

The report by Wiratchai is the most similar to the researcher’s inquiries in this thesis. It aimed to investigate three aspects of the reform but was limited to the status and changes in schools, the achievement of the implementation by schools, and the elements and conditions impacting the success of the pilot schools. Approximately one of ten pilot schools began the implementation of the school reform. In her study school staff and students stated that little progress with the implementation could be observed. Some teachers had only just started studying about the learner-centred approach. Teachers did not practice what they had been trained about learning assessment. Wiratchai also reported the process of the reform was slow and that, in each school, only a small number of teachers were involved. Teachers suffered from the implementation due to inconsistent and idealistic suggestions from authorities. Teachers did not see the internal quality
evaluation in relation to their teaching and learning duties. In schools meetings they were likely to be ordered what to do than to be consulted and asked to share knowledge. Training, which was normally provided from outside the school, was likely to have no large impact on change at a whole school level. Teachers not involved directly in the training were unlikely to change their approaches to teaching. A surprising finding was that teachers who were implementing changes in their practices were more likely to be more respected by teachers from outside their school than by those within it (Wiratchai, 2002, p. 16). She concluded that student-centred instruction was appropriate, and conformed to Thai culture and practice (Wiratchai, 2002).

These reports were produced for the policymakers, the ONEC, and ultimately the ADB which had and still has significant financial power over the nation as it struggles with economic problems. All the studies coherently reported the success of the project. No single problem was identified. However, their conclusions indicated that more funding was required. The reports responded very well to political and economic aspects for policymakers but lack those elements that operated at the school level.

Apart from these three reports some findings from the forty-four local researches conducted as part of the overall project reveal school level information regarding teaching and learning practices. This aspect of the research was conducted using action research. Framed by the Office of National Education Commission, the action research was designed to investigate five topics (a) the relationship between
teachers’ development and students’ outcomes, (b) factors and conditions that had an impact on cultural change, (c) any successful and unsuccessful learning cases, (d) how principals managed to allow learning to develop continually in a schools’ every day life, and (e) extensibility of the project (Leksirirad, Wongpraphajrod, and Krahoomwong, n.d.; Suwannarid, and Sadpherdpraaj, 2001).

Only a few of these researches are available for public access. Hence, findings presented below are not the generalisations of the whole forty-four researches but a comparison of findings from three local studies. They exemplified what could be happening in school level practices. They indicated that there was no clear relationship between teachers’ development and students’ learning except that students were more likely to have a better attitude towards school learning and working (Narrot, 2001, p. 11; Suwannarid, and Sadpherdpraaj, 2001). Findings of Leksirirad, Wongpraphajrod, and Krahoomwong (n.d.) also indicated increasingly happy students but no mention was made of better levels of learning. In relation to cultural change, Narrot found that the size of schools had no impact on learning but vision, teamworking, information exchanging, positive support from principals, good public relations, and teacher professional development had an impact (Narrot, 2001).

Suwannarid and Sadpherdpraaj (2001) indicated that teamworking and supportive leadership, the size of schools, the proximity of teachers’ residency, the age of teachers, and existence of master teachers within the schools had an impact on cultural change.
Leksirirad, Wongpraphajrod, and Krahoomwong (n.d.) mentioned internal factors including awareness, mutual interest of principals and teachers, individual factors such as goodwill, and external factors such as the Act, policy, trends, size of schools, age of teachers, principal personality all had an impact on school culture and learning.

Narrot (2001) suggested seven qualifications appropriate to effective principalship for the implementation of student-centred instruction. These are self-development, support to personnel’s individual development, continual conduct of parental participation activities, demonstration of readiness to work with non-pilot schools, provision of chances for other schools nearby to exchange learning, good information systems, and the willingness to assign other teachers, either as individual or groups, to assist in the supervision and evaluation of the implementation process (Narrot, 2001, pp. 20-21).

There are some important points from these researches that should be emphasised here as they contribute to the subject under investigation in this study. Firstly, the learning reform policy until 2002, is still in a process of awareness establishment. However, suggestions were made for a shift from just a plan it to use it (Atagi, 2002, p. 36). Furthermore, there was no clear linkage between workload and benefits that teachers and students could get from teachers’ changing pedagogy (Wiratchai, 2002). In other words, despite awareness, teachers found no meaning to use the new teaching method. Additionally, while it was found that awareness of the reform policies was successful (Atagi, 2002) only a small number of
classroom teachers were directly involved in the study (Wiratchai, 2002). On the matter of personnel development researchers were not in consensus. Amornwiwat indicated that there were reciprocal and amicable in-service training particularly from staff who were trained by outsiders. Wiratchai found that there was no obvious further development after some staff joined training workshops outside their schools. Amornwiwat also referred to potential teachers (particularly spearhead teachers)’s being successful in setting up amicable networks of teacher colleagues. Wiratchai presented instead these spearhead teachers were less used and respected by teachers within the same school. Moreover, it was found that large urban schools received more support from authorities so they tended to follow similar procedures to those which were intended, whereas medium and small schools in rural areas implemented the change according to local needs rather than policy requirements (Amornwiwat, 2002).

The Thai literature presented in this chapter pointed out a lack of deep, qualitative research related to the implementation of the learner-centred approach. This research has been undertaken in order to fill a gap in the knowledge base, and an understanding the impact upon institutional level implementers in the real settings which has generally been neglected and considered as insignificant for the use of ‘macro’ level policy decision making.
CHAPTER 4: LEARNER-CENTRED APPROACHES TO LEARNING: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presents a review of various conceptions of learner-centred approaches to learning and instruction and associated research. The term learner-centred is used mirroring the words used by the Thai Ministry of Education in relation to the approved method of teaching to be implemented as a part of the education reform. Other authors used other terms to describe similar approaches to instruction in schools. These include pupil-centred, child-centred, and student-centred. Discussion of the term is grouped into origins of the approach, conceptions of the approach in international context and Thais’, and the dilemmas in the using of the learner-centred approach.

Origins of the learner-centred approach

The idea that the approach to learning should emphasise the learner as an individual is not new. However, with the advent of mass schooling it was widely replaced by an approach that placed more emphasis on what was to be learned (the content) rather than on the learner. In spite of this, some key writers and thinkers on education have emphasised the need to focus on the learner throughout the centuries, for example Socrates in Greek period, Rousseau in the Middle Ages, Dewey in the beginning of the twentieth century, and Bruner in the second half of the twentieth century.
In *The Dialogues of Plato* (Buford, 1969), Socrates’ indicated that for human beings to know something learning must occur in an individual’s soul.

…the soul views some things by herself and others through the bodily organs….The simple sensations which reach the soul through the body are given at birth to men and animals by nature, but their reflections on the being and use of them are slowly and hardly gained, if they are ever gained, by education and long experience….And can a man attain truth who fails of attaining being?….And can he who misses the truth of anything, have a knowledge about that thing?….Then knowledge does not consist in impressions of sense, but in reasoning about them; in that only, and not in the mere impression, truth and being can be attained? (Buford, 1969, p. 233)

During the second half of the eighteenth century, Rousseau provided a clear view of what was necessary for a child to learn. He presented four principles for educators to teach children in his *E’Mile: Book I*. These principles are based upon the concept that human beings move far away from what nature intended as the best way to learn.

The principle once known, we see clearly the track wherein we began to deviate from nature: let us inquire then, what must be done, in order to prevent our going astray. So far from being endued with superfluous abilities, children have at first hardly sufficient for the purposes nature requires; it is requisite therefore to leave them at full liberty to employ those she[mother’s nature] hath given them, and which they cannot abuse: this is my first maxim. It is our duty to assist them, and supply their deficiencies, whether of body or mind, in every circumstance of physical necessity. Second maxim. Every assistance afforded them should be confined to real utility, without administering any thing to the indulgence of their caprice or unreasonable humours: for they will never be capricious unless through neglect, or in some particular circumstance depending on their constitution.
Third maxim. The meaning of their language and signs ought to be carefully studied, in order to be able to distinguish, in an age when they know not how to dissemble, between those inclinations that arise immediately from nature, and what are only fantastical. Fourth maxim. The design and tendency of these rules are, to give children more real liberty and less command; to leave them more to do of themselves than to require of others. Thus, by being early accustomed to confine their desires to their abilities, they will be little affected with the want of what is out of their power. (Ulich, 1954, pp. 392-393)

Dewey also presented a similar idea that educational designs could not be identical for everyone but should be suited to the needs of the individual.

With the advent of democracy and modern industrial conditions, it is impossible to foretell definitely just what civilization will be twenty years from now. Hence it is impossible to prepare the child for any precise set of conditions. To prepare him for the future life means to give him command of himself; it means so to train him that he will have the full and ready use of all his capacities…(Ulich, 1954, pp. 630-631).

Bruner (1960) pointed out that it was vital for teachers to relate a child’s thinking with the new concepts being taught:

What is most important for teaching basic concepts is that the child be helped to pass progressively from concrete thinking to the utilization of more conceptually adequate modes of thought. But it is futile to attempt this by presenting formal explanations based on a logic that is distant from the child’s manner of thinking and sterile in its implications for him….They [formal explanations] are not translated into his way of thinking. (Bruner, 1960, pp. 38-39)
The term student-centred learning originally used by Carl Rogers (Brandes & Ginnis, 1986, p. 1). Also the learner-centred education concept was derived from his client-centred therapy that enabled clients or learners “to assume full responsibility, with the aid of an acceptant and empathic therapist or mentor, for decisions, actions, and their consequences” (Withall, 1987, p. 332). In his conception a new framework for student learning was required. According to Brandes and Ginnis (1986), the term represented the exact goals of what school level practitioners expected to obtain using the approach. In other words, this concept implies that implementers, particularly those in educational organisations such as teachers, must refocus what is the most important in their work, that is the students. Student-centredness is not only a technique but also includes beliefs and assumptions relating to how people learn (Gibbs, 1985, p. 57).

Conceptions of a learner-centred approach

The conceptions of the approach are divided into three main categories: definitions of the term, the approach in a teaching context, and Thai’s conceptions towards the approach. Prior to presenting a definition of what is meant by learner-centred, it is necessary to point out distinctions between the term learner-centred and other similar terms such as child-centred, student-centred, and pupil-centred. Although in several educational studies the term learner-centred is used interchangeably with others, there is a difference in that the word ‘learner’ includes every age and status, not just those of an early age nor those of a student or pupil status (Lambert & McCombs, 1998, p. 9). In some research involving
schools for young learners, these terms are used interchangeably such as in the study of Darling-Hammond (1992). Often, the phrases are used in a way to denote that such an approach to learning is contrary to such terms as content-centred (Schofield, 1972), curriculum-centred (Schofield, 1972, subject-centred (Page & Thomas, 1977), even teacher-centred.

**Definition of the term**

The meanings of the terms pupil-centred, student-centred, and learner-centred are discussed in three references. In the *Collins Cobuild English Dictionary*, the word learner-centred has an equal meaning to student-centred approach.:

**learner-centred;** spelled learner-centered in American English. In teaching, if you describe a curriculum or activity as learner-centred it means that it is based on the needs or interests of the learner. (*Collins Cobuild English dictionary*, 1995, p. 946)

Furthermore, McCombs and Whisler (1997) provided a definition of learner-centred more specifically according to psychological aspects. Learner-centred is concerned with

The perspective that couples a focus on individual learners (their heredity, experiences, perspectives, backgrounds, talents, interests, capacities, and needs) with a focus on learning (the best available knowledge about learning and how it occurs and about teaching practices that are most effective in promoting the highest levels of motivation, learning, and achievement for all learners). (p. 9)
In the *International Dictionary of Education*, Page, Thomas, with Marshall (1977) defined the term pupil-centred teaching or approach according to the sociological perspective as follows:

**pupil-centred teaching or approach** General term for teaching in which the needs and developmental level of the individual child are given more consideration than the content of *curriculum* or the wishes of society. The teacher’s role is that of guide, support and *facilitator* rather than instructor. See also *subject-centred*. (p. 279)

All three definitions similarly identify a focus on individual learners’ needs. However, among these three meanings, the one defined in *Collins Cobuild English Dictionary* includes no information about how to use it. McCombs and Whisler’s definition (1997) refers more to knowledge that teachers should have for the approach. The definition given by Page, Thomas, and Marshall (1977) identifies roles of teachers with their pupils. Additionally, at the end of their definition, they indicated an attempt to differentiate the term pupil-centred with the term subject-centred.

Apart from these definitions, there are several studies on how these approaches can be conveyed at the classroom level. The next paragraphs discuss the term learner-centred in the classroom context.

*The term ‘learner-centred’ in a teaching context*

Teaching approaches that are based on a learner-centred concept can be interpreted diversely. Nevertheless, there are three patterns of interpretation of
the term in teaching context: those specifying one or more teaching methods as learner-centred, those placing teaching methods on a scale between two extremes concepts, and those interpreting loosely using suggestions and frameworks of what are and are not learner-centred teaching.

A plethora of specified learning- and learner-centred teaching strategies, models, or practices are discussed in much of the literature. For example, Hirumi (2002) presented eight events necessary for student-centred learning to occur. They include setting of challenges, negotiation of learning objectives and goals, negotiation of learning strategies, construction of knowledge, negotiation of performance criteria, assessment of learning is carried out by utilising the perspectives of students, peers and experts, the provision for performance monitoring and feedback, and the communication of the results of the learning to the learners (Hirumi, 2002). Performance monitoring and feedback provision is very important since the learning goals and objectives are negotiated between the learner and the teacher/facilitator (Hirumi, 2002).

Instead of specifying procedures, Killen (1991) identified three approaches that could be used as student-centred teaching strategies, namely, discussion, groupwork and co-operative learning, and problem-solving. Discussion refers to an informal group activity involving communication to share information, make a decision, or solve a problem (Turney et al., 1976, p. 13 cited in Killen, 1991, p. 2). Groupwork means “placing students into small groups for specific purposes” (Killen, 1991, p. 25). Co-operative learning involves formal groupwork that its
members are heterogeneous and work together as one team by encouraging and motivating one another rather than competing (Killen, 1991, p. 25). Problem-solving is a way to learn via inquiry that involves application of “existing knowledge to a new or unfamiliar situation in order to gain new information or knowledge” (Killen, 1991, p. 44).

In addition, Dimmock (2000) suggested four teaching approaches, namely, mastery learning, direct instruction, cooperative learning, and problem-based learning. Mastery learning, considered appropriate for low achievers (Dimmock, 2000, p. 143), is a pedagogy that assumes that students are able to learn when teachers follow certain fundamental principles. In this teaching method, the course content is divided into units and assessed normatively. The teaching techniques used in Mastery learning can be direct teaching but it is not always the case. Direct teaching is similar to lecturing, however, it includes three stages: introduce students to the objectives of the study, teach or to provide information, practice or the application of knowledge through teachers’ guide and assessment which Dimmock suggested should end with a summary. Cooperative learning is a learning process in which every learner makes a contribution to learning and does not compete with one another. It is not limited only to groupwork. Problem-based learning or PBL is a learning process that starts with a problem that is best fit conform to what happens in the real world, seeks knowledge around a problem, happens as a cooperative groupwork, and the learning is accounted for largely by learners either alone or as a group (Bridges and Hallinger, 1992 cited in Dimmock, 2000, p. 149).
Brown and Campione (1998), Hirumi (2002), Pillay (2002), Schuh (2003) pointed out constructivism as a learner-centred approach. Constructivist learning is a learning process in which an individual learner builds on what the learner brings to the situation and restructures initial knowledge in “a widening and intersecting spiral of increasingly complex understanding” (Marshall, 1992, p. 11). Believing that new knowledge is constructed in the learner’s mind using their existing knowledge and previous experiences, constructivist teachers consider largely on what individual learners have in mind, and respond accordingly to what knowledge they ‘should have’ or ‘should not have’. White (1995) suggested that it was necessary to include constructivist principles in pre-service teacher training to reinforce the importance of a student-centred approach. Hirumi (2002) further descriptively defined the student-centred in comparison with a teacher-centred instructional approach using seven teaching variables: learning outcomes, goals and objectives, instructional strategy, assessment, role[s] of teachers, role[s] of students, and environment. She specified “students work at stations, with access to electronic resources” (Hirumi, 2002, p. 508) as the learning environment for a learner-centred approach, in opposition to the traditional classroom row seating. The comparison is presented in Table 1.
Table 1.

A comparison of instructional variables used in student-centred instructional approaches and teacher-centred instructional approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Variables</th>
<th>Teacher Centred</th>
<th>Student Centred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discipline-specific verbal information.</td>
<td>• Interdisciplinary information and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lower order thinking skills (e.g., recall, identify, define).</td>
<td>• Higher order thinking skills (e.g., problem solving)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Memorisation of abstract and isolated facts, figures, and formulas.</td>
<td>• Information processing skills (access, organise, interpret, communicate information)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher prescribes learning goals and objectives based on prior experiences, past practices, and state and/or locally mandated standards.</td>
<td>• Students work with teachers to select learning goals and objectives based on authentic problems and students’ prior knowledge, interests and experience[s]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instructional strategy prescribed by teacher.</td>
<td>• Teacher works with students to determine learning strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group-paced, designed for “average” student</td>
<td>• Self-paced, designed to meet needs of individual student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information organised and presented primarily by teacher (e.g., lectures) with some supplemental reading assignments</td>
<td>• Student given direct access to multiple sources of information (e.g., books, online databases, community members)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Variables</td>
<td>Instructional Approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Centred</td>
<td>Student Centred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>• Assessments used to sort students</td>
<td>• Assessment integral part of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Paper and pencil exams used to assess students acquisition of information</td>
<td>• Performance based, used to assess students ability to apply knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher sets performance criteria for students</td>
<td>• Students work with teachers to define performance criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students left to find out what the teacher wants</td>
<td>• Students develop self-assessment and peer assessment skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' Role</td>
<td>• Teacher organises and presents information to group of students</td>
<td>• Teacher provides multiple means for accessing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher acts as gatekeeper of knowledge, controlling students access to information</td>
<td>• Teacher acts as facilitator, helps students access and process information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher directs learning</td>
<td>• Teacher facilitates learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Role</td>
<td>• Students expect teachers to teach them what’s required to pass the test</td>
<td>• Students take responsibility for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Passive recipients of information</td>
<td>• Active knowledge seekers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reconstructs knowledge and information</td>
<td>• Constructs knowledge and meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>• Students sit in rows, information presented through lectures, books and films.</td>
<td>• Students work at stations, with access to electronic resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. From Table 3 Hirumi (2002, pp. 507-508) a comparison of instructional variables associated with student-centred and teacher-centred approaches to teaching and learning. However, some words are changed from American English to Australian English.

Although it is possible to consider approaches to teaching and learning as either learner-centred or teacher-centred, teachers must find out which methods, alone
or together with others, are best for their teaching contexts (Atagi, 2002; Dimmock, 2000; Joyce & Weil, 1980; Mayer, 1998). For example, the traditional lecturing style generally used in Japanese classrooms probably fits the Japanese culture (Chenoweth et al., 1998).

Moreover, teachers can even create one or more teaching models of their own. As a result, instead of pointing out one method as learner-centred and others as not, some studies alternatively provided justification for the use of teaching strategies selected from a continuum ranging from traditional teach dominated methods to learner-centred approaches. This continuum is used in studies by Atagi (2002, p. 53), Brady (1985, p. 10), and Brandes and Ginnis (1986, p. 99). Brady (1985) and Brandes and Ginnis (1986) depicted the continuum between teacher-centred or traditional and pupil-centred or student-centred methods, whereas Atagi (2002), presented the continuum of ‘traditional’ and ‘constructivist’ methods. The different use of the terms at the opposite ends of the continuum implies that Brady and Brandes and Ginnis consider a student-centred approach as an extreme teaching approach that allows students’ utmost participation in the learning process. It also indicates that Atagi views learner-centred as not at the student-controlled extreme of teaching but somewhere between the extreme of traditional and constructivist methods.

Among the three studies, Brady’s study detailed the justification further in that he defined actions that differentiated the two extremes. These actions are presented in the Table 2. With reference to Table 2, features characterising teacher-centred
is on the left, and student-centred’s ones is on the right. Shifting pedagogy from teacher-centred to student-centred refers to a change in the focus of learning (from intellectual development to affective development), the roles of teachers (from an instructor and judge to a facilitator and supporter), curriculum (from teachers’ choice to students’ choice), evaluation (from formal examinations by teachers alone to collaborative evaluation procedures), as well as classroom management that includes groupwork, students’ participation and interaction among students.

Table 2.

*Brady’s comparative specification of teacher-centred and pupil-centred approach*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher-centred</th>
<th>Pupil-centred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Views learning as acquisition of knowledge; intellectual development.</td>
<td>Views learning as acquisition of experience; affective development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s main function is to instruct.</td>
<td>Teacher’s main function is to evoke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasises teacher as judge censor.</td>
<td>Emphasises teacher as facilitator, supporter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher selects learning experiences.</td>
<td>Pupils contribute to selection of learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teacher-pupil interaction.</td>
<td>Encourages pupil-pupil interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on tests and grades.</td>
<td>Emphasis on less traditional evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not encourage group work.</td>
<td>Encourages the use of groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation is a teacher responsibility</td>
<td>Evaluation is jointly determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasises teacher control</td>
<td>Emphasises pupil participation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. From the Exhibit 1 – 2 The continuum of teacher-centred and pupil-centred methods in Brady, 1985, p. 5.
According to Brady (1985), Brandes and Ginnis (1986), and Atagi (2002), it should be left to teachers to decide which teaching methods from the continuum to be used. Dimmock (2000) suggested a balance between teacher-centred and student-centred as well as teacher-informed knowledge and constructivistic knowledge (p. 138).

As we are interpreting the definition of the term learner-centred in the teaching context, two constructivist concepts related to learning and teaching are discussed. The first concept is about the learning process, and the second concept is about the roles of teachers. Learner-centred learning allows learners to build new knowledge upon their existing one. No more are teachers the exclusive source of knowledge to students; teachers and students alike perform multiple roles (Marshall, 1992, p. 11). To do that teachers have to perform two tasks: introduce ideas and provide support and guidance (Driver et al., 1994, p. 11).

Further than the continua of the two extremes, there are other three guidelines that can help for the determination of how learner-centred instruction should be. From a philosophical perspective, Schofield (1972) commented that the application of the concept ‘child-centredness’ in instructional design should be interpreted carefully and not overly focused on the children’s thinking of themselves or their demands alone. Teaching involves both instructing as well as unobtrusive guiding for children’s learning (Schofield, 1972). Another guideline is introduced by Lambert and McCombs (1998). They list four beliefs of teachers as well as actions that refer to the learner-centred model: the inclusion of learners in
processes of making educational decisions; the encouragement and recognition of diverse viewpoints of learners; the respect and accountability of learners’ different beings and needs; and the equal treatment of learners in either teaching or learning processes. The other framework was created and developed by American Psychological Association Board of Educational Affairs (1997). They are fourteen psychological principles for application of learner-centred approach. The principles themselves are derived from various research and research-based discussions regarding the constructivist perspective. These principles can be categorised into four main psychological facets: cognition and metacognition, motivation and affection, developmental and social influences, and individual differences (American Psychological Association Board of Educational Affairs, 1997; Lambert & McCombs 1998).

Principles regarding cognitive and metacognitive elements include the concepts, nature, and preferred characteristics of the learning process, learners’ knowledge and thinking capacity, and learning environment. The learning process is intentional (principle 1) and the relation of new information and old knowledge should be meaningful (principle 3). After learning process, learners can present the meaningful knowledge and are skillful in using and creating several thinking and reasoning strategies to reach complicated learning goals (principle 2 and 4). Learners can understand the process of their thinking and learning and can use the process later and wisely (principle 5). The learning context “is influenced by environmental factors” (Lambert & McCombs, 1998, p. 18) (principle 6). These factors include group or cultural influences, technologies and pedagogies, and
classroom environment particularly whether it is nurturing to learners’
development or not (such as the smaller-sized class that allows teachers greater
chances to give feedback to individual learners’ that is supportive to learners’
construction of knowledge).

Principles under the motivation and affection category indicate important
relationships among motivation, particularly intrinsic motivation,
conceptualisation of the self in learning situations, emotions, effort, and learning.
Motivation and emotion of learners have influences on learning, and can be urged
by some mild negative feelings such as mild anxiety or mild frustration and anger
but not intensive. Therefore, it is necessity for educators to know the emotional
states of learners (principle 7). Intrinsic motivation is indicated by learners’
“creativity, higher order thinking, and natural curiosity” (Lambert & McCombs,
1998, p. 19), and can be fostered by giving them knowledge and learning
activities that are new, difficult, related to personal interests, and giving them
more power to choose and control (principle 8). Motivation is necessary for
achieving complex learning as it needs effort. Hence, teachers should provide a
task that “is interesting and personally relevant” (Lambert & McCombs, 1998, p.
20) (principle 9).

Principles under the developmental and social heading explain and connect
developmental and social contexts and their influences on learning. Learning of
individuals can be optimised by providing material that is suitable for their
developmental level and in “an enjoyable and interesting way” (Lambert &
McCombs, 1998, p. 20) (principle 10). Social interactions, communication and interpersonal relations influence learning and that positive learning climate offsets learning obstacles such as negative beliefs or pressure as well as promoting contexts that support cognitive, affective, and behavioural development of learners (principle 11).

Principles involving individual differences present the commitment of educators and how they can promote learning as well as account for individual differences, particularly the integration of suitable standards and assessment throughout learning process. It is necessary for educators to “be sensitive to individual differences” (p. 21), and to show learners that differences are “accepted and adapted to” (p. 21) by applying various pedagogies and materials (principle 12). Also, diversity needs to be acknowledged and taken into account. There is enhancement in the level of motivation and achievement when learners acknowledge that their differences are respected, valued, and accommodated in different tasks and contexts of learning (p. 21) (principle 13). Lastly, appropriate challenging assessments are essential to the learning process (principle 14). There are four assessments suggested in this principle: ongoing assessment (checking of learners’ understanding of teaching), standardised assessment (checking of learners’ progress), outcome assessment (checking of achievement level), and performance assessment (checking of the achievement of learning outcomes).

These principles perform three tasks. First, they explain essential educational psychological concepts in accordance with practice and practitioners, for example,
efforts and motivation, and how educators use the concept to promote learning. Secondly, they depict connections among different agents, concepts, and environments such as teachers, learners, groups, and the classroom environment with learning process. Lastly, they enlist preferred characteristics of concepts such as learning process should be intentional as well as practices; a guideline of what teachers should prepare, what a learner-centred classroom and a school should be like. The guideline is also presented in Table 3. In the stage of lesson preparation, teachers need to explicitly teach the learning process (principle 1), to plan for an assessment to ask students to present their interpretation and construction of knowledge and skills of using and creating reasoning and thinking (principle, 2, 4, 5), to prepare positive social (principle 11), cultural, pedagogical, and physical environments (principle 6), to prepare to urge learners’ intrinsic motivation by giving them learning activities and knowledge that are new, difficult, related to personal interests, and more power to choose and control (principle 8) and interesting and relevant tasks (principle 9), to know and understand individual learners including their background (principle 12, 13), and developmental level (principle 10), as well as appropriate assessments (principle 14). In the classroom, teachers need to be sensitive to learners’ differences and diversity (principle 12, 13), be sensitive to learners’ emotional status and motivate them accordingly (principle 7), create and maintain positive social learning climate (principle 11), apply materials and techniques that suitable for learners’ developmental level and apply them in an interesting and enjoyable way (principle 10), urge their intrinsic motivation by giving them new, difficult, related to personal interests, and more power to choose and control (principle 8), apply appropriate assessment
(principle 14) to check learners’ understanding, interpretation, construction, and learning skills (principle 2, 4, 5). Students should be able to meaningfully link new information and old knowledge (principle 3), present their interpretation and construction of knowledge, and skills of using and creating reasoning and thinking (principle 2, 4, 5), probably show enthusiasm (principle 7, 8), enjoyment and interest to materials and techniques teachers used (principle 10), and appreciation to teachers’ acceptance, respect, accommodation of their differences in learning tasks (principle 12, 13), and experience positive social climate (principle 11).

Schools should provide support and encourage teachers to prepare and conduct the lessons accordingly, that is, support teachers to provide intentional learning process (principle 1), ask students to present their interpretation and construction of knowledge and skills of using and creating reasoning and thinking (principle 2, 4, 5), use knowledge of motivation and sensitivity of learners’ emotions, and providing an interesting and personally related to learners tasks (principle 7, 9), establish intrinsic motivation by giving learners learning activities and knowledge that are new, difficult, related to personal interests, and more power to choose and control (principle 8), set and maintain positive social climate (principle 11), show sensitivity to individual differences and diversity (principle 12, 13), and use appropriate assessments and apply them along the approach (principle 14).

Schools also need to provide and maintain nurturing cultural, pedagogical, and physical environment, and provide materials and knowledge for teachers to create material and techniques that suitable for learners’ developmental level and urge teachers to apply them in an interesting and enjoyable way (principle 10).
Table 3.

A guideline of preferred characteristics of learner-centred teachers, learner-centred schools, and students in learner-centred classroom regarding APA’s fourteen principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner-centred teachers</th>
<th>Students in a learner-centred classroom</th>
<th>Learner-centred schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have intention to provide learning process (principle 1).</td>
<td>Be able to meaningfully link new information and old knowledge (principle 3).</td>
<td>Support teachers to provide intentional learning process (principle 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to then assess learners to show interpretation, construction, and learning skills (principle 2, 4, 5).</td>
<td>Present their interpretation and construction of knowledge, and skills of using and creating reasoning and thinking (principle 2, 4, 5).</td>
<td>Support teachers to ask students to present their interpretation and construction of knowledge and skills of using and creating reasoning and thinking (principle 2, 4, 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare positive cultural, pedagogical, and physical environments (principle 6).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide and maintain nurturing cultural, pedagogical, and physical environment (principle 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner-centred teachers</td>
<td>Students in a learner-centred classroom</td>
<td>Learner-centred schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge and sensitivity of emotional status to motivate learners (principle 7).</td>
<td>Probably show enthusiasm (principle 7, 8).</td>
<td>Support teachers to use knowledge of motivation and sensitivity of learners’ emotions, and providing an interesting and personally related to learners tasks (principle 7, 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare interesting and relevant tasks (principle 9).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support teachers to establish intrinsic motivation by giving learners new, difficult, related to personal interests, and more power to choose and control (principle 8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare to then urge learners’ intrinsic motivation by giving them new, difficult, related to personal interests, and more power to choose and control (principle 8).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide materials and knowledge for teachers to create material and techniques that suitable for learners’ developmental level and urge teachers to apply them in an interesting and enjoyable way (principle 10).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know and understand individual learners’ development level and use pedagogy and materials accordingly (principle 10).</td>
<td>Probably show enjoyment and interest to materials and techniques teachers used (principle 10).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learner-centred teachers | Students in a learner-centred classroom | Learner-centred schools
---|---|---
Prepare, create and maintain positive social learning climate (principle 11). | Experience positive social climate (principle 11). | Support teachers to set and maintain positive social climate (principle 11).
Know and understand individual learners’ background (principle 12, 13), and be sensitive to learners’ differences (principle 12). | Probably show an appreciation to teachers’ acceptance, respect, accommodation of their differences in learning tasks (principle 12, 13). | Support teachers to show sensitivity to individual differences and diversity (principle 12, 13).
Plan then use appropriate assessments (principle 14). | Support teachers to use appropriate assessments and apply them along the approach (principle 14).


In summary, there is no one absolute definition, range, nor framework of the term learner-centred approach. The term has been defined diversely and differently among various scholars with different academic and professional background and interests. It is no surprise that the approach may be used as diversely as it is defined depending on the user’s knowledge and background, and to whom they employ the technique. In order not to have a limited vision of the approach, this research is designed to have a loose how-to definition of the term learner-centred ranging between traditional teaching approach and constructivistic approach.
Instead, this investigation considers the learner-centred classroom using the guideline derived from the APA’s fourteen principles.

*Thais’ conceptions of a learner-centred approach*

The learner-centred approach is not new to Thais in three ways, which are related to Thai-Buddhism’s use of the approach for teachers and learners. Firstly, Thais learnt that the Buddha himself used this approach teaching each follower. He considered individual’s knowledge and personality then related his style of teaching and knowledge to them. Secondly, the Buddha had one teaching, widely known by Thais, related to consideration of learners’ difference. It is learners generally divided into four main groups by analogy with growing lotuses in a pond. These lotuses are blossomed lotuses above water level, budding lotuses just above the water level, budding lotuses that just form itself, not yet bloomed, and are still under water, and blossomed lotuses that budded, grew, and flourished under water waiting for time to die without a chance to appear above water. (Thamma Discussion Area [Laan Tham Sewanaa], n.d.). Thai-Buddhism interpreted this teaching as teachers had to apply different attempt level to students using this analogy. For flourished lotuses above water which refer to bright and quick learners, teachers just guide and they can continue their own learning. The second group or budding lotuses just above the water level, teachers have to facilitate them a bit more. The third group, the just budding lotuses which still are under water, represent learners who have capacity to learn but teachers have to put a great deal of efforts to teach them. The last group is blossomed
lotuses that budded, grew, and flourished under water level, as unable-to-be-taught learners, teachers cannot do anything about them, nor can they learn by themselves. Teachers have to let these kinds of learners go. This interpretation, if considered it without proper judgment of teachers’ self performance, it can be used as teachers’ accuse not to teach some learners, as they may perceive these students are ‘underwater’ by not seeing that they themselves are also ‘underwater’. Thirdly, another teaching that also well known by Thais is ten tips for learners suggesting to believe no one, not even famous, trustworthy persons and teachers, or no rumours or news without deliberately thinking through by self.

Although these three teachings are learnt by many Thais, and appear positive to Thais’ perception of learner-centred approach, there are three obstacles burdened some Thais to apply them as a benchmark for teaching and learning. For the first teaching, many Thais consider Buddha’s ability to distinguished each learner and teach them successfully applying different pedagogy and knowledge is an extraordinary quality, and that is difficult for ordinary people to has. For the teaching lotuses analogy, many Thais who are in a position of teaching often consider slow learners as the bloomed lotuses underwater that cannot be developed, without paying attention to their own attempts whether or not they do their best or applied every possible way of teaching. The third teaching of ten tips for learners also is blocked from Thais’ habits of being followers and having no criticism that caused by centuries of being under control by authorities as well as traditional teaching.
Moreover, the learner-centred approach in Thai education reform is interpreted differently from what western culture defined in two ways. First, the goal of the learner-centred approach for individual learner is not exactly to achieve only intellectual development but also virtue, and happiness (Sub-committees on learning reform of the National Education Commission, 2000a, p.17; 2000b, p. 13). Atagi (2002) viewed this as the return of *Thai-ness* promoted by several leaders, officials, and some politicians (Atagi, 2002, p. 62). She also linked the concept of happy learners to the Buddhist concept of self-attainment (Atagi, 2002). Thai-Buddhist culture interprets expectations and learner conceptions of themselves differently from western cultures. According to Buddhism, an individual comprises five parts: body (including appearances and behaviours), emotion, perception, mental formations, and knowledge and consciousness (Amornwiwat, 1998). Although divided, they are considered in relation to others in a holistic approach (Amornwiwat, 1998; Phrathampidok et al., 2001). The whole self also cannot be detached from the social context where the individual mingles (Amornwiwat, 1998). In addition, Phrathampidok et al. (2001) discussed on Thai-Buddhist conceptions regarding four elements of individual development: physical, mental, social, and emotional. They pointed out the interpretation of these terms in Thai-Buddhist were slightly different from those of the west. The term physical includes not only body but also physical environments (Phrathampidok et al., 2001, p. 78). The term mental in western cultures refers to intellectual aspects but in Thai-Buddhist cultures it also refers to emotional aspects (Phrathampidok et al., 2001, p. 73). Social development in Thai-Buddhism means both societal as well as ethical enhancement (Phrathampidok et
al., 2001, p. 79). Also emotional aspects regarded in Thai-Buddhism includes both feeling and virtuous soul (Phrathampidok et al., 2001, p. 79).


Dilemmas in the using of the learner-centred approach

One study by Darling-Hammond (1992) presented some of the dilemmas associated with schools’ implementation of a learner-centred approach. Studied schools in the United States, Darling-Hammond (1992) found that despite many changes being found, they were changes directed by bureaucratisation and standardisation, which hindered the implementation of learner-centred approach that focused on learners not the authorities. Also, schools could not follow every prescriptive policy (Darling-Hammond, 1992, p. 21). For lasting reform, she suggested three components that needed to be given greater attention. These are professional development, policy development, and political development (Darling-Hammond, 1992).

In conclusion, learner-centred pedagogy is defined diversely. There is no one right or wrong teaching approach; in some contexts, even a lecturing style can be
learner-centred. No matter how the term learner-centred approach is defined, the approach will not be valuable without real usage by teachers. Whatever is written in a paper will not be valuable if its significance is not realised by implementers.

The discussion of how ‘lively’ the learner-centred approach can be at the school level, particularly in Thai secondary schools, again, is the main investigation of this study and it is presented in later chapters.
CHAPTER 5: METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses how this research was undertaken. Four parts are exemplified. The first part involves the research inquiries. The second part is theoretical frameworks underpinning the research conduct. The third part includes the methodology: data collection, and data analysis. The last part surrounds the issue of the research creditability including validity and reliability, ethical concerns, and limitations.

The research inquiries

A key question answered in this thesis is how secondary schools implemented the learner-centred instructional reforms. To get the answers about how the schools implemented this policy, the two issues were raised: what factors impacted upon the schools’ implementation of the policy, and how was the school implementation progressing. The purpose of the study was descriptive; to define current practices of the schools.

Theoretical Guidelines

The research was guided by various theories. Four of them were dominant. They were pragmatism, interpretivism, grounded theory, and case study. Marshall (1998) stated that pragmatism referred to a theory that sought truths through concrete experiences and languages rather than abstract philosophical systems,
and that use-value or outcomes determined truths. Interpretivism is a theory, which views that there is no single social reality. Instead, social reality is ambiguous as individuals interpret their own social realities based upon their own experiences and ways of thinking (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Marshall (1998, p. 265), and Strauss and Corbin, (1998) identified grounded theory as an inductive approach, which developed theory through systematic data gathering, and careful analysis rather than deductively setting an assumption then testing it. Case study is defined in three ways: process of investigation that focuses on a particular bounded system or case, unit of study itself which is the case, or the research reports and outcomes that describe and analyse the case as a whole (Merriam, 1998, p. 27).

The four theories were utilised throughout the whole process of the research, from the formulation of the research questions, through the data collection, and onto the data analysis. Whereas pragmatism was fundamental to the “what” of this research (the research goal, its questions, the expected findings, the analysis), interpretivism and grounded theory were involved with the “how” (processes of data collection, and data analysis, respectively), and case study related to “whom” (boundaries of unit of study).

The influence of pragmatism covered the research selection of informants as well as the analysis. As the pragmatic policy development scheme required researchers to find consensus and conflicts among various participants (Crump, 1992, p. 423), the informants were recruited from different levels of policy implementers. They
were public secondary school personnel, policy staff from the central agency of
Department of General Education, and policy staff of the provincial agency of the
Department. In pragmatism, languages are tools for practical purposes not for
world essence (Emerson, cited in Goodman, 1995). This view allowed the
researcher to focus on the purpose of the communication, rather than word by
word (Aronson, 1994).

Interpretivism guided the research in at least two ways: its design, and data
collection. Referring to Social Research Methods by Neuman (1999) the research
utilised three qualitative techniques: document analysis, participant observations,
and in-depth interviews. This was to gain empirical evidence in an inductive
fashion rather than in a positivist or critical way. The theory also influenced the
researcher’s pattern of observing, interviews, and analysis of the subject matter
via the participants’ perspectives.

Grounded theory was significant in the analysis of data, as it was a systematic
analytic tool that provided clear steps for a researcher, especially an inexperienced
qualitative researcher, to follow (Browne & Sullivan, 1999; Denzin, 1998).
Following the grounded theory procedure, codes and coding techniques were
derived from the data. However, two main codes (factors and outcomes) were
derived from the two main issues under inquiry (whether the schools experienced
any factors impacting their implementation of the policy, and how the school
implementation was progressing). Both predefined and postdefined codes were
renamed, checked, and regrouped several times in the interim. The details of how
this was achieved are presented in the data analysis later in this chapter.

Case study is defined by its interest in units of study rather than the method of inquiry applied (Stake, 2000, p. 435). This research used what Yin called *descriptive case studies* which described “the scope and depth of the object (case)” (Yin, 2003, p. 23) as it aimed to investigate how schools implemented the policy in order to provide a better understanding for educators. In this research the individual cases were two public secondary schools. The presentation of each case in this thesis involved both holistic and analytic tools. It was holistic in that the school’s setting was examined in detail, and analytic in the investigation into the implementation of the instructional reform policy. The detail of the rationale behind the selection of cases is discussed in the sampling section.

Apart from the four main theories, some theories about change and culture provided frameworks for the project. They are discussed in Chapter 2. However, the integrated model which is the model created from the integration between the two models using theories of change, one presented by Hall and Hord (1987, 2001) and the other presented by Fullan (1991) is specifically restated herein. The part of the integrated model derived from Hall and Hord’s model, known as Concerns-Based Adoption Model or CBAM, was used as a tentative sociological framework of policy implementation at the school level, that was, to give the researcher an understanding of how people within schools were likely to interact towards one another as individuals or as a group when an innovation was introduced.
The part that is involved with Fullan’s model, instead, provides a framework for the conduct of research and an analysis of its findings. The Fullan’s model, regarded as Interactive Factors Affecting Implementation, lists three major factors which have an impact on the implementation of an innovation: change characteristics, local characteristics, and external factors. The four characteristics of change include need, clarity, complexity, and practicality or quality. Local characteristics comprise four social and political units inside and outside a school: district level agencies, the community, principals, and teachers. The last factor that is defined as the external factors is government and other agencies. In other words, the first group of factors exists within individual implementers, whereas the other two groups of factors are involved in the sociology of change.

With reference to the model, this research gained data from different groups of people involved with the change or the instructional reform in order to identify characteristics of change. These people included teachers, principals, community, policy people from provincial agencies and the central agency. Both models, CBAM and Interactive Factors Affecting Implementation, were presented in Chapter 2.

The Research Action

Sampling

This research acquired data from two main sources: the Department of General Education (the governmental unit whose duty oversees all public secondary
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schools in Thailand), and two public secondary schools. Data collection in the ministry did not involve sampling, however, data collection from the schools did. Data from the ministry were gathered according to availability. Available policy people included those in the Department’s provincial agencies, as well as in its central office. In contrast, the schools were listed as case studies. Sample schools were selected according to their locations—one located in Bangkok and the other in another province in central Thailand. The one in Bangkok was given the pseudonym of Karunaa School whilst the one in another province was called Medtaa School.

The reason the samples were primarily selected due to location was that although Thailand was divided into seventy-six provinces, its development was unequal (Dixon, 1999). Most advancement including education occurred in the capital city, Bangkok. Thus, in terms of developmental balance, the cases were in the context of both Bangkok, and other non-metropolitan provinces. Then they were selected by the accessibility. The school in Bangkok was selected as its principal allowed the researcher to conduct the observation after three other secondary schools’ principals had already denied access. The school in the province was chosen through the researcher’s personal connections, as it was dangerous for any women in Thailand to stay alone to places where they were unknown.

There were three rationales for why policy people and school staff were significant sources of this research. The first was the influence of pragmatism. Following the pragmatic policy development scheme that required researchers to
discover both consensus and conflicts among various participants (Crump, 1992, p. 423), informants were recruited from different levels of policy implementers. The second reason concerned Fullan’s Model of Interactive Factors Affecting Implementation as it signified principals, teachers, as well as policy people in district and national agency, each as significant factors. The third reason relied on various theories about changes, and specifically ones about processes of change solidified this research that was change occurs through a subjective meaning then objective one (Fullan, 1991; Rogers, 1995; Schien, 1997). This concept motivated this study to search for answers from both subjective and objective perspectives, in other words, from school staff, and officials in the Department of General Education agencies. These indicative questions are listed in Appendix D.

Methods

This research was designed to seek understanding of the real and deep context of Thai public secondary schools, the advantage that only a qualitative approach could provide. As a result, three qualitative approaches were conducted to collect data for this study: document analysis, interviews, and observation. The data collection was conducted from March 2001 to September 2001. Whilst all approaches were used for collecting data from the two schools, only document analysis and interviews were applied in obtaining data from the DGE agencies. Also, the document analysis was used heavily to study how the reform was officially introduced to the schools through the agencies, interviews and observation were used as significant methods for studying in the fields. Despite
the same methodology and same researcher, details in the application of the methods were different towards different types of participants—policy people, and schools’ staff. Hence, the methods conducted with the different participants are explained in detail.

**Document analysis**

Documents collected from policy staff varied from the general documents and official records. Ones available to the public included books on general knowledge about the reform, handbooks for spearhead teachers, handbooks for schools, bulletins, maps, and other documents. Official documents were ones restricted to public access for example policy documents, reports of the agencies, annual reports, budgeting reports. To gain these official documents written approval signed by a key authority was required. (Please see Appendix E for the letter of permission to collect data from the Department.) To obtain approval required time and frequent communication with officials. However, the time can be shortened and frequency of communication can be reduced if using personal connections. To gain the general documents was easier and involved with less official procedures, but involved more human relations skills. The situation was similar to what Hodder suggested that to gain restricted documents involved power technology whereas to gain general documents required personal technology (Hodder, 1998, p. 111). If possible, these documents were read prior to the personal interview. However, they were often provided after the interview, when respondents were familiar with the researcher.
Similarly, documents provided by the schools can be divided into general documents, and official records. General documents were ones such as student handbooks, and school bulletins. Official records were ones involving policy include the school charter, meeting agendas, school meeting reports, and school annual prospects. Some documents were not permitted to be seen as the schools were not comfortable enough to allow so. For example, one school did not allow the researcher to read its existing but unfinished charter. Also there were differences in collecting documents between one school and another. In Karunaa School, most of the documents were provided by the principal, whereas in Medtaa School the researcher had to search for most of them herself.

After getting these documents, they were read through then relevant lines were marked for further analysis after consideration with data from interviews and observation. They were kept and analysed in groups according to where they were produced: roughly the ONEC, the MOE, the DGE, the provincial agencies, and the schools.

Document analysis provided two advantages for the researcher. The first benefit was that it helped the researcher have valid knowledge and anticipation of what happened before and was happening at the moment prior to conduct any methods for more validity and reliability of data collected. The second benefit was in the purpose of data collection itself: to gain information and to have a triangulation of analysis. There was a comparison of data collected through this method and other two research methods during the analysis process.
The classification of interview methods is in three categories: identification, procedure, and setting. The style of interviews was the in-depth interviews with indicative questions (Appendix D) to guide the interviewer what were the main or initial questions likely to be asked. Unexpectedly, however, two interviews outside the schools happened to be group interviews as the respondents allowed the researcher to do so only as a group interview. The groups consisted of two and three policy people. The questions were divided in two: questions for personal information such as positions, longevity of work experience, education background; and questions on the issues and consequences of implementation. Questions for personal information were applied similarly to every interviewee, questions on implementation although were initially indicated by the researcher as in Appendix D, were mostly open-ended that were easy to be navigated regarding each respondent’s perspective towards the implementation.

Altogether ten policy people outside the schools participated in the interview procedure. However, there were only seven interviews because of the two groups interviewed. (Intentionally, the researcher planned to conduct only partly structured interviews.) For each interview, the researcher made an appointment with each respondent. The night prior to each interview, questions were reviewed, questioning style was practiced, the consent forms were prepared, the tape recorder and the tape were checked. The consent form sets were submitted and signed prior to each interview. In the beginning of each interview while the
respondent(s) introduced himself(themselves), the researcher took notes on the respondent’s characteristics, and personality. During the interview, the dialogue was tape-recorded, the physical reactions of the respondent throughout the interview were recorded in a separate notebook. The researcher allowed the respondent to lead the conversation, despite having the indicative questions. Occasionally the researcher probed by asking the respondent to clarify or specify points. Similar actions were used for the group interviews. As face saving value in Thai culture was so strong that answers of an authority in higher position could strongly influence their subordinates’, the researcher tried to alleviate this problem by switching orders from one respondent to another in each round of questioning. This technique provided the subordinates chances to express their viewpoints prior to their superior, and can helps mitigating total domination of the higher authority in the situation. A switching technique was suggested by Fontana and Frey (1998, p. 55). Immediately after each interview, the tape and its box were labelled.

Most of the time, the interview with policy people occurred in a personal or office closeby. One interview however was conducted in a hotel restaurant as the interviewee was invited to be a lecturer for a seminar arranged there. Amidst the non-private setting, the place was quiet. There was no distraction caused by people around the place but there was disturbance from occasional calls to the interviewee’s mobile phone.
Interviews conducted in both schools also were partly structured in-depth interviews, and took place in the last week of the observation. In each school seven informants were selected for interviews. Within this number two were the school administrators and five were extreme teachers. (Extreme teachers are ones who showed the most among all teachers, extreme attitudes and actions towards the implementation of the policy, either for or against it.) The use of extreme cases is suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994) as a tactic to confirm findings. These informants were identified in the research using false names and non-specific attributes such as Administrator I, Teacher ii. From Medtaa School, two administrators included the principal himself, and the assistant principal who was responsible for the academic division, which much involved with teaching and learning management. The five teachers comprised two negative extreme teachers who had opinions against the implementation (one of them was also a head of one subject department, the other also worked for the school administration); and three positive extreme teachers who had strong support for the implementation and taught using learner-centred approach (one of them was also a spearhead teacher, and another involved with the school’s policy and planning). From Karunaa School, two administrators selected included the principal himself, and the academic assistant principal. The teachers included two negative extreme teachers, one also a head of a subject department; and three positive extreme teachers, one of them was a spearhead teacher, and another had to work regarding the school’s policy and planning.
In the interview, the researcher followed the same procedures as with the policy people: making an appointment, providing the consent form sets, notetaking the interviewee’s characteristics, tape-recording the dialogue, attempting to minimise the researcher intervention, and asking probing questions. However, there were two differences. One exception was that the consent form sets were provided a few days prior to the interview as to allow the respondents time to think about it. The other was that the prior three-week observation allowed the researcher to have a preliminary concept of what was happening in the schools, and was then able to finetune some issues with the respondents.

The interviews with the school staff were also normally conducted in closed offices. At their request, a few of them occurred in informal and open settings, such as on a balcony. The use of these informal places had both positive and negative aspects. The positive aspect was that the interviewees, as well as the interviewer, felt relaxed and natural. The negative aspect was the unavoidable distractions such as passersby. In this case the researcher re-asked the question.

Observation

In addition to the two qualitative procedures, document analysis and interviews, participant observation was also applied in the two schools in the data collection process. The researcher participated in the field as a “peripheral member-researcher” (Adler & Adler, 1998, p. 84-85) who went to the field, had rapport with the people in the field while taking notes of the observation, but avoiding active involvement in any activities. It was conducted in Medtaa School first.
One month was taken to conduct a preliminary analysis of Medtaa School’s data. Afterwards, the researcher went to the Karunaa School, the selected school in Bangkok.

Details of each observation can be divided into three stages: pre-observation, during the observation, and post-observation. Prior to each school observation, two things were prepared: permission; and the researcher, as the most important tool in the observation. Approval to conduct observations required two kinds of permission: official permission from the Department of General Education; and the personal permission from the authority in the schools, who were the principals. Fortunately, the researcher gained sufficient permission before entering the field from official contacts as well as personal connections. For the self-preparation, the researcher allowed her mind to be free to be able to focus herself to learn about everyone and everything in the field.

Within four weeks of the observations, a procedure was adopted. It comprised four steps: adjustment, general observing, attending meetings as well as observing classrooms, and interviews. Each step moved towards more acceptance of the researcher.

The adjustment period began after the researcher was introduced to each school staff and this took a few days. As an unobtrusive observer, the researcher avoided doing anything that could harm the staff’s first impressions of the observer. She meant to be polite, humble, simple and unobtrusive in order to build rapport. During this period, the researcher walked around the school and took notes in
order to allow teachers to get used to her presence and behaviours, and at the same
time she explored the school. Some informal conversations with the school staff
occurring within this period helped the researcher adjust her own interpretation to
the teachers. After a few days of entering the field when people in the field felt
ready to be observed—when they voluntarily reached out such as when they told
something personal or shared an idea with the researcher—the researcher began
the daily routine of observation.

The daily routine comprised one off-site and another on-site. The off-site
activities were daily reviews of indicative questions each morning, and at the end
of each observation day completion of notes as well as interim analysis. The on-
site activities included taking notes, browsing around the school, visiting places
accessible from teachers’ office to informal settings such as the school cafeteria.
The rationale behind this was that four-weeks is a short period of time, and the
researcher would like to, at best, be socialised with the staff, at worst, let them get
used to the observer’s presence in their territory. The notes comprised records of
events and activities, and the observer’s comments (Rossman & Rallis 1998, p.
137). The records included drawn maps, dialogues, interactions, environments,
and settings. The researcher took notes in accordance with strategies suggested by
Lofland (1971) by undertaking it regularly, immediately [if possible], totally, and
unobtrusively (as cited in Fontana and Frey, 1998, p. 60). It was considered
unobtrusive as it was perceived as the researcher’ routine. However, some staff,
particularly in Medtaa School, felt uncomfortable in the classroom observation
situation despite attempts at being unobtrusive. Later some of them confessed to
the researcher that they felt like they were being tested after a long while of isolated teaching experience.

The notebooks used in the field also were deliberately prepared. The recording page was double-spaced comprised a page on the left and a page on the right of a notebook. Each doubled page was divided into four parts: the first part for short notes of a phenomenon, the second and third part in the middle of the page for facts and information of the phenomenon in details, the last part for comments and initial analysis. Leaving spaces to be filled in was a correct decision because often the researcher could not record an event while it was happening as either it might offend participants or there were overwhelming amount of phenomena occurred simultaneously. In this case, the researcher had jot notes on the first part of the pages, as soon as she had privacy she described these jotted notes in the second and third part of the pages, then made comments on the last part.

With time, the researcher was accepted more and allowed to observe several meetings as well as teaching practices in several classes. Two issues were considered important at this stage: the permission and the position. To gain access to the meetings was different from classroom observation. The researcher was invited into the meetings whereas she had to ask for personal consent verbally from each teacher for each classroom observation. The position of the researcher’s seat also was of concern. In the classroom and meeting observations, the researcher chose a seat located at the back as to release the participants from the pressure caused by the sight of the observer. To collect data, she drew an outline
of the seating as it referred to social grouping of the staff, and functional culture in
the room aside. At the last week of each observation, the researcher conducted
partly structured in-depth interviews with selected informants.

Despite using similar procedures, some details of the observation in each school
differed from each other. The differences were in degree of adjustment, the
gatekeepers, and the degree of control over the observation. Between the two
schools, the researcher had to adjust herself more for the observation in Medt้าa
School than in Karunaa School. There were two reasons behind this. The first one
is that as the school is located in a rural area in central Thailand, and the
researcher had to move to stay in the community for the observation, living with a
homestay family whose hosts are parents of a friend. The researcher encountered
not only in-the-field difficulties regarding unfamiliarity, but also in-the-house
difficulties as she had to adjust herself to the new family. Fortunately, she had the
experience of living in a ‘foreign’ environment that helped her prepare for
difficulties and accept differences. As well, she had a few days of living
adjustment before conducting the observation. The second reason is that the
nature of staff in Medt้าa School is closed, and less friendly to newcomers. As a
result, the researcher felt isolated in the first few days. However, after the
researcher participated their informal after-hours party, they seemed to
increasingly accept her. When they were likely to fully accept the researcher, they
became warm, and relaxed. Unlike the Karunaa School, its staff seemed more
friendly and open at the beginning, but the passing of time showed no
development in the relationships between the researcher and the community as a
whole (although the researcher had a smooth relationship with a number of teachers). Time revealed that among staff there was balkanisation, and that they did not trust even one another.

The second difference is the informal gatekeeper, the key person whose acceptance is influential others in accepting the outsider. In Karunaa School the gatekeeper was the principal who was welcoming toward the researcher since her first self-introduction. In Medtaa School the gatekeeper was one of the assistant principals. He verbally showed the approval to her at the after-hours informal party on the first day of entering the school. Everyone seemed to be more welcoming toward her afterwards.

The other distinctive variable is the schools’ control over the observation. In Karunaa School, it was far more obvious than in Medtaa School. The reason was, as the principal directed, for a safety reason, that it was necessary for the researcher to inform him of every interaction she would like to have. If he considered it was safe, the researcher could continue her plans. She had to report where she would go, whose class she would like to see, and whom she would like to interview. The control was not only in a form of reports but also by arrangement with two personal *nannies*: teachers who were assigned to assist and ‘look’ after the researcher almost all of the time. Whilst in Medtaa School, the researcher could observe more freely. There was no obvious control over the observation.
The last step of observation was the period after each observation was finished. All the notes were preliminarily analysed to ensure the adequacy of data. Then they were recorded into a computer, for further analysis.

Data management

The raw materials for this research included documents, fieldnotes, and recorded tapes of the interviews. They were kept separately in groups for later retrieval. The documents that were collected referred to the units in which they were gained from: the central agency, each provincial agency, or schools. The raw fieldnotes of each school were kept together. Then they were transformed to Microsoft Word Documents into a computer. Each file contained one day of observation. The tapes were transcribed in the original language used in the interview, Thai, into a computer with the help of the transcribing machine. Each file referred to one interviewee. The notes and interviews were in Thai as it allowed the researcher to collect data at her best and to include colloquial language. They were then transcribed into Thai again as it prevented primary misinterpretation because the texts would have to be translated repeatedly. Then they were coded. Later the codes were translated into English. But the quotation that each code represented remained in Thai. When the codes were finalised, the quotations were translated into English along with the writing up the research findings.

The longevity and security of the raw materials were also of concern. All the computerised files were duplicated and kept in different disk spaces. Additionally,
they were printed out and kept in hardcopy form in a separate place from the raw materials. The tapes were also kept in a dry, cool, and locked cupboard.

Analysis

The analysis of the data occurred at different stages of the research; when documents had been collected, after conducting interviews, while in the field, while the notes and interviews were being transcribed. The obvious and systematic analysis began after all the fieldnotes and interview scripts were in electronic form. Each interview script was analysed one-by-one, in other words, by using the single-case analysis method. Then the transcripts, notes, and documents collected were analysed across cases by using a technique called variable-oriented analysis (Fischer & Wertz 1975, as cited in Huberman & Miles, 1998, p. 195). That was, data in these transcripts, notes, and documents within the same school and agency were analysed and categorized, firstly, according to the research two main inquiries (whether the schools experienced any factors impacting their implementation of the policy, and how the school implementation was progressing) under codes named factors, outcomes, and others, for any other interesting points that arose from the data. Afterwards, data, which developed similar themes, were categorised together. Then they were coded. This later process can be regarded as cross-case analysis. This process is illustrated in Figure 4.
Figure 4. An illustration of a case analysis procedure applied in this research.
Apart from the initial analysis conducted before, during, and after each small step of data collection, when all notes, and interview scripts were typed and transcribed, the sequential analysis began. The sequence of analysis was relevant to, first and foremost, the significance of the data to the research, and secondly, the sequence of data collection. In other words, data from the schools were analysed first, and data from Medttaa School were analysed before that from Karunaa School. Then interview scripts of the policy people were analysed.

The coding process followed four steps, and grounded theory techniques: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The first step used open coding technique including line by line analysis and paragraph analysis for notes and transcripts. For transcripts, whole document analysis was also applied. Meanwhile, three main codes, factors, outcomes, and others, were defined. ‘Factors’ and ‘outcomes’ derived from the two main inquiries (whether the schools experienced any factors impacting upon their implementation of the policy, and how the school implementation was progressing) whereas ‘others’ was the code for any other interesting data such as that relating to the school’s culture. Then the codes were connected with these main codes. This connecting technique was also known as axial coding. If a theme emerged from any lines or paragraphs, those lines or paragraphs were grouped together and the theme they represented was coded using simple words such as ‘support’, ‘obstacle’, ‘culture’ and these newly defined words were used as subthemes. This process was conducted repetitively to ensure that every theme was not neglected. After that they were checked again using a technique regarded by Strauss and Corbin as incident-to-
incident comparison (1998) to check whether the data were validly put into the most suitable theme or subtheme. (The link from subthemes to categories was also an axial coding.) If they did not fit appropriately, they would be reclassified until they fitted the best themes they each represented. Then these themes were integrated and refined in the composition of the report. The process of theory integration and refinement was also a selective coding technique. Although there were around nine hundred codes in the first step of the analysis (just after all data were collected), finally these codes were reduced and put under 131 themes; forty-eight emerged from data of Medtaa School and Karunaa School coincidentally equally, and thirty-five themes from data of policy people. Please see Appendix F for the ultimate themes and Table 4 for the coding process used in this research.
The raw data (translated).

I have not yet implemented [the student-centred approach]. The reason that I have not used it because of the time constraint as well as too much amount of content of subjects, they certainly are a lot, just for rural students. I have to clearly state, the content is too much for some rural students. For students in Bangkok or in town, they should consider the content is not much because they only are responsible for study. They do not have to do any other things else. Just study. They cannot study by themselves correctly. Just I tutor them train them to read books. I am the one who really like it [study by self] because I was a student who hardly pay attention in classroom teaching. When teachers want to test, I will not read [what they taught], I cannot understand. I will read by myself. I gain experiences in this that allow me to have knowledge. So I brought it to practice my students. But most of them, when they have exams no one read (Subject B)’s books. I asked them [they told] they did not read. This shows that our students do not have this personality shown yet. And every time I teach them by using this method, it is in failure because my students cannot figure it out, they cannot achieve it. It could be since their initial experience, since primary level. Their own parents tend to teach them by the old ways. Primary teachers also teach them the old ways.
Step 1: Identify codes by considering what it vividly represents by line by line and paragraph by paragraph analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have not yet implement [the student-centered approach].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time VS amount of content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The reason that I have not used it because of the time constraint as well as too much amount of content of subjects, they certainly are a lot, just for rural students. I have to clearly state, the content is too much for some rural students. For students in Bangkok or in town, they should consider the content is not much because they only are responsible for study. They do not have to do any other things else. Just study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>student habits not study by self yet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They cannot study by themselves correctly. Just I tutor them train them to read books. Personal experience I am the one who really like it[study by self] because I was a student who hardly pay attention in classroom teaching. When teachers want to test, I will not read [what they taught], I cannot understand. I will read by myself. I gain experiences in this that allow me to have knowledge. So I brought it to practice my students. But most of them, when they have exams no one read (Subject B)'s books. I asked them [they told] they did not read. This shows that our students do not have this personality shown yet. And every time I teach them by using this method, it is in failure because my students cannot figure it out, they cannot achieve it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>traditional teaching anywhere else</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It could be since their initial experience, since primary level. Their own parents tend to teach them by the old ways. Primary teachers also teach them the old ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 2: The connection of new coding and the predefined themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have not yet implement [the student-centred approach].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors, time VS amount of content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The reason that I have not used it because of the time constraint as well as too much amount of content of subjects, they certainly are a lot, just for rural students. I have to clearly state, the content is too much for some rural students. For students in Bangkok or in town, they should consider the content is not much because they only are responsible for study. They do not have to do any other things else. Just study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors, student habits not study by self yet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They cannot study by themselves correctly. Just I tutor them train them to read books. Others: Personal experience I am the one who really like it[study by self] because I was a student who hardly pay attention in classroom teaching. When teachers want to test, I will not read [what they taught], I cannot understand. I will read by myself. I gain experiences in this that allow me to have knowledge. So I brought it to practice my students. But most of them, when they have exams no one read (Subject B)’s books. I asked them [they told] they did not read. This shows that our students do not have this personality shown yet. And every time I teach them by using this method, it is in failure because my students cannot figure it out, they cannot achieve it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors, traditional teaching anywhere else</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It could be since their initial experience, since primary level. Their own parents tend to teach them by the old ways. Primary teachers also teach them the old ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 3: The codes then were put in a Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet as follows

**Within the worksheet name Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maphrau</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not use by himself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Within the worksheet name Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maphrau</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time VS amount of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maphrau</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural students habits not study by self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maphrau</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional teaching cause the habit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Within the worksheet name Others**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maphrau</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive experience to learning by self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 4: With codes from other informants, the codes were re-categorised, and renamed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maphrau (false name of a teacher)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the worksheet name Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>Obstacle</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>central, curricular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>Obstacle</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>Obstacle</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the worksheet name Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Positive experience in independent studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Creditability

Reliability and Validity

Validity of the data was attained in three ways: triangulation, the researcher’s tacit knowledge, and a revisit to the field. Triangulation occurred among the approaches, among participants within their groups, and without their groups. Among methods, the data were validated from comparisons of documents, field notes, and interview scripts. For example, the statement of a teacher that he used the learner-centred approach every time would not be valid if observation in his classroom indicated otherwise or the reaction of students to his teaching indicated otherwise. Validity was also gained from a triangulation among various participants; policy people, school managers, and teachers. For example a claim by a principal that he supported potential teachers financially would be reconsidered if the teachers disagreed on this claim. Additionally, validity in the depth of data was confirmed due to tacit knowledge that the researcher gained, and checked with the subjects’ responses during the field participation (Adler & Adler, 1998). Lastly, the validity derived from the researcher revisited to the field a year later to present the data and get feedback. The staff of one school confirmed the findings, one of them stated he did not think about it in this way previously.

The research also involved two kinds of reliability: data reliability and the researcher reliability. Reliability of the data was attained from the triangulation
among the methods: dialogues in the fieldnotes, interview scripts, and document review, and from within each method itself—consistency of each respondent’s answer towards the same question asked repeatedly one at a time. Researcher reliability was ensured by her acknowledgement of her duty and status in the field as she undertook several systematically practices such as reviewing the indicative questions each day prior to entering the field or before an interview, and focusing on the goal of the research.

Issues of internal and external validity (Neuman, 1999, pp. 236-241) were realised as well. Issues of internal validity such as tiredness of interviewees after the working day were alleviated by the researcher’s intensive but relaxed interview style. Furthermore, there were concerns about external validity issues, particularly the Hawthorne Effect and Demand Characteristics (Neuman, 1999). The Hawthorne Effect was avoided by the appearance of the observer regularly and consistently in the field. The Demand Characteristics that can happen when the informants’ changed their behaviours to be relevant to what the research expected, were reduced by the researcher’s indication that she preferred real behaviours.

Ethical Concerns

Various ethical issues were addressed in this study, at every stage. Prior to the data collection, the project was approved by the University of Sydney human ethics committee prior to conducting data collection. Consent forms including details of the project, the researcher, the use of apparatus such as a tape recorder were signed before interviews, and observations (please see Appendix G for
consent forms and their translated versions). For anonymity and confidentiality, each participant’s identity was hidden by the use of pseudonyms. After data were collected, the relevant documents and other materials such as tape recorders were kept in locked places and were not exposed, either intentionally or unintentionally.

Limitations

This research had three limitations. They were the small sample size, the language and cultural burdens, and the possibly outdated findings. As this research was to investigate the real-time implementation of the instructional reform, it gained data from only two schools and a number of policy people. Its findings may or may not necessarily be able to represent other public secondary schools in the nation. For this study, it was not so important that its findings did not stand for the major population. Instead it is more committed to the validity and reliability of actual implementation at the school level.

This research also had another burden due to different cultures to some of its audiences. The research was undertaken in a Thai context—in the Thai language, in the Thai education system, in Thailand and by a Thai researcher—with no intention to be a cultural comparative study genre. Some readers from different cultural backgrounds who did not recognise the existence of cultural and language discourses might find some points difficult to understand.

The third limitation of this research was its likely outdated findings. By the time this thesis was submitted a number of years had elapsed since the data collection.
Therefore, its findings regarding the implementation of the instructional and learning reform policy may be out of date because continuing implementation efforts have taken place. However, indirect ramifications involving the implementation of change presented such as the characteristics of the reform, the sociological nature of how the reform was implemented are still useful as such a study has never previously been undertaken in a Thai context at a school level.

The introductory part discussing underlying theories, assumptions, inquires, and how to conduct means to get the answers is ended in this chapter. The following chapters present the implementation of the instructional reform policy. The next chapter discusses the national situation and strategies used by the central official units, particularly, the Department of General Education in attempting to bring about educational reform.
CHAPTER 6: GENERAL INFORMATION ON THAI RECENT EDUCATION REFORM

This chapter presents general information about the recent education reform in Thailand. The information is grouped into two categories: general background of the reform, and the implementation of the policy at the national level. The general background comprises three sections. The first part introduces the rationale behind the initiation of this reform. The second part describes the reform policies, particularly instructional reform. The third section presents the settings of the implementation—the conditions and situations around the nation when the instructional reform policy was initially implemented. The national level implementation is presented in four topics. The first topic involves the definition of the term learner-centred in general Thai context. The second topic moves to the definition of the term as used by the central policy decision-making units: ONEC and the Ministry of Education. The third topic relates to the implementation of the reform and strategies used by the Department of General Education, the central agency that has direct authority over public secondary schools. The last topic is the initial analysis of the policy regarding its three aspects discussed in Chapter 2 that entails several states’ education reforms to failure.
General Background

*The rationale: the political and the economic environments*

There were two major simultaneous phenomena influencing the initiation of recent education reform: one was political and the other was economic. Both can be attributed to globalisation. The political phenomenon was the revision of the nation’s Constitution in 1997, in which the forty-third and eighty-first sections resulting in the establishment of the nation’s very first educational act—the laws that enacted the nationwide educational reform (Sub-committees on learning reform of the National Education Commission, 2000a). This was influenced covertly by the worldwide postmodernist phenomenon as mentioned in the Introduction Chapter, and overtly by the domestic political movement. Although the refinement of the constitution was recent and peaceful, it was, to some extent, related to three historical mass struggles which sadly became bloodshed events. The revision was related to the mass uprising in 1992 against the military coup of 1991. Many of the incident’s leaders were involved in two other similar riots almost two decades earlier. Both events also saw the uprising of university students, peasants, as well as workers against the military dictatorship at the time (Ungpakorn, 2002). This 1992 political movement “paved the way for reform” (Atagi, 2002, p. 2), but was accompanied by the simultaneous decrease of the nation’s economic competitiveness (Atagi, 2002, p. 21).

The second phenomenon was the economic crisis that occurred in the same year of the Constitution’s promulgation. It was the time when the camouflaged
economic strain was discovered out of the no-longer-affordable previous rich lifestyle due to the globalised financial meltdown. (Although, concerns about the then lifestyle existed before by some thinkers, it was not widely realized or discussed until the major economic collapse of 1997.) Hereafter, the national human resource development plans were revisited and many of its projects were canceled and there were nationwide discussions about how flaw the characteristics of manpower produced by the education system were. These two phenomena became significant catalysts for education reform (Atagi, 2002, p.21; Piya-Ajariya, 2002; Sub-committees on learning reform of the National Education Commission, 2000a; Wasii, 1996).

The policy

The education reform policies are outlined in the National Education Act B.E.2542 (1999), which is referred to as the Education Act (1999). The Act is divided into nine chapters:

Chapter 1: General Provisions: Objectives and Principles
Chapter 2: Educational Rights and Duties
Chapter 3: Educational System
Chapter 4: National Education Guidelines
Chapter 5: Educational Administration and Management
Chapter 6: Educational Standards and Quality Assurance
Chapter 7: Teachers, Faculty Staff and Educational Personnel
Chapter 8: Resources and Investment in Education
Chapter 9: Technologies for Education
Roughly, these chapters address two topics: the educational concept which is mentioned in the first and second chapters, and the educational practice, discussed in the others. Every chapter focuses on the benefits of learners. At the heart of this Act is Chapter 4 the National Education Guidelines which is devoted to lifelong learning reform (Sub-committees on learning reform of the National Education Commission, 2000a).

In the learning reform national guidelines, there are nine sections related to different educational elements. The first section involves the principle of educational provision which states the importance of individual capability of learning, and self-development, and sees learners as the most significant factor in this process. The second section relates to the contents of learning including “knowledge, morality, learning process” (Sub-committees on learning reform of the National Education Commission, 2000a, p. 10), and an amalgamation of five genres of knowledge and skills needed in each different educational level. Although it purports to relate to three elements of learning, comments have been made that this section specifies only academic knowledge and skills, as neither morality nor learning process is included. This may imply, in the worst case scenario, that the assembled body of the Act focuses on the knowledge facets of the contents rather than other facets which can lead to mis-implementation at the level of practices. The third section involves six guidelines for institutional practices. The fourth section concerns the state’s contribution to both existing and new lifelong learning sources. The fifth section discusses a number of institutional level assessments. The sixth and seventh sections identify the development of
curricula in different educational levels. The eighth section states the contribution of educational institutions and other involved parties outside institutions to learning for themselves, and for communities. The last section specifies institutions support towards effective learning processes, including instructors’ research into learning development. Even though the Act does not specify the learning approach to be only learner-centred, documents produced by policy makers emphasise that the ‘learner-centred’ approach is to be a mainstream method (Division of Policy and Planning, 2001; Office of Education Reform [OER], 2000; ONEC, 2003; Sub-committees on learning reform of the National Education Commission, 2000a, 200b).

In general, the guidelines are well written, and include necessary factors for the successful learning reform. Each section in the Chapter conveys different aspects of educational elements, and altogether they provide literal support for the utilisation of the new learner-centred teaching strategy. However, a perfectly composed policy can fail without effective implementation. The level of success of this policy is in a large part due to the implementation by a variety of educational organisations at different levels, that is, ministries, departments and their agencies, and educational institutions.

The research reported in this thesis investigated the implementation of the learner-centred approach in two public secondary schools. The implementation by institutions and the subjective views of agencies are presented in Chapter 7 and 8 respectively of this thesis. The Ministry and the Department involved with
learning reform in public secondary schools are presented in the last section of this chapter. Prior to that, in order to assist readers to understand what has been going on in the system, the following paragraphs briefly depict the political settings, particularly the leadership of each administrative leaders of the cabinet, the MOE, and the DGE.

*The milieu of the implementation*

Until now (the end of 2002), education reform in Thailand has been carried out by two governments. The first team, which is currently the Opposition, successfully established most of the documentation of the reform, including the Act, strategic plans, and subcommittees responsible for each plan. Then there was a change of the government. The current government has been in power since the beginning of 2001 under the leadership of the current Prime Minister, Taksin Shinawatra, whose reputation is based upon his success in creating and managing a successful Thai telecommunication business empire with more than sixty billion Baht value of assets in 1995 (“Rich take”, 1997, online). His first Cabinet’s policy announcement included educational, religious, and cultural aspects of the Thai society. In the educational part, the government stated clearly its commitment to education reform in relation to the National Education Act B.E.2542 (1999).
Among the twelve activities addressed, the eighth is the learning reform. It is translated as below.

[We will] reform learning by holding the principles on learner-centred, learning by self, and lifelong learning. [We will] emphasise creative thinking, and the love-to-read habit. [We will emphasise] the accessible provision of libraries, learning centres in communities, as well as other learning media. (Cidradab, 2001 p. 74)

Despite the Cabinet’s firm promise, the policy was not implemented very smoothly. The first obstacle involved the Ministry of Education itself. The administration in the ministry was unstable, including even the person on the highest position, the minister. In the year 2001 alone, there were three ministers appointed one after another. The first minister, regarded then as the academic minister (as opposed to usually assigned political ministers), brought along hopes of goodwill to the ministry (“Khaawden”, 2001, p. 4). Unfortunately, he stepped down in his third month for a number of reasons. Some sources saw problems stemming from the conflict with his political party administrators regarding the demand to delay the reform due to insufficient funds, or the demand to promote their friends into official positions they requested. The second was the Prime Minister himself, regarded as the invisible minister as he hardly appeared to work in the ministry, concentrating mainly upon the responsibilities of the prime ministership (“Khaawden”, 2001, p. 4). Instead, he assigned two existing deputy ministers to do most of the work. Three months later, the third minister was appointed. He stayed in this position for about a year and a half with criticism of his reconsideration on many matters of the reform that caused implementation
delays. His actions that entailed postponement of the reform were criticised as hindrance to the reform implementation process. Below is one press critique of him:

But he [the Minister, Suwit] did not follow the Education Act, whose objective, among others, was to liberate the education system from the outdated bureaucracy of the MOE. Instead, Suwit gave in to the old bureaucrats and indulged excessively in the politics of power-sharing between the central government in Bangkok and the existing bureaucratic structure in rest of the nation. (“Editorial: Rally”, 2002, online)

Finally, the current minister was appointed for the position. He has professional qualifications, reform knowledge, as well as personal connections with the national level authorities of the reform (“Editorial: Rally”, 2002, online). Yet, it is still too soon to judge his impact on the reform implementation.

The second obstacle derived from interference from international organisations, particularly the Asian Development Bank (ADB), and International Monetary Fund (IMF). These organisations both provided financial assistance when it was in need during the economic crisis in 1997. It was inevitable that they had influence on the government’s decision making. For example, matters agreed to by the government included the commercialisation of public universities, and the reduction of governmental officials through the ‘early-retirement’ project. Unfortunately, many of these voluntarily retired officials were educators, especially teachers. The retirement of teachers was so soon and unplanned that it caused a sudden shortage of teachers, especially those whose subjects were already experiencing a shortage of trained and experienced personnel, and
problems of management associated with the workload of school level personnel. This problem was found in both schools of this research. It is mentioned in the Findings chapter (Chapter 7) of this thesis.

The sense of instability, even if shared at the department level, was not exclusively caused by the changes of leadership at the ministerial level. It was caused by the educational structural reform that had not yet been applied irrespective of the deadline of August 20, 2002 by which time the introduction of several new official units as well as the decentralisation of educational positions from the central agencies to regional educational zones was planned to take place.

There have been three Deputy Generals since the Act was passed until the time the research was undertaken. The first Director General was assigned to the position when the previous government was in power. She successfully kept her position through the Cabinet changes until she was promoted to the highest rank of Thai civil service, the Secretary General of the Ministry in 2002. She was highly educated with bachelor and doctoral degrees from Harvard and came from a distinguished family. Despite her qualifications, she worked as a down-to-earth Director General who had a special interest in schools. She often investigated implementation of the reform herself. This attitude and the style of her leadership positively impacted upon educational administrators and led many to focus on the real implementation of the policy at the school and classroom levels.
The learner-centred approach is not new to Thais as it has been taught via at least three widely known Thai-Buddhist teachings. The first is that it is the Buddha’s approach of awakening and teaching followers. The second teaching is his differentiation of levels of learners into four major types, and that teachers have to apply different level of attempts accordingly. The third well-known by Thais teaching is the ten tips of learners who to and not to believe that is to believe your own deliberate considerations, not others. Furthermore, the learner-centred approach in Thai education reform is interpreted differently from that of western culture defined in two ways. First, the goal of the learner-centred approach for individual learner is not only to achieve intellectual development but also virtue and happiness (Sub-committees on learning reform of the National Education Commission, 2000a, p.17; 2000b, p. 13). As an individual, according to Buddhism, each person comprises five parts: body (including appearances and behaviours), emotion, perception, mental formations, and knowledge and consciousness (Amornwiwat, 1998). Although divided, they are considered in relation to others in a holistic approach (Amornwiwat, 1998; Phrathampidok et al., 2001), that cannot be detached from the social context where the individual mingles (Amornwiwat, 1998). Secondly, Phrathampidok et al. (2001) discussed on Thai-Buddhist conceptions regarding four elements of individual development: physical, mental, social, and emotional, and presented that these elements were
interpreted differently than those of the west. The term physical includes not only body but also physical environments (Phrathampidok et al., 2001, p. 78). The term mental in western cultures refers to intellectual aspects but in Thai-Buddhist cultures it refers to emotional aspects (Phrathampidok et al., 2001, p. 73). Social development in Thai-Buddhism means both societal as well as ethical enhancement (Phrathampidok et al., 2001, p. 79). Also emotional aspects regarded in Thai-Buddhism includes both feeling and virtuous soul (Phrathampidok et al., 2001, p. 79). Details of the teachings for and against the implementation of learner-centred approach as well as Thais’ different interpretation of individual were discussed in Chapter 4.

*The official definition of the term learner-centred: The transmutation and translation of the term ‘learner-centred’*

Thai educators adopted the concept of learner-centred as a major approach of instructional reform. According to Atagi, Thai educators tend to define the approach somewhere in between a traditional approach and a constructivistic approach (2002, p. 53). (The definition of the constructivistic approach is presented in Chapter 4.) However, the translation of the word ‘centred’ itself can cause misinterpretation, if they think of it in a literal translation rather than in its figurative meanings. Hence, the terminology has been slightly altered to a Thai term that means “learner is of the highest importance”(ONEC, 2000a, p. 9). Still, when Thai educators re-translate the term into English, they attach to its original form: learner-centred.
So far, there is no clear definition of how learner-centred approach can be achieved but there are some frameworks and suggested certain procedures in official documents published, and distributed nationwide ONEC (2000a). ONEC (2000a) provided four principles of the learner-centred approach. The principles comprise aiming for learners to achieve their highest benefits, letting them obtain researching skills, enabling them to apply in their real life learning techniques, and allowing anyone involved to participate regardless of the stage of the development of the learners (ONEC, 2000a, p. 27). In another document which is in Thai, the last three principles are the same. However, the one on the learners achieving benefits includes identification of happy learning. Together with the first point about learners’ development, the approach emphasises lifelong cognitive development (Sub-committees on learning reform of the National Education Commission, 2000a, p. 13). Additionally, its sub-committees on learning reform specified three preferred qualities of learners. They are to be integratedly happy (emotional and physical), virtuous (social and soul), and sophisticated (intellectual and social) (2000a, p. 17; 2000b, p. 13).

The DGE also identified certain guidelines for schools as well as teachers. These are presented in Figure 5 and Figure 6 as follows:
Figure 5. Schools’ working procedure in organising the learning process through learner-centred approach (Duplicated from Sub-committees on Learning Reform of the National Education Commission, 2000a, p. 45).
**Figure 6.** Teachers’ working procedure in organising the learning process through the learner-centred approach (Duplicated from Sub-committees on Learning Reform of the National Education Commission, 2000a, p. 46).

With reference to Figure 5, the DGE outlined school processes and teachers working procedures into three stages: preparation, action, and evaluation. The preparation of the school involves planning activities and publicity for the implementation of the policy. The implementation of the approach by schools refers to several activities in personnel development, curricular management and services, provision of supporting services, and establishing a demonstration system within school (Sub-committees on Learning Reform of the National
The school level evaluation is to gather results from a variety of evaluators within and outside the school. The preparation of teachers includes preparation of the self, of learning resources, and of lesson plans. To conduct a learner-centred approach in the classroom means to follow the CIPPA model where C stands for Construct, I refers to Interaction, P1 refers to Physical Participation, P2 refers to Process Learning, and A refers to Application, as in Figure 6 (Sub-committees on Learning Reform of the National Education Commission, 2000a, p. 46; 2000b, p. 35).

The model itself does not present stages of teaching or learning but rather a checklist of activities that would provide preferred characteristics of learning processes and outcomes. It provides conceptual knowledge of what teaching activities should be like but no procedural knowledge of how teaching should be undertaken.

In addition to the procedures in the documents, the Department proposed additional teaching-learning approaches in, as far as the researcher was able to determine, two documents. One document presents six different approaches: thinking processes, problem-solving, management, independent learning, integration, and affective domain development (Unit of Educational Supervision, 2000). Another document also produced by the Unit of Educational Supervision (n.d. a), lists guidelines for administrators, teachers, together with identifying roles for each stakeholder in a learner-centred classroom and schools. In addition, its appendix outlines several issues in relation to the learner-centred approach
including nine indicators of students’ learning and ten indicators of teachers’ activities, a multitude of teaching-learning techniques, procedures for teaching-learning, and assessments. Although this later publication seems to provide a great deal of knowledge, it is doubtful how widely it was distributed as the book itself was published just before the Director General of the time stepped down. Regarding to this stepping down, there is a tendency that the usage and distributions of these publications would not be promoted, and then faded away.

_The reform implementation and strategies used by the central agencies_

There were several central agencies involved with the implementation of learning reform policy in public secondary schools. Two agencies were responsible for national level planning and facilitation, the Office of National Education Commission (ONEC), and the Office of Education Reform. Beneath the ONEC, there was the Subcommittee of Learning Reform. Some units were accountable for the implementation of its own agencies as well as institutes, particularly the Ministry of Education (MOE). The MOE comprised sixteen departments including the Department of General Education (DGE) which oversaw public secondary schools in the nation. However, as the DGE had direct authority for the implementation of the instructional reform policy of public secondary schools only its strategic plans and the overall activities are discussed below. The information presented here is obtained from policy documents produced by the Department itself.
At the time of the data collection, the DGE simultaneously implemented six aspects of educational change: the learning reform, standards and quality assurance reform, teachers and educational staff reform, educational technology reform, resources and investment reform, and administration and management reform. Among these six reforms, the learning reform policy was the ultimate goal (Division of Policy and Planning, 2001). To achieve the implementation of the learning reform policy, the Department planned three major strategies: the decentralising from thirteen to over one hundred and seventy-five empowered educational zones (the exact number was not known until almost the end of 2003), school based management, and the ministry-wide Khruu Kaennam project (Unit of Educational Supervision, 2000, p. Preface). The DGE tried to apply the changes at three educational units highly related with school level implementation. These units are a group of schools, the school, and their teachers. Although the first two strategies had not yet been used, the Department provided a plan for each preliminary project: Sahawidthayaakhed for the decentralisation, and the “whole school” approach (see Figure 5) for the prospective school based management (SBM) approach of the DGE.

The establishment of Sahawidthayaakhed was not the first attempt by the Department to dezone educational units. The Department had set up its own agencies in each province of Thailand (seventy-six agencies nationwide) to be an authorised coordinator between the Department and schools within the province. The Department even divided secondary schools into a small group of schools, Klum Rongrien, solely for academic collaboration among their members.
However, after the Education Act was promulgated, another division of schools, Sahawidthayaakhed (details in Chapter 1) was additionally utilised. This educational zoning was applied for the purpose of not merely academic but also administrative assistance among its five to six member schools (Division of Policy and Planning, 2001, p.12). The Department claimed that they were trying to adjust roles of these Sahawidthayaakhed in keeping with the decentralisation of the system (Division of Policy and Planning, 2001, p.12).

The “whole school” approach is a school level working procedure to organise the learning-centred pedagogy (Sub-committees on learning reform of the National Education Commission, 2000a, p. 45). As seen in Figure 5, the approach comprises three stages: preparation, action, and evaluation. Although the figure seems to be uncomplicated, it is impractical, exclusive, and too simplified. The figure has no explanation of the relationship among each stage and this can result in misunderstandings during implementation. Also there is no evaluation of the planning or evaluation stages. It is impractical for three reasons. First and foremost is that the implementation of the approach is not forced; nor is it monitored or evaluated by outsiders. The non-existence of external evaluation tends to bring about ignorance of implementation of the approach from schools that believe they have more important requirements to address. Second is that at the preparation stage, ‘need identification’ is depicted to follow the policy formulation stage. This is not only ineffective but also unnatural policymaking as it should be need identification first followed by policy formulation. The third impracticality is the exclusion of essential managerial elements: adequate
resources. The figure also does not provide guidelines on how to acquire or develop resources. This model seems to be responded to teachers’ needs, not administrators’ needs. In addition, the approach excludes the community, which is important especially in providing financial support to schools.

The Khruu Kaennam development project was launched by the Ministry of Education in October 1999 with the aim being to select and develop teachers who are eager to participate in learning reform and will then to be able to be a mentor to five other teachers in implementing the new teaching approach. The project was inspired by two successful teacher networking projects introduced by the ONEC. Since 1998 teachers with recognised potential have been given funding in exchange for mentoring. They are Khruu Haengchaad (teachers of the nation), and Khruu Tonbaeb (master teachers) awards.

Teachers selected for the program are called Khruu Kaennam, or spearhead teachers. These spearhead teachers are categorised into two groups: Koor, and Khoor. According to the October 29, 1999 minutes of the Office of Education Reform, Koor type spearhead teachers were recruited from the available teachers who were already honoured by any educational organisations and institutes, including Khruu Haengchaad, and Khruu Tonbaeb. Khoor type spearhead teachers were recruited by provincial agencies from all over the country (OER, 1999, agenda 4.3).

The Khruu Kaennam project is considered an effective way to bring about the real implementation of learning reform policy as it wisely uses teachers as change
agents, and it focuses directly to teachers’ pedagogical change. From its start in 2000 to the end of 2001, the Department had 10,356 spearhead teachers (DGE, 2001, p. 13). However, the quality of the project and these teachers are in doubt. In spite of the positive scenarios, there are comments on the project’s focus, its inequality, the recruitment criteria, and a side effect regarding heavy workload. The first criticism is that the project’s positivistic perspective expects a mathematical increase of a certain number of teachers in certain [short] amount of time (Chiangkuun, 2001., p. 52). The DGE aimed to have 10,000, 50,000, and 100,000 spearhead teachers in 2000, 2001, and 2002 respectively. The aim was thus at the number of teachers, not the quality of the teaching process. This emphasis on increasing quantity of these spearhead teachers instead of quality of their teaching and mentoring could end up in failure as spearhead teachers would prefer superficial mentoring and making up teaching documents and occasionally performing teaching techniques for each evaluation as they gained no credit in doing it seriously. Chiangkuun recommended the networking should be analysed and criticised to actually develop the quality of teachers, not just this superficial change (2001).

Furthermore, the emphasis on the quantity of spearhead teachers resulted in two unequal treatments to spearhead teachers, which was also related to the next flaw of this project. The unequal treatments are the inequitable recruitment to the project, and the incommensurate financial funding to each participant. To increase the number of teachers in a very short time, the DGE had to change the criteria from recruitment by both on-site observation and documents to making a decision
based only on examining documents. The number of spearhead teachers who were selected via the initial criteria, or Koor type, were 16% of the whole, whereas the others, the Khoor type spearhead teachers were 84%. In addition, in 2001 of 10,356 spearhead teachers, approximately a quarter of the total received an allowance of Baht 4,000 (approximately 160 Australian dollars) for their projects (DGE, 2001). The other three-quarters gained no financial incentive. The inequality caused dissatisfaction among some teachers who, despite working as hard as other spearhead teachers, received no financial support. The third comment for this project is on the criteria of recruitment that firstly was based on the selected teacher’s perspective alone and excluded any criteria from their peer teachers and students, and secondly it was mainly based on documents, not what they did in classrooms. They can bring about misjudgment of teachers. The fourth concern is that the work overloads of these spearhead teachers could result in abandonment of classroom teaching (Chiangkuun, 2001, p. 52).

In addition to these three major strategies, the Department operated several activities to support its learning reform policy. They could be categorised into five genres: provision of materials, professional development, school management development, monitoring and evaluation, and student development. The provided materials were documents, and books on learner-centred pedagogy, as well as samples of instructional media. The professional development included training for school administrators, as well as teachers, especially spearhead teachers. The school management development related to the development of spearhead schools, schools that successfully applied the learning reform policy within itself.
and these expected by the DGE to assist in the development of other schools and teachers. The monitoring and evaluation involved evaluation by applying 3As’ criteria of learning reform policy: Awareness (A1); Attempt (A2); and Achievement (A3), as well as non-obvious monitoring procedure including institutional and public presentation of the implementation results. Student development included diverse activities established for students’ intelligence such as sex education camps, English camps, and Arts camps. Details of the report are in the Table 5.

Table 5.

*Activities regarding learner-centred approach conducted by the DGE.*

*(Translated from Division of Policy and Planning, 2001, pp. 3-5)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARNING MATERIALS SUPPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- [The DGE] produced documents involving learner-centred reform including underlying concepts, principles, patterns, techniques and methods on teaching, activities management, media production, evaluation, curriculum development, and classroom level research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [The DGE] produced and developed samples of instructional media for the learner-centred pedagogical reform which were distributed to schools nationwide. The approach was assigned to be mainly implemented at each subject’s learning quality development centres: both the central centres and their networking centres all over the nation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- [The DGE] trained school principals and major administrators of every school from 1997 to 2001 at least twice a year.

- [The DGE] trained all teachers in underpinning concepts, principles, patterns, techniques and learner-centred pedagogy, lesson plans writing, realistic evaluation, and classroom level research from 1997 to 2001 at least once a year.

- [The DGE] selected and developed spearhead teachers of each subject to be role models for the learner-centred reform. *Sahawidthayaakahed* arranged activities to develop these teachers due to learning reform, networking expansion, and exchanging learning experiences with others and funded these teachers to produce pedagogy development project to develop themselves and their mentees. Each teacher had to mentor at least five teachers. The establishment of clubs for teachers in each subject allowed teachers’ assembly to develop their academic and professional knowledge. Now there are several spearhead teachers clubs in many provinces. English teachers clubs in every province, and also being set up by ERIC (English Resource and Instruction Centres).

MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT

- [The DGE] developed spearhead schools by promoting schools in *Sahawidthayaakahed* to be learning reform spearhead schools to provide learner-centred pedagogy in 2000, there were 935 spearhead schools. [The DGE] also supported these schools to expand their networks to every other school to be likewise within 2002.
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

- [The DGE] employed activities to intellectually challenge students in several aspects through Sahawidthayaakhed such as camps.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

- [The DGE] arranged monitoring and evaluation through Sahawidthayaakhed by setting up three levels of criteria 3As': Awareness, Attempt, and Achievement. [The DGE] found that 82.4% of Sahawidthayaakhed were in the second stage of the Attempt, that is “there was serious, and continual development of learning approach to learner-centred one within Sahawidthayaakhed.” (Division of Policy and Planning, 2001, p. 4).

- [The Department] publicised, distributed information, knowledge, and results of learning reform of the Department through various mass media: newspaper, radio, television.

- [The Department] arranged to present results of learning reform from both individual schools and centres to outsiders parents (open house), and arranged seminars to demonstrate annual outcomes at the regional levels and at the department level in order to distribute results of implementation, support mentally to students, teachers, schools, and Sahawidthayaakhed that successfully implemented the learning reform.
The initial analysis

Regarding the international literature reviewed in the Chapter 2, educational policy at the national levels of many states failed to be implemented by school level practitioners because they misused three aspects of the policy: namely time, rationality, and direction. These criteria are used to consider Thai educational policy at the national level.

It was two years from when the Act was announced until the research was conducted. The time that the policy provided for the actual implementation could be too short, depending on how educators set the goals. If the goal was set to mean the full extent of implementation, perhaps every teacher would use it in their classrooms. A few years time is definitely too short for this kind of goal. If they expect realistic goals, such as nation wide awareness of the policy, the period might be appropriate. Furthermore, a sense of urgency may force schools to produce false ramifications (Stiegelbauer, 1994).

The prescriptiveness of the policy itself is satisfactory. The DGE prescribed neither how schools must achieve the policy nor what teachers must do to create learner-centred classrooms. It is a responsibility of individual teachers and schools to seek assistance and knowledge on the matters related to the reform.

Several studies suggested that for the success of policy implementation, the implementation should include both empowerment as well as an hierarchical
approach (Caldwell, 1997; Crump, 1993; Fraser, 1997; Fullan, 1993; Hargreaves, 1997; Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992; Lee, 1997; McBeath, 1997; Stiegelbauer, 1994; and Wonycott-Kyte & Bogotch, 1997). The direction of the policy seemed to be according to this suggestion. Despite its top-down origin, two main strategies introduced by the DGE were implemented in provide a balance from both ways. They are the bottom up resource management through Sahawidthayaakhed project, and the bottom up in-service training via the Khruu Kaennam project.

The information presented in this chapter is derived mostly from policy documents, and various types of publications, including newspapers, which involved presumed usage of the new teaching method, whether positive or negative. However, what was written in documents probably does not refer to what really happens in schools. What is needed now is the voice of the implementers. These voices are presented in the following chapters.
CHAPTER 7: IMPACTS OF THE POLICY TO EACH SCHOOL

IMPLEMENTATION

This chapter discusses the findings derived from two schools: the rural (Medtaa School), and the Karunaa School in Bangkok. The findings are divided into three major sections: the descriptive findings of Medtaa School and those of Karunaa School respectively and the comparative findings regarding the integrated model. The descriptive findings are categorised into the school’s profile, and the implementation of the policy of learner-centred instruction in that school. The profile comprises two major strands. Firstly, each school’s general information, its working culture, and its surrounding community is outlined; and secondly, the existing critical conditions that have a tendency to support or obstruct the implementation of the learning reform policy are presented. The general information relates to its location, curricula, demography, and administrative structure. The implementation is categorised in relation to factors, (any support for and obstacles acting against the implementation), and outcomes (details of the implementation as well as other unanticipated impacts of the implementation to the school and its staff).
Medttaa School

Profile

General information

Medttaa School was a secondary school situated in a subdivision of a province in central Thailand. It was the sole secondary school in the subdivision. It provided education in lower secondary and higher secondary levels as well as the provision of vocational classes, which were introduced in 2000 in response to local needs. The school contained approximately one thousand students and about thirty teachers. As such, the school was regarded as large by Thai governmental standards. Its students came from nearby districts, and were not selected. Hence, many of them were not academically talented. This means the school is less competitive, and less privileged.

The school’s administrative structure was hierarchical, as typical of Thai schools, although its specific breakdown was different from other schools. At the top was the principal, beneath him, two assistants, then three heads, each responsible for a division. One assistant was responsible for student discipline, and the other was responsible for academic management and administration. Following the assistants were three heads who were responsible for the administration, the facilities, and the planning and information systems division. Among these six leaders, five were male. The student discipline division involved students’ morals and behaviour. The academic management and administration included
curriculum, teaching timetables, and assessment across seven subject groups: Thai Language, Social Studies, Maths, Science, English Language, Physical Education, and Arts and Crafts. Each subject group or department had a head to oversee its academic management and administration. The administration division worked on such matters as teachers’ salary, tuition fees, and meeting agendas. The facilities division managed the school’s infrastructure as well as facilities supports. The planning and information system division developed the school’s strategic plans and policy. This work was routine tasks that each division was responsible for. Occasionally, there were additional innovations which were mostly initiated from outside the school. These innovations were either appointed to or voluntarily accepted by a division whose tasks had similar aspects to the innovations. For example, the arrangement of welcoming an honoured guest was appointed consensually by staff to the disciplinary division, while the instructional reform policy was appointed to the academic division. Despite the appointment, for the successful implementation of any projects, especially such a large project as the instructional reform, the appointed division was not doing it alone, all staff, at least apparently, collaboratively helped the division out. The administrative structure was presented in Figure 7.
The school also had a council, which included parents, local politicians, as well as teachers, with the principal acting as its secretariat. However, the council operated mainly as an occasional resource provider to the school. The council was not involved much with the school’s operation, even less with academic decision making. Its leader who was a local politician had never heard about the learner-centred reform before he met the researcher.

Culture

The school culture included shared values and three kinds of relationships: between administrators and teachers, among teachers, and between teachers and students. However, in the relationship between administrators and teachers, the administrative heads did not play significant roles in the school implementation of
the instructional reform policy.

The higher a person’s hierarchical status was, the more formal Medtaa School’s staff acted towards him. To begin with the most formal relationship was the one between the principal and teachers. Although, the principal himself began his first educational job here and stayed for a long period of time before starting his administrative career in another school, at the time of the observation he worked formally, and kept at a distance from his teachers. His working style let others learn how to do their jobs by him minimising control and supervision over his subordinates. Nevertheless, many teachers still preferred to be closely and formally supervised. The relationship between the assistants and teachers was more relaxed. Between them, they did their work separately and did not interfere with each other. In this way they could avoid confronting each other. With their subordinates, the academic assistant was more understanding and flexible, whereas the other assistant principal was more influential. Relationships among the teachers seemed to be collaborative. Despite being in different subject departments, they helped each other, especially in activities that involved the school’s reputation. Furthermore, when there was a conflict, the parties tended to discuss the problem to find a remedy. However, when it came to classroom teaching, the staff’s discussions seemed to take place only with their close peers. In other words, the culture of teaching in Medtaa School was one of isolation. The relationship between teachers and students was similar to many schools in the nation, in which teachers were respected by the students and their parents. Teachers recognised the students’ poverty and their problems and still had
positive attitudes towards their students.

During the period of observation, four working values shared by most teachers were revealed. Similar to other Thai’s official workplaces, the higher positioned administrators’ requests and directions were followed unconditionally and they were treated by their subordinates as superior. The second was that informal relationship among teachers had great impact on the success of tasks and activities that required groupwork. The third was that the school’s reputation was a very important and sensitive issue that could bring everyone together.

**Surrounding community**

Medtaa School was located in a community that had two problematic features: an intense political environment, and economic poverty. The intense political environment was caused by close monitoring and control of politicians in the community: by both local and national politicians. The local politicians were various Kamnan or heads of districts within a subdivision of a province. Most of them had both authority and financial resources. Kamnan did not interfere in schooling. Occasionally, they provided resources at the teachers’ personal request. However, during the electoral season, teachers, as respected figures in the community, were expected to help them in return. The national politicians were members of one particular family. Although based in this province, the family’s members played significant roles at the national level. This family had strong power in the province and sometimes interfered in the school management. For
example, the family forced the school to re-consider the priority of implementing particular projects in relation to other projects, including the instructional reform.

The next significant problem was its poor economic condition. Most families in the subdivision worked in the field of agriculture. Incomes were below A$1,500 per annum per family, about seven times lower than the national average family income of about A$10,000 (National Statistical Office, 2000). This poor condition effected students to some extent. The most obvious impact was on students’ academic opportunities. Many of them could not afford to study in higher level education. However, it should be noted that despite the community’s poverty, the natural environment allowed the production of adequate food. This allowed the community to have sustainable and better living conditions than other provinces such as those in barren areas and poor communities in the capital city.
The implementation

Factors

During the process of implementation, various factors underpinning the school’s implementation of the instructional reform policy were discovered. They can be divided into two kinds: supportive and obstructive. There are several types of supportive factors: academic, psychological, and financial factors whereas the obstructive factors include resources, management, and cultural problems.

Supportive factors

Supportive factors can be categorised into external and internal ones. External supportive factors are those originating from the central agencies and from two agencies within the province (the provincial agency and Sahawidthayaakhed), and from the community. Internal supportive factors originated from the school administration, and those created by teachers.

Support from the central agencies included psychological support and academic support. The psychological support was in the form of a commitment to the immediate implementation of the policy, and was provided by the leading educational authorities and the Prime Minister himself. The academic support was from the two educational agencies, the ONEC, and the DGE. They both provided academic support to the school for implementation of the policy, mostly in the form of books. They also provided visiting lecturers and videotapes. In relation
to the provision of books, the quality of books were confirmed and approved by Medtaa School’s administrators. However, in the interviews with them, criticisms were made about the quantity of books as the agencies sent one copy of a book at a time. The school had to deploy money out of its scarce financial resources to duplicate these documents. Additionally, the DGE initiated a support project that aimed to create different subject learning centres in various schools in each province.

There was also support from two local agencies: the provincial agency (the official unit, with staff assigned by the Department of General Education), and the smallest and closest agency to the school, Sahawidthayaakhed. Support from both agencies was in the form of professional development, particularly training. The provincial agency provided training of Khruu Kaennam. However, the training was initiated by the DGE and planned by the regional superintendent office. This training provided practical knowledge of teaching and action research. The training was supposed to be limited for expert teachers selected from each school to be spearhead teachers but some schools were able to send participants frequently. Sahawidthayaakhed provided several seminars for teachers such as how to write teaching plans according to the new teaching approach, how to do action research, and how quality assurance affected teachers’ work. The training was less selective and more responsive to the needs of local teachers. Some teachers criticised the training from the provincial agency as too short:
How is it possible [for teachers to learn anything?]…. [Even] tertiary students need a whole semester [to learn about it]. They have time to carefully read about this concept. Our teachers had only two days. (Teacher I, interview script, May 30, 2001, p. 17)

Despite the poverty of Medtaa School community, the community provided two kinds of support. The first was that the community helped the school with publicity, particularly through local politicians who had power and money to provide for the school. The second was financial support from particular local politicians. However, to gain this support from these politicians personal relationships were needed.

Internal elements of the school that supported the implementation were its administration and, in some cases, teachers. Although the administrators claimed that the instructional reform was considered as the school’s foremost policy and promised several prospective means of support, support from Medtaa School’s general administration was hardly evidenced. Most support was provided by the academic division. Some were materials such as books and media, Some were procedures such as practices of clarification of the policy to teachers and appraisal.

Teachers also provided positive elements towards the implementation of the instructional reform policy. For example, peer support reinforced discouraged colleagues. The reinforcement included discussions, consolation, and showing interest in their teaching styles. However, these kinds of support still were limited
to be among close friends.

Obstructive factors

The obstacles are categorised into external and internal elements. External obstructive features are categorised due to types of sources that provided them. They were the central agencies, the local agencies, and the community. However, the local agencies were criticised in tandem with the advantages they provided in the section of supportive factors in this chapter. Hence, external obstacles only from the central agency and the community are discussed. The internal elements were from the administration, individual teachers, and students.

The problems from the central agencies are divided into resource provision, curricula, and the policy itself. Problems with resource provision were due to the central policy of limiting the number of personnel, and insufficient funds for professional development. The current curricula, which were inflexible, also were problematic to the implementation. For example, in the English curriculum, students were expected to know words such as ‘skyscrapers’, or ‘monorail’, which were irrelevant to rural students’ need.

Problems with the instructional reform policy itself range from its production, the juxtaposition between the central agency’s need of instant results and the teachers’ need to have more time to learn about the policy, and the problem of leaders’ attitudes towards implementation of any policies that consider implementation as just a way to satisfy powerful persons. This kind of attitude was problematic to
the longevity of the policy. However, policy criticisms were reported by teachers only. One teacher criticised the central policy that cut the budget then required teachers to alleviate the problem by seeking local support.

[Authorities] in the administrative system said [that] teachers had to fix [the problem], had to adjust ourselves. Teachers had to seek local support. The mouth can talk [whatever it likes] but when you[we] do it in reality—[when] you[we] ask someone to help you with something….you[we] have to have a personal relationship [with that person]. Do you[we] have potential for doing that job, for asking others’ support? This is a difficult thing to do because we are unable to rely alone on ourselves. (Teacher III, interview script, May 29, 2001, p. 8)

In addition, there were two problems regarding the community. One was the problem due to the community’s situations. The other referred to its lifestyles that effected students’ learning habits. Three conditions of the community burdened Medtaa School’s implementation of the instructional reform. They were political, economic, and social conditions. The community’s political situation was one of the obstacles. One administrator mentioned political interference by politicians that blocked proper funding. The community’s poor economic circumstances also obstructed the school from having sufficient financial support for its implementation of the policy. Another administrator mentioned that this community could not support the school due to its economic problems. Two social circumstances of the community also burdened the implementation. The first negative social condition was associated with various social problems, for example drug and gambling addictions. These social problems weakened the community spirit for creation, especially as an administrator commented, they
moved the interest of people in the community away from considering the school’s changes as important. The second obstacle was the lifestyle of people in the community. One teacher pointed out the conflict between the community’s traditional Thai lifestyle and the western underpinning concept of the learner-centred teaching style:

When considering [just within] our own nation, our children [from different parts] have very different norms. Even uptown children and downtown children have considerably different behaviours and beliefs—especially beliefs in leadership and self-reliance. Our rural children rarely have [these qualities] due to their familiarity to their parents’ Thai style of teaching which is *pointing teaching, serving teaching, preaching teaching*. Also teachers used to teach like this. [Thai] Traditions [of imparting knowledge] are like this. Respectful men did something like that [using these methods]. Then we want our children to think and do by relying on themselves. They will not have these kinds of characteristics. I think these [unsupportive characteristics of students] are more problematic than teachers’ because teachers are trained and managed. (Teacher I, interview script, May 30, 2001, p. 5)

Moreover, problems existed within the school itself. Internal obstacles were divided into ones concerning the administration, ones concerning individual teachers, and the other concerning students. Three internal obstacles of the school management were of concern to most teachers, and were commented by all interviewees. The first was an insufficiency of financial resources. The second yet the most direct impact to teachers’ application of the new teaching method was the inappropriate assignment of educational duties. The other was the teacher’s
heavy workload. Additionally, some teachers mentioned five other internal obstacles—not shared by all but worth considering.

Relevant to the school’s poor financial conditions, in general, financial resources provided for the instructional reform were also mentioned as insufficient. Although many teachers often alleviated the problem by sacrificing their own money, the problem still existed. There were five problems for the implementation of this instructional reform policy, according to the staff. These were instructional material production, internal training provision, implementation of academic projects, and learning resources provision—including books in the school library. Some of the comments were listed in the following quotations.

Major (obstacles) are financial ones. If we build instructional media, for example, we need to have more. [For] material...we have to use money [in exchange of getting the material]: doing this, doing that, needs materials. [Any other problems] are derived [from the financial problem]....[When they] say they have money, but actually do not, implementers will stop doing it, won’t they? Staff who arrange training, produce instructional media, and other things, all complain [about this] because they used their personnel money, and were not able to get reimbursement. (Teacher II, interview script, May 26, 2001, p. 8)

Plans in the school project are hardly implemented due to the small budget. This is problematic for our school. Each year we have about two hundred thousand Baht for the academic division. [We] allot each subject department about twenty thousand bath [A$800]. [I] feel that when we want to do something [academically], it’s all stuck. (Teacher III, interview script, May 29, 2001, p. 3)
When I assigned [students] to research something, they reminded me that there were no books. I have to accept that our library really doesn’t have books for students to do research. Therefore, as we are teachers, what strategy will we use when there are no books in the library [or] when [there is] no overhead projector? They have transparency films but no overhead. There is a series of [learning] videotapes in the Subject C department but no video player. It was stolen. It is difficult. (Teacher IV, interview script, June 1, 2001, p. 16)

Not only teachers but also students were disadvantaged from the shortage of learning resources. A teacher stated the lack of learning resource obstructs students’ learning habit formation:

This is the result of rural students’ characteristics in that they do not have any habits to do research, study by themselves, or practise by themselves, even though they sometimes want to do it badly. But the environment is not supportive. [This] can be a great obstacle for students to be learners. [It] will be difficult because we do not have any learning resources. Everything has to rely on the teachers. (Teacher I, interview script, May 30, 2001, p. 5)

Another critical condition in the school that obstructed teachers from implementing the new teaching pedagogy in their classrooms was that teachers were sometimes assigned to teach subjects that they were not qualified for. This obstacle impacted directly on classroom practices. Teachers were concerned about this obstacle because it hampered teaching capabilities.

One teacher considered it important to have appropriate knowledge of a particular subject in order to successfully apply the new teaching method:
In this level, personnel who are able to do it [learner-centred approach] must be skilled in a specific subject. They need to foresee what students will do what, when and where [and guide them accordingly for their utmost learning capacity]. It is a matter of management. They [teachers with skills in specific subjects] have more comprehension of [classroom] management to stimulate students. (Teacher I, interview script, May 20, 2001, p. 5)

Another teacher viewed this obstacle as even more catastrophic than the financial one. He felt that it caused difficulties directly to individual teachers:

The significantly [negative] element is whether their skills and knowledge are valid for tasks they are responsible for. This is important. For example, some teachers instruct English even though they have neither degree in teaching the English language nor English. It is difficult [for them]. How far do you want to push them? The next and inferior obstacle is a matter of resources for the implementation in that if they [teachers] would like to do, is there any material resources provided for them? This is the inferior variable. (Teacher III, interview script, May 29, 2001, p. 7)

Amidst known difficulties, some teachers tried to teach these subjects. However, their attempts failed. One teacher described her attempt to teach the assigned subject which was other than her academic area by using the student-centred method. Because she had a lack of knowledge about the subject, what she was capable of was just to apply some psychological techniques.

Now I am trying to use the method at least half of my teaching practices. But what I cannot do is, for example Subject Q. Although I have never touched it before, [they] assigned me to teach it. Therefore, it [style of teaching] is inevitably ‘chalk and talk’. Students might participate in forms of demonstrating their calculation in front of classrooms...the nature of the subject, the subject does not belong to me. [What I could do is] just tempt
them to do some exercises in front of the class. Not much. (Teacher IV, interview script, June 1, 2001, p. 12)

One teacher confessed that she put less effort into these subjects.

Subject A? As I don’t teach it regularly so I do not want to do it [prepare instructional materials]. It is a waste of time. But in fact I would like to do [prepare some instructional materials] for them. I hardly do [that now] because it would be underused. If I owe [the subject]; teach it regularly, I will do. (Teacher V, interview script, June 1, 2001, p. 4)

The third problem concerned by most teachers was the heavy workload they were bearing. Teachers expressed their opinions towards the rationale behind the problem as well as their concerns of the negative effects on the implementation of the new teaching method. Two reasons caused an increase amount of work. The first reason was related to the central personnel limitation policy. The second was the shortage of personnel in the school itself. One teacher claimed that the central personnel limitation policy forced teachers to expand their workload due to other unexpected administrative work. Another teacher stated that the shortage of personnel in the school itself allowed no alternative for the school but required every teacher to do other tasks supplementary to their teaching duties.

But the Department [DGE] didn’t think about the canceled positions. They didn’t provide any administrative positions. Hence, it has to use teachers. What is the advantage of using teachers for this job? Can we deny doing this [administrative work]? No. Can we deny doing that [teaching]? No. (Teacher IV, interview script, June 1, 2001, p. 13)

The problem is as you already have seen, haven’t you? It is a shortage of personnel. Quantitatively, we lack of 43% of staff….Currently the number
is decreased to about 30%. However, it is still not enough staff....Our personnel have to work inside and outside their areas of expertise. This causes staff to have a great deal of work, and [obstruct them] not [to] be experts in some lines of work. Hence, work is not as good as it should be. This includes teaching jobs as well as administration jobs in the school. (Teacher I, interview script, May 20, 2001, p. 4)

The problem affected teachers’ inability to put the lesson plans into real practice. Many teachers saw that the excessive workload was problematic especially to the teachers’ implementation of the new policy. One of them stated:

It [the policy] is unable to be implemented because...they[teachers] have work overload. The amount of work is so overwhelming that sometimes they cannot finish work in time. When they cannot finish work in time...they do not flow fluently, and are unsuccessful. Unsuccessful teaching plans [cause] unsuccessful teaching processes. [Hence] they cannot be implemented. (Teacher I, interview script, May 30, 2001, p. 8)

The heavy workload lessened the quality of teaching. A teacher just told that she could not produce her teaching documents due to a heavy workload.

There are too many tasks so I have not typed them [information sheets for students] yet. (Teacher V, interview script, June 1, 2001, p. 3)
Worse, the heavy workload could cause the abandonment of the implementation of the new instructional approach. A teacher stated that when the workload was overwhelming, he decided to let go of the new teaching style.

Sometimes we have limited time, [but] we have to do two or three tasks. We then have to decide to work efficiently by ignoring rules or practicing [the new] teaching approach. So I have to cut it [the implementation] out. (Teacher I, interview script, May 20, 2001, p. 7)

In addition to these three critically problematic issues, there were claims made upon five other problematic issues. Although these problems might not be of concern to the majority of staff, they reflected some disadvantages that irritated the school staff during its current implementation of the policy, and might become more serious in the future. They were a public relations problem, a personnel management problem, an evaluation problem, a professional development problem, and unreadiness; all associated with the school management. Problems with the school’s communication burdened teachers:

It is not enough communication. For example, Teacher M, the assistant informed every subject department head to collect portfolios, then consider who will be spearhead teachers. Then they submit portfolios. They inform today and want it tomorrow. Unprepared teachers cannot collect the portfolios in time. (Teacher IV, interview script, June 1, 2001, p. 10)

The second problem occurred in the school personnel management. Although the full number of teachers in the school was insufficient, it was not the worst personnel problem. The teachers claimed that the implementation could not be
achieved at their best because the school’s teaching timetable had not yet been settled. Some staff whose names belonged to the school did not yet physically arrived. Due to the regulations, the school could not hire other temporary staff. They had to wait. Meanwhile, they alleviated the problem by arranging substitute teachers who already had excessive teaching workload.

Despite administrators’ promises to develop a working evaluation system, there was comments on the school evaluation practices. These comments included the poor quality of the monitoring system of the school as a whole as well as weak follow up. The school evaluative system was criticised as a weaker practice, in comparison to that of previous years, and its blurry structure that obstructed a head to follow up work due to a concern for involved parties loosing face.

The fourth problem related to the school’s professional development. Many staff believed in the teachers’ high potential. Nevertheless, the administrators hardly did anything to develop them. A teacher identified the lack of support from the school administrators:

It is that we were neglected in [providing teachers learning experiences across several kinds of tasks] besides their usual work and supporting teachers to develop themselves. As a result, teachers are doing just their immediate work. For example, they lacked their own promotional submission. (Teacher III, interview script, May 29, 2001, p. 8)

In addition to the eight problems regarding Medtaa School’s management, there were two obstacles derived from individual teachers, however, to some extent,
these problems related to the school management. These were a lack of clarity on the part of teachers towards how to do the new teaching approach, and a problem of motivation. Many teachers in the school were unclear what the new pedagogy was and were concerned whether some approaches were applicable or not. This doubt caused hesitation in the usage of the new teaching approach.

Individual teachers’ low motivation was the other obstacle. If individual teacher was willing enough to apply the teaching method, they could use it despite other surrounding problems. A teacher’s opinion supported this point:

Sometimes no one appreciates what we are doing but if we have them[real intention to work], it will make everything possible because sometimes pending for appreciation alone [and stop their best teaching practice]; waiting for appreciation, students suffer. (Teacher III, interview script, May 29, 2001, p. 6)

Students of Medtaa School caused three problems in the school’s implementation of the policy. These were a lack of learning skills, no habit to take care of learning resources, and low motivation to study. Their previous teachers and their elder relatives had not thought it is important to include skills to present creative ideas or answers and skill to use scientific thinking. Worse, for some of them, they could not even read or write the Thai language properly. Even their answers to a teacher’s question were conventional and non-creative. This lack discouraged teachers who had applied the new teaching approach in their classrooms because they did not get satisfactory responses from students. Two teachers explained that students did not have enough learning skills for teachers to use a learner-centred
approach. One of them stated that students could not study by themselves. Most of them did not even read books for the examinations. The other teacher claimed that students could not understand things easily.

Another discouragement towards teachers’ application of the learner-centred approach was that students did not have habits to maintain learning resources. Many books in the school’s small and outdated library were lost and torn. A teacher pointed out that her experience made her not want to provide materials to the students. The other problem was the students’ own low motivation to study. They did not take exams, even final ones, seriously. Most of them did not care even to attend the re-examination. They even refused one teacher’s offering to help them with a tutorial class using embarrassment as an excuse. From that could be inferred they were more concerned about face saving than learning.

Outcomes

Outcomes of the implementation can be categorised into anticipated and unanticipated outcomes. The anticipated outcomes included the extent to which the school was implementing the policy, and in which stage they were located. The unanticipated outcomes were impacts of the policy towards the school culture, teachers, and students.

There was no consensus as to what percentage of teachers were implementing the instructional reform. One administrator and some teachers indicated a small amount of less than 10%. Another administrator and other teachers estimated as
much as 80% or almost 100%. Whereas the ones who estimated the larger percentage of implementation made no further comments, those who estimated the smaller amount specified that their number referred to the real implementation in classrooms:

If we rate the implementation of student-centred pedagogy on a scale from 1 to 10, the teachers’ having real understanding of or having skills and using this teaching method in their classrooms would be 1. This is a problem. (Administrator I, interview script, May 30, 2001, p. 7)

There was a consensus on which stage the overall school implementation had reached. Everyone agreed it was in an early stage. Regarding the DGE’s criteria of 3A’s (Awareness, Attempt, and Achievement) (Details in Chapter 1), the staff agreed the school was between the ‘Awareness’ stage, and—in some cases—was in an ‘Attempt’ stage, as in Figure 8.

*Figure 8. Medtaa School’s stage of implementation.*

However, when considering the implementation by each subject department, some seemed to be making more progress in using learner-centred teaching style than
others. Most staff identified two subjects, Science and Thai Language, as subjects whose nature and content were more conducive to the new pedagogy. One administrator presented this view in the following:

The Science department [and the Thai Language department] are the subject departments which make apparently more progress in implementation of the student-centred approach. This happens perhaps because the nature of the subjects have the basic quality to support and implement the approach….Other subject departments have to develop more.

(Administrator I, interview script, May 20, 2001, p. 10)

One kind of concrete evidence of implementation was the learner-centred hourly lesson plans which were supposed to be bound and submitted to the academic division for later external evaluation. All interviewees and many participants mentioned the production of these plans, although only some teachers had already submitted theirs. Nonetheless, interviews with teachers revealed that there was not necessarily any relationship between these lesson plans and classroom teaching.

One teacher stated these documents were not really applied to classroom practices:

They [some teachers] already started implementation by producing teaching plans. However, they have not yet used them. [They] produced these teaching plans in order to protect themselves because these plans are trajectories of implementation. They are concrete evidences. Hence we wrote teaching plans according to the student-centred approach. But in real instructional practices, [they] are not yet used. [Nevertheless], the fact that they started is a good sign. (Teacher I, interview script, May 20, 2001, p. 7)
The school implementation of the instructional reform policy also indirectly impacted upon several aspects of the school: its working climate, individual teachers, and students. The school’s working climate changed after the policy was introduced to the school. It was less resistant to change. Similar to anywhere else, when the instructional reform policy was introduced to the school, there was resistance. However, it gradually decreased since then. The less resistance also affected to other new policies which were to be introduced later.

Impacts to teachers are divided into positive and negative ones. There were four positive impacts by teachers. Firstly, there was an improvement of teachers’ instructional behaviours, although it was on a small scale and seen in documents mostly. Secondly, the implementation also had a positive impact on teachers’ professional development. Thirdly, there was more participation of teachers and students as well as more interaction with teachers and their peers. Fourthly, the implementation awakened teachers from working by routine to something more worthwhile for their students. However, exhaustion and discouragement were also derived from teachers’ implementation of the new teaching approach. The overwhelming amount of work made teachers more exhausted. Also the lack of personnel, together with other surrounding problems, discouraged teachers.

The implementation of the instructional reform policy had a positive impact to students. Students increasingly acknowledged their own rights, and they were more active. An administrator stated this as follows.
No. As I observe. Probably still or may be Thai culture. [Students] may be considerate to teachers still. But actually, now students understand their rights more, that what rights they have, what should they do within a frontier or a limit that they have. (Administrator II, interview script, May 29, 2001, p. 10)

A teacher saw that students were more active due to more students’ involvement in the teaching and learning processes.

Now? [Something] is beginning to change. As I see, as I said before that giving students more important than teachers, when there is this emphasis, there will be a change that, probably technological change. Probably, new instructional media uses so students have more participation, than they used to be. Something like that. (Teacher II, interview script, May 26, 2001, p. 5)

Karunaa School

Profile

General information

Karunaa School was located in a metropolitan district of Bangkok, Thailand’s capital city. Its area was small and consisted of two separated areas for lower secondary level and high school level. Consequently, every facility was divided. There were separated laboratories, separated academic division office, separated canteens, even separated libraries. The school contained more than a hundred staff including over ten facility helpers, and approximately two thousand students. This number of students meant the school was regarded as a large school.
Typically, the school’s administrative structure was presented in a hierarchy with the principal on the top. Beneath him there were four assistants responsible for four different divisions: administrative, academic, service, and the student discipline division. However, on the site, there were only the academic assistant and the administration assistant. The assistant who was responsible for the service division was borrowed by an authority to work in the central agency. The student discipline assistant position was still unoccupied, despite two teachers’ fighting for it. Similar to Medtaa School, the student discipline division involved students’ morals and behaviour. The academic division was concerned with curriculum, teaching timetable, assessment across ten subject departments: Thai Language, Social Studies, Maths, Science, Foreign Languages, Physical Education, Arts, Handcrafting, Industrial Workshop, and Business Studies—three departments more than Medtaa School. Each department had its own head and its own administrative management. The administration division worked on matters such as teachers’ salaries, tuition fees, and meeting agendas. The service division was accountable for the school’s infrastructure as well as facilities support. See Figure 9 in tandem.
Karunaa School also had a council with the same composition as the council of Medtaa School, that included parents, local politicians, as well as teachers, with the principal acting as its secretariat. Karunaa School’s council similarly had no voice in the school’s operation nor academic decision making. However, the council was not just a resource provider, they also helped schools for disciplinary matters for example watch out for issues such as drugs or runaway students. The council also was informed about this instructional reform, however, it preferred to just support the school in terms of resources.
The culture in the school concerning teachers’ working patterns was contained in three relationships: relationship between the principal and teachers, among teachers, and between teachers and students. Prior to discussing Karunaa’s cultural situation, some commonalities and differences are noted. The relationship between administrators and teachers in the Karunaa School on one hand was similar to Medtaa School in that the principal had the highest authority. On the other hand, in this school, the hierarchical status was perceived to be less significant than in Medtaa School. The school administrator’s authority was not as elevated as in Medtaa School. Here teachers were more confident. They dared to do so many things more than the teachers in Medtaa School dared. For example, they could deny teaching subjects that they had no skills or knowledge for. The third difference was that the principal himself was more influential and active than his assistants.

Even if Karunaa School’s principal kept a distant relationship with teachers, he contributed to an informal climate by working in a down-to-earth style. To some extent, this working style satisfied his academic colleagues. In my four weeks of observation, not once did teachers show negative feelings to the principal or comment negatively. One teacher thought favourably of this principal compared to the previous tyrant.

The next was the relationships among teachers. The relationships among teachers in Karunaa School had two characteristics different from those of Medtaa’s.
Firstly, they were more segmented. When misunderstandings or problems occurred, there was no discussion of solutions among groups. Some groups disliked others, sometimes this was shown verbally. Secondly, they were more sensitive and could be envious of one another easily. This was one reason the principal stated communication was an important aspect to the management of this school as any misinterpretations due to staff’s sensitivity could bring him and his goodwill management quickly to doom. Finally, there were also the relationships between teachers and students. Students here were more relaxed and had informal communication with teachers more than at Medtaa. However, they paid respect to their teachers. Teachers saw their students as poor and pitiful. Many of them showed sympathy towards their students with both words and actions such as buying them a meal. Due to many students’ harsh life, some teachers told the researcher that teachers could not be too polite, sometimes had to be tough to get along well and manage their classrooms.

Surrounding community

In the community surrounding Karunaa School, there were two elements that influenced the demands of its students. The first was poverty. According to the school’s report, most students were from urban poor communities. These communities included families that were middle and lower class economically. Most of them lived in unhealthy physical and unpleasant social environments. These negative conditions impacted students’ lack of discipline, and their self-survival lifestyle. As there was little close caring and parenting, they had to take care of themselves. The second was an exploitation of progressive ideas of
families and students coming from organisations providing aids for the community. The ideas themselves would not be problematic if some families and students, despite not strong believers in these ideas, did not exploit it to take advantages from the school. For example, a student whom a teacher punished for his non-linear writing scripts threatened the teacher referring to his human rights and the persons who worked for an particular organisation in order to avoid the punishment.

The implementation

Factors

Administrators and teachers in Karunaa School encountered a multitude of elements that either supported or burdened the school implementation of the policy. Like Medtaa School, these are categorised into external, and internal elements. External factors are divided into ones from the central agencies (the ONEC, and the DGE), ones from the local agency, especially from Sahawidthayaakhed, and ones from the community. Internal factors are the school’s administration, teachers, and students. Supportive factors are discussed first.

Supportive features

There were two kinds of support from the central agencies: academic and financial. Academic support was provided by the ONEC. The ONEC provided two kinds of academic support. The first was documentation about the policy.
The second was academic support from teachers participating in the teacher development project called Khruu Tonbaeb (master teachers). (Its definition is presented in Chapter 1.) The document support was in a form a bulletin that individual staff who showed special interest in the matter could apply for membership. The principal himself was one of its members. From the Khruu Tonbaeb project, there was academic support in the form of instructional media documents, subject content, and supervision.

The financial support was from the DGE. It was derived from the Department’s Khruu Kaennam project (the spearhead teacher project). But it was criticised as inadequate. An administrator commented that the amount was insignificant to activate teachers to create effective projects. The comment was confirmed by a spearhead teacher.

Sometimes there are projects that funded one thousand Baht, or two. These amounts are so little [that] they[model teachers] may not acknowledge its significance. But it is important but because the funds are so small. Hence, they do their projects in small scales. They think that it is all right if they cannot finish it or whatever. So they haven’t yet report back to us. If the funds were ten thousand Bath or twenty, we would see [any obvious projects]. But it is one thousand or two something like this. (Administrator ii, interview script, July 26, 2001, p. 3)
They asked us to write up a project [and tell us that] the one that sounds good will be approved. But mine was rejected...They considered from how good the project sounds, they check from the composition which is well written or not, they didn’t check whether it is possible or not. As a result, I do not have to be concerned [from how can I achieve the project]. I just do [my uttermost from whatever I’ve got.] (Teacher v, interview script, July 30, 2001, p. 3)

In Medtaa School, two kinds of local agencies were reported to provide support to the school. However, in Karunaa School, only support from Sahawidthayaakhed was widely acknowledged. None of support from the provincial agency was referred to by any staff. Sahawidthayaakhed provided a support to Karunaa School in the from of training. Teachers felt that this training convinced many colleagues to improve their teaching approaches.

The community around Karunaa School was poor and could not provide the school with much support. Fortunately, the school’s council that comprised available and potential parents, as well as teachers and the principal as its secretariat, was long established and already supported the school in various matters, including financial and academic.

Supportive factors occurring inside the school are listed more than ones from outside the school. They derived from two different sources: the school administration, and teachers. Supportive factors from the school administration are classified into those from the principal himself, and those from the school administration. Support from the school principal was acknowledged by most
teachers, even isolated ones. His commitment to the policy, his several attempts to clarify the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of the policy to his subordinates, his application of psychological reinforcement techniques, and his evaluation were all mentioned as positive factors contributing to the implementation of the policy within the school.

The principal’s commitment to the policy influenced some teachers to change their teaching style. He stated that the policy was the school’s first priority. He also made frequent statements about the implementation of the policy.

The principal also helped teachers in the stage of the policy definition. One teacher stated that the principal invited guest lecturers and discussed the term learner-centred teaching approach with staff. In this way teachers’ interpretation of the term was finetuned, and united. The increased clarification of the term allowed teachers to feel confident enough with the approach to practice it in their classrooms.

Another of the principal’s attempts at clarification of the policy was to provide knowledge concerning how to implement the new teaching approach successfully. One was to provide training on the composition of learner-centred teaching plans. The other was in the form of document provision. The principal himself provided teachers with any news or documents involving the innovation of the learner-centred approach. Some documents were gathered from outside the school by teachers who participated in a training program. The principal asked the teachers to summarise what knowledge they gained from the training and to present it to
other teachers in the school.

The principal also used verbal reinforcement to urge teachers to implement the policy. He did this with teachers who implemented it or even showed some development on the policy. Several school staff appreciated the principal’s application of verbal reinforcement.

Another element of the principal’s support was his direct intervention in the policy implementation. His evaluation included his continuous monitoring, and his initiation of teaching workshops known as teaching showcases where teachers presented their portfolios at the end of the semester. However, in his own view this was not only an evaluation mechanism but also a stage where teachers could demonstrate and exchange their ideas with their peers.

In addition to principal support, four activities in the school administration also helped teachers adopt the new pedagogy. These were training provision, a well-managed academic plan, discussion of problems and supervision within subject departments, and tutoring for students who had learning difficulties.

Teachers themselves provided two supportive factors. The first was a project created by teachers themselves. This was one that required students to read specific lessons in front of their parents and get their signature afterwards. However, its implementation faded out. The second was a networking attempt from the spearhead teachers. One teacher saw that networking urged other teachers who were in the networks to change their teaching. However, three
pitfalls were raised. The first and foremost was that teachers produced documents but did not apply them in their classrooms, owing to time limitations. The second was that the networks did not expand to other groups due to the balkanised culture across the school’s departments. The third flaw derived from opinions of some teachers that spearhead teachers did this just for their personal gain and to get promotion. One teacher admitted:

Yes. I am a member of the network. I am doing the Khruu Kaennam project. It is good. But, really, whatever we do, mostly, we do it in documents, not yet in our actions. Actions means interaction with students. We don’t do it much. Therefore, whatever we did is evident that we did something. [The document may be] bound beautifully [or even] luxuriously, but whether we apply it with students or not, not much is truly applied. (Teacher iii, interview script, August 1, 2001, p. 3)

Factors supportive of the implementation of the instructional reform policy in Karunaa School were already outlined. Next, obstacles are considered. They are also divided into external and internal elements.

External obstacles comprised those due to the central agency and those from the community. Similar to those of Medtaa School, there were no obstacles caused obviously by agencies at the provincial level and Sahawidthayaakhed. Internal burdens was consisted of the school physical features, administration, teachers, and students themselves.
Obstructive factors

There were three obstacles created by the DGE according to staff in this school. These were problems in the Department’s implementation of the policy, in the curricula, and the insufficiency of resource provision.

The policy implementation was commented on by the school administrators. These comments are categorised into three topics: its start, its simultaneously introduced policy, and its evaluation. Firstly, the Department commenced the implementation without considering whether schools were ready or not. An administrator commented that the central agency expected the best results in spite of the school’s unreadiness. He considered this an unfair disadvantage to schools that had rare access to knowledge. Due to the lack of knowledge, they could not respond promptly to the policy. Secondly, the school’s attempt to implement the internal quality assurance policy, also required by the Department, pulled away teacher’s attention from the new teaching approach. An administrator explained the policy required a large number of documents to be produced. Consequently, teachers had to produce these documents instead of undertaking their instructional development. Thirdly, the Department accelerated the evaluation process. According to many staff members, the two year evaluation period was too short. This evaluation did not created a sense of long term implementation for the teachers. Instead, it produced a sense of producing superficial results. One teacher commented:

They don’t give it time…. I see that Thailand does like this all the time: do it and then want that [to see results immediately]. This makes teachers in
an awful rush. Schools say they [authorities] order me to do [produce some results for them]. [Then] I will do. When the process that they assign us to do is finished, they [teachers] will stop [doing it] That means they have to adjust new approaches, [and] create new projects to develop each point again. (Administrator ii, interview script, July 26, 2001, p. 7)

The current secondary level curricula was also a hindrance to the implementation of the instructional reform policy according to Karunaa School’s staff. They commented that it focused on the quantity of the contents rather than the quality of teaching process. The problem was caused by three different situations. The first was the pressure on high school students to pass the university entrance examination; the test that examined mostly students’ academic knowledge. The second was the intensive contents of some subjects which did not allow teachers adopt a learner-centred method because they struggled to teach the content of the curriculum in the time available. The third disadvantage was less study time allocated for some subjects in the curricula, such as Science.

Similar to Medtaa School, Karunaa School encountered a shortage of financial resources as well as personnel resources. The shortage of financial resources was caused by the decrease in the DGE’s funding tuition fees per head of students to the school. An administrator claimed this reduction had a negative impact on the school’s capacity to purchase instructional materials. Another hindrance was a shortage of personnel due to the new personnel limitation policy. Whilst some teachers had early retirement, no new teachers were recruited. Administrators felt that if new teachers were recruited, they would be inspired by the new teaching approach. Unfortunately, due to the central personnel policy which rarely
recruited new teachers into the system, this scenario could not be possible. A teacher commented that some current teachers, who were recruited during the time that they allowed anyone to become a teacher, were incompetent and could not apply this new teaching method as that they were not clever and sensitive enough to students’ learning.

The community also caused obstacles to the school’s implementation of the policy. The community held the value that emphasised students academic achievement, particularly passing the university entrance examination more than their learning skills. In addition families were incapable of supporting the school, or assisting their children to develop learning skills. An administrator asserted families did not pay attention to teaching matters of the school. As well as they were unable to provide financial support due to their poverty. One teacher commented that families were unable to help students to learn at home:

For our students, [when they] ask their parents, their parents chase them away [and say that] you [are the one who] study [so] you [should be able to] do it [by] yourselves. [I can’t help you because] I was not educated. (Teacher vi, fieldnote, July 9, 2001, p. 7)

In addition, many elements in the school itself did not support the implementation. These problems were contained in its administration, its teachers, and students. Two critical activities in the school administration were of concern to many teachers. The first was that the instructional reform policy was not really the first priority. Some teachers perceived that administrators preferred to support other policies and projects from the DGE. They considered that teachers who
were implementing the instructional reform policy were not appreciated as much as ones who worked in response to these other projects. Staff were also concerned by the heavy workload that developed due to three causes: an increase of tasks, an increase of teaching hours, and a decrease in the number of the school staff. Teachers complained that they were assigned an increasing number of tasks, especially those involving the school’s implementation of other education reform policies. They commented on these overwhelming responsibilities, as well as the increased hours of teaching—from sixteen hours per week to twenty hours per week. Some teachers were concerned that this problem might grow due to a decrease of number of personnel as mandated by the central personnel reduction policy.

Teachers also were sources of problems. Problems due to teachers include problems with their fragmented relationships, problems with their own teaching approaches, and problems with their production of outcomes. The fragmentation among groups of teachers obstructed the whole school implementation of the new teaching method. It blocked expansion of knowledge, and the policy implementation itself. Classroom implementation of the policy by some groups was criticised by rival groups. When the researcher asked a spearhead teacher whether other subject departments consulted her on anything, she stated that there was not much interest, and some of them laughed at her workload. The fragmentation occurred not only among teachers’ usual groups but also between competent teachers and others, including their peers. Some teachers criticised them as selfish.
Furthermore, many teachers were still attached to the traditional teaching way that focussed on subject content rather than the learning process. This attachment obstructed not only in their own practice but also that of their peers. Some teachers could not use the new teaching approach if their peers who taught the same subject using the old teaching style because, when using the new teaching approach within the same timeframe, they could not impart as much content as their peers. This resulted in their students being disadvantaged in the examination at the end of each semester as the same test was administered to all classes at the same educational level.

Evaluation among teachers also caused problems to the implementation of the instructional reform policy. There were three problems associated with the teachers’ evaluation. The first was their misconception of the nature of the new teaching approach. Many teachers in the school wondered whether their implementation of this new pedagogy was worth changing because no obvious student development had occurred so far. One administrator was concerned with the teachers’ early expectations of their students learning. These expectations could, in the end, discouraged students away from having sound learning habits. Some teachers focussed on instructional document submission rather than actual practice of the new teaching approach in their classroom. Some of these documents were not the teachers’ own work. Some teachers duplicated others’ lesson plans. In fact, some of them purchased lesson plans from external sources.
Teachers also had strong feeling towards their teaching privacy. Many teachers in this school had negative feelings about classroom observations, even towards their peers whom they acknowledged as were technically and academically superior.

Students were, as well, viewed as one of internal obstructive features in the school’s implementation of the policy due to two problems. They lacked learning skills due to their previous learning experiences, and they had low motivation to study. Every informant felt that their students did not have sufficient learning skills and some were illiterate. An administrator indicated that the lack of learning skills was caused by their families and their previous education. Students also had little motivation to study and to learn, or even to try to learn. Many teachers revealed that students hardly followed their lessons. Many students did not take exams seriously. Many of them did not even attend re-examinations.

Outcomes

Outcomes of the implementation can be categorised into anticipated and unanticipated outcomes. The anticipated outcomes included the extent to which the school was implementing the policy, and at which stage the school had reached in its implementation. The unanticipated outcomes were divided into impacts of the policy towards teachers and students.

The answers about percentage of teachers who changed their teaching styles varied. However, all of them were over forty percent. Some teachers thought that
this percentage included some teachers who did not implement the new pedagogy in their practices but only their documents.

Referring to the three scale criteria of the DGE (Awareness, Attempt, Achievement), one of the administrators stated that the school almost reached the end of the attempt stage and was moving into the stage of achievement. Please see Figure 10.

![Figure 10. Karunaa School's stage of implementation.](image)

Some teachers implemented the policy in advance of others. For example, a teacher included students' own experience in her teaching procedure. On the contrary, another teacher wrote information on a blackboard and required the students to copy it for the entire hour.

Strangely, some teachers did very well in the classroom despite not having any hourly teaching plans. One science teacher with an impressive record in relation to
the implementation of learner-centred pedagogy admitted she and her peers hardly produced any concrete documents for the approach.

There was no clear impact of the implementation of the policy on the school culture itself. Instead, the implementation of the policy had effects on teachers and students. The effects were divided into positive and negative ones. Staff found that the implementation of the new teaching approach provided three positive points: the teachers’ role in the classroom was changed, there was greater diligence of teachers in teaching preparation, and there was less stress in teaching.

Two negative impacts also occurred due to the policy. The first referred to negative attitudes of teachers towards the policy when it was first introduced because of its vagueness and the confusion this produced. Discouragement and some stresses were caused by teachers’ concerns with student academic achievement. Some stresses developed due to workload conditions:

I think teachers are depressed. They start to be depressed [which is] no fun. I have not heard someone said it is good. [They are] collectively depressed. I suppose they are depressed due to the policy because it requires [them to do] many things simultaneously. (Teacher v, interview script, July 30, 2001, p.6)

This workload entailed another problem on the school management, more teachers retired.

There are many teachers exhausted so they have early retirement. Our school is better [than others] in that there were two retirees last year and another two [bold added] this year. Other schools have more. School H lost
sixteen [bold added] teachers [in one year]. School J lost seven [bold added] teachers. (Teacher i, fieldnote, July 4, 2001, p. 4)

Students showed three positive changes after the implementation of the new teaching method. The first was that the approach provided them more opportunity to think. The second was their confidence due to their achievement of assigned tasks by themselves. The third was that they found studying could be more entertaining than before. Students themselves had fun with this new teaching method. However, one teacher said that it took a while before they were able to present their own thoughts.

The application of the new teaching method could have had a negative impact on students if teachers had used it to its extreme. (The specification of the two extremes were presented in Table 2, Chapter 2.) Many teachers affirmed that it was essential to provide some background knowledge for students to be able to work by themselves. A teacher indicated there was a comment made by students when some teachers assigned them to do assignments without any other guidance.

Some [teachers] apply it [the new teaching approach] to the extreme. But sometimes [if] using it in full form, there is feedback from students that they don’t understand anything. When teachers go to classes and just write down the topic and hardly explain anything and assign them to work by themselves in their own groups. Students said that they did not know how they can think it thoroughly [how they can achieve the project on their own]. (Teacher iii, interview script, August 1, 2001, p. 6)
The Comparative Findings regarding the integrated model

According to the Integrated Model of implementation of change presented in Chapter 2, both schools implementation of change can be rewritten into the following model.

\[ \text{Figure 11. Both schools’ implementation of change depicted in respect of the integrated model proposed in Chapter 2.} \]

There is an addition in that in this model teachers also are presented in relation to resource, as obviously as cased found in Medtaa School, when teachers sacrificed their earnings for a creation of instructional media as well as sought for resources from outsiders with whom they had connection.
Both schools received resources came in various forms since academic resources such as books and training to financial resources such as rewards for Khruu Kaennam. Through the change facilitators who were the principal (in Karunaa School) and the assistant principal (in Medtaa School) there were books from the ONEC and trainings from the Department and the district agent including Sahawidthayakhed. To teachers, there were rewards given to Khruu Kaennam of Karunaa School.

Between the implementation of the two schools, the change facilitator, particularly the principal of Karunaa School practised more frequent and sooner probing and intervening toward their teachers than the assistant principal or the principal of Medtaa’s did.

The change had caused several concerns to the implementers. According to the stages of concerns defined by Hall and Hord (1987, 2001), most teachers showed no concern on the policy. However, several teachers in both schools had concerns about impacts of the change towards themselves and tried to find more information about the policy which might be regarded by Hall and Hord as they reached ‘Personal’ and ‘Informational’ stage of concerns. Many users showed concerns over their students and how they would teach better. These type of concerns are called as ‘Consequence’ stage of concern and ‘Refocusing’ stage of concern respectively.

For level of implementation, many implementers would be in a category of ‘non-users’ of Hall and Hord (1987, 2001), when users seek information and prepare
to use the change. As well many implementers would be in a level of ‘mechanical use’ when they began to apply the change in their day to day use; however, little reflections which would leads to superficial changes.

There was also mushrooms in the implementation of both schools. These mushrooms were, for example, a gossip over the frequent and unexpected monitoring of the principal of Karunaa School (a positive mushroom in which it energises teachers to be prepared and apply the learner-centred approach more frequent), a gossip towards the rare supervision of the principal of Medtaa School over the implementation of the instructional reform policy (a negative mushroom in which it was interpreted as an abandonment).

In the implementers’ minds there were characteristics of change. As these four characteristics of change are related to practicality of change, they are not discussed here but in Chapter 9.

The presentation of the schools’ implementation of the learner-centred approach made in this chapter initially illustrated the schools’ contexts and how their staff coped with the innovation introduced centrally. Nonetheless, the focus on the cases is a part of this research. To put it into context of the implementation, it is necessary to consider both schools in comparison, and together with other involved policy staff who technically coordinates the schools to policymakers. The next chapter discusses on perspectives of each school in comparison to each as well as perspectives of policy people towards the implementation.
CHAPTER 8: DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES TOWARDS THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL REFORM POLICY

This chapter presents perspectives of different groups of people (teachers, principals, policy people in different levels) who are significant to the change in two ways. Firstly, these people are of importance in the implementation of change (Fullan, 1982, 1991) as indicated in Fullan’s model and the integrated model presented in Chapter 2. Secondly, a consideration of these perspectives provides knowledge of how different people have similar or different realities about how the schools implement the instructional reform. In this chapter, initially these perspectives are presented in comparison: between both schools, and among agencies. Then critical issues that emerging from these perspectives is examined.

General perspectives towards the implementation

This research examines several perspectives of people who involved with the implementation of the reform, from the direct users, staff within the two secondary schools, to policy people conveyed the policy from the Department to the schools or vice versa. Within each school, there are opinions of its administrators as well as teaching staff. Outside, there are viewpoints of policy people working in provincial as well as central agencies of the DGE. These perspectives are compared in the later paragraphs. Prior to the comparison, it is worthwhile to consider the nature of both schools together.
Karunaa School seems to have advantages over Medtaa School in a number of ways. It was located in Bangkok, the capital city, where many teachers preferred to be. Medtaa School was in a remote area, which many teachers avoided. Its location in Bangkok also provided easier access to the central units both the MOE and the ONEC that gave an advantage to the school for chances to update information about the policy as well as the learner-centred approach. Despite having twice as many students, Karunaa School had three times as many teachers as Medtaa. As staff positions in Karunaa School were preferred, competition was strong to be placed in Karunaa School. As such, the school was able to provide more diverse courses for students. Karunaa School also had higher quality learning resources, such as two air-conditioned libraries full of both recent and old books and a librarian who graduated in library management field.

Nevertheless, Medtaa School did not always have greater difficult conditions. Firstly, its number of students per classroom was less, and students as well as their parents paid more respect to the teachers than in Karunaa. Secondly, a better condition of the principal of Medtaa School’s, staff of Medtaa School were better listeners and followers than those of Karunaa School. Karunaa School’s staff were more confident, and difficult to control.

In each school, comments of administrators and teachers were not united. In one of the schools, the comments were relevant to an individual’s duty. In the other, they were mostly for their superiors. Administrators of Medtaa School, despite being the key administrators of the school, hardly discussed about school
management. Instead they commented a great deal about the educational system. Whilst, its teachers commented on the educational system, and the school management. Not often did they mentioned issues about teaching unless it was linked to problems about the system and school management. This pattern could be due to the staff of Medtaa School being more outspoken and blaming authority for the shortcomings in their own implementation of the new policy. On the contrary, Karunaa School’s administrators and teachers focused on issues that involved their individual duty. The key administrators discussed issues such as the school management and the system whereas its teachers talked about teaching issues although some teachers had further comments on management.

Some findings in each school were similar, especially those related to similar conditions, for example poverty. Some findings were different, as both schools had different contexts, and they were at different stages of implementation. In other words, Karunaa School started implementing before Medtaa School and was then (at the time of the research conduct) ahead of Medtaa in implementation as a result of its active and well-informed principal.

Summary of implementation is listed in Table 6.
Table 6.

Factors affecting the implementation of instructional reform policy and outcomes found in Medtaa School and Karunaa School in the first semester 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Medtaa School</th>
<th>Karunaa School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Central</td>
<td>• Psychological support from the Prime Minister &amp; Director General.</td>
<td>• ONEC – books, media outdated, insufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ONEC – books, media outdated, insufficient.</td>
<td>• DGE – Khruu Kaennam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DGE – Khruu Kaennam.</td>
<td>• DGE – Khruu Kaennam too little funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning centres.</td>
<td>• Sahawidthayaakhed – training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provincial</strong></td>
<td>• Sahawidthayaakhed – training.</td>
<td>• Council, everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Community</td>
<td>• No proactive council, helps publicity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have rich &amp; powerful local politicians but need personal relationship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Admin.</td>
<td>• Main: Academic Division.</td>
<td>• Main: Principal (commitment: introduction[knowledge, definition], reinforcement, evaluation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Principal (little support shown), consultation.</td>
<td>• School administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School administration.</td>
<td>• Initiated a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Teachers</td>
<td>• Reinforcement from peer.</td>
<td>• Networking attempt due to the project, but 3 staff critiques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obstacles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Central</td>
<td>• DGE – Resources (financial, personnel).</td>
<td>• DGE – Resources (financial, personnel).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Policy – problems in its production, convey, evaluation.</td>
<td>• Policy – commence, evaluation &amp; other intervened policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Curricula – Inflexible.</td>
<td>• Curricula – content focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Medtaa School</td>
<td>Karunaa School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process (cont.)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Obstacles</strong>&lt;br&gt;-Community</td>
<td>• Political interference.</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor.</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Weaker community.</td>
<td>• Value – entrance exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Value – traditional VS the new teaching method.</td>
<td>• No family’s assistance in students’ learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal</strong>&lt;br&gt;-Admin.</td>
<td>• Excessive workload</td>
<td>• Excessive workload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unqualified teachers</td>
<td>• Fragmentation of teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Insufficient resources</td>
<td>• Content focus rather than learning process focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Management</td>
<td>• Misconception of evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Teachers</strong></td>
<td>• Doubtness to the policy</td>
<td>• Lack of learning skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Individual’s low motivation</td>
<td>• Low motivation to study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Students</strong></td>
<td>• No learning skills</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not take care of learning resources</td>
<td>• + less work in class, awaken, diligent, less stress in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Anticipated</strong></td>
<td>• 10% and less in action</td>
<td>• 40%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A1-A2</td>
<td>• A2-A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Science &amp; Thai more progress</td>
<td>• Thai more progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unanticipated</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Climate</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td>• Less resistance to changes</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• + improved teaching behaviours, develop more, professionally awaken, participation</td>
<td>• + less work in class, awaken, diligent, less stress in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• -exhaust, discourage</td>
<td>• -negative first impression, discourage &amp; stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• +active, know rights</td>
<td>• +thinking skills, confidence, entertained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>• -‘learning shock’, if full fledged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The perspectives towards the schools’ implementation of the policy by school staff, provincial policy people, and policy people in central agencies are different depending on personal and professional interests. Schools, as the base of the implementation, perceived it at an institutional level—what the impacts were, what they had to do, what they lost and gained, in other words, what they subjectively perceived (Evans, 1996; Fullan, 1982, 1991; Hall & Hord, 2001, p. 10; Roger, 1995; Schien, 1997). Although many of administrators and teachers showed knowledge on the details of implementation at a micro level they showed awareness of national level issues. The provincial agencies had interest in both micro and macro level perspectives. Nonetheless, the provincial agency of Medtaa School was able to depict the actual situation at the school level whilst Karunaa had a blurred picture in the micro level but good comprehension of the macro level. The national policymakers and decision makers who were policy people in the DGE paid considerable attention to macro level views only.

Perspectives on process: support and obstacles

There are also similarities and differences for the factors that support and obstruct the implementation of the instructional reform policy between the two schools. The first similarity was that there were factors derived from three external sources (the central agency, the local level agency, and the community around the school), and three internal sources (administrators, teachers, and students).

Staff from both schools experienced five similarities regarding factors from the central level. Firstly both schools received academic resource support from the
ONEC and the DGE. However, Medtaa School, the remote school, complained that the resources were insufficient. Secondly, they both received insufficient financial and personnel resources: less tuition support, and a personnel reduction policy because of the government’s official early retirement policy as directed by the Asian Development Bank. However, the shortage of personnel in Medtaa School, further disadvantaged it, and increased the teachers’ heavy workload. The lack of staff also had an impact because teachers were required to teach subjects that they were not academically and professionally qualified for, and they had to undertake additional administrative work. Whilst, in Karunaa School, whose staff included separate administrative staff, also had a problem of heavy workload as more work was required by less personnel who had early retirement. The staff in Karunaa School also had concerns that the policy of no new recruitment would create a weak connection to the new generation of teachers. Thirdly, staff in both schools had concerns about the learner-centred approach because it was duplicated from a concept originated from western countries. They were unsure whether the concept was adapted to and could be fitted in Thai context. Fourthly, they also similarly questioned the policy evaluation as the evaluation had been done in a hasty fashion. Fifthly, staff in both schools were concerned about the centralised curricula. However, Medtaa School commented that the curricula as initiated centrally were inflexible as the content of many subjects was irrelevant to students needs and their lifestyle. Karunaa School specified that the curricula were content focused.
There were several different perspectives provided towards the external agencies as well. The differences included kinds of support and resources available, perceptions of the same centrally-initiated project, and additional comments towards different facets of the policy. Firstly, staff of Medtaa School mentioned psychological support from the expression of the Prime Minister as well as the Director General that monitored implementers for the usage of the learner-centred approach. They also mentioned the learning centre project. However, this project was irrelevant to the new teaching method because it overemphasised the application of electronic tools in class rather than how to apply it for the learner-centred approach. Karunaa School was one of the learning centres. In addition, staff in Karunaa School received further support from the *Khruu Tonbaeb* project (such as documents and instructional media provision) which was initiated by the ONEC. This occurred because the school was easy to reach and contact. Also Karunaa School staff commented on the inadequate funding from *Khruu Kaennam* project, as the school implemented it for a while and nothing much was improved. In comparison, there was no comment from Medtaa School’s staff whose spearhead teachers just received attention after the researcher arrival. Medtaa School also reported the problem during the policy conveyance. In the past, any policy introduced was re-interpreted in the hierarchical level, and these interpretations often focused on satisfying the authorities rather than achieving the main aim of each policy. They showed this concern because information on any decision making from the central agency to the school had to be reinterpreted gradually via different level agencies downwards. Karunaa School could adjust much easier to central policy staff as its principal had close relationships with
them as a former colleague, Karunaa School staff had no concerns on the matter. Instead, they mentioned a problem due to the other simultaneously introduced policies, the internal quality assurance policy, which was taken seriously as the school voluntarily participated in the pilot project of the policy via the leadership of its principal.

There were similarities and differences regarding the role of the local level agencies. Both schools made reference to training provided by *Sahawidhayaakhed*. They both showed a positive attitude to training that the organisation provided as well as to the organisation itself. The difference was that only Medtaa School mentioned the training provided by the provincial agency whereas no comment on the provincial agency was made any staff from Karunaa School, as the relationship between the provincial agency of Karunaa School and the school itself was not as significant as those of Medtaa School and its agency as Karunaa School had easier access direct to the central units.

Both schools also encountered three similar obstacles regarding their respective communities. They were the communities’ economic status which were poor, its social values, and weak relationships between students and their families. However, the values, and the weak family relationships that burdened the implementation in each school were slightly different. In the community that Medtaa School served, there was a strong belief in the traditional culture of seniority, in that the young should unconditionally obey and follow the suggestions or orders given by elders, which contradicted to the principle of the
learner-centred approach. The major goal in Karunaa School’s community was for their children to gain places in the national university entrance examination. Consequently, parents and students paid little attention to the process of study and instead focused on the content. Although the weak relationships between students and their families in both schools was relevant to their poor economic status (parents did not spend much time with their children, and hardly showed affection for them), parents in Medtaa School showed more responsibility towards their children. Parents of Medtaa School spent their hard-to-earned money on their children’s study. To gain a similar amount of money (as it is at the same minimum amount in all public secondary schools of the nation) was not as hard for parents of Karunaa School. There were also many cases of child abandonment, and many cases of domestic violence and child abuse by their parents in Karunaa School, whilst there was none in Medtaa School. In addition, the pattern of community support to Medtaa School included the support of local politicians. There was a great deal of support by the council in Karunaa School. The council supported everything: finance, staff and student morale, even infrastructure. Medtaa School also identified the negative community aspects such as drugs, and illegal daily lotteries, whilst there was no comment from staff of Karunaa School as the drug problem was alleviated.

Staff from both schools were concerned by the problem of a heavy workload. However, there are two differences. Firstly, internal problems in Medtaa School were involved in greater extent with internal administration than in Karunaa School. Secondly, the main supporter in Medtaa School was the academic
division whereas in Karunaa School it was the principal himself. The heavy workload in Medtaa School included increasing administrative work caused by school personnel mismanagement, personal values of teachers to work in town not the remote area such as in Medtaa School, and the government’s official reduction policy. Whilst in Karunaa School the increase of teachers’ work was due to the school participation in the pilot project via the principal’s action. Also, there were a few criticisms towards Medtaa School management, but none to Karunaa School’s. Many resources of Medtaa School were not well managed. Library management, financial management, even personnel management were chaotic in Medtaa School. The books in the library were outdated and insufficient. There was only one reasonably maintained learning centre in Medtaa School. With not enough money for teachers’ reimbursement, often teachers had to sacrifice their earnings to buy essential teaching materials such as instructional media. Furthermore, personnel mismanagement required teachers to teach subjects that they were not qualified for. For example, a Science teacher was assigned to teach Economics, and the Business and Economics teacher was assigned to teach another subject. Also, the school did not often acquire teachers that had been asked for, as not many teachers had a preference to teach in such a remote school. Most of Karunaa School’s staff commented on its internal factors such as a balkanised teaching culture as well as working culture that created a more competitive and hostile working environment.

Each school had different forms of teachers support. In Medtaa School, the teachers’ support was only in the form of reinforcement by peers. In Karunaa
School, some teachers further initiated a supportive project, and also, unlike in Medtaa School, there was the existence of a teachers’ support network due to the Khruu Kaennam project. However, teachers in Karunaa School were fragmented while this was not a case in Medtaa School.

Students in both schools had poor learning skills. In addition, many of them had low motivation to study. Furthermore, students in Medtaa School did not take care of learning resources. This was caused by insufficient library management and poor knowledge on how to maintain the resources.

When it came to what were supportive and obstructive features, different agencies expressed different views. They are presented separately to the views of policy people in provincial agencies (one in rural and another in Bangkok), then ones of policy people at the DGE.

The policy people in the provincial agency that oversaw Medtaa School had the closest perspectives to those in school level, apart from sharing regional and national level perspectives. Similar to those of Medtaa’s staff, they mentioned two main kinds of supportive factors (knowledge support and psychological support for the implementers), and similar obstacles in and out of the school. Supportive factors in the form of knowledge were training, provision of books, discussion between the agency’s leader and individual principals regarding the desired leadership style. The psychological support for the implementers was conveyed directly from the Director General herself to schools. The external obstacles were from the DGE, the agency, and the community. External obstacles from the
Department included inadequate financial as well as personnel resources, a problematic promotional system, and inflexible policy process due to the working values in the DGE itself. These problems about the system are common in any units of the MOE (details of the problems in Chapter 3). An obstacle created by the agency was the ineffective training that did not emphasise practical aspects of how the reform could be implemented in classrooms. The external obstacles from the community were its traditional way of bringing up their offspring that conflicted with the new teaching approach. There were three internal obstacles. The first was that the school’s leadership did not get involve very much with academic issues. Instead Medtaa School’s leadership was involved with the development of the schools’ infrastructure, which was more concrete than academic development. The second internal obstacle was the tendency of school staff to have stereotypical views against evaluation and external evaluators. The stereotype against the evaluation was that each evaluation aimed to check the school for any mistakes they made, not to monitor progress for further development of the program. The stereotype against the evaluators was that these evaluators, sent from agencies above the school, were arrogant and unsympathetic to the school, and, tried to identify as many faults in the school as possible. The stereotypes blocked them from telling the truth of what was really happening in their schools. Instead they provided false information that was seemingly satisfactory to the evaluators. In other words, the school practitioners provided the evaluators what these evaluators wanted to hear, which often was irrelevant to what was actually happening. The third internal obstacle was that teachers had to
teach subjects that they were not qualified for, and principals that did not have an adequate academic leadership.

The policy people in the provincial agency that oversaw Karunaa School presented more superficial views. However, sometimes these opinions were similar to Karunaa School’s staff’s viewpoints. They understood the school’s needs for support in the form of knowledge as well as management and mentioned obstacles concerning the international organisation that to some extent influenced the nation’s policy decision making. The support consisted of training, financial support, document support, and the administrative support that was the increasingly empowered schools and their groups to create projects by themselves. The obstacles included those caused by external agencies, and ones within schools. The external obstacles were the limitation of number of teaching staff due to Asian Development Bank’s policy, and values of the surrounding community that focused on university entrance examinations rather than the students’ learning process. The internal obstacles were from teachers who were unaware of their responsibilities, who were not confident with the new teaching approach, and who had no experience in teaching students how to think systematically. They also acknowledged that schools in the province had too many students per class, and students had insufficient self-discipline.

The policy people who worked in the central office of the DGE, despite having little first hand experience with school level implementation of the instructional reform policy did have some knowledge of what happened at the school level. The
support provided included a small amount of financial support via the *Khruu Kaennam* project as well as the provision of a handbook. One superintendent could describe the handbook details as it contained checklists of activities for learner-centred schools, publicity of the new pedagogy, inclusion of the approach into the Department’s policy, encouragement of professional development, plans of the new curriculum, operation of early retirement policy that permitted resisting teachers to voluntarily resign. Additionally, superintendents at the central agency claimed the Department’s empowerment towards establishment of *Sahawidthayaakhed*, and the Director General’s psychological support showed obvious personal interest at the school level implementation. Her focus allowed an emphasis on the academic aspects of school management rather than traditional infrastructure development. Generally, the central office policy people identified obstacles caused by a chaotic education system, as well as those ones caused by schools’ personnel and management.

Among these policy people, superintendents, in every level alike, was able to describe schools level problems, both outside and inside, in details. The chaotic systems outside school settings included the evaluation system, students’ achievement standard by using grade point average, the education system itself, social values of marks-oriented entrance examination, content-focused curricula, as well as insufficient resource provision. The internal obstacles began with school managers who had no academic leadership experience and who were not yet ready for this change, teachers who had no idea where to start, who were overly attached to the traditional teaching way, and students who did not have
sufficient learning skills. Other obstructive factors were an excessive number of students in each classroom, social problems such as drug addiction, under-trained teachers, and the incomprehensible concept of learning centre pedagogy.

*Perspectives on outcomes*

Between the schools, there were also similarities and differences in the outcomes of policy implementation. As Karunaa School adopted the policy before and beyond Medtaa School, the percentage of implementers in Karunaa School was also more than those of Medtaa. In Medtaa School, some subject departments were more progressive than others. These were the Science department, and the Thai Language department. In Karunaa School, no departments were more advanced than the others. However, it was noted that the Thai Language department had the most teachers involved with the teacher networking project or *Khruu Kaennam*. Additionally, Medtaa School’s working climate was changed due to the policy. The school staff at the time of that the research was conducted showed less resistance to any changes introduced. There was a similar impact on both schools’ teachers; they were awakened. However, they were still discouraged, and exhausted. In Medtaa School, the teachers were more developed, and participated more in the implementation. In Karunaa School, teachers who applied the learner-centred approach successfully felt less stressed when teaching. They also worked more diligently as they had to do more preparation prior to each class. Both schools reported their students had increased thinking skills. Staff of Medtaa School saw their students as more active, and with more knowledge of
their own rights. Students in Karunaa School reported more confidence in showing their own opinions and participation, and more enjoyment in lessons. However, there was a concern towards the application of leaving them to study on their own at the moment of the research as it caused learning-culture shock.

In the policy officers’ view, all participating agencies estimated that the percentage of teachers implementing the new teaching approach was high. Both provincial agencies inferred that most schools in their provinces were implementing the policy. Rural agents stated 60% of their teachers were using the method, compared with 100% of agents in Bangkok. In addition, the rural agents noted that some teachers did not produce any documents in relation to the new pedagogy despite teaching accordingly. Likewise, both policymakers and superintendents of the DGE viewed the schools’ implementation optimistically. They stated that half of teachers in the nation were implementing the new pedagogical approach, and every school was implementing the policy in their strategic plans.

Every agency rated most schools as being in the second stage of implementation, or ‘Attempt.’ The rural agents stated that overall schools were in the second stage of ‘Attempt,’ and a few of them were in the stage of ‘Achievement.’ (Please see Figure 12.) Whilst the city agents identified that their schools already were in ‘Awareness,’ many of them were already ‘Attempt,’ and about half of them already reached ‘Achievement.’ (Please see Figure 12.) They also mentioned that the stage of implementation of each school was different, depending on the school
context as well as their own staff. The schools that had spearhead teachers or progressive leaders implemented the policy more progressively than others. The central office policy people indicated schools achieved the stage of ‘Awareness’ and now were in ‘Attempt’ stage. (Please see Figure 12.)

**Figure 12.** Perspectives of the DGE’s agencies towards their schools’ stage of implementation.

There were both positive and negative unanticipated outcomes from the schools’ implementation of the policy. Policy persons in the provincial agency of Medtaa School indicated that the policy implementation positively awakened teachers. Whilst ones in the provincial agency of Karunaa School identified more sharing of resources. However, the new teaching method concerned some teachers in the Bangkok schools.
Policy people in the central agency stated both positive outcomes and negative outcomes of the policy. The positive elements were ones at the school level: teachers paid more attention to the policy, they were more eager, they realised an importance of their own portfolios, they perceived that the learning and thinking process was more significant than the content, they integrated and exchanged more ideas with colleagues in other subjects, and within the DGE there was tighter relationship among its different divisions because of the existence of more mutual projects for the reform. The negative elements were increased workload, and the decrease of number of staff due to the early retirement policy.

**Critical issues regarding the perspectives**

There are three dilemmas regarding the perspectives of policy people in the central agency as well as the schools. The first and foremost is the policy officers’ misconception of the nature of change. They, particularly in the central agency despite being supervisors, claimed that implementers should ignore the problems they as individuals or their schools as a whole were encountering, and instead keep on using the new teaching approach without being concerned. In other words, these policy people preferred implementers to perceive the change without emotional involvement or subjective interpretation. This viewpoint was linked to the misconception of the concept of change suggested in the literature which states that change involves with loss and grief (Evans, 1996) and implementers have to go through subjective processes prior to being able to reach an objective reality (Evans, 1996; Fullan, 1991; Roger, 1995; Schien, 1997). Furthermore, this
expression of the central agency was perceived as insensitive and it would widen
the understanding gap between implementers and policy people as it proved to
schools that policy people were arrogant and unsympathetic.

The second dilemma is the conflict of interest between implementers and policy
people, especially at the central level. Although some implementers in the schools
had knowledge of provincial or national level changes, their focuses were on
changes in their grassrooted level institutes. Policy officers, as they worked at a
higher level, commented this institutional and rich knowledge as too meticulous
for them to pay attention to. Rather, they paid attention to changes at the national
or even international level, and had little first hand experience with school level
practices. Policies and strategies that came out were grounded in knowledge of
academic elites, not people who used it. Although some superintendents had both
grassrooted and high level viewpoints, they had limited opportunities (if not a
cultural hindrance not to share knowledge among different divisions in the DGE)
to provide them to policymakers. As each of them, policy people and
implementers, who were supposed to help the other, had little coordination, it was
hard for the implementation of each side to be effective. Currently, the schools,
despite being the closest to the implementation, hardly had a clear view of the
problems or the overall picture of their own schools’ implementation as they were
blinded by being too close to and too involved with the problems that would
obstruct improvement of school level implementation. In contrast, the agency did
not have data that were valid and reliable for the effective and efficient
development of the policy implementation without practical and rich information
from schools. This is similar to what Hall and Hord (2001) called the “looking down the railroad tracks”: a perspective at the other end of a railway which often see the other end’s problems as so small and insignificant, depending on where one looks (p. 12).

The third dilemma was the feelings of practitioners that the problems in their institutes were the worst. This sense discouraged them from persisting with the implementation. The following quote is a commented by one administrator in Medtaa School.

This education reform will result in urban schools doing a better job than rural schools because their personnel are not exhausted. Rural schools contain exhausted teachers, exhausted both physically and financially. (Administrator I, interview script, May 30, 2001, p. 13)

Similarities and differences in the views of teachers, administrators, and policy people in different agencies of the DGE were discussed in this chapter presented the bureaucratic viewpoints of policy people towards both schools’ implementation. In the next chapter, its focus moves to the pragmatic perspectives of the reform: the quality and practicability of the strategies used, the implementation, and the change itself.
CHAPTER 9: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION: THE PRAGMATIC PERSPECTIVE

Positive change is highly exciting and exhilarating as it generates new learning, new commitments, new accomplishments, and greater meaning, but anxiety, uncertainty, exhaustion and loss of confidence also mark the way, especially at the early stages. What we are faced with is how to appreciate the good and bad of change and to approach it with a view to altering the mix by strengthening the good features and reducing the bad. (Fullan, 1993, p. 352)

This chapter considers the implementation of the policy in schools from a pragmatic perspective, that is, the practicality and practicability of the implemented policy and the change. The focus of this chapter shifts to the implementation process and outcomes regarding the quality of the reform and the change itself. However, as the program has only recently started, the achievement of outcomes is not obvious yet. In this chapter the process in school level implementation is discussed. Initially, the main strategies introduced by the Department of General Education are raised. Then the implementation is discussed in relation to issues about change and national reform presented in Chapter 2.

Practicality of the main strategies by the Department of General Education

The Department applied three main strategies for school level implementation of the learning-centred reform, known as the Sahawidthayaakhed, the whole school
approach, and Khruu Kaennam project (details of these projects was presented in the Chapter 6). The Sahawidthayaakhed project and the whole school project have been used as pilot projects for more serious reform policies, the decentralisation, and the School Based Management policy, respectively. Nevertheless, the implementations of these projects were not as smooth as were intended.

Most staff in both schools had positive attitudes towards their Sahawidthayaakhed. Every informant mentioned the existence and operation of Sahawidthayaakhed as one of the external supportive factors they received. An administrator in Medtaa School showed his approval to Sahawidthayaakhed:

but in forms of experimental trainings...we rather do it within Sahawidthayaakhed, because it is a decentralized structure....[The DGE] provided money and instructional media then assigned school groups to manage by themselves with respect to each group’s potential. Because there is proximity, there is a tight closeness, a personal relationship among them. [They] should [be able to] do better than the central agency does. (Administrator II, interview script, May 29, 2001, p. 6)

However, there were various critical situations that blocked collaboration among school in the Sahawidthayaakhed. They were the overload of work for each member, and in Medtaa School, which is located in the rural area, there were obstacles due to its resources and management within the Sahawidthayaakhed itself as well.
One aim to establish *Sahawidthayaakhed* is to foster coordination among member schools. However, the excessive workload burdened its members to support one another. One teacher depicted the busy work environment of the current situation.

Academic [assistance]? There is not much academic support. The reason there is not much academic support is that each school has to survive [first]. Each school is in crisis. In this [educational] community, each of us is in chaos. Nowadays we hardly have any chance to help one another. [It is] like two poor households. It is rare for one house to have enough time to mow the lawn of their neighbor. Each has to do domestic housework until exhausted. They are unable to help each other. (Teacher I, interview script, May 30, 2001, p. 17)

One administrator connected this overwhelming amount of work with the inadequacy of teachers in each school.

The second limitation is personnel. Within our *Sahawidthayaakhed*, all five schools are similar as the shortage of teachers is quite high percentage. As a result, we have no chance to alternate teachers from one school to another in order to exchange their instructional experiences….Consequently, there is no chance for us to alternate instructional staff from one school to another. Actually, one aim of this *Sahawidthayaakhed’s* assembling is to exchange skillful personnel, instructional specialists of each subjects, among schools [in order to] assist one another. But we are unable to do it. (Administrator I, interview script, May 30, 2001, p. 8)
In addition to the workload, the Sahawidthayaakhed itself encountered two other management problems: a financial problem, and a transportation problem. Sahawidthayaakhed of Medtaa School, similar to others, received a small amount of money for their internal operation, ironically to oversee all member schools.

Now we have to work within several limitations: the financial one, a personnel shortage, and transportation limit. Within these three limitations, I see that Sahawidthayaakhed’s potential to develop our school reforms is ineffective. For the first limit—financial limits, [we] have to admit that we receive quite small amount of budget to administrate Sahawidthayaakhed: if I remember correctly, around forty thousand Baht [A$1,600], with [a requirement] to look after many teachers and students. (Administrator I, interview script, May 30, 2001, p. 8)

Two transportation problems also burdened Sahawidthayaakhed’s members’ attempts to exchange teachers. Firstly, its members were far apart from one another. Secondly, some members did not have official vehicles of their own. A staff commented as follows:

Each of us is located quite far from one another. Some schools have no transportation facilities...If each of us had motor vehicles,...[I think the teacher-exchange policy would be possible] because teachers in this Sahawidthayaakhed are very kind and willing to help one another….But unfortunately we all have no vehicles, so, as a whole, the requirement of the Department of General Education for [each school] to support one another by exchanging teachers cannot happen. It is not that we don’t want to. We would love to but we did not have the means. (Administrator I, interview script, May 30, 2001, p. 8)
Unlike the Sahawidthayaakhed project, none of the participants seemed to know about the Department’s second strategy: the whole school approach. No one even mentioned or commented on it, including the policy people in the Department. Instead, they discussed the future of the school-based management strategy. Optimistically, they may take the project for granted as they are too busy implementing other policies, especially internal quality assurance. Negatively, they might never hear about it as they had not been informed nor had a chance to contact schools in the national pilot project (details of the project are in Chapter 6).

The Khruu Kaennam or spearhead teachers project was perceived positively by every informant, if they heard about it. However, staff including spearhead teachers made several comments on the project regarding the project incentives, the style of professional development of the project, the project evaluation, and the support from school level management towards the application of it. Firstly, the incentives were so insufficient that no effective projects could possibly be created out of it. Also, the fact that these incentives were provided selectively, not to every spearhead teacher, annoyed some spearhead teachers. Secondly, the style of professional development of the project, although arranged by different agencies each school belongs, was criticised as too conventional, too short, too document and lecturing oriented, and without practical component. A spearhead teacher commented that she did not gain the practical knowledge she expected. Thirdly, the evaluation of the project which relied heavily on documents had little connection to the real usage of the new pedagogy in classrooms. It neglected, then
discouraged spearhead teachers who were focused on actual practice. Lastly, the school management was commented on as very important towards the expansion of spearhead teachers networking. They would not be able to launch the network without serious support from key administrators within schools. One spearhead teacher in Medtaa School, despite having been honoured as a spearhead teacher, could not launch her network as no administrators supported her implementation.

Practicality of the policy and the change regarding school implementation

The implementation of policy and change are analysed regarding two frameworks provided in Chapter 2. The first is the three issues in national level implementation discussed in myriad of articles worldwide. These three issues are direction of the origin of policy (from central policy makers downwards or from school practitioners upwards), time provided for the implementation of the policy (short-term or long-term), and the prescriptiveness of the policy (whether the policy is prescribed and inflexible or not). The second is the four characteristics of change (need, clarity, complexity, and quality/practicality) included in the integrated model. These four factors are ones within Fullan (1991)’s nine factors indicated interactive factors affecting implementation.
Three facets of the implementation: Direction, time, prescriptiveness

Direction

The instructional reform was conducted according to the suggestion that the implementation should include both empowerment as well as a hierarchical approach (Caldwell, 1997; Crump, 1993; Fraser, 1997; Fullan, 1993; Hargreaves, 1997; Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992; Lee, 1997; McBeath, 1997; Stiegelbauer, 1994; and Wonycott-Kytle & Bogotch, 1997). Despite its top-down origin, two main strategies introduced by the DGE were implemented in balance from both ways. The policy was initiated from the central units and conveyed gradually in the normal manner in which the Department used the hierarchy to communicate with schools. At the same time, the means applied as the main strategies, e.g. Khruu Kaennam and Sahawidthayaakhed referred to an urge for initiation from within the school and at the near school level respectively. The problem was that there were obstacles in both ways. The resources provided from the central units were inadequate. The inadequacy obstructed the bottom up resource management of Sahawidthayaakhed. The inadequacy of resources also had impacts on Khruu Kaennam project management. The problems of these two projects are presented in the first part of this chapter.

Time for the implementation

It was two years after the time the Act was announced when this research was conducted. At the time of the research, some educators at the policy level and at
the school level hastily produced outcomes from the adoption of the learner-centred approach, that was that students had learning skills. This expectation was not realistic because insufficient time had elapsed between the announcement of the policy and when this study was undertaken. The teachers’ sense of urgency made them produce false outcomes. Furthermore, from most teachers’ point of view, they were unsure about the longevity of the instructional reform policy because of their experiences of previously and repeatedly abandoned policies of the MOE. The concern that the policy might have a short life made some teachers choose to superficially implement it by producing lesson plans but never using them in the classroom. These negative impacts were also found in studies of Stiegelbauer (1994) and Stokes (1997).

_Prescriptiveness of the policy_

The way in which the instructional reform policy was implemented is in line with recommendations contained in some of the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 (e.g. Fullan, 1991; Porter, 1997; and Stiegelbauer, 1994). The policy was not introduced prescriptively. The DGE prescribed neither how schools must implement the policy nor what teachers must do to create learner-centred classrooms. By doing that, policy people allowed individual teachers and schools to seek assistance and use their own knowledge and expertise on the matters related to the reform freely [probably too freely as the implementers did not know how they should teach according to the learner-centred approach]. However, the mindsets of educators were still attached to traditional school organisations, as much Thai literature implied that policy people as well as school staff themselves
considered schools as rational organisations. Although the policy was flexible, the
mindsets of people including lecturers, policy people, and the school staff
themselves, ignored one important reality of schools, that is, schools are neither
rational organisations nor operate in rational manners (Evans, 1996, p. 14; Fullan,
1997, p. 206; Wise, 1979, 1983). Everyone expected schools to act objectively,
with no individual emotional involvement, which is very unrealistic, especially in
these Thai schools, where face and feelings are highly regarded. Therefore, often
they were disappointed. For those whose work was outside schools, a feeling of
disappointment caused them to blame schools. For school staff, disappointment
brought them guilt and discouragement.

Characteristics of change: need, clarity, complexity, quality/practicality

The previous chapter referred to some of Fullan’s factors impacting upon
implementation that were also applied into the integrated model including
teachers, administrators, the district agents (in this study are policy people in the
provincial agencies), and government (in this case policy people in the central
agency and the Department itself which is separately discussed in Chapter 6).
These factors were derived from Fullan’s model of change. This chapter discusses
Fullan’s other four factors: need, clarity, complexity, quality/practicality, which
also were considered in the integrated model in Chapter 2. (Definition of each
factor is presented in Chapter 2.)
The instructional reform was produced due to the nation’s need to have competitive human capital to cope with a rapidly changing global environment by having necessary learning and thinking skills. However, the findings indicated, the national need underpinning the policy was not communicated to the key implementers, teachers, and, as a result of that, was not related to the needs of students. Most teachers showed little acknowledgement of the necessity to have teaching patterns changed. Teachers realised that they must allow more students’ participation regarding the National Education Act (1999), but they had no acknowledgement how vital it was for students to have learning and thinking skills. Hence, they just implemented it superficially for their survival; to pass the evaluation. In other words, as it was required that they needed to perform, they did something about the reform, but the policy itself was not necessary for them. Moreover, students in both schools still perceived their roles as passive. As their teachers did not realise the needs of their students to have learning and thinking skills, they were unlikely to recognise it.

Worse, some support did not respond to the needs of implementers. For example documents about teaching techniques did not exemplify how to teach in the learner-centred style.
Although clarity is a crucial element for successful change (Fullan, 1991), the reform policy has not been introduced in a clear way. When the policy was proclaimed by the Education Act, the practitioners were in a state of confusion. Teachers were unsure as to whether they used the correct learner-centred style or not. Administrators, particularly those with limited academic experiences or have focus other than on instructional aspects of the school, hardly knew how to bring about the instructional change. In other words, the confusion was based on the definition of the policy itself, and how to achieve it. Both matters were addressed by many teachers, even those who was implementing the policy. Even the nature of the learner-centred concept was confusing. For schools whose principal has strong instructional experience or has instructional leadership this problem should be solved easily. However, this is not always the case. The second matter questioned by administrators was how to persuade teachers to use the recommended method. Unfortunately, most of the answers from policy people did not provide any clear definitions or frameworks of learner-centred approach. Often, these unclear definitions were presented differently due to several interpreters. Implementers were left in confusion. The unanswered definition brought about a more confusing state as the practitioners had to interpret differently (as they had to implement it then). There were many cases that teachers informed the researcher that their learner-centred teaching versions were criticised as wrong but they were given neither a correct direction nor a correct definition. This trail and error weakened teachers’ attempts to use the approach. Worse, the vagueness of how to implement the reform caused confusion directly
on students. A female student introduced a substitute name for child-centred by using the term *Kwaaj*-centred (*Kwaaj* means buffalo; for Thai ‘buffalo’ refers to stupidity) in the Youth Council of the National Children’s Day (Centre of Educational Public Relations, 2002). The following is a quotation highlighting the confusion of one teacher in Karunaa School.

Each scholar who was invited to speak [at our school] quoted different ideas [about how the approach should be]. One said a particular way is the correct teaching way. Others said no, this particular way is wrong. Teachers have to practice differently. Then how can we implement? Teachers are confused. Finally, each teacher does what they assumed [is the right teaching way]. Sometimes, we already did [this way] and then [lecturers from outside] said it was wrong. Teachers are discouraged. (Teacher iiv, fieldnotes, July 9, 2001, p. 7)

*Complexity*

It is found in this research that school implementation of the instructional and learning reform policy relates with complexity. Despite having some support from outside organisations such as the DGE, the ONEC, and even the community itself, school level implementation of the learner-centred instructional approach involved several complicated obstacles. They can be categorised in relation to the chronological order of the implementation: in the beginning stage when the policy was interpreted, while the policy was used, and when the implementation was evaluated.
The beginning stage: where the confusion reigned

To restate, the policy was not introduced clearly to implementers. To begin with the policy itself, the concept of learner-centred was not explained when the policy was introduced. The meaning was confused by several academics whose terminology was different. Unfortunately, the policy’s lack of clarity caused confusion later in the evaluation of the policy. Teachers and school administrators were unsure how to evaluate it.

The utilisation stage: when resources are needed and they never are enough

The implementation of this policy was more successful than many other instructional reform policies introduced in the past; at least everyone had ‘awareness’ that this policy existed. More difficult is how to move implementers’ interest from ‘awareness’ to ‘attempt’ and from ‘attempt’ to ‘achievement’ and attract more implementers. One answer is to provide more resources into the system.

Resource provision was one of the most sensitive and controversial issues for policy people and implementers. They both often complained against each other. Policy people, despite sometimes accepting that there were insufficient resources, often argued for to provide as much resources as possible. They also denied the significant impacts of resource insufficiency on school level implementation. Rather, they viewed the implementation depending on the seriousness of implementers towards the policy. Implementers usually claimed inadequate
provision of resources results in them questioning the ‘seriousness’ of the policy people for the policy.

The problems regarding resources are categorised according to finances, personnel, and learning. The financial issue was that the government provided fewer funds yet asked schools and agencies to do more work. As stated in the Constitution, secondary education must be provided for free, but the Ministry has withdrawn the schools’ rights to collect fees from parents. In lieu of this rights, the Ministry subsidised 750 Baht, and 1,400 Baht for each lower secondary and high school students respectively (“Kromsamansyksaa con”, 2001, p. 21). Schools can have additional financial assistance from the community only in the form of donations. As a consequence, schools that fortunately were located in a prosperous community (and had politicians’ support) would be able to find alternative sources of finance. But schools in the opposite situation, which were the majority of the nation had no way out. Some policy people claimed that the lesser funding was to force schools to be able to reach out for support from the community. But in reality, it is hard for secondary school staff to reach out as it is not part of their culture to ask for support from the community. They may know that they have to increase community participation but practically they may not know how to do so, and they do not want to lose face by asking assistance from people in the community.

There were also three critical situations involving personnel. The first situation was that the government decreased the number of school staff, in spite of the
increasing amount of work. Initially the government terminated administrative staff in small schools. As a result, its teaching staff with no administrative skills or knowledge had to do administrative work. Whilst there was no new teaching staff officially recruited into the system, the government applied an early retirement program to allow so called ‘deadwood’ teachers to voluntarily step down. Unfortunately, many of the retirees were not ‘deadwood’ but ‘antiques’, they were old but knowledgeable, experienced, and skillful. The program caused a problem not only for the quality of teaching but also the quantity. At the national level nine or ten teachers retiring would make no different but in a single school nine or ten teachers could mean a whole subject department. This phenomenon was certainly catastrophic to the school. The other problem was the lack of existing learning resources. (This problem was found in only at Medtaa School. However, it is worthwhile discussing it here as it can refer to other remote and financially-restrained schools.) It is impossible for teachers to focus on the learning process if there are no adequate resources outside the school. The shortage of learning resources had an impact not only on students but also teachers as they had no input to develop themselves professionally and sometimes intellectually.

The second situation involves the attempt to develop the existing personnel to have adequate knowledge for the reform, which has two flaws. Firstly, the training and trainers were ineffective. Teachers commented that the training time was too short and often impractical, and trainers sometimes did not provide beneficial knowledge or gave irrelevant information. Secondly, the development was limited to certain types of stakeholders, in particular, teachers. The government made
attempts to develop teaching staff by initiating the project called *Khruu Kaennam* (as detailed in Chapter 6) but not much to develop other significant stakeholders, i.e., administrators (including heads of subject departments), policy people, and trainers. The suggestion here is to provide necessary knowledge and skills for each of the stakeholders: strategic and management knowledge for administrators, especially how to efficiently manage resources, optimise resources, attract and include the community; technological knowledge about changes for policy people; standardised concepts and training knowledge and techniques for trainers.

The third problematic situation in personnel concerns the qualification of existing teaching staff. Especially in the remote area school, many teachers had to teach subjects that they had no academic qualifications for. In many cases, the essential qualification of teachers to be recruited in such schools is not necessarily the academic qualifications. Except for those who have distinctive marks in the central teacher recruitment test, the preference can be made regarding each teacher’s personal connection to powerful people. The less preferable the school is, the more severe the phenomenon is. As the recruitment system was centrally managed, the less fortunate teachers were sent to less fortunate schools.

The evaluation: what to evaluate

Several studies of change highlighted evaluation as an important factor for successful change (i.e., Fullan, 1991; Hall & Hord, 2001; McBeath, 1997, p. 45). Hall and Hord (2001) further pointed out that sound evaluation could decrease the hindrances to change (p. 15). Some studies specified that learner-centred
assessment played an important role in the learner-centred approach (American Psychological Association Board of Education Affairs, 1997; Lambert & McCombs, 1998). In this research, two problems in the evaluation were found. They were caused by the central policy staff as well as implementers at the institutional level. These are the inappropriate evaluation, and the implementers’ misconception to the policy evaluation.

The plan for the policy implementation resembles many programs conducting by the Thai government in that they are not seriously evaluated (Chiangkuun, 2001, p. 55). Instead, the evaluation involved no evaluation methods investigating deep information about school that would provide close monitoring for school implementation but questionnaires conducted in a rushed fashion that asked for superficial evidences of implementation in the form of documents. Two negative aspects of implementers also resulted in problems in evaluation stage. They are misconceptions of the evaluation, including illusion for appropriate types of evaluation, the nature of the result of the implementation, and two cultures. The first misconception was that many of the staff as well as policy people conceived the evaluation in a summative type (i.e. results indicated a school and its agencies as ‘pass’ or ‘fail’, and then recorded on a blacklist, if ‘fail’), not as a formative evaluation with results providing information that could lead to project enhancement. Consequently, many staff in schools and policy people tended to make up the results, despite being exaggerated or irrelevant to the real implementation. The second misconception involves the viewpoint of some teachers that students, as the ultimate beneficiaries of the implementation, should
be good learners immediately, despite two facts. The first is that it has been only a few years since the implementation of the policy, and the second is that the implementation has been undertaken in a gradual and slow process to avoid learning shock as the students have no experience studying or living in this new style of approach. Another issue is the Thai value of saving face. Staff felt they, as individuals and as a whole school, would lose face if the results did not come out at a satisfactory level. Consequently, in the best case, they hastily implemented the new teaching method so they have something to write about. In the worst scenario, they produced false reports for the evaluation. However, both situations would not produce valid and positive outcomes for the implementation. The hastened implementation would cause students as well as teachers confusion and stress, whilst the false report would provide the administrators and policy people with a false vision of the real situation in the schools, and it could discourage the willing implementers. The last but not least is the problem due to teachers’ value, found likewise in both schools, that teaching is perceived to be an individual matter, and that classroom observation, especially by peers, can be threatening.

Furthermore, there are more complications attached to these obstacles. They are categorised here into three groups. Two of them existed within the education system. The other was outside the system. The first type refers to the learner-centred approach itself. There was no consensus about the meaning of the term learner-centred. The next complex issue is that some obstacles involve the highly centralised organisation. Not only were obstacles within the system, some complexities were from outside such as politicians’ interference, and community’s
values. For example, politicians’ interference in Medtaa School required the school to prioritise policies other than the instructional reform.

**Quality/practicality**

The quality and/or practicality of the change involve practical points and impractical points presented in previous chapters. The four positive points are the psychological support from policy people, particularly from the Director General and the Prime Minister, the academic support from the Office of National Education Commission (despite, a request for more books by the remote school), the academic support from the Ministry of Education itself in the form of *Khruu Kaennam* or the spearhead teacher project, and the decentralisation of resources and decision making to schools. Nevertheless, from this research, *Khruu Kaennam* project would be useless without serious support from any key administrators in each institute. Also the implementers advised the Ministry to inject more incentives such as a larger amount of financial support for each teacher. About the decentralisation of resources and project decision making through the central policy’s school grouping called *Sahawidthayaakhed*, schools felt more empowered, relaxed and creative. For example, they could create training that is more responsive to their needs.

The five impractical features of the policy includes resourcing, communication, training, perspectives of policy people towards schools, and evaluation. To restate, the resource provision for the policy implementation was inadequate. There was not enough financial support for staff to apply the DGE’s strategies as well as
learner-centred teaching effectively and develop them accordingly. In addition, communication of the policy from the DGE to school was another impractical element of the policy. A definition of the learner-centred approach was not communicated clearly to the implementers. There was no clear definition or frameworks of what the learner-centred teaching is and how it should be. Objectives of the policy were also not communicated well enough to implementers to create reciprocal comprehension of the need to implement the policy. Furthermore, the training time was too short, impractical and trainers sometimes did not provide beneficial knowledge or irrelevant information. Even in-service training by peer teachers seemed to be imparting of knowledge and skills, not constructing. Some perspectives of policy people toward school was also impractical. The concept of schools as rational organisations that would act objectively for the aim of the policy without individual emotional involvement is irrational. Schools are neither rational organisations nor operate in rational manners (Evans, 1996, p. 14; Fullan, 1997, p. 206; Wise, 1979, 1983). Lastly, The evaluation of the implementation of the reform, at the time of the research, was not seriously undertaken. In spite of the nationwide introduction of the quality assurance policy that forced every school to have internal evaluation, there was no systematic, sociological, or longitudinal evaluation plan designed to monitor the implementation of the learner-centred reform policy the outcomes of which were non-immediate and unobvious.

To conclude, in spite of having pre-planned strategies to help school level practitioners implementing the learner-centred approach, there were problems
burdening these practitioners when implementing the approach. Some problems existed in the strategies themselves. Some problems involved the system, for example shortage of communication or resources such as qualified teacher. Others were caused by the schools’ management and culture, for example personnel mismanagement. Due to the analysis of characteristics of the change (need, clarity, complexity, and practicality and quality), the policy was not relevant to the implementers’ needs, was not introduced clearly, involved with several complex problems, and in many ways was impractical. Recommendations relating to these problems are presented next in Chapter 10.
CHAPTER 10: REFLECTIONS

Change is everywhere, progress is not. The more things change the more they remain the same, if we do not learn our lessons that a different mind—and action—set is required. (Fullan, 1991, p. 345)

Previous chapters provided a background to Thai education, and the legal, political, bureaucratic and economic contexts of the instructional reform. The literature review looked at education reform in an international and Thai context as well as Western and Thai concepts of the learner-centred approach. The methodology utilised in this study used interpretivism and pragmatism as frameworks of data analysis. Data were collected through school level implementers, including administrators and teachers, and policy people in provincial and national level agencies. Documents collected from these people and their work units were analysed in tandem with interview scripts and fieldnotes. The significant issues that arose in those chapters are re-visited and extended further in this chapter. They are categorised into three groups: issues involving the main research question (how the schools implemented the learner-centred approach), underpinning concepts behind the problems of school implementation, and the policy implications.

How did the schools implement the instructional reform policy?

This research found that the schools were left to implement the policy with inadequate support and complicated obstacles. Users were in confusion. Many
teachers and school administrators had neither clear knowledge nor experience of how to initiate the policy successfully or how to cope with problems as the result of the new teaching method. Without any incentives, no one who possessed the necessary knowledge and experience would dedicate their time to assist schools and teachers. Despite having some support from outside organisations including the local school group (Sahawidthayaakhe), the Department of General Education, the Office of National Education Commission, and the school community itself, the level of support provided was insufficient. Some support created problems that could not be resolved in the short term, for example poorly resourced schools that required an injection of additional funding to them.

Although most policy people had goodwill towards national education reform policies, they did not have compassion or comprehension for the implementers, the administrators and teachers in schools. Implementers in school level felt left alone while they encountered numerous difficulties. The obstacles at the school level implementation existed in the introduction stage, the implementation stage, and the evaluation stage. There was confusion from teachers and school administrators alike as to what was specifically required in a learner-centred approach, how to conduct the approach and how to evaluate it.

What do these problems refer to?

These problems of the implementation reflect misconceptions particularly of policy people towards change and change implementers. These, who initially introduced the policy to educators all over the country, had a naive conception of
the nature of the change, as well as of the nature of school cultures and teachers’ work.

Policy people misconceived the nature of change. They acted as if change was not time consuming, requiring resources, and could be adopted without emotional involvement on the part of individual implementers. The strategies they used to urge implementation at the school level (the enforcement of legislative requirements and the provision of some resources) even though initiated with goodwill and with the approval of reputed academics and experts, were not as successful as planned as they did not provide for individual implementers to work through their subjective meanings of the change before being required to implement the new policy of the learner-centred teaching approach. The resources were inadequate and did not meet local needs. The evaluation involved only consideration of documents, and not real implementation of the policy into classrooms. Teachers were not informed why or how they should use the approach or why was considered an appropriate approach to use. The answers such as ‘it is the law’ or ‘it is good for the students’ were not clear and meaningful enough for most implementers. Implementers needed to have a concept of action (Crump, 1993). Policymakers should know that it would be irrational for teachers to risk trying a new teaching approach, which they were unsure about.

Furthermore, policy people misunderstood the nature of schools, particularly the nature of school organisation. Policy people and sadly even some staff at the school level tended to think of schools as rational organisations. Contrastingly,
schools, similar to other social organisations, are unlikely to be rational (Evans, 1996; Fullan, 1997; Wise, 1979, 1983). Even the well planned spearhead teachers project (*Khruu Kaennam*) introduced by the Ministry of Education was not used smoothly at the school level as a result of social organisation within schools. The perception of schooling as rational leads to two issues, an ignorance of the significance of a school’s culture in the implementation of a reform, and an ignorance of the difficulties school’s might have when implementing a reform as far-reaching as changing the way instruction was to be presented to students. In addition there were problems associated with inadequate of professional development of administrators and teachers, and a hurried and ill-conceived evaluation of the implementation of the policy.

Working cultures of secondary schools often reflect balkanisation among subject groups, isolation of individual teachers, a strong sense of territoriality and belonging within one’s own classroom, and a need for leadership and encouragement from school administrators. It is vital to emphasise the importance of Thai school leaders in any policy implementation. Although teachers are the key implementers, principals play very significant roles in prioritising the policy and influencing and stimulating teachers through evaluation processes and resource provision. Only a few teachers were confident enough to implement the policy on their own. Most teachers considered their principals’ commitment to the policy of prime importance before they went further. For instance, many teachers in Karunaa School admitted that they attempted to implement student-centred instruction into their lessons because the principal demonstrated his seriousness to
the policy. This was contrary to the case of Medtaa School, where principal did not show much commitment to the policy. Even high skilled teachers in Medtaa School were reluctant to expand their knowledge about the new teaching method to others.

Difficulties that were ignored by policy people included problems such as unqualified teachers, heavy workloads of teachers, a shortage of teaching resources that were appropriate to the new instructional method, teachers’ low motivation, and principals’ inexperience in using the new type of leadership and duties required in a rapidly changing education system. The problems associated with professional development was evident when the contents of official documents as well as that training that was offered focussed on content alone, and without conceptual explanations regarding the desirability of implementing such a change. The inadequacy of the evaluation of the policy was that policymakers evaluated the policy using documents rather than evaluating the real usage of the approach in classrooms. The misconception of implementers leads to one ironic point: **the policy was conveyed in a way that neither considers school level implementers as ‘learners’ nor applies the ‘learner-centred’ approach to distribute knowledge of the new teaching approach to implementers.**

How to change ‘progressively’?: policy recommendations

This research was far from the picture that was reported by several Thai academics and educators (e.g. Amornwiwat, 2002; Fry, 2002; Lekspirad, Wongpraphajrod, and Krahoomwong, (n.d.); Narrot, 2001; Suwannarid, and
Sadpherdpraaj, 2001). There were imperfections in the program’s understanding, resource provision, as well as the evaluation process. For the productive usage of the learner-centred teaching approach by the ultimate implementers, the following policy implications are recommended.

First of all, policy people should provide teachers and school administrators alike with conceptual as well as practical knowledge of what the policy requires to establish a sense of mutual appreciation towards the policy. The conceptual and practical knowledge includes definitions, suggestive indicators, and examples of a learner-centred approach teaching and administrating, and the everyday-life rationale behind the initiation of the approach. Teachers must have knowledge of what, why, and how the teaching approach involves. More importantly, these knowledge must be conveyed meaningfully to teachers. To be ironic, probably policy people should start thinking about applying the ‘learner-centred’ approach in training teachers to become supportive change agents.

Apart from knowledge of the teaching approach school administrators, particularly principals, need to have additional knowledge of how they can lead and support learner-centred schools. Despite many years as administrators, some school administrators are unfamiliar with a style of leadership that is required to conduct instructional change, namely academic leadership. They know how to undertake administrative work but they do not necessarily know how to progressively promote an academic innovation. Policy people need to provide support for principals and teachers whenever a reform as wide-ranging as learner-
centred instruction is to be implemented, and do this perhaps through personal dialogues via telephone, on-line sources, and video or television channels.

Secondly, resources should be provided sufficiently and efficiently. In particular, critical shortages of learning resources should be solved as soon as possible as they obstruct the practicability of the policy. These resources include shortages of teachers as well as library and teaching resources. These are particularly problematic in remote schools.

Thirdly, policymakers must plan appropriate evaluation of policy reforms. Suitable methods need to be valid to day-to-day classroom teaching as well as inoffensive enough for teachers and school administrators as to build a sense of enhancement not embarrassment. The application of questionnaires for self or peer-evaluation and document analysis were inadequate. These superficial evaluative methods led to an increase of work to an already heavy workload, and the reporting of what it was that schools thought policymakers would want to read. An evaluation system that measures the actual implementation of the approach though strategies such as action research is needed.

Last but not least, the mindsets of policy people towards change and implementers have to be altered. To urge the implementation does not necessarily need innovative theory but essentially new mindsets. Firstly, policy people must understand that change is difficult and schools are not rational in the way in which they undertake their work. To stimulate change and school implementation based upon rational approaches—wishing schools would use it without having
emotional claims—does not acknowledge the impact of change upon human beings and take into account the varied ways in which they may respond to that change. Secondly, policy people should have understanding and compassion towards school level implementers especially teachers. If something is wrong, the responsibility must be shared not blamed on one of the groups involved.

In conclusion, one reason this study focuses on the implementation of the learner-centred approach is that the policy is worthwhile and it is the essence of this education reform. The good as well as the bad ramifications have to be learnt equally as Fullan suggests:

Positive change is highly exciting and exhilarating as it generates new learning, new commitments, new accomplishments, and greater meaning, but anxiety, uncertainty, exhaustion and loss of confidence also mark the way, especially at the early stages. What we are faced with is how to appreciate the good and bad of change and to approach it with a view to altering the mix by strengthening the good features and reducing the bad.

(Fullan, 1993, p. 352)

For the long-lasting usage of the learner-centred approach, policy makers must become more serious and persistant to the implementation of learner-centred approach. Switching the priority from the instructional reform policy to other policies, such as quality assurance, from time to time lessens the importance of the policy and could result in users’ refusal to implement other new policies introduced later.
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APPENDICES

(Duplicated from ONEC, 2003, p.144)

Area : 513,155 sq.km.
Capital : Bangkok
Climate : Monsoon with average temperature between 23.7°C and 32.5°C.
Population : 64.2 million
Labour force : 34.4 million
Population growth : 1.09%
People : The majority are Thai. The rest includes ethnic Chinese, Malays, Lao, Vietnamese, Indians, and others.
Literacy Rate : 95.5%
Life expectancy : Male 67.3 (2000)
: Female 73.2 (2000)
Religion : Buddhism, the national religion, is the professed faith of 95% of the population, but there is absolute religious freedom.
Language : Thai is the national and official language. Dialects are spoken in rural areas. Other languages are Chinese, Malay and English.
Constitution : Constitutional Monarchy
Currency : Baht (1 US$ = 42.94 Baht, as of March 2003)
GDP (current price) : 5,399.6-5,728.9 billion Baht
GDP growth : 5.2% (as of March, 2003)
Per Capita GNP : 77,361.97 Baht (2000)
Government expenditure : 999,900 billion Baht
as % of GDP : 17.9%
Inflation : 5%
Unemployment rate : 1.8%
APPENDIX B: THE THAI ROMANIZATION SYSTEM.

The system is modified from Mary Haas’s system (Hass, 1964). A full citation is in the reference section.

### Alphabets

| ก | K | ม | Ch | ท | Th | ย | J |
|——|——|——|——|——|——|——|——|
| ข | Kh | จ | J | น | N | ล | L |
| ฃ | Kh | ฉ | D | บ | B | ว | W |
| ฅ | Kh | ช | Th | ป | P | ษ | S |
| ฆ | Kh | ซ | Th | ช | P | ษ | S |
| ง | Ng | ฌ | Th | ฬ | F | ส | S |
| จ | C | ญ | N | ว | Ph | อ | H |
| ฉ | Ch | ฎ | D | ค | F | พ | L |
| ช | Ch | ฏ | T | ก | Ph | อ | - |
| ซ | S | ฐ | Th | ม | M | อ | H |

### Vowels

| อ| A | เอ | e | อ ore | โอ | or | อ| aj |
|——|——|——|——|——|——|——|——|——|
| อ| Aa | เอ | ee | อ ore | โอ | oor | อ| aw |
| อ| I | เอ | ae | อ ore | โอ | ya | อ| af |
| อ| Ii | เอ | aee | อ ore | โอ | yaa | อ| af |
| อ| Y | อ | o | อ ore | โอ | ia | อ| af |
| อ| Yy | อ | oo | อ ore | โอ | iaa | อ| af |
| อ| U | เอ | er | อ ure | อ | ua | อ| af |
| อ| Uu | เอ | eer | อ ure | อ | uaa | อ| af |
APPENDIX D: INDICATIVE QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS.

Questions will be categorised into three sections due to different groups of participants: policy people, principals, and teachers.

I. Indicative questions for policy people
A.) Have schools implemented the Instructional Reform Policy?
   • To what extent have schools implemented the Instructional Reform Policy?
   • To what extent have schools managers facilitated their teachers for the change?

B.) How has the policy been implemented?
   • Have the reforms been implemented according to the Ministry of Education guidelines/expectations?
   • How did the ministry/regional office/provincial office support schools in the implementation of the reforms?
   • Were special programs/materials provided to assist the implementation?
   • What are problems arose during the implementation?

C.) What are the consequences of the implementation of the reforms?
   • Were there positive and negative outcomes? What were they?
   • What derivative changes occurred in schools as a result of the policy reforms?

II. Indicative questions for principals
A.) Have your schools implemented the Instructional Reform Policy?
   • To what extent have your schools implemented the Instructional Reform Policy?
   • To what extent have you facilitated your teachers for the change?
   • In which levels of implementation are your teachers as a whole?

B.) How has the policy been implemented?
   • Have the reforms been implemented according to the Ministry of Education guidelines/expectations?
   • How did the ministry/regional office/provincial office support your schools in the implementation of the reforms?
   • Were special programs/materials provided to assist the implementation of the reforms?
   • What are problems arose during the implementation of the reforms?
   • Were there any initiations of special programs within your schools or among schools to assist the implementation of the reforms?
• Have your teachers created any special approaches to assist the implementation of the reforms? Have they been shared? If no, why not?

C.) What are the consequences of the implementation of the reforms?
• Were there positive and negative outcomes to your school as a whole, to your teachers, to your students? What were they?
• What derivative changes occurred in schools as a result of the policy reforms? Has culture of schools changed? Has teachers’ work changed? Has teachers’ life changed? Have any perspectives about any particular things changed?

III. Indicative questions for a school teacher
A.) Has your school implemented the Instructional Reform Policy?
• To what extent has your school implemented the Instructional Reform Policy?
• To what extent has your principal facilitated you and other teachers for the change?
• In which levels of implementation are yours and other teachers’ in average?

B.) How has the policy been implemented?
• How did the ministry/regional office/provincial office support your school in the implementation of the reforms?
• Were special programs/materials provided to assist the implementation?
• What are problems arose during the implementation?
• Were there any initiations of special programs within your school or among schools to assist the implementation of the reforms?
• Have you or your colleagues created any special approaches to assist the implementation of the reforms? Have they been shared? If no, why not?

C.) What are the consequences of the implementation of the reforms?
• Were there positive and negative outcomes to you, to your students, to your school as a whole? What were they?
• What derivative changes occurred in your school as a result of the policy reforms? Has culture of school changed? Has your work changed? Has your life changed? Have any perspectives about any particular things changed?
APPENDIX E: A TRANSLATED VERSION OF LETTERS OF PERMISSION
TO COLLECT DATA FROM THE DGE’S AUTHORITY TO COLLECT
DATA.

No. Soor Thoor 0806/5674

Department of General Education
Ministry of Education
Bangkok 10300

April 12, 2001

Subject : Ask for cooperation for the research
To: General Education Director, the Bangkok General Education agency.

Miss Pattama Harn-asa, an EdD candidate, University of Sydney, Australia is conducting the research entitled “The Implementation of the Instructional Reform Policy in Thai Schools”. In this matter, she would like to collect data from the General Education Director as well as policy staff of the Bangkok General Education Agency.

The Secondary Education unit considers her research as useful for learning and instruction in secondary schools, and for the education system as a whole. As a result, the study is deserved to be supported. Furthermore, the Department of General Education has already informed the selected secondary school.

This letter is for your information.

With regards,

- Signed -

(Mr. Narong Rakded)

Deputy Directors-General, acting
Director-General of Department of General Education

Secondary School Division
Tel.: 2828466
Fax.: 2811392
No. Soor Thoor 0806/5674
Department of General Education
Ministry of Education
Bangkok 10300

April 12, 2001

Subject : Ask for cooperation for the research

To : General Education Director, the Suphan Buri General Education agency.

Miss Pattama Harn-asa, an EdD candidate, University of Sydney, Australia is conducting the research entitled “The Implementation of the Instructional Reform Policy in Thai Schools”. In this matter, she would like to collect data from the General Education Director as well as policy staff of the Suphanburi General Education Agency.

The Secondary Education unit considers her research as useful for learning and instruction in secondary schools, and for the education system as a whole. As a result, the study is deserved to be supported. Furthermore, the Department of General Education has already informed the selected secondary school.

This letter is for your information.

With regards,

- Signed -

(Mr. Narong Rakded)
Deputy Directors-General, acting
Director-General of Department of General Education

Secondary School Division
Tel.: 2828466
Fax.: 2811392
APPENDIX F: THE ULTIMATE THEMES OF ANALYSED DATA

(Medtaa School)
Other, school, culture, relationship, administrators to teachers
Other, school, culture, relationship, teachers to teachers
Other, school, culture, relationship, teachers to students
Other, school, culture, values
Other, school, administration
Other, school, administration, principal
Other, community
Other, community, politics
Other, community, economics
Other, community, sociology
Other

Factors support external agencies central psychological
Factors support external agencies central academic
Factors support external agencies central
Factors support external agencies local provincial
Factors support external agencies local Sahawidthayaakhed
Factors support external community

Factors support internal administration principal
Factors support internal administration
Factors support internal teachers

Factors obstacle external agencies central resource financial
Factors obstacle external agencies central resource personnel
Factors obstacle external agencies central curricular
Factors obstacle external agencies central policy
Factors obstacle external agencies central policy evaluation

Factors obstacle external community condition political
Factors obstacle external community condition economic
Factors obstacle external community condition sociology
Factors obstacle external community lifestyle

Factors obstacle internal administration budget
Factors obstacle internal administration workload
Factors obstacle internal administration assignment
Factors obstacle internal administration others
Factors obstacle internal administration others personnel
Factors obstacle internal administration others evaluation
Factors obstacle internal administration others training
Factors obstacle internal teachers
Factors obstacle internal students skills
Factors obstacle internal students destruction
Outcomes implementation percentage
Outcomes implementation stages
Outcomes unanticipated culture
Outcomes unanticipated teachers
Outcomes unanticipated teachers positive
Outcomes unanticipated teachers negative
Outcomes unanticipated students
Outcomes unanticipated students positive
Outcomes unanticipated students negative

(Karunaa School)
Other school culture relationship administrators to teachers
Other school culture relationship teachers to teachers
Other school culture relationship teachers to students
Other school culture values
Other school administration
Other school administration principal
Other community
Other community politics
Other community economics
Other

Factors support external agencies central academic
Factors support external agencies central financial
Factors support external agencies local
Factors support external community

Factors support internal administration
Factors support internal administration principal
Factors support internal administration principal commitment
Factors support internal administration principal clarification training
Factors support internal administration principal clarification document
Factors support internal administration principal psychology
Factors support internal administration principal evaluation
Factors support internal teachers

Factors obstacle external agencies central policy commence
Factors obstacle external agencies central policy simultaneity
Factors obstacle external agencies central policy evaluation
Factors obstacle external agencies central resource financial
Factors obstacle external agencies central resource personnel
Factors obstacle external agencies central curricular
Factors obstacle external agencies central curricular hidden
Factors obstacle external agencies central curricular intensive
Factors obstacle external agencies central curricular hours

Factors obstacle external community

Factors obstacle internal administration priority
Factors obstacle internal administration workload
Factors obstacle internal teachers fragmentation
Factors obstacle internal teachers instruction
Factors obstacle internal teachers outcomes
Factors obstacle internal students skills
Factors obstacle internal students motivation

Outcomes implementation percentage
Outcomes implementation stages
Outcomes unanticipated culture
Outcomes unanticipated teachers
Outcomes unanticipated teachers positive
Outcomes unanticipated teachers negative
Outcomes unanticipated students
Outcomes unanticipated students positive
Outcomes unanticipated students negative

(Policy People)
Provincial 1 Factors support academic
Provincial 1 Factors support psychological

Provincial 1 Factors obstacle external central resource financial
Provincial 1 Factors obstacle external central resource personnel
Provincial 1 Factors obstacle external local training
Provincial 1 Factors obstacle external community

Provincial 1 Factors obstacle internal leadership
Provincial 1 Factors obstacle internal evaluation
Provincial 1 Factors obstacle internal assignment

Provincial 2 Factors support academic
Provincial 2 Factors support management
Provincial 2 Factors obstacle external international resource personnel
Provincial 2 Factors obstacle external community value
Provincial 2 Factors obstacle internal teachers
Provincial 2 Factors obstacle internal students

Central 1,2,3 Factors support knowledge
Central 1,2,3 Factors support training
Central 1,2,3 Factors support planning
Central 1,2,3 Factors support resource financial
Central 2,3 Factors support empowerment
Central 2,3 Factors support psychological

Central 1,2,3 Factors obstacle external evaluation
Central 1,2,3 Factors obstacle external system
Central 1,2,3 Factors obstacle external value
Central 1,2,3 Factors obstacle external achievement
Central 1,2,3 Factors obstacle external curricular
Central 1,2,3 Factors obstacle internal leadership
Central 1,2,3 Factors obstacle internal classroom
Central 1,2,3 Factors obstacle internal problems
Central 1,2,3 Factors obstacle internal teachers

Outcomes implementation percentage
Outcomes implementation stage
Outcomes unanticipated culture
Outcomes unanticipated teachers positive
Outcomes unanticipated teachers negative
APPENDIX G: CONSENT FORMS AND OTHER RELATED DOCUMENTS

The English version was presented to the University of Sydney Human Ethics Committee whereas its Thai version was presented to each informant to be signed.

CONSENT FORM

I, ............................................................... , give consent to my participation in the research project

Name (please print)

TITLE: The implementation of the instructional reform policy in Thai schools.

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction;

2. I have read the Subject Information Statement and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher.

3. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time.

4. I understand that my involvement is strictly confidential and no information about me will be used in any way which reveals my identity.

Signed: .................................................... Date: ....................................

Name: ....................................................

Witness: .................................................... Date: ....................................

Name: ....................................................
หนังสือแสดงความยินยอม (Consent Form)

ชื่อ………………………………………ได้ความยินยอมเพื่อการเข้ามีส่วนร่วมของข้าพเจ้าในโครงการวิจัย
(ชื่อและนามสกุล  กรุณาเขียนตัวบรรจุ)
ชื่อ อ.การน่าน นโยบายปฏิรูปการเรียนรู้ไปใช้ในโรงเรียนไทย

ในการให้ความยินยอมนี้ ข้าพเจ้าจะระบุข้อต่างๆ ดังนี้

1. ข้อความต่างๆที่จัดเป็นสำหรับโครงการได้ถูกใช้โดยกลุ่มข้าพเจ้า และข้อความต่างๆที่ข้าพเจ้าจะต้องวิจัยได้ถูกตอบให้เป็นที่พอใจของข้าพเจ้า
2. ข้าพเจ้าได้รับข้อความและข้อถกข้อนามหนังสือผู้ถูกวิจัย (Subject Information Statement) และได้มีโอกาสได้ตอบข้อถกข้อในเอกสารดังกล่าวแล้วที่มีความเกี่ยวข้องของข้าพเจ้าในการวิจัยกับผู้วิจัย
3. ข้าพเจ้าเข้าใจว่า ข้าพเจ้าสามารถถอนตัวจากงานวิจัยนี้เมื่อใดก็ได้
4. ข้าพเจ้าเข้าใจว่า การเข้ามามีส่วนเกี่ยวข้องของข้าพเจ้าในงานวิจัยนี้จะถูกกล่าวเป็นความลับอย่างเคร่งครัด และจะไม่มีข้อมูลใดๆของข้าพเจ้าถูกกระทับโดยวิธีใดวิธีหนึ่ง อันจะเปิดเผยข้อมูลของข้าพเจ้า

ลายเซ็น……………………………………… วันที่………………

ชื่อ……………………………………

พยาน………………………………… วันที่………………

ชื่อ……………………………………
SUBJECT INFORMATION STATEMENT

Research Project

Title: The implementation of the instructional reform policy in Thai schools

(1) What is the study about?

This study will investigate how and to what extent Thai public secondary schools can accomplish the implementation of the instructional reform policy. It will also investigate some of the ramifications for teachers and policy makers arising from the implementation.

(2) Who is carrying out the study?

The study is being carried out by Ms Pattama Harn-asa a Doctor of Education student in the Faculty of Education at the University of Sydney, under the supervision of Dr Kevin Laws.

(3) What does the study involve?

The study involves an one hour interview for policy makers, principals and teachers and a period of 4 weeks observations in two selected schools.

Interviews will be audio-taped for later analysis.

(4) Can I withdraw from the study?

Participation in this study is completely voluntary - you are not under any obligation to consent to take part in it. You may also withdraw your participation at any time.

(5) What if there's a problem?

If there is a problem it should be discussed initially with Ms Pattama Harn-asa (phone 332-8756 or e-mail phar1416@mail.usyd.edu.au)

Dr Kevin Laws should be contacted at the Faculty of Education, the University of Sydney if any problem cannot be resolved.

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Manager for Ethics and Biosafety Administration, University of Sydney on (02) 9351 4811.
ข้อความแถลงเพื่อเป็นข้อมูลแก่ผู้ที่มีการเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัย (Subject Information Statement)
โครงการวิจัย
ชื่อ: การนำนโยบายปฏิรูปการเรียนรู้ไปใช้ในโรงเรียนไทย

(1) โครงการนี้เกี่ยวอะไร?
โครงการวิจัยนี้ ต้องการศึกษาก่อนการที่โรงเรียนมัธยมศึกษาสังกัดกรมสามัญศึกษา นำนโยบายปฏิรูปการเรียนรู้ไปใช้ ว่าจัดอย่างไร ประสบความสิ้นเชิงมากน้อยเพียงใด นอกจากนี้ยังต้องการศึกษาผลกระทบจากการนำนโยบายไปใช้ต่อครูและผู้ปกครอง

(2) ใครเป็นผู้ดำเนินงาน?
โครงการวิจัยนี้ดำเนินงานโดย นางสาวปทุมวารา หาญอาษา นักศึกษาระดับปริญญาดุษฎีบัณฑิต ของคณะครุศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยนิวซิดนีย์ ภายใต้การให้คำปรึกษาของ ดร. เควิน ลอว์ส

(3) งานวิจัยนี้เกี่ยวกับอะไรบ้าง?
งานวิจัยนี้จะเกี่ยวข้องกับการสัมภาษณ์เป็นเวลาประมาณหนึ่งชั่วโมงจากผู้วางนโยบาย ผู้บริหารสถานศึกษา และครู และยังเกี่ยวข้องกับการสังเกตคุณภาพในโรงเรียน 2 โรงเรียนโดยใช้เวลาประมาณ สัปดาห์ในโรงเรียนแต่ละแห่ง ในการสัมภาษณ์จะถูกบันทึกเทปเพื่อการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลต่อไป

(4) ข้าพเจ้าจะสามารถถอนตัวจากงานวิจัยนี้ได้หรือไม่?
การเข้าร่วมงานวิจัยนี้เป็นโดยความสมัครใจเท่านั้น - ท่านไม่ได้รับค่าตอบแทนใดๆที่จะต้องยอมรับ เข้าร่วมในงานวิจัยนี้ ท่านมีสิทธิ์เพิกถอนการเข้าร่วมของท่านได้ทุกเมื่อ

(5) ถ้ามีปัญหาเกิดขึ้น?
หากมีปัญหา โปรดแจ้งให้ทราบกับนางสาวปทุมวารา หาญอาษา โทร. 3328756 หรือทาง e-mail: phar1416@mail.usyd.edu.au

ทั้งนี้ หากมีปัญหาทางที่ไม่สามารถแก้ไขได้ กรุณาติดต่อ ดร. เควิน ลอว์ส ที่คณะครุศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยนิวซิดนีย์

บุคคลใดที่มีข้อสงสัยหรือข้อเรียนเกี่ยวกับการดำเนินงานวิจัย สามารถติดต่อกับ the Manager for Ethics and Biosafety Administration, University of Sydney ที่โทร 001-612-93514811
RESEARCH STUDY INTO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL REFORM POLICY IN THAI SCHOOLS (IIRPTS)

SUBJECT INFORMATION SHEET
(For each interviewee)

You are invited to take part in a research study into the implementation of the Instructional Reform Policy (IIRPTS). The object is to explore how and to what extent Thai public secondary schools can accomplish their implementation of the instructional reform policy. It is also to study some ramifications derived from the implementation. The study is being conducted by Ms. Pattama Harn-as and will form the basis for the degree of Doctor of Education at the University of Sydney.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in an interview. You will need to attend the interview for an hours on one occasions.

All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the investigator's name above and Dr. Kevin Laws, the investigator’s supervisor, will have access to information on participants. A report of the study may be submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary: you are not obliged to participate and - if you do participate - you can withdraw at any time.

When you have read this information, Ms. Pattama Harn-as will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Ms. Pattama Harn-as at the telephone number 332-8756 or via her e-mail address: phar1416@mail.usyd.edu.au. This information sheet is for you to keep.

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Manager for Ethics and Biosafety Administration, University of Sydney on (02) 9351 4811.
งานวิจัยเพื่อศึกษาเกี่ยวกับการนำนโยบายปฏิรูปการเรียนรู้ไปใช้ในโรงเรียนไทย (IIRPTS)
เอกสารข้อมูลเพื่อผู้ถูกวิจัย
(สำหรับ ผู้ถูกสัมภาษณ์)

ท่านได้ถูกเชิญให้เข้าร่วมงานวิจัยเพื่อศึกษาเกี่ยวกับการนำนโยบายปฏิรูปการเรียนรู้ไปใช้ในโรงเรียนไทย (IIRPTS) งานวิจัยนี้มุ่งประสงค์เพื่อศึกษากิจวัตรการที่โรงเรียนมีการศึกษาสังกัดกรมสามัญศึกษานำนโยบายปฏิรูปการเรียนรู้ไปใช้ ว่าที่สิ้นปี ประสบความสำเร็จมากยิ่งเพียงใด นอกจากนี้ยังต้องการศึกษาผลกระทบจากการนำนโยบายไปใช้ต่อครูและผู้ว่างงานไทย โครงการวิจัยนี้ดำเนินงานโดย นางสาวปิงจานา ทวีงศ์ ผู้ที่รับผิดชอบในการศึกษาระดับปริญญาดุษฎีบัณฑิต คณะครุศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยฮ่องกงเวียดนาม

หากท่านตกลงที่จะเข้าร่วมในงานวิจัยนี้ ท่านจะถูกขอร้องให้ร่วมในการสัมภาษณ์หนึ่งครั้ง ซึ่งอาจจะใช้ระยะเวลาประมาณหนึ่งชั่วโมง

ส่วนประกอบทั้งหมดของงานวิจัยนี้ ซึ่งรวมไปถึงผลของครัวจิ ที่ถูกเก็บเป็นความลับอย่างเคร่งเครียด และ มีที่จับคู่แล้วด้วยงานวิจัยข้างต้น และ คร.เกวิน ออร์ส อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาที่สืบทอดงานวิจัยท่านนี้ ที่จะสามารถเข้าถึงข้อมูลในส่วนของผู้ถูกวิจัย อนึ่ง ผลงานวิจัยนี้อาจถูกนำเสนอต่อพิพิธภัณฑ์ แต่ทั้งนี้ผู้ถูกวิจัยแต่ละท่านจะไม่ปล่อยให้ผู้อื่นเข้าถึงข้อมูลที่จะสามารถอ้างอิงได้ ในการรายงานผลการวิจัย การเข้าร่วมงานวิจัยนี้เป็นโดยความสมัครใจท่านนั้น ท่านไม่ได้ถูกบังคับเพื่อเข้าร่วมในงานวิจัยนี้ และหากท่านเข้าร่วม ท่านยังสามารถถอนตัวได้ทุกเมื่อ

เมื่อท่านได้รับข้อมูลเหล่านี้ นางสาวปิงจานา หากท่านจะต้องการขอข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมในขั้นตอนใดๆที่ตามที่ท่านอาจจะมักการที่จะขอทราบข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมในขั้นตอนใดๆที่ต้องการ กรุณาติดต่อกับนางสาวปิงจานา ที่ e-mail: phar1416@mail.usyd.edu.au หรือทางโทรศัพท์ 3328756 ท่านจะได้รับข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมที่ท่านต้องการได้ทันที

บุคคลใดมีข้อวิจารณ์ของเกี่ยวกับการดำเนินงานวิจัย สามารถติดต่อ the Manager for Ethics and Biosafety Administration, University of Sydney ที่โทรศัพท์ 001-612-93514811
RESEARCH STUDY INTO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL REFORM POLICY IN THAI SCHOOLS (IIRPTS)

SUBJECT INFORMATION SHEET
(For each classroom observation)

You are invited to take part in a research study into the implementation of the Instructional Reform Policy (IIRPTS). The object is to explore how and to what extent Thai public secondary schools can accomplish their implementation of the instructional reform policy. It is also to study some ramifications derived from the implementation. The study is being conducted by Ms. Pattama Harn-asa and will form the basis for the degree of Doctor of Education at the University of Sydney.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will allow the researcher to conduct observation in your class within a period of four weeks.

All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the investigator's name above and Dr. Kevin Laws, the investigator's supervisor, will have access to information on participants. A report of the study may be submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary: you are not obliged to participate and - if you do participate - you can withdraw at any time.

When you have read this information, Ms. Pattama Harn-asa will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Ms Pattama Harn-asa at the telephone number 332-8756 or via her e-mail address: phar1416@mail.usyd.edu.au. This information sheet is for you to keep.

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Manager for Ethics and Biosafety Administration, University of Sydney on (02) 9351 4811.
งานวิจัยเพื่ศึกษามาธยการดำเนินนโยบายปฏิรูปการเรียนรู้ไปใช้ในโรงเรียนไทย (IRPTS)
เอกสารข้อมูลเพื่อผู้ถูกวิจัย
(สำหรับ ชั้นเรียนที่ถูกสังเกต)

ท่านได้รับข้อมูลให้เข้าร่วมงานวิจัยเพื่ศึกษามาธยการดำเนินนโยบายปฏิรูปการเรียนรู้ไปใช้ในโรงเรียนไทย (IRPTS) งานวิจัยนี้มีจุดประสงค์เพื่ศึกษากิจวัตรการดำเนินนโยบายปฏิรูปการเรียนรู้ไปใช้ในโรงเรียนไทย 为目标ที่โรงเรียนมัธยมศึกษาสังกัดกรมสามัญศึกษาดำเนินนโยบายปฏิรูปการเรียนรู้ไปใช้ ทำให้ท่องถึงให้ประสบความสำเร็จมากขึ้นเพียงใด นอกจากนี้ยังต้องการศึกษาผลกระทบจากการดำเนินนโยบายปฏิรูปการเรียนรู้ไปใช้ต่อครูและผู้วางนโยบายโครงการวิจัยนี้ดำเนินงานโดย นางสาวปทมาหาญอาษา ซึ่งเป็นส่วนหนึ่งในการศึกษาระดับปริญญาดุษฎีบัณฑิต คณะครุศาสตร์ มาร์เวิลแลนด์ แห่งซิดนีย์

หากท่านตกลงที่จะเข้าร่วมในงานวิจัยนี้ ท่านจะอนุญาตให้ผู้ดำเนินการวิจัยเข้าทำการสังเกตในห้องเรียนของท่านในระยะเวลาสี่สัปดาห์ ส่วนประกอบทั้งหมดของงานวิจัยนี้ ซึ่งรวมไปถึงผลของการวิจัย จะถูกถือเป็นความลับอย่างเคร่งครัด และมีเพียงแค่ผู้ดำเนินงานวิจัยเข้าถึง และ ดร.เควิน ลอว์ส อาจารย์ผู้ให้คำปรึกษาแก่ผู้ดำเนินงานวิจัยท่านนี้ ที่จะสามารถเข้าถึงข้อมูลในส่วนของผู้ถูกวิจัย อย่างไรก็ตาม ผลงานวิจัยนี้อาจถูกนำไปเผยแพร่เพื่อศึกษาหรือวิจัย และท่านจะไม่สามารถเข้าถึงข้อมูลที่สามารถออกอากาศได้ ในรายงานต่อไป

การเข้าร่วมงานวิจัยนี้เป็นโดยความสมัครใจท่านนี้ ท่านไม่ได้ถูกบังคับเพื่อเข้าร่วมในงานวิจัยนี้ และหากท่านเข้าร่วม ท่านยังสามารถถอนตัวได้ทุกเมื่อที่ท่านต้องการ เนื่องจากท่านได้รับข้อมูลเหล่านี้ นางสาวปทมาหาญอาษาได้ติดต่อท่านและสอบถามท่านในขั้นตอนต่างๆที่ท่านอาจจะมี ทำให้ท่านต้องการทราบข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมในขั้นตอนใดๆที่ตาม การติดต่อนางสาวปทมาหาญอาษา ที่ e-mail: phar1416@mail.usyd.edu.au หรือ ทางโทรศัพท์ 001-612-93514811

บุคคลใดมีข้อสงสัยหรือข้อสงสัยเกี่ยวกับการดำเนินงานวิจัย สามารถติดต่อ the Manager for Ethics and Biosafety Administration, University of Sydney ที่โทรศัพท์ 001-612-93514811
RESEARCH STUDY INTO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL REFORM POLICY IN THAI SCHOOLS (IIRPTS)

SUBJECT INFORMATION SHEET
(for school observation)

You are invited to take part in a research study into the implementation of the Instructional Reform Policy (IIRPTS). The object is to explore how and to what extent Thai public secondary schools can accomplish the implementation of the instructional reform policy. It will also investigate some of the ramifications for teachers and policy makers arising from the implementation. The study is being conducted by Ms. Pattama Harn-as and will form the basis for the degree of Doctor of Education at the University of Sydney.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to allow the researcher to be presented in your school over a period of four weeks. During this time she will observe teaching in classrooms, attend meetings and special events, and participate in school activities.

All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the investigator named above and Dr. Kevin Laws, the investigator’s supervisor, will have access to information on participants. A report of the study may be submitted for publications, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary: you are not obliged to participate and - if you do participate - you can withdraw at any time.

When you have read this information, Ms. Pattama Harn-as will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Ms Pattama Harn-as at the telephone number 332-8756 or via her e-mail address: phar1416@mail.usyd.edu.au. This information sheet is for you to keep.

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Manager for Ethics and Biosafety Administration, University of Sydney on (02) 9351 4811.
งานวิจัยเพื่อดำเนินพิจารณาบัญญัติการนโยบายปฏิรูปการเรียนรู้ไปใช้ในโรงเรียนไทย (IRPTS)
เอกสารข้อมูลเพื่อผู้ถูกวิจัย
(สำหรับ โรงเรียนที่ถูกสังเกตภาคสนาม)

ท่านได้ถูกเชิญให้เข้าร่วมงานวิจัยเพื่อดำเนินพิจารณาบัญญัติการนโยบายปฏิรูปการเรียนรู้ไปใช้ในโรงเรียนไทย (IRPTS) งานวิจัยนี้มีจุดประสงค์เพื่อดำเนินการที่โรงเรียนมีข้อมูลหรือข้อมูลสำคัญเกี่ยวกับนโยบายปฏิรูปการเรียนรู้ไปใช้ ว่าผลที่จะได้รับในระยะสั้นหรือระยะยาวคืออะไร นอกจากนี้ยังต้องการศึกษาผลกระทบจากการนำนโยบายไปใช้ต่อครูและผู้ร่วมนโยบาย โครงการวิจัยนี้ดำเนินงานโดย นางสาวปทมาหาญอาษา

หากท่านตกลงที่จะเข้าร่วมในงานวิจัยนี้ ท่านจะถูกขอร้องให้ทุบถูกลูกตัวที่ผู้ดำเนินงานวิจัย ประกอบด้วยโรงเรียนของท่านในช่วงเวลาประมาณสี่สัปดาห์ ในระยะเวลานี้ ผู้ดำเนินงานวิจัยจะทำการสังเกตการสอนในชั้นเรียน เข้าร่วมการประชุม และเหตุการณ์สำคัญอื่นๆ รวมทั้งเข้าร่วมในกิจกรรมต่างๆของโรงเรียน

ส่วนประกอบทั้งหมดของงานวิจัยนี้ ซึ่งรวมไปถึงผลของการวิจัย จะถูกเก็บไว้เป็นความลับอย่างเคร่งครัด และมีเพียงแค่ผู้ดำเนินงานวิจัยชั้นต้น และ ดร.เคvin Lau อาจารย์ผู้ให้คำปรึกษาแก่ผู้ดำเนินงานวิจัยเท่านั้น ที่จะสามารถเข้าถึงข้อมูลกับส่วนของการวิจัย อย่างไรก็ตาม ผลงานวิจัยนี้อาจถูกนำไปเผยแพร่เพื่อเพื่อนประโยชน์ แต่ทั้งนี้ผู้ถูกวิจัยจะทำการขอความยินยอมก่อนที่จะรวบรวมข้อมูลไปใช้ในการวิจัย

การเข้าร่วมงานวิจัยนี้เป็นโดยความสมัครใจเท่านั้น - ท่านไม่ได้ถูกบังคับเพื่อเข้าร่วมในงานวิจัยนี้ - และหากท่านเข้าร่วม ท่านจะสามารถถอนตัวได้ทุกเมื่อ

เมื่อท่านได้รับข้อมูลดังกล่าวแล้ว นางสาวปทมาหาญอาษา ผู้ดำเนินงานวิจัยจะอภิปรายกับท่านและตอบคำถามที่ท่านอาจมี หากท่านต้องการทราบข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมในขั้นตอนใดๆตาม ท่านสามารถติดต่อที่หมายเลขโทรศัพท์ 3328756 หรือทาง e-mail: phar1416@mail.usyd.edu.au สอบถามรายละเอียดเพิ่มเติมที่เกี่ยวกับการดำเนินงานวิจัย สามารถติดต่อ Manager for Ethics and Biosafety Administration, University of Sydney ที่โทรศัพท์ 001-612-93514811