This report reviews Thailand's campaign for education for all, which is supported by United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). By focusing on two specific projects, the report attempts to discern how well this elaborate system of cooperation is working. The first case study in the report highlights two responses to the need to promote early childhood care and development; teaching child-rearing skills within the family and within a community setting; and establishing universal preschool education. The second case study looks at the policies designed to encourage students finishing primary school to stay in school through the lower secondary level. The report offers recommendations that grow out of the case studies, including expanding basic education to nine years, augmenting preschool education, and concentrating the administrative elements into one single organization. (Contains 6 tables of data.) (BT)
MID-DECADE REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARDS EDUCATION FOR ALL

CASE STUDY

THAILAND
FOREWORD

Five years after the World Conference on Education for All in Jomtien, Thailand 1990, the International Consultative Forum on Education for All (the EFA Forum) undertook a review of how far countries have come in their efforts to reach Education for All.

This stocktaking of progress was done by various means. It drew on statistics and reports done by ministries of education all over the world. To complement these governmental reports, the EFA Forum asked a number of independent researchers in developing countries to provide a more in-depth view of Education for All in their countries.

From among these case studies on interesting experiences in providing basic education, we have selected a few for publication. For example, these studies look at the challenges of getting girls to stay in school and complete their primary education even though they are needed in the household economy or the school environment is geared to boys; efforts to provide education in emergency situations due to war and conflict; and the provision of education in the mother tongue of the pupils to promote learning. In short, these case studies deal with some of the current issues in basic education worldwide, and they shed light on the varying conditions in which basic education takes place. The approach and perspective vary between the studies, reflecting the diversity of the actors involved in EFA. We hope you will find these studies interesting reading.

The authors of the case studies have been selected and contracted by field offices of UNDP, UNICEF and UNESCO. These offices also proposed the themes of the studies. The EFA Forum Secretariat wishes to extend its thanks to the authors and the field offices that have provided efficient assistance in carrying out these case studies.

These case studies are written by independent researchers and consultants. The views expressed on policies, programmes and projects are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the EFA Forum.

Final editing was done by the Secretariat of the EFA Forum.
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The 1990 Jomtien conference which gave rise to the World Declaration on Education for All was held in Thailand. Having hosted the international conference, the Thai government obviously considers the task of improving basic education a special priority. Even before 1990, the 6th National Economic and Social Development Plan (1987-1991) anticipated some of the major objectives of the EFA campaign. The 7th National Economic and Social Development Plan (NESDP), covering the years 1992 to 1996, and the 1992 National Scheme of Education (NSE) together set nine goals to guide efforts up to the year 2001:

1) expanding adult literacy;
2) reaching the stage where all primary school students continue their studies through, at least, the first three years of secondary education;
3) doubling the enrolment of poor children in primary schools;
4) ensuring that all children spend a minimum of one year in a pre-school programme before beginning primary school;
5) providing families with permanent resources to help and inform them about the care of the very young;
6) promoting awareness of issues related to student health;
7) developing curricula in mathematics, science, and Thai language;
8) instructing the principles of good citizenship within schools; and
9) organizing government agencies, private institutions, and local communities into learning networks that can facilitate the sharing of information.

These goals and the policies they guide reflect the continuing importance of the vision articulated on Thai soil in 1990.

The national campaign relies on the cooperation and coordination of several government ministries, non-governmental organizations and local groups. Government participants include the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Public Health, the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, the Ministry of University Affairs and the Office of the Prime Minister.

Private assistance has come from the Foundation for the Welfare of Poor Children, the Rural Development Organization, Save the Children and the Council for Child and Youth Development.

Thailand’s campaign for Education for All has also been supported by UNICEF. By focusing on two specific projects, the following report attempts to discern how well this elaborate system of cooperation is working. The first case study highlights two responses to the need to promote Early Childhood Care and Development: teaching child-rearing skills within the family and within a community setting; and establishing universal pre-school education. The second case study looks at the policies designed to encourage students finishing primary school to stay in school through the lower secondary level. It is hoped that the Thai example, both in terms of its successes and its shortcomings, can assist other developing countries that are trying to raise the level of and conditions for education.
Overview

Children need special care, from the day they are born to the age of six, since these first six years are crucial to the development of cognitive, emotional and social skills which they will rely upon for the rest of their lives. For this reason, out of the nine government goals for basic education cited in the introduction, two are directly concerned with child development: The 7th NESDP (1992-1996) inaugurated a programme improving the care of pre-school-aged children through teaching parents within the context of village child-care facilities; The NSE set a goal of providing at least one year of pre-school education for all Thai children before they enter primary school. The efforts to realize these goals provide the basis for the following case study.

The case study is divided into two parts. The first part will examine the Child Development by Family programme. The second part will look at the Pre-school Education programme.

1.1 Project 1: Child Development by Family

Background

The Project on Child care Development by Family was launched in 1990 with the support of UNICEF and the Foundation for the Welfare of Poor Children. A key factor of its success has been its coordination of a variety of public and private agencies. Government representation consists of the Department of Community Development, the Department of Public Administration, the Department of Health, the Department of Non-Formal Education, the Office of the National Primary Education Commission, the Department of Religious Affairs, the Department of Public Welfare, the Department of Agriculture Extension, Mahidol University and the Prime Minister’s Public Relations Office.

Non-government participants include The Rural Development Organization, Save the Children and the Council for Child and Youth Development.

Objectives

The main objective has been to increase awareness of the importance of pre- and postnatal care and develop child-rearing skills within the context of the family and the larger community. The Project on Child Development by family has placed a particular emphasis on facilitating and encouraging local initiatives. Examples of sub-projects inspired by the overall effort include:

1) the establishment of community health centres where parents can receive advice from public health officers, children can be vaccinated and undergo complete check-ups and volunteers specially trained in child development can teach accident prevention, nutrition advice and basic health maintenance;
2) the creation of a programme specially designed for pupils in grades 5 and 6, "Taking Care of Younger Brothers and Sisters," which encourages older siblings to apply their learning at home and develop parenting skills at an early age;

3) the extension of volunteer work beyond the village centres and into individual homes where the health of mothers and the overall growth, both physical and emotional, of the children can be monitored; and

4) the increase of economic assistance to poor village families through programmes organized and run by women’s groups;

The programme initially targeted so called level 1 villages, which were in urgent need of development, and which had people with a significant amount of malnutrition. In 1990, the project began in 10 provinces in the North and Northeast. In 1991 5 provinces in the South were added. One more northern province was added in 1993. The current target area consists of 102 villages in 16 provinces.

Results

Evaluation of the Project of Child Development by Family has shown that the programme has succeeded in increasing awareness of and achievement in successful child-rearing. That success has encouraged the government and UNICEF to continue their work at the originally targeted sites. In addition, in June of 1994, the government approved a plan to expand the project to cover the whole country. The expansion also enlarged the target group to children between the ages of 7 and 18. The new name of the effort became "Family Development," with the hope that attention to adolescent development would naturally complement the efforts to foster increased sensitivity to the needs of young children. As part of the project’s expansion, the government has created the National Institute for Child and Family Development at Mahidol University.

Problems

The project’s strength, namely its effort to coordinate activities between entire villages and government officials in Bangkok, seems to have engendered many of its weaknesses. Most data concerning the project have been processed in the capital and have not been sufficiently available to people at local level. Another problem has been the continual reassignment of state officials which causes delays and confusion. There was no systematic monitoring or evaluation, and thus no one was directly responsible for reporting the project’s achievements and setbacks.

1.2 Project 2: Pre-primary Education

Background

Both the 6th and the 7th NESDP emphasized the need to expand pre-school education, especially in rural areas. The government’s NSE set a specific goal of universal pre-school education--at least one year for every child before starting primary school.
Several government organizations share responsibility for pre-school education. Most of them are part of one of three ministries: the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of University Affairs. The greatest number of children attend programmes run by one of five departments within the Ministry of Education. Those five are the Office of the National Primary Education Commission (ONPEC), the Office of Private Education Commission (OPEC), the Teacher Training Department, the General Education Department and the Department of Religious Affairs.

Each agency runs or monitors pre-school programmes attended by a different group of children. The ONPEC provides pre-school and kindergarten programmes in both urban and rural areas. Overseeing private instruction falls under the domain of the OPEC. The programme run by the Teacher Training Department at a Teacher's College is the basis for continual research. For handicapped and disadvantaged children there are programmes run by the General Education Department. Cooperation between the Department of Religious Affairs and monasteries has led to the opening of numerous child development centres.

The Ministry of University Affairs runs pre-school programmes in conjunction with a Faculty of Education to further research into child development to further research into child development.

The Ministry of Interior has several units involved in pre-school education. The Department of Community Development works with sub-district councils in the organization of centres for child development. The Department of Local Administration organizes development centres in urban areas. The Department of Social Welfare works with disadvantaged groups in remote areas. The Police Department is responsible for border regions. Bangkok Metropolitan Administration runs programmes for children from poor neighbourhoods in the capital.

Objectives

The goals of the Pre-school Education programme are twofold: to increase the number of children participating in pre-school activities and to improve pre-school programmes nationwide.

Between 1987 and 1991, the goal was to provide pre-school education to 37% of children between the ages of 3 and 5. That target was increased to 59% for the period between 1992 and 1996. It is estimated that 72% of the children within the targeted age group will benefit from pre-school care by 1996.

Since 1987, pre-school education has involved a multiple approach to child development. The goal has been to cultivate children’s physical well-being, intellectual curiosity, emotional integrity and ease in social situations. The goal is to develop the whole person. Innovation at the local level has involved adapting this general idea of pre-school education into specific contents for specific programmes.

There are three standard forms of pre-school care: kindergartens, pre-school classes and child development centres. Kindergartens and pre-school classes are organized within existing primary schools. Kindergarten usually lasts two or three years, while pre-school
classes tend to be a one year preparation before entering primary school.

Child development centres are the result of close cooperation between families in villages and local government officials. Unlike kindergartens and pre-school classes, child development centres are independent of the formal education system. The first step in creating a child development centre is often taken by a group of village parents who form a committee. The committee's first task is to demonstrate to local officials their village's need for and commitment to a more organized form of pre-school education. Once funding for a centre is approved, the original committee takes on the responsibility of managing those funds and coordinating the participation of other village parents. The centres are generally open to children aged 2 to 6 years old.

Another form of pre-school education is the monastery pre-school centre. These programmes strengthen the once essential relationship that bound temples and local communities together, and provide additional pre-school possibilities to the poorest families. The centres are assisted in part by ONPEC, the provincial education office, and sub-district councils.

There are still many private pre-school programmes, particularly for poor children and orphans. The government has sought ways to increase private funding for pre-school education, particularly to support village efforts.

Results

As Table 1. (below) indicates, there has been a steady growth in the number of children attending pre-school programmes. Between 1987 and 1994, the number of pre-school students nearly doubled. The 59% enrolment rate hoped for by 1996 had already been surpassed by 1994, with 64.1% of children in the appropriate age bracket participating in some kind of pre-school education.

Measuring the quality of pre-school education is not as easy. Some idea of the quality of the various programmes comes from focusing on teacher/student ratios, teacher qualifications and pedagogical methods.

The average ratio of students per classroom for all pre-school programmes was 28:1, although it varied by geographical region. Bangkok had the highest ratio while the North had the minimum ratio. The Child Development Centres had an even lower average of 14:1.

Kindergartens and pre-school classes established in regular primary schools rely upon teachers who are not necessarily trained for pre-school instruction. In fact, a 1989 study of pre-school education showed that only 20% of pre-school instructors were specifically trained for teaching kindergarten. The situation is even more striking at the child development centres where 92% of the teachers had, at most, a high school education without any specialization in child development.
Table 1. Number of pre-school pupils classified by model of programme, 1987-1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Pre-school Classes</th>
<th>Child Development Centre</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>464,805</td>
<td>692,966</td>
<td>146,134</td>
<td>1,303,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>564,769</td>
<td>684,590</td>
<td>138,820</td>
<td>1,388,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>601,903</td>
<td>670,842</td>
<td>136,200</td>
<td>1,408,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>626,769</td>
<td>665,895</td>
<td>141,051</td>
<td>1,433,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>689,643</td>
<td>659,471</td>
<td>150,391</td>
<td>1,499,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>788,583</td>
<td>601,541</td>
<td>184,511</td>
<td>1,574,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,063,681</td>
<td>544,080</td>
<td>282,473</td>
<td>1,890,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1,350,073</td>
<td>330,191</td>
<td>396,015</td>
<td>2,076,279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variety of programmes led to different approaches to pre-school education. In general, the teaching methods can be divided into three categories, with an emphasis (i) on social and emotional development, (ii) on acquiring cognitive skills, or (iii) a mixed approach. Studies showed that 65.5% of the programmes fell into the first category, 20% into the second, and 13.8% made up the last. Private programmes tend to place far more emphasis on acquiring cognitive skills, on learning how to read and write, in order to prepare children for prestigious schools that sometimes administer competitive entrance exams.

In the late eighties, officials from the Ministry of Education conducted a study designed to determine if children finishing pre-school programmes were ready to enter primary school. The results were mixed: while 93 % of the children passed physical development tests and 56% passed tests of their social skills and emotional maturity, only 30% of those tested were deemed ready in terms of their cognitive skills. The study suggested, however, that parents were satisfied with their children’s behavioral development: the children’s willingness to help around the house, their hygiene practices and overall discipline.

Problems

Despite the rapid expansion of pre-school programmes, a significant number of the most needy children are still without any form of pre-school education. At the same time, in some areas there is duplication and an overlapping of services from different organizations. This overlapping reflects a lack of coordination and an inefficient sharing of resources which is a problem common to the campaign as a whole.
All the different programmes lead to substantial variations in terms of quality. There is no single standard for pre-school education. Ultimately the quality of each programme depends heavily upon the competence of those in charge.

Most of the teachers enrolled in pre-school teaching are trained for primary education, and do not distinguish the special needs of pre-primary aged children from those of their usual pupils. The expansion of primary education has occurred without the expansion of adequate teacher training. The low budgets of child development centres forces them to rely often on teachers with limited qualifications. What makes teaching even more difficult is the general dearth of materials and equipment appropriate to child development, particularly for schools and centres in remote areas.

CASE 2: THE EXPANSION OF BASIC EDUCATION UP TO NINE YEARS

Background

Currently, compulsory education in Thailand consists of six years of primary education; which, in fact, is not sufficient any more to fulfill the goals of development. Before 1987, usually only about a third of the children aged 12 to 14 were enrolled in some kind of lower secondary school programme. In 1987, with the launching of the "Expansion of Opportunity at Lower-Secondary Education Campaign," the state committed itself to increasing that number of students. All eight governments since 1987 have honoured that commitment.

Six departments, again under the Ministries of Education, Interior, and University Affairs, direct the campaign. The Department of General Education manages programmes in both rural and urban areas, having begun in 1987 with 38 poor provinces then expanding their activities nationwide. ONPEC runs lower secondary programmes within existing rural primary schools. These first "Expansion Schools" were created in 217 areas in 1990 and, by 1994, grew in number to encompass 4,200 schools.

Both the Department of Local Administration and the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration organized urban programmes in 1991 and 1992 respectively. The Department of Religious Affairs cooperates with temples in the education of young monks. In 1991 the Department of Non-Formal Education established programmes for children outside the regular system that feature both a standard lower secondary curriculum and a vocational curriculum.

Objectives

If more children are going to pursue a secondary education, three principal obstacles have to be overcome. The first impediment is the inability of many families to afford continued education after primary school, particularly those who rely on children to help generate family income. The second problem is the inconvenience caused by inadequate transportation. The third is a general lack of awareness on the part of parents as to the importance of education past primary level.
A variety of steps have been taken to reduce expenses for the poorest families. In rural "Expansion Schools" tuition fees are exempted. Scholarships from both state and private sources have been created. Rules concerning school uniforms have been relaxed to cut down on extra costs.

In order to coordinate the demands of families and of educators, the Department of General Education designed a "semi-formal" curriculum that allowed students to alternate between study at school and study at home. The content of the curriculum was specially tailored to enhance occupational skills which would be of use at home. As part of the programme, teachers are supposed to make regular visits to students' homes to provide advice and assistance. To alleviate transportation problems the government has arranged for shuttle buses, bicycle loans and helped with transportation fees.

Non-formal education began as an effort to give a second chance to students who had already completed primary education and did not continue. At first only the standard lower secondary curriculum was offered to those enrolled in non-formal programmes. Then in 1990, a special vocational certificate curriculum was introduced.

Another alternative that figured into the movement to expand secondary education was the monastery school. The majority of young monks come from poor families and are unable to afford regular schooling, accordingly Buddhist institutions have received assistance from the state to cope with the growing number of students.

Results

The project has achieved some success in its goal of increasing the number of lower secondary students. The rate of transition increased 41% between 1987 and 1994, when it was determined that 85% of the students finishing primary school continued their studies at the lower secondary level. Annex 1 contains a set of tables which provide a more detailed account of this trend.

An important aspect of the increasing opportunities for lower secondary education has been the expansion of non-formal schools, particularly those run by Buddhist temples. In 1988 there were 153 monastery schools. By 1993, 30,000 young monks were enrolled in one of the 254 schools which provided an affordable alternative to the formal system.

Monitoring the quality of these new schools has been critical to determining the success of the project. In 1993 the Department of General Education, ONPEC and the Bureau of Local Administration tested students in grade nine of the expansion schools and compared their results with those of students attending schools that existed prior to the campaign. The expansion project students proved to be fully comparable to students enrolled in the older schools. (See Annex, Table 6)

It is worth mentioning that the expansion project was accompanied by an effective public relations campaign. Pamphlets and posters provided information to the general public while more specific materials were distributed within schools. Primary school teachers made a special effort to help sixth graders understand government policy and to notify parents of the various forms of financial aid available.
A key element of the project's success has been the transformation of existing primary schools into multi-level schools. By avoiding a major building project, the state was able to channel more resources towards direct and indirect financial assistance to families.

Problems

The campaign was not without its problems, and many of those problems were the logical result of expansion without adequate resources.

Although the providing of scholarships is a major part of government policy, scholarships are still limited in number. Only 2% of the lower secondary students receive one, and as a result the drop-out rate before grade nine is significant, particularly among students from poorer backgrounds.

The relaxing of the dress code has not been welcomed by all. Students who do not wear school uniforms often feel inferior to other students because they do not "look like students." As a result, this part of the project has not been implemented everywhere.

The semi-formal curriculum has failed to work in several instances. Many students who are not needed at home stop doing their homework during the periods of study away from school. There are not enough teachers to visit homes and monitor students, many of whom lack the necessary self-discipline for the experiment to be a success. For these reasons, a lot of schools have discontinued the programme. This failure demonstrates the problem with introducing a curriculum to an entire school when it is only designed for a certain group within a school.

The shortage of teachers is a fundamental problem. Most schools that opened during the expansion phase lack teachers for key subjects like mathematics, science, English, and vocational studies. Training courses for teachers are not sufficient and curricula often fail to suit individual and local needs.

The overall supervision of the campaign has been both insufficient and too rigid. Many teachers in remote areas fail to receive the assistance they expect. In addition, red tape at every level of the administration has hindered the efficient use of resources, complicated the distribution of teaching materials and been an obstacle to the assignment of personnel.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The aim of this report has been to evaluate the efforts made towards realizing the international educational objectives proclaimed in Thailand in 1990. Although the report is divided into two parts there are really three projects analyzed and each project merits a separate set of conclusions and recommendations.
Child Development by Family

In order to expand the project of Child Development by Family, the responsible government agencies should consider the following recommendations:

- Each agency participating in this project needs to establish a clear hierarchy of decision-making for every step of its operation, from planning to budgeting to implementation to monitoring and evaluation.

- A standard system of monitoring and evaluation should be developed for the short and long terms. Standard indicators of child and family development need to be established. These indicators would allow families and outside agents to join in the measuring of child development.

- Villages should be encouraged to participate in periodic progress reports which would improve the sharing of information at local level.

Pre-school Education

In order to achieve the goal of universal pre-school education by 2001 there must be a particular emphasis on reaching the most disadvantaged children and on insuring that there are enough well-trained teachers. The following set of recommendations grows out of these two basic concerns:

- In any village where pre-school education is not available, the closest primary school should be responsible for providing at least one year of pre-school instruction. Where there is no primary school a village committee needs to be formed in order to create a development centre.

- Universal pre-school education cannot be achieved solely through government efforts; the private sector needs to contribute as well. Employers should be given incentives to create pre-school programmes for the children of their employees. Non-governmental organizations need to be supported in their efforts to provide pre-school programmes to disadvantaged children.

- National standards for pre-school education need to be established in order to clarify the monitoring process, particularly when so many government agencies involved.

- More needs to be done to provide sufficient teacher training and adequate teaching materials. Teachers have to be better versed in child psychology and development theory. Parents, too, need to be better informed as to the value of pre-school education. Educating parents could be accomplished through more extensive public relations.
Greater cooperation between the different government organizations would lead to better use of limited resources and to better coordination of services.

The Expansion of Basic Education Up to Nine Years

The project’s demonstrated ability to expand the numbers of children who stay in school after the first six years makes the needs of those who have not shared in those successes all the more acute. Many handicapped, hill-tribe and street children still don’t have the chance to go to primary school let alone pursue a secondary education. Therefore, to reach the goal of basic education for all, the following recommendations are proposed:

- Reduction of the drop-out rate at primary level has to become a priority. Although primary education is compulsory many children do not finish. For this reason, the transition rate can be illusory. A more valid indicator would be a comparison of enrolment rates in lower secondary schools with the total number of 12 to 14 year olds, not just with those who completed primary school.

- During the next stage of the project, more programmes specifically designed for disadvantaged children are needed.

- Another attempt should be made to fuse formal and semi-formal education. Despite the fact that many schools eventually discontinued the first experiment, a successful introduction of non-formal curricula into the formal system would enable many children to combine their desire for more education with their familial duties, and, thus, stay in school.

- To combat the drop-out phenomenon, an effort has to be made to make learning more enjoyable and lessons easier to understand.

- Although it is always important to have better trained teachers in general, it is essential to have more teachers for the subjects where there are shortages—mathematics, science, English, and vocational studies. Making use of technological innovations like distance learning and video tapes might help alleviate these shortages.

Having suggested ways to improve the three projects in question, this report must conclude by returning to the factor that distinguishes the Thai effort: the elaborate system of inter-ministerial cooperation. The goals for the year 2001 set by the 7th NESDP and the NSE involve more than the mere expansion of educational opportunities for Thai children; the effort to reach those objectives also expands and complicates the administrative responsibilities of the Thai government. Currently, administration of the various basic education projects is divided up between several ministries. In order to simplify the mobilization of resources and talent, it would be advisable to concentrate the administrative elements into one single organization.
List of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Education for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESDP</td>
<td>National Economic and Social Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE</td>
<td>National Scheme of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONPEC</td>
<td>The Office of the National Primary Education Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEC</td>
<td>The Office of Private Education Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations International Children's Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Transition rates from primary to lower-secondary school classified by educational region, 1987-1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Average</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North = Regions 7 and 8
Northeast = Regions 9, 10, and 11
Central = Regions 1, 5, 6, and 12
South = Regions 2, 3, 4
Table 3. Number of secondary students classified by grade level and year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rate of Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>422,630</td>
<td>395,338</td>
<td>399,470</td>
<td>1,217,438</td>
<td>-4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>439,871</td>
<td>402,349</td>
<td>379,004</td>
<td>1,221,224</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>476,073</td>
<td>419,751</td>
<td>386,200</td>
<td>1,282,024</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>543,681</td>
<td>455,879</td>
<td>406,807</td>
<td>1,397,367</td>
<td>9.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>608,736</td>
<td>516,402</td>
<td>442,121</td>
<td>1,567,259</td>
<td>12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>683,383</td>
<td>587,380</td>
<td>502,507</td>
<td>1,773,270</td>
<td>13.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>759,629</td>
<td>661,963</td>
<td>569,143</td>
<td>1,990,735</td>
<td>12.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>827,077</td>
<td>733,512</td>
<td>639,795</td>
<td>2,200,384</td>
<td>10.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Educational Information Centre, Office of the National Education Commission.

Table 4. Number of students enrolled in public and private schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Private:Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1,076,644</td>
<td>140,794</td>
<td>88:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1,078,740</td>
<td>142,484</td>
<td>88:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1,133,744</td>
<td>148,228</td>
<td>88:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,240,118</td>
<td>157,172</td>
<td>89:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,404,122</td>
<td>163,137</td>
<td>90:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1,609,537</td>
<td>163,733</td>
<td>91:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,827,646</td>
<td>163,089</td>
<td>92:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2,039,718</td>
<td>160,66</td>
<td>93:7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Number of non-formal students in the expansion project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regular Lower Secondary Curriculum</th>
<th>Vocational Certificate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>39,719</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>40,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>43,51</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>46,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>58,069</td>
<td>7,194</td>
<td>65,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>125,409</td>
<td>13,488</td>
<td>138,897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Comparison of expansion schools and regular schools based on success rates by subject on a 1993 standardized test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expansion School</th>
<th>Regular School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical thinking and problem solving</td>
<td>71.07</td>
<td>72.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>59.12</td>
<td>57.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>55.77</td>
<td>54.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai Language</td>
<td>55.53</td>
<td>55.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>51.03</td>
<td>49.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>46.70</td>
<td>43.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social development</td>
<td>75.62</td>
<td>77.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td>74.42</td>
<td>76.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Curriculum and Instruction Development, Ministry of Education
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