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1. Background

Project

- Six pilot schools in Thailand
  - Border areas to Laos and Myanmar
- Ethnolinguistic minorities
  - 2,000 children
  - 100 teacher
- Collaboration with OBEC and MoE
1. Background
Root causes analysis

**Reason**
Children and youth are taught in national language (Thai)

**Main problem**
Children and youth mother tongue is **NOT** national language

**Consequence**
- Poor learning achievements
- High dropout rates
1. Background
Basis for MTB-MLE

- **Education in mother tongue as a child’s right**
  - «The education of the child shall be directed to the development of respect for the child’s parents and his or her own cultural identity and language.» *(Article 29c)*

- **Imbedded in the Thai Law**
  - «It is the policy of the government to promote bilingual or multilingual education for the youth of the ethnic groups whose mother tongue is different from the national language ... in order to strengthen the study of the Thai language and to support the cognitive development and education of children.» *(National Language Policy 2010)*

- **Part of the Sustainable Development Goals**
  - «By 2030, eliminate gender disparities in education, and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples, and children in vulnerable situations. » *(SDG 4 goal 4.5)*
## 2. MTB-MLE approach

### Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Grade</td>
<td>Mother tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grade</td>
<td>Mother tongue + Thai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>Reading and Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Grade</td>
<td>Mother tongue, second term: bridging to Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grade</td>
<td>bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Grade</td>
<td>bilingual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Grade       | Original-script  
                      Mother tongue as a subject |
3. Project implementation

Communication • Coordination between schools, community, Foundation of Applied Linguistic (FAL) and OBEC officer

First Applications • Thai Alphabet used to transcribe Mother-Tongue • Contextualized curricula

Professional Training • Training of local teachers (methodology) • Development of special learning material
3. Project implementation

Teaching methods

- Lesson plan with specific language aim
- Thai teacher and Teaching assistant (MT) team teach
- Methodology: Total Physical Response (KG)

Learning material

- Visual aids (i.e. word flash cards)
- Big Scene/ Picture story
- Self-produced instructional and reading material > adjustable lesson plan, according to student performance
4. Performance review

Successes

+ Children are well literate both in Thai and their mother tongue
+ Achieve improved learning outcomes
+ Score higher in national test Are confident and enjoy learning
+ Relationship between children and teachers improved
+ Children take less time to adjust to school
5. Performance review
Thai writing assessment result of Hmong students in 2015

### Results by grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>MTB</th>
<th>Regular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
<td>18.25%</td>
<td>25.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.87%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>33.93%</td>
<td>22.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.60%</td>
<td>19.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.45%</td>
<td>12.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>31.37%</td>
<td>27.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.14%</td>
<td>14.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>20.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>MTB</th>
<th>Regular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>31.64%</td>
<td>14.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>23.35%</td>
<td>15.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>22.48%</td>
<td>20.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
<td>19.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't write</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **MTB**: Modified Teaching Method
- **Regular**: Regular Teaching Method
5. Performance review

Thai reading assessment results of Hmong students in 2015

Results by grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Can't read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1 control</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>22.92%</td>
<td>25.69%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2 control</td>
<td>29.01%</td>
<td>20.61%</td>
<td>15.27%</td>
<td>28.24%</td>
<td>6.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3 control</td>
<td>70.59%</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4 control</td>
<td>23.62%</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
<td>22.83%</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
<td>23.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5 control</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall results

- Very good: 26.88%
- Good: 19.51%
- Satisfactory: 20.89%
- Poor: 20.43%
- Can't read: 12.29%

MTB: 57.34%
Regular: 42.66%

10/10/2016
5. Performance review

Challenges

+ Consultation is time consuming and requires the free prior informed consent of the community
+ Acceptance of Thai script by the local community
+ Lack financial support to implement language policy
+ High turnover of teaching staff and school head masters
+ Preservice training does not include MTB-MLE
+ Only worked with one community of one ethnolinguistic group (problematic)
+ Methodology can only be applied in schools with only one ethnolinguistic group

→ impede the scaling up of MTB-MLE into the national education system to raise the quality of education
5. Performance review

Lessons learned

Advocacy

• Integrate MTB-MLE in the education system
• Financial support

Quality

• Development of guidelines

MTB-MLE teaching methods & practices

• Training of teachers

Community participation

• Strengthen role of school committees
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