

# Problems with Teaching and Learning Thai Language for Communication Competency for Elementary School Students

Taratchaporn Chantararat

Faculty of Education, Mahasarakham University

79/2 Nakhon Sawan Road, Talad, Mueang, Maha Sarakham 44000, Thailand

Tel: 66-43-754-321 E-mail: 62010563004@msu.ac.th

Chowwalit Chookhampaeng (Corresponding author)

Faculty of Education, Mahasarakham University

79/2 Nakhon Sawan Road, Talad, Mueang, Maha Sarakham 44000, Thailand

Tel: 66-43-754-321 E-mail: chowwalit.c@msu.ac.th

Received: December 6, 2022 Accepted: January 4, 2023 Published: January 16, 2023

doi:10.5296/jei.v9i1.20524 URL: <https://doi.org/10.5296/jei.v9i1.20524>

## Abstract

Thai language is a proud cultural heritage of Thais. Moreover, Thai language for communication is one of the student core competencies which must be improved through 12 years of basic education in Thailand in order to cope with a rapidly changing trend and live happily in the 21st century. This research was carried out to explore Thai teachers' problems with teaching Thai language for communication competency for elementary school students. The participants were 120 grade 1-3 teachers from private schools in Kalasin Province, Thailand. The questionnaires were employed to collect the personal information of the respondents and survey their problems. Percentage, mean, frequency distribution and standard deviation were applied to analyze the data. The findings revealed that problems with students' grammatical and social-communicative competencies ( $M = 4.32$ ,  $S.D. = .631$ ) as well as teachers' teaching management ( $M = 4.23$ ,  $S.D. = .618$ ) were at a high level. These provided useful basic information for developing a language for a communication competency-based program in the further phases.

**Keywords:** Problems, Thai language for communication competency, Elementary school

students

## **1. Introduction**

Language is a tool that humans use to communicate and convey meanings and ideas to create mutual understanding. Language is very important in many respects to human beings because language is not only a tool for communicating an understanding of people in society, but also a tool for learning, developing ideas, working, transferring cultures, beliefs, and morality from one generation to another, and to enhance the thoughts of the nation as well (Petcharat, 2012). The key skills for living in the 21st century are the core subjects consisting of mother tongue and major world languages, arts, mathematics, government and civics, economics, science, geography, and history (Panich, 2012).

According to the research report and development of the elementary school student competency framework for the basic education curriculum, the core competencies and minor competencies used by teachers to design teaching and learning management were found that the core competency that appeared the first most in the lesson plans was Thai language for communication competency (Office of the Education Council, 2019). This is in line with the 2008 Basic Education Core Curriculum that focuses on the students to develop five key competencies, with communication capacity being the first priority of competency, followed by thinking capacity, problem-solving capacity, capacity for applying life skills and capacity for technological application respectively (Ministry of Education, 2009).

However, considering the results of the national tests at the elementary school level, for the past three years it can be seen that the quality levels of the reading proficiency test of grade 1 students (Reading Test: RT) are increasing year by year, while the language and arithmetic proficiency test of grade 3 students (National Test: NT) is declining every year. This is consistent with the results of the reading test and the national test for the past 3 years of private schools at the provincial level in Kalasin Province and the school level where the researcher is teaching. The average scores of RT in the academic year 2018, 2019, and 2020 were: 69.39, 69.79, and 70.50, respectively. The results of NT were 48.19, 44.36, and 41.73. When comparing the NT scores, the averages continued to decline (Bureau of Educational Testing, 2018, 2019, 2020).

The researcher aimed to develop the Thai language for communication competency-based program for elementary school students which could be integrated into every other learning subject area by using active learning based on Task-Based Learning, Communicative Language Teaching: CLT, as well as Authentic Assessment. Therefore, this survey was systematically conducted to find out problems with teaching-learning Thai language at the elementary school level and its findings would be used as the basic information for further developing the program.

## **2. Literature Review**

The importance of Thai language for communication was discussed by several Thai language experts such as Thongprasert (1976); Kunacheewa et al. (1980); Kapklon and Insin (1981); Raksamanee (1987); Sophawong et al. (2004); Punnotok and Khetta (2005); Suwanthada et al.

(2005); and Petcharat (2012). Thai language is one thing that shows the identity of the Thai people. It has unique characteristics that are different from other languages. It shows that Thai people are civilized, and have had their own culture for a long time. Thai language is, therefore, a cultural heritage to be proud of.

According to Royal Institute (2010); Office of the Education Council (2019); Basic Education Core Curriculum (2008); Richards (1983); Savignon (1983); Hymes (1996); Celce-Murcia (1995); Bachman and Palmer (1996); and Canale and Swain (1980), the components of communication competence can be summarized as factors regarding the ability to communicate to achieve the goal, which is related to the ability to communicate in two areas; 1) Grammatical Competence which means the ability to use language correctly according to linguistic principles, and 2) Social-Communicative Competence refers to the ability to use language correctly according to social conventions, communicate appropriately according to the person's role, know the customs of the culture of the speakers of that language.

Thai language for communication competency is described in the framework of Competency-based Curriculum by the Office of the Education Council (2019) as the ability to use Thai language as a tool for communicating with people around you through listening, watching, speaking, reading and writing in order to receive, exchange and convey information, knowledge, feelings and thoughts, using linguistic knowledge, and the use of language in conjunction with their own experiences according to their ages through critical thinking reflect and solve problems consciously, timely and creatively in order to lead to a quality life and benefits to oneself and Thai society, including the use of Thai language through listening, watching, speaking, reading and writing to access knowledge of Thai society, pride, commitment and inherit good things, and reflect Thainess in the various works that they produce. It is also stated in Thai language learning standards and indicators of grade 3 learners by the Basic Education Core Curriculum 2008, in the framework of Reading Test (RT) on grade 1 students in terms of two capacities: pronunciation and reading comprehension, and in the framework of National Test (NT) on grade 3 students in terms of Thai language capability.

However, findings from a number of studies indicate there are several problems with teaching and learning Thai language in primary schools. Katfak et al. (2011) studied the conditions and problems of learning and teaching Thai in grade 6 schools in Muang District, Uttaradit Province. The sample consisted of 140 directors and Thai teachers, and 313 grade 6 students. The result of the study showed that 43% of each school has a maximum of 5 teachers which was not enough for teaching and learning management, 32% of them had not enough budget for providing instructional media and textbooks, and 24% of students had moderate scores of learning achievement and 9% of them gained low scores respectively.

Munghaisong et al. (2017) investigated the state and problems in Thai language instructional management of 33 schools in the highland area under Chiang Rai Primary Educational Service Area Office 3. The findings from the interview with school administrators and teachers in grades 1-3 revealed that the majority of the schools lacked Thai language teachers.

Among these, only 24.24% of teachers held degrees in teaching Thai language. The main Thai literacy problem was writing skills at 29.24% and reading ability problems at 28%.

Kampo and Sothayapetch (2018) investigated the states and problems of the Thai language instructional management of 298 Thai primary school teachers, who did not graduate with a Thai major in the Pathum Thani Primary Educational Area Office, District 1. The data were collected from the questionnaires. It was found that teachers had well prepared their teaching, learning activities, measurement, and evaluation, but they lacked Thai language instructional management skills.

Phiwhlaung, Kaitjarunphan, and Siriwatthanathakun (2020) presented the current conditions of Thai language learning activities. In the aspect of teacher problems, many problems in organizing Thai language learning activities resulted from teachers, such as curriculum and indicator analysis, lack of love and awareness in organizing activities, lack of a complete understanding of Thai language cores, limited strategies for learning, measurement and evaluation, unsuitable media and innovations for learners, teachers' lack of further education, research, training and seminars, and extra missions. For student problems, most of the students had physical, intellectual, mental, social, and emotional problems and their attitudes. In the aspect of curriculum problem, there were the problems of Thai learning substance group: course changes, consistency of the curriculum with teachers' learning management methods, courses' failure to respond to the needs of learners of all levels, abundant contents of the course with limited activity duration, incomprehensive books on course guidelines, too generalized formulation of learning standards and indicators.

Although it can be concluded from the studies above that teachers and students at the primary level are facing several problems with teaching and learning Thai language such as the curriculum, administration, teachers, and students, Thai language for communication competency hasn't been much inspected. Therefore, it's a great chance to disclose the problems involving this issue.

### **3. Methodology**

This study aimed to survey problems with teaching and learning Thai language for communication competency for elementary school students. Therefore, a questionnaire based on the qualitative method was employed to gather the data and achieve its objective.

#### *3.1 Participants*

The participants were 120 teachers selected by purposive sampling. They were 40 grade 1 teachers, 40 grade 2 teachers, and 40 grade 3 teachers from 40 private schools under Kalasin Provincial Education Office, Office of the Private Education Commission, Thailand. The potential respondents were required to have a bachelor's degree in education, be grade 1, 2, or 3 teachers, and have a minimum of one year of teaching experience. These 120 respondents were asked to complete a questionnaire in order to survey their problems with teaching Thai language for communication competency.

### *3.2 Instruments*

To create the appropriate questionnaire as an instrument for data collection, scholarly articles relevant to the development of learning programs, Thai language for communication competency, and the data from the national tests were reviewed, analyzed, and synthesized. The 5-point Likert scale questionnaire is composed of 2 sections including the respondents' personal information and their problems. The first section requested data on their genders (male and female), and their classes (grades 1, 2 and 3). In the second section, the respondents were administered to explore their problems with teaching and learning Thai language for communication competency for elementary school students with 21 items concerning students' grammatical and social-communicative competencies, and teachers' teaching management. The statements regarding Thai language for communication competency were adapted from Thai language learning standards and indicators of grade 1-3 learners in the Basic Education Core Curriculum 2008. Moreover, the findings from Research and Development Report on the Competency Framework for Lower Primary Level Learners for the Basic Education Curriculum by the Independent Commission for Educational Reform (Office of the Education Council, 2019) were employed as the problem statements involving the teachers' teaching management in the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was revised in accordance with comments and recommendations made by the advisor before evaluating its validity and reliability. 5 experts were selected to verify the quality of the questionnaire. The criteria for recruiting the experts were: 1) a doctoral degree in education; 2) a minimum of five years of teaching experience in higher education with an established reputation in the relevant field; and 3) expertise in the field of Educational Research, Psychology, relevant content (Thai language for communication competency base), and Measurement and Evaluation in Education. The experts inspected the content validity of the questionnaire by using IOC (Index of Item-Objective Congruence), and the total score was 0.72. Thus, it was a highly appropriate instrument. Moreover, 30 teachers who were not the participants of the current study were asked to respond to the questionnaires to figure out the reliability value. The overall Cronbach's alpha was 0.880 which met the criteria of Srisa-Ard (2002): the acceptable value must be higher than 0.86. Therefore, the questionnaire was highly reliable.

### *3.3 Data Collection*

The data collection was conducted during the 1<sup>st</sup> semester of the academic year 2022. The permission letter officially issued by the Faculty of Education, Mahasarakham University was used to coordinate with the schools and the participants for their consent to participate in the study. The respondents were kindly requested to complete the questionnaires and send them back through the mail. All 120 questionnaires were eventually returned to the researchers.

### *3.4 Data Analysis*

After the quantitative data from both parts of the questionnaire were collected, the researchers analyzed the respondents' demographic data by using percentages. Additionally, mean and standard deviation were employed to measure the levels of agreement towards the statements

regarding problems with teaching and learning Thai language for communication competency for elementary school students. The mean score of a 5-rating scale was interpreted to present the levels of agreement as follows (Tayraukham, 2009):

4.51-5.00 means the highest level of agreement;

3.51-4.50 means a high level of agreement;

2.51-3.50 means the moderate level of agreement;

1.51-2.50 means the low level of agreement;

1.00-1.50 means the lowest level of agreement.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Personal Information about the Participants

The findings of the first section can be illustrated in the following table.

Table 1. The participant's personal information

Personal Information	Number	Percent
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	0	0
Female	120	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>
<i>Class</i>		
Grade 1	40	33.33
Grade 2	40	33.33
Grade 3	40	33.33
<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>

As Table 1 illustrates, the personal information of the participants was classified by their genders and classes. According to gender, all of 120 respondents were female (100%) while the male was absent (0%). Moreover, it was found that the number of respondents for each class was equal; 40 teachers (33.33%) for grade 1, 40 teachers (33.33%) for grade 2, and 40 teachers (33.33%) for grade 3 respectively.

### 4.2 Problems with Teaching and Learning Thai Language for Communication Competency for Elementary School Students

The second section of the questionnaire surveyed the respondents' problems with 2 aspects; 1)

Students' grammatical and social-communicative competencies, and 2) Teachers' teaching management. The findings of this section can be presented as follows:

Table 2. Problems with students' grammatical and social-communicative competences

Students' Competences	Mean	S.D.	Levels of agreement
<i>1. Grammatical Competence</i>			
1.1 Reading	4.64	.425	the highest
1.1.1 Read aloud words, texts, short stories, and simple verses.	4.84	.367	the highest
1.1.2 Summarize knowledge and insights from what has been read for application in daily life.	4.96	.201	the highest
1.1.3 Make a sequence of situations and surmise on situations from what has been read providing reasons for justification.	4.72	.453	the highest
1.1.4 Have good reading manners.	4.04	.679	high
1.2 Writing	4.56	.555	the highest
1.2.1 Write the spellings and tell the meanings of words.	4.59	.510	the highest
1.2.2 Write paragraphs from imagination.	4.83	.374	the highest
1.2.3 Have good writing manners.	4.25	.781	high
<i>2. Social-Communicative Competence</i>			
2.1 Listening	4.01	.849	high
2.1.1 Give details of what they listen to and view, both for acquiring knowledge and for entertainment.	4.49	.810	high
2.1.2 Pose questions and answer questions about what they listen to and view.	3.81	.892	high
2.1.3 Have good listening manners.	3.74	.845	high
2.2 Speaking	3.98	.722	high
2.2.1 Verbally present opinions and feelings about what they listen to and view.	4.08	.805	high
2.2.2 Speak clearly to communicate.	4.01	.667	high
2.2.3 Have good speaking manners.	3.85	.694	high
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.32</b>	<b>.631</b>	<b>high</b>

According to Table 2, the respondents agreed that problems with students' grammatical and social-communicative competencies were at a high level ( $M = 4.32$ ,  $S.D. = .631$ ). Considering the grammatical competence of reading, the average score was at the highest level ( $M = 4.64$ ,  $S.D. = .425$ ). Item 1.1.2, 1.1.1, and 1.1.3 were rated at the highest level; ( $M = 4.96$ ,  $S.D. = .201$ ), ( $M = 4.84$ ,  $S.D. = .367$ ), and ( $M = 4.72$ ,  $S.D. = .453$ ), whereas Item 1.1.4: students who have good reading manners were at the lowest level ( $M = 4.04$ ,  $S.D. = .679$ ). In addition, the grammatical competence of writing was rated the highest level of problems ( $M = 4.56$ ,  $S.D. = .555$ ). The highest mean ( $M = 4.83$ ,  $S.D. = .374$ ) was Item 1.2.2: students can write paragraphs from imagination, followed by Item 1.2.1 ( $M = 4.59$ ,  $S.D. = .510$ ). Item 1.2.3 gained the lowest average score ( $M = 4.25$ ,  $S.D. = .781$ ). Furthermore, it indicated that the social communicative competence of listening was at a high level of problems ( $M = 4.01$ ,  $S.D. = .849$ ). All items of problems in this aspect earned high mean scores. The highest mean ( $M = 4.49$ ,  $S.D. = .810$ ) was Item 2.1.1: students can give details of what they listen to and view, both for acquiring knowledge and for entertainment. The second highest average score was Item 2.1.2 ( $M = 3.81$ ,  $S.D. = .8925$ ), whereas the lowest mean was assigned to Item 2.1.3 ( $M = 3.74$ ,  $S.D. = .845$ ). Moreover, the social-communicative competence of speaking was at a high level of problems ( $M = 3.98$ ,  $S.D. = .722$ ). All 3 items were at a high level of problems ranking in the order of mean from the highest to lowest as follows: Item 2.2.1: students can verbally present opinions and feelings about what they listen to and view ( $M = 4.08$ ,  $S.D. = .805$ ); Item 2.2.2: students can speak clearly to communicate ( $M = 4.01$ ,  $S.D. = .667$ ); and Item 2.2.3: students have good speaking manners ( $M = 3.85$ ,  $S.D. = .694$ ) respectively.

Table 3. Problems with teachers' teaching management

Teachers' teaching management	Mean	S.D.	Levels of agreement
1. Contents	4.65	.496	the highest
2. Learning time	4.38	.503	high
3. Teaching-learning activities	4.52	.579	the highest
4. Learning media	4.23	.683	high
5. Learning assessment			
5.1 Pre-While-Post-assessment	4.20	.616	high
5.2 Meet learning objectives	4.16	.778	high
5.3 Various methods of measurement and evaluation	3.93	.618	high
5.4 Reveal a student's true potential	3.77	.670	high
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>.618</b>	high



As seen in Table 3, the highest mean was Item 1: Contents ( $M = 4.65$ ,  $S.D. = .496$ ), and the second highest mean was Item 3: Teaching-learning activities ( $M = 4.52$ ,  $S.D. = .579$ ). While Items 2, 4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 were at a high level, the lowest mean was Item 5.4: Learning assessment can reveal a student's true potential ( $M = 3.77$ ,  $S.D. = .670$ ). The findings from the questionnaire indicated that teachers had problems with teaching management at a high level ( $M = 4.23$ ,  $S.D. = .618$ ).

## **5. Discussion**

As mentioned above, the participants were 120 grade 1-3 teachers from private schools in Kalasin Province, Thailand. All of them were female (100%) according to their personal information. It could be possibly assumed that most Thai female teachers were assigned to teach for elementary school students especially grade 1-3. The findings of the study can be discussed as follows:

### *5.1 Problems with Students' Grammatical and Social-Communicative Competences*

The findings revealed the problems with students' grammatical and social-communicative competencies were at a high level. The respondents agreed that students could not summarize knowledge and insights from what has been read for application in daily life, read aloud words, texts, short stories, and simple verses, and make a sequence of situations and surmise on situations from what has been read providing reasons for justification, and have good reading manners. Their grammatical competence in reading was the first highest problem. As the second highest problem, the grammatical competence of writing consisted of writing paragraphs from imagination, writing the spellings and telling the meanings of words, and having good writing manners. This is consistent with a study by Khala et al. (2021). The findings showed that the reading and writing ability of the Grade 1 student was ranked at the poor level which there was 89.29 percent of students who couldn't read and write, 48.89 percent of Grade 2 student was ranked at the poor level, as well as 61.54 percent of Grade 3 student. Moreover, the social-communicative competence of listening was rated as a high problem. Students could not give details of what they listen to and view, both for acquiring knowledge and for entertainment, pose questions and answer questions about what they listen to and view, and have good listening manners. Additionally, students could not verbally present opinions and feelings about what they listen to and view, speak clearly to communicate, and have good speaking manners in the aspect of the social-communicative competence of speaking. The causes of illiteracy problem figured out by Churak (2019) were 1) the childhood students having the different readiness for learning, 2) some students with special needs joining in the class, 3) frequent absences of students, 4) teachers teaching in a different field of study, and 5) students having the family issues. From such problems, the Ministry of Education, therefore, had a policy "Lessing out illiterate students" to enable students of all levels to be literate, read fluently, write fluently and communicate, which are necessary skills for the 21st century and lay the foundation for further higher learning. This policy had been considered as an important national agenda that has to be resolved urgently since 2015 (Bureau of Academic Affairs and Educational Standards, 2015).

### *5.2 Problems with Teachers' Teaching Management*

The findings revealed the problems with teachers' teaching management were at a high level. The first highest problem involved the content which was redundant. The second highest problem was given to teaching-learning activities which could not support students to achieve their goals. Other problems were rated as a high level including learning time, learning media, and learning assessment. If considering the curriculum content, especially Thai language indicators, it is found that there are many indicators in each level in which teachers must organize activities to achieve all of the above indicators in order to be able to be promoted. However, it was found that there were many indicators. Thai language teachers cannot organize all activities because the teaching time in a week is only a few hours. This contradicts learning a language that has a lot of content, coupled with the need to practice skills for proficiency. Therefore, the time is not suitable for organizing learning activities (Phiwhlaung, Kaitjarungphan, & Siriwatthanathakun, 2020). The findings were in line with the research report and development of the elementary school student competency framework for the basic education curriculum (Office of the Education Council, 2019). It was found that the fact that the Basic Core Curriculum of 2008 required early elementary students to study 8 subject areas with many indicators causing problems for teachers and learners. Teachers need to accelerate teaching, resulting in students not being successful in learning, unhappy in learning, and other consequences. Many teachers agree that the knowledge should be reduced to a minimum and given time to develop literacy and arithmetic as it is an important base for learning in other subjects. Furthermore, in terms of teaching-learning activities teachers still manage teaching that emphasizes the content of knowledge as the main. Their teaching cannot help learners gain the understanding and performance they need. Therefore, learners are unable to apply their knowledge to be useful in daily life. In terms of measurement and evaluation, in addition, it was found that measurement and evaluation caused teachers to accelerate teaching. Many learners are unsuccessful in their studies and lack the joy of learning, as well as assessing schools with the same standard tools. This is especially unfair to schools where the context and supporting factors are not conducive to development.

### **6. Conclusion**

In this study, 120 participants were asked to reply to the questionnaire to reveal problems with teaching and learning Thai language for communication competency for elementary school students. The high level of problems regarding the students' grammatical and social-communicative competencies was accepted by the respondents. The student had problems with reading, writing, listening, and speaking ranked from the highest to the lowest level. In addition, the overall level of problems with teaching management involving contents, learning time, teaching-learning activities, learning media, and learning assessment was high. Students in Elementary Level have limited in reading and writing skills and they learn language by implicit knowledge. Therefore, it is necessary to teach them grammar. The findings from the questionnaire would be applied as guidelines for teaching-learning management based on Thai language for communication competency.

## References

- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press, UK.
- Bureau of Academic Affairs and Educational Standards. (2015). *Literacy operation manual book: read fluently, write fluently, and communicate*. Bangkok: The Agricultural Cooperative Federation of Thailand.
- Bureau of Educational Testing. (2018). *Report on the results of National Test: NT of grade 3 students in academic year 2018*. Retrieved September 30, 2021, from <http://180.180.244.42/NT/ExamWeb>
- Bureau of Educational Testing. (2018). *Report on the results of Reading Test: RT of grade 1 students in academic year 2018*. Retrieved September 30, 2021, from <http://180.180.244.42/NT/ExamWeb>
- Bureau of Educational Testing. (2019). *Report on the results of National Test: NT of grade 3 students in academic year 2019*. Retrieved September 30, 2021, from <http://180.180.244.42/NT/ExamWeb>
- Bureau of Educational Testing. (2019). *Report on the results of Reading Test: RT of grade 1 students in academic year 2019*. Retrieved September 30, 2021, from <http://180.180.244.42/NT/ExamWeb>
- Bureau of Educational Testing. (2020). *Report on the results of National Test: NT of grade 3 students in academic year 2020*. Retrieved September 30, 2021, from <http://180.180.244.42/NT/ExamWeb>
- Bureau of Educational Testing. (2020). *Report on the results of Reading Test: RT of grade 1 students in academic year 2020*. Retrieved September 30, 2021, from <http://180.180.244.42/NT/ExamWeb>
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.1.1>
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1995). Communicative Competence: A Pedagogically Motivated Model with Content Specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.5070/L462005216>
- Churak, P. (2019). Policy Recommendations Illiteracy Problem Primary 1 Students. *Journal of MCU Nakhondhat*, 6(3), 1095-1108.
- Hymes, D. (1996). *Two Types of Linguistic Relativity*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Kampo, S., & Sothayapetch, P. (2018). A study of the Thai instructional management of non-elementary and Thai major teachers in Pathum Thani Province. *Online Journal of Education*, 13(1), 103-117.

- Kapklon, P., & Insin, N. (1981). *Textbook for Thai language, subject T 051 Language and Culture*. Bangkok: Wattana Panich.
- Katfak, M., et al. (2011). A study of the conditions and problems of learning and teaching Thai for grade 6 of school in the Amphur Muang, Uttaradit. *Journal of Graduate Studies in Northern Rajabhat Universities*, 1(1), 181-188.
- Khala, W., et al. (2021). Strategies for Solving the Problem of Students Cannot Read and Write in the Grade1-3 of the Civilize Phittaya School in Accordance with the Skills of Education in the 21st Century. *Journal of Education Academic Chiang Rai Rajabhat University*, 1(2), 137-145.
- Kunacheewa, N., et al. (1980). *Methods for teaching Thai language in secondary school*. Bangkok: Ramkhamhaeng University.
- Ministry of Education. (2009). *Indicators and core learning content of the Thai language learning subject group according to the Basic Education Core Curriculum, B.E. 2551*. Bangkok: The Agricultural Cooperative Federation of Thailand.
- Munghaisong, M., Chanrueang, Y., Klaisuwan, S., Utthayanukul, P., Sukwat, B., Tungkawet, W., & Klip-Ngoen, S. (2017). The state and problems in Thai language instructional management of schools in highland area under Chiang Rai Educational Service Area Office 3. *Journal of Academic Social Sciences*, 10(SP), 09-22.
- Office of the Education Council. (2019). *Core competency framework of learners at the basic education level and lower elementary school (Grade 1-3)*. Bangkok: 21 Century Co., Ltd.
- Office of the Education Council. (2019). *Research and Development Report on the Competency Framework for Lower Primary Level Learners for the Basic Education Curriculum*. Bangkok: 21 Century Co., Ltd.
- Panich, V. (2012). *Ways to create learning for students in the 21st century* (3rd ed.). Bangkok: Sodsri-Saritwong Foundation.
- Petcharat, J. (2012). *Thai language for communication*. Bangkok: Odeon Store.
- Phiwhlaung, Kaitjarunphan, & Siriwatthanathakun. (2020). Thai Language Teachers' Learning Management Conditions: Solutions for Problem Solving. *Journal of Education, Mahamakut Buddhist University*, 8(2).
- Punnotok, T., & Khetta, W. (2005). *History of King Ramkhamhaeng Thai script and its spread to the Lanna Kingdom of Lan Xang*. Nonthaburi: Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University.
- Raksamane, K. (1987). *Thai Textbook for Thai language, subject T092, knowledge of the Thai language*. Bangkok: Aksorn Charoen Tat.
- Richards, J. C. (1983). Communicative needs in foreign language learning1. *ELT Journal*, 37(2), 111-120. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/37.2.111>

---

Savignon, S. J. (1983). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice Reading*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Sophawong, W., et al. (2004). *Thai Textbook for learning Thai language*. Bangkok: Thai Wattana Panich.

Srisa-Ard, B. (2002). *Basic research*. Bangkok: Suweriyasarn.

Suwanthada, N., et al. (2005). *Writing academic works and articles*. Bangkok: Phappim

Tayraukham, S. (2009). *Research Methods for Humanities and Social Sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahasarakham: Mahasarakham University Press Office.

Thongprasert, C. (1976). *Thai subjects* (Vol. 1, TH 401-TH 402). Bangkok: Aksorn Charoen Tat.

### **Copyright Disclaimer**

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).