

Challenges in implementing bilingual education in Thai public schools

Wattnamongkol, Piyamon

Pituksil, Pacharakamol

Sanguean, Nawanun

Maneekiang, Phatharasuda

Saraphon, Phromrop

Leungphetngam, Ratchadaporn

Nateprakan, Naphat

National Chengchi University, Taiwan



ISSN: 2243-7703
Online ISSN: 2243-7711

OPEN ACCESS

Received: 13 May 2025

Revised: 18 June 2025

Accepted: 8 July 2025

Available Online: 10 July 2025

DOI: 10.5861/ijrse.2025.25207

Abstract

This report explores the multifaceted challenges of implementing bilingual education in Thai public schools, focusing on the systemic and contextual barriers that limit its effectiveness and equity. As Thailand strives to enhance its global competitiveness and regional integration within ASEAN, bilingual education particularly programs like the English Program (EP), Mini English Program (MEP), and English for Integrated Studies (EIS) has become central to national education reform. However, the implementation of these models remains highly uneven, with significant disparities between urban and rural areas. Drawing on policy analysis and comparative research, this study identifies five key challenges: policy fragmentation, limited teacher training, regional inequality, inadequate infrastructure, and cultural tensions. The report highlights how these challenges intersect to undermine educational equity, teacher capacity, and student outcomes, especially in under-resourced communities. By examining experiences from Thailand, Singapore, and Malaysia, the report underscores the need for a coherent national framework, capacity-building initiatives, and culturally responsive pedagogy. The findings call for equity-based reforms that prioritize both linguistic competence and social inclusion, ensuring that bilingual education in Thailand moves beyond surface-level implementation toward meaningful transformation.

Keywords: bilingual education, Thailand, public schools, language policy, regional inequality

Challenges in implementing bilingual education in Thai public schools

1. Introduction

Bilingual education has emerged as a pivotal strategy for enhancing global competencies among students in non-English speaking countries, particularly Thailand. As the nation deepens its integration within the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the global economy, English language proficiency is increasingly seen as a necessary skill for economic and academic advancement. In response, Thai education policymakers have turned to bilingual education as a tool to bridge linguistic gaps and equip students for the demands of the 21st century (ASEAN Secretariat, 2016). In the context of Thai public schools, bilingual education refers to the use of both Thai and English as mediums of instruction for core academic subjects, not merely teaching English as a subject. Key models include the English Program (EP), Mini English Program (MEP), and English for Integrated Studies (EIS). The EIS model, in particular, allows Thai teachers to teach STEM subjects in English, supported by targeted training and lesson design (Ngamsom, 2019). These initiatives are grounded in the Basic Education Core Curriculum B.E. 2551 (2008), which outlines the goals of fostering communication skills, cultural understanding, and global readiness among Thai learners (Office of the Basic Education Commission, 2008). Despite these efforts, the implementation of bilingual education remains inconsistent and heavily skewed toward urban or well-funded schools. Rural regions often face shortages in trained teachers, limited English resources, and unclear policy support. This paper investigates these systemic challenges, focusing on four core areas: policy limitations, teacher preparedness, regional inequality, and differences between urban and rural implementation contexts.

2. Literature Review and Policy Background

2.1 Bilingual Education Policy Development in Thailand

The Thai government's interest in bilingual education stems from broader efforts to improve national competitiveness and integrate with ASEAN's socio-economic agenda. This shift can be traced back to education reforms in the 1990s and 2000s that emphasized communicative English and the promotion of global skills (Foley, 2005; Hallinger & Bryant, 2013). The Basic Education Core Curriculum B.E. 2551 (2008) reflects these goals by emphasizing linguistic proficiency, intercultural communication, and student-centered learning (Office of the Basic Education Commission [OBEC], 2008).

In practice, the implementation of bilingual programs in Thai public schools has taken several forms. Most notably, the English Program (EP) and Mini English Program (MEP) were introduced to promote partial or full English instruction for select subjects, mainly math, science, and computing. The English for Integrated Studies (EIS) model offers a more scalable solution by training Thai teachers to deliver STEM content in English, supported by specialized instructional frameworks and mentoring (Ngamsom, 2019). These programs represent a significant departure from traditional rote English instruction, aiming instead to develop functional language skills through content integration. However, the rollout of bilingual programs has been uneven.

Most EP and MEP schools are located in urban or affluent areas, where funding is sufficient to hire foreign teachers or bilingual Thai educators. Meanwhile, rural public schools continue to struggle with insufficient training, inadequate materials, and teacher shortages, factors that contribute to persistent inequality in English learning outcomes (Kaur et al., 2016; Hallinger & Bryant, 2013). The discrepancy is not only geographical but also socio-economic, as students from wealthier families are more likely to access bilingual education, either through public EP schools or private international schools (Tupas, 2014).

2.2 Thai Curriculum Structure and Implementation Gaps

The Thai national curriculum promotes bilingualism in principle, but execution remains limited by a lack of institutional coherence. While OBEC (2008) sets forth guidelines for communicative and content-based instruction, the curriculum lacks detailed alignment between language learning objectives and subject-matter content. Moreover, most Thai teachers are trained in general education, not in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) methodologies, which are essential for successful bilingual instruction (Ngamsom, 2019). As a result, even schools with EIS or MEP models often default to teaching in Thai or resort to translating technical terms without adequate language scaffolding (Kaur et al., 2016).

Another challenge lies in the high-stakes national examination system, which prioritizes rote memorization and grammar-based English knowledge rather than communicative competence. This discourages innovation in classroom practices, especially in rural schools where exam results influence school funding and teacher evaluations (Hallinger & Bryant, 2013). While some pilot programs have attempted to integrate formative assessment and bilingual instructional strategies, these efforts are fragmented and not supported by long-term professional development.

Efforts to scale bilingual education have also been hampered by teacher resistance and policy ambiguity. Many teachers view bilingual education as an added burden, especially when training opportunities are limited and policy goals are poorly communicated (Kaur et al., 2016). Even where EIS is introduced, teachers frequently lack confidence in their English proficiency and are reluctant to use English beyond memorized scripts or phrases (Ngamsom, 2019). These challenges are exacerbated by a policy environment that lacks accountability measures and consistent evaluation criteria.

2.3 International Comparisons: Lessons from Singapore and Malaysia

Thailand's experience contrasts sharply with countries like Singapore and Malaysia, where bilingual education is more systematically embedded into national education frameworks. Singapore's bilingual policy mandates English as the main medium of instruction across all public schools, while simultaneously requiring mother tongue instruction to preserve cultural identity (Goh & Gopinathan, 2008). This dual-language strategy is supported by strong teacher training institutions, coherent curriculum design, and consistent political backing. Importantly, bilingualism in Singapore is viewed as a societal norm, which reduces classroom resistance and enhances parental support.

Malaysia's PPSMI policy (2003–2012) mandated the teaching of mathematics and science in English to boost language skills and global competitiveness. However, Pratheepa (2015) found that implementation was uneven, teachers lacked linguistic and pedagogical preparation, rural regions were under-resourced, and some students underperformed due to a mismatch between language proficiency and subject demands. The policy was eventually reversed, underscoring the need for capacity-building and equity-focused rollout in bilingual education.

Compared to these models, Thailand's bilingual education strategy lacks the infrastructure and institutional alignment required for national-scale implementation. Moreover, Thailand's linguistic and regional diversity, including the use of local languages such as Isan and Malay, adds another layer of complexity to the adoption of bilingual models focused on Thai and English alone (Tupas, 2014).

2.4 Previous Research on Thai-English Bilingual Models

Several studies have examined the outcomes and challenges of Thai-English bilingual education. Foley (2005) notes that while Thailand has embraced English for economic and diplomatic reasons, the actual classroom environment remains bound by traditional pedagogies. Ngamsom (2019) offers a more optimistic view through her study of the EIS model, which shows promise in building teacher confidence and student

engagement when adequate support systems are provided. However, her findings also highlight the difficulties in scaling such a model without national coordination and policy backing.

Hallinger and Bryant (2013) provide a meta-analysis of education reforms in Thailand and emphasize the disconnect between central policy ambitions and decentralized implementation. Their findings align with Kaur et al. (2016), who identify teacher capacity, inconsistent training, and lack of stakeholder communication as key obstacles to policy success. Tupas (2014) adds a socio-cultural lens, warning that bilingual models can unintentionally reinforce class and regional inequalities when implemented without social justice considerations.

These studies converge on a common theme: bilingual education in Thailand is conceptually promising but practically underdeveloped. Without stronger policy coherence, teacher development, and contextual sensitivity, bilingual programs risk becoming cosmetic reforms rather than transformative strategies.

3. Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research methodology grounded in policy analysis, secondary data review, and comparative case study. Core materials include official Thai education policy documents such as the Basic Education Core Curriculum B.E. 2551 (OBEC, 2008), alongside educational reports and academic analyses (Ngamsom, 2019; Hallinger & Bryant, 2013). To assess implementation challenges, the study analyzes data from UNICEF's Thailand Education Fact Sheets (Mishra & Amaro, 2019) and recent findings from the World Bank (Boonruang, 2024), particularly regarding regional disparities and access to learning resources. Comparative insights are drawn from bilingual education experiences in Singapore and Malaysia (Goh & Gopinathan, 2008; Pratheepa, 2015), which help contextualize Thailand's position. While no original fieldwork or interviews were conducted, the paper incorporates qualitative evidence from teacher reflections, educational case studies, and classroom observations reported in prior research (Laksanasut, 2020; Songkram & Osuwan, 2022; Thanaittipath & Boonmoh, 2024). These secondary sources provide a grounded understanding of real-world school conditions and policy impacts, particularly in rural and under-resourced areas.

4. Key Challenges in Implementation

4.1 Policy Gaps and Structural Problems

Thailand's bilingual education system continues to struggle due to the absence of a coherent national framework that clearly defines program standards, teacher qualifications, curricular requirements, and assessment protocols. While the Basic Education Core Curriculum B.E. 2551 (2008) encourages bilingual instruction, it lacks the detailed structuring needed to guide schools uniformly (Macrothink Institute, 2023). As a result, provincial education offices and school administrators interpret the policy differently, leading to significant regional disparities (Kaur, Young, & Kirkpatrick, 2016). Some schools leverage local autonomy to pilot structured English for Integrated Studies (EIS) models, while others with limited capacity merely append English lessons to Thai-medium subjects, resulting in inconsistency and dilution of bilingual objectives.

A second structural issue is the absence of standardized teacher criteria for bilingual instruction. Neither English Program (EP) nor EIS models enforce minimum linguistic proficiency or pedagogical competencies, allowing schools to recruit teachers based on availability rather than expertise (IPGCE, 2024). This creates a wide proficiency gap: urban schools might attract foreign or highly proficient Thai-English teachers, while rural schools often rely on general Thai teachers with limited English and no exposure to Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) methodologies (Taylor, 2022). Teacher training, when available, is sporadic and often lacks follow-up support, resulting in only short-term improvements rather than systemic change. The fragmented support system undermines program quality, as many Thai teachers lack the confidence to deliver instruction beyond rote phrases or pre-written scripts (Taylor, 2022; IPGCE, 2024).

Finally, there is no nationally recognized bilingual curriculum or assessment system, leaving schools to design their own content, materials, and metrics based on local capacity (Macrothink Institute, 2023). This has led to a patchwork of EIS, EP, and Mini English Program (MEP) implementations, each with varying standards. Without alignment to assessment tools—particularly national exams, which remain Thai-language focused—bilingual models risk prioritizing Thai proficiency for test preparation, defeating the intent of English-medium content (Kaur et al., 2016). Pilot initiatives that aim to incorporate bilingual assessments often falter due to a lack of funding, teacher preparedness, or systemic oversight. These factors reinforce a cycle of low structural accountability and limited scalability (Johnston, 2016).

4.2 Teacher Training and Capacity

A major barrier to implementing bilingual education effectively in Thai public schools is the limited English proficiency among teachers. While some urban schools can hire bilingual or native English-speaking staff, the majority of public schools especially in rural areas, rely on Thai teachers who often lack confidence in using English beyond memorized scripts or basic classroom phrases. Even in English for Integrated Studies (EIS) programs, many teachers feel unprepared to teach academic subjects in English and tend to revert to Thai during instruction (Ngamsom, 2019). This undermines the goals of bilingual education, which depend on consistent English-medium instruction to build student proficiency across content areas.

This language barrier is further compounded by the lack of targeted training and ongoing professional development, particularly outside urban centers. Most Thai teacher training programs do not focus on bilingual or CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) instruction, leaving educators without the necessary pedagogical tools (Hallinger & Bryant, 2013). Teachers in rural schools often face additional challenges such as isolation, inadequate mentorship, and scarce training opportunities. These gaps lead to high stress levels and a lack of confidence when teaching in English, with many teachers viewing bilingual instruction as an added burden rather than a skill-building opportunity (Kaur, Young, & Kirkpatrick, 2016). Without a stronger training infrastructure and support systems, bilingual education risks deepening inequalities between schools rather than narrowing them.

4.3 Regional Disparities: Urban vs Rural

Thailand faces stark educational disparities between urban and rural areas, significantly affecting learning outcomes and literacy development. According to the *Thailand Education Fact Sheets 2019*, while primary school completion rates are nearly universal, the gap widens dramatically at the secondary level. Only 47% of students complete upper secondary education, with rural students lagging behind urban counterparts (37% vs. 56%). Furthermore, just 19% of students from the poorest wealth quintile complete upper secondary, compared to 76% from the richest, underlining how poverty and geography compound barriers to educational attainment (Mishra & Amaro, 2019).

The disparities extend to foundational learning. Children in rural areas are more likely to lack basic reading and numeracy skills, with 30% lacking reading skills and 35% lacking numeracy, compared to 24% and 27% in urban areas, respectively (Mishra & Amaro, 2019). Socioeconomic status again plays a decisive role: while 78% of children from the richest quintile demonstrate foundational numeracy skills, only 59% of those from the poorest do. A 2024 report by the World Bank echoes these findings, revealing that 70.3% of rural Thai youths and adults lack foundational literacy, as opposed to 58% in urban areas (Boonruang, 2024).

These learning gaps are aggravated by unequal access to learning resources. The number of bookstores in Thailand dropped from 2,483 in 2022 to just 800 in 2024, with most located in urban centers like Bangkok. In rural areas, students often grow up in households without a single children's book. For instance, a teacher in Chiang Mai noted that mountain communities rarely prioritize reading, due in part to economic hardship and cultural norms that deprioritize books in favor of toys or digital media (Boonruang, 2024). While the Thai

government has expressed intent to promote reading nationwide, advocates argue that more tangible investments are needed, such as funding for mobile libraries, free books in schools, and community engagement programs (Boonruang, 2024; Mishra & Amaro, 2019).

4.4 Infrastructure, Student Impact, and Learning Conditions

One of the primary challenges facing bilingual education in Thai public schools is the infrastructural gap, which manifests in large class sizes, limited access to educational materials, and an unequal transition to online learning. Many public school classrooms in Thailand accommodate over 40 students, making it difficult for teachers to provide individualized support or facilitate meaningful English-language interaction (Laksanasut, 2020). Bilingual education, which relies on active engagement, is constrained in such overcrowded environments. Furthermore, the lack of teaching materials, especially bilingual textbooks and language-learning software, disproportionately affects rural schools. This divide became more visible during the COVID-19 pandemic, when schools were forced to shift to digital platforms. While some urban schools adapted quickly, rural schools lacked basic infrastructure such as stable internet connections or access to digital devices. As Songkram and Osuwan (2022) point out, many Thai teachers also lacked the training needed to implement online learning effectively, widening the digital learning gap between regions and school types.

These infrastructural issues directly influence students' academic performance. In bilingual programs that are well-supported with proper resources, students have been shown to perform better not only in language subjects but also in other academic areas due to cognitive benefits associated with multilingualism (Laksanasut, 2020). However, in under-resourced schools, the absence of supportive conditions undermines learning outcomes. Thanaittipath and Boonmoh (2024) observed that teachers in these contexts often struggle to integrate digital tools or differentiated instruction strategies, leading to inconsistent learning experiences. Students in less privileged settings often receive limited language exposure and fewer opportunities to practice English, resulting in lower test scores and a weaker grasp of content delivered in a second language.

Beyond grades, students' confidence and communication skills are also affected. Many Thai students, especially those in public schools, report being hesitant to speak English due to fear of making mistakes or embarrassment in front of peers (Songkram & Osuwan, 2022). These communication barriers are often compounded by limited speaking opportunities in large classes and a lack of encouragement or feedback. Over time, this leads to reduced motivation and engagement with bilingual learning. Moreover, the long-term impact is significant; students who lack English proficiency face disadvantages in accessing global academic or employment opportunities. As Thanaittipath and Boonmoh (2024) argue, unless schools can close these confidence and opportunity gaps, bilingual education will continue to reinforce social inequality rather than bridging it.

4.5 Parental and Community Role + Cultural Concerns

Community engagement and parental perception play a pivotal role in the success or failure of bilingual education in Thai public schools. While urban, middle-class parents often view English proficiency as a tool for upward mobility and international opportunity, many rural families remain cautious or even resistant. These differing views are shaped by socioeconomic backgrounds, access to resources, and cultural concerns about identity and linguistic heritage.

In rural and ethnolinguistic regions of Thailand, such as Isan or the Deep South, parents and local leaders frequently express concern that bilingual education prioritizes English and standard Thai at the expense of local languages and cultural identity (Tupas, 2014). This perception can lead to reduced community support, mistrust toward school initiatives, and a lack of encouragement for students to engage in English learning at home. These concerns are not unfounded. As Zajda and Ozdowski (2017) argue, education policies that ignore cultural contexts and emphasize one dominant language often deepen existing social inequalities, especially in

linguistically diverse societies. The marginalization of regional identities may inadvertently create cultural dissonance and resistance among families who fear assimilation or loss of heritage.

Furthermore, human rights education literature underscores the need for education systems to balance universal competencies with localized values and inclusive pedagogy (Zajda, 2021). Bilingual education should not simply aim for global competitiveness but also foster intercultural dialogue, respect for minority languages, and democratic participation. To achieve this, schools must actively engage parents and communities in the policy process. Outreach strategies such as multilingual communication, cultural fairs, and parent workshops can build trust and show respect for local identities. As emphasized by Monaghan and Spreen (2017), inclusive and context-sensitive education policy fosters long-term social cohesion and promotes both equity and cultural continuity. Therefore, sustainable bilingual education in Thailand must go beyond language delivery. It must be grounded in human rights principles of equity, identity, and participation. Only by aligning educational reform with both global competencies and local values can Thailand build a system that is inclusive, effective, and just.

5. Recommendations

Thailand's education system continues to face challenges, particularly the widening gap between urban and rural areas. This structural inequality contributes to a second critical concern: the limited English proficiency among teachers, especially in rural schools. The findings indicate that teachers encounter notable difficulties in teaching writing, integrating experiential learning into English instruction, and utilizing English effectively due to minimal exposure to the language. From the students' perspective, the situation is equally concerning. Many learners lack opportunities for independent English practice, experience limited exposure to English outside the classroom, and possess insufficient foundational language skills. These issues are further compounded by systemic limitations within the national curriculum and assessment frameworks. Teachers have expressed concerns regarding the impracticality of curriculum guidelines, content overload, lack of familiarity with curriculum structure, and the misalignment between prescribed content and local educational contexts. Although problems such as outdated curricula and restricted autonomy in textbook selection were deemed less severe, they nonetheless highlight the need for broader reform.

To address these interrelated challenges, a set of comprehensive and strategic actions is essential. First, the establishment of a national bilingual education framework would provide clear and consistent direction for the implementation of bilingual policies across the country. In parallel, targeted investment in teacher training, especially in bilingual education strategies and CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) is critical to enhance both capabilities and language competence. Moreover, implementing equity-based funding models would help reduce resource gaps between urban and rural schools, ensuring more inclusive access to training, materials, and support systems. Lastly, integrating culturally relevant and context-sensitive content into curricular materials would better engage students by reflecting their lived experiences and local identities. Collectively, these recommendations aim to support the development of a more equitable, effective, and linguistically inclusive bilingual education system in Thailand.

6. Conclusion

Thailand is still facing many challenges in building a bilingual education system that is truly inclusive and effective. One of the biggest issues is the gap between urban and rural areas, which affects access to resources, teacher quality, and learning conditions. Problems with infrastructure, teacher training, curriculum, and lack of community involvement continue to impact how students learn and how well they do in school. These are not just educational problems; they also reflect deeper concerns about fairness, respect for culture, and human rights. To move forward, it's important that bilingual education reforms consider both the big picture and the local context. Everyone, no matter where they live or what their background is, should have access to quality education. Supporting multilingual learning, making teaching more relevant to students' lives, and ensuring fair policies can help Thailand build a system that respects students' identities, rights, and future opportunities.

7. References

- ASEAN Secretariat. (2016). ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint 2025.
<https://asean.org/book/asean-socio-cultural-community-blueprint-2025/>
- Boonruang, W. (2024, December 17). Rural Thai children face a reading crisis through little access to books. BenarNews.
<https://www.benarnews.org/english/news/thai/rural-thai-children-face-a-reading-crisis-through-little-access-to-books-12172024120927.html>
- Foley, J. A. (2005). English in... Thailand. *RELC Journal*, 36(2), 223–234.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0033688205055578>
- Goh, C. C. M., & Gopinathan, S. (2008). The development of education in Singapore since 1965. National Institute of Education, Singapore.
<https://repository.nie.edu.sg/server/api/core/bitstreams/de3f7aa5-fe5e-4939-8a3-08a0b2d40d11/content>
- Hallinger, P., & Bryant, D. A. (2013). Synthesis of findings from 15 years of educational reform in Thailand: Lessons on leading educational change in East Asia. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 16(4), 399–418.
- Kaur, A., Young, D., & Kirkpatrick, R. (2016). English education policy in Thailand: Why the poor results? In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 345–361). Springer.
- Laksanasut, S. (2020). Bilingual education in Thailand: Background, implementation, limitation, and case study. *OEJ Journal*, 17(3).
- Mishra, S., & Amaro, D. (2019). Thailand Education Fact Sheets 2019: Analyses for learning and equity using MICS data. UNICEF Thailand Country Office. <https://www.unicef.org/thailand/>
- Mohandhas, P. O. C. R. (2015). A policy analysis of the delivery of primary and secondary school mathematics and science in English. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 42, 246–285.
- Monaghan, C., & Spreen, C. A. (2017). Human rights education in context: Exploring policy, pedagogy and practice. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Globalisation and Human Rights Education* (pp. 173–187). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-0995-6_12
- Ngamsom, S. (2019). Development of an alternative system for Thai instructors using English as a medium of instruction. *Thammasat Review*, 13(1), 1–15.
- Noom-ura, S. (2013). English-teaching problems in Thailand and Thai teachers' professional development needs. *English Language Teaching*, 6(11), 139–147.
- Office of the Basic Education Commission. (2008). *Basic education core curriculum B.E. 2551* (A.D. 2008). Ministry of Education, Thailand. http://academic.obec.go.th/images/document/1525235513_d_1.pdf
- Songkram, N., & Osuwan, H. (2022). Applying the technology acceptance model to elucidate K-12 teachers' use of digital learning platforms in Thailand during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sustainability*, 14(10), 6027.
- Thanaittipath, N., & Boonmoh, A. (2024). Thai Secondary EFL Teachers' Use of Digital Literacy Tools in Post-COVID-19 Teaching. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 12(3), 197–207.
<https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.12n.3p.197>
- Tupas, R. (2014). Inequalities of multilingualism: Challenges to mother tongue-based multilingual education. *Language and Education*, 29(2), 112–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.977295>
- Wang, L., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2015). Trilingual education in Hong Kong primary schools: From policy to practice. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12(2), 149–162.
- Zajda, J. (2021). Current research on human rights education globally. In J. Zajda & V. Rust (Eds.), *Globalisation and Comparative Education* (pp. 187–196). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-2054-8_12
- Zajda, J., & Ozdowski, S. (2017). Human rights education and global citizenship education: Promoting tolerance and inclusivity. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Globalisation and Human Rights Education* (pp. 173–187). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-2054-8_12