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Discussion of the Results

The findings of the study in hand can be discussed clearly on the basis of the analysis of data, objectives and hypotheses of the study and the earlier studies as follows:

5.1 PART A:

The findings of the comparative analysis of the seriousness of each problem perceived by the formal and non-formal school administrators in Bangkok area of Thailand show that with respect to the statistical significances, the t-values between the two groups of formal and non-formal school administrators are found to be significant at .01 level in 39 problems and, on the basis of both the means of the two groups of respondents it is found that the formal school administrators perceived the problems more seriously than their counterparts in the non-formal schools in the following 28 problems: "The school does not have sufficient number of teachers in the foreign language subject"; "The school does not have sufficient number of teachers in the art subjects"; "New teachers or transferred teachers are sent to school very late during the session"; "Placing new teachers or transferred teachers is not in accordance with the subject requirement of the school"; "Some teachers do not keep the cumulative records of students"; "Most of the teachers do not take interest in
the improvement of their qualities"; "Most of the teachers do not read any educational journals"; "The school is unable to admit all applicants"; "The conduct of the students towards the opposite sex is improper"; "Some students show aggression towards the teachers"; "Some students demolish the school property"; "Students do not consult their teachers for their difficulties during extra-hours"; "Syllabi, text-books and teacher handbooks are sent late to the school by the Department of General Education"; "Some text-books are not available in the market in time"; "Some teachers do not take interest in their duties about student activities"; "Some students are not interested in school activities"; "Extra curricular activities do not get due recognition from the students"; "Teacher handbooks are not sufficient to meet the needs of all teachers"; "The teachers are not provided with proper facilities for their lives"; "The teachers do not have confidence to organize school activities as their own"; "There is no unity and cooperation among the teachers"; "Teachers do not discharge their duties effectively"; "The teachers do not have willingness to perform their work"; "The teachers do not get a fair share of work"; "The administrators do not emphasize the importance of educational supervision"; "The teachers have less time to visit the community"; "The school does not get enough budget allocation from the government"; and "The school budget is allocated with tardiness".

But the non-formal school administrators perceived the problems more seriously than the formal school administrators
in the following 11 problems; "Some documents of applicants are not completed at the time of seeking admission"; "Science laboratory equipment is inadequate for the number of the students"; "The school has insufficient sports facilities"; "The library has inadequate number of reference books"; "The library has inadequate number of general books"; "Most of the students are afraid of the kidnappers"; "The school gets insufficient budget for library books"; "The school gets insufficient budget for science laboratory equipment"; "The school gets insufficient budget for teaching aids"; "The school gets insufficient budget for medical instruments and medicine"; and "The school gets insufficient budget for equipment for school office".

The statistically significant differences between the two groups of formal and non-formal school administrators are found out at .05 level in 9 problems and from the analysis of the means of the two groups as already indicated in the previous chapter the results show that the formal school administrators perceived the majority of the problems more seriously than their counterparts in the non-formal schools in the following 7 problems: "The school does not have sufficient number of the teachers in social subject"; "Some teachers do not obey their superiors"; "Most of the teachers are not interested in reading their extra books for updating their knowledge"; "The student initiative is not encouraged by the teachers"; "Some teachers do not provide time for students to consult about their difficulties"; "The financial expenditure of school is not
flexible"; "The amount of tuition fees of the school is not sufficient for the expenditure needs". However, the non-formal school administrators perceived the problems more seriously than their counterparts in the formal schools in the following two problems: "The applicants are not enough to meet the school requirement"; and "Some students drink during school hours".

No statistically significant differences between both the groups of the school administrators are found out at any level in 69 problems as follows: "The school does not have sufficient number of teachers in the science"; "The school does not have sufficient number of teachers in mathematics"; "The school lacks teachers or officers who are incharge of the counselling"; "The school lacks teachers or officers who are incharge of the evaluation"; "The school lacks teachers or officers who are incharge of the medical service"; "The representatives of the school administrators do not have participation in the committee for selection of teachers"; "The school administrators do not have any say in the transfer of the teachers"; "The school administrators do not get advice concerning school administration from the Department of General Education/Non-formal Education"; "The school administrators do not get due encouragement from their superiors"; "The higher administrative authorities do not realize the problems of the school"; "The higher administrative authorities reject the innovative ideas of the school administrators"; "Some teachers come late"; "Some teachers remain mostly absent from the class";
"Some teachers are not punctual in meeting their classes";
"Most of the teachers do not correct the work of the students regularly"; "Most of the teachers do not respect the school regulations"; "Some teachers smoke in the class"; "Some teachers take alcoholic drinks"; "Some students take intoxicants"; "Most of the students smoke in the school"; "Some students frequently quarrel amongst themselves"; "Library has inadequate number of text-books"; "Repairs and improvement of school material are not well looked after"; "The school office has insufficient equipment"; "The teaching procedures employed are not appropriate to the subject matter area"; "The teachers teach without preparing the lesson plans"; "There is no proper interaction between the teachers and students in the class room"; "The standards of evaluation are not uniform"; "Examination paper does not cover the entire syllabus"; "Evaluation is not done in view of the objectives of teaching"; "Most of the students always cheat in the examination"; "The teachers and students do not show mutual respect and confidence"; "Most of the teachers are not friendly with the students"; "Curriculum is not flexible"; "The content in the syllabus is not clearly defined"; "Student activities are not guided by the teachers"; "The school medical facilities are inadequate for students"; "The school does not have adequate number of drinking water containers for the students"; "The teachers are afraid of unfairness of administrators"; "Undue pressure is exercised upon the teachers by the administrators"; "The teachers have no faith in the justice of the administrators"; "Because
the interference from the administrators the teachers can not discharge their responsibilities properly"; "The school administrators use their authority improperly"; "Rules are not framed in a democratic way"; "The administrators do not encourage good relationship among the teachers"; "The teachers have no faith in the administrators"; "The teachers do not receive encouragement from the administrators"; "There is no supervision in the school"; "The school lacks skilled educational supervisors for supervising the work of teachers"; "The supervisors are not adequately experienced in supervision"; "The supervisors are not adequately trained in performing their job well"; "There is no provision for in-service training for supervisors in upgrading their quality of work"; "There is no provision for in-service training for supervisors for improving their academic qualifications"; "The scope of supervision is very wide"; "Supervisors do not get good salary"; "The personal relationship between the supervisors and teachers is not proper to promote the quality of education"; "The teachers are not taken into confidence at the time of supervision"; "Community does not know about the philosophy and purpose of the school"; "Community feels difficult and inconvenient to contact the school authorities"; "Community does not have any communication with the school"; "The school does not get support and assistance from the community"; "The parents of the students do not consult the school authorities on the problems of the students"; "The residences of the teachers are far away from the community"; "There are conflicting ideas between the teachers and community
The above results indicate that the differences between formal and non-formal school administrators in Bangkok area of Thailand with regard to the perception of seriousness of problems exist in 48 problems and in 69 problems the results do not reveal significant differences between the two groups. Thus, the first hypothesis of the study which states that "The differences between the school administrators of formal and non-formal institutions are significant for each individual problem under each sub-group of problems within every major group of problems" is partially retained.

5.2 **PART B**

The findings of the comparative analysis of the seriousness of problems perceived by formal and non-formal school administrators depict that in respect of the sub-groups of problems the t-values are found out to be significantly different between the two groups of formal and non-formal school administrators at .01 level in 10 sub-groups and with respect to the analysis of the means of the two groups the
results show that the formal school administrators perceived the problems more seriously than their counterparts in the non-formal schools in the following sub-groups as under:

- Subject teachers sub-group (t=3.682)
- Recruitment, selection and transfer of the teachers sub-group (t=3.718)
- Personnel improvement of the teachers sub-group (t=7.354)
- Admission and enrolment sub-group (t=2.806)
- Responsibilities of the students (t=3.148)
- Teaching procedure sub-group (t=3.076)
- The teacher and student relations sub-group (t=3.949)
- Curriculum, tax-books and teacher-handbooks sub-group (t=5.887)
- Extra curricular activities sub-group (t=7.773)
- Responsibilities of the teachers sub-group (t=2.426).

For this sub-group of the problems, it is found to be significant at .05 level.

Only one sub-group of problems, "Equipment and teaching aids", is found to be significant at .01 levels and the analysis of the two means of the two groups of respondents shows that the non-formal school administrators perceived the problems more seriously than the formal school administrators. The statistically significant differences between the two groups of respondents are not found out in six sub-groups of problems namely; teachers or officers incharge of various services; school relation with the Department of Central Education/Non-formal Education; order and discipline of the teachers; evaluation; students security; and teacher security.
The results of the sub-groups of problems show that the second hypothesis which states that the differences between formal and non-formal school administrators for each sub-group of problems within every major problem group are significant is partially confirmed.

5.3 PART C:

The findings of comparative analysis of the seriousness of problems in each major group of problems as perceived by the formal and non-formal school administrators show that in case of total scores of all problems for the total sample, the statistically significant differences between the formal and non-formal school administrators in respect of the level of seriousness of problems have been found out at .01 level (t=7.076). It is clearly shown by the means of both the groups of the school administrators that the formal school administrators perceived the problems more seriously than the non-formal school administrators since with respect to the total scores of all problems for the total sample the mean of the group of formal school administrators (2.176) is higher than the mean of the group of the non-formal school administrators (2.118). The results of the study show that out of the ten major groups of problems, the statistically significant differences between the two groups of the school administrators are found out at .01 level in five major groups of problems as follows: administrative personnel problems; teacher problems; student problems; curriculum problems; and morale problems. It is clearly revealed by the mean of each major group of problems that in both the
groups of school administrators the formal school administrators perceived the seriousness of problems more than the non-formal school administrators did in five major groups of problems mentioned above. No statistically significant differences are found out even at .05 level in the following five major groups of problems: Instructional programme problems; security problems; supervision problems; school and community problems; and financial problems. The results of the study as mentioned depict that the third hypothesis which states that the administrators of non-formal institutions at the secondary stage perceive more serious problems than those perceived by the administrators of formal institutions in each major group of problems is refuted.

The results of the study in hand reveal that the formal school administrators have exhibited the seriousness of problems with respect to the major groups of problems at the following rank orders:

1. Financial problems (M = 2.623)
2. Curriculum problems (M = 2.391)
3. Administrative personnel problems (M = 2.306)
4. Teacher problems (M = 2.171)
5. School and community problems (M = 2.151)
6. Supervision problems (M = 2.079)
7. Instructional programme problems (M = 2.072)
8. Student problems (M = 2.042)
9. Morale problems (M = 1.922)
10. Security problems (M = 1.908)
In all ten major groups of problems, the seriousness of problems is exhibited at the "Moderately serious" level by the formal school administrators in the major group of problems pertaining to financial problems but the "A little serious" level of seriousness of problems is found out in the following 9 major groups of problems: the curriculum problems; administrative personnel problems; teacher problems; school and community problems; supervision problems; instructional programme problems; student problems; morale problems; and security problems.

On the basis of the opinion of the non-formal school administrators the seriousness of problems with respect to the ten major groups of problems can be put in the following rank orders:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Financial problems</td>
<td>M = 2.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administrative personnel problems</td>
<td>M = 2.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>School and community problems</td>
<td>M = 2.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Curriculum problems</td>
<td>M = 2.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instructional programme problems</td>
<td>M = 2.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supervision problems</td>
<td>M = 2.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teacher problems</td>
<td>M = 2.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Student problems</td>
<td>M = 1.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Security problems</td>
<td>M = 1.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Morale problems</td>
<td>M = 1.777</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the rank orders mentioned above, it is clearly revealed that on the basis of the means the seriousness of the problems is exhibited at the "Moderately serious" level by the
non-formal school administrators in respect of the major group of problems relating to the financial problems and the "A little serious" level of the seriousness is revealed by the non-formal school administrators in the major groups of problems pertaining to the administrative personnel problems, school and community problems, curriculum problems, instructional programme problems, supervision problems, teacher problems, student problems, security problems, and morale problems.

5.4 COMPARISON OF THE RESULTS WITH EARLIER STUDIES

In respect of the seriousness of problems in ten major groups, the findings of the present study are partly supported and contrasted by the findings of the earlier studies as follows:

In the first major group of problems (vide Fig.4.22), personnel administrative problems, pertaining to the subject teachers, the findings are partly supported by the study of Gupta (1967) who found that forty per cent of students failed at high school and fifty per cent at intermediate stage because of lack of interest, poor teaching and over emphasis on English subject. The results of the present study in the sub-group of problems regarding teachers or officers in charge of various services are partly supported by the study of Brook (1970) who made a study in techniques for secondary school principals in the improvement of communication with teachers and found that the teachers and principals were in agreement on the need for principal's consulting with teachers concerning decision. The
findings of the study in the sub-group of problems pertaining to the recruitment, selection, and transfer of the teachers are partly supported by the findings of Copes (1982) who recommended in his study that training programmes placed added emphasis on an understanding of one's power base and its relationship to management systems. And the findings of the study in the sub-group of problems relating to the school relation with the Department of Central Education/Department of non-formal Education are partly supported by the findings of Fruend (1978) who discovered in his study that the consensus of different facets of a principal's role might have very different impacts on the function of his school.

For the second major problem group, teacher problems, the results (vide Fig. 4.23) of the study concerning the sub-group pertaining to the responsibilities of the teachers are partly supported by the findings of DeWitt (1982) who made a study on the teacher absenteeism and revealed that there was a significant difference in teacher absences among elementary, middle and high school teachers. In the sub-group of problems regarding the order and discipline of the teachers, the results of the present study are partly supported by the findings of Martoccia (1977) who made a study concerning the secondary principal perceptiveness as it relates to principal - teacher relations and found that teachers in smaller - sized schools perceived their principals being friendlier and displaying greater mutual trust and respect. And in the sub-group of
problems regarding the personnel improvement of teachers the results are partly supported by the finding of Ward (1982) who revealed in his study that there was too little variety in both journals to keep reader sufficiently informed.

In respect of the third major problem group, student problems, the results (vide Fig. 4.24) of the study in the sub-group of problems regarding the admission and enrolment, and responsibilities of the students are partially supported by the findings of Jacops (1982) who found that there was a significant difference in attitudes of teachers and administrators towards the degree of seriousness attached to each student's behavioral problem.

In the fourth major problem group, instructional programme, the results (vide Figure 4.25) of the study in the sub-group of problems pertaining to the equipment and teaching aids are partly supported by the study of Burstiner (1970) who recommended after his study that similar workshops should be instituted in public school system for secondary school department chairman as a step towards the mitigation and solution of supervisory problems. The results in the sub-group of problems relating to the teaching procedure are partly supported by the findings of Chongrakse (1969) who concluded after the study that the responsibilities which most of the principals and assistant principals delegated by themselves were academic personnel administration, supervising instruction, controlling teachers' instruction, evaluating student progress,
following up and evaluating the academic achievement, coordinating affairs and supervising student teaching. The findings of the study in the sub-group of problems regarding the evaluation are partially supported by the conclusions of Tirrel (1982) who found that the principals and teachers differed in their perceptions of the principals in communicating, controlling and implementing teacher evaluation. The findings of the study in the sub-group of problems pertaining to teacher and student relations are partly supported by the findings of Frailey (1982) who revealed in his study that there was significant difference between teacher communication styles and how they are related to their students.

The results of the study in the fifth major group of problems, curriculum problems, are partially in conflict with the findings of Gerald (1977) who found that administrators' and teachers' perceptions of a number of different areas related to curriculum, did not differ significantly.

In the sixth major group of problems, security problems, the results of the study seem to be in conflict with the study of Johnson (1972) who gave one part of the conclusion that administrators and teachers felt that salaries should match responsibilities and a large majority felt that the teacher talent should be encouraged through higher salaries and differentiated roles and that salary status should be derived from performance and competence.

In the seventh major problem group, morale problems, the
findings of the study (vide Table 4.161) are partly supported by the results of the study of Wold (1982) who revealed in his study a different climate perception profile on the part of students. As with teachers, significant correlations were always negative and on the other hand a few exception, the significant correlations were generally found within the principal's management.

For the eighth major problem group, supervision problems, the findings of the study (vide Table 4.162) are partly supported by the studies of Jorden (1982) who found in his study that the opinions of selected secondary administrators and counsellors were significantly more positive than the opinions of secondary teachers towards the concept of educational streaming, and the results of the study in this major group are also partly supported by the findings of Tapaneeyangkul (1983) who found that there were no significant differences in the expectation for role of supervisors as perceived by supervisors and teachers.

In the ninth major problem group, school and community problems, the findings of the present study (vide Table 4.163) are partly supported by the results of a study by Bishopp' (1982) in which he found that there was a need for an effective communications programme between individual school and parents. The results of this study are also partly supported by the findings of Harper (1982) who found that administrators, citizens, and teachers by level of position (elementary middle/junior, high school and district) responded with significant differences
in many statements on selected current issues in public education.

For the tenth major problem group, financial problems, the findings of the study in hand (vide Table 4.164) are partly supported by the findings of Clark (1973) who made a study in the financial area and then gave the conclusion that principals did not have sufficient budgetary provisions to be held accountable for the effectiveness of all educational programmes within their schools.