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This chapter deals with the design of the study. It is divided into ten parts as follows:

3.1 Method of the Study
3.2 Sample
3.3 Tool Used
3.4 Construction of Tool Used
3.5 Description of the Questionnaire
3.6 Reliability
3.7 Validity
3.8 Collection of the Data
3.9 Scoring of the Data
3.10 Statistical Techniques Employed

3.1 Method of Study

The descriptive survey method has been employed in this investigation to study the issues relating to the school administration as perceived by the school administrators of government co-educational and non-coeducational secondary schools as well as private co-educational and non-coeducational secondary schools in Bangkok and some provincial areas. The main purpose of this study is to give objective touch to the perception of school administrators of schools differentiated by type of management with respect to the different problems.
3.2 Sample

In the present study, the investigation was carried upon the groups of secondary school administrators in Thailand selected by the stratified random sampling technique. The sample consisted of school administrators from government co-educational and non-coeducational as well as private co-educational and non-coeducational schools at the secondary stage in Bangkok, Chiangmai, Chonburi, Khonkaen, Krabi, Lampang, Mahasarakham, Nakhonpathom, Nakhonratchasima, Nonthaburi, Pathumthani, Ratchaburi, Samutprakan, Sisaket, Trang, Ubonratchathani and Udonthani.

The total sample of the study was restricted to 200 school administrators, i.e. 100 were taken from the government schools and 100 were drawn from the private schools. The Principals and the Vice-Principals / Assistant Principals were treated as subjects in the present study. As per the nature and purpose of this study, it also aimed at observing the differences in the perception among the school administrators themselves. Thus, they were divided into different categories in accordance with their experience of working. The Experience-span of the school administrators was divided into 4 categories i.e., 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years and 16+ years. The sample structure has been shown in Tables 3.1 and 3.2.
Table 3.1

Sample Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Co-educational</th>
<th>Non-educational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Chiangmai</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Chonburi</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Khonkaen</td>
<td>North-eastern</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Krabi</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Lampang</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Mahasarakham</td>
<td>North-eastern</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Nakhonpathom</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Nakhonratchasima</td>
<td>North-eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Nonthaburi</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Pathumthani</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Ratchaburi</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Samutprakan</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Sisaket</td>
<td>North-eastern</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Trang</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Ubonratchathani</td>
<td>North-eastern</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Udonthani</td>
<td>North-eastern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 50 + 50 = 100
The same number of administrators were taken from the private non-coeducational schools. Out of which 9, 9, 18 and 14 were taken from the experience-spans of 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years and 16+ years respectively.

Similarly, there are 50 subjects taken from the government co-educational schools. Out of 50 subjects, 3, 7, 23, and 17 were drawn from the experience-spans of 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years and 16+ years respectively.

Finally, the same number of administrators were taken from government non-coeducational schools. Out of them, 3, 4, 19 and 24 were chosen from the experience-spans of 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years and 16+ years respectively.

3.3 Tools Used

Questionnaire is one of the most commonly used techniques of data collection. It is usually a list of planned, written questions related to a particular topic, with space provided for indicating the response to each question, intended for submission to a number of persons for reply. It is often used in normative and survey studies and in the assessment of attitudes and opinions.

The tool used for the present study was questionnaire, which was constructed by Sookmaung (1986). It was then improved and translated into the Thai language by the investigator himself for evaluating the seriousness of administrative problems as perceived by the school administrators on a 5-point scale.
3.4 Construction of Tool Used

After studying about philosophy, objectives, tasks and functions of the school administrators, the investigator kept in mind the significant problems pertaining to many areas in school administration. Based on this view, the investigator decided to study the following 10 areas of problems.

i) administrative personnel problems; ii) teacher problems; iii) student problems; iv) instructional programme problems; v) curriculum problems; vi) security problems; vii) morale problems; viii) supervision problems; ix) school and community problems; and x) financial problems. The first set of 130 statements of problems was arranged in 10 major areas. Then it was got review from 10 school administrators. On the basis of their report, 9 statements were dropped out.

The second draft of the questionnaire included 121 statements and was got review from 10 secondary school administrators from different institutions in Thailand. On the basis of their reactions, the draft questionnaire was modified and then submitted to the six experts of the Department of Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for revision. The final draft of the questionnaire, thus developed, dealt with the ten major groups of problems mentioned earlier under this caption. It contained 121 statements divided into 10 major groups and each major group
- Subject teachers (5 items)
- Teachers or officers incharge of various services (3 items)
- Recruitment, selection and transfer of teachers (4 items)
- School relations with the department of Central Education (4 items)

Teacher Problems:

This major group of problems has been subdivided into three sub-groups which are given below:

- Responsibilities of the teachers (5 items)
- Order and discipline of teachers (4 items)
- Personnel improvement of the teachers (3 items).

Students Problems:

This major group of problems has been subdivided into two sub-groups as under:

- Admission and enrolment (3 items)
- Responsibilities of the students (11 items)

Instructional Programme Problems:

Four sub-groups of the problems are arranged in this major group as detailed below:

- Equipment and teaching aids (7 items)
- Teaching procedure (4 items)
- Evaluation (4 items)
- Relationship between teachers and students (4 items)

**Curriculum Problems:**

Two sub-groups of problems have been arranged in this major group of problems as follows:
- Curriculum, text-books and teacher handbooks (4 items)
- Extra-curricular activities (5 items)

**Security Problems:**

This major group has been subdivided into two sub-groups of problems as follows:
- Student security (3 items)
- Teacher security (5 items)

**Morale Problems:**

There were 10 items in this major group of problems.

**Supervision Problems:**

There were 11 items in the major group of problems pertaining to supervision in school.

**School and Community Problems:**

Nine (9) items were included in the major group of problems concerned with the relation between the school and community.
Financial Problems:

There were thirteen (13) items in the major group of problems relating to school budget and mobilization of the school funds.

3.6 Reliability

Reliability means the accuracy of measurement by a test. Mehrens (1976) says, "Reliability is typically defined as the degree of consistency between two measures of the same thing". For the present study, the final draft of the questionnaire was administered to a sample of 50 school administrators in Thailand i.e. 25 school principals of government schools and 25 school principals of private schools. The statistical values of reliability were found out to be 0.904 and 0.900 by the Test-Retest Method for government school and private school administrators respectively.

3.7 Validity

According to Best (1977), "Basic to the validity of a questionnaire is the right questions phrased in the least ambiguous way ........... The panel of experts may rate the instrument in terms of how effectively it samples the significant aspects of its purpose, providing estimates of content validity".

For the instrument used in the present study, the validity of the questionnaire was judged on the basis of the opinion of the experts in this area. The draft
questionnaire was given to six experts from the Department of Education of the Panjab University, Chandigarh, for their comments with regard to the purpose of the items in the light of the study in hand. Their suggestions were duly incorporated in the final draft. The questionnaire in final form has been given in Appendix.

3.8 Collection of the Data

The data were collected from Thailand. The questionnaires were administered to the government co-educational as well as government non-coeducational and private co-educational and also to private non-coeducational school administrators i.e., the principals and the vice-principals/assistant principals of the secondary schools in Bangkok and some provincial areas of Thailand by the investigator himself. On the basis of the responses, the investigator was able to assess and examine the seriousness of the problems of school administrators by statistical techniques.

3.9 Scoring of the Data

The scoring of the data in the present study was simple. All items in the questionnaire were positive and the level of scale was a number scale : 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 respectively. The values on the number scale were given as follows:
3.10 Statistical Techniques Employed

After collecting the data, suitable statistical techniques were used for the analysis of data. All the scores had to be systemized and organized for the worthwhile purpose. These consisted of checking-up of the gathered data for accuracy and the dividing of information into different categories for use. The statistical methods employed in the present study are given as under:

i) Tabulation and Frequency Distribution.

ii) Calculation of the Mean.

iii) Calculation of Standard deviation to find out the dispersion of the respondents' opinion with respect to their perception.

iv) Calculation of standard Error of the Mean to find out the fluctuation of flexibility of each Mean.

v) Calculation of T-ratios.

vi) To judge the rank order of the seriousness for each problem in a sub-group of every major group of problems, the mean of each item in the sub-group was compared with the mean of other problems under the
same category, and the test of difference between two means (t-ratio) was used.

In deciding the seriousness of each problem on the basis of the criteria set by the investigator, the level of seriousness of the problems was judged on the basis of the value of rank-span of mean which has been given in the Table 3.3 below:

Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Span of Rank</th>
<th>Degree of Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.50 - 5.49</td>
<td>Extremely Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 - 4.49</td>
<td>Much Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 - 3.49</td>
<td>Moderately Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50 - 2.49</td>
<td>A little Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50 - 1.49</td>
<td>Not at all Serious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The details of the statistical analysis carried out for arriving at the conclusions in the light of the objectives of the study have been provided in Chapter IV.