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The problem with which this investigation is concerned is that of describing the secondary school principalship as perceived by selected principals and teachers in Bangkok, Thailand.

The purposes of this study are (1) to collect selected demographic data about the secondary school principals and teachers in government and private schools, and (2) to measure and determine the relative effectiveness of principals of government and private secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand, as perceived by secondary school principals and teachers.

The instruments used in this study are the General Information Form and the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI) which the researcher validated for use in Thailand with the cooperation of a selected panel of experts in Thailand.

The population sample of this study consists of 71 principals and 355 teachers from the government and private secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand. A total of 89.91 percent usable instruments were returned for analysis.

The findings from analysis of the data indicates that: (1) the majority, 70.2 percent, of secondary school principals
are male, (2) the majority, 62.3 percent, of secondary school teachers are female, (3) the mean age of all principals is 45 years and the mean age of all teachers is 35 years, (4) 66.7 percent of government secondary school principals have the bachelor's degree and 63.0 percent of the private secondary school principals have the bachelor's degree, (5) 67.0 percent of government school teachers have a bachelor's degree and 47.4 percent of the private secondary school teachers have the bachelor's degree, (6) the number of secondary school principals receiving their highest degree reached a peak in the early 1960's and has been declining since that time, (7) 49.1 percent of the principals have had over twenty years of experience in the educational profession, (8) 48.4 percent of the teachers have had less than ten years of experience in the educational profession, (9) 49.1 percent of the secondary school principals earn over 4,000 Baht per month, and (10) in both government and private secondary schools, there was a significant difference between principals' self-perception of principal effectiveness and teachers' perception of principal effectiveness.

The conclusions of this study are as follows: (1) principals in government and private secondary schools appear equivalent in professional preparation as measured by highest degree held, (2) principals in government and private secondary schools earn equivalent salaries, (3) teachers in private secondary schools have less professional preparation than
teachers in government secondary schools, (4) teachers in
government schools are better paid than teachers in private
schools, (5) principals in both government and private
secondary schools perceived their effectiveness as higher
than did the teachers in those schools.

As a result of the study, the following recommendations
are made for implementation by the Department of Secondary
Education: (1) that a special program be initiated to
encourage principals to seek higher degrees; (2) a program
be developed to measure the performance of secondary school
principals; (3) action be initiated to establish a program
for certifying school administrators and that a master's
degree serve as the basis for a permanent administrator's
certificate, and (4) that a special incentive program be
provided to encourage all secondary school teachers and
especially private secondary school teachers to continue
educational training toward the bachelor's degree and higher
degrees.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

In 1969 the Ministry of Education in Thailand established a policy aimed at raising the educational standard of the Thai people. Since then, the Ministry has attempted to establish a secondary school in every amphur (district) which, it is hoped, will result in the improvement of the standard of living in Thailand (7, p. 155). Particular attention has been paid to the improvement of quality, as well as the quantity, of secondary education. This means that the Thai people will be educated according to their individual capacities so that they may become moral and cultured citizens, characterized by discipline and responsibility, and possess good mental and physical health and a democratic outlook. The Thai people will be given knowledge and skills to carry out an occupation useful to their country and to themselves. These tools will form the foundation for a well-conducted life and for further education (5, p. 2). In Thailand, secondary education is the level of education that is responsible for these educational goals.

All education, public and private, in Thailand is under the control of the Ministry of Education. Secondary
education is organized in two streams: the general stream, which deals chiefly with academic education; and the vocational stream, the goal of which is to give specific vocational training (5, p. 5). The general stream is under the Department of Secondary Education, and the vocational stream is under the Department of Vocational Education (11, p. 133).

The general stream institution, the academic secondary school, is responsible for the recruitment and selection of students, providing and caring for instructional aids, and maintaining good public relations. This institution also is responsible for evaluating student accomplishment, evaluating the quality of teaching, and providing in-service training for teachers (13, p. 15). The Department of Secondary Education oversees these activities in both the government and private general stream (academic) secondary schools in the kingdom (13, p. 10).

Education in the government secondary schools is free. But due to the shortage of funds, teachers, and schools, the government at this point cannot provide education for all children who finish their elementary education. Only a portion of students who pass the selection process will be accepted into the government secondary schools (10, p. 60). The selection process is based on competitive examination. Each school is responsible for the construction and administration of the examination and for the final decision.
The Christian missionary school, the first type of private school in Thailand, was established initially in 1683 during King Narai's reign. Since the educational reforms of the 1870's, the missionary schools have gradually become a more important part of the whole system of public education (2, p. 62).

The 1960 National Scheme of Education affirmed private contribution to education when it stated:

In carrying out the work of education, the state shares its labour with private organizations or persons of those levels not defined as higher education (5, p. 8).

The majority of high school students in the general stream are taught in private schools. According to the Educational Statistics of Thailand in 1967, there are 478 government secondary schools and 1052 private secondary schools in the general stream. The enrollments in these government and private secondary schools are 171,175 and 187,046 students, respectively (8, p. 58).

In Thailand, the principalship is one of the key administrative positions in both government and private schools. By virtue of the responsibility, the secondary school principal is one of the most influential persons in determining the educational quality of the individual school. To a great extent, the major responsibility for the development of educational experiences for the students in each school is vested in the secondary school principal (18, p. 27).
The principal is recognized as the intermediary between the teachers and higher administrative levels of authority. The principalship in Thailand over the past decade has evolved into a full-time administrative job entailing total responsibility for internal management of a school (11, p. 31).

In Thailand, many cities developed rapidly after 1965. Enrollment likewise increased at a very rapid rate in urban school districts, especially in secondary schools. This fast growth in enrollment made organizational problems more complex for principals (3, p. 81).

Studies which describe the principalship are important for the Ministry of Education, as well as for principals and teachers. Such studies can help clarify the expectations that the kingdom has for principals. They will help principals themselves gain insight into their strengths as well as their weaknesses.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is a description of the secondary school principalship as perceived by selected principals and teachers in Bangkok, Thailand.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are

1. To collect selected demographic data about the secondary school principalship and teachers in the general stream
government and private secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand.

2. To measure secondary school principal effectiveness, as perceived by secondary school principals and teachers at selected secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand, in the areas of

(1) Educational Programmatic Improvement
(2) Personnel Selection and Development
(3) Community Relations
(4) School Management
(5) Technical Skills
(6) Human Skills
(7) Conceptual Skills
(8) Total Effectiveness

3. To determine the relative effectiveness of principals of government secondary schools and principals of private secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand, as perceived by secondary school principals and teachers in the areas of

(1) Educational Programmatic Improvement
(2) Personnel Selection and Development
(3) Community Relations
(4) School Management
(5) Technical Skills
(6) Human Skills
(7) Conceptual Skills
(8) Total Effectiveness
4. To provide information which will be useful in the improvement of those school principals currently in service.

Hypotheses

The basic hypotheses of this study are as follows:

1. There will be no significant difference between the principals' self-perception of principal effectiveness and teachers' perception of principal effectiveness in government secondary schools in the following areas:
   (1) Educational Programmatic Improvement
   (2) Personnel Selection and Development
   (3) Community Relations
   (4) School Management
   (5) Technical Skills
   (6) Human Skills
   (7) Conceptual Skills
   (8) Total Effectiveness

2. There will be no significant difference between the principals' self-perception of principal effectiveness and teachers' perception of principal effectiveness in private secondary schools in the following areas:
   (1) Educational Programmatic Improvement
   (2) Personnel Selection and Development
   (3) Community Relations
3. There will be no significant difference in the self-perception of principal effectiveness between principals in government schools and principals in private schools in the following areas:

(1) Educational Programmatic Improvement
(2) Personnel Selection and Development
(3) Community Relations
(4) School Management
(5) Technical Skills
(6) Human Skills
(7) Conceptual Skills
(8) Total Effectiveness

4. There will be no significant difference in the perception of principal effectiveness between teachers in government schools and teachers in private schools in the following areas:

(1) Educational Programmatic Improvement
(2) Personnel Selection and Development
(3) Community Relations
Ancillary Questions

This study will provide answers to the following ancillary questions about principals and teachers in the general stream of government and private secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand.

1. What are the average age, salary, sex, years of administrative experience, and educational level of principals and teachers in government (academic) secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand?

2. What are the average age, salary, sex, years of administrative experience, and educational level of principals and teachers in private (academic) secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand?

3. What is the pattern of school organization and the size and composition of the student population in both the government and private general stream secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand?

Significance of the Study

If the population had remained sparse, and no more young people had sought to attend the secondary school,
then there would have been little need for a principal. But, when the situation changed, mounting enrollments forced many towns to organize multiple-room secondary schools which required the services of several teachers. It then became necessary to devise some way to coordinate the instruction services of the entire school, secure supplies and equipment, manage the building, and communicate with parents. When the schools began to expand, many communities appointed one teacher to administer the school. The teacher who was assigned to these administrative duties was called the principal teacher, but later the title was shortened to "principal" (1, p. 4).

The early high school principalship was not considered a professional position as it is in secondary schools today. Jacobson has described the duties which the principal was called upon to perform.

The duties of master or principal of the early colonial secondary schools were extremely varied. In addition to teaching and administering his school, he often served as town clerk, church chorister, official visitor of the sick, bell ringer of the church, grave digger and court messenger, not to mention other occasional duties (6, p. 28).

Today's view of the principalship differs greatly from the early days. Consider the relationship of these people in the school organization: principal, teacher, students, superintendent, and parents. Of these people, the principal is the only one to whom all the others in the group typically
have direct access (4, p. 2). The principal is the person-in-the-middle and is perhaps the most important administrator in the hierarchy. The principal interprets and translates educational programs and policies into meaningful terms for the school and community. The National Association of Secondary School Principals has described the principal as:

The person responsible for all the activities that occur in and around the school building. It is his leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of professionalism and morale of teachers and the degree of concern for what students may or may not become. He is the main link between the school and the community and the way he performs in that capacity largely determines the attitudes of students and parents about the school (16, p. 43).

The secondary school principal, more than anyone else, determines the nature and extent of a school's service. With his leadership and help, improvement can be enhanced within the school. In describing the principal as the most potent factor in determining school excellence, Lloyd J. Trump says:

The principal, therefore, must bear the responsibility for the degree of teaching and learning excellence. No one is in a better position than a principal to influence the quality of the school (15, p. 4).

The principal is in a unique position to decide the quality of the educational program in the school. Herbert W. Wey states that
One key to quality education in the secondary schools of America is the principal. It is true that now and then an individual teacher or a small faculty group will take the initiative in attempting to improve the quality of education, but whenever an entire school becomes quality-education-minded, then almost without exception, it is a result of leadership by the principal (17, p. 178).

Each individual principal has a special need from time to time to examine the quality of his own work. Only by the results of a clear and reliable analysis of the level of his administrative effectiveness is it possible for a principal to improve the quality of his performance in ways that will significantly affect the educational opportunities for all who attend that school (12, p. 24).

Arch Patton writes about personnel evaluation in The Art of Top Management as follows:

Men who are strongly achievement-oriented need to have a feedback on their own performance. Behavioral science studies have repeatedly indicated that substantial performance can be expected from the individual who: (1) knows the strengths and weaknesses in his performance, (2) knows what he can do to improve it, (3) has the power to make this change himself, and (4) has the incentive to do so (9, p. 93).

Many men and women enter the principalship. The principal must be a competent individual, a person with values, beliefs, and purposes. The competent principal's performance is the result of years of work and contemplation, study and practice, both intellectual and emotional. Donald Thomas,
superintendent of the Salt Lake City (Utah) school District, states that the qualities possessed by effective principals are as follows:

The effective principal must have a purpose for being and the intellect to understand it, appreciate, and enjoy making decisions, be just and ethical, believe in, support and motivate the other members of the organization, cultivate the art of active listening, be low-key, have a soft voice, and must control his boiling point, and be able to defend the system (14, p. 48).

The effective principal should be able to discern and utilize the abilities of his staff, to inspire among them an attitude of confidence and cooperation. The principal should be able not only to identify the responsibilities but also be able to distinguish the relative importance of each of those responsibilities. The principal should have the training and background in administrative leadership necessary to fulfill his responsibilities to the staff, the community, and ultimately to the students (6, p. 20).

It is hoped that the study will contribute to the knowledge about describing, measuring and evaluating the performance of secondary school principals in Thailand.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following definitions have been formulated.

Secondary School is the academic school with any combination of grade of Maw Saw 1-3 (grade eight through ten) or Maw Saw 1-5 (grade eight through twelve).
Maw Saw or Mathayom Suksa is the Thai equivalent term for secondary education. Maw Saw Thon or lower level of secondary education is equivalent to American grades 8-9-10, while Maw Saw Paai or the upper level of secondary education is equivalent to grades 11-12.

Private School is the secondary school which is operated by private persons or special groups outside of the government but subject to the control of the Ministry of Education.

Government or Public School is the secondary school which is operated by the government under the Ministry of Education.

Secondary School Principal is a principal of a secondary school organized and operating Maw Saw 1-5 (grade eight through twelve).

Principal Effectiveness is the degree of success a principal has in performing duties inherent in his position as perceived by teachers under the principal and by principals themselves.

Secondary School Teacher is a person employed for the purpose of directing the learning experience of students in the secondary schools.
Limitation of the Study

The findings and conclusions reached in this study are limited in their application to the principalship of government and private secondary schools in general stream education in Bangkok, Thailand. The school must have an enrollment of 500 to 2,000 and over students, and the principal must have served as principal for at least one year with a staff of at least fifteen full-time teachers.

Organization of the Study

This study is divided into five chapters. Chapter I presents a general background of the study, a statement of the problem, the purposes of the study, the hypotheses, ancillary questions, significance of the study, definitions of terms, the limitation of the study, and organization of the study. Chapter II examines the related research and literature. Chapter III presents the description of the study, a definition of the population sample, instruments, procedures for collection of the data, and methods of treating the data. Chapter IV is a presentation and analysis of results. Chapter V presents the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations from this study.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A search of educational literature reveals a very limited number of research studies concerning the Thai educational system.

The Development of Research Studies in Thailand

A significant movement concerning research studies and their utilization was made in 1963 when the joint Thai-USOM (United States Operation Mission) Task Force made a study entitled "The Preliminary Assessment of Education and Manpower in Thailand." Two recommendations from this study had special impact on educational research in Thailand. One recommendation called for the establishment of an educational planning office in the Ministry of Education. The other recommendation proposed an intensive study of secondary education, both vocational and academic, with special reference to manpower needs (9, p. A).

In 1964, the Royal Thai government entered into a contract with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and Michigan State University for technical assistance in the form of educational advisors to aid the Educational Planning Office in conducting studies concerning secondary education in Thailand. This effort was
a major impetus for educational research in Thailand. One research study, "The Secondary Education Study of 1966," was a comprehensive study of all aspects of secondary education in Thailand. A summary of major findings and recommendations from this study are as follows:

1. Curriculum Implications. The secondary school curriculum does not offer courses that are adequately geared to the student's aptitudes, interests, and abilities. The Ministry of Education should resolve to encourage the development of a broader-based secondary curriculum which enables students to take a greater number and variety of courses for exploring their talents and possibly uncovering new interests.

2. Organization Implication. The present organization of education at the secondary school level permits duplication of effort, provides for poor use of space, and is relatively low in teacher utilization. The pattern of separate schools for boys and girls, both vocational and academic, results in low educational productivity in the administrative as well as in the instructional phases. The committee which directed this study suggests promoting a single stream of coeducational schools for MS 1-5.

3. Teacher Preparation. The percentage of unqualified teachers at the secondary level of education is quite high, especially in private and vocational schools. Teachers need
more specialization in their preparation. The present syllabus for the secondary school teacher certificate could be strengthened by requiring more concentration in the areas that the teachers are preparing to teach.

4. Educational Productivity. Qualified secondary school teachers are assigned wholly or partly non-teaching functions, such as clerical duties, thereby reducing the number of teachers available for full-time teaching. The Ministry of Education should have regulations that prohibit unreasonable and unnecessary demands of teachers' time for nonprofessional duties.

5. Needed Financial Investment. It is necessary to determine the per pupil cost of providing education as needed in academic, teacher training, and vocational schools during the next ten years (9, pp. 170-203).

During the past decade the increasing interest in educational research has continued. This increase is mainly due to the activity of two universities in Thailand, Chulalongkorn University and Prasarnmitr College of Education, which require the Master's degree candidate to complete a thesis in his major field of study. As a result, some research studies have been conducted concerning the school principal in Bangkok and Thonburi, Thailand.
Studies of the Principalship in Thailand

The research studies which have been conducted in Thailand related to the school principal are reported below.

Pisarnsarisitkram (7) asked the government secondary school principals to express their views on functions and duties of the secondary school principal. He found that the important functions of the secondary school principal were (1) personnel administration, (2) office management, (3) curriculum development, (4) finance, (5) human relations, (6) guidance and discipline, (7) extracurricular activities, (8) building maintenance, (9) public address, and (10) communication with other institutions.

Jantapoom (3) conducted an analysis of the government school principal's responsibility for personnel administration. The purpose was to investigate the principal's tasks, the problems encountered, and the solutions conceptualized for personnel administration. The instruments used were an interview form and a questionnaire. A sample of twenty-two principals, 240 teachers, 460 pupils, and 214 parents was utilized as the basis for the study. The findings on the principal's responsibilities for personnel administration were as follows.

1. As perceived by the teachers, the principal's responsibilities at the high level were mainly concerned
with the designation and verification of work assignments; at the middle level, the maintenance of morale, the progression of professional development, and the transfer, promotion, and control of work regulation; and at the low level, the evaluation of job performance.

2. As perceived by the pupils, the principal's responsibilities at the middle level were the extracurricular activities, the guidance service, and other pupil personnel services; but at the high level, the responsibilities were the promotion of good pupil behavior and control of discipline.

3. As perceived by the parents, the principal's responsibilities at the middle level were providing school information, providing school instructional media, and maintaining the school-community relation; but at the low level, parents saw the principal's responsibility as enlisting the cooperation of parents in school administration.

Pinsompong (6) conducted a study of the Bangkok school principals' understanding of administrative principles and concepts. The purpose of this study was to ascertain the understanding of administrative principles and concepts by principals in Bangkok. The findings indicated that most principals have a good understanding of administrative principles and concepts. Sex and age do not influence the principals' understanding of administrative principles and
concepts, but rather years of teaching experience and the professional level attained are the influencing factors.

A similar study was conducted by Kittasakdi (4) concerning the elementary school principal's concepts of school administration. The purpose of this study was to research the principalship of elementary schools in Bangkok and Thonburi, Thailand, and their administrative concepts. The conclusions of data from 392 evaluated questionnaires are as follows:

1. The principalship. The professional training of the school principals was indicated to be in the field of school finance and educational evaluation. Most of the principals showed a need for more study in the area of supervision and personnel administration.

2. The administrative concepts. The qualified principals utilized the technique of classroom visitation more often. The better qualified principals utilized the technique of job delegation, while the unqualified principals said that they always worked closely with the teachers in every situation. The principals with professional degrees stressed the importance of observation as a criterion for position promoting, while the principals without the professional degrees stressed follow-up of teachers' work as a criterion for promotion. Both groups of principals
considered the teachers' ability and responsibility as the two main criteria for promotion and for new teacher probation.

Kosashunhanan (5) conducted a study concerning the career path to the principalship in the government secondary school division. The purpose of this study was to determine the personal background regarding family, academic preparation, previous employment, and migration from native province, of the principals presently employed at that time by the government secondary division. The data was collected by a questionnaire from 453 principals. The major findings indicated that many principals were raised in rural farm families. The median age of secondary school principals was reported to be forty-two years of age, and the median salary was $125.00 per month (2450 BAHT). In terms of educational achievement, 51.10 percent of the principals had a bachelor's or master's degree while 49.90 percent had less than the bachelor's degree.

Dheerakul (2) conducted a study of leadership behavior of the secondary school principals in Bangkok, Thailand, as related to sex, age, experience, and qualifications. Dheerakul found that there was a wide range of major and minor fields in the undergraduate preparation of the principal in Bangkok. She concluded that educational preparation plays an important role in the principal's leadership behavior and that the principal who studies educational
supervision and administration in graduate preparation is more likely to be effective.

Chaiyadej (1) conducted a study of the relationship between administrators and teachers in private schools. The results of the study indicated that most private school administrators and teachers agree that delegation of authority and supervision, personnel development and opportunity, the availability of materials and non-materials for the teacher, the teachers' perception of the school activities, and the degree of security in the profession will influence relationships between the administrators and the teachers. Chaiyadej suggested that the time had come for the Thai school administrators to develop a realistic outlook on the present situation concerning the relationship between the administrators and teachers.

Sripraphai (8) conducted a comparative study of secondary school programs as perceived by the principals of the government and private schools in Bangkok and Thonburi. The study indicated that most of the government and private schools had well established programs to reflect the National Objectives of Education. Another finding was that participation by teachers in the school administration and in decision making was limited in the secondary schools in Bangkok. One of the observations was that the role of
the secondary school principal in Thailand is changing drastically. It was recommended that school principals allow their teachers to be actively involved in the decision making process in their schools.

Summary

The major research studies related to the school principalship which have been conducted in Thailand since 1965 may be summarized as follows.

According to Pisarnsaritkram's study, the functions and duties of the secondary school principals were personnel administration, office management, curriculum development, finance, human relations, guidance, extracurricular activities, building maintenance, public address, and communication. Jantapoom conducted another study concerning the government school principal's responsibility for personnel administration. He indicated that the responsibilities of the principals, as perceived by the teachers, were mainly concerned with the designation and verification of work assignments; as perceived by the pupils, the major responsibility of the principal was extracurricular activities; and as perceived by the parents, the major responsibility of the principal was providing school information and instructional media. Pinsompongs indicated that most principals have a good understanding of administrative principles and concepts. According to Kittasakdi's study
of school principals' concepts of school administration, most of the school principals showed a need for more study in the area of supervision and personnel administration. Kosashunhanan's study found that many principals were raised in rural farm families, the median age of principals was forty-two years, and 51 percent had a bachelor's or master's degree. Dheerakul's study found that educational preparation plays an important role in the principal's leadership behavior. Chaiyadej conducted a study of the relationship between administrators and teachers in private schools. He indicated that most private school administrators and teachers agree that delegation of authority and supervision will influence relationships between the administrators and the teachers. Sripraphai indicated that most of the government and private schools had well established programs to reflect the National Objectives of Education.
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CHAPTER III
THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter consists of the description of the study, the definition of the population sample, the instruments, the procedures for collection of the data, and methods of treating the data.

Description of the Study
The problem of this study was a description of the secondary school principalship as perceived by selected principals and teachers in Bangkok, Thailand. The main purposes were (1) to collect selected demographic data about the secondary school principalship and teachers in government and private schools, and (2) to measure and determine the relative effectiveness of principals of government secondary schools and principals of private secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand, as perceived by secondary school principals and teachers.

Definition of the Population Sample
The population of this study consisted of the principals and teachers of government and private general stream secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand. There are eighty-one government secondary schools and 288 private secondary
schools in Bangkok, Thailand. Many of the private schools are very small. For this study, it was decided to select the sample based on the size of enrollment and type of school; the study was limited to schools with student enrollments between 500 and 2,000 and over.

With regard to the types of schools, the following criteria were established as guidelines.

1. Only the government and private secondary schools under the supervision of the Secondary Education Department, Ministry of Education, would be eligible for the random selection process.

2. The schools must encompass grade eight to grade twelve (Maw Saw 1-5).

3. There must be at least fifteen full-time certified teachers in the faculty in addition to the principal.

4. The principal must have served as a principal of the subject school for at least one year prior to the study.

A sample group, consisting of 71 secondary school principals, was selected by the process of random sampling from 178 principals of government and private secondary schools meeting the criteria given above. The researcher listed the name of every school in the population sample on a separate slip of paper, placed all slips of paper in a container, and drew the slips from the container. Of the 71 schools finally selected for the sample, 36 were government secondary schools and 35 were private schools. (See list of selected schools in Appendix A).
Five teachers who worked at the same school with each principal were selected. Systematic sampling with a random start was employed. The researcher selected the first teacher at random from each school's roster of teachers and continued to select four more teachers with a sampling interval of ten. A total of 355 teachers were selected for this study.

Instruments

The instrument for describing principal effectiveness is a translated and revised version of the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI) which the researcher validated for use in Thailand. The original instrument was developed by Dr. Richard L. Andrew for use in measuring principal effectiveness. The instrument yields a total score indicating the general level of principal effectiveness, and it provides meaningful sub-scores which break down principal effectiveness into some of its dimensions (1, p. 3). The 1971 revision consists of seven categories.

1. "Educational Programmatic Improvement" deals with the principal's behavior while operating, evaluating, and revising the existing programs of his school.

2. "Personnel Selection and Development" relates to the principal's behavior while selecting personnel, executing personnel policies, relating to his staff, stimulating the staff's growth and development, and handling the students' affairs.
3. "Community Relations" pertains to the principal's behavior as he endeavors to know his community, participates in community activities, and effects community and school integration.

4. "School Management" refers to the principal's behavior in relation to his staff organization, use and maintenance of facilities, record keeping, communication, and legal entanglements.

5. "Technical Skills" relates to the principal's behavior while demonstrating proficiency in a specific kind of activity, particularly one involving methods, processes, procedures, or techniques.

6. "Human Skills" deals with the principal's behavior while working with people and with his behavior as a group member in building a cooperative effort within the organization.

7. "Conceptual Skills" relates to the principal's perception of the enterprise as a whole, his analytical ability, his behavior in coordinating the various interdependent functions of the organization, and his behavior as he advances the overall welfare of the total organization.

Copies of both the English language and the Thai language versions are in Appendix D and Appendix E.

Andrew utilized peer judgments in the validation of the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI).
Within particular school systems, secondary school principals specified effective and ineffective administrators by name. In this way, "high," "medium," and "low" effectiveness groups were identified.

To determine the instrument's validity against the peer judgment criterion, mean scores of the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI) were calculated for each of these groups. Differences among the three groups were in the expected direction and significant beyond a .05 level of significance. To test reliability, the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI) was administered to a stratified random sample of twenty-eight secondary school principals. Four weeks later the instrument was readministered to the same administrators. The test-retest correlation for the total score was .92.

A letter asking permission to use, adapt, and translate the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI) into the Thai language was sent to Dr. Richard L. Andrews, Bureau of School Service and Research, The University of Washington. The permission to translate and use the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI) in the study was granted on February 5, 1976 by the return of his letter to the researcher. (See Appendix B). After permission was granted, the English language version of the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI) was translated into Thai language by the
researcher. The final check and verification of the translation was made by the Royal Thai Embassy in Washington, D. C.

The translation of the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI) was submitted to a selected panel of experts in Thailand for validation. The panel consisted of two college professors, two secondary school principals, two secondary school teachers, and one educational officer in Thailand. (See Appendix C). The panelists were asked to consider whether each item was relevant to the performance of secondary school principals and whether each item was clearly stated. A validity response space was provided in the right-hand margin after each item number. Five of the seven panel members were required to approve an item in order for the item to be on the final questionnaire. The results of these reactions were that all of the items were retained, although some words had to be changed to achieve proper connotation.

The General Information Form developed by the researcher was used to obtain demographic information about the principals and teachers in the sample. It generated data about (1) age, (2) salary, (3) sex, (4) years of administrative experience, (5) educational level, (6) school size, and (7) student composition and school organization, and was
sent to the jurors for comments and suggestions. The jurors agreed that the questionnaire was well suited for this study. (See Appendix E).

Procedures for Collection of the Data

The procedures for data collection in this study are given below.

A letter asking permission to collect data and to administer the questionnaire and the instruments to the government and private secondary school principals and teachers was sent to The Director of Secondary Education Department, Ministry of Education, in Bangkok, Thailand. (See Appendix F).

The permission to collect data was granted by the Department of Secondary Education on May 20, 1976. To obtain the highest rate of response, the Department of Secondary Education requested the principals and teachers to assist the researcher in collecting the data. (See Appendix G). A return of 70 percent was to be expected for the purposes of this study.

All material to be used—the questionnaire and the translated version of the inventory—was sent to Miss Sumala Dachanuluknukul in Bangkok, Thailand, who had them printed. From May 25 to June 3, 1976, the General Information Form and Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI) were carried to the selected schools by
seven university students in Thailand. The university students gave the instruments to each selected principal and requested the principal to make the distribution to the selected teachers. The instruments were picked up by the university students between June 7 and June 11, 1976. All the completed questionnaires were then carried to the United States by Miss Sumala Dachanuluknukul. The number and distribution of respondents is given in Table I on page 39.

Methods of Treating the Data

The data from the General Information Form and the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI) were coded and punched on IBM cards by keypunch operators. A computer programmer at North Texas State University developed a program to provide a printout containing the tabulation of the General Information Form data.

Each item on the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI) was assigned a score of 0 to 4, depending on each of the five possible responses which are as follows: Always = 4, Often = 3, Occasionally = 2, Seldom = 1, and Never = 0. The teachers' and principals' mean scores were determined for each of the four groups: government school principal, private school principal, government school teacher, and private school teacher. Then the t-test for
two independent samples was utilized to test the hypotheses. The .05 level of significance was established as the standard level of acceptance.

The results of the study are given in the following chapter.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The data presented in this chapter was obtained by compiling the results of the instruments, "A General Information Form" and the "Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory" (WPEI).

Results and Analysis of General Information Form

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE RETURNS BY RESPONDENT CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Groups</th>
<th>Number in Sample</th>
<th>Number of Returns</th>
<th>Percent of Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public School Principals</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Principals</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Teachers</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>94.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Teachers</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>89.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>426</strong></td>
<td><strong>383</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.91</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table I presents a distribution of sample returns by respondent categories. A total of 426 secondary school principals and teachers were selected at random to
participate in the study. A total of 383 (89.91 percent) usable instruments were returned for data treatment. The returns exceeded 70 percent of the test sample in each group, and this was considered sufficient to support the purposes of the study.

TABLE II

SEX DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS IN SELECTED SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government School</td>
<td>M*</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F**</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* M - Male  ** F - Female

The data in Table II gives the sex distribution of principals and teachers. Analysis of the data indicates that the number of male principals is greater than the number of female principals in both government and private secondary schools. Of the secondary school principals, 70.2 percent are male and 29.8 percent are female. The
data in Table II also shows that, in government and private schools combined, 37.7 percent of the teachers are male and 62.3 percent are female.

TABLE III

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS IN SELECTED SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Less than 25</th>
<th>25 to 31</th>
<th>32 to 38</th>
<th>39 to 45</th>
<th>46 to 52</th>
<th>More than 52</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>f*</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (3.3)</td>
<td>2 (6.6)</td>
<td>11 (36.7)</td>
<td>8 (26.7)</td>
<td>8 (26.7)</td>
<td>30 (100.0)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>24 (14.1)</td>
<td>43 (25.3)</td>
<td>38 (22.4)</td>
<td>34 (20.0)</td>
<td>22 (13.0)</td>
<td>9 (5.2)</td>
<td>170 (100.0)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (18.5)</td>
<td>12 (44.5)</td>
<td>6 (22.2)</td>
<td>4 (14.8)</td>
<td>27 (100.0)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>24 (15.4)</td>
<td>55 (35.2)</td>
<td>29 (18.6)</td>
<td>25 (16.0)</td>
<td>7 (4.5)</td>
<td>16 (10.3)</td>
<td>156 (100.0)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.8)</td>
<td>7 (12.3)</td>
<td>23 (40.3)</td>
<td>14 (24.6)</td>
<td>12 (21.0)</td>
<td>57 (100.0)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>48 (14.7)</td>
<td>98 (30.1)</td>
<td>67 (20.5)</td>
<td>59 (18.1)</td>
<td>29 (8.9)</td>
<td>25 (7.7)</td>
<td>326 (100.0)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*f - frequency
The data in Table III reports on the ages of principals and teachers. No principal in either government or private secondary school was less than 25 years of age. The mean age of the government school principal was 47 years. The mean age of the private school principal was 44 years. The mean age of the government school teachers was 36 years, and the private school teachers had a mean age of 34 years.

TABLE IV
HIGHEST DEGREE HELD BY PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS IN SELECTED SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Lower Certificate</th>
<th>Higher Certificate</th>
<th>Bachelor Degree</th>
<th>Master Degree</th>
<th>Higher than Master</th>
<th>Doctor Degree</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f*</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f*</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f*</td>
<td>f*</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
<td>20 (66.7)</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>30 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>4 (2.4)</td>
<td>35 (20.6)</td>
<td>114 (67.0)</td>
<td>16 (9.4)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>170 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
<td>17 (63.0)</td>
<td>8 (29.6)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>27 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>15 (9.6)</td>
<td>64 (41.1)</td>
<td>74 (47.4)</td>
<td>3 (1.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>156 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (8.8)</td>
<td>37 (64.9)</td>
<td>14 (24.6)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>57 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>19 (5.8)</td>
<td>99 (30.4)</td>
<td>188 (57.7)</td>
<td>19 (5.8)</td>
<td>1 (0.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>326 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*f - frequency
The data in Table IV gives the highest degree held by principals and teachers in the selected schools. An analysis of the data indicates that 66.7 percent of the government secondary school principals and 63.0 percent of the private secondary school principals had a bachelor's degree. Also 67.0 percent of the government secondary school teachers and 47.4 percent of the private secondary school teachers had a bachelor's degree.

A total of 64.9 percent of both government and private secondary school principals had a bachelor's degree. A total of 8.8 percent of both government and private secondary school principals had less than a bachelor's degree, and 26.3 percent had higher than a bachelor's degree.

A total of 57.7 percent of both government and private secondary school teachers had a bachelor's degree. A total of 36.2 percent of both government and private secondary school teachers had less than a bachelor's degree, and only 6.1 percent had higher than a bachelor's degree.

The data in Table V gives the year that the highest degree was obtained by principals and teachers in the selected schools. An analysis of the data reveals 36.7 percent of the government secondary school principals obtained their degrees between 1962-1969. Of the government secondary school teachers, 47.1 percent obtained their degrees between 1970-1975. Of the private secondary school teachers, 41.0 percent obtained their degrees between 1970-1975.
### TABLE V

#### DATE HIGHEST DEGREE WAS OBTAINED BY PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS IN SELECTED SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
<td>11 (36.7)</td>
<td>7 (23.3)</td>
<td>2 (6.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>3 (1.7)</td>
<td>17 (10.0)</td>
<td>38 (22.4)</td>
<td>32 (18.8)</td>
<td>80 (47.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
<td>3 (11.1)</td>
<td>10 (37.0)</td>
<td>11 (40.8)</td>
<td>2 (7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>5 (3.2)</td>
<td>11 (7.1)</td>
<td>25 (16.0)</td>
<td>51 (32.7)</td>
<td>64 (41.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>6 (10.5)</td>
<td>8 (14.1)</td>
<td>21 (36.8)</td>
<td>18 (31.6)</td>
<td>4 (7.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>8 (2.5)</td>
<td>28 (8.6)</td>
<td>63 (19.3)</td>
<td>83 (25.5)</td>
<td>144 (44.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table VI presents the years in the profession of education of the principals and teachers. Fifty-six and eight-tenths percent of the government secondary school principals had over twenty years in the profession of education. Only 40.8 percent of the private secondary school principals
had over twenty years in the profession. Thirty and six-tenths percent of the government secondary school teachers and 26.9 percent of the private secondary school teachers had

**TABLE VI**

YEARS IN THE PROFESSION OF EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Under 5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>Over 20</th>
<th>Mean in Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>f*</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>17 (56.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>(30.6)</td>
<td>(13.5)</td>
<td>(17.6)</td>
<td>(16.5)</td>
<td>(21.8)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18 (40.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>(26.9)</td>
<td>(26.3)</td>
<td>(20.5)</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td>(18.6)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18 (49.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>(28.8)</td>
<td>(19.6)</td>
<td>(19.0)</td>
<td>(12.3)</td>
<td>(20.3)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*f = frequency

less than five years in the profession. Government and private secondary school principals had the same mean of eighteen years in the profession of education. The mean length of time
The data in Table VII presents the student composition and school organization patterns. Analysis of the data indicates that half of the government secondary schools were coeducational. The number of the boys' government schools was greater than the number of girls' government schools. Forty-eight and two-tenths percent of the private secondary schools were coeducational. The number of boys' private schools was equal to the number of girls' private schools.
TABLE VIII

ENROLLMENT OF SELECTED SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>501-1,000</th>
<th>1,001-2,000</th>
<th>Over 2,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government School</td>
<td>3 (10.0)</td>
<td>10 (33.3)</td>
<td>17 (56.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>5 (18.52)</td>
<td>11 (40.74)</td>
<td>11 (40.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (14.0)</td>
<td>21 (36.9)</td>
<td>28 (49.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table VIII presents the enrollment in the schools selected. There were 56.7 percent of government schools and 40.74 percent of private schools with over 2,000 students. Analysis of the data showed that in government and private secondary schools, 49.1 percent have an enrollment of more than 2,000 students.

The data in Table IX presents the monthly salaries of principals and teachers. Sixty-three and three-tenths percent of the government school principals had salaries over 4,000 Baht. One-third of the private secondary school principals
had a salary over 4,000 Baht. A larger percentage of government school principals had salaries over 4,000 Baht than the private school principals.

**TABLE IX**

PRINCIPALS' AND TEACHERS' SALARIES BY TYPE OF SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Per Month in Thai Money (Baht)*</th>
<th>Under 2,000</th>
<th>2,001 to 2,400</th>
<th>2,401 to 2,800</th>
<th>2,801 to 3,200</th>
<th>3,201 to 4,000</th>
<th>Over 4,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1 (3.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>8 (26.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>19 (63.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>60 (35.3)</td>
<td>33 (19.4)</td>
<td>23 (13.5)</td>
<td>19 (11.2)</td>
<td>13 (7.7)</td>
<td>22 (12.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (7.41)</td>
<td>8 (29.63)</td>
<td>8 (29.63)</td>
<td>9 (33.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>103 (66.0)</td>
<td>31 (19.9)</td>
<td>4 (2.6)</td>
<td>8 (5.1)</td>
<td>5 (3.2)</td>
<td>5 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1 (1.8)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4 (7.0)</td>
<td>16 (28.1)</td>
<td>8 (14.0)</td>
<td>28 (49.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>163 (50.0)</td>
<td>64 (19.6)</td>
<td>27 (8.3)</td>
<td>27 (8.3)</td>
<td>18 (5.5)</td>
<td>27 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*20.5 Baht = 1 U.S. Dollar

**f = frequency**
Thirty-five and three-tenths percent of the government secondary school teachers had a salary under 2,000 Baht, and 66 percent of the private school teachers had salaries under 2,000 Baht.

Results and Analysis of Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI)

The data presented in the following pages were collected from 383 usable returns of the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI). Each Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI) form consisted of sixty-four items which separate into seven categories: (1) educational programmatic improvement, (2) personnel selection and development, (3) community relations, (4) school management, (5) technical skills, (6) human skills, and (7) conceptual skills. The total number of items and the number of items in each of the seven categories are indicated in Appendix H.

For this study, each item was assigned a score of 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4. Each category score was obtained by summing the weights which have been assigned to the items belonging to that category. The total score was obtained by summing the category scores of category 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and dividing by two.

The principal effectiveness score was classified into four levels: high effectiveness, medium effectiveness, low effectiveness, and very low effectiveness. The four levels
of principal effectiveness correspond to the score of each category as indicated in Table X.

**TABLE X**

SCORES AND LEVELS OF PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS AS MEASURED BY WASHINGTON PRINCIPAL EVALUATION INVENTORY (WPEI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Very Low Effectiveness</th>
<th>Low Effectiveness</th>
<th>Medium Effectiveness</th>
<th>High Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programmatic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00-12.00</td>
<td>12.01-24.00</td>
<td>24.01-36.00</td>
<td>36.01-48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Selection and</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.00-22.00</td>
<td>22.01-44.00</td>
<td>44.01-66.00</td>
<td>66.01-88.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.00-11.00</td>
<td>11.01-22.00</td>
<td>22.01-33.00</td>
<td>33.01-44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.00-19.00</td>
<td>19.01-38.00</td>
<td>38.01-57.00</td>
<td>57.01-76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.00-20.00</td>
<td>20.01-40.00</td>
<td>40.00-60.00</td>
<td>60.01-80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Skills</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.00-21.00</td>
<td>2.01-42.00</td>
<td>42.01-63.00</td>
<td>63.01-84.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Skills</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0100-23.00</td>
<td>23.01-46.00</td>
<td>46.01-69.00</td>
<td>69.01-92.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.00-64.00</td>
<td>64.01-128.00</td>
<td>128.00-192.00</td>
<td>192.00-256.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first category, educational programmatic improvement, consists of twelve items. The minimum score of this category was 0.00 and the maximum score was 48.00. The first level of principal effectiveness, very low effectiveness, corresponds to the score of 0.00 to 12.00. The second level of principal effectiveness, low effectiveness, corresponds to the score between 12.01 and 24.00. The third level of principal effectiveness, medium effectiveness, corresponds to the score between 24.01 and 36.00. The fourth level of principal effectiveness, high effectiveness, corresponds to the score between 36.01 and 48.00.

The same procedure was used to classify principal effectiveness within the other categories and the total category.

Table XI shows mean scores, standard deviations, and levels of principal effectiveness in each of the seven categories as well as a total for each of the four measurements. The data show that for all categories and the total, the medium level of principal effectiveness was indicated.

Hypothesis Testing

There were four hypotheses to be tested. All of these hypotheses were stated in the form of null hypotheses. The results of the hypotheses-testing was tabulated and is reported here.

Hypotheses 1. There will be no significant different between the principals' self-perception of principal
### TABLE XI

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Level of Principal Effectiveness as Perceived by Principals and Teachers in Government and Private Schools Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean (N-383)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Level of Principal Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programmatic Improvement</td>
<td>31.97</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Selection and Development</td>
<td>63.80</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management</td>
<td>52.18</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills</td>
<td>52.18</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Skills</td>
<td>60.09</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Skills</td>
<td>66.83</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179.09</td>
<td>41.64</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

effectiveness and teachers' perception of principal effectiveness in the government secondary schools in the following areas:

1. Educational Programmatic Improvement
2. Personnel Selection and Development
3. Community Relations
4. School Management
5. Technical Skills
6. Human Skills
7. Conceptual Skills
8. Total Effectiveness

The subtest means and standard deviations for the government secondary school principals and teachers are presented in Table XII. The t-value was computed for the subtest means between the two groups.

According to the data in Table XII, there was a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence in the principals' self-perception and teachers' perception of principal effectiveness in the government secondary schools. In seven categories and in total effectiveness the principals perceived their effectiveness as higher than did the teachers. This hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 2. There will be no significant difference between the principals' self-perception of principal effectiveness and teachers' perception of principal effectiveness in private secondary schools in the following areas:

1. Educational Programmatic Improvement
2. Personnel Selection and Development
3. Community Relations
4. School Management
5. Technical Skills
6. Human Skills
7. Conceptual Skills
8. Total Effectiveness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRINCIPALS N = 30</th>
<th>TEACHERS N = 170</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.**</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programmatic Improvement</td>
<td>38.27</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>32.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Selection and Development</td>
<td>73.23</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>63.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>35.73</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>29.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management</td>
<td>61.30</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>52.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills</td>
<td>63.43</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>50.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Skills</td>
<td>68.23</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>59.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Skills</td>
<td>76.86</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>66.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208.53</td>
<td>24.94</td>
<td>177.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant, P > .05.

**Standard Deviation.
The subtests means and standard deviations for the private secondary school principals and teachers were presented in Table XIII. The $t$-value was computed for the subtest means between the two groups. According to the data in Table XIII, there was a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence in the principals' self-perception and teachers' perception of principal effectiveness in the private secondary school. In seven categories and in total effectiveness the principals perceived their effectiveness as higher than did the teachers. This hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 3. There will be no significant difference in the self-perception of principal effectiveness between principals in government secondary schools and principals in the private secondary schools in the following areas:

1. Educational Programmatic Improvement
2. Personnel Selection and Development
3. Community Relations
4. School Management
5. Technical Skills
6. Human Skills
7. Conceptual Skills
8. Total Effectiveness

The data in Table XIV indicate the subtest means and standard deviations for the government secondary school principals and private secondary school principals. The $t$-value was computed for the subtest means between the two groups.
### TABLE XIII

Differences between the Private Secondary School Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Principal Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRINCIPALS N = 27</th>
<th>TEACHERS N = 170</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.**</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programmatic Improvement</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>29.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Selection and Development</td>
<td>72.22</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>61.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>34.92</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>28.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management</td>
<td>60.70</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>51.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills</td>
<td>61.11</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>49.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Skills</td>
<td>67.62</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Skills</td>
<td>75.74</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>63.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>204.48</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td>171.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant, P > .05.

**Standard Deviation.
According to the data in Table XIV, there was no significant difference above the .05 level of confidence in self-perception of principal effectiveness between the principals of the government schools and the principals of the private secondary schools. The $t$-value of 2.00 was required for significance at the .05 level of confidence. This hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 4. There will be no significant difference in the perception of principal effectiveness between teachers in the government schools and the teachers in the private schools in the following areas:

1. Educational Programmatic Improvement
2. Personnel Selection and Development
3. Community Relations
4. School Management
5. Technical Skills
6. Human Skills
7. Conceptual skills
8. Total Effectiveness.

The data in Table XV indicate the subtest means and standard deviations for teachers in the government and the private secondary schools. The $t$-value was computed for the subtest means between the two groups. There was no significant difference above the .05 level of confidence between the teachers in the government schools and the teachers in the private secondary schools in their perceptions of principal
### TABLE XIV

**DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PRINCIPALS OF GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>PRIVATE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.*</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programmatic Improvement</td>
<td>38.26</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>36.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Selection and Development</td>
<td>73.23</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>72.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>35.73</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>34.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management</td>
<td>61.30</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>60.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills</td>
<td>63.43</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>61.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Skills</td>
<td>68.23</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>67.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Skills</td>
<td>76.86</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>75.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208.53</td>
<td>24.96</td>
<td>204.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standard Deviation*
effectiveness. Only one of the $t$-values obtained a level of significance of .05, educational programmatic improvement. The hypothesis was rejected in the area of educational programmatic improvement. The hypothesis was not rejected in the areas of personnel selection and development, community relations, school management, technical skills, human skills, conceptual skills, and total effectiveness.

TABLE XV

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TEACHERS OF GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Public School Teachers (N = 170)</th>
<th>Private School Teachers (N - 170)</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.**</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programmatic Improvement</td>
<td>32.05</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>29.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Selection and Development</td>
<td>63.31</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>61.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>28.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management</td>
<td>52.42</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>51.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills</td>
<td>50.89</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>49.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Skills</td>
<td>59.82</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Skills</td>
<td>66.52</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>65.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177.24</td>
<td>38.41</td>
<td>171.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically Significant, $P > .05$

**Standard Deviation.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains a summary of the study, findings, conclusions, and recommendations related to describing the principalship as perceived by selected principals and teachers in the government and private secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand.

Summary

The general purpose of the study was to measure and compare secondary school principal effectiveness as perceived by the principals and teachers at selected secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand. The study was undertaken to determine the degree of success a principal has in performing his total duties as divided into seven areas: educational programmatic improvement, personnel selection and development, community relations, school management, technical skills, human skills, and conceptual skills. This study also sought to answer the following ancillary questions.

1. What are the average age, salary, sex, years of administrative experience and educational level of principals and teachers in the public secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand?
2. What are the average age, salary, sex, years of administrative experience, and educational level of principals and teachers in the private secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand?

3. What is the pattern of school organization and the size and composition of the student population in both the government and private general stream secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand?

The data for this study was obtained from a General Information Form and the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI). These instruments were administered to a random sample of teachers and principals in private and government general stream academic secondary schools in Bangkok, Thailand.

Usable returns of the instruments were received from 326 teachers for a return of 92.11 percent and from 57 principals for a return of 80.28 percent. The data from the instruments were tabulated with computer assistance and analyzed. The results were presented in narrative and tabular form.

Findings

These findings are based on an analysis of the data from the General Information Form and Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI).

1. The majority, 70.2 percent, of secondary school principals are male.
2. The majority, 62.3 percent, of secondary school teachers are female.

3. The principals in the secondary schools are ten years older on the average than teachers, with the mean age of all principals being 45 years and the mean age for all teachers being 35 years.

4. Regarding the highest degree held by the government school principals, none have the doctor's degree, 20.0 percent have the master's degree, 66.7 percent have the bachelor's degree, and 13.3 percent have less than the bachelor's degree.

5. Regarding the highest degree held by the private school principals, none have the doctor's degree, 29.6 percent have the master's degree, 63.0 percent have the bachelor's degree, and 3.7 percent have less than the bachelor's degree.

6. Regarding the highest degree held by the government school teachers, none have the doctor's degree, 9.4 percent have the master's degree, 67.0 percent have the bachelor's degree, and 23.0 percent have less than the bachelor's degree.

7. Regarding the highest degree held by the private school teachers, none have the doctor's degree, 1.9 percent have the master's degree, 47.4 percent have the bachelor's degree, and 50.7 percent have less than the bachelor's degree.
8. The number of secondary school principals receiving their highest degree reached a peak in the early 1960's and has been declining since that time. The total data for all principals shows 10.5 percent received the highest degree in 1938 to 1945, 14.1 percent in 1946 to 1953, 36.8 percent in 1954 to 1961, 31.6 percent in 1962 to 1969, and only 7.0 percent in 1970 to 1975.

9. The number of secondary school teachers receiving the highest degree has been increasing in linear fashion from 1938 through the present time. The total data for all teachers shows 2.5 percent received the highest degree in 1938 to 1945, 8.6 percent in 1946 to 1953, 19.3 percent in 1954 to 1961, 25.5 percent in 1962 to 1969, and 44.1 percent in 1970 to 1975.

10. Regarding years of experience in the education profession for all secondary school principals, the total data reveals that 49.1 percent have had over twenty years of experience in the educational profession, 38.6 percent have had between ten to twenty years, and 12.3 percent have had less than ten years.

11. Regarding years of experience in the educational profession for all secondary school teachers, the data indicates that 20.3 percent have had over twenty years of experience in the educational profession, 31.3 percent have had between ten to twenty years, and 48.4 percent have had less than ten years.
12. A total of 49.1 percent of all secondary schools in the sample are coeducational. Of the remainder, 31.6 percent are boys' schools, and 19.3 percent are girls' schools.

13. Of the total secondary schools in the sample, 14.0 percent have enrollments of less than 1,000 students, 36.9 percent have enrollments between 1,001 and 2,000 students, and 49.1 percent have enrollments of over 2,000 students.

14. Regarding salaries for school principals, 49.1 percent earn over 4,000 Baht per month, 42.1 percent earn between 2,801 to 4,000 Baht, and 1.8 percent earn under 2,000 Baht.

15. Regarding salaries for government secondary school teachers, 12.9 percent earn over 4,000 Baht per month, 7.7 percent earn from 3,201 to 4,000 Baht per month, 11.2 percent earn from 2,801 to 3,200 Baht per month, 13.5 percent earn from 2,401 to 2,800 Baht per month, 19.4 percent earn from 2,001 to 2,400 Baht per month, and 35.3 percent earn under 2,000 Baht per month.

16. Regarding salaries for private secondary school teachers, 3.2 percent earn over 4,000 Baht per month, 3.2 percent earn from 3,201 to 4,000 Baht per month, 5.1 percent earn from 2,801 to 3,200 Baht per month, 2.6 percent earn from 2,401 to 2,800 Baht per month, 19.9 percent earn from 2,001 to 2,400 Baht per month, and 66.0 percent earn under 2,000 Baht per month.
17. In the government secondary schools, there was a significant difference between principals' self-perception of principal effectiveness and teachers' perception of principal effectiveness.

18. In the private secondary schools, there was a significant difference between principals' self-perception of principal effectiveness and teachers' perception of principal effectiveness.

19. There was no significant difference between principals in government secondary schools and principals in private secondary schools in self-perception of principal effectiveness.

20. There was no significant difference between teachers in government secondary schools and teachers in private secondary schools in perception of principal effectiveness in all areas except educational programmatic improvement.

Conclusions
The following conclusions are based on the findings of this study.

1. Principals in government and private secondary schools appear equivalent in professional preparation as measured by highest degree held.

2. Teachers in private secondary schools have less professional preparation than teachers in government secondary schools as measured by the highest degree held.
3. Teachers appear to be continuing efforts toward higher degrees, while principals appear to be declining in efforts toward higher degrees.

4. Secondary schools appear to have adequate enrollments to be able to offer appropriate programs.

5. Principals in government and private schools earn equivalent salaries.

6. Teachers in government schools are better paid than teachers in private schools.

7. Principals can expect to earn about double the amount that teachers earn per month.

8. Principals in both government and private secondary schools perceived their effectiveness as higher than did the teachers in those schools.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the Department of Secondary Education provide a special incentive program to encourage all secondary school teachers and especially private secondary school teachers to continue educational training toward the bachelor's degree and higher degrees.

2. It is recommended that the Department of Secondary Education initiate a special program to encourage principals to seek higher degrees.

3. It is recommended that the Department of Secondary Education develop a program to measure the performance of
secondary school principals. The results of the program could be used for accountability purposes and also as the basis for a program for improving the performance of school principals.

4. It is recommended that the Department of Secondary Education initiate special leadership development programs for principals.

5. It is recommended that the Department of Secondary Education initiate action to establish a program for certifying school administrators and that a master's degree serve as the basis for a permanent administrator's certificate.
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PRIVATE SCHOOLS

1. Tawetvithaya School
2. Phanakornvithaya School
3. Rachinee School
4. ChugAkartaumroong School
5. Satreevoranart School
6. Sainfrancesisaveakornvant School
7. Saintkhabreal School
8. Padoongsitpithaya School
9. Phunthaserksar School
10. Rachineebol School
11. Kithikulvithaya School
12. Parsapong School
13. Satreephatoungvit School
14. Srivikorn School
15. Areephadoongvit School
16. Saint John School
17. Panaphunvithaya School
18. Satreebooranavit School
19. Pathanabangken School
20. Mansripithalai School
21. Rittiyawannalai School
22. Satreevoranardbangken School
23. Krongtab Christainvithayai School
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24. Saintjorsapkornvan School
25. Martaedaeevithayalai School
26. Srithaboudbumroong School
27. Somthavilrajdumri School
28. Somboonvithaya School
29. Kamasirianusorn School
30. Bangorserksa School
31. Booranavit School
32. Pimulvit School
33. Suwanninvitaya School
34. Ananvitaya School
35. Aumnoursilthonbiri School

PUBLIC SCHOOLS
1. Chanhunbumpen School
2. Tiamumdomsuksa School
3. Taimitrvitayarai School
4. Tapsirin School
5. Don Maung School
6. Kunnatirutcharam Vitayakom School
7. Tavitapisek School
8. Taplila School
9. Nonseevitaya School
10. Bangghapi School
11. Radparkowpithaya School
12. Benjamaramachalai School
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13. Phatumkongkha School
14. Pracharajumphatum School
15. Phakhanongpitayalai School
16. Puthajugvithaya School
17. Yannavavithayakom School
18. Yothinburana School
19. Wimutiyarampithayakhon School
20. Watchinoros School
21. Wattadthong School
22. Watnolnoradit School
23. Watborwormnivat School
24. Watborwormmongkol School
25. Watbenjamabopit School
26. Watmakutkasat School
27. Watrajathiwat School
28. Watsarket School
29. Watsunkvet School
30. Sriayuthaya School
31. Serksarnaree School
32. Satreevithaya School
33. Saipunya School
34. Suankulabvithayalai School
35. Sarmsenvithayalai School
36. Suwannaramvithayakom School
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AUTHORIZATION TO TRANSLATE WPEI

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98195

February 5, 1976.

Mr. Narong Boonme,
432 Cardinal #E-2,
Forton, Texas 76201.

Dear Mr. Boonme:

This is in response to your letter of January 19, 1976 concerning your request to adapt and translate the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI) into Thai for purpose of using the instrument in your dissertation.

You are authorized to translate the WPEI into the Thai language for the sole purpose of using it in your dissertation. Any other use of the translation without the express permission of its author is not authorized.

I would be interested in receiving a copy of the translated instrument when you have completed it and receiving an abstract of your doctoral dissertation.

Yours sincerely,

Richard L. Andrews, Ph.D.
Associate Professor,
Educational Administration.
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APPENDIX D

GENERAL INFORMATION FORM AND WASHINGTON
PRINCIPAL EVALUATION INVENTORY IN ENGLISH

QUESTIONNAIRE

The following is a list of items to be used to collect the demographic data about government and private secondary schools. Each item describes a specific kind of information. Its purpose is to make it possible for you to describe your school.

DIRECTIONS:

1. Read each item carefully
2. Draw a circle around one of the letters (a,b,c,d,e,...) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

1. Sex
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. Position
   a. Principal
   b. Teacher

3. Age
   a. Less than 25 years
   b. 25-31
   c. 32-38
   d. 39-45
   e. 46-52
   f. More than 52

4. Type of School
   a. Public
   b. Private

5. Highest degree held
   a. Lower Teaching certificate
   b. Higher Teaching certificate
   c. Bachelor's Degree
   d. Master's Degree
   e. Higher than Master
   f. Doctor's Degree

6. Date Obtained
   a. 1938-1945
   b. 1946-1953
   c. 1954-1961
   d. 1962-1969
   e. 1970-1975
7. Type of Student Body
   a. All boys
   b. All girls
   c. Co-educational

8. Number of Students in the School
   a. Less than 500 students
   b. 501-1000 students
   c. 1001-2000
   d. More than 2000 students

9. Number of Teachers in the School
   a. Less than 25 teachers
   b. 25-50 teachers
   c. 51-75 teachers
   d. 76-100 teachers
   e. More than 100 teachers

10. Present salary per month
    a. Less than 100.00 dollars
    b. 101.00 - 120.00 dollars
    c. 121.00 - 140.00 dollars
    d. 141.00 - 160.00 dollars
    e. 161.00-200.00 dollars
    f. More than 200.00 dollars

11. Number of years in profession
    a. Less than 5 years
    b. 5-10 years
    c. 11-15 years
    d. 16-20 years
    e. More than 20 years
WASHINGTON PRINCIPAL EVALUATION INVENTORY (WPEI)

Prepared by Richard L. Andrews

This instrument is designed to provide you the opportunity to rate your principal as to the degree he is fulfilling the role you expect of him in relation to various school problems. There are no right or wrong responses, so do not hesitate to mark the statements frankly.

Fill in your responses on this form. You will notice that there is no place for your name. Please do not record your name. This form has been coded in order that the data can be treated by code numbers only. DO NOT OMIT ANY ITEMS.

DIRECTIONS FOR RECORDING RESPONSES ON THIS FORM

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate whether the principal always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never fulfills the responsibility you expect of him. Mark your answers on the right side of the page in the following manner:

- If he **always** fulfills the responsibility: A O OC S N
- If he **often** fulfills the responsibility: A O OC S N
- If he **occasionally** fulfills the responsibility: A O OC S N
- If he **seldom** fulfills the responsibility: A O OC S N
- If he **never** fulfills the responsibility: A O OC S N
- If the responsibility is not that of your principal, write NA, Does Not Apply: A O OC S N

In this instrument, A—Always, means that you can not quickly think of a time that he did not perform the function; O—Often, means most of the time; OC—Occasionally, means about 50 percent of the time; S—Seldom, means a small portion of the time; and N—Never, means that you can not quickly think of a time that he did perform the function.
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1. Perceives operation of the school program as only one aspect of an administrator’s job ........................................... A O OC S N

2. Gains the esteem of his staff by demonstrating a genuine respect for them ................................................................. A O OC S N

3. Communications to his staff, the central office, and the surrounding community are clearly understood ................................ A O OC S N

4. Stimulates staff to actively and continuously engage in professional growth activities ................................................. A O OC S N

5. Relates well to community leaders who are influential in educational matters ......................................................... A O OC S N

6. Establishes machinery that permits school patrons, staff, and students to evaluate the educational program ................... A O OC S N

7. Views discipline as an educational rather than merely a punitive measure ............................................................... A O OC S N

8. Facilitates staff participation in community activities ........................................................................................................ A O OC S N

9. Assists staff in understanding their professional roles and responsibilities ................................................................. A O OC S N

10. Perceives good staff organization as a link to good human relations ................................................................. A O OC S N

11. Encourages widespread participation of others in developing criteria to use in school evaluation ............................... A O OC S N

12. Procedures developed for teacher sponsorship of school activities tend to work well ................................................. A O OC S N

13. Communicates current school program information to teachers and other school staff ................................................. A O OC S N

14. Organizes staff so that authority and responsibility are clearly understood ............................................................... A O OC S N

15. Perceives record keeping as a housekeeping function which must be kept at a minimum ........................................... A O OC S N

16. Assists teaching staff in understanding and using pupil personnel records and data ................................................... A O OC S N

17. Believes the administrator should play an influential role in nonschool educational activities of the community .......... A O OC S N

18. Effectively contributes to the resolution of student discipline problems ................................................................. A O OC S N

19. Establishes an efficient communications network within the school ........................................................................ A O OC S N

20. Provides a school environment where staff members make good use of their time ................................................ A O OC S N

21. Perceives staff development and orientation as necessary to the maintenance of an effective organization ................ A O OC S N
22. Provides means for staff to gain knowledge concerning their legal roles

23. Believes that a good community image of the school gains community support

24. Keeps channels of appeal open to his staff

25. Handles the routine functions of administration in an efficient manner

26. Believes that staff utilization should be determined by how staff members relate to the school and achievement of its purposes

27. Perceives complementary roles for local, state, and federal agencies in education

28. Contributes to orderly changes in the staff and the system

29. Provides an efficient system of record keeping on school staff, supplies, and materials

30. Utilizes staff competencies in the personnel selection process

31. Provides means and materials for staff to engage in curriculum study

32. Establishes procedures that tend to encourage teacher-parent interaction through conferences, visits, etc.

33. Works with staff so that routine activities in school plant operations are at least burden to all

34. Views student involvement in school affairs as helpful in developing a good student climate

35. Believes the school administrator should encourage and facilitate program evaluation

36. Associates good personnel practices with good production from the staff

37. Believes that extraneous activities which take teaching time may endanger learning

38. Establishes a program of information about the school to be communicated to the community

39. Encourages staff and student involvement in the school’s public information program

40. Relates to staff members in informal as well as formal situations

41. Operates within the framework of the established school system policies

42. Formulates workable procedures for determining staff needs and assignments

43. Conceives that the administrator’s own security is an issue if new ideas are to be implemented
44. Makes provisions for periodic evaluations of the school program by school officials.

45. Provides resources and materials for staff participation in planning in-service growth and development activities.

46. Visualizes one of his most important functions as seeing each situation in its entirety.

47. Perceives all the students' experiences in the school as the curriculum.

48. Participates as a responsible citizen in community organizations and activities.

49. Establishes procedures for initiation or revision of personnel policies on an objective and whole group basis.

50. Devises procedures for making community resources information available to the school staff.

51. Views development of a good internal staff organization as an important function.

52. Understands the function of the school in relation to the community.

53. Believes that good communication is a necessary factor in school operations.

54. Stimulates the work of groups engaged in program revision.

55. Considers the impact of curriculum change on students, school, and community.

56. Recognizes each individual's contribution to the success of the school.

57. Develops an efficient means for determining staff material and resource needs.

58. Understands the community and its impact on education.

59. Foresees those actions needed to improve the function of the school.

60. Clearly interprets the school district's policies to his staff.

61. Fosters a healthy school climate regardless of cross-cultural make-up of the student body.

62. Perceives the educator to be a service arm of the broader community.

63. Provides for efficient use of school equipment and facilities.

64. Establishes an efficient communication network between the school and the community.
APPENDIX E

LETTER AND FINAL INSTRUMENTS
IN THAI

เรียน ณ รายละเอียด

เรื่อง ข้อมูลเชิงดิจิตอล

ที่ส่งมาبلاغ ณ จดหมายจากอัยการกรมการเมือง

แบบสอบถาม

ชายเจ้า บุญถึงนุ้ม นักศึกษาปิดการศึกษาที่กรมการเมือง

Texas State University 

... สำนักงาน กรมการเมือง

Principalship as Perceived by Selected Principals of Bangkok, Thailand.

ชายเจ้าโดยรวมความรู้จากฐานการเรียนรู้ ได้ทำการจัดแบ่งเป็นกลุ่มๆ เกี่ยวกับความรู้

แบบสอบถาม แบบสอบถามชั้นไม่มีอุดมสมบูรณ์ เพราะลดลง ในวิชาที่ไม่ได้ขึ้น ที่มีไปเพียง

แสดงความคิดเห็นของผ่านยังคงเป็น ชายเจ้าช่วยรายงานการกระทำให้เกิดขึ้นใหม่ในกรณีที่

แบบสอบถาม ช่วยกระจายความตื่น

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

( ชายเจ้า บุญถึงนุ้ม)
แบบสอบถามประจำสถานกงาน

แบบสอบถามครุภัณฑ์ เป็นแบบสอบถามเกี่ยวกับการวิเคราะห์ของผลวิจัย
และรองเรื่องที่ส่วนทั้งหมดอยู่ โปรดหมายถึงสอบถามรองเรื่องที่ส่วนทั้งหมดอยู่
เพื่อให้เกิดการจัดเก็บข้อมูลและรองเรื่องของท่านมากที่สุด

1. เพศ
   ก. ชาย ข. หญิง

2. ตำแหน่ง
   ก. ครูต้น ข. ครู

3. อายุ
   ก. น้อยกว่า 25 ปี ข. 26 - 30 ปี ค. 31 - 35 ปี
   ง. 36 - 40 ปี จ. 41 - 45 ปี ฉ. 46 ปีขึ้นไป

4. ฝีมือรองเรื่อง
   ก. รองเรื่องประจำจังหวัด ข. รองเรื่องประจำท้องที่

5. วุฒิ ชั้นตุ่นที่เกียรติ
   ก. บ. กศ. ข. บ. บ.กศ. ด. ปริญญาตรี
   ง. ปริญญาโท จ. ปริญญาเอก

6. อิ่มตื่น
   ก. 7.00 - 7.30 ข. 7.31 - 7.45 ค. 7.46 - 8.00
   ง. 8.01 - 8.15 จ. 8.16 - 8.30

7. วันหยุดนักเรียน
   ก. ชายทั้งหมด ข. หญิงทั้งหมด ค. ทั้งหมด

8. จำนวนนักเรียนในโรงเรียน
   ก. น้อยกว่า 500 คน ข. 501 - 1,000 คน ค. 1,001 - 2,000 คน
   ง. มากกว่า 2,000 คน
8.

จาแนกเป็นห้ารูปในโรงเรียน

ก. แบบที่ 3 ปี  จ. 25 - 50 ปี  ก. 50 - 95 ปี

ง. 26 - 30 ปี  จ. มากกว่า 300 ปี

26. อัตราเงินเดือนพนักงานในบ้าน

ก. แพนกวิน 2,000 บาท  จ. 2,500 - 3,000 บาท  ก. 3,000 - 4,000 บาท

ง. 4,000 - 5,000 บาท  จ. 5,000 - 6,000 บาท  ก. 6,000 - 8,000 บาท

27. จาแนกเป็นห้ารูปทำงานภายนอกเกี่ยวกับการศึกษา

ก. 8 ปี  จ. 3 - 5 ปี  ก. 6 - 8 ปี

ง. 9 - 10 ปี  จ. มากกว่า 20 ปี
แบบสอบถาม

แปลงผลการคิด ในการประเมินผลการทำงาน
ของผู้เรียน ว่าสามารถทำตามข้อกำหนดหรือไม่ การตอบคำถามให้ถูกต้องที่สุดหรือถูก
ดังนั้นการตกลงแสดงความยินยอมโดยผู้สอนที่
ในการตอบคำถามท่านไม่จำเป็นต้องสร้างข้อความ
กรุณาตอบให้หมดทุกคำถาม

คำถามในการตอบแบบสอบถาม

ถามประโยคและประโยคคัดลงตามแนวคิดทั้งหมด เหล่านี้ทันกับสิ่งที่คุณ ควรที่จะ
ตอบถูกในคำถามต่อไปนี้ ซึ่งติดตามข้อความ ลงล่างจากหน้าต่อไปนี้ รายการตามข้อความของแบบสอบถาม
ที่ต้องตอบข้างล่าง

ก = ถูกเข้าใจ
ข = ไม่เข้าใจ

ก) ผู้เรียนมีการเรียนรู้เรื่องมูลคุณประสงค์ สม่ำเสมอ

ข) ผู้เรียนมีการเรียนรู้เรื่องมูลคุณประสงค์ สม่ำเสมอ

ค) ผู้เรียนมีการเรียนรู้เรื่องมูลคุณประสงค์ สม่ำเสมอ

ง) ผู้เรียนมีการเรียนรู้เรื่องมูลคุณประสงค์

จ) ผู้เรียนไม่มีการเรียนรู้เรื่องมูลคุณประสงค์

ฉ) ผู้เรียนไม่มีการเรียนรู้เรื่องมูลคุณประสงค์

ช) ผู้เรียนไม่มีการเรียนรู้เรื่องมูลคุณประสงค์

ซ) ผู้เรียนไม่มีการเรียนรู้เรื่องมูลคุณประสงค์

ฌ) ผู้เรียนไม่มีการเรียนรู้เรื่องมูลคุณประสงค์

ฎ) ผู้เรียนไม่มีการเรียนรู้เรื่องมูลคุณประสงค์
1. ข้อมูลขั้นตอนการปฏิบัติงานตามการเรียนการสอน นั้นให้ข้อความจากองค์กรในส่วน
ก. ต. ง. จ.
2. โดยการนำข้อมูลมีผลจากองค์กร โดยผู้เรียนแต่ละส่วนความหมายของข้อความ
ที่ข้อจักรวาลจึงทำ
ก. ต. ง. จ.
3. การติดต่อกับส่วนงานกลับเครื่อง และกิจการและธุรการเป็นที่
เริ่มต้นงาย
ก. ต. ง. จ.
4. องค์การในขณะนี้เป็นผู้จัดทำข้อมูลที่จะมีความหมายในการอธิบายเหตุการณ์
ก. ต. ง. จ.
5. รายงานความมีผลจากองค์กรในส่วน ที่จะใช้ข้อมูลจากในองค์การสินค้า
ก. ต. ง. จ.
6. ยกเลิกการตั้งข้อมูลการเรียน คณะและกลั่นเก็บข้อมูลรวมในการประเมินผลทางการ
จัดการข้อมูลของโรงเรียน
ก. ต. ง. จ.
7. วิชานักเรียนรายบุคคลรายแผนงานที่วิชานักเรียนขององค์กร
ก. ต. ง. จ.
8. ให้ความสะดวกแก่เครื่องในการตั้งข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับข้อมูลงานของข้อมูล
ก. ต. ง. จ.
9. แนะนั้นรายละเอียดเครื่องมีความง่ายใจในหน้าที่และความรับผิดชอบของตนเอง
ก. ต. ง. จ.
10. ปรับปรุงการบริการงานระหว่างเครื่องและเครื่องใดๆ ที่มีเนื้อหาอย่างต่อเนื่อง
ที่จะให้เกิดความมีประสิทธิ์งานของเครื่อง
ก. ต. ง. จ.
11. เปิดโอกาสให้ผู้คลายงานออกโรงเรียนเมื่อรวมในการประเมินผลการศึกษา
ของโรงเรียน
ก. ต. ง. จ.
12. สมัครลงในเครื่องจัดการงานงบประมาณโรงเรียน
ก. ต. ง. จ.
13. รายงานเกี่ยวกับความเคลื่อนไหวของโรงเรียนให้คณะและธุรงานอื่นๆทราบ
ก. ต. ง. จ.
14. การมอบหมายหน้าที่และความรับผิดชอบให้แก่คณะครูตามการเรียนไงอาจารย์
ก. ต. ง. จ.
๔๕. ยอมรับจากการเปลี่ยนแปลงการบริหารจัดการของโรงเรียน ณ วันที่ ๑

๔๖. รายละเอียดของความมั่นใจในการบริหารจัดการของโรงเรียนโดยรวมทั้งหมด ณ วันที่ ๑

๔๗. มีความมั่นใจในการบริหารจัดการของโรงเรียนโดยรวมทั้งหมดไม่ต่ำกว่า ๗๕ เปอร์เซ็น

๔๘. สามารถแสดงพื้นที่ไม่เหมาะสมในการบริหารจัดการของโรงเรียนโดยรวมทั้งหมด ณ วันที่ ๑

๔๙. มีการจัดระบบภูมิทัศน์ สถานะและจำนวนผู้จำนวนให้ประโยชน์รวมทั้งหมด ณ วันที่ ๑

๕๐. จัดทำแผนกลับกลาการควบคุมความมั่นใจในการบริหารจัดการของโรงเรียน ณ วันที่ ๑

๕๑. ยอมรับจากการบริหารจัดการของโรงเรียนโดยรวมทั้งหมดไม่ต่ำกว่า ๗๕ เปอร์เซ็น

๕๒. จัดทำแผนกลับกลาการควบคุมความมั่นใจในการบริหารจัดการของโรงเรียน ณ วันที่ ๑

๕๓. มีความมั่นใจในการบริหารจัดการของโรงเรียนโดยรวมทั้งหมดไม่ต่ำกว่า ๗๕ เปอร์เซ็น

๕๔. เฝ้ารักษาบุคคลของโรงเรียนโดยรวมทั้งหมด ณ วันที่ ๑

๕๕. มีการเตรียมการเกี่ยวกับการจัดการของโรงเรียน ณ วันที่ ๑

๕๖. จัดทำแผนกลับกลาการควบคุมความมั่นใจในการบริหารจัดการของโรงเรียน ณ วันที่ ๑
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30. มีการจัดเก็บเวลาสอบรางวัลวิชาต่าง ๆของกลุ่ม
31. กำหนดเวลาสิ้นสุดและส่งประจำไปยังเครื่องวัดเวลาโดยมีการจัดเก็บ
และส่งผลกับผล
32. ให้很清楚
33. โดยการประมวลผลผลการสอบและคำและคำให้เข้าใจโดยผู้สื่อสาร
34. โดยจะมีข้อมูลในการประมวลผลในวิชาแต่ละวิชา

35. ให้ความรู้ เรียนรู้และทราบในกระบวนการของโรงเรียน เลือกเรื่องความต้องการ

36. ให้ความรู้ ระหว่างวิชาการและเรียนรู้จากกระบวนการที่มี

37. มีการส่งเสริมการเรียนรู้และใช้เวลาในการเรียนรู้

38. มีความรู้สนับสนุนในการเรียนรู้และการเรียนรู้จากโรงเรียน

39. สืบสานให้กับและส่งเสริมความรู้ในการประมวลผลของโรงเรียน

40. มีความรู้พื้นฐานของกลุ่มไทยและเรียนรู้

41. การเรียนรู้ในระบบของกลุ่มไทยของกลุ่มไทยของโรงเรียน

42. การเรียนรู้ในกระบวนการเรียนรู้และส่งเสริมการเรียนรู้

43. ยอมรับความรู้ในการทำขั้นตอนของกลุ่ม นำการเรียนรู้ของกลุ่ม

44. มีการบริการที่มีคุณภาพในการวัดผลการศึกษาของโรงเรียน

45. มีการจัดทำเรียนรู้และส่งเสริมการเรียนรู้ให้ได้รับความรู้จากเครื่องมือและเครื่องมือในการเรียนรู้

46. มีความสามารถของโรงเรียนที่ส่งเสริมความรู้โดยผู้ทำการศึกษาในกลุ่ม
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87.

88. มอบหมายหลักฐานการตกลงต่าง ๆ ของนักเรียนไม่โรงเรียน เบื้องต้นที่

ของหลักฐาน

89. ให้ความรู้ความถี่ติดตามทางทุกอย่างน้อยเนื่องนับเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของยุติ

ก ข ค ง จ

90. วิธีการวัดผลการทำงานของผู้ติดต่อศูนย์ มีฐานะจัดตั้งและหลักการที่

ก ข ค ง จ

91. หมายความส่วนหนึ่งของการสร้างความมั่นใจต่อความรู้ความเข้าใจของผู้เรียน เบื้องต้นที่

ของผู้เรียน

ก ข ค ง จ

92. มีความหมายของการโรงเรียนและผู้เรียน รวมถึงความสัมพันธ์กับผู้เรียน

ก ข ค ง จ

93. มีความหมายของการดำเนินการสร้างความเข้าใจ เพื่อให้การเรียนแบบเรียน

ก ข ค ง จ

94. สมัครทั้งนี้ให้ได้สมัครส่วนที่ต่างของโรงเรียน ก ข ค ง จ

95. ยื่นบัตรการเบิกแผ่นและหลักสูตรการเรียนแบบเกี่ยวข้องเรียน ครูและผู้เรียน

ก ข ค ง จ

96. ยื่นบัตรการเรียนแบบเกี่ยวข้อง ให้ส่งหลักฐานของโรงเรียน บรรจุอยู่ในชุดหมาย

ก ข ค ง จ

97. มีการจัดทำผู้ปกครอง ในการกำหนดความชอบของการของครู ก ข ค ง จ

98. ยื่นบัตรความชอบหรือความชอบเป็นต้องโรงเรียน ก ข ค ง จ

99. มีการจัดทำข้อความที่ความชอบการในบัตรปัจจุบันโรงเรียน ก ข ค ง จ

100. อธิบายและขึ้นทะเบียนไปทางการปกครองของบัตรเกี่ยวกับงานโดยทั่วไป

ก ข ค ง จ

101. สงเคราะห์ความพิการ หรือความต้องการที่พิการ เล็กน้อย

ก ข ค ง จ

102. ยื่นบัตรความชอบการที่เหมาะสมกับการที่พิการหรือความต้องการทางกาย

ก ข ค ง จ

103. มีการจัดทำผู้ปกครองเพื่อการพิการหรือความต้องการทางกาย

ก ข ค ง จ

104. จัดให้มีการคัดออกประสานงานส่วนเบื้องต้นที่ต่างของโรงเรียน

ก ข ค ง จ
APPENDIX F

THE LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION
TO ADMINISTER TESTS WITH LETTER
OF INTRODUCTION ATTACHED

[Address]

[Date]

[University Name]

[City, State]

Dear [Name of Person or Institution],

I am writing to request permission to administer the tests mentioned in the attached letter of introduction. I am currently working on a project that requires the use of these tests, and I believe that the information gathered will contribute significantly to the research goals.

I am confident that the introduction letter provides a comprehensive background on the purpose of the project and the context in which the tests will be used. Further details are included in the attached letter.

I look forward to hearing from you soon and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Signature]

[Contact Information]
April 5, 1976

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is to introduce Mr. Narong Boonme, who is a candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree with a major in Administrative Leadership at North Texas State University.

At the present time, Mr. Boonme is writing the dissertation. His topic is "A DESCRIPTION OF THE SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS IN BANGKOK, THAILAND."

Hopefully, the findings of this study should provide valuable information for educators in Thailand. Any cooperation granted Mr. Boonme is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jim Bazdek
Professor of Education and
Chairman of Advisory Committee
เรียน  ขอความร่วมมือในการทำวิจัย

เรียน  ผู้อำนวยการโรงเรียนชั้นต้น อาสาร่ายใหญ่ และผู้ใหญ่โรงเรียนมัธยมศึกษาในส่วนกลาง

พิจารณาความ แบบสอบถาม จำนวน 6 รูป

ถึงสาขาวิชาการ การศึกษา มหาวิทยาลัยแม่ฟ้าหลวง  North Texas State University  สาขาวิชาการศึกษา ณ ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา มีความประสงค์จะขอข้อมูล จากผู้บริหารโรงเรียน และผู้ว่าการโรงเรียน ณ โรงเรียนต่าง ๆ เพื่อนำไปเป็นประโยชน์ในการวิจัยอื่น ๆ

จึงเรียนมาเพื่อโปรดอนุญาตให้ โดยมีข้อห้าม และขอความร่วมมือในการตอบแบบสอบถามจำนวน 5 ท่าน ครอบคลุมทุกหน่วยงาน ทั้งหมด เพื่อให้ได้ผลการวิจัยที่มีความหลักฐานแบบสอบถามก่อนทำวิจัยเพื่อให้ความร่วมมือในวันที่ 11 มีนาคม 2519

ขอแสดงความนับถืออย่างยิ่ง

(ลายเซ็น)
(นาย ผู้อำนวยการ)

ผู้ช่วยผู้อำนวยการกอง ปฏิบัติการการแผน
ผู้ช่วยผู้อำนวยการกองการมัธยมศึกษา

สำนักเสริมโรงเรียน
โทรศัพท์ 2816330
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>NO. OF ITEMS</th>
<th>CONTAINS ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programmatic Improvement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1  6  11  13  20  31  35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44  47  54  55  59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Selection and Development</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2  4  7  12  18  21  24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25  26  28  30  34  36  42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43  45  46  49  51  56  60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5  8  17  32  41  48  50  52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58  62  63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3  9  10  14  15  16  19  22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23  27  29  33  37  38  39  40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53  57  64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skill</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6  8  12  14  19  20  22  25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29  31  32  38  42  44  45  49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50  57  63  64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Skill</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2  3  4  5  9  11  13  16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18  24  28  30  33  39  40  41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48  54  56  60  61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Skill</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1  7  10  15  17  21  23  26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27  34  35  36  37  43  46  47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51  52  53  55  58  59  62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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