

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The Qualitative analysis in regard to the research was used under two frameworks as follows:

1. The scope of study
2. The research procedure

#### **1. The Scope of Study**

It was classified into five categories as follows:

- 1.1 Location
- 1.2 Target group
- 1.3 Information resources
- 1.4 Content
- 1.5 Study time frame

##### **1.1 Location**

The selection criteria included the least categorized educational institution which had no less than 120 students under the jurisdiction of the Office of Educational Service Lamphun Area 1. The distance between this educational institution and the Office of Lamphun Educational Service Area 1 is more than 20 kilometers and it is situated at a hill tribe or tribesmen community. Finally, the board members would include some of these hill tribesmen.

The reason why a small school which has hill tribesmen as board members is selected reflects to the educational backgrounds of these members

which point that they graduated only the primary level. They have to share the education management at a point of transferring time from the Old National Education Act to the new National Education Act of B.E. 2542(1999) and the Second Amendment B.E. 2545( 2002 ). This Act gives the basic educational school board to join an educational administration and management system regarding academic matters, budgeting, personnel and general affair. These roles are newly set. Furthermore, the new academic matters have a drastic change with the simple implementation of the new curriculum in all basic education levels throughout Thailand.

The promulgation of the National Education Act B.E.2544 (1999) has completely changed the curriculum structure of learning and teaching. Previously school children were taught in five subjects, but now they are compulsorily supposed to be taught 8 learning substances instead. In addition, each a school has to create its own curriculum for itself. The educational institution curriculum must include the core basic education of 8 learning substances together with the local curriculum which is made by each school. The curriculum substance has to be in accord with the needs of learners, community and locality.

For the process of prescribing and developing education institution curriculum, the basic educational school committee is highly given power to participate in every step of curriculum development. Starting from giving suggestions of curricular substance until approval and signing for it, the basic educational school committee is also responsible for other three areas of work in supporting the management of the institution which has some connections with the other laws such as the Ministry of Education Act B.E.2546, the government regulations of teachers and regulations, rules about financial issues.

## 1.2 Target Group

The target group consisted of 9 school board members from Ban Doikham School and they were as follows:

- 1) The chairperson
- 2) 1 representative for parents
- 3) 1 representative for teachers
- 4) 1 representative for the local administration organizations
- 5) 1 representative for the alumni of Ban Doikham school
- 6) 1 representative for the Local community
- 7) 1 representative for monks
- 8) 1 scholar
- 9) The director of the educational institution served as a member and a secretary of its board.

## 1.3 Information resources

They were divided into 3 categories which were documentary, informants and internet resources:

### (1) Documentary was classified into 5 types.

Type 1 was the educational principles, acts and laws, regulations and other branches

Type 2 was educational institution documentary and community data in the service area such as educational institution curriculum, operational plan, self assessments report and annual report.

Type 3 was an academic documentary involving principles, themes and theories used for this study.

Type 4 was miscellaneous documentary such as maps, charts, brochures, newspapers, journals and other simple basic adverts.

Type 5 was the 24 related literatures which comprised of 19 Thai literatures and 5 foreign abroad literatures.

1. **Informants Resource** who could consistently, reasonably, and genuinely respond to research objectives together with those stakeholders with educational management were critically selected for this research. The researcher divided these people into 4 groups as :

**Group 1** consisted of 9 educational school board members of Ban Doikham school.

**Group 2** had the director of educational institution, teachers and educational personnel.

**Group 3** consisted of 6 students' parents or guardians

**Group 4** The grouping had the superintendent of the Office of Education Service Lamphun Area 1 who over looked after Ban Doikham school

## 2. Internet Resources were extracted from related websites

### 1.4 Content

- 1) the context of school and community in the service area
- 2) the procedure involved in the selection and gaining of school board members.
- 3) the procedure of academic participation such as the educational institution curriculum development and other academic matters such as, creating the ambience, environment and facilities for learners to study and use in their course
- 4) the participatory process of supporting the management of the educational institution in 3 areas regarding budget, personnel and general affair of administration

5) supportive or obstructive factor affecting the school board's participation in curriculum development and supporting learning/ teaching management

6) the development of school board participation in curriculum development activities and supporting educational management through meeting agenda's resolution.

### **1.5 Study time frame**

The time frame for this study started in 2548 B.E. academic year and it ended in the middle of 2551 B.E.

## **2. Procedure**

The Procedure has been set into 5 stages:

Stage 1 studying and analyzing related literature in this field.

Stage 2 establishing rapport with a target group and informant resources

Stage 3 setting the instruments and ways of data collecting.

Stage 4 examining and analyze data collected.

Stage 5 developing the participatory procedure of the basic educational school committee.

### **Stage 1 Studying and analyzing related literature in this field.**

The literature consisted of the educational institution curriculum, the educational development plan, and the self assessment report (SAR), the school annual report, the school committee minutes, and the teacher monthly minutes and the annual report of the office of Education Service Area.

## **Stage 2 Establishment of rapport with the target group and informant resources**

Making friends, Familiarization and creating a friendly atmosphere brought about the familiarity, trust between the researcher and informants throughout the data collective.

The familiarity technique was being used with the target group and informant resources that comprised of 4 groups, and the group was as follows:

**Group 1 Members of the school board.** These Members were partly from Karen tribe and native Thai. The interpretation for the Karen tribe people was done by two people who worked as gate keepers Mr. Tun and Mr. Kaew respectively. They were also Karen people in the school service area.

The two workers could listen and speak both northern and central Thai and they were well accustomed to the researcher since they used to work in the longan orchard of the researcher.

**Group 2 The Educational Institution Director and Teachers.** Since the director served as the board member and a secretary at the same time, he knew the most information about the board.

He is the researcher's gatekeeper. We made an agreement that he would inform the researcher about the board meeting, school activities such as sports day, community sports in order to join them, form a relationship and collect data simultaneously.

Furthermore, the representative of teacher in the board and other school teachers were previously accustomed to the researchers. The data was collected through informal conversations during many visit, luncheon and dinner time.

**Group 3 Students' parents.** Two of students' parents from 3 villages were visited by the researcher accompanied by Mr. Tun, the gatekeeper, especially on weekends.

**Group 4 The superintendent.** His work was to supervise the school once or twice a month so he had a better known how about it. Besides that, he and the researcher had good relationship since they both worked in the same place. He is another gatekeeper for this study.

Therefore, in the case of creating relationship with the target group and informant resources, paying them a visit, making a conversation were used. Then the data was collected through participatory and non- participatory observation and informal interviewing.

### **Stage 3 Setting the instruments and ways for data collecting in the field**

#### **A. Setting the instruments into the field**

The instrumentation system was divided in two ways. There were 2 types of instruments – main and additional ones

##### **Type 1 Main instrument**

The researcher was the main instrument into the field work

##### **Type 2 Additional instruments:**

1. Questionnaire framework
2. Non-participant observation form
3. Participant observation form
4. Informal interviewing form
5. Focus group record form
6. Note book/notes
7. Camera/photo
8. Materials, equipments for holding seminars
9. Vehicle and researchers assistants



## **B. Ways of collecting data in the field**

During the course of the fieldwork, there were 5 ways given for data collection

1. Non-participant Observation
2. Participant Observation
3. Informal Interview
4. Focus Group
5. Data Recording

### **1. Non – Participant Observation**

It involved merely watching what was happening and recording events on the spot as follows:

- 1) surveying and observing school contexts as defined in the scope of contents such as location, internal and external environment and atmosphere of the school, route of transportation, villages in the immediate vicinity of the school ,the school surrounding area and the local learning resources
- 2) taking part in the school meeting. This had less or no part in it. The role was merely limited to the researcher as the observer.

### **2. Participant Observation**

Techniques used for data collection were as follows

- 1) Taking part in school activities after having been told by the gatekeepers about when the activities were to be hold such as the school board meeting sports day, school camping. The researcher then asked for permission to join them formally or informally
- 2) Taking part in social situations through luncheon or dinner time with members after meetings .By means of participants observation, the physical



characteristics of the social situation and what it feel like to be part of the scene were recorded

### **3. Informal Interview**

Holding a casual conversation with one or two informants each time on related and non-related topics was undertaken. The role was taken in one way or the other under the atmosphere of cooperation, trust, openness and acceptance

### **4. Focus Group**

It was conducted in a small group consisting of 3-5 or 5-7 people. They were to be either all teachers, teachers and the administrator, pupils and teachers, all members of the board or board member with school personnel. It had to be planed earlier who would join the discussion. It was hypothesized that persons expressing themselves the most relevant to the research objectives would be in line with the discovery-based strategy. The focus group was based on the assumption that if people were activated to share opinions on a certain topic, the research issues would be focused on broadly and with much detail.

### **5. Data Recording**

The notes were taken in by different settings such as the village geographic; the route to and from the school, the route to a district office and provincial hall agricultural setting, forestry, house settlements and occupations. Then the data were allocated to particular categories.

## **Stage 4 Examination and Analysis of Data**

### **A. Examination of Data**

The researcher had established the categories within which the data were organized and had sorted all bits of data into relevant categories by means of transferring and linking them in order to check out the relevancy and validity.

Triangulation was used to improve the internal validity. Different data collection from different data sources at different time setting and sites were allocated to particular categories. The researcher had conducted it as follows: 1. linking the data of the same person, the same questions but different times, sites and situations. 2. linkage of the data from different person of times, sites and situations but the same issues addressed and 3. linkage of the data from different persons and times but the same site at different or similar situations.

All the received data was categorized to particular types in order to further the analyses

### **B. Analyzing Improved Data**

The researcher began analyzing the data while the data was being checked out, i.e. after having been triangulated; the continuous analytical procedure was conducted. This was consistent with the principle of qualitative data analyzing that the data could be analyzed since the beginning while and at the final stage of data collection.

The researcher used the inductive method to analyze the data by means of a comparison of the approved data, event or situations in order to access the consistency then recorded up the research findings.

### **Stage 5 The Development of the School Board Participation Procedure**

According to the third research objectives which were based on the school board participation procedure. The researcher held two seminars which were:

1. The seminar focused on developing the participatory procedure;
2. The follow up seminar which followed up the first seminar on developing the participatory procedure almost immediately it had been completed.

#### **1. The first seminar on developing the participatory procedure**

The aim of this seminar was to propose the findings from the first and second research objectives to the school and the school board members in order to establish the participatory procedure framework. The seminar was held on March 16, 2550 B.E.(1997) at Ban Doikham school auditorium. The researcher had organized the conducting of the seminar by ensuring that the following was in place

#### **1. The Seminar Instruments –This had up to 6 issues:**

1. Topics/items of the seminar came from the findings regarding the first and second research objectives as;

- 1.1 The previous participation in the educational institution curriculum development

- 1.2 The participation in other academic matters such as the provision of ambience, environments; the management of learning process, learning recourses and local wisdoms.

- 1.3 The participation in promoting learning management regarding 3 areas of budget, personnel and general affairs administration.

- 1.4 Problems and obstacles in participating educational management.

- 1.5 Other issues of participation beyond the previous implementation or things that could have been accomplished to take part in but could not due to lack of opportunities.

2. The researcher served as one of the instruments and the master of ceremonies when conducting the seminar.

3. The school administrator was one of the instruments acting as the facilitator of the seminar by setting the site and facilitating other relevant matters.

4. Two research assistants who took notes on details during the seminar.

5. A camera, projector and record player.

6. The documents of research summary and roles and duties of the school board members as prescribed directly by the laws.

## **2. The Seminar Procedures: It followed the planned 6 step such as:**

1. Distribution of seminar documents.

2. Reporting and explaining the research findings regarding the first and second research objectives achieved

3. Making the presentation orally on the topic of previous issues on participation.

4. Taking part in expressing opinions, making suggestions about what had been done and future actions & plans

5. Recording data during the seminar by:

5.1 Assigning the research assistants to take every note thoroughly into the notebook.

5.2 The researcher herself took brief notes relevant to the points.

6. Taking seminar photos.

## **3. Steps in Organizing the Seminar**

It was organized in six steps that were to be followed as:

1. The researcher submitted the research findings to the school board members and the school in order to validate the consistency, the relevancy and to gain acceptance in the research findings.

1. Each of the board members reviewed his own roles during the past 2 years and expressed how he perceived the role and the authority of the school board
2. To have a discussion panel to compare between the school participation and the role as stipulated in the National Education Act.
3. Each board member was to share his own ideas and curriculum development guidelines together with suggestions on promoting educational management regarding the 3 areas of budget, personnel and general affairs of administration.
4. All members helped to summarize the past issues and their roles to participate in curriculum development and promoting educational management according to the agreement obtained from the seminar.
5. The researcher summed up the contents in the seminar in order to review and check the coherency

### **The Second Stage on Monitoring after the First Participation Developing**

It aimed to monitor the outcomes after having been developed at the participation procedure from the first stage. The researcher regularly continuously followed up the school boards participation through out one academic year, that's 2550 B.E.(1997). The second seminar was held on March 12, 2551 B.E.C(1998) at Ban Doi kham school auditorium the methods of follow-up to the first seminar was to be:

1. Participant and non-participant observation;
2. Informal interviewing;
3. Holdings a follow-up seminar.

### **1. Participant and Non -Participant Observation**

**1.1 Participant Observation** After having been hold on the first seminar, the researcher had joined the school activities such as the school board meeting in

which the researcher was one of the meeting body , sports day and the school academic competition in order to observe the school board participation. It was found that they were admirable and very active to take part in no time powerfully and skillfully.

**1.2 Non-Participant Observation** sometimes the researcher took part in the meeting as the observer without expressing any idea, giving opinion or discussing thus silently listened to the proceedings. The researcher observed the school board members on the lunch project many times and also watched the usage of learning resources of the board members and villagers .It was found that the school board members elicited and shared their ideas, discussed and made some suggestions more than it used to be in the past time.

**2. Non-Formal Interviewing** This was another way the researcher used for a follow-up to their participation thought the conversational settings with the school board, teachers, pupils, the janitor, the luncheon cook and villagers while they were using learning reasons. The conversation was made into two types; one by one and groups of 3-4 persons. The researcher found that everyone was quite likely talking in the same direction and viewed the school board members had been cooperative as usual. Besides that the teachers said that the school board members were braver to share ideas in the discussions when there were formal meetings and informal seminars. This was relevant to the researcher findings from the non-participant meetings.

### **3. The Follow-up Seminar**

The researcher had employed the first seminar procedure and used it in the follow-up of the school board participation. The second seminar had been held on March 12, 2551 B.E. focused 3 areas:

3.1 The seminar Instruments

3.2 Procedures.

3.3 Steps Followed in the seminar.

### 3.1 The Seminar Instruments

The researcher used the same instrument as in the first seminar except the topics/points that had been changed according to the findings:

- 1) The participation in the educational Institution curriculum development;
- 2) The Participation on other academic matters of the school;
- 3) The participation in promoting the learning management regarding 3 domains; budget personnel and general affairs management;
- 4) The results obtained from item1)-3);
- 5) The differences of the participative results between pre and post participation procedure development;
- 6) How the board members thought they could participate in a full role;
- 7) Were there some weaknesses, strengths, problems and obstacles on the participation relevant to their direct roles? What were they? How?
- 8) What other issues did they want to take part in beyond the things that they had done before or what other issues did they want to do because they had no opportunity to do?
- 9) What issues did they want the school to do in order to have more roles and efficiency?

### 3.2 The Procedure Used in the Seminar

The same procedure as in the first one was applied for this seminar

### 3.3 The Step in Organizing the Seminar

The same steps that were used in the first one was applied for this seminar.