

Relationship between transformational leadership of Administrators and administration of schools in the Secondary Educational service area 19

Saman Prawanto¹

Abstract

The objectives of this research were 1) to study transformational leadership of administrators 2) to study administration of schools, and 3) to study the relationship between transformation leadership of administrators and administration of schools. The samples were 311 persons from the personnel of schools. The research instruments were the questionnaires with the reliability was 0.96. The statistics using for data analysis included mean, standard deviation and the Persons correlation

The results of findings were as follows: 1) transformational leadership of school administrators for overall and each aspect were in high level. 2) administration of schools for overall and each aspect were at a high level 3) transformational leadership of administrators for overall and each aspect were in medium level and statistically significance was at .01 level.

Keywords: leadership, administrators, administration

Introduction

The growth and advancement in many sciences during the globalization period, were very quick affecting the social and economical changes of every country. Thailand is a country increasing and developing the population's potentiality to be ready for competition as well as cooperation creatively in the world stage. The education was the most important tool for national development. The country where its population receiving the education appropriately and thoroughly, it would be successful in almost every aspect of development. (Sermsak Wisalapon, 2009) The society would be continuously changed. In addition, there was changing rate very quickly in the present. The scholars in various fields of the world as well as Thailand paid their attention to social situation very much. The scholars called the future society differently. Besides, it was called in other names as the periods of "boundless world," "globalization" or society-based" focusing on friendliness. The pattern of closed thinker was changed into opened thinker. It was the world stepping over the society focusing on competition into creative cooperation. It was the world of wisdom developing and stepping over the intellectual property into mass wisdom like you tube or Wikipedia. The world after knowledge-based society, was the world for changing human's lifestyle from dependency to freedom and interdependency. (The Office of the National Economics and Social Development Council, 2015)

The National Education Act 1999, the Revised Issue (the 2nd Issue) 2002, Section 4, specified that the educational standard included the specification of desirable characteristic, quality, and standard needed to be occurred in every educational institution for using as principle in promoting and monitoring the educational audit, evaluation, and quality assurance in Division 1, specified the major educational objective and rational in Section 6 that the educational management should be for developing Thai people to be perfect in their physical, mental, intellectual, knowledge, ethical, moral, and cultural aspects in their livelihood. They should live with other persons happily. Section 11 specified that the educational management had to be based on principle that every one was capable to learn and develop oneself. Furthermore, the students were the most important persons. The educational management process had to enhance the learners to be able to develop themselves naturally with full potentiality. Moreover, the educational institutions had to develop the efficient learning and teaching process. The teachers had to be encouraged to be able to conduct research for developing suitable learning for students in each educational level so that the education would lead the national development in different aspects. Stepping in pace with various civilized countries during the new century, the mechanism in creating and developing efficient human beings was necessary in order to develop the learning society realistically. It would be also new dimension of educational

development being occurred by many problems in Thai educational management being happened continuously. As a result, Thai peoples' competencies in various aspects of competitions, were lower than those of competitors from almost every country. (Achara Kahinpong, 2012).

So, the leaders from every level of educational institutions were very important since they were the most powerful persons in schools who played their roles in both of creative and destructive ways. It could be said that whether the school quality would be happened or not, was depended on the administrators as key persons. Because the administrative and management system or leadership style in the period of globalization. The new age administrators had to develop new image of academic leaders putting new approach into practice, and be transformational leaders in both of administrative and management techniques or learning and teaching process management. The school administrators had to have transformational leadership who inspired one's thought for developing the school work. Hence, the educational institutions should be learning organization rather than any other kinds of organizations. Since in the former decade, the appropriate leadership with present age as changing period, was studied. The famous and new theoretical approach being recognized in the present, was transformational leadership as new age leadership theory or new paradigm. Since the transformational leadership was the changing of paradigm into leadership with vision. The decentralization or empowerment the ethical motive were develop[ed]. In addition, the leadership was also stimulated. The transformational leadership would consider leaders' characteristics, behavior, power and related situational variables which were broader than the other theoretical approaches of leaders. (Bass 1999: cited in Rattikon Chongwisana, 2000)

According to the above problems, the researcher was interested in studying the administrators' transformational leadership in schools, under the Secondary Educational Service Area 19, regarding to the charismatic development, inspirational development, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration aspects in order to apply the findings to be congruent with school situation as well as to develop the schools under the Secondary Educational Service Area 19, to be relevant to the organizational working change in educational institutions to be effective and efficient further.

Objectives

1. To study the administrators' leadership of schools in Secondary Education Service Area 19.
2. To study work administration of schools in Secondary Education Service Area 19.

3. To study relationship between administrators' leadership and work administration of schools in Secondary Education Service Area 19.

Methodology

The population of this study consisted of the school director, the assistant school director, and the teachers, under jurisdiction of the Secondary Educational Service Area 19, including 32 school directors, 33 assistant school directors, and 1,561 teachers, total of 1,626 persons, 1,547 in-service teachers (The Secondary Educational Service Area 19, 2018).

The samples of this study were the staffs of Secondary Educational Service Area 19, including 6 school directors, 9 assistant school directors, and 311 in-service teachers. They were selected by classified random sampling. (Boonchom Sri-sa-ad, 2017: 70) For sample size, it was implemented by the researcher as follows: The samples were from Krejcie Morgan's Table. The samples from each group including the school directors, assistant school directors, and in-service teachers, were selected by proportional sampling from samples.

The research instruments

The research instrument was the questionnaire asking the respondents' opinion, divided into 3 parts as follows:

Part 1: the respondents' demographic data were asked. It was the checklist of status and size of schools where they were working.

Part 2: the administrators' 4 aspects of leadership in schools, under the Secondary Educational Service Area 19, 34 items including: 1) 7 items of the charismatic leadership, 2) 11 items of the inspirational development, 3) 7 items of intellectual stimulation, and 4) 9 items of individualized consideration. It was 5 level-rating scale ranging from the highest, high, moderate, low, and lowest levels.

Part 3: 4 aspects of work administration in schools, under the Secondary Educational Service Area 19, was asked. Two questions were used: 1) 8 items of academic work administration, 2) 5 items of students' positive attitude, 3) 6 items of school change and development, and 4) 7 items of problem solving in school. It was 5 level rating scale ranging from the highest, high, moderate, low, and lowest levels.

The instrument construction and validation were implemented by the researcher as follows:

1. The theoretical approach and rational regarding to the school administrators' transformational leadership and work administration as well as the rating scale construction, were studied (Sri-sa-ad, 2017).

2. The questionnaire of administrators' transformational leadership and work administration of Kamolman Chaisiritanya (2016), Sutasine Singprakone (2015), Chatupong Leprasert (2015), Natakij Buachom and Werawat Utairat (2015), Worachak Tawonkul (2014), and Wichanchai Chandang (2013), were studied.

3. The research objectives and conceptual framework were used in determining the questions asking the administrators' leadership and work administration.

4. The questionnaire was constructed based on research objectives and conceptual framework.

5. The constructed questionnaire was presented to 3 experts including the expert in educational administration, and the expert in measurement and evaluation for being investigated its content validity by finding the Index of Item Objective Congruence (IOC) ranging between 0.67 and 1.00.

6. The investigated content validity questionnaire was revised and improved based on the experts' recommendations. Then, it was tried out with 10 school directors, 10 assistant school directors, and 20 secondary school teachers who are not the samples, total of 40 persons. Then, the reliability was calculated by using Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient.

7. The tried out questionnaire was established as complete questionnaire in using for data collection.

Data Collection

1. The permission document for data collection from graduate school, Pitchayabundit College to the directors of Secondary Educational Service Area 19 and the directors of schools under the Secondary Educational Service Area 19, the samples, was requested.

2. The questionnaires were sent to the samples, and collected by the researcher himself until they were completely received within 3 weeks.

The statistic for data analysis

The statistic using for investigating the quality of instruments included Mean, Standard Deviation, and Pearson's Correlation Coefficient.

Results

Table 1: Mean, standard deviation, and transformational leadership level of school administrators, under the Secondary Educational Service Area 19, in overall and each aspect.

The administrators' transformational leadership (n = 311)	\bar{X}	S.D.	Opinion
1 Charismatic Development (X_1)	4.36	0.56	High
2. Inspirational Development (X_2)	4.40	0.56	High
3. Intellectual Stimulation (X_3)	4.27	0.59	High
4. Individualized Consideration (X_4)	4.20	0.56	High
Overall (X)	4.35	0.54	High

According to Table 1 found that the overall and each aspect of school administrators' transformational leadership, were in "High" level. ($\bar{X} = 4.20-4.40$) The aspect with highest level of transformational leadership was the Inspirational Development ($\bar{X} = 4.40$) The second order consisted of the Charismatic Development ($\bar{X} = 4.36$) the Intellectual Stimulation ($\bar{X} = 4.27$) and the Individualized Consideration ($\bar{X} = 4.20$) respectively.

Table 2: Mean, standard deviation, and work administration level of schools, under Secondary Educational Service Area 19, in overall and each aspect.

The administrators' transformational Leadership (n = 311)	\bar{X}	S.D.	Opinion
1. Academic work administration. (Y_1)	4.30	0.61	High
2. Budget work administration. (Y_2)	4.31	0.62	High
3. Staff administration. (Y_3)	4.36	0.58	High
4. Gene5ral work administration. (Y_4)	4.31	0.61	High
Overall (X)	4.29	0.62	High

According to Table 2 found that the overall and each aspect of work administration in schools, under Secondary Educational Service Area 19, were in "High" level ($\bar{X} = 4.29-4.36$). The aspect with highest level of practice was the Staff Administration. (Y_3) ($\bar{X} = 4.36$) The second order consisted of the Budget

Administration (Y_2) ($\bar{x} = 4.31$) and the General Work Administration (Y_4) ($\bar{x} = 4.31$) and the Academic Work Administration (Y_1) ($\bar{x} = 4.30$) respectively.

Table 3: Relationship between the administrators’ transformational leadership and work administration of schools, under Secondary Educational Service Area 19, in overall and each aspect, were shown.

Leadership	Academic Administration (Y_1)	Budget Administration (Y_2)	Staff Administration (Y_3)	General Work Administration (Y_4)	รวม (Y)
Charismatic Development (X_1)	.495**	.467**	.551**	.410**	.476**
Inspirational Development (X_2)	.612**	.572**	.668**	.541**	.579**
Intellectual Stimulation (X_3)	.583**	.639**	.619**	.578**	.588**
Individualized Consideration (X_4)	.634**	.608**	.603**	.640**	.686**
Total (X)	.599**	.592**	.621**	.511**	.580**

* $p < .01$

According to Table 3, found that the overall and each pair of relationship between administrators’ transformational leadership and work administration were in “Moderate” level. ($r = 0.410-0.686$) at .01 significant level. The aspect with highest level of .01 significant relationship, was the Inspirational Development and Staff Administration ($r_1 = 0.668$). The aspect with lowest level of relationship was the General Work Administration. ($r_2 = 0.410$)

Discussion

The administrators’ overall transformational leadership of schools under Secondary Educational Service Area 19, was in “High” level. It was supported by Chaisirikanya’s (2016) findings found that the administrators’ overall transformational leadership in schools, under the Secondary Educational Service Area 2, was in “High” level. It was also supported by Singprakone’s (2015) findings found that the administrators’ overall transformational leadership in schools, under the Secondary Educational Service Area 32, was in “High” level. It was supported by Leeprasert’s (2015) findings found that the administrators’ overall transformational leadership in schools, under the Secondary Educational Service Area 18, was in “High” level.

The overall work administration in schools, under the Secondary Educational Service Area 19, was in “High” level. It was congruent with Yompook (2015) findings found that the overall administration of schools, under the Secondary Educational Service Area 1, group 4, was in “High” level. It was supported by Worachak Tawonkul’s findings found that the overall and each aspect of educational administration success of schools, under the Secondary Educational Service Area 3, Nondaburi, were in “High” level. In addition, it was supported by Wichanchai Chandang’s findings found that the overall and each aspect of administration of Pacharakitiyapa Secondary School 2, Kampangpech, were in “High” level.

The administrators’ overall transformational leadership and work administration of schools, under the Secondary Educational Service Area 19, was in “Moderate” level at .01 significant level. It was supported by Nontok Aroono’s findings found that the relationship between administrators’ transformational leadership of schools, under the Secondary Educational Service Area 17, and school effectiveness, was in “Moderate” level at .01 significant level. Furthermore, it was supported by Chalekreu’s findings (2016) found that the overall relationship between transformational leadership and work effectiveness of teachers, under the Non-formal and Informal Education, Rayong Province, was in “High” level at .01 significant level.

The research findings of administrators’ transformational leadership and work administration of schools in Secondary Educational Service Area 19, found that in overall and each aspect, were in “High” level. In addition, the relationship between administrators’ transformational leadership and work administration of schools in Secondary Educational Service Area 19, found that in overall and every pair, the relationship was in “Moderate” level at .05 significant level.

Recommendation

1. Recommendations from research findings

1.1 According to research findings found that the practice of academic work administration was in “Low” level in every aspect. Therefore, the schools administrators in Secondary Educational Service Area 19, should bring information from this study to be analyzed whether it was true or not. If it was true, the administrators should be aware of and practice truly and continuously because the academic work was the key of schools or educational institutions.

1.2 According to research findings found that there was moderate relationship between charismatic development and general work management which was lower than every pair. Therefore, the school administrators, under the Secondary Educational Service Area 19, should pay attention to and practice truly.

2. Recommendations for future research

2.1 Should study other factors Which affects the change leadership of the school administrators which Work Satisfaction of Teachers Secondary Educational Service Area 19, such as knowledge management factors Organizational culture factors Academic leadership factors good governance factors, for example, to develop the leadership change of the school administrators and to achieve a variety of research results Which will be beneficial to the school management of the executives in the future.

2.2 Should study the motivation in the performance of teachers of successful schools in administration or schools with excellent management practices. By focusing on the schools that the administrators have been Acknowledging the transformational leadership In order to get a clear research result about factors That causes change leadership of school administrators.

References

- Aroono, Nontok. (2016). *A study of school administrators' transformational leadership affecting effectiveness of schools, under secondary educational service area 17*. Master of Education Thesis, Rampaipane Rajabhat University.
- Buachom, N. and Utairat, W. (2015). The model development of secondary school administrators' transformational leadership in universal standard schools. *The Academic Journal, Eastern Asia University, Social Sciences and Humanities Issue, 5(2): 215-229*.
- Chaisiritanya, K. (2016). The administrators' transformational leadership affecting teachers' core competency in schools under the secondary educational service area 2. *Journal of Humanities, Social Science, and Art*. Silapakon University.
- Chandang, W. (2556). *The work administration of Kampongpech Pacharakitiyapa Secondary School 2, Kampongpech Province*, (Online) Searching from <https://www.thongsook.ac.th/2556>.
- Chalekreu, T. (2016). *The relationship between transformational leadership and work effectiveness of teachers under office of The Non-formal and Informal Education (NFE), Rayong Province*. Master of Education Thesis in Educational Administration, Burapa University.
- Chongwisan, R. (2000). *The effect of transformational leadership training of student leaders, Kasetsat University*. Doctoral Dissertation of Science (Behavioral Science). Bangkok: Graduate School, Srinagarindwirot University.

- Kahinpong, A. (2012). *The administration presentation model for small-sized schools, under Pranakon-sri-ayutaya Primary Educational Service Area 1, and 2*. Doctoral Dissertation. Ayutaya: Pranakon-sri-ayataya Rajabhat University.
- Leeprasert, J. (2015). *Relationship between the administrators' transformational leadership and effectiveness of schools under Secondary Educational Service Area 18, Choburi Province*. Master of Education Thesis in Educational Administration, Burapa University.
- Ministry of Education. (2002). *National Education Act 1999, and the Revised Issue (The 2nd issue) 2002, the Related Ministry Law and Compulsory Education Act 2002*. Bangkok: Express Transportation and Organization of Thailand Printing, 2003.
- Singprakone, S. (2019). *The School Administrators' Transformational Leadership in Schools, under Secondary Educational Service Area 32*. Searching on the 9th April 2019 from <https://www.dspace.bru.ac.th/2015.Province>. Master of Education Thesis in Educational Administration, Burapa University.
- Srisaad, B. (2017). *Foundation of research*. The 10th Ed. Bangkok: Suwiryasan Printing.
- Tawonkul, W. (2014). *The school administration success of schools, under Secondary Educational Service Area 3., Nondburi*. Master of Education Thesis in Educational Administration, Rachapruk University.
- The Secondary Educational Service Area 19. (2018). *The information technology of schools, under Loei, Nongbua-lampoo: The Secondary Educational Service Area 19*.
- Yompook, S. (2015). The School Administration and Perception in Work Support affecting Teachers' Teaching Effectiveness in Secondary Schools, under Secondary Educational Service Area 4. *Thai Issue of Silpakon Journal in Humanities, Social Science, and Art*, 8(2): 1476-1495.
- Development Council. (2015). *The direction of national economics and social development plan, the 12th issue (2017-2021)*. Bangkok: Office of The National Economics and Social Development Council.

