



Education Quarterly Reviews

Supreeworakit, J., & Salamteh, S. (2025). General Administration of the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 8(1), 220-229.

ISSN 2621-5799

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1993.08.01.568

The online version of this article can be found at:
<https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/>

Published by:
The Asian Institute of Research

The *Education Quarterly Reviews* is an Open Access publication. It may be read, copied, and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

The Asian Institute of Research *Education Quarterly Reviews* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of education, linguistics, literature, educational theory, research and methodologies, curriculum, elementary and secondary education, higher education, foreign language education, teaching and learning, teacher education, education of special groups, and other fields of study related to education. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Education Quarterly Reviews* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of education.



ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide

General Administration of the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2

Jittipong Supreeworakit¹, Suwit Salamteh²

^{1,2} Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Sarasas Suvarabhumi Institute of Technology, Thailand

Correspondence: Jittipong Supreeworakit. E-mail: jittipongsupreeworakit@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aimed to 1) examine the general administration of the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2, and 2) compare the general administration of this school group based on differences in job positions, school sizes, and years of work experience. The sample consisted of 140 administrators and teachers selected using stratified random sampling and simple random sampling. The research instrument was a five-point Likert scale questionnaire with a reliability coefficient of 0.95. Data analysis included Mean, Standard Deviation, t-test, and One-Way ANOVA. Research Findings: 1) The overall and specific aspects of general administration in the Bang Bo 1 School Group were at the highest level; 2) The comparison of general administration based on job positions, school sizes, and years of work experience revealed that job positions showed statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level, while school size and work experience did not show significant differences.

Keywords: General Administration, Educational Management, Comparison

1. Introduction

The National Education Act B.E. 2542 (1999) and its amendments mandate the Ministry of Education to decentralize educational administration in areas such as academic affairs, budgeting, personnel management, and general administration. This decentralization empowers educational service areas and schools to enhance education quality, student competency, and personnel development while ensuring that student learning outcomes meet societal expectations (Office of Basic Education Commission, 2013).

The Ministerial Regulations on Educational Administration B.E. 2550 (2007) define key aspects of general administration, including information system development, educational planning, resource mobilization, public relations, student activities, and collaboration with organizations and communities. These areas support efficient school operations and student development (Ministry of Education, 2007).

General administration is essential for managing school operations, resources, and administrative efficiency to align with national education policies. It includes organizational management, policy research, school governance,

and monitoring systems that contribute to an effective educational management framework (Office of Education Reform, 2002).

Given its importance, the researcher, as the head of general administration, conducted this study to examine the general administration practices of the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2. The study aimed to assess administration levels and develop strategies to improve efficiency. The findings will serve as a foundation for future administrative improvements in schools within the region.

2. Research Objectives

1.2.1 To study the general administration of the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2.

1.2.2 To compare the general administration of the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2 based on job position, school size, and years of work experience.

3. Research Hypotheses

1.3.1 The general administration of the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2 is at a moderate level.

1.3.2 The general administration of the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2 differs significantly based on job position, school size, and years of work experience.

4. Literature Review

4.1. General Administration: Definitions and Perspectives

Yutthana Lamloet (2022) stated that general administration refers to the implementation of operations that focus on supporting, facilitating, and providing services to internal school units. It ensures the provision of all forms of education while engaging individuals, communities, and organizations in coordinating and streamlining teaching, learning, and administrative tasks, leading to efficient and effective goal attainment.

Budsaba Kena-on (2022) described general administration as the successful implementation of various educational support functions, including: Developing information systems and educational networks Coordinating and planning educational administration Conducting research for policy and strategic development Managing school facilities and environments Handling student census and enrollment Proposing school establishment, mergers, or closures Mobilizing educational resources Organizing student activities and field trips Promoting educational public relations Collaborating with communities and organizations in education Monitoring and evaluating internal control systems Implementing behavioral modification programs for students.

Sittisak Petchyim (2020) defined general administration as the management of school operations that support and enhance educational processes to meet quality standards and institutional goals. It also involves facilitating the functions of different school departments, ensuring their successful implementation.

Pramoon Suwannamajo (2019) emphasized that general administration refers to the management of various school operations in alignment with the Ministry of Education's decentralization policies. It focuses on coordination, facilitation, and support to ensure that all school functions achieve their intended objectives.

Atchara Chongdee (2017) described general administration as the process of providing services to different school units, ensuring that they operate efficiently and achieve their objectives. She likened general administration to the backbone of school operations, supporting teaching and learning effectiveness.

Brown (1993) stated that general administration involves the management of various school departments, ensuring they function smoothly to achieve their objectives. It plays a coordinating and supportive role in helping schools accomplish their goals.

Joyce (1992) defined general administration as organizational management that facilitates coordination and support for various school functions. It plays a key role in enhancing administrative efficiency.

Candoli et al. (1991) explained that general administration is the preparation and support of educational management to enhance teaching and learning efficiency and effectiveness.

In conclusion, general administration refers to managing school operations to support and enhance educational quality and standards. It ensures that all school functions align with institutional objectives while facilitating collaboration with external organizations to achieve successful educational outcomes.

5. Population and Sample

5.1. Population

The population for this study includes 220 teachers and school administrators from the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2.

5.2. Sample

The sample size was determined using G*Power version 3.1.9.2, with the statistical test set as Correlation Bivariate Normal Model. The parameters included a Power Analysis of 0.99, a significance level of 0.01, and a medium effect size of 0.3, following Cohen (1977) (as cited in Nipitphon Sanitlua, Watchareephon Sartphet, and Yada Napha-arak, 2018). Based on these parameters, a total of 140 participants were selected through stratified random sampling and simple random sampling.

6. Research Instrument

The instrument used for data collection was a questionnaire developed and refined based on academic literature and previous research related to general administration. The questionnaire consisted of:

Questionnaire Structure:

Part 1: Demographic Information – A checklist covering respondents' position, school size, and years of experience.

Part 2: General Administration – A Likert Scale questionnaire (5 levels) evaluating general administration in five key areas:

- Administration and Clerical Work
- Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Infrastructure
- Resources and Facilities Management
- Student Affairs
- Educational Coordination and Public Relations

The Likert Scale ratings were:

- 5 = Highest level
- 4 = High level
- 3 = Moderate level
- 2 = Low level
- 1 = Lowest level

7. Instrument Development and Quality Validation

1. Development Process

1. Review of literature, theories, and research related to general administration in the Bang Bo 1 School Group.
2. Creation of a structured questionnaire with two main parts:
 - Demographic Information (Position, school size, years of experience).
 - General Administration Assessment (Five key aspects).
3. Expert validation by an advisory committee, incorporating suggestions for improvement.

2. Expert Validation Criteria

Three education experts were selected through purposive sampling, including:

1. An educational administrator (Ph.D. in education or equivalent) with at least five years of experience in educational management.
2. Two school administrators (Master's degree or higher in education) with at least five years of experience in school management.

These experts assessed the questionnaire's content validity using the Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC) with the following rating scale:

- +1 = The item is relevant to the research objective.
- 0 = Uncertain if the item is relevant.
- -1 = The item is not relevant.

Items with IOC values between 0.60 - 1.00 were included in the final questionnaire.

3. Pilot Testing and Reliability Analysis

1. Refinement of the questionnaire based on expert feedback.
2. Pilot testing (Try-out) with a group of teachers not included in the sample.
3. Reliability testing using Cronbach's Alpha (1990: 202-204) to assess the internal consistency of the questionnaire.
4. Finalized questionnaire used for data collection.

8. Data Collection Process

1. Approval and coordination with the Graduate Studies Office, Faculty of Education and Liberal Arts, Suvarnabhumi Institute of Technology, to obtain permission for data collection.
2. Distribution of the questionnaire to administrators and teachers in the Bang Bo 1 School Group.
3. Follow-up and retrieval of incomplete questionnaires.
4. Data verification and validation before analysis.

9. Data Analysis

1. Data Processing Steps

1. Verification of returned questionnaires for completeness.
2. Scoring and categorization of responses based on predefined criteria.
3. Statistical analysis using SPSS to generate results.

2. Statistical Methods Used

2.1 Descriptive Statistics

- Percentage (%) – To summarize demographic data.
- Mean (\bar{X}) – To measure the overall level of general administration.
- Standard Deviation (S.D.) – To assess data dispersion.

2.2 Hypothesis Testing

- One-way ANOVA – To compare general administration based on position, school size, and years of experience.
- Scheffe's Method – To determine pairwise differences if significant differences were found.

2.3 Instrument Reliability Testing

- Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC) – To validate content accuracy.

- Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient – To assess questionnaire reliability.

11. Data Analysis

Results of Data Analysis on General Administration of the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2.

Table 1: Mean, Standard Deviation, Interpretation, and Ranking of General Administration in the Bang Bo 1 School Group (n=140)

General Administration	Level of Implementation		Interpretation	Rank
	\bar{x}	S.D.		
1 Administration and Clerical Work	4.52	0.25	Highest	3
2 Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Infrastructure	4.51	0.27	Highest	4
3 Resources and Facilities Management	4.50	0.25	Highest	5
4 Student Affairs	4.54	0.23	Highest	2
5 Educational Coordination and Public Relations	4.56	0.28	Highest	1
Overall (\bar{X}_{tot})	4.52	0.20	Highest	

Based on Table 1, the overall level of general administration in the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2 was at the highest level ($\bar{X} = 4.52$, S.D. = 0.20). When considering each aspect individually, the rankings based on the highest mean scores were as follows: Educational Coordination and Public Relations had the highest mean ($\bar{X} = 4.56$, S.D. = 0.28). Student Affairs followed closely ($\bar{X} = 4.54$, S.D. = 0.23). Administration and Clerical Work ranked third ($\bar{X} = 4.52$, S.D. = 0.25). This indicates that educational coordination and public relations were the most efficiently managed, while resources and facilities management had the lowest mean but remained at the highest level of effectiveness.

Analysis of General Administration in the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2, Classified by Job Position, School Size, and Years of Work Experience.

Table 2: Comparison of General Administration in the Bang Bo 1 School Group, Classified by Job Position (n=140)

General Administration	School Administrators (n=21)		Teachers (n=119)		t	p
	\bar{x}	S.D.	\bar{x}	S.D.		
1 Administration and Clerical Work	4.66	0.29	4.49	0.23	3.01	0.00
2 Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Infrastructure	4.69	0.29	4.47	0.23	3.82	0.00
3 Resources and Facilities Management	4.64	0.35	4.48	0.22	2.80	0.00
4 Student Affairs	4.79	0.25	4.50	0.24	5.37	0.00
5 Educational Coordination and Public Relations	4.80	0.27	4.52	0.23	5.01	0.00

Overall (X_{tot})	4.72	0.20	4.49	0.19	4.98	0.00
-----------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------

*p < .05

According to Table 2, the overall general administration in the Bang Bo 1 School Group, classified by job position, showed a statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level. School administrators ($\bar{X} = 4.72$, S.D. = 0.20) reported a higher level of general administration compared to teachers ($\bar{X} = 4.49$, S.D. = 0.19). All five aspects of general administration showed significant differences ($p < 0.05$), with school administrators rating higher in all areas than teachers. The largest differences were observed in Student Affairs ($t = 5.37$, $p = 0.00$) and Educational Coordination and Public Relations ($t = 5.01$, $p = 0.00$), indicating that school administrators perceived these areas more positively than teachers. These findings suggest that job position influences the perception of general administration efficiency, with administrators rating overall management higher than teachers.

Table 3: Comparison of General Administration in the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2, Classified by School Size

General Administration	Source of Variation	df	ss	ms	f	p
Administration and Clerical Work	Between Groups	2	0.02	0.01	0.21	0.80
	Within Groups	137	8.98	0.06		
	Total	139	9.01			
Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Infrastructure	Between Groups	2	0.11	0.05	0.85	0.42
	Within Groups	137	9.09	0.06		
	Total	139	9.21			
Resources and Facilities Management	Between Groups	2	0.31	0.15	2.50	0.08
	Within Groups	137	8.61	0.06		
	Total	139	8.91			
Student Affairs	Between Groups	2	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.96
	Within Groups	137	8.72	0.06		
	Total	139	8.72			
Educational Coordination and Public Relations	Between Groups	2	0.05	0.02	0.40	0.66
	Within Groups	137	9.22	0.06		
	Total	139	9.27			
Overall	Between Groups	2	0.01	0.00	0.12	0.88
	Within Groups	137	6.03	0.04		
	Total	139	6.04			

*p < .05

According to Table 3, the general administration in the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2, classified by school size, showed no significant differences in both overall and individual aspects ($p > 0.05$). This indicates that school size does not significantly influence general administration efficiency, implying that schools of different sizes operate under similar administrative conditions and follow standardized management practices.

Table 4: Comparison of General Administration in the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2, Classified by Years of Work Experience

General Administration	Source of Variation	df	ss	ms	f	p
Administration and Clerical Work	Between Groups	2	1.20	0.02	0.23	0.60

	Within Groups	137	7.80	0.07		
	Total	139	9.01			
Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Infrastructure	Between Groups	2	0.75	0.0	0.87	0.32
	Within Groups	137	8.45	0.07		
	Total	139	9.21			
Resources and Facilities Management	Between Groups	2	0.49	0.16	2.55	0.06
	Within Groups	137	8.42	0.07		
	Total	139	8.91			
Student Affairs	Between Groups	2	0.55	0.01	0.07	0.36
	Within Groups	137	8.17	0.07		
	Total	139	8.72			
Educational Coordination and Public Relations	Between Groups	2	0.81	0.03	0.50	0.26
	Within Groups	137	8.46	0.07		
	Total	139	9.27			
Overall	Between Groups	2	0.71	0.01	0.14	0.78
	Within Groups	137	5.33	0.05		
	Total	139	6.51			

*p < .05

According to, the general administration in the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2, classified by years of work experience, showed no significant differences in both overall and individual aspects ($p > 0.05$). This indicates that years of work experience do not significantly impact the perception or effectiveness of general administration, suggesting that personnel across different experience levels operate under similar management conditions and follow standardized administrative procedures.

12. Discussion of Research Findings

The findings from school administrators and teachers' opinions on the general administration of the Bang Bo 1 School Group under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2 present several key points for discussion, as follows:

Administration and Clerical Work The general administration in the aspect of administration and clerical work was rated at the highest level. This may be attributed to the strong leadership of school administrators, who emphasize listening to and supporting personnel, fostering a positive and efficient working environment. **Factors Contributing to High Performance Participatory Decision-Making:** Teachers and staff actively participate in setting standards, indicators, and success criteria, leading to shared responsibility and commitment to development. **Clear Planning and Continuous Evaluation:** Systematic planning and performance evaluation allow for efficient improvements in administration. These findings align with Anudet Bansara (2021), who studied general administration in schools under the Pathum Thani Primary Educational Service Area Office 2. The study emphasized that school administrators must thoroughly understand clerical work, appoint administrative officers, establish operational guidelines based on government regulations, and integrate technology for administrative support, such as an online document submission system.

Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Infrastructure The ICT infrastructure in the general administration of the Bang Bo 1 School Group was rated at the highest level, reflecting Digital Transformation in education. This aligns with the concept of e-Governance in Education, which enhances data management and communication with the school community. **Key Contributing Factors** **School Policy on IT Integration:** The investment in IT infrastructure, including high-speed internet and cloud-based systems, facilitates data storage and accessibility. **IT Training for Staff:** Enhancing teachers' and staff members' IT skills improves administrative efficiency. **Community and Parental Involvement:** The use of ICT for communication with parents and communities promotes transparency and administrative efficiency. These results align with Prawanrat Pimphrom

(2016), who studied educational administration from the perspective of school administrators and teachers under the Pathum Thani Primary Educational Service Area Office. The study found that ICT in education significantly improves problem-solving and administrative efficiency.

Resources and Facilities Management The resources and facilities management aspect of general administration was rated at the highest level. This may be due to: **Key Contributing Factors** **School Policy on Resource and Facility Development:** A clear strategic plan ensures effective resource allocation and facility improvement. **Support from Various Sectors:** Collaboration with government agencies, private sectors, and local communities provides additional resources. **Modern Learning Spaces:** The design of innovative and multi-purpose learning environments aligns with changing educational needs. **Health and Environmental Standards:** Clear hygiene and environmental regulations enhance the overall learning environment. These findings are consistent with Prawnrat Pimphrom (2016), who emphasized that school facility management involves systematic planning, implementation, and evaluation to meet organizational and educational goals. The Ministry of Education (2008) outlined four key steps in facility management: Assessment of current conditions, challenges, and needs. Strategic planning and project proposal for improvements. Implementation of planned improvements. Regular evaluation and adjustments based on defined timelines.

Student Affairs The student affairs aspect of general administration was rated at the highest level. This may be due to: **Key Contributing Factors** **Structured Administration:** Schools implement clear policies and guidelines for student affairs management. **Stakeholder Involvement:** Teachers, students, and parents actively participate in shaping policies and initiatives. **Administrative Support:** Resource allocation and planning facilitate successful student programs and activities. **Technology Integration:** IT systems are utilized for student behavior tracking and analysis. These findings align with Pramoon Suwannamajo (2019), who studied student affairs administration in primary schools in Nakhon Phanom Province. The study concluded that effective student affairs management requires student participation, promotes positive behavior and values, and encourages social responsibility.

Educational Coordination and Public Relations The educational coordination and public relations aspect of general administration was rated at the highest level. **Key Contributing Factors** **Emphasis on Stakeholder Participation:** Schools prioritize building strong networks with communities and relevant organizations. **Use of Technology in Public Relations:** Online platforms and social media enhance information dissemination and accessibility. **Evaluation and Improvement Strategies:** Schools continuously assess and refine their public relations strategies. **Collaboration with External Organizations:** A strong network of partnerships increases access to resources and support programs. These findings align with Chatchai Tantranon (2019), who studied public relations management at Wachirawit Chiang Mai School. The study highlighted key recommendations for improving school public relations, including: Implementing a modern document management system. Continuously promoting school activities and events. Optimizing human resource allocation. Conducting satisfaction surveys to enhance public relations efforts.

Comparison of General Administration Based on Job Position, School Size, and Years of Work Experience **Job Position Affects General Administration ($p < 0.05$)** Significant differences were found between school administrators and teachers in their perceptions of general administration. This may be due to varying responsibilities: School administrators have a strategic, high-level perspective. Teachers focus more on practical, operational aspects. This finding aligns with Role Theory (1979), which suggests that roles and responsibilities influence perception and decision-making.

School Size Does Not Significantly Affect General Administration ($p > 0.05$) No significant differences were found in general administration across small, medium, and large schools. Possible reasons: Schools follow standardized policies from central authorities. Resource and personnel allocation is proportionally balanced. This finding aligns with Organizational Structure Theory (1979), which states that centralized administrative structures have a greater impact than organizational size.

Work Experience Does Not Significantly Affect General Administration ($p > 0.05$) No significant differences were found between personnel with varying years of work experience. Possible reasons: Standardized administrative

policies ensure uniform practices. Structured training programs enable new staff to perform similarly to experienced personnel. This finding aligns with Human Resource Development (HRD) Theory and research by Swanson & Holton (2001), which emphasizes that HRD enhances workforce competency through systematic learning, training, and development.

The findings indicate that general administration in the Bang Bo 1 School Group is highly effective, with key strengths in administration, ICT, resource management, student affairs, and public relations. Job position significantly affects administrative perceptions, while school size and work experience do not. These results highlight the importance of leadership, stakeholder collaboration, and technology integration in modern school administration.

13. Recommendations

Recommendations from the Research

1. Administration and Clerical Work – There should be a systematic analysis and evaluation to identify and improve organizational structure and operations, enhancing administrative efficiency.
2. Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Infrastructure – A network system should be developed to connect schools with external organizations, ensuring fast and secure administration and coordination.
3. Resources and Facilities Management – The landscape and infrastructure within the school should be designed and improved to create a learning-friendly environment that supports student well-being.
4. Student Affairs – Activities should be summarized and evaluated to facilitate continuous improvements and development, ensuring they effectively support students' learning experiences.
5. Educational Coordination and Public Relations – Schools should plan and implement public relations strategies to promote educational activities and projects, fostering public understanding and support.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. Future research should explore factors affecting problem-solving in the implementation of general administration in schools under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2.
2. Further studies should investigate the effectiveness of general administration practices in schools under the Samut Prakan Primary Educational Service Area Office 2.

Author Contributions: All authors contributed to this research.

Funding: Not applicable.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Informed Consent Statement/Ethics Approval: Not applicable.

References

- Ahmet, G. (2020). Cultural administration in compulsory lessons teaching programs in the context of school administration. *EJERCongress 2022 Conference Proceedings*, 319-334.
- Biddle, B. J. (1979). *Role theory: Expectations, identities, and behaviors*. Academic Press.
- Brown, W. B., & Moberg, D. J. (1993). *Organizational theory and management: A macro approach*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Brown, W. B., & Moberg, D. J. (1998). *Organizational theory and management: A macro approach*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Candoli, I. C., et al. (1991). *School business administration: A planning approach* (4th ed.). Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

- Cronbach, L. J. (1990). *Essentials of psychological testing* (5th ed.). New York: Harper Collins Publishers (pp. 202-204).
- Demirali, Y. E. (2019). Developing the scale of classroom management skills. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 7(4), 250-258.
- Fatih, B. (2022). The relationship between participation in administrative decisions and school effectiveness: An empirical study on teachers. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 9(1), 143-152.
- Joyce, B., Masha, M. W., & Showers, B. (1992). *Model of teaching* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations: A synthesis of the research*. Prentice-Hall.
- Swanson, R. A., & Holton, E. F. (2001). *Foundations of human resource development*. Berrett-Koehler.
- Yusuf, G. (2023). The mediating role of teamwork in the correlation between administrative support and school belonging. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 18(3), 465-482.