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Abstract

This study was conducted at Technical-Vocational Schools in the Province of Rayong, Thailand. The objectives of this study were to investigate the public relations of the 10 Technical-Vocational Schools, public and private; their communication management; and the relationship between the levels of practices in public relations and the degree of communication management by schools. The participants were asked to answer and complete the survey questionnaires to reveal their public relations practices and degree of communication management. The findings revealed that public relations are sometimes practiced; that age, length of service, and type of job of respondents are significant determinants of their levels of practice but not by their sex, and highest educational attainment; that management of communication was oftentimes done for internal and external use, staff management, and for making mass media effective; that the degree of communication management is not significantly determined by sex, age, highest educational attainment, length of service, and monthly income of the respondents but is significantly determined by their school assignment. In addition, the level of public relation practices in the public and private technical and vocational schools are not significantly influenced by the degrees of communication management. The researcher provided the recommendations for the administrators and teachers for their public relations practices towards students, parents and stakeholders to develop a program that would encourage and engage the community to cooperate with the schools.

Introduction:

Public relations describe the various methods a company uses to advertise messages about its products, services, or overall image to its customers, employees, stockholders, suppliers, investors relations or other interested members of the community (http://www.ipr.org.uk/). By these, it involves two-way communication between an organization and its public. They can communicate in many ways such as face-to-face communication, social media, TV, newspapers and pamphlets.

Today’s public relations is a global profession, and multinational agencies continue to gather market globally by utilizing social media, virtual conferences and other innovations in technology and communication Toth and Aldoory (2010) and in accordance to the study of Mutua (2016), the most utilized in public relations is media
coverage. Among Americans, they used media as a major weapon in public relations. They used it as media outreach, media control by the government or business and media access (Freitag & Stokes, 2009).

Schools leaders and principals are using public relations for the awareness of the community (Coruk, 2018) and to show them the positive image that leads to gather support from the stakeholders, as stated by the Saskatchewan School Boards Association (2015). Public relations follow a certain ethics that play a vital role in human communication. It encourages avoiding the harmful content, protecting the individual interest, safeguarding the human dignity and maintaining justice in communication (Haque & Ahmad, 2017).

At school, public relations are a big and important duty to maintain the dignity of a certain school. Public relations can be used as marketing (Gawronski & Jakubowski, 2018). The school can show to the community and around the world about their projects, their activities through social media. They can present it to the potential investors and parents of the students, community and the local or national government. They can hold an annual fund drive and always positively gathered the donors, stakeholders and investors. According to the study of Paradise and Heaton (2012), alumni relations staff members spent more time on the annual fund, and the percentage of alumni who were donors tended to be greater. In the study of Satchwell (2010), most of the fundraising managers use strategies, methodologies and thought this will be the best method and it’s also good to know the public relations.

Public relations through communication is a vital part of acquiring help, donors from the investor relations, communities and family. The involvement of the parent and family engagement in schools help and support the children’s success in school, according to Ferrara (2015), some parents give monetary support to the schools. It is supported with the study of Bertolini, et. al. (2012), and further discussed that parental involvement can have an impact on student achievement. Parents who are active at school gathering and meetings, tend to push their children to study hard, and support their children to have better futures.

The government sector uses public relations strategies and tactics in many areas of political communication. In some schools, they open courses in public relations and help the students to learn the strategies, theory and practices of public relations. The study of Li (2016) stated that the Chinese government explored and plays particular role in higher education. Government allocated fund for the education sector to improve the settings. Mwasho (2014) stated that Kenya school of government led the employees for their training in public relations and it significantly improved their job performance as well as service to the public.

Public relations in the West is based on behavior and cultural understanding, which is also the practice here in Thailand to understand the culture before engaging the community. In addition, Alanasim (2013) stated that King Saud University perform well in both public relations and their activities such as writing press releases, writing newsletters, communicating with media, and holding events. Most of the schools have some school newsletters, websites, such as Facebook and increase the presence of media during programs and activities.

This is in consonance to the study of Yang and Chiu (2010) who mentioned that the most influential organizational factors to the performance of the general public relation practice are the media relations and issue management, image building and external public relations of the school. The education program of British Columbia has been discursively framed by the government and media sources to be able to generate more students internationally and further increase revenue from the tuition fees (Cover, 2016).

With regards to funding of schools, most of the school in Rayong received healthy donations and support from the private companies. Most of the companies are the investors and stakeholders of the schools around the area. These findings contradict the study of Maloney and Wolf (2017) who stated that public sources of funding tend to be more reliable than non-public sources such as philanthropy. According to the Green Dot Public Schools (2018), the funding comes through public federal, state and local finances while some district-run charter schools have been funded partly by private foundations.

In public relations to the community, cooperation between schools and universities is an important aspect; the involvement of teachers and teacher’s trainees are important too. These will lead to public relations activities as well as higher public recognition (Wegner, Janzen and Zehne (2015). According to the study of Johnson et.al. (2010), it should begin with administrators to teachers to school, bus drivers to custodians. Creating a good internal communications system will lead to an effective community outreach and media relations programs.
Not only the administrators and teachers, but also the students are encouraged to participate in community programs and voluntary programs led by the schools. The schools create an environment where the members of the community share together and learn together with the help of usually graduating students, in a way to secure a good image of the school. Peralta and Galaviz (2013) stated that when the students engage the community, and neighborhood through home visits, they understand the importance of bringing together communities, schools, and homes to create an optimum environment for the students’ success.

Effective public relations practices of the schools make organizations more effective (Mohammed, 2014) and also the school principals had enough awareness about public relations but routine activities had been carried out rather than planned activities (Coruk, 2018). In the study of Ferrara (2009), results showed that parents are the least vocal when compared to the teachers. Therefore, training for teachers to help broaden the narrow vision of parent involvement should be provided.

Some schools thought that parent’s involvement improve students’ chances for academic success (Schueler, 2014) and Community School Standards (2017). Even though, more schools focused and engage stakeholders such as parents and the local community and parental engagement proves more difficult, despite the fact that the school communicates effectively (Anchor, Benesova, Martina, et.al. (2011). In the same study of Chen (2011), it mentioned that in Indonesia, the level of parental participation and voice in school management is extremely low while the role of school committees is still limited to community relations.

In theory, Yes (2014) mentioned that communities, stakeholders, including families, educators, community organizations and businesses have come together to define problems in education and find solutions. These show that schools have a strong community relationship that help and connects each other. In addition, Sumarsono, Imron, Wiyono., et.al. (2016) mentioned that parent’s participation improves the quality of education in the aspects of learning, student’s affair, facilities and infrastructure, public relations, educational finance and school personnel. In some cases, teachers go beyond the call of being teachers. The study of Daniel (2017) stated that teachers learn new language to accommodate the families of immigrant, they embrace the challenges to promote school-community relationships and improve classroom instruction for the English language learners.

Technical-Vocational Schools in Rayong have public and private sectors. Private schools are usually financed by the companies, owned by family, corporation and other stakeholders while public schools are supported by the government, and receive funds from other charitable organizations. The government is also giving finance to private schools but this is in contrast to the study of Campbell (2018) who stated that this is diverting money away from public schools if the government subsidizes private education. These days, public schools are given incentives from the government, private companies and local stakeholders to improve the facilities of the schools and also to improve the quality of teaching. In terms of fundraising, it is suggested that leadership attributes of good communication and fiscal management experiences, and engagement within the local and surrounding community and involvement in social activities and events should be observed (Hargrove, 2015).

Every school has a different environment, policies and the behavior of the administrators and teachers. This has a positive or negative big impact to the teachers and students. The study of Rauf, et. al, (2012) stated that school culture has an impact and influence on the management and teachers. Therefore, it suggested that teachers should be encouraged by their principals to work for the common goal. It is also mentioned that poor communication underlies the interpersonal conflicts (Ustuner and Kis, 2014). There are a lot factors that can affect teaching. One of them is the behavior of the administrators, principals, teachers and students. In classroom settings, teacher’s classroom management strategies were affected by their gender differences. Female teachers exhibited more classroom management than male teachers (Ahmed, Ambreen and Hussain, 2018).

Karaferye and Agaoglu (2017) stated that management and leadership influence the teaching environment. In this study by Wright and O’Neil 92017), it was mentioned by Karaferye (2017) that in Canada, USA, the UK and Australia over 300 campuses were surveyed and it showed that leadership of deans and heads was rated the most effective in all countries except Canada where it was rated as the second. This finding was disputed by Uzun and Ayik (2017) in the paper which focused on school principals having the ability to solve the conflict and to maintain the collaborations between the partners. The results showed that teachers think that principals use avoiding and obliging styles at a medium level.
Communication is an act of conveying messages and information through verbal, non-verbal, symbols and behavior of an individual. Teacher communicates to the students in all aspect, different ways to convey the meaning towards the students. Communication does not only take place by means of words. Okoli (2017) mentioned that even ways of talking like pauses, stress on words, postures, facial expressions head movements and sounds are means of communication.

Communication skill is as good as content knowledge defining teaching effectiveness. For the principals’ task is to inform, supervise, guide, educate, and give performance feedback. Communication in various media is involved in the information transmissions, including e-mails, telephone calls, presentations, memos, and letters. This formal communication is used as a tool for avoiding conflicts and crisis, according to the study of Nwogbaga, Nwanko, and Onwa (2015).

Effective communication is the result of a common understanding between the communicator and the receiver. Communication is the way we share ideas, goals and directions even feelings and emotions according to Sabanci, Sahin and Ozdemir (2018). In addition, Akinnubi, Gbadeyan, Fashiku, and Kayode (2012) mentioned that it is a part of the responsibility of the school to maintain close ties with teachers and encourage maximum performance. Nowadays, technology is part of teaching, part of the students’ daily life. At schools, teachers use new technologies for teaching and learning and it is more efficient and effective method (Yalcin, 2012).

The communication of schools usually starts from the upper level. The administrators are considered as the head and should communicate with students, staff, parents and stakeholders in a daily basis (Egboka and Alike, 2018). In this part, the principal is the person on whose shoulders rest the entire administration, success or failure of the school. It is also mentioned that the principals identify the goals and objectives of the school (K. E., 2015). It is also having the skills, abilities in guiding and directing others and it’s a part of a managerial effectiveness (Olorunsola, E.O, Belo and F.A., 2018). In the schools, the administrators are accountable to the stakeholders in achieving the goals of education (Usman, 2016), and teachers expect their leaders to contribute to the collaborative atmosphere by resolving conflicts, supporting, protecting and respecting them all (Terek, Nikolic, Gligorovic, et. al., 2015).

In the communication from teachers to students, some may indicate it’s easier to penetrate the feelings and emotions of the students but others say it is crucial to invade their privacy. The study of Merdian and Warrior (2015) mentioned that students use social media or face-to-face meetings, or lectures. The finding showed that students preferred to attend lectures over reading slides online. Some students can manage to focus on studying online but others can’t concentrate studying online without help from the teachers or peers.

In creating an effective communication and successful engagement with the stakeholders, the leader or the administrators must know what parents expect or want from the school, what the stakeholders want to achieve in the particular school (Hillard and Newsome, 2013). This study corroborates the finding of Sumarsono, Imron, Wiyono and Arifin (2016) who revealed that parental involvement improves the quality of education and students’ affair, and boasts public relations of the school. The parents are the first and most important stakeholders of the school as they are putting their children at the school, they are conveying to other people to invest, witnessing the programs and activities of the school and spreading the news by any means such as word-of-mouth advertisement and it can go a long way. Other studies stated that it reduces students drop out risk (Argentin and Barbeta, 2016). This somewhat agrees with the study of Akan (2017) that the school managers and the teachers think that parents make a medium-level contribution to the effectiveness of the school. However, it suggested that the school environment and the parent attention, having an important place in the effectiveness of schools, need new understandings and practices to be on a sufficient level. In this case, it needs to be more active and open communication must be practiced. This finding is in contrast to the study of Lipsky, Friedman and Harkema (2017) who mentioned that teachers believe parental involvement is the key for cooperative partnerships as long as that parental involvement does not threaten a teacher’s professional authority. In the same way, the study of Ozmen, Akuzum, Zincirli, et. al (2016) stated that the school and teachers adopt an open-door policy for parents; and the schools collaborate with the parents, staff and other stakeholders.

In some instances, teachers are not so close with the parents because some parents are tending to overpower the teachers’ decision-making. In the study of Natale and Lubniewski (2017), results showed that there is a discrepancy between family and teacher communication expectations. In such case, teachers must learn how to reach out to
parents in order to become more involved with teachers (Albertson, 2012). As they believe parent-teacher interactions are immensely important and it is believed they can be reliable in terms of help.

Social media these days are so popular that even old generations are trying to learn how to use them. It is a blessing; some say that these modern technologies came about. The educational administrators revealed that there is a big contribution of technologies to educations. The result showed that social media have an effect on school administration and they should be used effectively implying that every school administrator should know how to use social media consciously (Bayran, 2017; Mann, 2016). The school administrator has likely little knowledge on the uses of these technologies compared to the teachers and even students. Most of the students use Facebook, WhatsApp and even in the schools, they use Facebook to show their pictures through activities and programs. According to the result, majority of the administrator use these social media. School principals use WhatsApp for communication with other administrators and teachers. It showed the positive views on saving time and money, and it is believed that they are safe and fast. For the students, mainly they like Facebook. For instance, in the sharing of ideas, and course materials, they can ask without having second thoughts, they can discuss freely and students can access anytime, anywhere (Kalelioglu, 2017; Cetinkaya, 2019; Mingle, Adam and Adjei, 2016; Ribble and Miller, 2013).

Akaranga and Makau (2016) stated that in some schools it is important to use the modern technology for educational technology because it is fast and modestly safe. The result showed that schools are in the process of automating their records by capturing, storing data, retrieving and updating all the information about school. This finding is in contrast with the study of Abed (2018) who mentioned that it not possible to update from old to new. But there is some problem, teachers are lacking knowledge in various uses of technology.

In Malaysia, Information, Communication and Technology is considered as one of the main elements in transforming the country into the future. The results of the study showed that the teachers are well-equipped and prepared with ICT tools and facilities which are considered as one of the main factors of success (Ghavifekr and Rosdy, 2015). In the old days, teachers use “chalk and talk” but these days’ teachers have wide resources of modern technologies. They can use social media inside the classroom like they can blogs, wikis, videos, etc., and it is the conventional approach to learning (Friedman, and Friedman, 2018).

Social media are integrated in schools and higher learning institutions for communication and the results suggested that students enjoyed learning the new technologies (Abulibdeh, 2013). In these modern times, the technologies helped the disadvantaged schools to uplift their standard of teaching and to improve learning as well. The teachers use these technologies to support learning, the knowledge and skills of teachers have developed and creativity improves as well (Johnson, 2016; Mihai and Nieuwenhuis 2015).

In using the technology at schools, a principal knows that it is for communication, instruction, administrative tasks and data sharing. According to the study of Waxman, Boriack, Lee, et.al. (2013) and Ogunshola and Adeniyi (2017), both gender and years of experience influence how principals perceive the functions of technology in their schools. Some of the principals thought that social media invade the privacy of an individual and it is too open while others think they are very useful and it pays to learn how to use them in their favor at work and the school itself.

Government sees the need for modernization and so they are allocating funds to the education to support the goal. In some secondary school in Indonesia, the local government, stakeholders, and education commission legislator helped to upgrade the ICT Integration. According to the result, it mentioned that government capacity as external support has influenced the success of the program (Putera, Mochtar, and Candra, 2015). It is also supported with the study of Oboegbullem and Godwin (2013) who stated that the staff and students of the universities in Nigeria must go through the seminars, workshops, and conferences on how to use the new program, ICT. This finding contradicts the study of Dlamini and Mlbatha (2018) who stated that despite the huge investments into ICT infrastructure by the government of South Africa, inequalities in ICT competencies among teachers remain. In the schools, they need to understand the use of this new technology, to be able to promote its use in the school, especially in teaching. However, principals in Malaysia had moderate competency in computer applications and it takes long time to master them (Arokiasamy, Abdullah and Ismail, 2014). Principals and teachers have to learn how to use the technologies in an efficient way. However, because of their hectic schedule, and more classes to teach, they lack time to enhance their knowledge on this matter.
In the Nigerian Educational System, the effect of information and communication technology has showed lack of professionals who know the program and it also affects effective teaching, learning and research. Common challenges are included but are not limited to poor funding, lack of infrastructure and lack of integration into curriculum (Baba and Odiba, 2015). Therefore, the government should ensure that principals, teachers and computer personnel should go through trainings, seminars and workshops in the use of computers and other ICT (Adeyemi and Olaleye, 2010).

In Thailand, the economic growth is continuous. Education also is growing and enrollment is increasing and the demand for the private and public distribution of investment in education is high. Michel (2015) stated that the contribution of education to the growth regime is increasingly questioned. Thailand has financed the expansion of its education system through sustained economic growth. With this increase in education, Thai universities collaborate with other higher education institutions and international agencies in the region are being formed and strengthened. In this program, Thai higher institutions will play an active role for both in the Asian and the rest of the world (Sinhaneti, 2011). As the world is connected in promoting education, Hauwadhanasuk, Karnas and Zhuang (2018) mentioned in their study in three countries like China, Thailand and Turkey about the special educational programs, services and public policy toward inclusive education for individuals with disabilities and are improving.

In Thailand, although the education growth is continuously rising, limited levels of practical experience as part of the higher education curricula are offered and still lack skilled graduates (Reinhard and Pogrzeba, 2016). In Thailand, need for public relation in education, the most important things to pay attention are the different patterns of communication when dealing with stakeholders from other cultures (Chaidaroon, n.d). In addition, Aornvuthivorn, (2016) mentioned that technical –vocational schools and Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET) should help in strengthening government leadership and practitioners, the decentralization empowerment of local actors, the active engagement of private stakeholders, the long-term strategic planning and implementations of the programs that align with national, social and industrial and culture of evidence-based policies and practices. In Rayong, TVET offices can be found and located especially in the public technical-vocational schools. In Thailand, public relations are active, it is experiencing a booming trend that keeps growing. They use social media to communicate and promote products and services (Puksawadde, Rerkkang and Jirasophon, 2015). It is visible in every school, that they have an office for public relations and their job is to go to every school, company and other stakeholders to showcase the activities and programs.

In Thailand, students are open to bring their cellphones inside the classroom. They can access the internet easily and the connection is fast. Some of the teachers allowed them to use it in their studies and some of the educational materials are downloaded in the app and can be accessed anytime. In addition, Sereetrakul, (2013), stated that students used Facebook on an average of one hour and thirty minutes, for the purpose of communication and collaboration and that number of hours spent on Facebook had no effect on their academic achievement and that using Facebook did not impair academic achievement. The study of Lakarnchua and Wasanasomsithi, (2013), mentioned that social media is integrated in schools and higher learning institutions for communication and reflection of learning which enhance teachers’ performance in leadership quality and effective teaching.

In Thailand, the school directors use educational technology less than 50% of the time (Tuntinakhongul, 2019). In consonance, the study of Akarawang, Kidrakran and Nuangchalern, (2015) mentioned that teachers and directors need training for practical use and understanding towards Information, Communication and Technology for establishing strategies, improving teacher’s and supporting staff technological skills (Aporn, Sisa and Tungkunan, 2019). Many apps are used in educational materials. Some of them have to be paid to access and use them. More companies are starting to create an app, website to help in the improvement and measurement of students’ knowledge. In the study of Boie, (2012), it was mentioned that to maintain relationship between an organization and its publics. ICT is used as a bridge between internal and external communication. In order for public relations to work successfully, they need to communicate in and out of the organization, working side by side to showcase the school, companies and create a positive and good image.

In Rayong Technical College, there are numerous programs for the parents, stakeholders and the community. They had a scheduled parents’ meeting every semester. Visiting teachers and administrators coming from Nong Khai Vocational College, share knowledge between these two schools on teaching and learning management and quality assurance work. The administrators and teachers together with the students attended the Rayong on the Thai Heritage Conservation Day. They exposed the students through community outreach and showed them how to
Rayong Technical College supported the community by engaging and helping through the students. The Director of the Cooperation Bureau was honored to deliver the innovative water spray machines from the volunteer programs to reduce smoke, reduce dust to be installed in areas with critical dust conditions and are at high risks. Together with the educational institutions, they got a total of 25 sets. They invited people from all over Rayong to join the professional training on how to repair electrical equipment and electronics to check the condition of cars and motorcycles located at the Community Repair Center (Fix it Center) in the school premises. The Eastern Polypack Company Limited made a generous donation to colleges in the eastern area for the academic year 2018. For the first year diploma students, each received 5,000 baht for a total of 25,000 baht. Companies like PCT (Public Company Limited), together with EEC (The Eastern Economic Corridor) and Rayong itself cooperated in teaching the local food profession in Rayong to support the expansion of the former S-curve industry in the tourism industry. The Rayong Technical College, along with the students in the field of electrical and petrochemical, co-produce solar water turbines and donated them to the Central Prison, Rayong and with the budget support of 100,000 baht from the SCG Foundation under the “Young Do Good Youth Project Year 5”. Mr. Worawit Supachokchai, Mayor of Rayong presided over the scholarship ceremony of the Foundation for Poor Students in Klaeng District for the second semester of the academic year 2017, totaling to 43 scholarships, overall total of 268,000 baht consisting of 11 vocational certificate levels with 4,000 baht per scholarship and vocational diploma level of 32 scholarships with 7,000 baht each.

On collaboration between schools and companies, the Bilateral Vocational Education System project offered the contracts to certified first bilateral students to train and prepare for work and with the cooperation of Rayong Technical College and CP All Publish Company Limited. Mr. Chiraphong Chanprasert Deputy Director of Institute of Vocational Education, Eastern Region gives certificates to students attending the training under the potential development project for entrepreneurs in the design and manufacture of automotive parts and technology aircraft in the Eastern Special Development Zone with the Institute of Vocational Education in the East. It has collaborated with Sahakit Institute to study and develop Thai-German electronic media with King Mongkut’s University of Technology North Bangkok at Rayong Technical College.

Mr. Theerawat Sudsook, Deputy Governor of Rayong Province presided over the ceremony to give the scholarship with HMC Polymers Company Limited with the support scholarships for Rayong Technical College. Every student receives 35,000 baht and supports five types of garbage bins with four tanks, a total of 20 tanks.

For the stakeholders of Rayong Technical College, the companies around the area have many programs to offer. Thai-Oil Energy Services Company Limited (TES) made a career roadshow event; they help and give trainings to students about written exam and how to do a job interview. The BLCP Power Company Limited provides scholarships for students in the vocational certificate level, industrial type consisting of mechanical techniques, measuring and controlling tools. The company gave four grants of 10,000 baht each, totaling to 40,000 baht at the multipurpose yard. Thai Yamaha Motor Co., Ltd donated media and teaching materials, motorcycles, and repair manuals for use in professional courses, motor vehicles and small multi-purpose engines to be able to meet the need of the market.

Maptaphut Technical College has always welcomed the parents, stakeholders and companies to collaborate each other. They welcomed teachers from Phayakkhaphum Phisai Vocational College to share their ideas and opinions.
They hold a parent-teacher meeting every semester. They had a community “fix-it-center” program and it offers to the community surrounding the area and this program is done annually.

Maptaphut Technical College helped the needy students whose parents can’t afford to send their children to school. The basic requirements are: the family income does not exceed 200,000 baht per year with carrying interest of 1 percent per year and the student must be a Thai national. They are qualified for the Educational Loan Fund (Khorosot); they can repay it after graduation.

Maptaphut Technical College, opened a new project called V-ChEPC (Vocational Chemical Engineering Practice College Project). This is in collaboration with Petroleum Institute of Thailand, Education Phat Foundation and the Office. Scholarships are given to students who are qualified and selected with a budget of 100,000 baht each covering expenses such as registration fees, accommodation, meals, uniform and shuttle bus also with internship, extra-curricular activities, medical treatment and others. BLPC Power Company, Limited presented scholarships to students of this college. Maptaphut Technical College together with Total Honda Motors Ltd. and AP Honda Co., Ltd organized campaign activities for safe driving.

Rayong Polytechnic College has engaged the parent by having a meeting regularly. In 2017, scholarships were given to two vocational certificate students. They attended the program of water forest conservation and gave training and seminars to students on solving drug problems.

IRPC Technological College is open for parents’ visit as the school regularly held meeting with them. The school participated in the “Plastic rights garbage collection boat conservation Rayong River”. This is a big help to the community for the proper waste management and recycling. The school organizes public service activities like the fix-it-center, changing oil, repairs, lighting system, brake system, motorcycle repair, and repair of electrical equipment such as fans, irons, televisions, and audio equipment. IRPC Technological College, with the collaboration of other schools, signed an MOU with the Institute of Vocational Education in the East, Anca Manufacturing (Thailand) Co., Ltd; CPSC (Columbo Plan Staff College of Technician Education) and with Bulacan University, Philippines.

IRPC Technological College had joined merit scholarship ceremony in Myanmar, Ministry of Education of Myanmar and executives from PTT Group, Thai Oil, GPSC and PTT OR. They also started with Ford Start Engine Project Scholarships and BLCP Power Company Limited. The school attended the Annual General Meeting of Shareholders IRPC Public Company Limited 2017.

Rayong Business Administration Technological College (R-TECH), opens its school to the community. They participate in the Community Development Volunteer Spirit Project for the purpose of good deeds, public mind. The administrators and teachers, together with the students, participated in the anti-drug concert project, promoting recreational sports in collaboration with artists of The Voice and True Project. They also joined the garbage collection at Laem Charoen Beach and participated in the disease-free waterfront project on the conservation and development day of the National Cana at the Nam Nam Wat Nam Pak Temple in Rayong.

Rayong Polytechnic Vocational College is participating and organizing programs for the community. They organized an Open House with secondary schools participating in the activity. They also engage in World AIDS Campaign to make the students aware of the disease and educate them in visiting the people infected with HIV/AIDS and orphans affected by AIDS. They help and cooperate in the Environmental Development Volunteer Spirit Project at ChoengNoen, Subdistrict Municipality and promote the World Smoking Day Campaign against drugs in and outside school.

AKSORN Business Administration Technological College has been serving the members of the community who easily can access the service of the school. They organize a parents’ meeting for the students’ success and achievements. They participated in the Anti-drug activity and warned the students of the outcome and results. They were also involved in the World Anti-Drug Day Activity and organized the programs to go for this event. They got involved in Environmental Conservation and Individual Development Volunteer Camp and made the community aware of the program. The school also collaborated with and did the cultural exchange performances for Korean students by showing different cultures around the world.
Pattana Vechech Technological College collaborated and signed the academic memorandum of agreement for vocational education management between Pattana Vechech Technological College and Ban Chang Municipality and Tam Phla Municipality. Another collaboration was done with Thai Nishis Engineering Co., Ltd and participated in the academic record agreement for vocational education management. They participated in Vocational Labor Market Job and Career EEC’s in Rayong, letting the students know how to apply, then engaging them into the community’s activities such as Coral Reef Conservation Project and marine life, preserving the natural resource and environmental conservation and restoration activities, world no tobacco day, PTC Cup Futsal Anti-Drug Competition program and preservation and reduction of road accidents according to the agenda of Rayong Province.

Theoretical Framework
Public relations describe the various ways a company uses to publicize messages about its products, services, and overall image to other organizations, employees, stockholders, suppliers and also the community. At school, it is a way to attract stakeholders, company to invest, make donations and to show the community the great work it has done for the students.

Technical-Vocational schools in Rayong have a good strategic location as they are surrounded by big companies and a rich coastal area. This is where the school needs some good public relations to attract the corporate organizations in the area to communicate with their stakeholders carefully, to gain their trust and maintain good relationships so that the schools can benefit and receive help in tough times.

The theory of social capital is one of the most influential and most popular theories to emerge in social sciences, and research based on Coleman’s or Bourdieus’ theories of capital. According to the study of Galstyan and Movsisyan (2013), in their research on the relationship between education and social capital, social capital is positive, and it is a magic glue to create a productive environment for more effective allocation and use of scarce resources. In this theory, it stated that the more we interact with people, the more we trust them.

Furthermore, according to Onyx et al. (2011), social capital refers to human networks of interaction by which energy is shared. It is where you can develop strong relationships with the community; you can get the participation of the community life at the same time their trust. Social capital is about the connections between people especially between school and stakeholders.

It is a powerful weapon that encourages social mobility, it can influence an individual’s educational achievements, as stated by Rogosic and Baranovic (2016). Another study supported this theory that it helps shape a shared value that learning becomes possible among students (Liou & Chang, 2008). It discusses further that it gives an opportunity to the less fortunate students and to those low-income families.

Most of the technical-vocational schools are offering scholarships and free education and it is supported by the private companies and the government itself. All schools are allowing the community and families to participate in the activities held by the school. Yamauchi et al. (2017), supported this strategy. When families participate in their children’s education, it allows more benefits to the school at the same time to the students. This theory recognized the family and community assets and the importance of incorporating them into the school.

The technical-vocational schools allow parents and teachers to collaborate as they get involved openly. These will give a healthy relationship and positive outcome to the student’s education. Parents openly shared and volunteered in the educational programs and even donate material for the schools and extra-curricular activities, attend meetings regularly, and participate in the community outreach of the schools, as these are the potential benefits of social capital, stated by Imandoust, (2011).
Statement of the Problem
This study sought to determine the level of practice in public relations and the communication management of technical-vocational schools. It specifically sought to answer the following questions:
1. What is the profile of administrators and teachers in terms of:
   1.1 Age;
   1.2 Sex;
   1.3 Highest educational attainment;
   1.4 Length of service;
   1.5 School assignment; and
   1.6 Monthly income?
2. What is the profile of external stakeholders in terms of: age; sex; type of job; and monthly income?
3. What is the level of practices in public relations along its dimensions?
   3.1 Investor relation
   3.2 Government relation
   3.3 Community relation
4. Is there a significant difference between levels of public relations practices according to:
   4.1 Profile of respondents;
   4.2 Type of respondents; and
   4.3 Dimensions of public relations?
5. What is the degree of communication management among the schools in Rayong in terms of:
   5.1 Internal and External Communication;
   5.2 Staff Engagement; and
   5.3 Media Effectiveness?
6. Is there a significant difference between the degrees of communication management according to:
   6.1 Profile of respondents; and
   6.2 Type of respondents?
7. Is there a significant difference between the dimensions of communication management?
8. Is there a significant relationship between the levels of practices in public relations and the degree of communication management by schools?
9. What intervention program is proposed to improve communication management among technical-vocational schools?
Hypotheses
1. There is no significant difference between the levels of practice in public relations and
2. Profile of respondents;
3. Type of respondents; and
4. Dimensions of public relations.
5. There is no significant different between the degree of communication management and
6. Profile of respondents; and
7. Type of respondents.
8. There is no significant difference between the dimensions of communication management.
9. There is no significant relationship between the level of practices in public relations and the degree of communication management by schools.

Chapter 2
Methodology:
Research Method
This study involves a descriptive research design that uses a survey investigation of data collection from the students who took part in the study.

Research Environment
Research was conducted to the administrators and teachers in the Province of Rayong, Thailand. Rayong is an eastern Thai province in the Gulf of Thailand, known for its national parks and beaches. Neighboring provinces are from west Chonburi and Chantaburi. To the south is the Gulf of Thailand. Although the north is hilly, the province consists mostly of low coastal plains. Several islands in the Gulf of Thailand belong to the province, including the popular tourist destinations, Ko Samet, Ko Mun, and Ko Khod. The eastern province of Rayong has held its position as the province with the highest per capita income in Thailand. Rayong’s economy depends chiefly on three major sectors: mining and quarrying, industry and retailing and wholesaling.

Rayong province is divided into eight districts. These are further subdivided into 58 sub-districts and 388 villages. The eight districts are (1) Mueang Rayong (City), (2) Ban Chang, (3) Klaeng, (4) Wang Chan, (5) Ban Khai, (6) Pluak Daeng, (7) Khao Chamao and (8) Nikhom Phatthana. These eight districts were the location of the 10 Technical-Vocational schools covered by the researcher’s respondents.

Fig. 2: Map of Rayong Province, Thailand.
The researcher conducted the study in the 10 Technical-Vocational schools which belong to the public and private sectors. There are five (5) public Technical-Vocational schools: Rayong Technical College, Maptaphut Technical College, Rayong Polytechnic College, Klaeng Industrial & Community Education College and Ban Khai Technical College. There are five (5) private Technical-Vocational schools namely, IRPC Technical College, Rayong Business Administration Technological College, Rayong Polytechnic Vocational College, AKSORN Business Administration Technological College and Pattanavech Technological College.

![Fig. 3: Map of Districts of Rayong, Thailand.](image)

Technical-Vocational Schools in The Province of Rayong

Public Technical-Vocational Schools
The first public technical-vocational school is Rayong Technical College, located in 086/13 TaksinMaharach Road, Tapradoo Sub-District, Mueang District (City of Rayong). The total area is 122,468 square meters. On the third of October 1938, the Department of Vocational Education worked side by side with Rayong province to establish “Chang Mai Rayong School” (Carpentry School). In 1958 the school got approved for a name change to “Karn Chang Rayong School” and later it was upgraded to “Rayong Technical College on the first of May 1980.

The second public technical-vocational school is Maptaphut Technical College. It is located at 234 Ratburana Road, Huay Pong Sub-District, Muang District and has a total area of 105 square meters. This school is located at the heart of the industrial development of the country, and the coastal area is convenient for transportation by land, sea and air. It is called “Maptaphut Industrial Estate” and it is rapidly growing but there is lack of labor force. Because of this demand, the Ministry of Education established an educational institution that caters to the needs of the industry around the province. As to this day, they offered Vocational Certificate level and High Vocational Certificate level.

The third public technical-vocational school is Rayong Polytechnic College. Rayong Polytechnic College is an educational institution that the Ministry of Education has established in response to professional policies for the people and disadvantaged people in vocational education during the development phase 7 (1992-1996). It was assigned to the Department of Vocational Education, and was established on September 28, 1994, as a branch of Chonburi Polytechnic College.

Over the years, it offered vocational certificate programs and developed short-term professional courses. In 2005, additional courses such as the Diploma in Food and Nutrition, to cater to special students with physical disabilities. In the year 2006, they developed a course for teaching and learning transfer systems by offering vocational certificate programs (vocational certificate) in the industry category, Factory mechanic and Motor mechanics. In 2007, the curriculum was developed and offered Diploma level.
The fourth public technical-vocational school is Klaeng Industrial and Community Education College formerly known as "Klaeng Vocational College. It is located at 333 Moo 7, Krasae Bon Subdistrict, Klaeng District, Rayong Province with an area of 54 rai, 72 square meters. Klaeng Vocational College is an educational institution established in accordance with the policy of expanding vocational education opportunities of the Ministry of Education. The college establishment project was proposed and brought for the consideration by the Department of Vocational Education in 1997.

Klaeng Vocational College opened for teaching for the first time in 1997 in the Vocational Certificate Program (Vocational Certificate), 3 departments, Department of Automotive Electrician, Accounting, and short-term courses and a variety of short-term courses. In the academic year 2008, Klaeng Vocational College has opened a vocational certificate program (Vocational) in Business Computer. In the academic year 2012, Klaeng Vocational College has introduced the Diploma of Vocational Education (Diploma) 4 courses, namely Mechanical Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Accounting, and Computer Business.

The fifth public technical-vocational school is Ban Khai Technical College. Formerly called Rayong Technical College, second place, the location of the College is a royal estate of 202 rai, the Treasury Department, Ministry of Finance has given to Ban Khai Technical College. On 18 June 1997, the Ministry of Education announced the establishment of Ban Khai Technical College (Rayong Technical College No. 2) and approved to open teaching in the academic year 1998, two subjects, namely the Construction Technician and the Electronics Technician. In year 1998, the vocational certificate programs were opened: Normal System, Construction Technician and the Electronics Technician. In 1999, bachelor's degree programs in bilateral systems, four branches, namely, Construction Technician, Electronics Engineering, Maintenance Technician and Tourism Industry were opened. In 2001, the College opened another 1-year vocational certificate program, namely Business Computer. Teaching at the vocational level is the production technician branch (Mechanical equipment group) and the technical field of ship engineering. In 2002, the College opened a new vocational certificate (DVT) program, which is an electronic branch by organizing teaching and learning with Star Copper Nation Company Limited. In 2003, the College opened two additional vocational courses for students (DVT), namely Business Computer and Construction Technician.

In 2004, the College opened four additional vocational programs for students (DVT), namely Information Technology, Mechanical Technician, Hotel and Services, Industrial Techniques and Unity Industrial Company Limited. In 2006, the College has organized teaching and learning methods to transfer knowledge and experience for professionals to enter into a vocational certificate, which is in collaboration with the Office of Skill Development, Rayong Province and Industrial Estate Group, Tokai Company Limited, Samed Resort Company Limited, Electronic Company Thai Auto Parts Co., Ltd. In school year 2007-2008 and in cooperation with Burapha University; the Faculty of Engineering offered a bachelor's degree program in the Faculty of Engineering, two branches of Technology Production and Technology Fields in Industrial Management.

Private Technical-Vocational Schools
There are five private technical-vocational schools in the province of Rayong. The first is Integrated Refinery Petrochemical Complex (IRPC) Technological College, which is located in 309 Moo 5, Sukhumvit Road, Chernmong. The technical college was founded on 1 June 1995 through the initiative of IRPC Public Company, Limited, in response to the need for an educational college in Rayong to meet the demands of local and national industry for the on-going supply of skilled technicians and artisans.

H.R.H Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn presided at the College’s inauguration ceremony on 15th of March 1996. The founding concept of IRPC Technological College is “Create Social Values”.

As the school name implies, IRPC Technological College was founded in close collaboration with the industrial sector, namely IRPC Public Company, Limited. IRPC, including its subsidiaries, is the first fully integrated petrochemical complex in South East Asia. IRPC is a major employer in Rayong and contributes enormously to the prosperity, air quality, and welfare of the region and the nation.

The partnership between industry and educational college provides huge benefits to our students. It means they have access to and use of equipment, instruments and machinery that are modern and relevant to current industry practice.
The second private technical-vocational school is Rayong Business Administration Technological College (R-TECH). It is located at 77/1 soi Ruen Pram, Choeng Noen Subdistrict, Rayong with a total area of 6 rai and 20.3 square wa. It was founded by Worathep Phoompakdeephan, the director of Muangchol Commercial Technological College, Pakdeephan School in Chonburi, Pakdeephan Nursery School in Rayong. He was an experienced educational management director. In Rayong, there are not many colleges that offered Business Administration program. With this said problem, the school was established.

The third private technical-vocational school is Rayong Polytechnic Vocational College. It is located in an area of 14 rai, with a total of 5 Sukhumvit Road, Choeng Noen Subdistrict, Mueang Rayong District. Ajarn Udom and Ajarn Pissamai Saenghiran were always determined to continue their national education. They saw that it was appropriate to contribute to the educational burden of the country as well. So they proceeded to set up the secondary school “Sanghiran School” which is located at the foot of Phra Khanong Bridge, Phra Khanong District, Bangkok. Therefore, in 1969, another vocational school was established, the Bangkok Technology School, for industrial technicians. At the first stage, teaching was conducted at the vocational certificate level and extended to the diploma level in accordance with the state policy by opening the Auto-mechanic Department, Industrial Technical Department, Electrical Department and Electronic Technician Department.

In the year 1981, they saw that national education should be distributed to some regions, for the children who are far away in the countryside. They should have the opportunity to study as much as the children who live in the central. Therefore, the Rayong Polytechnic School was established, an indented IRPC factory which is in line with the Eastern Seaboard Development Plan that was being constructed at Map Ta Phut Industrial Estate.

The fourth private technical-vocational school is AKSORN Business Administration Technological College. It is located at 111/7 Moo 3, Sukhumvit Road, Ban Chang Subdistrict, Rayong. The name was changed from Alphabet Business Administration College to the original AKSORN Business Administration College then to AKSORN Business Administration Technological College. At present, Dr. Malika Chantabutra is the manager of the school. The college’s philosophy focused on good knowledge, great skill and being disciplined.

The fifth private technical-vocational school is Pattanavech Technological College. It is located in Samnak Thon Subdistrict, Ban Chang District, Rayong with a total area of 30 rai. The school was established by the founder who aspired to improve the education in Ban Chang. In the past, the school had a small number of students. Furthermore, the founder saw that the public-school education was not consistent with their expectation. Currently, the school is open to learners from kindergarten to the elementary level. It has a population of around 1300 with 80 teachers and one affiliated school: Pattanavech Business Administration School. This is open for vocational certificate and higher vocational certificate program in accounting, marketing and computer accounting.

Fig. 4: Map of Rayong Province, School Location.
Respondents
The first set of respondents are the 29 administrators and 218 teachers of technical-vocational schools in the Province of Rayong. This research focused on five public schools and five private schools. In order to get the preferred population, the researcher used the Slovin’s Formula. The distribution of respondents is presented in Table 1.

The table shows that in public schools most of the administrator respondents come from Rayong Polytechnic College, 3 or 11.1%, next is from Rayong Technical College, 2 or 7.4% and the least are from Maptaphut Technical College, Klaeng Industrial and Community Education College and Ban Khai Technical College, 1 or 3%. For the private school, majority of the administrator respondents come from IRPC Technological College, 14 or 51.9%, followed by AKSORN Business Administration Technological College, 2 or 7.4%, and the least come from Rayong Business Administration Technological College, Rayong Polytechnic Vocational College and Pattanavech Technological College, 1 or 3.7%.

For the teacher respondents from the public schools, most of them come from Ban Khai Technical College, 31 or 14.2%, second from Rayong Polytechnic College, 20 or 9.2% then followed by Rayong Technical College and Maptaphut Technical College, 19 or 8.7% and the least respondents come from Klaeng Industrial and Community Education College, 14 or 6.4%. For the private schools, most of the teacher respondents come from IRPC Technological College, 71 or 32.6%, the second highest is AKSORN Business Administration Technological College, 22 or 10.1%, then followed by Pattanavech Technological College, 13 or 6% and the least is from Rayong Polytechnic Vocational College, 9 or 4.1% and none from Rayong Business Administration Technological College.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents: Administrators and Teachers.

| School                              | f (Administrators) | %   | f (Teachers) | %   |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| **Public Schools**                  |                    |     |              |     |
| Rayong Technical College            | 2                  | 7.4 | 19           | 8.7 |
| Maptaphut Technical College         | 1                  | 3.7 | 19           | 8.7 |
| Rayong Polytechnic College         | 3                  | 11.1| 20           | 9.2 |
| Klaeng Ind. & Comm. Educ. College   | 1                  | 3.7 | 14           | 6.4 |
| Ban Khai Technical College         | 1                  | 3.7 | 31           | 14.2|
| **Private Schools**                |                    |     |              |     |
| IRPC Technological College         | 14                 | 51.9| 71           | 32.6|
| Rayong Bus. Ad. Technological College | 1      | 3.7 | 0            | 0   |
| Rayong Polytechnic Vocational College | 1      | 3.7 | 4.1         |     |
| AKSORN Bus. Ad. Technological College | 2   | 7.4 | 10.1        |     |
| Pattanavech Technological College   | 1                  | 3.7 | 31           | 6   |

The other respondents are the external stakeholders of Technical-Vocational Schools in the Province of Rayong. This research divided the group of careers on 11 categories. In order to get the preferred population, the researcher used the Slovin’s Formula. The distribution of external stakeholder respondents is presented in Table 2. Research was conducted with the external stakeholders around the province of Rayong in terms of public relations. The researcher decided to group their careers into 11 categories.

(1) Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources. Resources include jobs in farming, energy and oil production and distribution, and jobs in commodities, such as wood and animal products.

(2) Architecture and Construction. The category includes a full spectrum of jobs in design, engineering, physical labor, planning, management, and drafting. Jobs in design include architects, structural engineers, and infrastructure design planners. Jobs in structural building and repair include mechanical and infrastructure engineers, draftsmen, and construction laborers.
(3) Business Management and Administration. The category includes any management level job that has its core discipline in managing people, operations, and financial record keeping. Jobs include any business management position, from a line manager or business consultant, to a CEO or a VP of operations. Generally speaking, these jobs are cross-disciplinary, meaning that their function can be brought to other industries easily.

(4) Education and Training. This includes teachers, school administrators, academic support, subject matter mentors, special needs professionals, and academic advisors. Educational professionals are also not limited to the public sector, but also include curriculum consultants and designers, and professionals in educational content development, private tutors, private schools and certificate programs. In the training family, jobs also include corporate trainers, software trainers, speakers, conference providers, educational courseware developers, and implementation experts.

(5) Finance which includes all banking jobs, financial positions, and careers in the insurance sector. Typical jobs include financial analysts, bank managers and staff, brokers, investment bankers, investment analysts, financial planners, insurance agents, and all operational level positions within the sector.

(6) Government and Public Administration includes any number of types of jobs. In addition to encompassing any discipline (such as anything from science to accounting), every function of a professional is covered as well. Large management structures, complex regulations, and massive budgets require multi levels of management and oversight.

(7) Health Science includes doctors, nurses, surgeons, medical personnel, hospital administration, medical scientists, disease management professionals, and any number of related careers. In general, any job which has its focus in helping to cure or prevent disease and/or ailment falls into this cluster of jobs.

(8) Hospitality and Tourism. The category encompasses waiters, restaurant managers, hotel management and hotel staff, tour guides, travel guides, resort workers, and operational staff in any type of leisure or travel related industry. It includes the massive casual dining category, which employs a good percentage of hourly workers.

(9) Human Services include social workers, case workers, state and city officials involved in public planning projects, certain teachers and related staff, and additionally certain workers within the non-profit sector.

(10) Law, Public Safety, Corrections and Security. To this category belong the lawyers, paralegals, legal staff, judges, court professionals, and any legal consultan or related profession. Security jobs include all jobs in public safety, including the police and jobs involved in the correctional and prison system. Additionally, careers in the private security field are included. Jobs at the national level, including homeland security, are also in the law and public safety career group.

(11) Marketing, Sales and Services include creative designers, account executives, product marketing, and all related management level marketing careers. Sales positions include business development managers, sales managers, customer service personnel, sales support, and divisional sales operations management.

The highest number among the external stakeholder respondents are in Business Management and Administration and Marketing, Sales and Services, 90 or 28.8%. Then the second highest come from the group of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources, 59 or 19%. The third is from Hospitality and Tourism, 19 or 6%, then followed by Education and Training, 15 or 4.8%. The next is Architecture and Construction, 11 or 3.5%, then Law, Public Safety, Corrections and Security, 10 or 3.2% followed by Government and Public Administration, 8 or 2.6% then Finance, 6 or 1.9% and the least are Health Science and Human Resources of 2 or .6%.

Table 2:- Distribution of Respondents: External Stakeholders.

| Group of Careers                          | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Agriculture, Food & Natural Resources     | 59        | 19      |
| Architecture & Construction               | 11        | 3.5     |
| Business Management & Administration      | 90        | 29      |
| Education & Training                      | 15        | 4.8     |
| Finance                                   | 6         | 1.9     |
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Data Gathering Procedure
The revised version of the questionnaire was originally in English. Since the researcher’s respondents are all Thai administrators and teachers, the researcher hired a Thai teacher who teaches English in the school to translate the survey into Thai.

Before the survey questionnaires were distributed, the researcher gave it to the adviser for approval with Thai translations. Then the researcher gave a consent letter to the head of the school or the director for the approval of their distribution and randomly distributed to the administrators and teachers in each school.

The questionnaires were filled out and the school Human Resources officers were tasked to gather them afterwards. Then the researcher was notified to collect them. The researcher tabulated the data using SPSS for the calculation and analysis.

Data Gathering Instrument
The questionnaire was developed to obtain information about public relations and communication management in technical-vocational schools. The first set of questions is for public relations and it had three (3) dimensions. First dimension is for communication, the questions were taken mostly from Craig and Thornton (2009); and Khanal, (2016). The first-dimension questions focused on the public relations of the school and community managed schools in Nepal. The second dimension for public relation is focused on investor. The questions were taken mostly from Paradise and Heaston (2012), and it focused on the alumni relations in the community. The third dimension in public relation is for the government. The questions were taken mostly from Yang and Chiou (2010); and Castelli (2007), and it was the study on factors influencing the public relations practice in higher education.

The second set of questions is for school communication management. The questions were taken mostly from Aslestig, (2008). This questionnaire had been developed and evaluated for communication between principals and teachers in successful schools. The researcher hired Thai teachers who teach English inside the campus and translated the survey into Thai. The question is in English and below it is translated into Thai.

The questionnaire consists of two (2) sets, first is for public relations and the second is for communication management. The first set consists of four (4) sections. The first section deals with respondent’s personal information, such as their age, there are six (6) brackets to choose from. The second is sex, there are two brackets to choose. The third is their highest educational attainment and there are four brackets to choose from certificate/diploma to doctorate. Then the respondents answered the length of service which had five brackets to choose from. This is followed by the school assignment which is either private school or public school. After that, they have to choose six choices from the bracket about their monthly income and finally the type of job they have at present.

The second section of the questionnaire is all about public relations to the investor. The researcher put them in cluster for easier evaluation. The first is regarding the level of school practices to solicit for financial contributions. The second is the statement regarding the level of school practice to engage stakeholders and the last is regarding the level of frequency used to communicate with alumni.

The third section of the questionnaire is all about public relations to the government. The researcher grouped them into two sections. The first is all about statement regarding the level of practices of school functions and activities and the second is the level of practice used by the school to monitor the effectiveness of promoting good public relationship or reputation.
The fourth section of the questionnaire is all about public relations to the community. It focused on how the schools open and operate within the community and participate and involved the community in their activities. Also, they focused on the level of practice in communication links with students, parents and community.

The stakeholders were asked to rate each item so as to determine their level of agreement with each item statement in the following Likert scale: (5) = always, (4) = Oftentimes, (3) = Sometimes, (2) = rarely, (1) = Never. The questionnaires were given to the stakeholders and the researcher gathered them afterwards either the same day or at an appointment time by the group of stakeholders.

The second set of questionnaires is communication management. It has three sections namely; internal and external communication, staff engagement and media effectiveness. The first section, focused on the involvement of the management and teacher to the work at hand such as meetings and administrative duties given by the administrators of the school. The second section is for the staff engagement to the activities initiated by the management and how well they perceived it. The third section is focused on the media effectiveness. The respondents have to indicate how frequently they use that mode of communication and how effective it is.

The management and teachers were asked to rate each item so as to determine their level of agreement with each item statement in the following Likert scale: (5) = always, (4) = Oftentimes, (3) = Sometimes, (2) = rarely, (1) = Never. For the effectiveness of the uses of media, they have to rate it their level of agreement with each item statement in the following Likert scale: (5) = Extremely Effective, (4) = Effective, (3) = neither nor Ineffective, (2) = Somewhat Ineffective and (1) = Ineffective. The questionnaires were given to the Human Resource officers of each school who were tasked to gather them. Then the researcher was called for pick-up.

Treatment of Data
To determine the profile of the administrators, teachers and stakeholders, frequency and percentage were computed. For the level of practices in public relations along the three (3) dimensions, mean and standard deviation were computed. To find out if there is a significant difference between levels of public relations practices according to the profile of respondents, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), t-test were computed and subjected to least significant difference (LSD). For the type of respondents, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and multiple comparisons test were computed and the dimension of public relations, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), difference between means were computed then subjected to F-test.

To determine the degree of communication management among the schools in Rayong in terms of the three dimensions, mean and standard deviation were computed. To find out if there is a significant difference between the degree of communication management according to the profile and the type of respondents, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), t-test, mean and standard deviation were computed. To find out if there is a significant difference between the dimensions of communication management, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and multiple comparison test were computed. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to find out if the practices of public relations is related to the communication management of schools.

Chapter 3
Results And Discussions:
In order to describe the profile of administrators and teachers, the gathered data and their interpretation are presented in this section.

The Profile of the Respondents
As shown in table 3, 20 or 8.2% are under 25 years old, 47 or 19.2% are 25–29 years old, 94 or 38.4% are 30–39 years in age, 65 or 26.5% are 40–49 years old, 16 or 6.5% are 50–59 years in age and 3 or 1.2% are 65 years old and up.

In addition to table 3, 85 or 34.7% are males while the majority or 65.3% of the respondents are females.

This shows that most of the respondents are 30-39 years old and more female teachers and administrators are from the private vocational schools of Rayong province.
Moreover, for the highest educational attainment of the respondents, there are 12 or 4.9% of the respondents with a certificate/diploma in teaching, 162 or 66.1% had a bachelor’s degree, 70 or 28.6% with master’s degree and there was only 1 or 0.4% with a doctorate degree.

For the experiences, there are 20 or 8.2% of the respondents just had their first year of teaching, there are 69 or 28.2% with 1 – 5 years’ experience, 71 or 29% with 6 – 10 years teaching experience, 42 or 17.1% with 11-15 years’ experience and 43 or 17.6% with 20 years and above teaching experience.

For school assignment, 134 or 54.7% are in private schools while 111 or 45.3% are in public schools.

This research generally confirms that highest educational attainment of teachers and administrators was bachelor’s degree. For the length of service, the data show that 6-10 years of experience has the highest percentage and there are more administrator and teacher respondents from private schools.

For the monthly income of the administrators and teachers, 122 or 49.8% had an income under 20,000 baht, 91 or 37.1% had an income of 21,000 – 30,000 baht, 16 or 6.5% had an income of 31,000 – 40,000 baht, 6 or 2.4% had an income of 41,000 – 50,000 baht, 3 or 1.2% had an income of 51,000 – 60,000 baht and 7 or 2.9% had a monthly income of more than 61,000 baht.

For the type of job, 27 or 11% of the respondents are administrator while 218 or 89% Are teachers.

For the discussions regarding the income of the administrators and teachers, under 20,000 baht had the highest percentage and also for the type of job. It highlighted that there are more teachers than administrators. Most of the teachers received this bracket of income aside from the health insurances and bonuses. This is also the common salary around Rayong province.

**Table 3:** Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Profile.

| Age Range (Years) | Frequency | %   |
|-------------------|-----------|-----|
| Under 25          | 20        | 8.2 |
| 25-29             | 47        | 19.2|
| 30-39             | 94        | 38.4|
| 40-49             | 65        | 26.5|
| 50-59             | 16        | 6.5 |
| 60+               | 3         | 1.2 |

| Sex               |          |     |
|-------------------|----------|-----|
| Male              | 85       | 34.7|
| Female            | 160      | 65.3|

| Highest Educational Attainment | Frequency | %   |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----|
| Certificate / Diploma          | 12        | 4.9 |
| Bachelor’s Degree              | 162       | 66.1|
| Master’s Degree                | 70        | 28.6|
| Doctorate Degree               | 1         | 0.4 |

| Length of Service | Frequency | %   |
|-------------------|-----------|-----|
| This is my First Year | 20        | 8.2 |
| 1-5 years          | 69        | 28.2|
| 6-10 years         | 71        | 29.0|
| 11-15 years        | 42        | 17.1|
| 20+                | 43        | 17.6|

| School Assignment | Frequency | %   |
|-------------------|-----------|-----|
| Private           | 134       | 54.7|
| Public            | 111       | 45.3|

| Monthly Income (Baht) | Frequency | %   |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----|
| Under 20,000          | 122       | 49.8|
| 21,000-30,000         | 91        | 37.1|
| 31,000-40,000         | 16        | 6.5 |
### Distribution of Respondents by School

Table 4 shows the frequency distribution of respondents by schools. There are 21 or 8.6% of the respondents from Rayong Technical College, 20 or 8.2% are from Mapthaphut Technical College, 23 or 9.4% from Rayong Polytechnic College, 15 or 6.1% from Klaeng Industrial and Community Education College, 32 or 13.1% are from Ban Khai Technical College, 85 or 34.7% are from IRPC Technological College, 1 or 0.4% is from Rayong Business Administration and Technological College, 10 or 4.1% are from Rayong Polytechnic Vocational College, 24 or 9.8% are from AKSORN Business Administration Technological College, and 14 or 5.7% are from Pattanavech Technological College.

This paper highlighted that the IRPC Technological College, a private vocational school, has the most number of respondents and that Rayong Business Administration and Technological College has the least number of respondents. This is the biggest private vocational school in Rayong province so far.

**Table 4:** Frequency Distribution of Respondents by School.

| Name of School                                      | f  | %   |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----|-----|
| Rayong Technical College                            | 21 | 8.6 |
| Mapthaphut Technical College                        | 20 | 8.2 |
| Rayong Polytechnic College                          | 23 | 9.4 |
| Klaeng Industrial and Community Education College   | 15 | 6.1 |
| Ban Khai Technical College                          | 32 | 13.1|
| IRPC Technological College                          | 85 | 34.7|
| Rayong Business Administration and Technological College | 1  | .4  |
| Rayong Polytechnic Vocational College               | 10 | 4.1 |
| AKSORN Business Administration Technological College | 24 | 9.8 |
| Pattanavech Technological College                   | 14 | 5.7 |
| **Total**                                           | **245** | **100** |

### Profile of External Stakeholders

Table 5 presents the frequency distribution of stakeholders by their profile. There are 48 or 15.4% who are less than 25 years in age; there are 20 or 6.4% who are 25–29 years old, 55 or 17.6% are 30–39 years old; most of the stakeholders are 40–49 years old with 133 or 42.6%, 50 or 16% are 50–59 years old, and only 6 or 1.9% are 60 and above.

In addition, table 5 shows that 189 or 60.6% are males, 123 or 39.1% are females.

Moreover, table 5 presents the monthly income of the stakeholders. Most of them had below 20,000-baht monthly income, 97 or 31.1% with 21,000–30,000-baht income, 22 or 7.1% had 31,000–40,000-baht income, 21 or 6.7% with 41,000–50,000-baht income, 10 or 3.2% with 51,000–60,000 baht and 19 or 6.1% with 61,000 baht and above.

Table 5 also presents the type of job of the stakeholders. It shows that 90 or 28.8% are in business management and administration; another 90 or 28.8% are in marketing, sales and services; and 59 or 18.9% are in agriculture, food and natural resources. The least number of respondents are in either health services or human services.

In summary, most of the external stakeholders are 40–49 years old, receive a monthly income of less than 20,000 baht; and are in Business, Management and Administration and Marketing, Sales and Services.
In Rayong Province, these types of jobs are common. Under Business, Management and Administrations are employees in computer graphic designer, staff and clerk while in Marketing, Sales and Services are car agent, driver, businessmen, vendors, freelancers and traders.

The Inside Thailand report on 2016 highlighted that Rayong’s economy depends chiefly on three major sectors: mining and quarrying, industry, and retailing and wholesaling.

**Table 5:** Frequency Distribution of Stakeholders’ Profile.

| Profile                  | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|
| **Age**                 |           |         |
| Under 25                | 48        | 15.4    |
| 25-29                   | 20        | 6.4     |
| 30-39                   | 55        | 17.6    |
| 40-49                   | 133       | 42.6    |
| 50-59                   | 50        | 16.0    |
| 60+                     | 6         | 1.9     |
| **Sex**                 |           |         |
| Male                    | 189       | 60.6    |
| Female                  | 123       | 39.1    |
| **Monthly Income**      |           |         |
| Valid                   |           |         |
| Under 20,000            | 143       | 45.8    |
| 21,000-30,000           | 97        | 31.1    |
| 31,000-40,000           | 22        | 7.1     |
| 41,000-50,000           | 21        | 6.7     |
| 51,000-60,000           | 10        | 3.2     |
| 61,000 or more          | 19        | 6.1     |
| **Type of Job**         |           |         |
| Agriculture, Food & Natural Resources | 59 | 18.9 |
| Architecture & Construction | 11 | 3.5 |
| Business Management & Administration | 90 | 28.8 |
| Education & Training    | 15        | 4.8     |
| Finance                 | 6         | 1.9     |
| Government & Public Administration | 8 | 2.6 |
| Health Science          | 2         | .6      |
| Hospitality & Tourism   | 19        | 6.1     |
| Human Services          | 2         | .6      |
| Law, Public Safety, Corrections & Security | 10 | 3.2 |
| Marketing, Sales & Services | 90 | 28.8 |
| **Total**               | 312       | 100.0   |

**Level of Practices in Public Relations**

**According to Investor Relation**

Table 6 shows that the schools sometimes use Email, direct mail, facebook, alumni magazines/newsletter, line app, gala fundraiser, phone bank and individual phone in their investor public relation. This is indicated by the mean range from 2.7 to 3.3.

The same table shows that the schools sometimes practice the following means to engage stakeholders: alumni board meetings, meetings or events of alumni based on affinity/program, invitations to college events, invitation to students’ activities, college volunteer opportunities, community service projects, helping with students’ recruitment, and free alumni social gatherings. These had means that range from 2.7 to 3.3.

Table 6 also shows that the schools sometimes use the following ways to communicate with alumni: posting for Facebook, posting for twitter, posting for google, posting for college website, sending text messages, via college
administered online community, print newsletter/magazine, direct mail and individual phone calls. These had means that range from 2.7 to 3.1.

These results suggest that these social media that the schools use are applicable and reliable to the stakeholders since they are sometimes used for communication. The current study corroborates the finding of Shea, Cinotti and Stone (2018), that gaining comfort with technology is necessary due to the increased emphasis on technology in schools and that technology can also assist with communication with parents, school personnel and other stakeholders for implementation of school activities and evaluation of the schools.

Table 6: Means and SDs of the Investor Relations of the Respondents.

| Investor Relation                                      | Mean  | Description | SD   |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------------|------|
| Email                                                  | 3.0449| Sometimes   | 1.25368|
| DirectMail                                             | 2.7899| Sometimes   | 1.23820|
| Facebook                                               | 3.3106| Sometimes   | 1.32034|
| Alumni Magazine/Newsletter                              | 2.7110| Sometimes   | 1.19987|
| LineApp                                                | 3.1982| Sometimes   | 1.32744|
| GalaFundraiser                                         | 2.7415| Sometimes   | 1.10978|
| PhoneBank                                              | 2.7630| Sometimes   | 1.22674|
| Individual Phone Calls                                  | 3.0682| Sometimes   | 1.23891|
| Alumni Board Meetings                                  | 2.6984| Sometimes   | 1.14059|
| Meetings or Events of Alumni based on affinity/program  | 2.7289| Sometimes   | 1.10920|
| Invitations to College Events                          | 3.1311| Sometimes   | 1.09728|
| Invitations to Student Activities                      | 3.2406| Sometimes   | 1.09262|
| College Volunteer Opportunities                        | 3.3483| Sometimes   | 1.07157|
| Community Service Projects                             | 3.3124| Sometimes   | 1.13452|
| Helping with Student Recruitment                       | 3.1508| Sometimes   | 1.16091|
| Free Alumni Social Gatherings                          | 2.8510| Sometimes   | 1.17882|
| Individual Emails                                      | 3.0072| Sometimes   | 1.20995|
| Posting for Facebook                                   | 3.1903| Sometimes   | 1.22609|
| Posting for Twitter                                    | 2.7230| Sometimes   | 1.29681|
| Posting for Google                                     | 2.7140| Sometimes   | 1.30248|
| Posting to College Website                             | 2.9388| Sometimes   | 1.31102|
| Sending Text Messages                                  | 2.9569| Sometimes   | 1.22104|
| Via College Administered Online Community              | 2.7810| Sometimes   | 1.18388|
| Print Newsletter/magazine                              | 2.7181| Sometimes   | 1.19708|
| Direct Mail                                            | 2.7307| Sometimes   | 1.20372|
| Individual Phone Calls                                 | 3.0144| Sometimes   | 1.19191|

According to Government Relation

Table 7 presents the level of practices of schools in their relation with the government. Better government relations, and public opinion pressure had means that range from 3.0 to 3.3, and interpreted as “sometimes”. The sense of duty citizen and improved image and reputation had means that range from 3.5 to 3.6 and interpreted as “oftentimes”. The increased favorable media coverage, environmental projects, arts and cultural activities, conducting routine research to determine public attitude toward the school and how those attitudes might be changed, making contact with opinion leaders outside the organization, response to major social issues, major initiatives (e.g. new developments, services, and programs) and keeping bad publicity from a staged event had means that range from 3.2 to 3.4 and interpreted as “sometimes”. For the tools that schools used to monitor the effectiveness of promoting good public relationship, they start from monitoring media coverage, and utilize leaflets/posters, press release/press conferences, mass media, campaigns, wordof mouth, websites, school newsletter, and daily newspaper. These had means that range from 3.0 to 3.4 and interpreted as “sometimes”.

Prior to this research, it highlighted two reasons why they have to get involved in government relation activities of the vocational schools in Rayong. These are a sense of duty as a citizen and improved image and reputation. As can
be seen, these schools rely heavily on the donors and sponsorship from the big companies around the province of Rayong. They may have an assistance, funds from the government but they get more from private sectors and companies.

These results substantiate the study of OECD (2012), that the great public benefits of education have historically prompted governments to assume the primary role in managing and funding schools. It is also a trend in different countries, and it is a belief that the public interest in education can be better served by also involving private entities, including parents, non-governmental organizations and enterprises, in addition to government agencies, in managing and funding schools.

Table 7: Means and SDs of the Government Relations of the Respondents.

| Government Relations                                      | Mean  | Description | SD    |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| Better government relations                               | 3.3034| Sometimes   | 1.04720|
| Public opinion pressure                                  | 2.9964| Sometimes   | 1.06277|
| Sense of duty as a citizen                                | 3.6409| Oftentimes  | .95792 |
| Improved image and reputation                            | 3.5135| Oftentimes  | .99019 |
| Increased favorable media coverage                        | 3.4560| Sometimes   | 1.01621|
| Environmental projects                                   | 3.4488| Sometimes   | 1.00519|
| Arts and cultural activities                              | 3.3752| Sometimes   | 1.02713|
| Conducting routine research to determine public attitude toward the school and how those may be changed | 3.2460| Sometimes   | 1.03648|
| Making contact with outside leaders                       | 3.2388| Sometimes   | 1.05193|
| Response to major social issues                          | 3.4022| Sometimes   | 1.95908|
| Major initiatives (e.g. new developments)                 | 3.3214| Sometimes   | 1.07077|
| Keeping bad publicity from a staged event                 | 3.3483| Sometimes   | 1.20134|
| Monitoring Media Coverage                                 | 3.3579| Sometimes   | 1.02910|
| Leaflets                                                  | 3.3268| Sometimes   | 1.05303|
| Press Release                                             | 3.3268| Sometimes   | 1.06153|
| Mass Media                                                | 3.2890| Sometimes   | .99501 |
| Campaigns                                                 | 3.2962| Sometimes   | 1.02146|
| Word of Mouth                                             | 3.3591| Sometimes   | 1.04760|
| Websites                                                  | 3.3609| Sometimes   | 1.10466|
| School Newsletter                                         | 3.2011| Sometimes   | 1.09239|
| Daily Newspaper                                           | 2.9102| Sometimes   | 1.15640|

According to Community Relation

Table 8 presents the level of practices of the respondents in their community relations. Community people frequently visit school; the parent-teacher association is active in our school, have parent conferences with all parents at convenient times, the teachers return phone calls from parents promptly, parents get a periodic call from their child’s teacher for updates on their child’s progress, and the school invites community groups to tour the school (e.g., realtors, civic groups, companies, etc.) are practices of respondents for their relations with the communities. These had means that range from 3.5 to 3.6 and interpreted as “oftentimes”.

In addition, parents regularly receive a newsletter from their child’s school progress, parents from the child’s school meet with the principal/director on a regular, planned basis, the school board of the local school district keeps in touch with the community on key issues, the school uses multiple, evaluated, and targeted techniques for informing parents, celebrates students successes at every board meeting, and the school uses electronic mail to promote the school and to keep in contact with key individuals in the community are the means by which respondents relate with the community. They had means that range from 3.3 to 3.4 and interpreted as “sometimes”.

The Vocational Schools in Rayong maintained their community relations by having open relationships with the stakeholders. According to the result, six practices were highlighted. Community people frequently visit school; active parent-teacher association in the school; conferences among parents at convenient times; the teachers return
phone calls from parents promptly; parents get a periodic call from their child’s teacher for update on their child’s progress; and the school invites community groups to tour the school.

This result is supported with the study of Stefanski, Valli and Jacobson (2016) who revealed that partnership between schools and neighborhood communities support student learning, improve schools, and strengthen families and neighborhood.

Table 8: Means and SDs of the Community Relations of the Respondents.

| Community Relations                                                                 | Mean  | Description | SD   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------------|------|
| Community people frequently visit school                                         | 3.628 | Oftentimes  | 1.017|
| The parent-teacher association is active in school                                | 3.542 | Oftentimes  | .933 |
| Student’s flow from schools to community has increased                            | 3.482 | Sometimes   | .968 |
| Have parent conferences with parents at convenient times                           | 3.605 | Oftentimes  | 1.055|
| The teachers return phone calls from parents promptly                              | 3.658 | Oftentimes  | 1.008|
| Parents get a periodic call from their child’s teacher to update on their child’s progress | 3.626 | Oftentimes  | 1.014|
| Parents regularly receive newsletter from school                                  | 3.456 | Sometimes   | 1.032|
| Parents meet with the Principal/Director on a regular, planned basis               | 3.327 | Sometimes   | 1.092|
| The school board of the local school district keeps in touch with the community on key issues | 3.402 | Sometimes   | .992 |
| The school invites community groups to tour the school (e.g., realtors, civic groups, companies, etc.) | 3.569 | Oftentimes  | 1.002|
| The school holds open houses                                                      | 3.484 | Sometimes   | 1.022|
| Celebrates students successes at every board meeting                               | 3.474 | Sometimes   | 1.073|
| The school uses electronic mail to promote the school and to keep in contact with key individuals in the community | 3.461 | Sometimes   | 1.063|
| Others                                                                            | 3.398 | Sometimes   | 1.0791|

Public Relations Practices and Profile By Age

Table 9 shows that there is significant difference between the levels of public relation practices of the respondents when grouped according to age. Using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to test the differences, there is a significance difference in investor relations, government relations and community relations. The overall public relations practices have a p-value of .000. Therefore, it rejects the null hypothesis which is significant.

These results suggest that there is a significant difference in public relations practices of the respondents when they are grouped by age.

This finding rejects the study of Yolcu (2013), that school administrators’ opinions did not differ meaningfully in regards to age, gender, seniority level, position, or educational background in any of the dimensions in the scale. The schools are open to any monetary, or non-monetary but voluntary contributions.

Table 9: Result of ANOVA between Public Relations Practices of the Respondents and their Age.

| Age          | Investor Relations | Government Relations | Community Relations | Public Relations Practices |
|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Under 25     | 3.3500             | 3.5129               | 3.5799              | 3.4803                    |
| 25-29        | 3.2379             | 3.6099               | 3.7112              | 3.5200                    |
| 30-39        | 2.9216             | 3.3600               | 3.6406              | 3.3073                    |
| 40-49        | 2.7939             | 3.1835               | 3.3829              | 3.1201                    |
| 50-59        | 2.8803             | 3.1868               | 3.3309              | 3.1323                    |
| 60+          | 2.5733             | 3.0200               | 3.3367              | 2.9744                    |
| F-value      | 2.9561             | 3.0200               | 3.3367              | 2.974                     |
| Sig          | 7.302              | 5.062                | 3.764               | 6.531                     |
Table 10 shows the results of multiple comparisons between public relation practices of the respondents and their age. Since significant differences existed between the respondents’ perceptions on public relations, multiple comparison tests were run using Least Significant Difference (LSD).

Table 10 revealed that among the results of multiple comparison test between public relations of respondents were grouped by age, the comparison in investor relations between those under 25 against those 30-39; and those 40-49 years in age; had a p-value of .000 while those who are 50-59 years in age had a p-value of .001; and those 60+ had a p-value of .006 which is interpreted as “significant”.

The comparison between those who are 25-29 years old against the 30-39 age group had a p-value of .007; than those 40-49 had a p-value of .000; those who are 50-59 years old had a p-value of .010 and those who are 60+ had a p-value of .019. These are interpreted as “significant”. When compared to those 60+ against those under 25 years old, the p-value is .006 and 25-29 had a p-value of .019. These are interpreted as “significant”.

When the levels of practices in public relations to establish relationship with the government by the respondents are compared by each pair of age group, the resulting p-values are lower than the .05 significant level of the test. This gives reason to reject the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences between the levels of practice in public relations by the respondents. The paired comparison between the levels of practice in public relations by respondents for community relations when grouped according to age, showed that the p-values are lower than .05, the level of significance of the test. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that other age groups and older ones showed no significant differences in their levels of practice in public relations. This means that age is a significant determinant of the respondents’ level of practice in public relations.

| Dependent Variable       | (I) Age | (J) Age | Sig.  | Interpretation | Decision |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|-------|----------------|----------|
| Overall Investor Relation| Under 25| 30-39   | .000  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 40-49   | .000  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 50-59   | .001  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 60+     | .006  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          | 25-29   | 30-39   | .007  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 40-49   | .000  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 50-59   | .010  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 60+     | .019  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          | 60+     | Under 25| .006  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 25-29   | .019  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
| Govt relation             | Under 25| 40-49   | .002  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 50-59   | .012  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 30-39   | .023  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          | 25-29   | 40-49   | .000  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 50-59   | .001  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 60+     | .026  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 40-49   | .029  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          | 30-39   | Under 25| .002  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 25-29   | .000  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | Under 25| .012  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          | 40-49   | 25-29   | .001  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 50-59   | .026  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          | 25-29   | 40-49   | .003  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
| Community Relations       | 30-39   | 50-59   | .005  | Significant    | Reject Ho|
|                          |         | 40-49   | .002  | Significant    | Reject Ho|

Table 10: Result of Multiple Comparison Test between Public Relations Practices of the Respondents and their Age.
By Sex
Table 11 presents the results of t-test between the levels of public relation practices of the respondents according to sex. For investor relations, the male had a mean of 3.01 while female had a mean of 2.90 with a t-value of 1.519 and a p-value of 0.129 which means insignificant and that denotes the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

For government relations, male had a mean of 3.30 while the female had a mean of 3.34 and a t-value of 0.706 and a p-value of 0.481 which means insignificant and signifies the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

For community relations, males had a mean of 3.43 while the females had a mean of 3.58 with a t-value of 2.309 and a p-value of 0.022 which means significant and that denotes the rejection of the null hypothesis.

This means that the females have significantly higher levels of their practices compared to the males. This is in accordance to Vanc and White (2013), who stated that women held more liberal view of their role in society and in the workplace, it indicated a positive attitude.

| Public Relations Practices | Sex       | Mean   | SD    | t-value | Sig  | Interpretation | Decision |
|----------------------------|-----------|--------|-------|---------|------|----------------|----------|
| Investor Relations         | Male      | 3.0092 | .8607 | 1.519   | .129 | Not Significant| Accept Ho |
|                           | Female    | 2.9042 | .7676 | .706    | .481 | Not Significant| Accept Ho |
| Government Relations       | Male      | 3.2975 | .7831 | .706    | .481 | Not Significant| Accept Ho |
|                           | Female    | 3.3430 | .7366 | .022    | .022 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
| Community Relations        | Male      | 3.4322 | .8156 | 2.309   | .022 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                           | Female    | 3.5844 | .7380 | .544    | .567 | Not Significant| Accept Ho |

By Highest Educational Attainment
Table 12 presents the ANOVA results between the levels of public relation practices of the respondents and their highest educational attainment. Using ANOVA to test the significance of the difference, for investor relations, respondents with Certificate or Diploma of Teaching had a mean of 3.08, Bachelor’s Degree holders had a mean of 3.01, Master’s degree holders had a mean of 2.96 and doctorate degree holders had a mean of 3.46. The F-value is 0.250 and the p-value is 0.861 which is insignificant and denotes the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

For government relations, respondents with Certificate or Diploma of Teaching had a mean of 3.55, Bachelor’s Degree holders had a mean of 3.54, Master’s degree holders had a mean of 3.60 and doctorate degree holders had mean of 3.67. It had an F-value of 0.203 and a p-value of 0.894 which is insignificant and denotes the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

For community relations, respondents with a Certificate or Diploma of Teaching had a mean of 3.83, Bachelor’s Degree holders had a mean of 3.76, Master’s degree holders had a mean of 3.77 and doctorate degree holders had mean of 4.14. It had an F-value of 0.158 and a p-value of 0.924 which is insignificant and denotes the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

This means that the highest educational attainment of the respondents is not a significant determinant of their level of practice of public relations. This finding is supported by the study of Gundla, Kadam and Parab (2013). It emphasized that public relations are the practice of managing the flow of information between an individual or an organization and the public. The main purpose is to encourage and persuade the public, investors, partners,
employees, and other stakeholders to maintain a certain relationship, and disregards the status and educational attainment of an individual.

Table 12: Result of ANOVA between Public Relations Practices of the Respondents and their Highest Educational Attainment.

| Highest Educational Attainment | Investor Relations | Government Relations | Community Relations | Overall |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Certificate/Diploma            | Mean               | 3.0767               | 3.5475              | 3.8267  | 3.4842  |
|                                | N                  | 12                   | 12                  | 12      | 12      |
|                                | SD                 | .87878               | .49168              | .78486  | .56413  |
| Bachelor's Degree              | Mean               | 3.0049               | 3.5363              | 3.7551  | 3.4320  |
|                                | N                  | 162                  | 162                 | 162     | 162     |
|                                | SD                 | .71021               | .56363              | .65098  | .49216  |
| Master's Degree                | Mean               | 2.9566               | 3.5993              | 3.7730  | 3.4427  |
|                                | N                  | 70                   | 70                  | 70      | 70      |
|                                | SD                 | .79587               | .64105              | .65920  | .57631  |
| Doctorate Degree               | Mean               | 3.4600               | 3.6700              | 4.1400  | 3.7600  |
|                                | N                  | 1                    | 1                   | 1       | 1       |
|                                | SD                 | .               | .                   | .       | .       |
| Overall                        | Mean               | 2.9965               | 3.5554              | 3.7653  | 3.4390  |
|                                | N                  | 245                  | 245                 | 245     | 245     |
|                                | SD                 | .74058               | .58101              | .65660  | .51832  |
| F-value                        | .250               | .203                 | .158                | .167    |
| Sig                            | .861               | .894                 | 924                 | .918    |
| Interpretation                 | Not Significant    | Not Significant      | Not Significant     | Not Significant |
| Decision                       | Accept Ho          | Accept Ho            | Accept Ho           | Accept Ho |

By Length of Service
Table 13 shows the ANOVA results between the levels of public relation practices of the respondents and their length of service. Using ANOVA to test the significance of the difference, there are significant difference between investor relations, as indicated by the computed p-value of .014 and between government relations as shown by the p-value of .012. On the other hand, the p-value of community relation is .412 which is interpreted as not significant.

This means that the length of service of the respondents makes a significant variation in their level of practice in investor and government relations. It is observed that the more you gain experience, the more you become expert in dealing with the internal and external stakeholders. As what Sterne (2011) studies showed, good public relations are stakeholder relationship management-building mutual understanding with key stakeholders, using communication as a tool to achieve this.

Table 13: Result of ANOVA between Public Relations Practices of the Respondents and their Length of Service.

| Length of Service | Investor Relations | Government Relations | Community Relations | Overall |
|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------|
| This is my First Year | Mean               | 2.6460               | 3.6045              | 3.7675  | 3.3385  |
|                   | N                  | 20                   | 20                  | 20      | 20      |
|                   | SD                 | .84456               | .57981              | .68823  | .49045  |
| 1-5 years         | Mean               | 3.1688               | 3.6364              | 3.7177  | 3.5078  |
|                   | N                  | 69                   | 69                  | 69      | 69      |
|                   | SD                 | .74112               | .52899              | .61735  | .50023  |
| 6-10 years        | Mean               | 2.8386               | 3.3668              | 3.6830  | 3.2961  |
|                   | N                  | 71                   | 71                  | 71      | 71      |
|                   | SD                 | .64421               | .55673              | .62181  | .45041  |
| 11-15 years       | Mean               | 3.0662               | 3.5445              | 3.8367  | 3.4824  |
Table 14 shows the multiple comparisons test result between public relation practices of the respondents grouped according to their length of service. Since significant differences existed between the respondents’ perceptions on public relations, multiple comparison test was run using Least Significant Difference (LSD). When the levels of practices length in investor relations of those with first year against those with 1-5 years; 11-15 years and 20+ length of service, results showed computed p-values of .005, .035 and .030 respectively. The comparison between 1-5 years against those with first year and 6-10 years had p-values of .005 and .008 respectively. The p-values are less than the .05 level of significance of the test. The differences are significant.

The other pairs yielded p-values that are less than .05 level of significance of the test. This indicates that the differences are significant.

When the levels of practices in government relations by the respondents was compared, those with 1-5 years against 6-10 years length of service had p-value of .006 and is interpreted as significant. When those with 6-10 years length of experience was compared against 1-5 years and 20+ years, it had a p-value of .006 and .001 respectively and is significant. When those with 20+ years of service were compared against those with 6-10 years, the p-value is .001 and is significant. When the overall levels of practice in public relations were compared based on the length of service, the p-values were .015 and .006 which are interpreted as significant.

Table 14: Result of Multiple Comparison Test between Public Relations Practices in terms of Investor and Government Relations of the Respondents and their Length of Service

| Variable          | (I) Length of Service | (J) Length of Service | Sig. | Interpretation | Decision |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------|----------------|----------|
| Investor Relation | This is my First year | 1-5 years             | .005 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                   |                       | 11-15 years           | .035 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                   |                       | 20+                   | .030 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                   |                       | 1-5 years             | .005 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                   |                       | 6-10 years            |      |                |          |
|                   |                       | 6-10 years            | .008 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                   |                       | 1-5 years             |      |                |          |
|                   |                       | 11-15 years           | .035 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                   |                       | 20+                   | .030 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                   |                       | This is my first year |      |                |          |
| Gov’t relation    | 1-5 years             | 6-10 years            | .006 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                   |                       | 1-5 years             |      |                |          |
|                   |                       | 6-10 years            |      |                |          |
|                   |                       | 20+                   | .001 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                   |                       | 6-10 years            | .001 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
| Overall Public    | 1-5 years             | 6-10 years            | .015 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                   | 6-10 years            | 1-5 years             | .015 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                   | 20+                   | 6-10 years            | .006 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                   | 20+                   | 6-10 years            | .006 | Significant    | Reject Ho |

By Monthly Income

Table 15 reveals the ANOVA result between the levels of public relation practices of the respondents grouped according to monthly income.
For investor relations, all the p-values are more than the .05 level of significance of the test showing that the difference in the levels of practice in investor relation are not significant. This means that the monthly income of the respondents does not make a significant variation in their levels of practices in investor relations. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.

For government relations, the p-values are greater than the .05 level of significance of the test. This gives reason for the acceptance of the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the level of practice in government relation by the respondents when they are grouped by monthly income. This means that monthly income of respondents does not make a significant difference in their level of practice in government relations.

This means that the monthly income of the respondents does not make any significant difference in the level of practice of the dimensions of public relations. Most of the schools depend on the external stakeholders for the support they can give. The government is helping and contributing much higher fund to sustain the education budget (Brumfield and Miller, 2008).

### Table 15: Result of ANOVA between Public Relations Practices of the Respondents and their Monthly Income.

| Monthly Income | Investor Relations | Government Relations | Community Relations | Overall |
|----------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Under 20,000   | Mean               | 2.9668               | 3.3634              | 3.5826  | 3.3043  |
|                | N                  | 265                  | 265                 | 265     | 265     |
| 21,000-30,000  | Mean               | 2.8855               | 3.2730              | 3.4337  | 3.1969  |
|                | N                  | 188                  | 188                 | 188     | 188     |
| 31,000-40,000  | Mean               | 3.0689               | 3.3471              | 3.5768  | 3.3311  |
|                | N                  | 38                   | 38                  | 38      | 38      |
| 41,000-50,000  | Mean               | 3.1863               | 3.4093              | 3.6185  | 3.4056  |
|                | N                  | 27                   | 27                  | 27      | 27      |
| 51,000-60,000  | Mean               | 2.9000               | 3.1908              | 3.2408  | 3.1100  |
|                | N                  | 13                   | 13                  | 13      | 13      |
| 61,000 or more | Mean               | 2.9808               | 3.1500              | 3.2135  | 3.1135  |
|                | N                  | 26                   | 26                  | 26      | 26      |
| Overall        | Mean               | 2.9561               | 3.3200              | 3.5085  | 3.2613  |
|                | N                  | 557                  | 557                 | 557     | 557     |
|                | F-value             | .888                 | .730                | 2.060   | 1.298   |
|                | Sig                 | .491                 | .597                | .069    | .263    |
|                | Interpretation      | Not Significant      | Not Significant     | Not Significant | Not Significant |
|                | Decision            | Accept Ho            | Accept Ho           | Accept Ho | Accept Ho |

### By Type of Job

Table 16 presents the ANOVA result between the levels of public relation practices of the respondents grouped according to type of job was compared. When the levels of practice respondents based on their type of job was compared, investor, government and community relations showed p-values of .003 and .000 respectively showing that the differences are significant. Therefore, the type of job of the respondents make a significant difference in the dimensions of public relations practices. The type of job influences the relations towards investor, government and community. The school must open all school activities to the stakeholders.

This is in accordance to Ackerlund (2015) who suggested that in order to improve community relationships through public relations, there must be transparency through surveys, newspaper advertisements and open meetings that can help leaders obtain valuable feedback from parents and key stakeholders.

### Table 16: Result of ANOVA between Public Relations Practices of the Respondents and their Type of Job.

| Type of Job | Investor Relations | Government Relations | Community Relations | Overall |
|-------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Administrator | Mean               | 3.1085               | 3.4565              | 3.5463  | 3.3701  |
Table 17 reveals the results of multiple comparison test between the public relation practices of the respondents grouped according to type of job. For the investor relation practices of administrators against those in Human Services and Architecture, the p-values are .000 and .017 respectively and both are interpreted as significant.

For investor relation practices of teachers against those in Human Services and Architecture, the p-values are .002 and .007 respectively and are interpreted as significant. Between those in Agriculture and teachers, it had a p-value of .017 and is interpreted as significant. Between those in Architecture and those in Government and Public Administration and Human Services, the p-values are .028 and .000 respectively and are interpreted as significant. Between those in Education and Training and those in Human Services, the p-value is .021 and is significant. The comparison between those in Government and Public Administration and those in Architecture resulted in a p-value of .028 and is interpreted as significant. The comparison between Hospitality and Tourism and Administrator had a p-value of .000. The teacher got a p-value of .002 and is interpreted as significant.

For the government relation practices between those in Human Services and those in Education and Training the p-value is .021 and those in Agriculture has a p-value of .000 and both are interpreted as significant. The comparison test between Administrator and those in Government and Public Administration has a p-value of .030; Human Services and Agriculture has a p-value of .000 and are interpreted as significant. The comparison between teacher and Government and Public Administration has a p-value of .009 and Human Services and Administrator has a p-value of .000 and are interpreted as significant. The comparison between Agriculture and Teacher, Architecture and Agriculture has a p-value of .000 and Hospitality and Tourism has a p-value of .030 and are interpreted as significant. The comparison between Architecture and Government and Public Administration has a p-value of .011 and Human Services has a p-value of .000 and are significant. Between Finance and Administrator, the p-value is .030 and is significant. For Government and Public Administration against Teacher, the p-value is .009 and Architecture has a p-value of .011 and is interpreted as significant. For Health Science against Agriculture the p-

|                          | N  | 86  | 86  | 86  | 86  |
|--------------------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Teacher                  | N  | 229 | 229 | 229 | 229 |
| Agriculture              | Mean | 2.8890 | 2.9836 | 3.1830 | 3.0183 |
| Agriculture              | N  | 90  | 90  | 90  | 90  |
| Architecture             | Mean | 3.4913 | 3.6980 | 4.0280 | 3.7373 |
| Architecture             | N  | 15  | 15  | 15  | 15  |
| Business Management      | Mean | 2.9700 | 3.5383 | 3.7983 | 3.4367 |
| Education and Training   | N  | 6   | 6   | 6   | 6   |
| Education and Training   | Mean | 3.3463 | 3.2625 | 3.2050 | 3.2712 |
| Education and Training   | N  | 8   | 8   | 8   | 8   |
| Finance                  | Mean | 3.5350 | 3.6200 | 3.0000 | 3.3850 |
| Finance                  | N  | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   |
| Government and Public Administration | Mean | 2.8800 | 3.0579 | 3.1916 | 3.0432 |
| Government and Public Administration | N | 19 | 19 | 19 | 19 |
| Health Science           | Mean | 3.3050 | 3.8600 | 3.6750 | 3.6150 |
| Health Science           | N  | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   |
| Hospitality and Tourism  | Mean | 3.1650 | 3.5090 | 3.9580 | 3.5420 |
| Hospitality and Tourism  | N  | 10  | 10  | 10  | 10  |
| Human Services           | Mean | 2.6622 | 2.9850 | 3.1538 | 2.9337 |
| Human Services           | N  | 90  | 90  | 90  | 90  |
| Overall                  | Mean | 2.9561 | 3.3200 | 3.5085 | 3.2613 |
| Overall                  | N  | 557 | 557 | 557 | 557 |
| Std. Deviation           | .81507 | .75901 | .77988 | .66727 |

| F-value                  | 2.601 | 6.711 | 7.969 | 6.652 |
| Sig                      | .003  | .000  | .000  | .000  |
| Interpretation           | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant |
| Decision                 | Reject Ho | Reject Ho | Reject Ho | Reject Ho |
value is .030 and is significant. Between Hospitality and Tourism and Human Services and Administrator, the p-values are .030 and .000 and are interpreted as significant. The comparison of Human Services against Teacher and Architecture has a p-value of .000 while Hospitality and Tourism has a p-value of .030 and are significant.

For community relations practices comparison test between Administrators and Teachers, and those in Agriculture, Architecture, and Human Services, the p-values are .037, .001, .020, and .000 respectively and are interpreted as significant. The comparison between Teacher and those in Agriculture and Human Services, and Architecture has a p-value of .000 while Education and Training, Government and Public Administration and Administrator have a p-value of .043, .002 and .001 respectively and are interpreted as significant. The comparison of community relation practices of those in Agriculture against those in Hospitality and Tourism and Administrator have p-values of .002 and .020 and are interpreted as significant. Between those in Architecture and Agriculture and Human Services, the p-value is .000, while Education and Training has a p-value of .011, Government and Public Administration has a p-value of .001, and are interpreted as significant. For those in Business Management against those in Human Services, Teacher and Architecture, the p-values are .038, .043 and .011 respectively and are interpreted as significant. Between Education and Training and Hospitality and Tourism, the p-value is .031 and is interpreted as significant. The comparisons of community relations between those in Public Administration against Teacher, and those in Architecture, Hospitality and Tourism have p-values of .002, .001, and .008 respectively and are interpreted as significant. Between workers in Health Science and those in Agriculture, the p-value is .002 and is interpreted as significant. The comparison between Hospitality and Tourism against Administrator, Teacher and Architecture has a p-value of .000 while Education and Training, Government and Public Administration, Human Services and Business Management have p-values of .031, .008, .001, and .038 respectively and are interpreted as significant.

Between those in Human Services and those in Hospitality and Tourism, the p-value is .001 and is interpreted as significant.

Segura, et. al. (2019) mentioned that there are two clusters of stakeholders of the universities, the high stakeholder-oriented universities and the low stakeholder-oriented universities. The high-stakeholder-oriented ones perceive themselves to have a greater organizational complexity than the lower level stakeholder-oriented ones but they are more active in terms of resource acquisition. Hughes and Lynell (2014) supported this finding. They stated that there is another type of stakeholder called stakeholder groups’ levels of salience. These are the type who are critical to the university’s success during the regulatory approval process and appear to warrant more of the university’s resources.

Table 17: Result of Multiple Comparison Test between Public Relations Practices of the Respondents and their Type of Job.
| Government Relations | Human Services | Education and Training | .021 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------------|------|-------------|-----------|
| Administrator        | Agriculture    | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Government and Public Administrator | .030 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Human Services | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Agriculture    | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
| Teacher              | Government and Public Administration | .009 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Human Services | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Administrator  | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
| Agriculture          | Teacher        | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Architecture   | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Hospitality and Tourism | .030 | Significant | Reject Ho |
| Architecture         | Government and Public Administration | .011 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Human Services | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Administrator  | .030                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
| Finance              | Teacher        | .009                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Architecture   | .011                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Agriculture    | .030                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Government and Public Administrator | .000 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Human Services | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Administrator  | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Agriculture    | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Government and Public Administrator | .000 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Human Services | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Administrator  | .030                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Agriculture    | .030                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Education and Training | .043 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Government and Public Administration | .002 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Human Services | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Administrator  | .001                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Agriculture    | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Hospitality and Tourism | .002 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Administrator  | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Agriculture    | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Education and Training | .011 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Government and Public Administration | .001 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Human Services | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Administrator  | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Agriculture    | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Hospitality and Tourism | .002 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Teacher        | .002                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Architecture   | .001                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Hospitality and Tourism | .008 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Teacher        | .003                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Agriculture    | .000                   |      | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Hospitality and Tourism | .002 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Education and Training | .031 | Significant | Reject Ho |
|                      | Government and Public Administration | .008 | Significant | Reject Ho |
By Type of Respondent

Table 18 shows the ANOVA results between the levels of public relation practices according to type of respondents. For investor relations, administrators had a mean of 3.08, teachers had a mean of 2.99, stakeholders had a mean of 2.92, and had an F-value of 0.679 and a p-value of 0.508 which means insignificant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

For government relations, administrators had a mean of 3.79, teachers had a mean of 3.53, stakeholders had a mean of 3.14, and had an F-value of 24.345 and a p-value of 0.000 which means significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

For community relations, administrators had a mean of 3.87, teachers had a mean of 3.75, stakeholders had a mean of 3.31, and had an F-value of 26.168 and a p-value of 0.000 which means significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

The overall result showed the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is a significant difference between the levels of practices in the dimensions of public relations when the respondents are grouped by type. According to the study of Freitag and Stokes (2009) in Thailand, social status shapes public relations practices. The higher the status a person, the more people believe in look-up to, and trust and support the cause of that person. The most important is the school image and the public support. It is also said that the assessment of factors influencing school image varies across different groups of respondents (stakeholders) (Eger, Egorova&Pisonova, 2018).

Table 18: Result of ANOVA between Public Relations Practices by Type of Respondent.

| Type of Respondent | Investor Relations | Government Relations | Community Relations | Overall |
|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Administrator      | Mean               | 3.0752               | 3.7878              | 3.8722  | 3.5785  |
|                    | N                  | 27                   | 27                  | 27      | 27      |
|                    | Std. Deviation     | .84667               | .69600              | .70586  | .62645  |
| Teacher            | Mean               | 2.9867               | 3.5266              | 3.7520  | 3.4217  |
|                    | N                  | 218                  | 218                 | 218     | 218     |
|                    | Std. Deviation     | .72797               | .56035              | .65075  | .50234  |
| Stakeholders       | Mean               | 2.9243               | 3.1351              | 3.3068  | 3.1218  |
|                    | N                  | 312                  | 312                 | 312     | 312     |
|                    | Std. Deviation     | .86896               | .82895              | .81017  | .73542  |
| Overall            | Mean               | 2.9561               | 3.3200              | 3.5085  | 3.2613  |
|                    | N                  | 557                  | 557                 | 557     | 557     |
|                    | Std. Deviation     | .81507               | .75901              | .77988  | .66727  |
| F-value            |                    | .679                 | 24.345              | 26/168  | 17.101  |
| Sig                |                    | .008                 | .000                | .000    | .000    |
| Interpretation     | Not Significant    | Significant          | Significant         | Significant |
| Decision           | Accept Ho          | Reject Ho            | Reject Ho           | Reject Ho |

Table 19 shows the multiple comparison between the government relations. The comparison between administrator against teacher had a p-value of .080, against the stakeholder had a p-value of .000 and administrator had a p-value of .080 and is interpreted as significant. The comparison between teacher against stakeholders and administrator had a p-value of .000 and is interpreted as significant. The comparison between stakeholders against administrator and teacher had a p-value of .000 and is interpreted as significant. For the community relations, the administrator, teacher and stakeholders were compared. The comparison between administrators against stakeholders had a p-
value of .000 and is interpreted as significant. The comparison between teachers against stakeholders had a p-value of .000 and it’s significant. Under the community relations, when administrator and teacher were compared and vice-versa, teacher against administrator, the p-values are interpreted as not significant.

Lingad (2015) stated that even in times of conflict management practices by the principals the result showed that there is no significant difference as perceived by the teachers and school principals themselves.

**Table 19:**- Result of Multiple Comparison Test between Government and Community Relation Practices by Type of Respondent

| Dependent Variable | (I) Type of Respondent | (J) Type of Respondent | Sig. | Interpretation | Decision |
|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------|----------------|----------|
| Government Relations | Administrator | Teacher | .080 | Significant | Reject Ho |
| | | Stakeholders | .000 | Significant | Reject Ho |
| | Teacher | Administrator | .080 | Significant | Reject Ho |
| | | Stakeholders | .000 | Significant | Reject Ho |
| | Stakeholders | Administrator | .000 | Significant | Reject Ho |
| | | Teacher | .000 | Significant | Reject Ho |
| Community Relations | Administrator | Teacher | .430 | Not Significant | Accept Ho |
| | | Stakeholders | .000 | Significant | Reject Ho |
| | Teacher | Administrator | .430 | Not Significant | Accept Ho |
| | | Stakeholders | .000 | Significant | Reject Ho |
| | Stakeholders | Administrator | .000 | Significant | Reject Ho |
| | | Teacher | .000 | Significant | Reject Ho |
| Overall | Administrator | Teacher | .237 | Not Significant | Accept Ho |
| | | Stakeholders | .000 | Significant | Reject Ho |
| | Teacher | Administrator | .237 | Not Significant | Accept Ho |
| | | Stakeholders | .000 | Significant | Reject Ho |
| | Stakeholders | Administrator | .000 | Significant | Reject Ho |
| | | Teacher | .000 | Significant | Reject Ho |

**By Dimension**

Table 20 shows the ANOVA results between public relation practices by dimensions. Investor relations had a mean of 2.96, government relations had a mean of 3.32 and community relations had a mean of 3.57. It had an over-all F-value of 79.522 and an over-all p-value of 0.000 which means significant.

Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected because they really differ from one another in favor to community relations.

Ni, Yan and Pounder (2017) stated that among all the stakeholders, principals perceived themselves to have the greatest influence in school decisions in almost all key decision areas while other stakeholders also either support or inhibit their own influence. Still the principal or administrator has the decision to make and have it final.

**Table 20:**- Result of ANOVA between Public Relation Practices by Dimension.

| Public Relations Practices | Mean | SD    | F-value | Sig  | Interpretation Description |
|-----------------------------|------|-------|---------|------|---------------------------|
| Investor Relations          | 2.9561 | .81507 | 79.522  | .000 | Significant               |
| Government Relations        | 3.3195 | .75842 |         |      | Reject Ho                 |
| Community Relations         | 3.5680 | .75954 |         |      |                           |
| Total                       | 3.2626 | .81738 |         |      |                           |

Table 21 presents the multiple comparison between public relation practices of the respondents by dimensions. It shows that the levels of public relations practices by respondents in community relations is significantly higher than those in investor or government relations.
In Rayong, the community stakeholders have different points of views, ideas as to what extent they can support the school. There are a lot of private companies in different sectors like oil companies, manufacturing of cars and seafood. Aside from that, most of those in the community are engaged in agriculture, marketing buying and selling business.

Table 21: Result of Multiple Comparison Test between Public Relation Practices by Dimension.

| (I) Public Relation | (J) Public Relation | Sig. | Interpretation | Decision |
|---------------------|---------------------|------|----------------|----------|
| Investor Relations  | Government Relations| .000 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                     | Community Relations  | .000 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
| Government Relations| Investor Relations  | .000 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                     | Community Relations  | .000 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
| Community Relations | Investor Relations  | .000 | Significant    | Reject Ho |
|                     | Government Relations| .000 | Significant    | Reject Ho |

Degree of Communication Management
Internal and External Communication

Table 22 presents the frequency of communication management practices among the schools in Rayong in terms of internal and external communication. It shows that faculty meetings, teacher team meetings, morning assembly announcement, kick-off meetings, individually organized meetings, other planned meetings; e.g. team leader meetings, development meetings, student conferences team leader meetings, development meetings, student conferences, informal meetings initiated by teacher, informal meetings initiated by administrators, unannounced classroom visits, administrative duties (e.g., hiring, budgeting, scheduling, meetings), instructional leadership (e.g., developing curriculum and pedagogy), supervising and evaluating teachers are oftentimes done in the schools.

The internal and external communication methods by the administrators and teachers are oftentimes used and positively gained good results. The standard deviations are higher than 0.05 which tells us that they are more spread out or dispersed.

The finding is similar to the study of Victor (2017) who stated that there must be a good communication mechanism among teachers, students and school administrators within and outside the schools for goal achievement at all levels of education.

Table 22: Means and SDs of the Internal and External Communication Management of the Respondents.

| Internal and External Communications                                               | Mean   | Description | SD   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|-------------|------|
| Faculty Staff meetings                                                             | 4.306  | Oftentimes  | .70141|
| Teacher Team meetings                                                              | 4.244  | Oftentimes  | .71662|
| Morning Assembly Announcement                                                       | 4.375  | Oftentimes  | .78263|
| Kick-Off meetings                                                                  | 4.012  | Oftentimes  | .78135|
| Individually organized meetings                                                    | 3.620  | Oftentimes  | .95320|
| Other planned meetings; e.g. Team leader meetings, Development meetings, conferences| 4.036  | Oftentimes  | .79101|
| Informal meetings initiated by teacher                                             | 3.742  | Oftentimes  | .85603|
| Informal meetings initiated by administrators                                      | 3.767  | Oftentimes  | .87248|
| Unannounced classroom visits                                                       | 3.449  | Oftentimes  | .99303|
| Announced or planned classroom visits                                              | 3.685  | Oftentimes  | .87027|
| Administrative duties (e.g., hiring, budgeting)                                    | 3.804  | Oftentimes  | .84105|
| Instructional leadership (developing curriculum)                                  | 3.849  | Oftentimes  | .81837|
| Supervising and evaluating teachers and others                                     | 3.849  | Oftentimes  | .84788|

Staff Engagement

Table 23 presents the frequency of communication management among the schools in Rayong in terms of staff engagement, communication about teaching and instruction, communication in relation to the curriculum and school policies, communication about every day activities (school management), communication about the schools
vision and goals, communication about student social behavior and rules, communication in relation to assessment and grading, communication about school outcomes, communication about every day activities (mainly practical issues), communication regarding school improvement, and communication about outcomes in relation to teaching and learning had means that range from 3.6 to 4.0 and interpreted as “oftentimes”.

The staff engagement showed positive results that they are actively engaging and participating for the common goals and vision of the schools. This is in consonance to the study of Sang (2016) who stated that through communication, they release and express their emotions and feelings for fulfillment of social needs. They give feedback on progress toward the goals and stimulate motivation towards each other.

Table 23: Means and SDs of the Staff Engagement Communication Management of the Respondents.

| Staff Engagement                                                                 | Mean  | Description   | SD  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|---------------|-----|
| Communication about teaching and instruction                                     | 4.012 | Oftentimes    | .786|
| Communication in relation to the curriculum and schools’ policies                | 3.840 | Oftentimes    | .821|
| Communication about every day activities                                         | 3.853 | Oftentimes    | .929|
| Communication about the schools vision and goals                                 | 3.881 | Oftentimes    | .862|
| Communication about student social behavior and rules                            | 3.963 | Oftentimes    | .865|
| Communication in relation to assessment/grading                                   | 3.906 | Oftentimes    | .860|
| Communication about school Outcomes                                              | 3.624 | Oftentimes    | 1.04 |
| Communication about every day activities (mainly practical issues)               | 3.914 | Oftentimes    | .899|
| Communication regarding school improvement                                        | 3.791 | Oftentimes    | .906|
| Communication about outcomes in relation to teaching and learning                | 3.902 | Oftentimes    | .813|

Media Effectiveness

Table 24 presents the frequency of communication management among the schools in Rayong in terms of media effectiveness. Media effectiveness, student handbook, workshops, line app, facebook, twitter, youtube, face to face, instagram, google, skype, school website, newsletter, memos, department head/colleague, telephone and school meeting had means that range from 2.2 to 4.1 and interpreted as “oftentimes”. This shows that school administrators and teachers are aware of all the social media application to use and the data show that they often used these methods of communication. The researcher observed that in Thailand, school administrators often or always used Line application as a means of communication to the teachers.

According to the research of Eke and Singh (2018), school managers have taken advantage of social media as a way of communicating through teachers and students. In their study they focused on school-based violence and the result was that school used social media to communicate to harness information for a decision-making process.

Table 24: Means and SDs of the Communication Management of the Respondents in terms of Media Effectiveness.

| Media Effectiveness        | Mean   | Description   | SD  |
|----------------------------|--------|---------------|-----|
| Media Effectiveness        | 3.8816 | Oftentimes    | 1.074|
| Student Handbook           | 3.1143 | Oftentimes    | 1.045|
| Workshops                  | 3.4612 | Oftentimes    | 1.045|
| Line App                   | 4.1224 | Oftentimes    | 1.109|
| Facebook                   | 3.9102 | Oftentimes    | 1.116|
| Twitter                    | 2.3197 | Oftentimes    | 1.291|
| Youtube                    | 3.0898 | Oftentimes    | 1.336|
| Face to Face               | 3.2898 | Oftentimes    | 1.349|
| Instagram                  | 2.5551 | Oftentimes    | 1.300|
| Google                     | 2.9306 | Oftentimes    | 1.492|
| Skype                      | 2.2377 | Oftentimes    | 1.263|
| School Website             | 2.8163 | Oftentimes    | 1.225|
| Newsletter                 | 3.4000 | Oftentimes    | 1.242|
| Memos                      | 3.0735 | Oftentimes    | 1.343|
| Department Head/Colleague  | 3.3061 | Oftentimes    | 1.290|
| Telephone Calls            | 3.6327 | Oftentimes    | 1.188|
Degree of Communication Management of Respondents by Profile

By Sex

Table 25 shows the results of t-test between the degrees of communication management of the respondents grouped according to sex. For internal and external management, male had a mean of 3.85, female had a mean of 3.92 with a t-value of 1.048 and a p-value of 0.296 which means insignificant. This denotes the acceptance of the null hypothesis. For staff engagement, male had a mean of 3.75 and female had a mean of 3.93 with a t-value of 1.941 and a p-value of 0.243 which means insignificant. This signifies the acceptance of the null hypothesis. For media effectiveness, male had a mean of 3.16 and female had a mean of 3.25. It had a t-value of 0.990 and a p-value of 0.323 which means insignificant that denotes the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

There is no significant difference in the communication management between male or female. This suggests that there’s really not much difference between male or female in terms of communicating. Sex is not a significant determinant of communication management of respondents. This finding corroborates the study of Matheri, Cheloti, ad Mulwa (2015), which focused on the effects of principals’ gender on management effectiveness. Between the principals’ gender, there was no significant difference between the two dimensions.

| Communication Management | Sex   | Mean     | t-value | Sig  | Interpretation/Decision |
|--------------------------|-------|----------|---------|------|-------------------------|
| Internal and External    | Male  | 3.848    | 1.048   | .296 | Not Significant          |
|                          | Female| 3.932    |         |      | Accept Ho               |
| Staff Engagement         | Male  | 3.750    | 1.941   | .243 | Not Significant          |
|                          | Female| 3.931    |         |      | Accept Ho               |
| Media Effectiveness      | Male  | 3.156    | .990    | .323 | Not Significant          |
|                          | Female| 3.254    |         |      | Accept Ho               |

By Age

Table 26 shows the ANOVA result between the degrees of communication management of the respondents grouped according to age. For those who are under 25 years in age, internal and external communication had a mean of 3.79, staff engagement had a mean of 3.80 and media effectiveness had a mean of 3.48. For respondents who are 25 – 29 years old, internal and external communication had a mean of 3.94, staff engagement had a mean of 3.97 and media effectiveness had a mean of 3.02. For those who are 30 – 39 years old, internal and external communication had a mean of 3.86, staff engagement had a mean of 3.80 and media effectiveness had a mean of 3.23. For those who are 40 – 49 years old, internal and external communication had a mean of 3.92, staff engagement had a mean of 3.90 and media effectiveness had a mean of 3.21. For those who are 50 – 59 years old, internal and external communication had a mean of 4.18, staff engagement had a mean of 4.04 and media effectiveness had a mean of 3.46. For respondents who are 60 years old and above, internal and external communication had a mean of 3.60, staff engagement had a mean of 3.30 and media effectiveness had a mean of 3.37. Internal and external communication had an over-all F-value of 1.162 and a p-value of 0.329 which means insignificant. Staff engagement had an over-all F-value of 1.005 and an over-all p-value of 0.415 which means insignificant. Media effectiveness had an over-all F-value of 1.537 and an over-all p-value of 0.179 which means insignificant.

This denotes the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This means that the degrees of communication management of the respondents are not determined significantly by their age. This finding is similar to the study of Terek, Nikolic, Gligorovic, Glusac and Tasic (2014), which focused on the communication satisfaction of teachers to their principals’ management of communication. Age was not confirmed as a significant determinant of the principal’s management of communication.

Table 26:- Result of ANOVA between the Communication Management of Respondents and their Age.

| Age (years) | Internal and External Communication | Staff Engagement | Media Effectiveness |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Under 25    | Mean 3.7923                         | 3.8000           | 3.4775             |
| N           | 20                                 | 20               | 20                 |
## By Highest Educational Attainment

Table 27 reveals the ANOVA results between the degrees of communication management of respondents grouped according to their highest educational attainment. For the management of internal and external communications, regardless of the highest educational attainment, the p-value of .354 is greater than the .05 level of significance of the test indicating that the difference is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

For the management of staff engagement, those with Certificate/Diploma in Teaching had a mean of 3.73, Bachelor’s Degree holders had a mean of 3.89, Master’s Degree holders had a mean of 3.84, Doctorate Degree holders had a mean of 3.60 and it had an overall F-value of 0.324 and a p-value of 0.808 which means insignificant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

For media effectiveness, those with Certificate/Diploma in Teaching had a mean of 3.10, those with Bachelor’s Degree had a mean of 3.25, Master’s Degree holders had a mean of 3.16, Doctorate Degree holders had a mean of 3.12 and it had an overall F-value of 0.357 and a p-value of 0.784 which means insignificant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

There are no significant differences between the degrees of communication management of respondents when they are grouped by educational attainment. It contradicts the study of Helvaci and Takmak (2016) that there are differences between teachers’ viewpoints related to the competences of managing the emotions of teachers and school managers in terms of management processes regarding their gender, branch, school type, task type, seniority and educational status.

### Table 27: Result of ANOVA between the Communication Management of Respondents and their Highest Educational Attainment.

| Highest Educational Attainment | Internal and External Communication | Staff Engagement | Media Effectiveness |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Certificate/Diploma            | Mean 3.6090                         | 3.7250           | 3.0983             |
|                                | N 12                                | 12               | 12                 |
|                                | Std. Dev 0.87427                     | 0.72629          | 0.67066            |
| Bachelor's Degree              | Mean 3.9221                          | 3.8938           | 3.2540             |

---

**By Highest Educational Attainment**

Table 27 reveals the ANOVA results between the degrees of communication management of respondents grouped according to their highest educational attainment. For the management of internal and external communications, regardless of the highest educational attainment, the p-value of .354 is greater than the .05 level of significance of the test indicating that the difference is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

For the management of staff engagement, those with Certificate/Diploma in Teaching had a mean of 3.73, Bachelor’s Degree holders had a mean of 3.89, Master’s Degree holders had a mean of 3.84, Doctorate Degree holders had a mean of 3.60 and it had an overall F-value of 0.324 and a p-value of 0.808 which means insignificant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

For media effectiveness, those with Certificate/Diploma in Teaching had a mean of 3.10, those with Bachelor’s Degree had a mean of 3.25, Master’s Degree holders had a mean of 3.16, Doctorate Degree holders had a mean of 3.12 and it had an overall F-value of 0.357 and a p-value of 0.784 which means insignificant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

There are no significant differences between the degrees of communication management of respondents when they are grouped by educational attainment. It contradicts the study of Helvaci and Takmak (2016) that there are differences between teachers’ viewpoints related to the competences of managing the emotions of teachers and school managers in terms of management processes regarding their gender, branch, school type, task type, seniority and educational status.
By Length of Service

Table 28 reveals the ANOVA results between the communication management of the respondents when they are grouped by length of service. For the management of internal and external communication, those who are in their first year in service had a mean of 3.71, those with 1 – 5 years in service had a mean of 3.88, those with 6 – 10 years in service had a mean of 3.92, those with 11 – 15 years in service had a mean of 3.94, those with more than 20 years in service had a mean of 3.96. It had an over-all F-value of 0.709 and an over-all p-value of 0.586 which means insignificant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

For staff development engagement, those in their first year in service had a mean of 3.57, those with 1 – 5 years in service had a mean of 3.88, those with 6 – 10 years in service had a mean of 3.85, those with 11-15 years in service had a mean of 3.95, those with more than 20 years in service had a mean of 3.93. The over-all F-value is 0.709 and the over-all p-value is 0.586 which means insignificant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

For media effectiveness, respondents in their first year in service had a mean of 3.06, those with 1 – 5 years in service had a mean of 3.09, those with 6 – 10 years in service had a mean of 3.25, those with 11-15 years in service had a mean of 3.22, those with more than 20 years in service had a mean of 3.45. It has an over-all F-value of 1.844 and an over-all p-value of 0.121 which means insignificant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

This denotes the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This means that the length of service of the respondents does not significantly make a difference in the degree of communication management. This is in contrast with the study of Waxman, Boriack, Lee and MacNeil (2013), which focused on the principals’ perceptions and the importance of technology in schools, used in communication. The results indicated that both gender and years of experience influence how principals perceive the functions of technology at school.

Table 28:- Result of ANOVA between the Communication Management of Respondents and their Length of Service

| Length of Service | Internal and External Communication | Staff Engagement | Media Effectiveness |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| This is my First Year | Mean 3.7115 | 3.5700 | 3.0645 |
| 1-5 years | Mean 3.8818 | 3.8826 | 3.0913 |
| 6-10 years | Mean 3.9187 | 3.8507 | 3.2504 |

ATTENTION: Numbers in parentheses represent the number of respondents.
By Monthly Income

Table 29 revealed the ANOVA result between the communication management of the respondents when they are grouped by monthly income. For the management of internal and external communication, those with under 20,000 baht monthly income had a mean of 3.92, those with 21,000 – 30,000 baht monthly income had a mean of 3.87, those with 31,000 – 40,000 baht monthly salary had a mean of 4.07, those with 41,000 – 50,000 monthly income had a mean of 3.73, those with 51,000 – 60,000 baht monthly income had a mean of 3.64, those with more than 61,000 baht monthly income had a mean of 3.95. It had an over-all F-value of 0.578 and a p-value of 0.717 which means insignificant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

For the management of staff engagement, those with under 20,000 baht monthly income had a mean of 3.96, those with 21,000 – 30,000 baht monthly income had a mean of 3.74, respondents with 31,000 – 40,000 baht monthly salary had a mean of 4.15, those with 41,000 – 50,000 monthly income had a mean of 3.75, those with 51,000 – 60,000 baht monthly income had a mean of 3.33, those with more than 61,000 baht monthly income had a mean of 3.70. It had an over-all F-value of 2.076 and a p-value of 0.069 which means insignificant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

For media effectiveness, those with less than 20,000 baht monthly income had a mean of 3.17, those with 21,000 – 30,000 baht monthly income had a mean of 3.19, those with 31,000 – 40,000 baht monthly salary had a mean of 3.49, respondents with 41,000 – 50,000 monthly income had a mean of 3.16, those with 51,000 – 60,000 baht monthly income had a mean of 4.37, those with more than 61,000 baht monthly income had a mean of 3.46. It had an over-all F-value of 2.236 and a p-value of 0.052 which means insignificant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

This denotes the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This means that the degrees of communication management of the respondents are not significantly determined by the monthly income.

Sener and Ozan (2017) contradicted this finding and mentioned that the job satisfaction of administrators and teachers is related to their additional payment, reward, the job itself, working conditions, workmates and communication, but at a low level.

Table 29: Result of ANOVA between the Communication Management of Respondents and their Monthly Income

| Monthly Income | Communication Management | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
|----------------|--------------------------|------|---|---------------|
|                | Internal and External Communication | 3.9432 | 42 | .52724 |
|                | Staff Engagement | 3.9548 | 42 | .60816 |
|                | Media Effectiveness | 3.2186 | 42 | .64002 |
| Under 20,000   |                          | 3.9624 | 43 | .59118 |
|                |                          | 3.9326 | 43 | .67497 |
|                |                          | 3.4521 | 43 | .72643 |
| Overall        |                          | 3.9033 | 245 | .59268 |
|                |                          | 3.8690 | 245 | .69984 |
|                |                          | 3.2204 | 245 | .74053 |
| 21,000-30,000  |                          | 3.8656 | 91 | .60140 |
|                |                          | 3.7374 | 91 | .69517 |
|                |                          | 3.1885 | 91 | .72919 |
| 31,000-40,000  |                          | 4.0721 | 91 | .54509 |
|                |                          | 4.1500 | 91 | .65873 |
|                |                          | 3.4894 | 91 | .76616 |
By School Assignment
Table 30 presents the results of t-test between the communication management of the respondents grouped by their school assignment. For internal and external communication management, private schools had a mean of 3.82 while public schools had a mean of 4.01. It had a t-value of 2.501 and a p-value of 0.013 which means significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

For staff engagement, private schools had a mean of 3.76 while public schools had a mean of 4.00; it had a t-value of 2.525 and a p-value of 0.012 which means significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

For media effectiveness, private schools had a mean of 3.22 while the public schools had a mean of 3.23; it had a t-value of 2.625 and a p-value of 0.009 which means significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

The result shows significant difference. This means that the respondents from the public schools have higher perceptions of their communication management compared to those from the private schools. The results showed that respondents from the public schools did much better job, work on the process of communicating through their teachers. On the other hand, according to the study of Awan, (2015), parents prefer to send their children to private school and tried to avoid sending them to public schools. Even though, in public schools’ education is free, there are a lot of reasons parents send their children to private schools. These include socioeconomic status of the household, the school accessibility, the parents’ perceptions of school quality and their perceptions of the availability of employment.

Table 30: Result of t-test between the Communication Management of Respondents and their School Assignment.

| Communication Management | School Assignment | Mean | SD  | t-value | Sig  | Interpretation | Decision |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------|-----|---------|------|----------------|----------|
| Internal and External    | Private           | 3.8180 | .612 | 2.501   | .013 | Significant    | Rejected |
|                          | Public            | 4.0062 | .552 |         |      |                |          |
| Staff Engagement         | Private           | 3.7634 | .725 | 2.525   | .012 | Significant    | Rejected |
|                          | Public            | 3.9964 | .648 |         |      |                |          |
| Media Effectiveness      | Private           | 3.2155 | .789 | 2.625   | .009 | Significant    | Rejected |
|                          | Public            | 3.2258 | .680 |         |      |                |          |

By Type of Respondents
Table 31 shows the results of t-test between the communication management of respondents grouped by type. For internal and external communication management, administrators had a mean of 4.05 while teachers had a mean of

| Communication Management | School Assignment | Mean | SD  | t-value | Sig  | Interpretation | Decision |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------|-----|---------|------|----------------|----------|
| Internal and External    | Private           | 3.8180 | .612 | 2.501   | .013 | Significant    | Rejected |
|                          | Public            | 4.0062 | .552 |         |      |                |          |
| Staff Engagement         | Private           | 3.7634 | .725 | 2.525   | .012 | Significant    | Rejected |
|                          | Public            | 3.9964 | .648 |         |      |                |          |
| Media Effectiveness      | Private           | 3.2155 | .789 | 2.625   | .009 | Significant    | Rejected |
|                          | Public            | 3.2258 | .680 |         |      |                |          |
3.89; it had a t-value of 1.351 and a p-value of 0.178 which means insignificant. It denotes the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This means that the perception of the administrators and teachers are almost the same.

For staff engagement, administrators had a mean of 4.06 while the teachers had a mean of 3.85; it had a t-value of 1.472 and a p-value of 0.142 which means insignificant. It signifies the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This means that the perception of the administrators and teachers are almost the same.

For media effectiveness, administrators had a mean of 3.50 while the teachers had a mean of 3.19; it had a t-value of 2.071 and a p-value of 0.039 which means significant. It connotes the rejection of the null hypothesis. This means that administrators have higher perceptions of their communication management compared to the teachers. This is consonance to the study of Wahed (2012), which showed that an essential element of the school leaders job ability to communicate effectively with people. They should have the skill and aptitude.

Table 31: Result of t-test between the Communication Management of Respondents and their Type of Job.

| Communication Management | Type of Job | Mean | t-value | Sig | Interpretation |
|--------------------------|-------------|------|---------|-----|----------------|
| Internal and External    | Administrator | 4.04 | 1.351   | .178| Not Significant|
|                          | Teacher     | 3.88 |         |     | Accept Ho      |
| Staff Engagement         | Administrator | 4.05 | 1.472   | .142| Not Significant|
|                          | Teacher     | 3.84 |         |     | Accept Ho      |
| Media Effectiveness      | Administrator | 3.49 | 2.071   | .039| Significant    |
|                          | Teacher     | 3.18 |         |     | Reject Ho      |

By Dimensions
Table 32 shows that there is a significant difference between the degree of communication management of respondents by dimension. Using ANOVA, internal and external had a mean of 3.90, staff engagement had 3.87 and media effectiveness had 3.22. The three dimensions of communication management had an over-all mean of 3.66 and an over-all F-value of 78.315 and an over-all p-value of 0.001 which means significant. This denotes the rejection of the null hypothesis.

This means that the communication management of the respondents really differ each other in terms of dimensions. It is because to compare the administrators and teachers, the latter have the authority to use resources effectively in order to reach their goals and to make planning about school, making appropriate decisions is attributed to success (Sahin & Faruk, 2018).

Table 32: Result of ANOVA between the Communication Management of Respondents by Dimension.

| Communication Management | Mean | SD  | F-value | Sig | Interpretation |
|--------------------------|------|-----|---------|-----|----------------|
| Internal and External    | 3.903| .596| 78.315  | .000| Significant    |
| Staff Engagement         | 3.869| .698|         |     | Reject Ho      |
| Media Effectiveness      | 3.220| .745|         |     |                |
| Overall                  | 3.664| .748|         |     |                |

Table 33 shows the results of the multiple comparison tests between the communication management of respondents by dimension. Since significant differences existed between each of the dimension of communication management, multiple comparison was run using Least Significant Difference (LSD). This is shown in Table 33. Internal and external communication with staff engagement had a p-value of 0.577 which means insignificant and denotes the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Internal and external with media effectiveness had 0.000 which means significant and this signifies the rejection of the null hypothesis and staff engagement with media effectiveness had 0.000 which means significant. This denotes the rejection of the null hypothesis.

This supports the study of Tomic, Dvorski and Kirinic, (2015), which concluded that based on the results, teachers do not connect burnout at work with communication in classroom, they lack communication skills and knowledge. In
some cases, teachers are having more than enough work in the classroom and more subjects to teach. They also lack time for the preparation of their work and need more help from the administrators.

Table 33:- Result of Multiple Comparison Test between the Communication Management of Respondents by Dimension.

| (I) Communication Management | (J) Communication Management | Sig.   | Interpretation    | Decision |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|------------------|----------|
| Internal and External Staff Engagement | Media Effectiveness | .577   | Not Significant  | Accept Ho |
| Staff Engagement Internal and External | Media Effectiveness | .577   | Not Significant  | Accept Ho |
| Media Effectiveness Internal and External | Staff Engagement | .000   | Significant      | Reject Ho |
| Media Effectiveness Internal and External | Staff Engagement | .000   | Significant      | Reject Ho |

Public Relations Practices and Communication Management

Table 34 reveals the results of Pearson r between the levels of practices in public relations and the degree of communication management. Using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) to identify the relationship, the r-value is 0.057 and the p-value is 0.374 which denotes the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

This means that public relation practices and the communication management of the respondents do not influence each other. The relationship is very weak. This finding is similar to the study of L.E, D.E & M.P (2018), which showed that communication with publics and the development and sustainability of a positive school image influence not only the marketing of the school but also the educational process in the school today.

Table 34:- Result of Pearson r Public Relations Practices and Communication Management.

| Variables Compared | r   | Strength of correlation | Sig | Interpretation Decision |
|--------------------|-----|-------------------------|-----|-------------------------|
| Public Relation Practices and Communication Management | .057 | Very weak               | .374 | Not Significant |

Intervention Plan

As a result of the study, an intervention plan designed to improve public relations is proposed.

Chapter 4

Conclusions And Recommendations:-

Conclusions:-

1. The administrators and teachers at the technical vocational schools in the province of Rayong, Thailand are dominated by females, and bachelor’s degree holders, from the private schools; most of them are 30-39 years old and receive a monthly income of less than 20,000 baht.
2. The external stakeholders are dominated by males. Most of them are in their forties, with a monthly income of less than 20,000 baht and are in jobs related to Business Management and administration and Marketing. Sales, and Services.
3. Public relations are sometimes practiced in the technical-vocational schools to their investors, the government, and the community.
4. The levels of public relations practiced in the technical-vocational schools at Rayong, Thailand are significantly determined by their age, length of service and type of job of respondents but not by their sex, highest educational attainment and monthly income; significantly higher among the school administrators than the teachers and external stakeholders; and significantly different in their relations with the investors, the government, and the community.
5. At the technical-vocational schools I Rayong, Thailand, communication management is oftentimes used for internal and external communication, staff engagement, and making mass media effective.
6. The degree of communication management is not significantly influenced by the sex, age, highest educational attainment, length of service and monthly income of respondents but is significantly determined by their school assignment; and school administrators have a significantly higher degree of communication management than the teachers.

7. The degree of management of internal and external communications is significantly higher than that of media effectiveness but do not significantly differ from the degree of communication management for staff engagement.

8. The level of public relations practices are not significantly related with the degree of communication management in the technical-vocational schools.

9. The intervention program is needed to improve the public relations of the schools to the investor, government and community.

Recommendations:-

1. Since majority of the administrators and teachers are young adults, it would be easy for the school to provide training on the use of social media to cater to the needs of the students and stakeholders. In addition, school should offer scholarship grants for the administrators and teachers to finish their master’s and doctorate degrees since most of them graduated bachelor’s degree and the salary range is minimum only.

2. The school public relations will focus on implementing the short-term free courses focusing on skills needed in the community in partnership with the stakeholders who are in their middle age, and are working in companies, private businesses related to Business Management and Administration, Marketing, Sales and Services.

3. Since the results are very positive from investor relations, to government relations and community relations, that they all felt the need to help their community and thought that it’s their duty to cooperate, this is the best time for the public relations to implement programs that surely benefit the school and the students.

4. The school public relations will implement programs that will get the attentions and interest of stakeholders and align them to the stakeholder’s beliefs and cultural practices.

5. Since the social media used by the schools are effective and reliable, the school administrators must take time to learn and train. Since they are the leaders and implementers, they should take the lead. In order for the teachers to learn more and use them in the teaching-learning practice, and they should have less class and less school work so they can have the time for training.

6. Due to the significance in difference between the communication management by respondents grouped by school assignment, the programs and activities will vary according to their school assignments and the availability of funds.

7. The school administrators have to allocate funds for training and seminars for staff, teachers and also administrators on how to use social media properly and for effective communication.

8. The school administrators, teachers together with the parents and stakeholders should work side by side to improve and strengthen their relationship.

9. The intervention program in improving public relations of the schools to the investors, government and the community should be implemented.
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