

A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON GOVERNMENT POLICY REGARDING SMALL-SIZED SCHOOLS IN CHINA AND THAILAND: A CASE STUDY OF SHANGYOU COUNTY IN GANZHOU CITY, CHINA AND NAM PHONG DISTRICT IN KHON KAEN, THAILAND

การศึกษาเชิงเปรียบเทียบนโยบายของรัฐบาลที่เกี่ยวข้องกับโรงเรียนขนาดเล็กในประเทศจีน
และประเทศไทย: กรณีศึกษา เขตชางโหยา เมืองก้านโจว ประเทศจีน
และอำเภอหนอง จังหวัดขอนแก่น ประเทศไทย

Xiuzhen Yin¹ and Pennee Kantavong Narot²

^{1,2}College of Local Administration, Khon Kaen University

Abstract

This research investigated government policies regarding small-sized schools in China and Thailand. The objectives of the study were: 1) to study the current situation of small-sized schools in two places, 2) to analyze the problems of small-sized schools faced by two case schools, and 3) to compare the policies adopted by two local governments.

The data were obtained from two case schools, Taozhu Primary School in Shangyou County, China and Phrathat Kham Kaen Pittayalai School in Nam Phong District, Thailand. The key informants included school administrations, teachers, students and parents from these two schools, totaling 22 people. Data were analyzed with content analysis, application of the case study method, and summarized report in descriptive manner. It was found that the small-sized schools in both places face problems and challenges. The same problems of small-sized schools in both places were: 1) the heavy workload of teachers, 2) the lack of professional teachers, multimedia sources and scientific laboratory equipment. And 3) the students were mostly left-behind children with a lack of family education and weak learning ability. A difference between the two case study schools was that there were relatively lower level of teacher education in the Taozhu Primary School, and teachers' lack of in-service training opportunities.

The policies implemented by the Shangyou County government include the Specially Contracted Teachers Plan, the Nutri-meal Plan, the Weak School Reform Plan and the Curriculum Reform Plan. Nam Phong District is implementing projects on School-based Management for Local Development and an Opportunity Expansion School model.

Keywords: Small-sized school, Government policy, Comparative study

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยนี้เป็นการศึกษานโยบายของรัฐบาลที่เกี่ยวกับโรงเรียนขนาดเล็กในประเทศไทย วัตถุประสงค์ของการศึกษานี้มีดังนี้ 1) เพื่อศึกษาสภาพทั่วไปของโรงเรียนขนาดเล็กของทั้งสองโรงเรียน 2) เพื่อวิเคราะห์ ปัญหาของโรงเรียนขนาดเล็กของทั้งสองโรงเรียน 3) เพื่อเปรียบเทียบนโยบายด้านการศึกษาขององค์กรปกครองส่วนท้องถิ่นของทั้งสองประเทศ

ข้อมูลที่ใช้ในการศึกษานี้ได้มาจากการณศึกษาของทั้งสองโรงเรียน คือ โรงเรียนประถมekaจุ (Taozhu Primary School) ในเขตช่างโภยา เมืองกันโจว ประเทศจีน และโรงเรียนพระราศานุราษณ์ จังหวัดขอนแก่น ประเทศไทย ผู้ที่ให้ข้อมูลหลัก ได้แก่ ผู้อำนวยการ ครู นักเรียน และผู้ปกครองของทั้งสองโรงเรียน จำนวนทั้งหมด 22 คน ข้อมูลที่ได้นำมาวิเคราะห์เชิงเนื้อหา (Content Analysis) ใช้กระบวนการวิเคราะห์กรณีศึกษา และสรุปรายงานเชิงพรรณนาความ

จากการศึกษาพบว่า โรงเรียนขนาดเล็กทั้งสองแห่งมีปัญหาและความท้าทายต่างๆ โดยปัญหาที่ทั้งสองโรงเรียนพบเหมือนกันคือ 1) ครุภาระงานที่มากเกินไป 2) ขาดแคลนครูที่มีความเป็นมืออาชีพ ขาดสื่อการสอนที่มีคุณภาพ และขาดอุปกรณ์ที่ใช้ในห้องปฏิบัติการทางวิทยาศาสตร์ และ 3) นักเรียนส่วนใหญ่ไม่ได้อาศัยอยู่กับพ่อแม่ทำให้ขาดความอบอุ่น มีผลให้มีความสามารถในการเรียนรู้ที่ต่ำ ข้อแตกต่างระหว่างสองโรงเรียนคือ การศึกษาของครูในโรงเรียนekaจุ ต่างกว่าครูในโรงเรียนพระราศานุราษณ์ แห่งนี้ แต่ครูในโรงเรียนekaจุได้รับโอกาสในการอบรมเกี่ยวกับการเรียน การสอนไม่เพียงพอ

การขับเคลื่อนนโยบายองค์กรปกครองส่วนท้องถิ่นในเขตช่างโภย ที่มีนโยบายที่เกี่ยวกับแผนการทำสัญญาพิเศษของครู (Specially Contracted Teacher Plan) แผนการโภชนาการ (The Nutri-Meal Plan) แผนการปรับปรุงโรงเรียนที่ด้อยคุณภาพ (Weak School Reform Plan) และแผนการปรับปรุงหลักสูตรการศึกษา (Curriculum Reform Plan) ส่วนองค์กรปกครองส่วนท้องถิ่นของจังหวัดขอนแก่น มีการนำโครงการบริหารโดยใช้โรงเรียนเป็นฐาน (School-Based Management) ในการพัฒนาท้องถิ่น และโครงการโรงเรียนขยายโอกาสทางการศึกษา (Opportunity Expansion School Model) มาใช้

คำสำคัญ: โรงเรียนขนาดเล็ก นโยบายของรัฐบาล การศึกษาเชิงเปรียบเทียบ

Introduction

The issue of retaining small-sized schools is becoming a more urgent policy issue for governments. The precarious position of the small school is caused by the decrease in the number of school-age students; low natural growth rate and population outflow from rural areas; the location of villages in remote and highly isolated places; the degraded natural geographical environment; the limited cultural or socio-economic conditions which reduce potential for entrance to large-scale schools; poverty in remote rural areas; inconvenience of transportation; lifestyle and living characteristics of nomadic population; and a shortage of teachers. As a basic education policy, the location of a school should be close to the student's family. In remote villages and isolated communities, small-sized schools are the only way to meet the educational needs of local residents. Providing educational opportunities for all children should rely on the long-term existence of small-sized schools. Some countries need special development policies for remote villages due to historical, political, moral or religious reasons (Gordon, Lokisso & Allen, 1997). Keeping the small-sized schools is a general educational policy adopted by governments all over the world, in order to expand educational opportunities. This is the background of policy behind small-sized rural schools. As American educator Coleman (1966) pointed out, everyone should have equal opportunities for education, no matter their background. The governments, communities and scholars should pay attention

to how to achieve the equitable development of urban and rural education, and improve the implementation of educational policy.

In Thailand the Office of Basic Education Commission stipulated the policy for improving the quality of schools, so the schools with less than 120 students are classified as small schools (Pinyowong, 2010). The Ministry set the clear objectives for school administration to enhance the school outcomes with the development of quality of students, teaching and learning instruction and administrative work. In Thailand, the problem about how to accommodate the small-sized rural schools has been debated for several years as well. The issue is how to deal with these small-sized schools: close them, preserve them, or combine them with larger schools. In 2013, when the Thai government announced a policy to close and consolidate small-sized schools, there was a public outcry and, accordingly, this policy was suspended for re-examination (Buaraphan, 2013).

In China, since the new round of the school distribution adjustment in 2001 up to the present, the distribution adjustment policies towards small-sized rural schools has changed several times. From 2001 to 2005, the policy of the central government gave more emphasis to removal and merging small-sized schools. Since 2006, more emphasis has been given to the requirement that the distribution adjustment shall "be practical and realistic, forging ahead steadily and making convenience for entry." This period can be called the phase of "giving priority to the proper reservation and construction

of small-sized schools". In September 2012, the issue of Opinions of the General Office of the State Council on Regulating the Distribution Adjustment of Rural Compulsory Education Schools marked the time that policies began to protect small-sized rural schools, and the initiative of "running primary schools in villages and teaching points well" was also put forward (Zhang, 2012). Lei & Zhang (2014) believes that in the context of the process of urbanization, small-sized schools not only need to be restored and retained, but also developed into high-quality institutions. Based on long-term field investigation, he believes that the current small-sized school policy still needs to improve the efficiency on the aspects of value orientation, policy development and implementation.

School size is a critical factor in determining educational outcomes. Chaiyamee (2016) observed that the effective of administering schools in the present decade needs to consider various aspects. He proposed the strategies for self-sufficiency schools. One of the important issues is strategy for participation from stakeholders. This strategy is under the approach suggested by Nenyod (2002) the School Based Management (SBM) approach for developing quality of learners. Under the SBM the small school can be jointly managed by the participation of three major groups. They are representative form the family of students, schools administrators and teachers, and representative from school board (Choompala, Pongpinyo & Larsak, 2014).

Many urban systems have recently improved education for all students by breaking large

schools into smaller units. (The Rural School and Community Trust, 2003) But small-sized schools have long been more common in rural areas. In this research, small-sized schools refer to small-sized rural schools run by the government. Small-sized urban schools and small-sized private schools are not in the scope of the study.

Small-sized rural schools are those small-scale schools set up to meet the sparse conditions of students in remote rural areas (Sigsworth & Solstad, 2001). Domestic and foreign scholars have not come to an agreement on the definition of small-sized rural schools. The specific scale varies due to the different situations of different regions. Multi-grade schools are small and have the general characteristics of small-sized schools. In China, small-sized rural schools are usually named teaching points or primary schools located in villages.

Over the past two decades, both in Thailand and China, the flow of large rural populations to cities and towns, and the change of the population structure has resulted in the rapid decline of the number of rural schools, and small-sized schools. These two types of schools have been the main targets for removal and mergers. (Zhang, 2012) .The student scale in rural schools has been declining year by year, so adjusting the school distribution and reducing the number of schools has become an inevitable trend. Numerous reports of news media have aroused the extensive attention and discussion of all sectors of society on small-sized rural schools.

Study purposes

The purposes of the study were to: 1) study the current situation of small-sized schools in Shangyou, China and Nam Phong, Thailand, 2) analyze the problems faced by small-sized schools in Shangyou, China and Nam Phong, Thailand, and 3) compare the policies adopted by Shangyou County government and Nam Phong District government for small-sized schools.

Research method

This is a comparative study of government policy regarding small-sized schools in China and Thailand, conducted through cases visits. An in-depth investigation carried out in Taozhu primary school, Shangyou County and Phrathat Kham Kaen Pittayalai school, Nam Phong District. This paper primarily used literature analysis, comparative study method, field study method and case study method.

The in-depth interview was conducted with 22 key informants including school administrators, teachers, students and parents from these two, small-sized schools. Altogether, the respondents include 3 students, 3 parents, 5 teachers, and 1 school administrator from Phrathat Kham Kaen Pittayalai School, and 3 students, 3 parents, 3 teachers, and 1 school administrator from Taozhu primary school.

Research tools

1. Observation forms include the times of observations, date, place, content, type, environmental status, details, questions and reflections.

2. Structured interview forms consist of three parts. Part one of the form is the personal information of the interviewee (name, gender, age, occupation, residence, nationality and place of birth). Part two has the general questions relevant to the type of key informant (i.e., students, parents, teachers, school administrators). Part three contains open-ended questions for the interviewee.

Data analysis

In this paper, the obtained data were analyzed by the qualitative research method. The available data were classified and sorted into patterns as the primary basis for organizing and reporting the study findings. Next, the data are presented in a descriptive manner (narrative descriptions, quotes from participants, charts and tables to demonstrate the study results).

Result

1. Background information of small-sized schools in the two cases

1.1 Small-sized schools in China

In China, many scholars have set 100 students as a threshold for defining small-sized schools and non-small-sized schools. Lei & Zhang (2011), according to the scale of adjustment of the primary school or teaching point in the rural compulsory education school in China, concluded that 100 students or less is the standard criteria of a rural small-sized schools, and in line with the actual development of China's education.

According to the "China Rural Education Development Report 2016", which presents

research data of the China Rural Education Development Institute of Northeast Normal University in China, the rural compulsory education system shows that “small-sized schools in the rural area, boarding schools in the town, large-scale schools in the city” pattern. In 2015, there were 283,560 primary schools and teaching points, of which 200,199 were in rural areas, accounting for 70.6% of the total primary and teaching points in the country. There was a total of 126,751 small-sized schools in the country, accounting for 44.7% of the total primary and teaching points. There are 9,667 no students' schools in the country, and 33,900 rural schools with less than 10 people. (China Rural Education Development Report 2016, 2016)

1.2 Small-sized schools in Thailand

In Thailand, there are three general definitions of school size based on the number of students enrolled.

The Office of the Basic Education Commission generally divides the school into seven sizes based on number of students: Size 1 (0-120), Size 2 (121-200), Size 3 (201-300), Size 4 (301-499), Size 5 (500-1,499), Size 6 (1,500-2,499) and Size 7 (2,500 or more) (Office of the Basic Education Commission, 2015).

Some Thai scholars such as Sasithorn (2015) classified schools into four categories: small-sized schools, medium-sized schools, large schools and extra-large schools. Among them, less than 120 students means that a school is a small-sized school.

The Upper Secondary Education Bureau of Thailand classified schools into four sizes

as well, but determined by the budgeting and budgeting guidelines. They are small-sized schools (1-499 students), medium-sized schools (500-1,499 students), large schools (1,500-2,499 students) and extra-large schools (2,500 students or more). (Upper Secondary Education Bureau of Thailand, 2011)

In 2015, the total number of schools in Thailand was 30,816. Schools in Thailand with less than 120 students totaled 15,577, nearly half of all schools in Thailand. The specific data is as follows:

Table 1 Number of schools by size in Thailand, 2015

School size	Number of students (person)	Number of schools (schools)
Type 1	Less than 20	1,059
	21-40	2,488
	41-60	3,388
	61-80	3,515
	81-100	2,768
	101-120	2,359
Total		15,577
Type 2	121-200	6,791
Type 3	201-300	3,547
Type 4	301-499	2,310
Type 5	500-1,499	1,899
Type 6	1,500-2,499	390
Type 7	2,500 and up	302
Total (all types)		30,816

Sources: Office of the Basic Education Commission (2015)

2. Situations of small-sized schools in two places

The target small-sized school in China is Taozhu primary school, located in An He Township, Shangyou County, Ganzhou City, Jiangxi Province, China. It is a small village school as a branch of An He school (a central nine-years school in this district), under the management of Shangyou County Education Bureau. At present, the school has kindergarten, primary grade one and primary grade two, only three teachers and a total of 34 students in 2016 academic year. (Data collected from Taozhu primary school, March of 2017.)

The target small-sized school in Thailand is Phrathat Kham Kaen Pittayalai school, located in No.199, Ban Kham Moo 2, Ban Kham Sub-district, Nam Phong District, Khon Kaen Province, Thailand. At present, school under the management of Khon Kaen Provincial Administrative Organization. The school has a total of 22 staffs, they are 1 director, 13 full-time teachers, 4 teaching assistants, 1 accountant, 2 equipment administrators and 1 janitor. It has both lower secondary and upper primary grades with a total of 143 students in 7 classes, of which 83 boys and 60 girls in the 2016 academic year. (Data collected from Phrathat Kham Kaen Pittayalai school, March of 2017.)

3. The problems faced by small-sized schools in two places

According to the requirements of the national education policy, after field trips this study found that the two schools in the

education management system, teachers, students, funds, curriculum are facing some challenges and problems.

Specifically, the problems faced by small-sized schools in Shangyou County include: (1) The teacher's educational background is not good enough, and they have a heavy workload and lack of training opportunities. (2) The school lacks professional teachers and multimedia devices. Teaching facilities are not complete. The curriculum is too simple. Funding sources are meager. (3) Students mostly are 'left-behind children' with a lack of family educational support and have weak learning ability.

The problems faced by small-sized schools in Nam Phong District are as follows: (1) The teachers have heavy workloads. (2) The school lacks professional teachers and scientific laboratory equipment. (3) The students mostly are 'left-behind children' with a lack of family education and weak learning ability.

4. The policies adopted by two governments

4.1 Analysis on the policies and implementation effects of the small-sized schools in Shangyou County

(1) Specially Contracted Teachers Plan

The specially contracted teachers program is a special policy of the central government to guide and encourage the graduates to work on rural education. It is intended as an innovation of the teachers' supplementary mechanism to solve the problems of insufficient teachers and unreasonable structure in rural schools. This policy focuses on junior high schools,

and takes into account primary schools. The specially contracted teachers are mainly assigned to the rural township junior high schools located outside the county, and take into account the township center primary school in a proper way. Therefore, generally, village schools have no chance to apply for the specially contracted teachers. The funds for recruitment of the specially contracted teachers are from both the central government and local finance; the central government is regarded as the major undertaker.

The specially contracted teachers generally have three to five years of employment, but mostly three years. Many teachers do not continue to teach in rural areas after the end of the tenure, but seek new opportunities in the cities. The three years of the specially contracted teacher can be a good experience for them, and it gives them a great advantage in finding jobs in the big cities. But the schools they leave need to train new teachers.

(2) Nutri-meal Plan

After 2012, in order to alleviate the economic burden of the parents of poor students in rural schools, and to respond to the call of the state, the government of Jiangxi Province carried out a nutrition improvement program for students from poor families in 17 counties, including Shangyou, which were concentrated in the especially difficult rural areas.

The government finance provides a nutritional dietary supplement for students in the compulsory education phase of the

pilot area in accordance with the standard of three yuan per student per day (the whole school year is 200 days in accordance with the school time). According to the current research, in 2017, the standard has been raised to four yuan per student per day. In addition to nutrition lunch subsidies, the regions also raise and balance building renovation funds for the rural primary and secondary schools. The student canteen is the key construction challenge, and needs to meet standards and requirements of the licensing of catering services.

All the grade one and two students of Tao Zhu primary school receive the nutritional meal subsidies. This policy solved the problem of students eating a cold lunch or having to rush home to eat at noon. This subsidy also reduced the financial burden of the students' families. At the end of 2016, the financial allocation helped the school to repair the canteen, add tables and chairs, and has created a good dining environment for the children.

(3) Weak School Reform Plan

In order to implement the National Medium and Long Term Education Reform and Development Plan (2010-2020), the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Finance have implemented the weak school reform program in rural areas since 2010.

In 2013, the Ministry of Education promulgated *the Education Counterpart Support of Shangyou County Program (2013-2020)*. With the help of the Ministry of Education, Shangyou County began to implement the weak school reform plan.

The weak school reform plan requires more multimedia teaching equipment and office computers for the village schools and also laboratories and laboratory equipment, music equipment, and library configuration. Tao Zhu primary school has no such teaching facilities; the implementation of the weak school reform plan still needs to be strengthened.

(4) Curriculum Reform Plan

According to the notification and stipulation of the “Compulsory education curriculum experiment scheme (2001)” of the Ministry of Education, the courses shall be balanced and shall strengthen the comprehensiveness of the curriculum. There are clear instructions on the opening and development of English, information technology education, music, arts, and PE courses. Taozhu Primary School has no students at grade three and, thus, it is understandable that they haven't opened English classes. That leaves only Chinese and mathematics classes for the grade one and two students. Due to the lack of the corresponding professional teachers, although the syllabus lists content in music, arts, and PE, the school doesn't have real classes of these subjects. For example, the teacher occasionally holds a class meeting in which students sing or perform, and this is regarded as music class. The curriculum lists courses in diversity education to promote the all-round development of morality, intelligence, physique and aesthetic to develop morally, intellectually, physically and aesthetically. But, in practice, this is a mere formality, and the quality is not up to standard.

4.2 Analysis on the policies and implementation effects of the small-sized schools in Nam Phong District

(1) School-based Management for Local Development

Nowadays, local government plays an important role in school education, especially when the school is under the direct management of local government. Local government, schools and communities are closely related. In order to play a better role and advance the development of education, the School-based Management for Local Development (SBMLD) project was set up by the Department of Local Administration.

SBMLD is an education policy of schools with the aim to promote youth and local people to aspire to lifelong learning, and to promote the development of individual talent. Local development is to be used as a guideline for the management and evaluation of educational institutions so that educational institutions should progress unceasingly and manage their education better.

Phrathat Kham Kaen Pittayalai school participated in this project. In addition to extra funds for school development, following the guidance of this project, the school established a characteristic system. The school focuses on the development of sports and training athletes and, therefore, it has recruited athletes from other areas. It has had outstanding performance in enrollment for a small-sized school.

(2) Opportunity Expansion School

The ‘opportunity expansion school’ refers to the school which provides elementary

to secondary (usually secondary 1-3) education, but is classified as an elementary school. These schools are located in districts with too few students in both primary and secondary levels. These schools are appropriate for the community's cultural development and where the parents have no ability to pay for their children to go to school elsewhere.

However, from the interviews with staff of the Phrathat Kham Kaen Pittayalai school, the researcher found that the principal and some teachers do not agree that the opportunity expansion school is useful. First, the education quality will be a problem, the teacher is only familiar with primary school curriculum but not secondary school curriculum. Second, the existence of some schools is not for the community and the students, but the principal is not willing to lose the position because of the closure of the school. Third, the school will also take away the original junior high school students, it affects the development of the original secondary school.

Conclusions and discussion

There are a number of small-sized schools in both countries of both regions. The development of small-sized school in both regions is facing problems and challenges in the education management system, curriculum, funds, teaching and learning. In response to these problems, the two governments have implemented different policies. Decentralization is the process of redistributing or dispersing functions, powers, people or things away from a central location

or authority (The Free Dictionary, n.d.). Although the political system, educational system, social and culture are all different in China and Thailand, but the management of small-sized schools has been affected by decentralization both. School-based Management model is one of the policies support decentralization implementation.

School-based management (SBM) is a strategy to decentralize decision making authority to the individual school site. It is part of an international school management reform movement that originated in the United States in the 1980s and then spread to most developed countries and regions. Now, school-based management has become a model with worldwide influence (Murphy, 1994).

The comparison of small-sized school management between the two governments under the School - based Management model as follow:

(1) Decentralization in SBM

Decentralization in SBM refers to decentralizing the authority from the central government, the central education administrative organs and local education departments down to the school. Under this system of governance, schools become deregulated from the district office and gain control and responsibility over their own affairs.

(2) Both countries have tried to carry out decentralization of educational authority from the central government to local governments and schools. However, in both settings, there is still considerable central control of the

school. Small-sized school management is still basically managed by the central government and the central education administrative departments, just as in the past. The management authority of local government, the school and principal is very limited; they mostly just play an executive role.

In China, the government established the Central Primary School Responsibility System for decentralization. However, the school lacks budgetary power, and only has daily teaching management power. Power is generally concentrated in the principal only.

In Thailand, some schools are directly subordinate to the local administrative organization and, thus, those schools are more closely related to the local administrative organizations. But the devolution of administrative power only reaches as far as the local administrative organization. The principal and the school teachers still only play the role of administrative execution.

(3) Decision making in SBM

Decision-making is shared at the local school between teachers, parents, other community members, and sometimes students (Murphy, 1994). Authority is delegated to school, usually to a school board or school committee, not to the principal only. There is an emphasis on democratic management, i.e., in theory, the school committee is generally composed of the principal, teachers, parents, students and community members. (Huang, 2003)

The level of democratic management of the school is not high, however, in the two countries in this research. The school committee is actually comprises several senior teachers with almost no students, parents, community members being involved.

(4) Functional change in SBM

SBM reform has adjusted the relationship between government and school, and the educational administration and school functions have changed. The functions of the government are changing from command to support, coordination and evaluation. The school also is changing its function accordingly, from the original executive body to a decision-making body. As such, it enjoys more power, and must also assume more responsibility for the use of power and its results (Huang, 2003). But the real situation is functional change in two counties are not thorough enough.

State policy makers, county administrators, principals, and teachers are altering their role in schools to accommodate the changes from traditional education processes and operations to SBM. (Murphy, 1994) In the actual situation, the principal is both a decision-maker, and also an implementer. Although teachers are increasingly involved in the management of schools, the role of teachers has not changed much, i.e., they still just play the role of classroom manager. Students, parents, community members are still limited to the role of education services consumers, recipients and sponsors.

Suggestions

As Charles O. Jones believed, policy implementation is a series of activities to put policy into action, among which, the most important three are interpretation, organization and application. Educational policy implementation is a two-way interactive process which requires educators to follow a certain program, apply various resources, and transform the content of education policy into effective real results in order to achieve the policy objectives in a certain period of time.

Therefore, the Chinese and Thai governments should review and reflect on the implementation of the policy thus far. They need to reconsider their own policies and learn the advantages of small-sized school management based on experience from other countries. This study found that the Phrathat Kham Kaen Pittayalai school, under the management of the Khon Kaen Provincial Administrative Organization, is under less control by the central government, and has strong support from local government, whether financial, teachers or teaching equipment. By contrast, the Taozhu primary school has less

local support. In conclusion, we should focus more on the actual effect of decentralization and consider how to better to apply it in the future.

Finally, the researcher would like to concede that this study has weaknesses regarding several areas. First, because of the limited theoretical books, the theoretical part of this paper is still relatively thin; Second, the limited research time, funding and geographical constraints led to the lack of continuous follow-up survey, this study cannot fully reflect the existence problems faced by small-sized schools and policies adopted by the two governments; Third, this study excessive attention to the problems of small-sized schools but lack of in-depth analysis of the reasons, the policy recommendations have yet to be explored, need to continue to enrich and improve in practice; Fourth, the language of the article is not concise, writing skills need to be improved. Above these weaknesses, the author in the future study will continue to keep going, and to be better.

References

Buaraphan, K. (2013). Educational Quality of Small Schools in Thailand. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 41(1), 130-147. [in Thai]

Chaiyamee, P. (2016). Effective Strategies for Administering Sufficiency Schools. *Panyapiwat Journal*, 8(2), 168-182. [in Thai]

China Rural Education Development Report 2016. (2016). *China Rural Education Development Institute of Northeast Normal university*. Retrieved February 17, 2017, from http://news.jyb.cn/china/gnxw/201612/t20161226_691183.html [in Chinese]

Choompala, C., Pongpinyo, P. & Larsak, P. (2014). *Research Report on A Case Study: Successful Model of Education Management in Small Schools in Northeast of Thailand*. Bangkok: The Thailand Research Fund. [in Thai]

Coleman, J. S. (1966). *Equality of Education Opportunity*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

Gordon, W., Lokisso, A. & Allen, J. (1997). *Enhancing the effectiveness of single teacher schools and multi-grade classes*. Norway: Royal Ministry of Education Research and Church Affairs.

Huang, D. (2003). *A Comparative Study of School Management System in China and West*. 1994-2011 China Academic Journal Electronic Publishing House. [In Chinese]

Jones, C. O. (1984). *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Lei, W. P. & Zhang, X. Y. (2011). Discussion on Classification Development Policy of Rural Small-scale Schools. *The Journal of Educational Research and Experiment*, 21(6), 7-11.

Lei, W. P. & Zhang, X. Y. (2014). Investigation on Resource Allocation and Operating mechanism of rural small-scale schools. *People's Education*, 64(6), 29-32. [in Chinese]

Merriam-Webster Dictionary. (n.d.). *Definition of decentralization*. Retrieved February 17, 2017, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/decentralization>

Murphy, J. (1994). *Principles of School-based Management*. Carolina, USA: The University of North Carolina Press.

Nenyod, B. (2002). *School-Based Management: Thai Ways and Methods*. Bangkok: Office of the National Education Commission. [in Thai]

Office of the Basic Education Commission. (2015). *Annual Report 2015*. Bangkok: Office of the Basic Education Commission, Ministry of Education of Thailand. [in Thai]

Pinyowong, E. (2010). *Small-sized school management*. Retrieved February 17, 2017, from <https://www.gotoknow.org/posts/343990> [in Thai]

Sasithorn, L. (2015). *Managing small schools by combining small schools into groups, under the Krabi primary education service area office*. Master of Education Degree in Administration, Hatyai University.

Sigsworth, A. & Solstad, K. J. (2001). *Making small-sized schools work: A Handbook for Teachers in Small Rural Schools*. UNESCO, International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa.

The Free Dictionary. (n.d.). *Definition of decentralization*. Retrieved February 20, 2017, from <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/decentralization>

The Rural School and Community Trust. (2003). *School Size: Research Based Conclusions*. The Rural School and Community Trust. Retrieved February 13, 2017, from <http://www.ruraledu.org/articles.php?id=2038>

Upper Secondary Education Bureau of Thailand. (2011). *Guidelines of budgeting and management of budgeting of Secondary Education Services Area Office*. Retrieved December 20, 2016, from <https://www.sesao1.go.th/media/files/budget.pdf>

Zhang, X. (2012). *A Policy Study on Rural Small Schools Development*. Central China Normal University. [in Chinese]



Name and Surname: Xiuzhen Yin

Highest Education: Master Degree of Public Administration,
Khon Kaen University

University or Agency: College of Local Administration,
Khon Kaen University

Field of Expertise: Language & Education

Address: No.74, Shui Nan Rd., Dong Shan, Shang You, Gan Zhou,
Jiang Xi, China



Name and Surname: Pennee Kantavong Narot

Highest Education: Ph.D. International and Development Education,
University of Pittsburgh, U.S.A.

University or Agency: College of Local Administration,
Khon Kaen University

Field of Expertise: Adult / Non formal education, Inclusive education

Address: 123 College of Local Administration, Khon Kaen University,
Khon Kaen 40002