THESIS TITLE : AN ANALYSIS OF THESES ON CONSTRUCTING EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT DURING B.E. 2522 - B.E. 2539

AUTHOR : MISS KUSOL MOUDSOM

THESIS ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

Samphan Phanphruk .....Chairman

(Associate Professor Dr. Samphan Phanphruk)

Boonchom Srisa-ard .....Member

(Associate Professor Dr. Boonchom Srisa-ard)

Sompong Punturat .....Member

(Mr. Sompong Punturat)

ABSTRACT

This research had an objective to analyze theses on constructing or developing an educational measurement instrument during B.E. 2522-2539 of graduate students in the field of Educational Measurement and Evaluation at the following universities:Chulalongkorn, Kasetsart, Khon Kaen, Chiang Mai, Naresuan, Mahasarakham and Srinakharinwirot totalling 299 copies. The tool for data collection was through summaries of research work. The classification of theses and data analysis were done by content analysis, frequency and percentage distribution.

The findings had the following characteristics:

1. The institutions attached to the theses were Srinakharinwirot (40.47%), followed by Chulalongkorn and Mahasarakham with the equal number (14.38%), Chiang Mai (14.05%), Naresuan (8.69%), Khon Kaen (7.36%) and Kasetsart (0.67%)

respectively by constructing or developing educational measurement instruments:the most on Cognitive Domain (45.15%), followed by on Affective Domain (25.08%), others (21.07%), and on Psychomotor Domain respectively (8.70%). The population for used in construction instruments on three domains and others were secondary school at the most (48.49%), followed by primary school students (28.09%), higher education/lower,higher vocational school students (14.38%) , career people (7.02%) and pre-school children (2.01%) respectively.

2. The educational measurement instrument on Cognitive Domain was Achievement Test at the most, followed by Intelligence and Aptitude Test. Achievement Test was Diagnostic Test at the most, followed by Criterion Referenced Test and others and Domain Referenced Test respectively, while Intelligence and Aptitude Test was measurement of Aptitude at the most, followed by measurement of Intelligence. Aptitude Test was measurement of Scholastic Aptitude at the most, followed by measurement of Specific Aptitude.

The population used in construction instruments were secondary school students at the most (52.59%) through stratified random sampling at the most (38.52%). The kind of constructed instrument was the test at the most (100%), with the math content at the most (49.63%). In Achievement Test, item difficulty index is calculated by simple formula at the most . In Criterion Referenced Test, item discriminating power was through Kryspin and Feldhurson at the most, The cut-off score through Berk at the most, the content validity through Rovinelli and Hambleton, the construct validity through Carver at the most. In Domain Referenced Test, item-discriminating power was through Kryspin and Feldhurson at the most, the content validity through Rovinelli and Hambleton, the construct validity through Carver at the most, the reliability coefficients through Lovett at the most. In Diagnostic Test, item-discrimination power was through Brennan at the most, and the content validity through Rovinelli and Hambleton at the most, and the reliability coefficients through Lovett at the most. In Intelligence and Aptitude Test, item-difficulty and item-discrimination power with 27% group division was used at the most, content

validity by experts judgment at the most, construct validity was through factor analysis at the most; criterion-related validity was through predictive validity at the most; the reliability coefficient is calculated by KR-20 formula at the most.

3. The educational measurement instrument on Affective Domian was of other Affective Domians at the most, followed by ethics and virtue respectively. The population were secondary school students at the most. The item-discriminating power was through t-test at the most, content validity by experts at the most, construct validity with known group technique at the most and reliability coefficient through Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient at the most.

4. On Psychomotor Domain was Performance Test in various subjects at the most, the population used in construction instruments were higher education / lower,higher vocational school students at the most, content validity by experts at the most, construct validity with known group technique at the most, criterion-related validity was through concurrent validity at the most and reliability coefficient with the judgment at the most.

5. On other domians (for example, Personality Test), the population used in construction instruments were secondary school students at the most, item-discriminating power was by means of t-test at the most, content validity by experts judgment at the most, construct validity with known group technique at the most, criterion-related validity was through concurrent validity the most and reliability coefficient through Cronbach 's Alpha Coefficient at the most.