CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the subjects and instruments of the study. It also explains the procedure used in collecting data and data analysis.

3.1   SUBJECTS

The population of this study was fifty-three auditors, who were working in Chong Non Si, Bangkok area. The study aimed at subjects who had working experience as an auditor. Non-Random sampling with snowball technique was used in the sampling; that is, a subject who met the criteria of selection was approached to ask for their willingness to participate in the study, then the researcher asked the subject to recommend other groups of auditors who had the same qualification to the researcher. After the recommendation was made, the research approached the other groups of auditors and asked for their willingness to participate in the study.

3.2   MATERIAL

This research consists of both qualitative and quantitative study. The Thai language questionnaire was adopted from "WHOQOL - BREF: PROGRAMME ON MENTAL HEALTH, WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION: GENEVA" and consisted of both closed ended and open ended questions.

3.2.1 Quantitative Study

In quantitative study, the researcher use questionnaires which were divided into 2 parts:

Part 1: The questionnaire collected the general information about age, marital status, education, length of service, and monthly net income.

Part 2: In this part, the questionnaire was designed to find out the level of quality of life of the auditor. It consists of four dimensions of quality for life of auditors: Physical Health, Psychological, Social Relationship and Environment. The

5-point rating scale, ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree" was used. The criteria and meaning of the rating is showed in the following table.

Table 2. The Table of Criteria and Meaning of the Rating

Rating Score	Range	Interpretation of the score
5	4.21 - 5.00	Strongly Agree
4	3.41 - 4.20	Agree
3	2.61 - 3.40	Uncertain
2	1.81 - 2.60	Disagree
1	1.00 - 1.80	Strongly Disagree

3.2.2 Qualitative Study

In qualitative study, the researcher used a detailed interview with respondents who were willing to participate in the interview. By using the snowball technique, the researcher established a network of population by asking the interviewed respondents to make appointments with auditors who qualified for interviewing as follows: (1) An audit manager, (2) An assistance audit manger, (3) A senior auditor, (4) A junior auditor, (5) A new entry auditor, and (6) A resigned auditor

Questions used in the interview were related to four components of quality of life which were (1) physical health, (2) psychological health, (3) environment, and (4) social relationships.

3.3   PROCEDURES

This study was a cross-sectional design. The data were collected from the primary source. The researcher went to the study area and asked subjects for willingness to participate in the study. Once the subjects agreed, the researcher distributed the questionnaire and waited for the questionnaire to be returned by hand. The researcher took a total of 3 weeks for data collection. Fifty-three subjects agreed

to participate in this study including six subjects who the researcher interviewed at the study area.

3.4   DATA ANALYSIS

The data given by the respondents were be analyzed by The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 14.0. The researcher used both the descriptive statistic and the inferential statistic.

The Descriptive Statistic

Frequency Distribution and Percentage were used to analyze answers regarding the personal backgrounds of the subjects, such as age, education, marital status, monthly net income, and working period as an auditor.

Arithmetic Mean was used to calculate the average level of the quality of life of auditors.

According to the scale represented above, the statistics used in data analysis were calculated from the statistical analyses which were all set at the .05 probability level ($p < 0.05$). The number of interval scales were the highest score minus the lowest score and divided by five based on the five point Likert scales. The average score has been interpreted as follows:

Table 3. *Criteria and Meaning of the 5-point rating scale*

The average score	Interpretation of the score
1.00 - 1.80	Very low level of quality of life
1.81 - 2.60	Low level of quality of life
2.61 - 3.40	Moderate level of quality of life
3.41 - 4.20	High level of quality of life
4.21 - 5.00	Very high level of quality of life