CHAPTER V
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
SCHOOL CLIMATE CHARACTERISTICS
NON-DEMONSTRATION SCHOOLS

5.1 Identification Of School Climate Characteristics

Table 5.1 reveals that the values of mean of the perception of teacher-student relationships dimension of the school climate characteristics of non-demonstration schools as perceived by students, teachers and parents are 3.80, 4.27 and 3.77 respectively, all of which are in the category of "agree". This indicates that the teacher-student relationships in non-demonstration schools is that of mutual help and liking. Teachers help students, are friendly, kind and patient. When students have trouble learning, they make extra efforts to help them, understand and meet the needs of each student as well as praise students and explain carefully so that they can get their work done.

On the second subscale of security and maintenance, the perception of students, teachers and parents submits mean values of 3.97, 4.10 and 3.74 respectively. As on the previous dimension, all values on this characteristics too fall in the category of "agree". In other words, the students, the teachers and the parents have positive perceptions on the statements related to this dimension. Students and teachers usually feel safe in the school building even before or after school time of working. They perceive that not only
### TABLE 5.1

School Climate Characteristics Of Non-Demonstration Schools As Perceived By Students, Teachers And Parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate Characteristics</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Teacher-Student Relationships</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Security and Maintenance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Administration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Student Academic Orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Student Behavioral Values</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Guidance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Student-Peer Relationships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Parent and Community-School Relationships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Instructional Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Student Activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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classroom but the school building are usually clean and also neat and attractive. So is the perception of parents of the students studying in non-demonstration schools.

The third subscale relates to the perception of administration of the school climate of non-demonstration schools. The obtained mean scores of students and teachers are 3.70 and 3.81 respectively which are in the category of "agree". It implies that the students and teachers in non-demonstration schools feel free to express their ideas, and also that the administrators set high standards and let them and their parents know what these standards are. They are willing to hear student's complaints and opinions, and yet teachers and students co-operate with one another and mutually decide what happens in their school. On the other hand, the parents of the students do not think so on this subscale as their mean is 3.39 which falls in the category of neutrality meaning thereby that they are neither happy nor unhappy as far as the administration of non-demonstration schools is concerned.

On the fourth subscale, that is student academic orientation dimension, the obtained means are equal to 4.04, 3.76 and 3.82 for students, teachers and parents respectively which are in the category of "agree". This means that the students, the teachers and the parents of students in non-demonstration schools are satisfied on academic matters. They understand the goals to be achieved
Students perceive themselves as interested in learning new things. They not only have fun but also work hard in their studies and complete their school assignments.

However, on the fifth subscale, that is the **student behavioural values** dimension of the school climate characteristics of non-demonstration schools, the values of mean as perceived by students, teachers, and parents are 3.21, 3.29 and 2.94 respectively which are in the category of 'neutrality'. It indicates that they neither agree nor disagree with the items. In other words, they show their indeterminateness as to whether students in the school are well-behaved when the teachers are not watching them. They also are not sure if students would do their work or not if the teacher stepped out of the classroom.

From the sixth to the tenth subscale of the school climate characteristics that is subscale of **guidance**, **student-peer relationships**, **parent and community school relationships**, **instructional management** and **student activities**, all the three groups under study i.e. the students, the teachers and the parents "agree" with the statements. The value of mean scores on guidance dimension as perceived by the students, the teachers, and the parents are 4.24, 4.10 and 4.04 respectively. This implies that students in non-demonstration schools feel that the teachers or counsellors in their schools encourage them to think about their future, not only help them plan for future classes and future jobs but also help them with personal
problems. With regards to the student-peer relationships dimension as perceived by the students, the teachers and the parents, the obtained mean scores are 4.09, 3.97 and 3.96 respectively. It means respondents perceive themselves as caring and respecting each other, wanting to be friends with one another as well as having a sense of belonging to their school. On parent and community-school relationships, dimension of the school climate characteristics of non-demonstration schools, the values of mean as perceived by students, teachers and parents are 4.00, 3.94 and 3.89 respectively indicate satisfaction of the respondents as to parents attending school meetings and other activities, and helping the school in one way or another. They attend meeting programmes and perceive them as good. Also community groups honour student achievement in learning, music, drama and sports. Students, teachers and parents also feel satisfied with respect to instructional management dimension of the school climate characteristics of non-demonstration schools; the mean scores are 3.67, 3.74 and 3.49 respectively. In other words, all the three sub-samples invited in the present study perceive that schools have a clear set of rules to follow. Other tasks do not interfere with classroom teaching. Teachers spend almost all classroom time in teaching activities and give the students assignment to do, not only spend classroom time in talking about classwork or assignments but also help students learn
assigned work. Likewise, the means of **student-activities** dimension of the school climate characteristics of non-demonstration schools are perceived by three sub-samples are equal to 3.95, 3.93 and 3.68, respectively for students, teachers and parents. The three groups view that the students can be the members in school activities in which they are interested, they can join in sports, music and play even if they are not very talented. They feel comfortable staying after school for activities such as sports and music, and also they can take part in sports and other school activities even if their families cannot afford them.

From the analysis of the data in respect of school climate of non-demonstration schools, the following conclusions emerge:

1. In short, all the three sub-samples of the students, the teachers, and the parents perceive in seven of the ten dimensions of school climate namely teacher-students relationships, security and maintenance, student academic orientation, guidance, student-peer relationships, parent and community-school relationships and student activities as satisfactory.

2. With regard to the administration subscale, both students and teachers show satisfaction. However, parents are neutral. It was also found that parents also neutral on instructional management subscale.

3. On the characteristics of student behavioural values, perception of students, teachers and parents of non-
demonstration schools is "neutral", that is they neither express their satisfaction nor dissatisfaction on this subscale.

4. None of the sub-samples perceived the school climate characteristics (all the ten dimensions) as unsatisfactory.

The mean profile of school climate characteristics of non-demonstration schools as perceived by the students, the teachers, and the parents has been presented graphically in Figure 8.
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5.2 Intra-differences Among Non-Demonstration Schools On School Climate Characteristics.

5.2.1 Students' Perception

Table 5.2.1 shows results of inter comparisons of non-demonstration schools on students' perception of the school climate characteristics. The differences do not indicate only less or more satisfaction because it is clear from the previous section 1 that the perception of all the three sub-samples regarding school climate characteristics was not unsatisfactory.

Teacher and Student Relationships (A)

The first variable of school climate is teacher and student relationships (A) for which the t-ratios showing significance of mean differences between $S_1$ and $S_3$ ($t = 2.98$), $S_2$ and $S_3$ ($t = 3.53$), $S_3$ and $S_5$ ($t = 4.23$) and $S_4$ and $S_5$ ($t = 2.93$) are found to be significant at .01 level; and the mean differences between $S_1$ and $S_4$ ($t = 2.11$), $S_2$ and $S_4$ ($t = 2.39$) are significant at .05 level.

An examination of mean scores in respect of schools No. 1 ($M = 45.20$), $S_3$ ($M = 41.04$), $S_4$ ($M = 41.24$), and $S_5$ ($M = 46.31$) shows that school No. 1 (Yoppharaj Vidhayalai), No. 2 (Benjamachutid) and No. 5 (Sattreevidhaya II) are comparable and exhibit better teacher and student relationships than the schools No. 3 and 4 as perceived by students.
Table 5.2
The Means And SDs Of School Climate Characteristics As Perceived By Students In Five Non-Demonstration Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate</th>
<th>School No 1</th>
<th>School No 2</th>
<th>School No 3</th>
<th>School No 4</th>
<th>School No 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>45.20</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>45.31</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>41.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>25.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.29</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>21.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>14.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>15.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>13.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5.2.1
The t-ratios Among Various Non-Demonstration Schools On School Climate Characteristics As Perceived By Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate</th>
<th>t-ratio between group of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df.

95

97

84

96

96

83

95

85

97

84

* significant at .05 level

** significant at .01 level
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The teacher relates to the students both academically and personally. Academic relationship is usually clear cut and well understood. In a classroom situation, the teacher-student interaction is meant to promote the students' learning. Such a relationship is supposed to be objective and based on facts. Criticism is directed not at the individual but at his work. Hence, professional association is formal according to the prescribed rules and regulations of the school. This requires the observance of a status relationship which automatically assigns a leadership role to the teacher in relationship to the student in as far as he is the determinant of the situation influencing the students' behaviour. This kind of relationship may sometimes produce frustration.

Personal association on the other hand is not consciously purposive and it bears no definite obligation on the parties involved to perform clearly defined tasks, and its continuity is not compulsory. Emotion is the key to the personal relationship when two people enter into a personal relationship they do not usually try to analyse, to objectify or to understand the reason for their attraction. It negates the influence of status, power and prestige between the associates. As a result personal relationship protect less antagonism and latent aggression than do professional associations, hence lesser frustration than professional relationship.
However, in a real school environment personal and professional relationships become closely interwoven that they are difficult to distinguish. In the view of the students of non-demonstration schools No. 1, 2 and 5 are these relationships are much better than is the case with their counterpart of schools No. 3 and 4 implying thereby that teachers in the former schools generally like their students and would try to do everything possible to meet their needs. It is also envisaged that teachers in these schools take a personal interest in counselling the students, to reinforce their confidence, the teachers ensure that they use an objective approach towards assessing student performance in academic works.

Similar results were also obtained by Brophy (1981), Wongplukkaow (1983), Keefe (1986), Rosenblam and Firestone (1987), and Wells (1987) who concluded that the relationship between teachers and students can become highly supportive and mutually satisfying one with the type of relationship the school climate improves and student and teachers performance is enhanced. Also, it serves as an important catalyst in building students' self-esteem.

It is, therefore, recommended that schools No. 3 and 4 which are lagging behind on teacher-student relationships need to improve on the interpersonal relationships between the teachers and the students.
Security and Maintenance (B)

Regarding the second sub-variable, that is security and maintenance, the results of t-ratios for schools $S_2$ versus $S_3 (t = 1.98)$ and $S_2$ versus $S_5 (t = 2.04)$ are found to be significant at .05 level.

The comparison of mean scores between schools No. 2 and 3 ($M = 27.44, 25.64$) and schools No. 2 and 5 ($M = 27.44, 25.57$) indicates that school No. 2 (Benjaminachutid) is better than schools No. 3 and 5 in security and maintenance aspects of the school.

The issues regarding security and maintenance of schools is probably more critical in non-demonstration schools than in demonstration schools, as the source of finance in this category of schools is less promising than in the latter schools. Results amply demonstrate that security and maintenance is poorer in non-demonstration schools No. 3 and 5 (Chonkanyanukul, Sattreevidhaya II) vis-a-vis school No. 2 (Benjaminachutid) as per students' perception. The content of the items on this scale lead to infer that in this two girls schools (No. 3 and No. 5), students usually feel unsafe in the schools. As a result meeting and programmes organised in the schools in the evening meet with a poor response in terms of attendance.

Similar results were found in the studies of Stavros and Moore (1985), and Sange (1987) who reported that the school climate must be directed at improving both the
organizational performance and the quality of life of individuals and groups within the organization.

Administration (C)

The t-ratios for differences between the means on students perception of administration variable of school climate among non-demonstration schools are found to be significant at .01 level for $S_1$ versus $S_4$ ($t = 3.30$), $S_2$ versus $S_4$ ($t = 3.89$), $S_2$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 2.66$). Whereas the t ratios for $S_1$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 2.15$) and $S_3$ versus $S_4$ ($t = 2.59$) are significant at .05 level.

The mean values for schools No. 1,2,3,4 and 5 are 21.29, 21.60, 21.14, 16.78, 18.71 respectively. This indicates that the administration of schools No. 1 and 2 is better than their counterparts schools No. 4 and 5 respectively.

There are many situational factors that influence educational administration and education in general. Hence there is a great need to organise and provide the potential leadership required for steering the school towards the fulfilment of its objectives. The role of the administrator is, therefore, basically to organize and mobilise all the needed resources in order to improve the quality of education and to relate it more closely to the community, regional as well as the traditional needs.

According to the students' perceptions, non-demonstration schools No. 1 (Yoppharaj Vidhayalai) and No. 2 (Benjamaramachuthid) display more democratic school
administration than the latter. This means that there is more participation of the teaching staff in the development of administrative policy, with such participation being shared with students whenever it is envisaged that such participation would be advantageous educationally. Moreover, the administrators communicate to the teachers, students, and parents the standards set, and they, in turn, also personally contribute towards the fulfilment of these targets. Such a co-operative relationship helps create a feeling of belonging to the school among the student leadership, the teachers as well as the parents.

In earlier studies, Taylor (1989), commented that the principal is the key to improve school climate. Effective learning, personal satisfaction and constructive attitudes are all present among staff members and students in schools with a healthy, positive climate. However, contradicting results have been reported by Marine (1984), and Stavros and Moore (1985), measured students’ perceptions, the other assessed staff perceptions and found that in order to get a good picture of the school climate, data from both students and staff were needed. Staff and students had convergent opinions in many areas. Both students and staff were generally satisfied with the school but had negative perceptions concerning the school administrator. The staff viewed the principal as accessible but as a poor instructional leader.
Student Academic Orientation (D)

On the sub-variable of student academic orientation (D) as perceived by students of non-demonstration schools, the t-ratios for $S_1$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 3.95$), $S_3$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 3.30$) are found to be significant at .01 level while the value for $S_1$ versus $S_2$ ($t = 2.58$) is significant at .05 level.

The mean scores show the comparison between schools No. 1 and 2 ($M = 16.61, 15.04$), schools No. 1 and 3 ($M = 16.61, 14.02$), schools No. 3 and 5 ($M = 14.02, 16.16$). These values indicate that school No. 1 has higher rating on student academic orientation than schools No. 2 and 3 and also that school No. 5 is perceived significantly better than its counterpart school No. 3.

Student academic orientation is related to their performance in class and examinations. It is a reflection of how well the students have adjusted to the physical as well as the academic environments within the school because the school climate influences the affective domain, skill, knowledge and attitudes that the students gain as part of their learning experiences through the school courses. Teachers have an important role to play in academic orientation of their students, as they are the ones to plan and organise a suitable surrounding in the school in order to help the students gain more knowledge and experiences. On the basis of results it can be safely concluded that
students in school No. 1 are most clear about their main reason of being in school. Hence, they are more motivated to learning new things than their counterparts in other schools. They are also keen on accomplishing their school assignments within the required time limits.

As the academic orientation is a very important variable against which the achievement of the students and the efforts of the teachers may be transparent, such an environment would stimulate the students to study hard and gain interest in learning new things. If adopted, this approach would help schools No. 2 and 3 also to uplift their academic achievements to an appreciate level.

**Student Behavioural Values (E)**

On the fifth characteristics of school climate as perceived by students of non-demonstration schools, there is a significant difference between the S$_2$ versus S$_4$ ($t = 2.81$) at .01 level. The mean values of schools No. 2 and 4 are 9.65 and 8.00, respectively. Thus students’ perception of behavioural value of school No. 2 is better than school No. 4. In other words, students, as per their ratings of student behavioural values in the non-demonstration schools, prefer school No. 2 (Benjamarachuthid) to school No. 4 (Kaennakorn-Vidhayalai) meaning thereby that students in this school are generally more well-behaved than their counterparts in other schools. They also show more sense of responsibility even when their teachers are not around.

It may, therefore, be concluded that inculcating a
proper discipline requires among other things developing satisfactory relationships with agemates, establishing more mature relationship with adults, achieving emotional maturity and achieving intellectual maturity. School No. 4 benefit greatly in terms of student behavioural values if it would investigate the factors affecting the student behaviour in their school. This requires developing rapport between the teachers and students in order to learn the substantive factors leading to some degree of indiscipline in their school. Wynne (1980), also concluded that consistently applied disciplinary rules improved both school coherence and student behaviour.

Guidance (F)

On the variable of guidance, the t-ratio is found to be significant at .01 level in respect of the comparison of S₃ versus S₅ (t = 2.82) whereas the value for S₁ versus S₅ (t = 2.17) is significant at .05 level of confidence.

The mean scores for schools No. 3 and 5 and schools No. 1 and 5 are 15.48 : 17.37 and 16.08 : 17.37, respectively. This means that the school No. 5 is better than schools No. 1 and 3 in view of their students perception of the variable of guidance.

The significance of guidance in the schools can no longer be questioned. It has become a part and parcel of the curriculum development. Many schools offer a number of informal guidance services. However, to be more effective,
these services must be formally organised and directed. This means the administration has an additional responsibility of organising and operating a successful guidance programme.

Organised guidance programmes/services are likely to lead to better adjusted students. Since each student is different in terms of background, experience and intelligence and since the aim of education is to develop each child as much as his potential allows. Guidance, therefore, may be viewed as those range of services which the school renders to its students in its efforts to enable students to become happy, efficient and well-adjusted individuals. Counselling and guidance can help students to grow up to mature, self-reliant resourceful and happy individuals. Counselling also helps to significantly improve the educational efficiency by helping the programming courses in schools when the students' aptitudes and interests are known. Results of the present study show that these services are effectively run and have had positive implications for the improvement of school climate characteristics in school No. 5 (Sattreevidhaya II). Results that guidance services are provided at different satisfaction level have also been reported by Suwanmanee (1976), who concluded that guidance service of secondary schools of Southern part of Thailand were average. There was no significant difference between teachers' perception and students' perception, but the students perceived more
positively than teachers. Sukkongwaree (1976), reported the problems of guidance services of secondary schools in Bangkok by stressing that there are less amount of counsellor in schools; lack of materials and facilities; and teachers don’t have sufficient time to serve guidance programme.

Student-Peer Relationships (G)

On student-peer relationships, the t-ratios for $S_2$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 2.73$), $S_3$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 2.63$) are found to be significant at .01 level, while $S_2$ versus $S_4$ ($t = 2.20$) and $S_4$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 2.10$) differences are significant at 0.05 level.

The mean scores obtained in respect of comparisons of schools No. 2 and 3, No.2 and 4, No. 3 and 5 and No. 4 and 5 are 16.65, 14.88; 16.65, 15.19; 14.88, 16.72; and 15.19, 16.17, respectively. Schools No. 2 and 5 show significantly better relationships of students with their peer groups than schools No. 3 and 4.

Interaction among students as a social group is a requisite quality for developing the students' competencies and qualities necessary for living in a complex culture. In the process, one learns democratic values, tolerance, cooperation and skills for collective thinking by participating in many activities in which goals are formulated by a group, projects are planned by a group and rules are made by a group. The peer group as a social unit
provides for the need for affection of its members. Positive student-peer relationships may, therefore, supplement the efforts of the teachers or counsellors in attempting to alleviate students' personal problems.

Results that schools No. 2 (Benjamarachuthid) and No. 5 (Sattreevidhaya II) are perceived better than schools No. 3 and 4 with regard to student-peer relationships lead to infer that students in the former category of non-demonstration schools care for each other and give due respect to each other. This feeling of affection for each other has created a sense of belongingness to their schools and the peer group cohesion they have developed greatly modifies their relationships. Teachers can also use this opportunity by assigning classworks to peer groups so that they may help one another to learn through group discussions. However, the teachers should plan such group learning activities so in such a manner that individual's self-directed study is not interfered with as this will deny individual creative thinking.

Parent and Community School Relationships (H)

Regarding the eigth variable that is parent and community school relationships, the analysis in terms of the t-ratios submits significant differences between S₄ and S₅ (t = 3.15), S₁ and S₅ (t = 3.45), S₂ and S₄ (t = 2.95) and S₂ and S₅ (t = 3.23) at .01 level. Differences between S₁ and S₃ (t = 2.37) and S₂ and S₃ (t = 2.11) are significant at .05 level.
The mean scores are (a) 16.29 and 14.86 for S\textsubscript{1} and S\textsubscript{3}; (b) 16.29, 13.70 for school No. 1 and school No.4, (c) 16.29, 13.71 for schools No. 1 and 5; (d) 16.10, 14.86 for schools No. 2 and 3; (e) 16.10, 13.70 for schools No. 2 and 4; and (f) 16.10, 13.71 for schools No. 2 and 5, respectively. This implies that the non-demonstration school students of S\textsubscript{1} and S\textsubscript{2} perceive their parent and community relationships with schools as significantly better than their counterparts in schools No. 3, 4 and 5. In other words parents and members of the community attend school meetings and other activities of school 1 and 2 and so they positively contribute towards the school programmes. Moreover, community attendance at school meetings and programmes is good and constructive. Excellent students are duly honored for their achievement in learning, music, drama and sports. This concern for the schools’ attainment of its objectives by the parents and the community at large inculcates a feeling of competition and, hence, achievement among the students.

These findings are consistent with the conclusions of FreCarter (1985), who recommended that parents, students, community members, teachers and principals and others should work together closely in designing and implementing effective written policies concerning student discipline.
Instructional Management (I)

On the ninth sub-variable of school climate that is instructional management, the results of t-ratios as perceived by students of non-demonstration schools for group of $S_1$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 3.05$), and group $S_2$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 4.55$) are found to be significant at .01 level. Whereas for group $S_3$ versus $S_4$ ($t = 2.45$), and group $S_3$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 2.46$) results are significant at .05 level.

The mean scores of comparison belonging to students’ perceptions are 25.59, 22.24 for $S_1$ and $S_3$; 26.56, 22.24 for $S_2$ and $S_3$; 22.24, 24.89 for $S_3$ and $S_4$; 22.24, 24.71 for $S_3$ and $S_5$, respectively. It means that the students perception of school No. 3 (Chonkanyanukul) in respect of instructional management is significantly lower than schools No.1,2,4 and 5.

Good instructional management requires the availability of good facilities and equipment, good teachers and a pleasant learning environment. All these resources must be in sufficient supply in order to ensure that no interference affects the learning process. In addition, the teachers should express themselves to the students very clearly so that they may listen and understand the subjects. The teachers may, however, apply such flexible methods as may be possible such as asking students to read or write, show some models or pictures to illustrate the ideas. It is up to the teacher to manage the situation with the given
facilities and available materials and how well he achieves the learning objectives. It depends upon his experience, skills and knowledge of the techniques involved.

The students of school No. 3 perceive their school as falling below the desirable or acceptable standard of instructional management as compared with their counterparts in other schools. They feel that there are no clear rules for the students to follow during the learning process. Consequently, the students are unable to accomplish their assignments effectively.

A good instructional management requires a proper planning of the logistics required for the teaching purposes, their procurement in appropriate quantity and supplies and their utilization by skilled teachers in such a way that the students can grasp the real expressions being portrayed in a better way. Similarly, Russell and others (1985), found that the school climate characteristics in effective schools related to recognition of academic success, orderly environment, emphasis on curriculum articulation, instructional support and high expectations for student performance etc. And Johnson (1985), recommended that teaching them means creating a situation where structures can be discovered and where students can verify and relate ideas to objects.
Student Activities (J).

On the tenth sub-variable that is student activities, t-values for $S_2$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 3.49$) and $S_2$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 2.87$) are found to be significant at .01 level and for $S_1$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 2.30$) comparisons lead to significant differences at .05 level.

The comparison of the mean scores of schools No. 1 and 3; schools No. 2 and 3; schools No. 2 and 5 shows mean values of 15.49, 13.54; 16.17, 13.54, and 16.17, 14.18 respectively. These values indicate that the students perceptions of schools No. 1 and 2 in respect of student activities is higher than in school No. 3. Also, school No. 2 is higher than school No. 5 on the same variable.

Beyond the class activities called as extracurricular activities or student activities have become an unavoidable part of school programmes necessitating administrative policy formulation in order to regulate their operation consistently with the normal academic programmes.

Originally termed "extra-curricular" it is no longer viewed as outside the academic programme as such. Rather it is viewed as complementary to the teaching schedules because it also contributes towards the development of the students' personality. However, the list of potential student activities which a high school could organize and sponsor may be long and comprehensive ranging from class organisation, competitive athletics, music, debates and
presentations, student assemblies, school publications etc.

Student perceive schools No.1 (Yoppharaj Vidhayalai) and No. 2 (Benjamarachuthid) to be on the ahead of other schools with regard to students activities and feel that those activities afford ample opportunities for that students to participate in activities of their interests. They opine that the teachers in these school try to encourage and stimulate interest among the student. Hence, a more widespread participation is observed among these categories than in any other non-demonstration schools. And the students are motivated to participate in student activities after school even if their families cannot afford it. These findings are partially in agreement with the view of Atencio (1988) who recommends that high school should develop student activities which produce great interaction and which encourage a more open atmosphere for school improvement. Meissen (1990), however, found that there were no significant differences between student involvement in co-curricular activities and perception of school climates.

The intra-differences among non-demonstration schools with respect of student perception of school climate characteristics, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The students of school No. 1 perceive teacher-student relationships subscale better than those of schools No. 3 and 4. In case of student academic orientation subscale also students of school No.1 perceive better than schools No. 2 and 3. On other
two subscales viz., administration and parent and community-school relationships, students of school No.1 perceive these better than those of schools No. 4 and 5. On other three subscales that is instructional management, student activities, and parent and community-school relationships, their perception is better than those of school No. 3.

2. Teacher-student relationships and student-peer relationships are perceived by students of school No. 2 as better than those of schools No. 3 and 4. On security and maintenance and student activities subscales of school No. 2 students' perception is better than those of schools No. 3 and 5. In case of administration they perceive it better than those of schools No. 4 and 5. With regard to three subscales viz., parent and community-school relationships, student behavioural values and instructional management subscales, student of school No. 2 are more satisfied than those of schools No. 3, 4 and 5 on parent and community-school relationships; than those of school No. 4 on student behavioural values; and than those of school No. 3 on instructional management.

3. Students of school No. 3, perceive administration subscale better than their counterparts of school No. 4.
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4. Students of school No. 4 perceive instructional management subscale better than those of school No. 3.

5. School No. 5 is perceived significantly better than school No. 1 by students on guidance subscale. For five of ten characteristics viz; teacher-student relationships, student academic orientation, guidance, student-peer relationships, and instructional management subscales, these students (that is of school 5) show significantly better perception than school No. 3. In addition, the teacher-student relationships and student-peer relationships are also perceived significantly better by students of school No. 5 than those of school No. 4.

The intra-differences of school climate characteristics in five non-demonstration schools as perceived by students is presented in Figure 9.
SCHOOL CLIMATE CHARACTERISTICS AS PERCEIVED
BY STUDENTS IN FIVE NON-DEMONSTRATION SCHOOLS
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5.2.2 Teachers' Perception

The results of intra-school differences among non-demonstration schools in respect of the perception of teachers of their school climate characteristics as entered in Table 5.3.1 show that two of the ten characteristics namely the teachers and student relationships (A) and instructional management (I) are not found to be statistically significant at any level. Non-demonstration schools of Thailand were taken from five zones that is north, south, east, north-eastern and central. As per perception of teachers, non-demonstration schools in all zones of Thailand have more or less identical type of school climate as far as the relationships with students' and the type of instructional management sub-variables are concerned. This is also reflected by the values of means and SDs which are similar to one another for all the schools included in the sample.

Significant differences among non-demonstration schools are reflected from t-ratios entered in Table 4.7.1 on the remaining eight sub-scales of school climate, namely security and maintenance (B), administration (C), student academic orientation (D), student behavioural values (E), guidance (F), student-peer relationships (G), parent and community-school relationships (H), and student activities (J). The intra-differences of school climate characteristics in five non-demonstration schools as perceived by teachers are presented in Figure 10.
Table 5.3
The Means And SDs Of School Climate Characteristics As Perceived By Teachers In Five Non-Demonstration Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate Dimensions</th>
<th>School No 1 M</th>
<th>School No 1 S.D</th>
<th>School No 2 M</th>
<th>School No 2 S.D</th>
<th>School No 3 M</th>
<th>School No 3 S.D</th>
<th>School No 4 M</th>
<th>School No 4 S.D</th>
<th>School No 5 M</th>
<th>School No 5 S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>51.07</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>50.59</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>52.47</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>50.28</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>51.63</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>27.43</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>28.52</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>31.63</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.89</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>24.28</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>15.97</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>15.34</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>25.59</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3.1
The t-ratios Among Various Non-Demonstration Schools On School Climate Characteristics As Perceived By Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate Dimensions</th>
<th>t-ratio between group of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# df.
55  56  55  56  57  56  57  57  58  57

* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level
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Security and Maintenance (B)

The dimension of security and maintenance in the perception of teachers of non-demonstration schools has submitted significant differences with t-values = 4.83 for S1 versus S3, 3.03 for S2 versus S3, 3.01 for S3 versus S4 and 4.32 for S3 versus S5, all significant at .01 level.

The mean scores for schools are 27.43, 28.52, 31.63, 28.72 and 27.27 for school 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively. This implies security and maintenance of school No. 3 (Chonkanyanukul) is perceived by teachers as better than schools 1, 2, 4, 5.

The teachers feel that school No. 3 is ahead of the other schools with regard to the sub-variable of security and maintenance on the grounds that students, workers and teachers feel safe in the school buildings during the school and after school working hours. As a result of this positive attitude with regard to security and maintenance, people are willing to come to school No. 3 for meetings and programmes in the evenings without fear. Comparatively, the school surrounding is more attractive than in the other non-demonstration schools, with the buildings and school compound’s being clean and neat.

English (1989), reported the facility, cleanliness and security was at one of the lowest possible levels in organisation and recommended that no decision be made without this input. Wentworth (1990), also found that the
school climate reflected a feeling of unity, pride, cooperation, acceptance of differences and security.

**Administration (C)**

With regard to the third sub-variable of school climate characteristics as perceived by teachers of non-demonstration, the t-ratios are significant at .05 level for S2 versus S4 (t = 2.39), and S3 versus S4 (t = 2.23).

While examining the intra-school differences between pairs of five non-demonstration schools, it is seen that the mean scores are equal to 24.28 and 20.69 (S2 and S4), and 24.07 and 20.69 (S3 and S4) which reveal that the administration of school No. 4 is perceived as poorer by teachers than schools No. 2 and 3.

School administration is a necessary activity required especially for co-ordinating all the other activities taking place within the organisation in order to ensure that programmes are being implemented according to the objectives of the school and the national or government policy. The administration in the non-demonstration schools is steered by the principal with his team of selected and competent teachers working together. This is not to say that other teachers do not participate in the running of the schools, rather their levels of participation is determined by the leadership styles of the principal. If it is democratic, consultation of all teachers and other concerned parties is utilised, but if it
is autocratic, the principal would accommodate a very limited contribution from other teachers.

Similar views have been expressed by Sellars (1984), Czaja (1985), Bancroft (1986), Dudney (1986), Bartell and Willis (1987), Meltzer (1988), Scott (1988), Hall (1989), Galindo (1990) and Tausere (1990) who all found that there was a significant relationship between the leadership style of school principals and school climate.

However, studies by Wiggins (1972), Krueger (1984), Brooks (1986); Bailey (1988); and Kennebrew (1988) reveal that principal behaviour and organisation climate were not significantly related.

**Student Academic Orientation (D)**

In case of the forth variable of school climate characteristics that is student academic orientation, t-ratios are found to be 4.14 and 3.05 for S2 versus S3 and S2 versus S4 respectively which are significant at .01 level. Differences between S1 and S3 (t = 2.31) are significant at .05 level.

The mean values when compared for each pair of schools are 13.24, 16.27 for school No. 2 and school No. 3; 13.24, 15.97 for school No. 2 and school No. 4; and 14.64, 16.27 for school No. 1 and school No. 3, respectively. This exhibits that student academic orientation of school No. 2 is lower than the schools No. 3 and 4 and that of school No. 1 is lower than school No. 3 in teachers' opinion.
Student academic orientation in the non-demonstration schools is determined by a number of factors but basically the instructional management and the personal interaction greatly influence the students' output or academic performance. Many students want to learn what the school and teacher desire. They also have the ability to perform the desired tasks efficiently. However, there are a few students who may not be motivated to learn. The school has to perform duty to increase their desire to learn. The significance of motivation for learning cannot be overlooked. Motivation can be increased through reward. Simultaneously interest, curiosity, and self-selected goals may be ensured to keep the learner at work without pressure from the teacher.

The teachers are of the view that non-demonstration schools No. 3 and 4 have better student-academic orientation than schools No. 1 and 2. This impression is derived from the observation that students in the former category of schools clearly understand their purpose of being in the schools as a result of which they are inquisitive about learning new things. They are also enthusiastic about compiling their class assignments. The motivation they have in learning new things makes them work hard in their study and hence they enjoy the learning situation. Etzioni (1983), discussed the schools as character-building institution, where academic and behaviour standards should encourage self-discipline and learning.
Student Behavioural Values (E)

The fifth variable of school climate characteristics as perceived by teachers of non-demonstration schools is student behavioural values. The t-values for this sub-scale are found to be significant at .05 level with respect to the comparison of $S_1$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 2.05$) and $S_3$ versus $S_4$ ($t = 2.02$). The mean values of two pairs of schools are 9.50 and 10.77 for school No. 1 and 3; and 10.77 and 9.24 for schools No. 3 and 4 respectively. This reveals that the student behavioural values of school No. 3 (Chonkanyanukeel) are higher than their counterparts' in schools No. 1 and 4 in teachers' perception.

Similar results are reported by Lalitha Kumari (1984), who found that teacher behaviour had positive significant relationships with pupils’ behaviour in case of all the categories of school climate. However, innovative classrooms affected the classroom climate and its components like pupils’ psyche, initiative, pupils’ motivation, and social relationships, the teacher behaviour and pupils behaviour.

Guidance (F)

On the variable of guidance, the significant t-values have been noticed in respect of $S_2$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 3.42$) at .01 level, and $S_1$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 2.19$) and $S_2$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 2.47$) at .05 level.
The mean values of the pairs of schools are 15.34, 17.63 for school No. 2 and school No. 3; 15.68, 17.63 for school No. 1 and school No. 3; and 15.34, 17.03 for school No. 2 and school No. 5, respectively. This implies that according to the teachers’ perception of the guidance programme of their schools, school No. 3 (Chonkanyanukul) and school No. 5 (Sattreevidhaya II) are definitely more appreciable and satisfying than schools No. 1 and 2.

As per the nature of items, good guidance service means that the teachers apply guidance services in their day-to-day performance of their duties, it is useful in the improvement of teacher-student relationships. Teachers guide their students to become better acquainted with the institutions well as they also guide them on choice of subjects as well as career prospects. Counselling at an appropriate place in order to retrieve personal information of the students so as to redirect students in their efforts to develop their mental and physical potential is also rendered.

The teachers seem to have favourably rated schools No. 3 and No. 5 on the basis of teacher positive efforts to improve students’ conditions and status by showing willingness to help meet the psychological need of the students.

Stavros (1985), and Keefe (1986), also opine that with effective guidance and counselling in schools, the
Advisement relationship is strengthened over the years. Advisers are able to help students make better decisions about school programmes, career and college choices and ordinary school adjustment.

Studenmt-Peer Relationships (G)

On student-peer relationships, there exist significant differences at .01 level for S₂ versus S₅ (t = 2.79) as perceived by teachers of non-demonstration schools. Differences in S₂ versus S₃ (t = 2.58) are significant at .05 level with values of mean equal to 14.76 and 16.70 for S₂ versus S₅ and 14.76 and 16.47 for S₂ versus S₃, respectively indicating thereby that the student-peer relationships of the school No. 2 is poorer than those in schools No. 3 and 5.

Students within the same peer groups have a lot to share in common on the basis of the similarity in their experiences in chronological terms of development. Within the same peer group, students inquisitively try to find out why they differ from one another in certain respects. This influences the way they interact with each other. Hence, the extent of their personality growth.

The teachers perceive the student-peer relationships to be better in schools No. 3 and No. 5 as compared to school No. 2. This shows that students in non-demonstration schools No. 3 and No. 5 care a lot about each other and would try as much as possible to support their
colleagues whenever confronted with problems. Moreover, they also respect each other, a behaviour which has a positive implication in the building of trust among the peer groups. A definite feeling of affection and affiliation exists among the students and hence they try as much as possible to make friends. This atmosphere is definitely conducive for teaching purposes as it facilitates the learning process. In a way, it becomes easier for the teachers to organise students into groups convenient for teaching purposes. Findings of Ellett et al., (1978), also support that agreement among all school participants was associated with academic outcomes and student attendance.

Parent and Community - School Relationships (H)

On the dimension of parent and community school relationships, significant differences are observed between S\textsubscript{2} and S\textsubscript{3} \((t = 2.37)\) and S\textsubscript{3} and S\textsubscript{5} \((t = 2.46)\) at .05 level.

The mean scores of both pairs of non-demonstration school are 15.38 and 16.83 \((S\textsubscript{2} , S\textsubscript{3})\); and 16.83 and 15.20 \((S\textsubscript{3} , S\textsubscript{5})\), respectively. This indicates that school No. 3 (Chonkanyanukul) is much better on the variable of parent and community school relationships than school No. 2 and No. 5 in teachers' perception.

Parents and community-school relationships play a major supporting role to facilitate the working of the school administration. Parents are interested in improved academic performance of their students or children and are
ready to co-operate with the administration if this objective will be achieved to a large extent. The public or community at large are interested in having a school in their locality a good reputation. They, therefore, require a good public relations in order to effectively communicate with the school administration. Parents and community are, therefore, on the whole keen to be involved in the affairs of the school if the administration can afford them the opportunity. The school administration and the teachers on the other hand would like the parents, the public and even students to appreciate the circumstances under which they are performing their duties so that shortcomings are solely not blamed on them. The parent and community school relation, therefore, depends upon the extent to which each of the party's expectations are met.

The results of this study reveal that non-demonstration school No. 3 to be the best in terms of parents and community - school relationships as compared to schools No. 2 and No. 5 thereby implying that parents and members of community are actively involved in such meetings, and other activities as a result of which most people in the community are ready to give a hand in one way or the other. The community groups also appreciate good performance by honouring student achievement in learning, music, drama and sports. This has very important implications with regard to motivating students to become achievers in various activities in the school. This further enhances their
mental and physical as well as emotional developments.

It may, therefore, be inferred that a co-operative relationship between schools, parents and the community is essential in terms of the support needed to run the schools. Teachers should help parents to understand the growth and development of their children. When this is appreciated, teachers concentrate on their programme without much interference.

Results regarding parent and community - school relationships as found in the present study are in agreement with the findings of Breckenride (1976), Phil Delta Kappa (1980); Russell and Others (1985), and Winter (1987) that community perceptions and parental support are important factors in influencing school climate.

**Student Activities (J)**

The last characteristics of school climate namely student activities in non-demonstration schools has been perceived by the teachers significantly differences at .05 level for S₃ versus S₅ (t = 2.03). The comparison of teachers perception of school No. 3 and school No. 5 shows that mean score of two schools are 16.43 and 15.10, respectively, implying thereby that school No. 3 is perceived as having much more student activities as compared to school No. 5. This means that student in school No. 3 are more enthusiastic than their counterparts about sports, music, group discussion, debates etc. They are interested
in participating in activities of their preference.

The evidence from this study confirms that given the opportunity and availability of various co-curricular activities, students would wish to recreate themselves in these activities as a means of testing their potential in life in addition to the normal academic responsibilities. It would appear that the diversity of student activities available in a given non-demonstration school is determined by the availability of funds to afford the desired equipment as well as the orientation of the school administration towards co-curricular activities. School No. 3 may, therefore, be allocating adequate funds for the promotion of supports and other student activities as well as emphasis on its curricular development.

Atencio (1988), & Meltzer (1988), recommended that school climate needs to be explored as an outcome as well as an activity of schooling and that developing activities in high schools produce greater interaction and encourage more open atmosphere for school improvement.

The intra-differences among non-demonstration schools as perceived by teachers with respect to school climate characteristics lead to:

1. There are no significant differences between various pairs of schools on two of the ten characteristics that is; teacher-student relationships and instructional management subscales.
2. Teachers of school No. 1 perceived security and maintenance, student academic orientation, student behavioural values and guidance sub-variables worse than those of school No. 3.

3. The teachers of school No. 2 perceive administration in their school better than those of school No. 4.

4. In case of school No. 3, teachers' perception of security and maintenance is better than those of schools No. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Likewise, teachers of school No. 3 perceive student behavioural values better than those of schools No. 1 and 4; student academic orientation and guidance subscales better than schools No. 1 and 2. Student-peer relationships and parent and community-school relationships better than those of school No. 2. Furthermore, teachers of school No. 3 have perceived administration of their school better than those of school No. 4, and parent and community-school relationships and student activities subscale better than those of school No. 5.

5. Perception of teachers of school No. 4 for academic orientation of their school is better than those of school No. 2.

6. In school No. 5, teachers perceive guidance and student-peer relationships subscales better than those of school No. 2.
5.2.3 Parents' Perception

Table 5.4.1 presents the intra-differences among non-demonstration schools of school climate characteristics as perceived by parents on subscale of non-demonstration schools pair. These results are shown in Figure 11.

Teacher and student Relationships (A)

The t-values for $S_1$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 3.59$), $S_1$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 3.11$), $S_2$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 3.83$), and $S_2$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 3.19$) are significant at .01 level in respect of teacher-student relationships.

An examination of the mean scores between school No. 1 (48.93) and 3 (42.63), school No. 1 (48.93) and 5 (41.39), school No. 2 (48.77) and 3 (42.63), and school No. 2 (48.77) and 5 (41.39), indicates that the parents' perception of school No. 1 (Yoppharaj Vidhayalai) and school No. 2 (Benjamarachuthid) in respect of teacher-student relationships is comparable and higher than the schools No. 3 and 5.

Teacher-student relationships are fundamental in the learning process. Although parents are not conversant with the intricacies of the teaching process, nevertheless they are capable of assessing the impact of teacher-student relationships on learning. Consequently, their appreciable identification of schools No. 1 and 2 indicates that they are aware of contribution of these schools to the learning of students and feel satisfied that teachers in these
schools like their students and would always try to support them whenever necessary. In addition, they realize that whenever students are confronted with problems of any nature, the teachers readily come to their rescue. Probably one important factor as depicted by the nature of items which has influenced the parents in giving credit to schools No. 1 and No. 2 is the way the teachers assess the performance of their students: that is parents feel that teachers are objective in their evaluation of the students’ works. When students get the scores, they feel that students deserve and are encouraged to work harder to meet the demand of competition.

Rosenblum and Firestone (1987), to report that a variety of school factors influences the interaction between teachers and students as a factor of school climate. Eberle (1988), found the most significant indicators of healthy school climate were the relationship between the student and a particular teacher and the supportive environment of the home, school and community.

Security and Maintenance (B)

On the second variable, that is security and maintenance (B) as perceived by parents of non-demonstration schools students, t-ratios for $S_1$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 3.41$) and $S_2$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 2.86$) are found to be significant at .01 level; and for $S_1$ versus $S_4$ ($t=2.33$) and $S_3$ versus $S_5$ ($t=2.12$) significant at .05 level. The respective mean scores are 28.37, 24.52 for $S_1$ versus $S_4$; 28.37, 23.82 for
Table 5.4
The Means And SD Of School Climate Characteristics As Perceived By Parents In Five Non-Demonstration Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate Dimensions</th>
<th>School No 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>School No 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>School No 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>School No 4</th>
<th></th>
<th>School No 5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>48.93</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>48.77</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>42.63</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>44.37</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>41.39</td>
<td>11.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>28.37</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>24.52</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.53</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4.1
The t-ratios Among Various Non-Demonstration Schools On School Climate Characteristics As Perceived By Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate Dimensions</th>
<th>t-ratio between group of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df. 58  58  55  56  58  55  56  55  56  53

* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level
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SCHOOL CLIMATE CHARACTERISTICS AS PERCEIVED BY PARENTS IN FIVE NON-DEMONSTRATION SCHOOLS

A. TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS
B. SECURITY AND MAINTENANCE
C. ADMINISTRATION
D. STUDENT ACADEMIC ORIENTATION
E. STUDENT BEHAVIORAL VALUES

F. GUIDANCE
G. STUDENT-PEER RELATIONSHIPS
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The examination and comparison of these means reveal that the school No. 1 (Yoppharaj Vidhayalai) is much better than the school No. 4 (Kaennakorn Vidhayalai) and No. 5 (Sattreevidhaya II) and school No. 5 is also lower than other non-demonstration schools, that is school No. 2 (Benjamarchutid) and school No. 3 (Chonkanyanukul), on the variable of security and maintenance.

Parents' view of performance of non-demonstration school No. 1 on the lead as compared to other counterpart schools with regard to the variable of security and maintenance is indicative of parents' opinion that in school No. 1, students, workers as well as teachers, feel secure to stay within the school buildings. Moreover, the classrooms here are clean and neat and so are the school buildings which are generally well maintained. Hence, to the parents the physical structures and the general organisation in school No. 1 is adequate and has a remarkable standard worth appreciating.

Galindo (1990), also noted that even while high school students, professionals (including teachers and campus administrators), and parents, had positive view about the quality and effectiveness of schools, parents identified problems associated with school facilities, and class size as requiring attention.
Administration (C)

Administration is the third variable of school climate characteristics. The t-ratios reveal a significant differences in cases of $S_1$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 3.33$), $S_1$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 3.56$), $S_2$ versus $S_3$ ($t=3.05$) and $S_2$ versus $S_5$ ($t=3.42$) at .01 level, whereas differences between $S_1$ and $S_4$ ($t = 2.43$) and $S_2$ and $S_4$ ($t=2.04$) are significant at .05 level.

The pair-wise comparative mean values on this variable for schools No. 1 and 3 ($M = 23.53, 18.03$), schools No. 1 and 4 ($M = 23.53, 19.44$), schools No. 1 and 5 ($M = 23.53, 18.14$), schools No. 2 and 3 ($M = 22.33, 18.03$), schools No. 2 and 4 ($M = 22.33, 19.44$), and schools No. 2 and 5 ($M = 22.33, 18.14$), respectively indicate that the administration of schools No. 1 and 2 is better planned than that of the other schools as viewed by parents of non-demonstration schools students.

School administration, as has already been explained, earlier is concerned with planning, organising and controlling the activities of the school in an effort to meeting the stipulated objectives of the school. Administration provides the leadership required to steering the school towards its goals, and, therefore, the type of leadership style in practice in a particular school will determine to what extent it has a multiplier effect on the education of the students.
The principal, his deputy and the team of teachers in the school administration, have to relate to the students, parents and community in such a way that co-operative relationship result into a successful attainment of the desired standards. According to the parents' perception, schools No. 1 and No. 2 have a better system of administration than their counterparts of schools No. 3, 4 and 5 because the administrators in the former schools listen to the students' ideas, and communicate effectively with the teachers and parents. Even though they set high standards, they let all the concerned parties know what these standards are. Hence, the administrators in these non-demonstration schools set good example by working hard themselves. They allow students and teachers to decide on what happens in these schools. Such a democratic leadership style, whereby the teachers, students and parents are involved stimulates everybody to contribute effectively and wholeheartedly towards the success of the schools.

In earlier studies by Fairbain and Pegolo (1983), Sellar (1984), Bancroft (1986), Dudney (1986), Bartell (1987), and Meltzer (1988) also revealed that the effective principals who generate the positive climate in each school are attributable, at least in part, to the leadership style of principal. They are best prepared in designing, implementing and evaluating a school climate improvement programmes. Gunning, Heinz, Rhoads and Watkins (1988),
recommended that school climate can determined the direction and implementations of all activities in the secondary setting. A positive school climate is the foundation for effective learning and it is achieved through the cooperation of teachers, administrators, support staff members and parents.

However, findings of no significant relationship between the school climate profile and the leader behaviour factor have been reported by Krueger (1984), Brooks (1986), Bassou (1987), Bailey (1988) and Kennebrew (1988).

**Student Academic Orientation (D)**

Parents of students belonging to non-demonstration schools, show significant differences in their perception of student academic orientation sub-variable for \( S_1 \) versus \( S_5 \) (\( t = 3.18 \)) and \( S_2 \) versus \( S_5 \) (\( t = 3.06 \)) at .01 level; and \( S_3 \) versus \( S_5 \) (\( t = 2.58 \)) at .05 level.

The comparative picture of the mean scores of schools Nos. 1 and 5, schools No. 2 and 5, and schools No. 3 and 5 submits values of 16.37, 13.57; 15.90, 13.57; 15.67, 13.57, respectively. This implies that the parents' perceptions of school No. 5 in respect of student academic orientation is lower than the schools No. 1, 2 and 3.

The source of information about student academic orientation to the parents is through the first sessions of the new admission of the year which is compulsory arranging for both students and their parents before the programme of learning starts or through the parent-teacher association.
which may give them an overview of the situation. As a whole, the parents are generally satisfied with the student academic orientation arranged in most of the non-demonstration schools under study except school No.5 (Sattreevidhaya II) which the parents perceive does not make it clearly known to the students as to why they are in this school. They attend classes merely as a matter of routine. Improved student academic orientation may be made possible if the teachers explain to the students the real essence of school education. It, therefore, requires each teacher to give guidance to his/her students on ongoing basis. Better student academic orientation may also be achieved when the teachers give unbiased evaluations of the students' performance. This also encourages a feeling of healthy competition and learning.

The findings of Stavros and Moore (1985), suggest that in order to get a good picture of the school climate, staff and students had convergent opinions in many areas and yet the school's academic programme was viewed positively by both groups. Students were positive about guidance and counselling, the curriculum, and the instruction.

**Student Behavioural Values (E)**

On the fifth characteristics of school climate, that is **student behavioural values**, differences are significant between $S_2$ and $S_4$ ($t = 2.17$) and $S_2$ and $S_5$ ($t = 2.55$) at .05 level.
The obtained mean scores of schools No. 2 and 4 are respectively 9.97, and 8.19 and of schools No. 2 and 5 are 9.97, 8.25, respectively. This shows that the student behavioural values of school No. 2 (Benjamarachuthid) are higher than schools No. 4 and 5 as perceived by parents of students in non-demonstration schools.

In order to prepare the students for adult citizenship and intelligent obedience, it is imperative that the students be trained to learn acceptable behaviour. This requires some degree of control and direction. The school today conceives of discipline as a learning process by which students can develop to a point of self-control and self-discipline. The development of this realization gives the opportunity to students to adjust within their own groups and learn to control themselves independently without undue interference from the teachers.

Findings on student behavioural value in the present study are similar to those of Lalitha (1984), who reported that teacher-behaviour had positive significant relationships with students' behaviour in the case of all the categories of school climate.

Guidance (F)

Intra-differences among non-demonstration schools as perceived by parents on the guidance characteristic of school climate are found to be significant at .01 level for $S_1$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 2.74$) and $S_1$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 3.10$),
respectively. T-values between $S_2$ and $S_5$ ($t = 2.22$) are significant at .05 level.

The mean scores obtained for pair of school viz., school No.1 and No.3, school No.1 and No.5, and school No.2 and No.5 are 17.53 and 15.40; 17.53 and 14.64; and 16.77 and 14.64, respectively. It implies that the guidance of school No.1 is much better than their counterparts (i.e. school No.3 & 5). Also, school No. 2 is higher than No.5 in respect of guidance as perceived by parents of non-demonstration schools. In other words, parents have opined that teachers in these schools are readily available to give assistance or advice in any form to students including helping them with personal problems. They also help them plan for their future classes and future jobs, as well as their future personality developments. Giving clear career guidance helps students assess their potential vis-a-vis the available employment opportunities. When students know what they are aspiring for, they tend to work hard so as to achieve it.

The result of Smithiseth (1981), on problems of secondary schools’ advisers of seventh educational region in Thailand revealed that there were significant differences between male and female advisers and between the trained and the untrained counsellors in schools.

**Parent and Community-School Relationships (H)**

Significant differences exist in non-demonstration schools as perceived by parents of **parent and community-school relationships** variable. T-values for $S_1$ versus $S_4$ ($t$
= 2.68), \( S_1 \) versus \( S_5 \) (\( t = 3.80 \)) are significant at .01 level, whereas, for \( S_1 \) versus \( S_2 \) (\( t = 2.57 \)) and \( S_3 \) versus \( S_5 \) (\( t = 2.59 \)) these are significant at .05 level.

Further examination of the table (No. 4.8) the comparative picture of the mean scores for schools No.1 and 2 (\( M = 16.93, 15.53 \)), schools No.1 and 4 (\( M = 16.93, 14.93 \)), schools No. 1 and 5 (\( M = 16.93, 14.14 \)), and schools No. 3 and 5 (\( M = 16.07, 14.14 \)). This exhibits that parents’ perception of school No.1 is more appreciative of relationships among parent-community and school than schools No. 2, 4 and 5 and further for school No.5 as less appreciative than school No.3.

This is the variable in which the parents are expected to contribute most, both materially and morally. The school belongs to the public and is therefore almost entirely dependent on the goodwill and support of the "stakeholders." That is to say the schools are dependent upon the favour of all they serve. It is the citizens of the community which evaluate the overall performance of the schools and therefore each activity of school which is considered successful by the public brings commendation to the school and adds proportionately to the improvement of school-community relations.

On the perception of the parents of students in the non-demonstration schools, due credit is given to school No.1 because of its excellent relationship with the parents.
and the community at large. This view is substantiated by their observation that parents and members of the community are regularly invited to attend school meetings and other activities. As a result of this co-operative relationship community attendance at meeting and school programmes are good, to the extent that the community willingly honors student achievement in learning, music, drama and sports. This kind of relationship is lacking in the other schools (i.e. schools No. 2, 4 and 5), that they rated low by the parents with regard to this variable. This requires an effective system of communication or feedback. Staff members should also be well informed about the school policies achievements, through orientation meetings, bulletins, the school newspaper etc. Similarly, Russell and other (1985), and Trimarco (1989), found that a more positive approach would be studying and implementing the administrative, curricular and community school, policies which are positive contributors to the school climate.

**Instructional Management (I)**

The next variable is instructional management. The results of t-ratios for $S_2$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 3.31$) are significant at .01 level, whereas, those for $S_1$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 2.38$) and $S_2$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 2.64$) are significant at .05 level.

The comparison between various pairs of non-demonstration schools taken at a time, show the mean values
for schools No. 1 and 5 (M = 26.17, 22.11) schools No. 2 and 3 (M = 26.50, 23.27) and schools No. 2 and 5 (M = 26.50, 22.11) implying thereby that schools No.1 and 2 have better conduct of instruction than school No.5, and also school No.2 is higher than school No.3 as perceived by parents in respect of instructional management of five non-demonstration schools.

Parents' perceptions on this variable of ranking schools No.1 and No.2 as higher than schools No.3 and No.5, shows that the former group of schools tends to be more consistent and effective in instructional management. This is possibly because in the former category of schools, students are given very clear instruction on what they are to do. Moreover, teachers also try to help students discuss assignments during class hours, they are devoted to teaching, so that they spend most of the classroom time in learning activities.

It may, therefore, be concluded that the success of instructional management in a classroom situation relies on the teachers' capabilities and interpersonal skills. The instructional management considered by Perrone (1985), had recommended the development of more explicit goals that are clear to teachers, students and their parents; more curriculum development to support inquiry, problem solving and more active learning as well as to attend to interdisciplinary studies and greater integration of students' academic and prevocational experiences; and
reduced teaching loads to allow more time for individualization. And Haryana and others (1987), also found that parents perception of school climate improved in school development programme impact towards study. 

**Student Activities (J)**

The last characteristic of satisfaction variables is student activities, the perception of parents of five non-demonstration schools shows significant difference for certain pairs of schools. The values of t for S1 versus S3 (t = 3.78), S1 versus S5 (t = 5.47) and S2 versus S5 (t = 4.29) are found to be significant at .01 level, while t-ratios for S1 versus S4 (t = 2.51) and S2 versus S3 (t = 2.45) are significant at .05 level.

Mean scores for schools No.1 and 3 are M = 16.83, 13.97; for schools No.1 and 4 values of mean are 16.83, 14.44, schools No.1 and 5 have means equal to 16.83, 12.32; schools No.2 and 3 equal to 15.77, 13.97, and schools No.2 and 5 equal to 15.77, 12.32 respectively. This indicates that the parents' perception of the students activities of school No.1 is much better than that of schools No.3, 4 and 5 and for school No.2 it is higher than schools No. 3 and 5. Student activities contribute significantly towards helping students to develop a pleasant and attractive personalities. Activities are designed to develop leadership, responsibility and respect for each other that cannot be gained by academic programmes. In
addition, participation in these activities contributes towards the health and happiness, physical skills and emotional maturity, social competence and moral-values of the students.

Furthermore, participation in school activities helps in teaching, the value of co-operation as well as the spirit of competition, hence it is an essential factor in character building.

In the present study, the parents view schools No.1 and No.2 to be more active with respect to student activities than their counterparts. This is based on the realization by schools No.1 and No.2 that sports and other forms of recreation are a necessary adjunct to personality development, consequently they have with keen interest found a wide range of such activities so that students have a wide variety to choose from activities. Moreover, teachers are willing to encourage the students to join these activities. As a result, most students are motivated to take part in sports, music and plays even though they are not talented. In this way, they can improve their skills through practice. Students often feel comfortable staying after school for activities such as sports and music. Parents tend to favour schools which promote student activities, as these help their children develop a more stable personality.

It may, therefore, be deduced that subject-affiliated, hobby and service clubs often give students more opportunity for self-direction and group planning than
regular classes do. Similarly, assemblies athletic, music, drama and art activities typically permit more creative expressions than classes do. However, for a co-curricular activity to be successful, the teacher must assume the role of the director of learning as well as a counsellor.

Weber (1971), reported that high achieving inner city schools were characterized by many opportunities for students to participate with each other in activities. And Ruther et al., (1979), reported the extent of opportunities students have to participate in activities as their freedom to use the building and students' success in extra-curricular activities.

On the basis of intra-differences among non-demonstration schools in respect of parents' perception of school climate characteristics, following conclusions may be drawn:

1. There are no significant differences between various pairs of schools on student-peer relationships subscale. Also, parents of schools No. 4 and 5 do not perceive this school climate characteristics in both the schools as having significant differences from other non-demonstration schools climate characteristics.

2. The parents of students of school No. 1 perceive administration and student activities subscales better than those of schools No. 3, 4 and 5. On
teacher-student relationships and guidance subscale, their perception is also better than those of schools No. 3 and 5. Likewise, on security and maintenance and parent and community-school relationships subscales, they show greater appreciation than those of schools No. 4 and 5. The parents show greater happiness for school No. 1 strongly in respect of relationships of community and school, than school No. 2 too. On student academic orientation and instructional management subscales, they perceive school No. 1 as better than school No. 5.

3. In case of school No. 2, parents perceive teacher-student relationships, administration, instructional management and student activities of this school better than schools No. 3 and 5. For security and maintenance, student academic orientation, student behavioural values and guidance subscales, their perception of this school is better than school No. 5. In addition, administration and student behavioural values subscales find greater favour of parents of students of school No. 2 as compared to the perception of those characteristics for school No. 4.

4. The parents of students studying in school No. 3 perceive security and maintenance, student academic orientation and parent and community-school relationships subscales better than those of school No. 5.
Based on the analysis of *intra-differences* in respect of school climate characteristics among *five non-demonstration schools* of all the *three sub-samples* (the students, the teachers and the parents), the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Students and parents of school No. 1 have perceived in favour of teacher-student relationships, administration, student academic orientation, parent and community-school relationships, instructional management and student activities subscales of school climate characteristics. Besides these, parents have perceived in security and maintenance and guidance subscales. Teachers of this school have, however, perceived in significantly on any subscale.

2. In case of school No. 2, students, teachers and parents perceive in favour of administration subscale. However, students and parents perceive significantly, in same results on teacher-student relationships, security and maintenance, student behavioural values, instructional management and student activities subscales. Only the two subscales i.e., student-peer relationships and parents and community-school relationships are perceived significantly by students. Likewise, the two subscales viz; student academic orientation and guidance are perceived significantly by parents.
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3. Out of ten school climate characteristics only one of them i.e. administration are perceived favourably by student and teachers of school No. 3. Teachers and parents have perceived significantly on security and maintenance, student academic orientation and parent community-school relationships subscales. There are four subscales viz; student behavioural values, guidance, student-peer relationships and student activities in which teachers of school No. 3 perceive significantly.

4. In case of school No. 4 students perceive significantly on instructional management subscale. Likewise teachers show strongly their perception in favour of student academic orientation subscale. Parents, however, perceive insignificantly on any subscale.

5. The students and teachers of school No. 5 perceive significantly on guidance and student-peer relationships subscales. Furthermore, students show strongly their perception in favour of teacher-student relationships, student academic orientation and instructional management subscales whereas parents of their school perceive insignificantly in any subscale.