CHAPTER VI
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
COMPARISON OF DEMONSTRATION AND
NON-DEMONSTRATION SCHOOLS
SCHOOL CLIMATE CHARACTERISTICS

Differences Between Demonstration And Non-Demonstration Schools On School Climate Characteristics

6.1 Students’ Perception

Table 6.1 shows the means and SDs on ten characteristics of school climate of demonstration and non-demonstration schools as perceived by students along with t-ratios for determining the significance of differences between respective means on various characteristics. The values of t-ratio for seven of the ten subscales of the school climate characteristics, namely; teacher-student relationships \((t = 2.312)\), security and maintenance \((t = 6.790)\), administration \((t = 4.918)\), student behavioural values \((t = 3.316)\), guidance \((t = 3.289)\), parent and community-school relationships \((t = 2.667)\) and instructional management \((t = 3.597)\) are found to be significant whereas non-significant differences were found on the remaining three subscales namely student academic orientation, student-peer relationships and student activities \((t = 0.186, 0.313, 0.283,\) respectively). The details are comparative analysis on each of the significantly differing characteristics are as fellow:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate Characteristics</th>
<th>Demonstration Schools</th>
<th>Non-Demonstration Schools</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Teacher-Student Relationships</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Security and Maintenance</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Administration</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Student Academic Orientation</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Student Behavioural Values</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Guidance</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Student-Peer Relationships</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Parent &amp; Community-School Relationships</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Instructional Management</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Student Activities</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 218 230

* Significant at .05 level ± 1.96
** Significant at .01 level ± 2.58
Teacher-Student Relationships

Values of means on teacher-student relationships show that the students in non-demonstration schools scored a mean of 3.80 as against the mean scores of 3.68 of demonstration schools students. The value of $t = 2.312$ is significant at the .05 level in favour of non-demonstration school, that is, the non-demonstration school students perceive their relationship with teacher significantly better than their counterparts in demonstration schools. If schools are to become effective, the relationship among the members and also students and teachers in the school is important. To create an atmosphere for the realization of objective of the curriculum of secondary education in Thailand that the schools should lay emphasis on the development of spirit of goodness which affect the societal welfare, it is healthy to take a start from the teacher-student relationships in school wherein the teacher helps students, is friendly and kind to them, and treats them as individuals. How teachers interact with students is of utmost significance in learning such attributes.

Non-demonstration schools teachers, the results of the study show, are spending more time interacting with children in their schools with great quality of interaction as compared to demonstration schools. Non-demonstration schools being public schools, the routine of working has to be more regular and inflexible than that of demonstration
schools which have different administrative system wherein teachers enjoy freedom to work and interact with students. It was expected that the flexibility and freedom, essential components of autonomy, shall enable the teachers in the demonstration schools to generate more healthy and congenial interactions with students. However, contrary to expectations, it has been found that although teacher-student relationships is being perceived as satisfactory by students in both the types of schools, the non-demonstration schools students are significantly more satisfied with their relationship to teachers as compared to students of demonstration schools.

Similar observations have been made by Eberle (1988), who found that the relationship between teacher and student was one of the most important variable of effective small rural secondary schools. Wynne (1980), pointed out the value of good relationships and non-academic events involving both faculty and students as contributing to a school's coherence. Duke and Perry (1978), noted that good student-teacher relationships in alternative schools are associated with both a degree of informality and good behaviour.

**Security and Maintenance**

Intercomparisons of means on security and maintenance show that students in non-demonstration schools scored a mean of 3.97 as against the mean scores of 3.53 scored by demonstration school students. The value of \( t = 6.790 \)
submits significant differences at .01 level in favour of non-demonstration schools that is the perception of students of non-demonstration schools in respect of the security and maintenance of their schools is significantly better than the students in demonstration schools. The security of the organization as a whole in relation to social forces in its environment is one of the needs of the organization as a prior condition of its effectiveness as a social system. The provision of secure building kept in good repair, the cleanliness and the neatness of classroom and school building also add to the good school appearance. This is a more proximal variable than the age of the building in terms of student impact.

The standard criteria of various non-demonstration schools in stipulation of their facilities and environment, and the responsibility for maintaining schools that falls on the staff and authorities of the school may account for the safer and more secure environment in the non-demonstration schools than in the demonstration schools. Students of the demonstration schools also agree that their schools are moderately neat and attractive as the score is above the average point on the scale. However, these qualities pertaining to the building and its upkeep exist in a higher degree in non-demonstration schools as per perception of students.

In Madzey’s study (1984), the researcher compared alternative school students and traditional school students
on perceptions of selected issues of school climate. Students coming from larger schools felt the need to feel comfortable in their physical surroundings.

NASSP (1987), found that atmosphere of the school was mentioned as one of six significant categories of strength of a school (administration, the teacher, the student, the community and guidance). English (1989), also suggested several areas of exemplary programmes in school-site management, these being the facilities of cleanliness and security.

Administration

From intercomparisons of means on administration subscale it is clear that a higher mean (3.70) was achieved by students of the non-demonstration schools as against the mean scores of 3.31 of demonstration schools students. The value of $t = 4.918$ is significant at .01 level in favour of non-demonstration school indicating thereby the existence of a better and effective administrative functioning in the former. The role of the principal and his ability to lead in establishing a healthy organization climate is the nucleus of a good administration, the qualities of which include setting up of high standards of work ethic, well identified and clearly defined goals, effective communication of these goals to teachers and students and parents resulting into productivity and satisfaction of all concerned. Thus on the strength of evidence of results, it may be said that the
administration of the non-demonstration schools is more open and participative as compared to that of the demonstration schools where these qualities are perceived just 'on average' by students.

Existence of corresponding administration in the schools was also reported in the study of Stavros and Moore (1985), wherein students felt that administration was not accessible, and they were not involved in the decision-making process. William (1985), in his study of implications of student involvement for administrative decision-making in a house system, emphasized that what students feel and think are important and that once expressed their feedback will have an impact upon the type and way decisions related to their school lives are made.

Student Behavioural Values

The results of intercomparisons of means on student behavioural values, show that the students in non-demonstration schools scored a mean of 3.21 as against the mean scores of 2.96 of demonstration schools students. The t-value=3.316 is significant at .01 level in favour of non-demonstration schools that is the non-demonstration school students are in considerable agreement in what student behavioural values are, what they ideally should be, and whether teachers keep on doing their work. The response of demonstration school students falls around the average. In other words, the demonstration schools students neither
agree nor disagree hence they are not clear as to the behavioural values in their schools. Value as a functional concept relates to activities for the well-being of an individual and can be organized in a hierarchy in the personality of an individual. Values, thus become a strong dynamic determining force of individual’s behaviour, his likes, dislikes, goals and activities. Along with personal and psychological dimension, values have a societal context wherein the entire life of the school in which a child lives provides social, intellectual and moral environment. The presence of such an environment has been clearly envisaged and appreciated by the students of non-demonstration schools in Thailand.

**Guidance**

On the guidance subscale, students of non-demonstration schools scored a mean of 4.24 as against the mean scores of 4.04 of demonstration schools students. The value of $t = 3.289$ is significant at .01 level in favour of non-demonstration school that is the non-demonstration school students perceive the provision of guidance services at their schools significantly better than their counterparts in demonstration schools. Guidance, a process, of helping every individual through his/her own effort to discover and develop his/her potentialities for his/her personal happiness and social usefulness, reduces to a minimum the wastage of time, money and energy of the students on the one
hand and increases the standard of education on the other. Students of the non-demonstration schools agree that they can get help and advice from teachers and counsellors with regard to their personal problems, plan for future classes and jobs. In the demonstration schools, students agree they are getting guidance but the agreement is not as strong as is that of students of non-demonstration schools.

Similar results have been reported by Stavros and Moore (1985), in their study to identify characteristics of a good picture of the school climate on samples of students and staff who viewed guidance and counselling as an important part of the good school climate.

**Parent and Community - School Relationships**

Intercomparison of two types of schools on parent and community-school relationships show that students in non-demonstration schools scored a mean of 4.00 as against the mean scores of 3.84 of demonstration schools students. The value of $t = 2.67$ is significant at .01 level in favour of non-demonstration schools. This implies that the perception of students of non-demonstration schools in respect of their parent and community-school relationships is significantly better than that of the students in demonstration schools. Parents expect open channels of communication and active opportunities to participate in school. They also expect schools to listen to their concerns and respond to their suggestions. While, no school can ever be perfect in meeting
every need and desire of parents, a widespread feeling of satisfaction with school performance and interactions should be evident in the community.

In case of schools not responding, parents through their expression of dissatisfaction or their accessibility of school board members try to bring about such changes. Thus, the community-school relationship which assumes a paramount importance vis-a-vis perception of the school climate characteristics shows a better rating by students of non-demonstration schools indicating thereby that these schools are more open and participative, help and respond equally in one or the other way as compared to the demonstration schools which are perceived just average on this scale by their students. In other words parents and most people in the community of both group of schools under investigation, are willing to help the school; this attitude is being more effectively utilized by the non-demonstration schools as compared to demonstration schools.

In the workshop organized by Breckenridge (1976), climate was improved by increasing the communication and rapport between parents and school. Schools generating maximum satisfactory community participation maintained appropriate climates whereas those not ensuring community participation were least effective in maximizing non-parent community satisfaction.
Instructional Management

Students of non-demonstration schools scored a mean of 3.67 as against the mean score of 3.47 of demonstration schools students on the perception of instructional management. The t-value = 3.597 is significant at .01 level in favour of non-demonstration schools. Effective instructional management processes pertain to multiple and multidimensions aspects. However, the four essential components are; (1) a set of educational goals toward which progress can be measured; (2) a means of assessing students' instructional needs and determining placement and grouping; (3) an organizational structure and instructional process capable of providing alternatives and flexible uses of resources; and (4) a method for monitoring progress toward goals. The discussion of these components and their implication for effective education was addressed to planning including selecting planners, ensuring commitment to systematic planning, and establishing agreement on definitions, philosophies, and direction; assessing and prioritizing instructional needs in such areas as school climate, management practices, and instructional subject areas, and setting goals to meet them obtaining effective leadership from administrators, staff members, teachers, and parents; teaching effectively within an instructional management framework; evaluating the programme, its application and its results; and working towards consensus concerning the purposes of education.
Demonstration schools, have to encourage students in self-development of their potentialities. Therefore, the curriculum gives flexibility for students' opportunities to learn each programme that they need and are interested in and have skill. Ordinarily, such arrangement should have led to students' satisfactory perception of the instructional management as it provides spontaneity and freedom in the instructional process. However, as indicated by the mean values, students of demonstration schools have perceived this type of instructional arrangement satisfactorily but only at the average level of satisfaction. In comparison the non-demonstration schools students on the other hand view their instructional management as more satisfactory although instructional process in these schools is conventional and is supposed to cater less to the individualizational needs. Results are rather surprising but concur with the trends of results on other dimensions of the school climate as discussed in previous pages. It is possible that the innovative, flexible process of instructions are either not carried on in their true spirit which involves lot of preparation by teachers and self-initiate and regular hard work by students, or perhaps as yet these instructional strategies have not been able to attract a positive attitude of the student community. This is also justified by Anderson's and Tissier's (1973) observations that while school bureaucratization had a
minimal effect on student aspiration, the type of programme in which the student was enrolled influenced his aspirations.

Comparison of the school climate characteristics as perceived by students of demonstration and non-demonstration schools has also been presented graphically in Figure 12. This figure shows that dimensions which students of both demonstration and non-demonstration schools perceived as more or less similars are teacher-student relationships (A), security and maintenance (B), student behavioural values (E), guidance (F) and parent and community-school relationships (H). In differences, non-demonstration schools are perceived as satisfactory by students on administration (C) and instructional management (I) dimensions, demonstration schools require that some improvement is brought in these areas.

The significant differences between the perception of students of demonstration schools and non-demonstration schools on two of the ten subscales of school climate lead to the partial acceptance of hypothesis No.(1) that "significant differences exist between the demonstration and non-demonstration schools on school climate variables."
SCHOOL CLIMATE CHARACTERISTICS AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS OF DEMONSTRATION AND NON-DEMONSTRATION SCHOOLS

Figure 12

- Demonstration + Non-demonstration

259
### Table 6.2
Comparison Of Demonstration And Non-Demonstration Schools On School Climate Characteristics As Perceived By Teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate Characteristics</th>
<th>Demonstration Schools</th>
<th>Non-Demonstration Schools</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Teacher - Student Relationships</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Security and Maintenance</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Administration</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Student Academic Orientation</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Student Behavioral Values</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Guidance</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Student - Peer Relationships</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Parent and Community - School Relationships</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Instructional Management</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Student Activities</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level
6.2 Teachers' Perception

Table 6.2 shows comparison of the means along with calculations of significance of difference between means for school climate as perceived by teachers. The t-ratios are found to be significant on five of the ten subscales: teacher and student relationships ($t = 2.189$), security and maintenance ($t = 5.816$), administration ($t = 2.437$), parent and community-school relationships ($t = 4.598$) and also instructional management ($t = 2.414$). The remaining five dimensions of school climate; student academic orientation, student behavioural values, guidance, student-peer relationships, and student activities did not submit significant differences between two types of schools that is demonstration and non-demonstration schools ($t = 0.352, 1.561, 1.722, 0.394$ and $1.085$ respectively).

Teacher-Student Relationships

Intercomparisons of means on teacher-student relationships show that the teachers in non-demonstration schools score a mean of 4.27 as against the mean score of 4.12 of demonstration school teachers. The value of $t = 2.189$ indicates significant differences at .05 level in favour of non-demonstration schools, that is the non-demonstration school teachers perceive their relationships with students significantly better than their counterparts in demonstration schools. If schools are to become personalized and effective, the teacher as advisor is the
critical variable. Teachers in the school get to know their students as friends. As the relationships is strengthened over the years, teachers are able to help students make better decisions about school programme and school adjustment. The relationship between teachers and students thus becomes highly supportive and satisfying one. School climate improves, students and teacher performance is enhanced.

The results of the study show non-demonstration school teachers perceive themselves as more understanding towards the needs of students in their schools than those of demonstration school. It may be noted from the mean scores that teachers of both the schools perceive their relationship with students towards positive side of the scale on which the measure of teacher-student relationships was taken, yet the value is significantly higher for the non-demonstration schools. In other words, teachers in both schools agree that they spend sufficient extra efforts to help students in schools, give them the grades they deserve, and treat each student as an individual but this perception is stronger in the teachers of non-demonstration schools as compared to their counterparts in demonstration schools.

The importance of this variable has been stressed by Keefe (1986), who noted that a school without advisement is like a scholar without insight. Each student needs the continuing and caring advice that only an experienced
teacher can give advice someone who has already walked the same road. And Norman's conclusions (1988), indicated that secondary school teachers' ability to solve its problems and make improvements based on known goals with infrastructures providing effective communication among students, parents, administrators, and the school. The results of the present study indicate greater provision of such type of interactions in the non-demonstration schools than in the demonstration schools of Thailand.

Security and Maintenance

On security and maintenance, the perception of teachers in non-demonstration schools submitted a mean of 4.10 as against the mean of 3.58 of demonstration schools teachers. The value of $t = 5.816$ is significant at .01 level. The comparisons of mean values indicate that the teachers of non-demonstration schools perceive the security and maintenance of their schools significantly higher than their counterparts in demonstration schools. Reports from Charlton and others (1989), whose studies on teachers' perception of the characteristics of good schools showed the existence of institutional biases in all types of schools yet a high level of agreement was found among primary, secondary, and special school teachers' ratings of the qualities of good schools, whereas Stavros and Moore (1985), found that the staff did not feel safe in the school as assessed on two perspectives on school climate that is staff and students see a school the same way or not.
A safe and orderly environment conducive to learning was one of the five characteristics that Lyons and Sheathelm (1988) found as heavily influencing the effective schools. Results of the present study amply support the need of improving this aspect of security and maintenance in demonstration schools in order to be at least comparable with the non-demonstration schools.

**Administration**

The intercomparisons of mean on administration subscale show a higher value obtained by the teachers in non-demonstration schools (mean = 3.81) as against demonstration school teachers (mean = 3.50). The $t = 2.437$ depicts significant differences at .05 level. Thus teachers in non-demonstration schools as compared to those in demonstration schools perceive the administration in their schools more favourably which in turn indicates that they perceive their administrators as persons who listen to students' ideas, often talk with teachers and parents, set high standards and usually let teachers, students and parents know what these standards are. Moreover, administrators set a good example by working hard themselves. They are willing to hear student complaints and opinions. Also, they make an effort to share decision-making powers with teachers by providing opportunity for teacher to assess the policies and practices and performance of the district both in face to face contacts as also
through a formal written surveys. Simultaneously, relationships of trust and confidence between administrators and teachers, which are of vital importance to good school performance, are encouraged.

Parent and Community-School Relationships

It is evident from the results of the intercomparison of means that non-demonstration school teachers perceive the parent and community-school relationships more positively ($\bar{X} = 3.94$) than their counterparts in demonstration schools ($\bar{X} = 3.43$) and these differences are significant at .01 level ($t = 4.598$). The effective communication and relationships between school and parents is obviously important, and requires the participation, support, and encouragement of administrators as well as teachers and other staff personnel. Similarly, parents and members of the community by attending school meetings help the school in useful ways, and honour student achievements in the activities. This is supported by Brekenridge’s (1976) study wherein climate was improved by increasing the communication and rapport between parents and school while the teachers of non-demonstration school involved in the sample of present study undoubtedly perceive quite favourably this type of relationship, it needs to be strengthened in the demonstration schools.
Instructional Management

Instructional management is another sub-variable of school climate which yielded \( t = 2.414 \) significant at .05 level. Non-demonstration schools teachers score a mean of 3.74 as against the mean score of 3.55 of demonstration schools teachers. The non-demonstration school teachers consider that they have a clear set of rules for students to follow, that when they are busy in the class other tasks do not interfere with classroom time in learning activities which is better than their counterparts in demonstration schools. Non-demonstration schools teachers play an important role in shaping and moulding the habits, tastes, manners and above all the characters of the students. In their hands there have been entrusted the supreme task of instructional management of giving schoolwork or assignments. The responsibilities of the teachers in both groups of schools under study are to initiate direct and guide school learning experiences of the child in order that each, according to his capacity, will develop intellectually, aesthetically, morally, physically, and emotionally as a useful, self-educating member of society. These qualities need to be strengthened in demonstration school as far as instructional management is concerned. Stavros and Moore. (1985), have found that the staff at Detroit’s Boulevard High School were positive about frequent monitoring of student progress and opportunity to learn and
time-on-task. They viewed the department head, especially in the role of instructional leader, in a positive light.

In addition, the school climate characteristics as perceived by teachers of demonstration and non-demonstration schools have been presented graphically in Figure 13. This figure shows that dimensions which teachers of both demonstration and non-demonstration schools perceive as more similar are teacher-student relationships (A), security and maintenance (B) and instructional management (I). In differences, there are administration (C) and parent and community-school relationships (H) which teachers of non-demonstration schools perceive as satisfactory, while demonstration schools need to improve on these dimensions.

Hence, on the basis of the results obtained in the present investigation, it may be concluded that hypothesis (i) which states that "significant differences exist between demonstration and non-demonstration schools on school climate variables" as perceived by teachers is partly accepted in respect of two of the ten subscales.
SCHOOL CLIMATE CHARACTERISTICS AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS OF DEMONSTRATION AND NON-DEMONSTRATION SCHOOLS

Figure 13

Mean Score

--- Demonstration ---

--- Non-demonstration ---

Figure 13

268
Table 6.3

Comparison Of Demonstration And Non-Demonstration Schools On School Climate Characteristics As Perceived By Parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate Characteristics</th>
<th>Demonstration Schools</th>
<th>Non-Demonstration Schools</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Teacher -Student Relationships</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Security and Maintenance</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Administration</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Student Academic Orientation</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Student Behavioural Values</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Guidance</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Student - Peer Relationships</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Parent and Community - School Relationships</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Instructional Management</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Student Activities</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 126 145

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level
6.3 Parents' Perception

The results of t-ratios on the basis of the Table 6.3 in comparison of the school climate characteristics of demonstration and non-demonstration schools as perceived by parents of the students indicate that the t-ratios are found to be significant in favour of seven subscales namely; teachers and student relationships \((t = -2.873)\), security and maintenance \((t = -3.638)\), student behavioural values \((t=2.266)\), guidance \((t=3.166)\), student-peer relationships \((t = 2.035)\), parent and community-school relationships \((t=3.358)\), and instructional management \((t=2.807)\). It may be said that the perception of parents of students in non-demonstration schools has positive agreement higher than the perception of parents of students in demonstration schools whereas non-significant differences were found on the remaining three subscales namely; administration, student academic orientation and student activities \((t = 1.622, 0.000, 0.432 \text{ respectively})\).

Teacher-Student Relationships

The intercomparison of means on teacher-student relationships subscale shows that the parents of students in non-demonstration schools score a mean of 3.77 as against the mean score of 3.47 of demonstration schools parents. The value of \(t = 2.873\) indicates significant differences at 0.01 level in favour of non-demonstration schools, that is the non-demonstration school parents perceive the
relationships of teacher and their children significantly higher than parents of students in demonstration schools. No one could doubt the intentions of the parents. They want to see their children happy, healthy, and safe. Yet, so often their efforts are unrewarded and their love unrequired. So the parents accept to believe that in teacher-student relationships within the schools, teacher can do better. The type of experience a person has determines the attitudes, values, and point of view he develops. If his experiences with people are pleasant ones in which his personality is respected, he comes to believe in the worth of personality and to be concerned about the feeling of others. The teacher builds good human relations with students, or hinders by the way he treats them. Good human relations cannot be obtained by demanding or requesting students. They are built by living and working with students in such a way that they can practise good human relations, too.

The results of this study indicate better exhibit in the worth of teacher-student relationships of parents of non-demonstration schools than parents of demonstration schools of Thailand. Similarly, a comprehensive plan developed by the Minnesota State Department of Education (1984), found that positive teacher-student interactions was improving school effectiveness throughout the state. Gaddy and Kelly (1984), identified factors in maintaining a
positive school climate are good student-teacher relations and a responsive curriculum reflecting student needs and interests and the changing emphasis of society.

Security and Maintenance

In respect of intercomparison of means on security and maintenance subscale, the perception of parents in non-demonstration schools submitted a mean of 3.74 as against the mean of 3.35 of demonstration schools parents. The value of $t = 3.638$ is significant at .01 level. The comparisons of mean values signify that the parents of students in non-demonstration schools perceive the security and maintenance of their children's schools significantly higher than parents in demonstration schools. An educational system which is obligated to consider the total welfare of the society in which it functions, also recognizes individual needs as well as social needs. Since the concern of the study is with one group of individuals which is the Thai Secondary School age youth, it is appropriate to identify the security and maintenance in their schools. All youth need to develop insights of security and unity as follows; feel safe in the school buildings, their schools and classroom usually neat and clean, kept in good repair and attractive. Taking into consideration of the parents of students, the results show non-demonstration schools parents perceive security and maintenance of schools meeting the need of feeling in
security better than parents of demonstration schools. It also means that teachers and other workers feel safe in the buildings before and after school. Moreover, parents are not afraid to come to school for meeting and do programmes in the evening.

Similarly, Behlings (1984), brief comments on the effective school on the research methodology of the studies cited that the school processes and outcomes are divided into the following categories; a safe and orderly environment, school climate, school values and norms and improved student achievement. Also Coleman (1984) reported that parents' rating of school climate was adopted as the criterion variable and initial data from parent and teacher surveys yielded five parent factors; there are principal activities, achievement, challenge and motivation, warm welcoming environment, and social contract.

Student Behavioural Values

It is evident from the results of the intercomparison of means that non-demonstration schools parents perceive the student-behavioural values more positively ($M = 2.94$) than parents in demonstration schools ($M = 2.60$) and these differences are significant at .05 level ($t = 2.266$). Moreover, both groups of parents under study perceive below the average of agreement ($M = 3.50$) it indicates that they neither agree nor disagree on this dimension. Ruskin, John (1911), said that education does not mean teaching people
what they do not know; it means teaching them to behave as they do not behave. In Nwankwo’s model (1979), climate does not serve merely to transmit the effect of social relationships in the school (principal-teacher, principal-student, teacher-student, teacher-teacher, student-student) to student behaviours. Rather, climate is affected simultaneously by student behaviour even as it affects behaviour.

And one out of nine objectives of Thai National Youth Development Plans (1983) is to promote health whether physical, mental or intellectual so as to be in readiness for his/her development of ability, attitude, behaviour, value and morality of young people so that they become good citizens. In this study, parents of students studying in demonstration schools are getting their children behavioural values not more than all parents of students in non-demonstration schools.

The results of Fiedler Brand (1989), suggested that the methodology used for identifying gifted students who may be at risk in the high school environment, can successfully identify students who are experiencing dissonance with the school environment.

**Guidance**

On guidance subscale, the intercomparison of means gives the results that the perceptions of parents in non-demonstration schools (M = 4.04) are more strongly than that
of their counterparts in demonstration schools (M = 3.66) and the differences are significant at .01 level (t=3.166). In high school, a student feels grown-up. He/she is nearing independence and resents limits on his/her autonomy. Yet, adults cannot relinquish their guidance. At this age, students are in danger of over-crowding their social life to the detriment of academic achievements. Conflict with parents and teachers are almost inevitable. The functions of teachers or counsellors are not to give careers guidance to the students or even to advise them on choice of subject. Teachers or counsellors have been specially trained to help adolescents with the many emotional problems that beset a student. The counsellor will treat all discussions, in the strictest confidence. The results of the present study indicate better provision of guidance in the non-demonstration schools than in the demonstration school of Thailand.

Bergmann (1989), studied at the middle school level, representative of large, urban, suburban, and rural settings. Results showed that every student mentioned at least once that he would like someone to listen to him.

**Student-Peer Relationships**

The intercomparison of means on student-peer relationships sub-variable show a higher value obtained by the parents of students in non-demonstration schools (M=3.96) as against those (M = 3.71) in demonstration school.
schools. The $t = 2.035$ depicts significant differences at 0.05 level. Thus, parent perception helps to ensure recognition throughout the entire school organisation that what parents think is important. From the National Youth Policy of Thailand plans (1983) with a clear and coordinated objective as ; to intensify the sincere desire of young people to participate and accept responsibility in developing the society in order to effect the greatest benefit to the public to usefully employ free time and to reduce conflict among various groups of young people so as to enable them to live together in the society, to respect the opinions and not to violate the honour and dignity of others and to solve problems peacefully through reasoning by adhering to the principles of middle path and for mutual benefit. A similar group emphasised that the existence of constructive student groups, was considered by Wynne (1980) as a source of positive school spirit that contributed to climate. He also found that an emphasis on students helping each other and outsiders was a significant factor in building character while the parents involved in the sample of the present study undoubtedly perceive that this student-peer relationships needs to be strengthened in the demonstration schools. Similarly, Downing (1978), noted that opportunities for and encouragement of cooperative behaviours are significant environmental conditions for learning. Bergmann (1989), showed the results that the most part of students interviewed were gregarious and talkative
and needed more time to socialize than the school day allowed.

Parent and Community-School Relationships

Values of means of parents and community-school relationships show that the parents in non-demonstration schools score a mean of 3.89 as against the mean score of 3.53 of those in demonstration schools. The t = 3.358 is significant difference at .01 level. A parent who sends the student to school is presumed, under common law, to have given the teachers the power to make rules for the student. These include rules which affect the good order of the school both inside and outside the school premises. This applies to all schools, whether state or private. But the law also says the rules should be 'reasonable' and in fact heads usually make sure they are known to parents. 'The active cooperation of the parents should be sought and maintained at all time.' A self-assessment process to achieve an effective high school, Los Angeles Unified School District (1984) considered the critical elements wherein evaluation as the following (1) direction and purpose, (2) classroom instructional emphasis, (3) dedicated and qualified staff, (4) skilled leadership, (5) counselling emphasis, (6) communication and involvement, (7) student advocacy, involvement, and awareness, (8) positive and safe school climate, (9) parent and community involvement, (10) regular evaluation of all aspects of the school. These
parents and community-school relationships need to be strengthened in demonstration schools concerned. Carter (1985), strongly supported that parents, students, community members, teachers, principals and others should work together closely in designing and implementing written policies. Similarly, the study of the New York State Department (1976), reported that high-achieving schools studied in the New York State research also appeared to be characterized consistently by parent-principal rapport.

**Instructional Management**

On instructional management is another subscale of school climate which yielded $t = 2.807$ significant at $.01$ level. Parents of non-demonstration schools score a mean of 3.49 as against the mean score of 3.17 of demonstration schools parents. If students and teachers are to spend six hours a day in class, it should be attractive for taking attendance. There is a clear set of rules for students to follow, teachers spend almost all classroom time in learning activities, students usually have assigned schoolwork to do, and most classroom time is spent talking about classwork or assignments. Although activity in a professional organization does not guarantee classroom competency, participation in local, state and national organizations is another indication of the professional spirit of the staff. Parent behaviour and the attitudes of parents enhance the desire of teachers to exert leadership in improving education through instructional management.
In addition, the school climate characteristics as perceived by parents of students studying in demonstration and non-demonstration schools has been presented graphically in Figure 14. The figure shows dimensions which parents of both demonstration and non-demonstration schools perceived as more or less similar are student behavioural values (E), guidance (F), student-peer relationships (G), parent and community-school relationships (H) and instructional management (I). In differences, non-demonstration schools are perceived as satisfactory by parents on teacher-student relationships (A) and security and maintenance (B), demonstration schools need to be strengthened.

The significant differences between the perception of parents of students in demonstration schools and non-demonstrations schools on two of the ten subscales of school climate characteristics lead to the partial acceptance of hypothesis No. (1) which states that "significant differences exist between the demonstration and non-demonstration schools on school climate variables."
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6.4 Strength And Weakness Of Demonstration And Non-Demonstration Schools On School Climate Characteristics

On the basis of perception of all three groups of sample (students, teachers and parents) involved in the present following conclusions as directed to the fifth objective, that is to identify the perceived strength and weakness in demonstration and non-demonstration schools, may be drawn regarding school climate characteristics. These are also presented in Summary Tables A.

1. Demonstration Schools

a) The four out of ten subscales of school climate characteristics on which all groups of samples (students, teachers and parents) responded in the category of agreement, indicating thereby their respective satisfaction, are (i) student academic orientation, (ii) guidance, (iii) student-peer relationships, and (iv) student activities. Perception of students, teachers and parents was indicated by their mean score on respective scales*. Hence, it may be concluded that teachers, students and their parents are satisfied as far as these four characteristics of school climate in Demonstration Schools are concerned.

* Responses of students, teachers, and parents on various subscales of the school climate characteristics have been put in three category after analysis. The uppermost scale points from 3.50 to 5.00 indicate agreement; followed by the category of neutrality from value 2.50 to 3.49 indicating that most people neither agree nor disagree. The lowest values from 1.00 to 2.49 have been kept under the category of disagreement.
b) Both students and teachers of all five demonstration schools perceive two school climate characteristics favourably namely, teacher-student relationships and security and maintenance subscales whereas, parents of students express their neutrality on both these scales.

c) The subscale of parent and community-school relationships is perceived favourably by both students and parents but teachers’ perception indicates uncertainly on the parent and community-school relationships vis-a-vis schools.

d) On two subscales namely administration and instructional management subscales, only teachers of all five demonstration schools show their agreement. The other two samples that students and their parents remain neutral with regard to administration and instructional management of the demonstration schools.

e) On the student behavioural values subscale (the remaining variable of school climate characteristics) has been perceived as neutral by all the three groups of samples (students, teachers and parents) mean for students = 2.96, for teachers = 3.11 and for parents = 2.60. However, none of these samples has perceived it as unsatisfactory.

f) None of the school climate characteristics has been identified as unsatisfactory (as weakness) by students,
teachers and parents. It may, thus, be said that while none of the three samples involved in the present study that is teachers, students and their parents have expressed dissatisfaction for the school climate of demonstration schools, a mixed picture of satisfaction or neutrality has been obtained. Hence, characteristics which have been perceived as satisfactory need to be strengthening so as not to become a weakness of the demonstration school system. Putting this in a slightly different way, it can be stated that for the four characteristics that is (i) student academic orientation (ii) guidance (iii) student-peer relationships and (iv) student activities which are perceived satisfactorily by all the three categories of respondents (that is students, teachers and parents) the demonstration schools need to be constantly vigilant in maintaining the quality of operations of these characteristics. As far as the characteristics which evoked the response of neutrality are concerned, the demonstration school should try to attend to these characteristics in such a manner that a participative team work of teachers, students and their parents is ensured in the functioning so that none of the samples remains neutral. That is parents who remain neutral in their perception on the characteristics of teacher-student relationships and security and maintenance are likely to feel satisfied if demonstration schools try to involve parents in order to plan activities and encourage participative democratic
outlook for promoting still better and healthier relationships between teachers and students and for taking care of school maintenance.

Similarly teachers by remaining "neutral" on parent and community - school relationships have indicated that schools should endeavour to arrange meaningful activities which correspond to interest and needs of parents and community in order to develop the better understanding between school and parents - community. And it goes without saying that demonstration schools may better attempt to inculcate values such as sense of accountability, punctuality, respectability etc. in students so as to bring student behavioural values to the level of satisfactory perception.

2. Non-Demonstration Schools

a) As far as non-demonstration schools are concerned all groups of sample (students, teachers and parents) 'agree' this indicating their satisfaction on seven of the ten subscales of school climate characteristics namely; (i) teacher - student relationships, (ii) security and maintenance, (iii) student academic orientation, (iv) guidance, (v) student peer relationships, (vi) parent and community-school relationships, and (vii) student activities. In other words non-demonstration schools are strong in all these seven areas.

b) Two subscales namely; administration and
instructional management have been perceived favourably by students and their teachers although parents feel unsure on these characteristics.

c) Out of ten subscales of school climate characteristics, only one subscale namely; student behavioural values, has been perceived by all groups of sample (students, teachers and parents) as neutral (mean for students = 3.21, for teachers = 3.29 and for parents = 2.94).

d) The perception of none of the subscale falls in the category of disagreement.

It may thus be said that while none of the school climate characteristics is identified as unsatisfactory and thus 'as a weakness' of non-demonstration schools by students, teachers and parents, these schools however, should try to strengthen administration and instructional management (perceived as 'neutral' by parents) as also student behavioural values (as per perception of students, teachers and parents) so as to bring it to the level of being perceived as satisfactory. It can thus be said that non-demonstration schools need to ensure that their administration, instructional management and student behavioural values are also perceived in the category of "agree" by developing and strengthening the democratic atmosphere through greater participation of working groups concerned, groups that is teachers, students and parents in
matters of administration; by providing financial support, educational materials, and better teacher training programmes for instructional management; and by instilling various values such as sense of responsibility, punctuality, respectability etc. among its functionaries and students to ensure improved student behavioural values.

By comparison, it can be seen that;

a) Both demonstration and non-demonstration schools have emerged strong in areas of student academic orientation, guidance, student-peer relationships and student activities.

b) While demonstration schools are perceived as non satisfactory better than non-demonstration schools in any dimensions, non-demonstration schools are perceived as satisfactory by students on administration and instructional management dimensions; by teachers on parent and community school relationships dimension; and by parents on teacher student relationships and security and maintenance dimensions, demonstration schools need to improve on these dimensions.

c) On administration and instructional management dimensions as perceived by parents; and student behavioural values as perceived by all the three samples (students, teachers and parents), both the types of schools have been commonly perceived as neutral and therefore need to be strengthened.
### Summary Table A: School Climate Characteristics

**Identification Of Strengths And Weaknesses In Demonstration And Non-Demonstration Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Student academic Orientation (S,T,P)</td>
<td>* Teacher-student relationships (P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Guidance (S,T,P)</td>
<td>* Security &amp; maintenance (P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Student-peer relationships (S,T,P)</td>
<td>* Administration (S,P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Student activities (S,T,P)</td>
<td>* Student behavioural values (S,T,P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Parent and community-school relationships (T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Instructional management (S,P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demonstration Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Teacher-student relationships (S,T,P)</td>
<td>* Administration (P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Security and maintenance (S,T,P)</td>
<td>* Student behavioural values (S,T,P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Student academic orientation (S,T,P)</td>
<td>* Instructional management (P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Guidance (S,T,P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Student-peer relationships (S,T,P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Parent and community-school relationships (S,T,P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Student activities (S,T,P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Demonstration Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Teacher-student relationships (S,T,P)</td>
<td>* Administration (P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Security and maintenance (S,T,P)</td>
<td>* Student behavioural values (S,T,P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Student academic orientation (S,T,P)</td>
<td>* Instructional management (P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Guidance (S,T,P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Student-peer relationships (S,T,P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Parent and community-school relationships (S,T,P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Student activities (S,T,P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S stands for student
T stands for teacher
P stands for parents