CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
SCHOOL CLIMATE CHARACTERISTICS
DEMONSTRATION SCHOOLS

The results of the study are reported and discussed in five chapters, from chapter IV to VIII. Chapter IV, V and VI deal with the analyses of data and discussion of results pertaining to identification of school climate characteristics of the demonstration schools, of the non-demonstration schools, and comparison of two types of schools in respect of school characteristics respectively. Chapter VII is devoted to the results and their discussion with regard to satisfaction variables as perceived by students, teachers and parents in respect of two types of schools (demonstration and non-demonstration schools). Chapter VIII contains results and discussion of the relationship between various variables under study (school climate characteristics and satisfaction variables) on the one hand, and the academic achievement of the students, on the other.

The present chapter deals with the statistical analysis of data, interpretation of results and discussion in respect of school climate characteristics. It may be recalled here that the school climate has been measured in terms of ten characteristics of schools, namely, teacher-student relationships (A), security and maintenance (B), administration (C), student academic orientation (D),
student behavioural values (E), guidance (F), student-peer relationships (G), parent-community school relationships (H), instructional management (I), and student activities (J).

Accordingly, the relevant statistical devices as given at the end of the previous chapter (III) have been pressed into service in order to analyse the data.

4.1 Identification of School Climate Characteristics

Responses of students, teachers and parents on various subscales of the school climate characteristics have been put in three categories for the purpose of interpretation. The uppermost scale points from 3.50 to 5.00 which indicate agreement on various items which the respondents think most people in their community would pick, have been grouped as "agree"; followed by the category of "neutrality" which includes the range of scale points from values 2.50 to 3.49 and is indicative of that most people neither agree nor disagree. The range of lowest values from 1.50 to 2.49 has been kept under the category of "disagree". For the formulation of these categories, mean values on each subscale were worked out by adding scale points of all items and dividing the cumulative value by the number of items in each subscale.
### TABLE 4.1

School Climate Characteristics Of 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>Student</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Teacher-Student Relationships</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Security and Maintenance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Administration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Student Academic Orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Student Behavioural Values</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Guidance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Student-peer Relationships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Parent-Community School Relationships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Instructional Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Student Activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N                               | 218  | 103  | 126   |
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Table 4.1 shows the mean perception of teacher-student relationships dimension of the school climate characteristics of demonstration schools as perceived by students and teachers which fall in the category of "agree" with means equal to 3.68 and 4.12 respectively. In other words teachers and students in the demonstration schools perceive themselves as liking each other; teachers perceive themselves as supporting their students and giving them grades as they deserve. They also feel that they help students, are friendly and kind to them, not only treat each student as an individual but also are willing to help him. Likewise, their perception of relationships indicates that teachers are patient when students have trouble in learning, they make extra efforts to help them, understand and meet the needs of each student as well as praise students more often than they scold them. They are fair to students and explain assignment carefully so that they can get work done. But parents of students is 3.47. This value falls in the category of neutrality that means neither "agree" nor "disagree."
On the **security and maintenance** dimension of the school climate characteristics of demonstration schools as perceived by students and teachers, the mean scores are 3.53 and 3.58 respectively, both of which fall in the category of "agree". This indicates that students and teachers usually feel safe in the school building even before or after school time of working, and people are not afraid to come to school for meetings and other programmes in the evening. They perceive that classrooms along with the whole of school buildings including school grounds are usually neat and clean and are kept in good repair. On the other hand, the parents of students do not perceive so on this subscale, the mean score is 3.35 which falls in the category of the neutrality. It means that they neither agree nor disagree with these items.

The value of mean of the perception of **administration** dimension of the school climate characteristics of demonstration schools as perceived by students, teachers and parents are 3.31, 3.50 and 3.17, respectively. These values fall in the category of the neutrality which means they neither agree nor disagree with items related to administrative. In other words, the three groups of sample under study i.e. students, teachers and parents as indicated by results, show their indeterminateness as to whether the administrators listen to students' ideas, interact often with teachers and parents, set high standards and let them
know what these standards are. They don’t feel sure that administrators set a good example by working hard themselves, are willing to hear students’ complaints and opinions, and allow teachers and students help to decide what happens in the school.

On the student academic orientation subscale, the obtained means are equal to 4.03, 3.80 and 3.82 for students, teachers and parents respectively, all of which are in the category of "agree". This indicates that the students, the teachers and the parents in demonstration schools understand why they are in school, that students perceive themselves as interested in learning new things, not only have fun but also work hard and complete their school assignments.

On the students behavioural values dimension of the school climate characteristics of demonstration schools, the mean values obtained by students’, teachers’ and parents’ are 2.96, 3.11 and 2.60 respectively, which are in the category of the "neutrality". It means that they neither agree nor disagree with the statements which as per manual of the scale are concerned with situations such as: if one student makes fun of someone, other students do join in or not, whether students in the school are well-behaved or not even when the teachers are not watching them, and most students would do their work or not even if the teacher stepped out of the classroom.
Furthermore, the students of demonstration schools fall in the category of "agree" on the two subscales of school climate characteristics namely; guidance and student-peer relationships by obtaining means equal to 4.04 and 4.07 respectively. This implies that students think the teachers or counsellors in their schools, encourage them to think about their future, not only help them plan for future classes and for future jobs but also help students with personal problems. With regards to the student-peer relationships, it means that the students care for each other, respect each other, want to be friends with one another as well as have a sense of belonging with their school. The perception of teachers and parents on both these categories also indicates that they think positively on both scales as the means are 3.90 and 3.66 respectively on guidance subscale; and 3.93 and 3.71 respectively on the student-peer relationships subscale. In other words, all the three groups under study i.e. students, teachers and parents consider the guidance as well as the student-peer relationships as satisfactory.

The value of mean of the perception of parent and community-school relationships dimension of the school climate characteristics of demonstration schools as perceived by students and their parents are 3.84 and 3.53 respectively. These values fall in the category of "agree". It means that they are satisfied, perceive themselves as
attending school meetings and other activities, helping the school in one way or another, and, moreover, honouring student achievement in learning, music, drama and sports. On the other hand, teachers do not think so on this subscale. The mean score is 3.43 which falls in the category of the "neutrality" and indicates that they neither agree nor disagree with these items.

The perception of students and their parents of instructional management dimension of the school climate characteristics of demonstration schools is expressed by the values of mean which are 3.47 and 3.17 respectively and which fall in the category of the "neutrality". It can be said that both students and their parents neither agree nor disagree with the items. But the teachers in the sample of study have positive thinking on the instructional management subscale, the mean score being equal to 3.55. Thus, the teachers seem to be satisfied that they give a clear set of rules for students to follow in their school, spend almost all classroom time in learning activities and give them assignment to do, not only spend time in talking about classwork or assignments but also help them learn assigned work.

Finally, the values of mean of the perception of student activities dimension of the school climate characteristics of demonstration schools by students, teachers, and parents are 3.97, 3.83 and 3.63 respectively, all the three of which are in the category of "agree". This
indicates that the students, the teachers and the parents are satisfied in respect of students taking part in school activities in which they are interested. They are comfortable staying after school for activities, and also can take part in sports and other school activities even if they are not very talented and even if their families cannot afford the expenses.

From the analysis of the data in respect of school climate of demonstration schools, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. All the three groups under investigation: students, the teachers, and the parents, perceive that demonstration schools have a satisfactory degree of students academic orientation, guidance, student-peer relationships and student activities.

2. (a) The perception of the parents of the students regarding teacher-student relationships subscale and security and maintenance subscale of the school climate characteristics of demonstration schools is at variance with that of the teachers and of the students. Parents do not perceive these dimensions as satisfactory or dissatisfactory, the teachers and the students, on the other hand, especially the teachers, agree that these school climate characteristics are present to a high degree in the schools.
2. (b) The students and their parents are satisfied with the parents and community-school relationships subscale but the responses of teachers fall in the category of "neutrality" indicating thereby neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction.

2. (c) Contrary to 2(b), the students and their parents express neutrality in respect of administration and instructional management subscales, but the teachers feel satisfied on this subscale.

3. On the subscale of student behavioural values, all the three groups under study i.e. the students, the teachers, and the parents fall in the category of "neutrality".

4. None of the samples under study, that is students, teachers and parents show dissatisfaction on any of the ten sub-variables characterising school climate of the demonstration schools.

The mean profile of school climate characteristics of Demonstration Schools as perceived by students, teachers and parents has also been presented graphically in Figure 4.
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4.2 Intra-differences Among Demonstration Schools On School Climate Characteristics.

An attempt has also been made to obtain analytic picture of the school climate characteristics by way of calculating intra-differences that is differences among various demonstration schools as perceived by students, teachers and parents respectively so as to identify strengths and weaknesses within demonstration schools and later on suggest improvements.

4.2.1 Students’ Perception

Results as shown in Table 4.2 and 4.2.1 reveal the intra-differences among demonstration schools in respect of students’ perception on various school climate characteristics. On five of the ten characteristics that is; teacher-student relationships (A), student academic orientation (D), student behavioural values (E), student-peer relationships (G), parent and community-school relationships (H), no significant differences were found between various pairs of schools when the comparisons were made taking two schools at a time.

On the remaining five sub-variables of school climate characteristics as perceived by students, namely; security and maintenance (B), administration (C), guidance (F), instructional management (I), and student activities (J) significant differences have been observed among various demonstration schools. These results are shown in Figure 5.
Table 4.2
The Means And SDs Of School Climate Characteristics As Perceived By Students In Five Demonstration Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate Dimensions</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>A</td>
<td>43.34</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>41.19</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>40.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>24.83</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>20.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>15.26</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>18.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>14.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>15.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>24.34</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>23.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>14.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.1
The t-ratios Among Various Demonstration Schools On School Climate Characteristics As Perceived By Students

<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>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| df | 95 | 98 | 81 | 86 | 95 | 78 | 83 | 81 | 86 | 69 |

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

On the characteristics of security and maintenance (B), t-ratios are significant at .01 level for S₁ versus S₃ (t = 3.12) and S₂ versus S₃ (t = 4.05), while t-ratios for S₂ versus S₅ (t = 2.42) and S₃ versus S₄ (t = 2.33) are significant at .05 level.

Values of the means indicate that the security and maintenance of School No. 3 (Phiboonbumphen Demonstration School) is poorer (mean = 20.34) than school Nos. 1 (M = 24.00), 2 (M = 24.83) and 4 (M = 23.39). Further school No. 2 (Prince Songkhla Demonstration School) is better (M = 24.83) than school No. 5 (Mean = 22.03) as per students' perception. In other words, students have singled out school No. 3 as the lowest of all demonstration schools in the sample in respect of the required standard of security and maintenance as compared to the other schools. According to their perception, students, teachers and workers are not comfortable within the premises of school No. 3. Moreover, the upkeep of the physical structures and the compound organization is unattractive, as compared with Schools No. 1,2,4 and 5.

Generally, students do not like overcrowding in classroom and in the library. The school building should be a stimulating agency to all the users in order to enhance the learning process. The disqualifying factors for school No. 3 as compared with school Nos. 1,2,4 and 5 are that school buildings are old, making it unpleasant to stay in,
and hence students' perception and concentration in class is
affected as they find the atmosphere unattractive. Over the
years, even though the school intakes have been expanding,
no proportional enlargement schemes have been denied. As a
result, the classrooms have become too small to cope up with
the current size of students, making it congested and
definitely uncomfortable. Moreover, being situated far from
the community, students feel isolated with a sense of
alienation as their participation in school community
activities becomes limited.

It is, therefore, necessary to review the physical
infrastructures within the schools, both quantitatively and
qualitatively in order to ensure satisfaction of all the
human resources employed or involved in the activities of
the school.

There is need to assess the available physical
facilities in relation to the current demands for them and
plan to renovate and expand them accordingly. This also
requires taking an inventory of the equipment and other
materials in use to take care of obsolescence, overcrowding
in classrooms and need for expansion.

Administration (C)

Another school climate variable where intra-
differences are significant is administration (C). The
groups of comparison's show that t-ratios are significant at
.01 level for S\textsubscript{1} versus S\textsubscript{2} (t = 5.07), S\textsubscript{1} versus S\textsubscript{4} (t =
2.67), $S_1$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 3.27$) and $S_2$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 2.84$). For $S_1$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 2.03$) $t$-ratio is significant at .05 level.

The comparison between the mean values of each pair of schools indicates that in the students' opinion, the administration of school No. 1 (Mean = 21.00) is much better than of school Nos. 2 (Mean = 15.26), 3 (Mean = 18.76), 4 (Mean = 17.42) and 5 (Mean = 17.39). Also school No. 3 is better than school No. 2 on the characteristic of administration.

Results demonstrate that the administration in school No. 1 is more receptive and responsive to students' complaints than it is in the other schools. Objective setting here is participative in the sense that administrators set standards and let teachers, students and parents know what these standards are. This means that everyone is made clear about his role right from the onset and each one tries to make an effort towards the achievement of his targets. Such an arrangement of being afforded the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process in the school is also relevant to the development of the students' personalities as they mature in life.

It may, therefore, be observed that in schools where the leadership style of the administrators is such that participation of the students, parents and teachers in school affairs is allowed, students tend to be happy with
the decisions. Students tend to be resistant to policies in which their view has not been sought. On the basis of results of the present study, it can be stated that the system of administration in schools No. 2, 3, 4 and 5 should improve by way of both formal and informal communication between administrators and the clients or interested parties.

Guidance (F)

The analyses on guidance dimension (F) exhibit that the t-ratios are significant at .01 level between S₁ and S₂ (t = 6.15), S₁ and S₃ (t = 5.78), S₁ and S₄ (t = 5.45), and S₁ and S₅ (t = 3.24), while t-ratio for S₄ versus S₅ (t=2.54) is significant at .05 level.

Intra-comparisons show that the guidance programme of school No. 1 (Chiangmai Demonstration School) with mean value of 17.64 is much better than school Nos 2, 3, 4 and 5 with means equal to 14.30, 14.44, 12.88, 15.71 respectively. School No. 5 is also better perceived than school No. 4.

As in the previous two characteristics, School No. 1 (Chiangmai Demonstration School) is ranked highest by the students with regard to guidance variable. As students are away from their parents during the time they spend in schools, they need the support of teachers or counsellors to help them develop their personalities. In the absence of such a service the students may become delinquents in society. Such a service is, therefore, important for
shaping their present attitude in life to be consistent with their future ambitions and plans.

In other schools where guidance has been found as inadequate, there seems to be definite lapse in career service. Teachers and counsellors do not seem to help students plan for future classes and for future jobs. Further, their personal problems are not attended to with keenness.

It is, therefore, advisable to train teachers in counselling or employ professional student counsellors as an aid to accomplish the psychological satisfaction of the students which they normally cannot derive from the class lessons.

It is recommended that student guidance should involve the entire school staff acting as a team, rather than limiting it to only particular counsellor or teachers. This would help to broaden the scope of advisory service and hence a concern of all the teachers to see to it that their students are attended to any moment they face some problems. In this way, the schools become more personalised and effective in helping the students to develop.

**Instructional Management (I)**

In respect of **instructional management (I)** sub-variable of school climate, differences emerged as significant at .05 level for $S_2$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 2.36$). Mean scores of $S_2$ and $S_5$ are 24.34 and 22.24 respectively
ng thereby that the instructional management of No. 2 is better than it is in school No. 5 as far as the perception of this dimension is concerned. The selection, use and management of instructional materials is an important aspect of educational policies and it clearly reflects on the quality of teaching. The instructional materials available today is so vast that it requires wisdom in its selection and usage due to the attention given to the prevailing circumstances existing in the particular school.

Results clearly show that in school No. 2 students get very clear instructions regarding steps to follow in the process of learning. Moreover, the teachers are more aware and committed to utilizing the classroom time for instructional work and they ensure that as little distraction as possible is allowed. To keep the students busy with instructional work, assignments are given to the students to do outside class hours and parts of the lesson hours are spent in discussing the assignments. Such an approach in instructional management instills a sense of responsibility in the minds of the students, and both the students and teachers can reciprocally learn from one another.

It may, therefore, be observed from the students' perceptions that the deficiency in instructional management in No. 5 is attributable to the lack of a well-developed procedure of instruction and possibly also to the motivation of teachers to devote all their efforts to
aid the learning process.

In a study by Rattanakomol (1988), on the educational comparison of perceptions on instructional management of basic vocational subjects for demonstration schools in Bangkok, she found that demonstration schools students need to study basic vocational subjects, particularly agriculture to be the first, and industrial arts to be the second. Even the commercial courses had been taught in every demonstration school and no significant differences in the perceptions of teachers and students were observed on all dimensions of basic vocational subjects.

**Student Activities (J)**

The t-ratio is found to be significant at .01 level for $S_1$ versus $S_4$ ($t = 2.69$), whereas values of t between $S_1$ and $S_5$ ($t = 2.66$); $S_2$ and $S_4$ ($t = 2.46$) and $S_2$ and $S_5$ ($t = 2.40$) are significant at .05 level in respect of student activities (J) as perceived by students of the demonstration schools. Inter-school comparisons of mean values show that the student activities of schools Nos 1 (Mean = 15.96) and 2 (Mean = 15.70) are much better than school Nos. 4 (Mean = 13.88) and 5 (Mean = 14.00).

Concerning co-curricular activities, student perceived schools No. 1 and 2 to be availing a better variety of student activities than their counterparts in other schools. Implicitly, more emphasis is being placed on student participation in sports. They are given ample
opportunities to plan social events and execute them for themselves. This means that the teachers and administrators are supportive of students activities.

It may, therefore, be observed that apart from normal academic works, students often like to recreate by participating in activities that help them assess their potential in life both mentally and physically. Essentially, the student participation in programme activities provides an informal group opportunity for their personality growth and maturity.

Schools No. 1 and 2 provide better opportunity to students in co-curricular activities as a means of building their personality as well as recreating their minds. This has a reinforcing impact upon their academic orientation.

Conclusion

On the basis of the intra-differences among demonstration schools in respect of students' perception on various school climate characteristics, following conclusions can be drawn:

1. There are no significant differences between various pairs of schools on five of the ten characteristics of school climate that is; teacher-student relationships (A), student academic orientation (D), student behavioural values (E), student-peer relationships (G), parent and community-school relationships (H).
2(a) Students of school No. 1 perceive a) administration and guidance subscale better than those of school No. 2, 3, 4 and 5; b) security and maintenance subscale better than those of school No. 3, and c) student activities better than those of school No. 4 and 5.

2(b) Students of school No. 2 feel better in a) security and maintenance subscale than those of school No. 3 and 5, b) in student activities subscale than those of school No. 4 and 5, and c) in instructional management subscale than those of school No. 5.

2(c) Perception of student of school No. 3 on administration subscale is more satisfactory than those of school No. 2.

2(d) Students of school No. 4 perceive security and maintenance subscale better than those of school No. 3.

2(e) Students of school No. 5 perceive guidance subscale better than those of school No. 4.

3) On the remaining five characteristics of the school climate wherein significant differences were found, students perception of these characteristics were not consistently in favour of a particular school. School to school variations in their perception of the climate characteristics occurred depending upon the characteristic they perceived. In other words, none of the demonstration school has been perceived
consistently significantly better than others by
students on all the five dimensions wherein
significant differences have been observed. Each
school emerged with its own unique features of
strength.

4.2.2 Teachers' Perception

Table 4.3.1 reveals the analytic picture of the
intra-differences among demonstration schools in terms of
significance of differences between means (t-ratios) with
respect to teachers' perceptions of various variables of
school climate characteristics. The results have been
discussed only for those differences which were found to be
significant at least at .05 level of significance. These
results are also shown in Figure 6.

Teacher-Student Relationships (A)

The first variable is teacher-student relationships
(A) for which the t-ratios are found to be significant at
.05 level for S₁ versus S₄ (t = 2.17), S₂ versus S₄ (t =
2.66) and S₃ versus S₄ (t = 2.24). The inter-schools
comparisons of means submitted values of 50.32 and 45.44 for
schools No. 1 and 4; 50.84 and 45.44, for school No. 2 and
4; 50.50 and 45.44 for school No. 3 and 4 respectively. This
means that teacher-student relationships in school No.2 is
perceived better than S₄ which alongwith S₁ in turn is
perceived better than S₄ on this variable by the teachers.
The teachers thus feel that teacher-student relationships is best in school No.1 followed by school No.2 and 3; $S_4$ being at the lowest end. A good teacher-student relationships is characterised by an atmosphere of mutual understanding between the two parties and a realistic and positive attitude towards each other. Moreover, when the teachers objectively rank the student performance in class tests or exams, the latter gets motivated in the works and atmosphere of confidence, trust and reciprocity is developed. Under such a climate teachers try to assist every student personally where necessary, counsel them for any shortcoming in order to try to understand and try to meet the needs of each student. Hardworking and excellent students are praised and encouraged to maintain such high standard of performance, and poorly performing students are helped to improve their performance, rather than being ridiculed and discouraged.

The extent to which these factors are reconciled determine the teacher-student relationships as most of the policies formulated ultimately have a direct impact on the students' co-operation. In the case of present study the perceptions of the teachers for the teacher-student relationship are better in demonstration school No.1, 2 and 3 than school No.4. This means that the teachers' attitude towards their students is more positive in the former school than in the other schools, to the extent that the teachers are willing to help the students in the learning process.
### Table 4.3
The Means And SDs Of School Climate Characteristics As Perceived By Teachers In Five Demonstration Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate Dimensions</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>A</td>
<td>50.32</td>
<td>50.84</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>45.44</td>
<td>48.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>25.39</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>23.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.57</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>21.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>14.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>16.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>23.31</td>
<td>24.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>14.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.3.1
The t-ratios Among Various 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>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

On the second sub-variable, of security and maintenance (B), calculations of significance of differences between means of the teachers' perceptions submit t-ratios which show that the differences are significant for $S_2$ versus $S_3$ ($t=2.19$), $S_2$ versus $S_4$ ($t=2.28$) and $S_2$ versus $S_5$ ($t=2.09$) at .05 level.

Mean values for Schools No. 2, 3, 4 and 5 are 27.36, 24.07, 23.38 and 23.80 respectively. These values exhibit that the teachers' perception on security and maintenance of the demonstration school No.2 is significantly better than schools Nos. 3, 4 and 5.

The teachers' perception of the security and maintenance of the five schools under investigation seems to be identical to the parents' perception as both of the groups concur that school No.2 has better security and maintenance than the other schools. This means that school No.2 is a model worth emulating by the other schools in order to create a congenial atmosphere for both the students, workers and the teachers. It is indeed a positive impetus for the teachers themselves to acknowledge without prejudice that the security and maintenance of one school is better than the other, for this is the infrastructural foundational variable upon which all the other variables of school climate may develop. School No.2 may therefore be used as a model or standard for designing appropriate plans.
to improve the other schools in terms of this dimension. That is, a deliberate attempt needs to be made to improve the cleanliness, neatness, attractiveness of the school compound as well as the buildings and other physical facilities.

**Administration (C)**

On the sub-variable of administration as perceived by teacher, the t-ratios are significant for $S_1$ versus $S_2$ ($t = 4.39$), $S_1$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 3.51$) and $S_1$ versus $S_4$ ($t = 2.74$) at .01 level, and $S_1$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 2.40$) at .05 level.

Comparative mean values are equal to 24.57 and 17.52 for schools No.1 and No.2; 24.57, 19.93 for school No.1 and No.3; 24.57, 20.75 for school No.1 and No.4; and 24.57, 21.15 for school No. 1 and No.5, respectively. This indicates that the administration as a characteristic of the school climate of school No.1 is much better that of the remaining demonstration schools 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Administration in the schools serves the main function of facilitating and improving the instructional programme so that the programmes can be executed conveniently and effectively. Administration provides for organisation, facilities, personnel, materials, co-operation and other conditions which make instruction possible.

In the demonstration schools, administration is provided by a team of teachers selected from among the teachers, headed by the principal. Their role is to
formulate and modify programme adopted for the school system as a whole to suit the needs of a particular demonstration schools as well as to incorporate the view that is developed by the principal and a group of teachers. The task of the school administrator is a challenging one as he deals with many groups both formal and informal many of whom have conflicting goals and purposes. In addition, he has to operate within the limitation of statutory bodies as well as within the regulations of the department of education. Hence many situational factors influence the behaviour of the educational administrator.

The content of the items on the subscale administration shows that high score on it is an indicator of effective mode of communication between the administrators and the students, as well as for the teachers and the parents. Further, the objectives of the school are realistically set-up and every party involved is made aware of them in order to individually and collectively work towards their achievement.

The administration in school No.1 could, therefore, serve as a model while the other schools could adopt to improve their own administration.

In conclusion, teachers are of the view that the system of administration in school No.1 is relatively better than in school Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 because the administrators in this school listen to students’ ideas frequently and get feedback from parents and teachers. Moreover, the
administrators objectively set high standards which are communicated to the teachers, students and parents. They themselves set a good example by being hardworking and also receptive to students complaints. It is, therefore, the participative leadership style that makes the administration in school No.1 more efficient than the others as perceived by the teachers.

Students Academic Orientation (D)

The fourth sub-variable i.e. student academic orientation (D) as perceived by teachers of demonstration schools shows significant differences at .01 level between $S_1$ and $S_3$ ($t = 3.60$) and $S_1$ and $S_4$ ($t = 2.95$) with mean values equal to 16.71, 13.50; and 16.71, 14.00, respectively, comparison of means shows that the student academic orientation in school No.1 is better than in schools No. 3 and 4 in respect of teachers' perception of this variable.

Results are similar to those obtained in respect of preceding dimension wherein $S_1$ emerged as a good model with reference to administration. Once again the teachers are of the view that school No.1 excels in student academic orientation, and the students in this school are clear about their objective of being in the school and hence are more interested in learning new things. The students are also stimulated to accomplish their assignments according to schedules. This means that the climate prevailing within
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school No.1 is challenging to the students and hence they are more motivated to utilize their talents to their utmost in order to make the best achievement in their academic performance. Simultaneously, students also have some fun without forgetting their main objective of being in the school.

**Student Behavioural Values (E)**

On the fifth sub-variable, that is student behavioural value (E), significant differences in teachers' perception are found between S2 and S4 ($t = 2.24$) at .05 level, and between S2 and S5 ($t=2.79$) at .01 level. The pair-wise mean scores are 10.56, 8.50 and 10.56, 8.25, respectively which imply that the teachers perception of student behavioural values of school No.2 (Prince Songkhla Demonstration School) is significantly better than that of schools No. 4 and 5.

Teachers view of school No.2 as being on the lead indicates that the students in the school seem to be more adjusted towards a co-operative effort among themselves. They are more disciplined than students in other schools. As the students develop new social skills, adolescents need to work out ways to get along better with teachers, parents and other adults. They themselves feel they are adults and should be treated as adults; but they do not have the requisite skills, nor do adults give them many opportunities for behaving in a grown up manner.
It is the realization of this need for allowing for initiative of the students that has given school No.2 the advantage over other schools. This is a way of helping students to develop their personality without undue interference in their group behaviour. This is consistent with the common view that a person's behaviour in a particular situation is determined more by how he feels than by his knowledge of what to do. Implicitly this indicates the great need to help adolescents learn how to control their emotions. Attaining emotional maturity demands that they increasingly refrain from relieving emotional tension by outward expression. Classroom activities should, therefore, be directed towards assisting boys and girls to develop competence which may facilitate the attainment of emotional maturity.

The teachers' appreciation of the students' behavioural values in school No.2 also reflects that students are more tolerant to one another e.g. if one student makes fun of another, other students do not join in. Moreover, even in the absence of the teachers, students maintain discipline among themselves on their own. And they are not conditioned to do their work only in the presence of their teachers. Even when their teacher moves out of the class, they continue to do their assignments with devotion.
Guidance (F)

On the sixth characteristic of school climate, that is guidance sub-variable, there exist significant differences at .01 level between $S_1$ and $S_2$ ($t = 3.38$), $S_1$ and $S_3$ ($t = 4.37$), $S_1$ and $S_4$ ($t = 5.71$), $S_4$ and $S_5$ ($t = 2.92$), while the difference between $S_1$ and $S_5$ ($t = 2.03$) is found to be significant at .05 level.

The inter-school comparison of demonstration schools shows mean values as 17.89, 14.84 ($S_1$, $S_2$); 17.89, 14.71 ($S_1$, $S_3$); 17.89, 12.63 ($S_1$, $S_4$); 17.89, 16.40 ($S_1$, $S_5$); and 12.63, 16.40 ($S_4$, $S_5$) respectively. This means that the perception of teachers of the guidance programme of school No.1 (Chiengmai Demonstration School) is better than the guidance programme of their counterparts of schools No. 2, 3, 4 and 5 perceive in this respect. Further, school No.5 (Chulalongkorn Demonstration School) in its own turn is perceived better than school No.4 by teachers of demonstration schools. In other words, more effective guidance and counselling is given in school No.1 than in other schools implying thereby that teachers here are more inclined to helping the students meet their present as well as their future challenges and therefore seek to give them more guidance for emotional and physiological development so that they may settle down and work towards achievement of their academic goals.
The number of guidance workers/counsellors in schools has increased greatly as a means of reducing the dropout rates from school or the incidence of antisocial conduct and emotional disturbance among students. However, teachers can also be as helpful as the professional counsellors on guidance matters. Counselling involves a face to face interaction between the counsellor and the student with the main purpose of helping the student clarify his feelings and problems, make better adjustment with himself and others and learn to plan wisely. However, effective counselling requires certain attitudes, understanding and skills. Basically, the counsellor needs to appreciate the need to respect, accept rather than reject the student and hold the personal problems presented by the student in confidence.

The shortfall in guidance as portrayed in schools could be attributed to the lack of skilled and motivated counsellors. Secondary Education today requires that the teacher acts as a counsellor to young people individually in class or with smaller groups of students including co-operation with parents or others when the students need special assistance. A guidance programme as such needs direction, just as the regular programme of instruction and co-curricular activities does. This may necessitate recruitment of someone specialised in guidance to ensure overall co-ordination of guidance programme and to formulate a committee representing teachers and administrators and sometimes parents and students to meet the principal
formulate the overall policies.

It may, therefore, be concluded that school No.1 is fairing well on the variable of guidance as perceived by the teachers.

**Student-Peer Relationships (G)**

The t-ratios are found to be significant at .01 level for $S_1$ versus $S_2$ ($t = 2.60$), $S_1$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 4.05$), $S_1$ versus $S_4$ ($t=3.79$), and $S_1$ versus $S_5$ ($t=2.97$) on seventh sub-variable of school climate i.e. student-peer relationships (G) as perceived by teachers of demonstration schools.

Mean scores are 17.61, 15.52 for $S_1$ and $S_2$; 17.61, 14.86 for $S_1$ and $S_3$; 17.61, 14.06 for $S_1$ and $S_4$; and 17.61, 15.30 for $S_1$ and $S_5$ respectively. This indicates that student-peer relationships of school No.1 is highest of all schools (No .2,3,4 and 5) as viewed by teachers of demonstration schools.

Once again, according to the teachers' perceptions school No.1 is on the lead with regard to positive student-peer relationships. The climate here is such that the students have affection for each other to the extent that they care for each other and respect one another. Because of this conducive atmosphere they have a sense of belonging to this school.

As students grow up, they try to learn new skills and attitudes out of their association with each others within the peer groups. It is the duty of the teachers to promote
rather than obstruct such a process. Most students in school No.1 see the value of education not only for learning subject matter but also for its role in helping them learn about themselves and others and in helping them make their way in a rapidly changing social and physical environment.

Participation with others in all social groups is a requisite for developing competencies and qualities necessary for living in a complex society. In the process, students learn how to co-operate and think as a group by participating in activities formulated by the group. Such a friendship is more clearly demonstrated in school No.1, which encourages students to work co-operatively with other class members. In such peer groups, students tend to work together efficiently and as quickly as possible especially when they relate on the basis of friendship.

This has a positive implication for planning instructional programmes and it becomes easier for the teachers to administer a training programme where group learning approach is conducive. The remaining schools could probably improve on student-peer relationships by organizing many group discussion sessions as well as field trips in order to increase interpersonal relationships.

Parent and Community-School Relationships (H)

On parent and community-school relationships, one of school climate variable of demonstration schools, the mean differences in teachers' perceptions are significant at .05
level for $S_1$ versus $S_2$ ($t = 2.51$), $S_2$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 2.13$) and $S_2$ versus $S_4$ ($t = 2.10$).

The values of mean are 14.46, 11.76 for $S_1$ versus $S_2$; 11.76, 14.50 for $S_2$ versus $S_3$; and 11.76, 14.50 for $S_2$ and $S_4$, respectively. This means that the teachers of demonstration school No.2 are lower on parent and community school relationships than the schools No.3 and 4 in their school climate characteristics.

Good public relations require that the schools and the community groups work together for their mutual benefits by having a good educational programme as its chief basis. However, as a prerequisite, the principal needs to establish and operate the best curriculum for all the students so that they are satisfied and are supportive to the school administration because a dissatisfied student can defy all the administrations’ best laid plans. Similarly the role of the principal and his team of teachers is significant in this relationships as they are in strategic positions to help determine the community’s evaluation of the schools programme.

However, apart from the different groups in the schools, the parents must be involved in the public relations programme because they need to be satisfied with the attitude and conduct of their children. The knowledge of progress and achievement in academic subjects, improved habits of conduct and dress, greater facility in the use of
language and skills etc., although important to parents, do not replace the need for parent participation in school and community projects, in parent-teacher organisation activities. In many other functions too, community leaders want to participate in determining parts of the school programme and in helping to solve its problems. Thus maintaining good school-community relations is necessary for them in order to seriously exchange ideas and work on problems which hinder educational progress.

As implicit in results, school No.4 (Mordindang Demonstration School) and school No.3 (Phiboonbumphen Demonstration School) are rated high on parent and community-school relationships whereas there is a need in school No.4 (Mordindang) to encourage parents and members of the community to actively participate in school meetings and other activities thereby helping the schools in one way or the other. And the community, in turn, may honour achievements of students in the field of academics, music, drama and sports.

**Instructional Management (I)**

The t-ratios for $S_1$ versus $S_3$ ($t = 2.18$), $S_1$ versus $S_4$ ($t = 2.46$) and $S_2$ versus $S_4$ ($t = 2.27$) are found to be significant at .05 level on teachers perceptions of instructional management sub-variable (I) of the school climate among demonstration schools.
The mean scores of pairs of schools on this dimension as perceived by teachers are 26.11 and 23.50 for $S_1$ and $S_3$; 26.11 and 23.31 for $S_1$ and $S_4$; 27.64 and 23.31 for $S_2$ and $S_4$, respectively. This indicates that school No. 1 is much better than schools No. 3 and 4. Likewise school No. 2 is better than school No. 4 in respect of instructional management as perceived by teachers regarding the school climate characteristics among demonstration schools.

School No. 1 (Chiangmai Demonstration School) ranks highest with regard to instructional management as perceived by the teachers implying thereby that there is a clear set of rules for students to follow in this school, classroom time is optimally spent for learning purposes, students are usually assigned schoolwork to do, teachers use class time to help students learn the assigned work and only minimal disturbance of classroom is observed.

A number of factors determine the quality of instructional management. Firstly, providing a good quality education, requires a lot of funding in order to hire well qualified and competent teachers and buying the requisite materials and equipments; secondly, students should not be grouped at random for instruction purposes without taking keen interest in individual differences; and thirdly, the choice of text-books selected determines the extent of communication of ideas, selection of instructional supplies and aids to learning.
The advantage which school No.1 has over its counterparts may, therefore, lie in its ability to procure enough funds to hire the best qualified teachers, buy sufficient instruction equipment and materials of the requisite quality. However, much of its achievements may be due to the devotion of the teachers who spent most of the classroom time on activities relevant to learning, devoid of distraction. These conditions need to be encouraged in school 3 (Phiboonbumphen Demonstration School) and S₄ (Mordindang Demonstration School).

Student Activities (J)

The last characteristic of school climate is student activities (J), the t-ratios for which are found to be significant at .05 level for S₁ versus S₃ (t = 2.24) and for S₂ versus S₃ (t = 2.18).

School Nos. 1 and 3 are shown having means of 15.93, 14.07; and schools No. 2, shows the mean value of 16.08. This means that the student activities of school climate characteristics in school No.2 are perceived as the highest followed by school No.1 which is better than the school No.3.

The high score on this subscale means that teachers are of the view that given the motivation, students tend to take part in activities in which they are interested. Sports, music and plays are a good source of recreation for students and as such they feel comfortable attending such activities after schools. Moreover, they are willing to take part in sports and other activities even if their families
Participation in activity programmes also contributes to the health and happiness, physical skill and emotional maturity, social competence and moral values of students. Such participation in activities can help in teaching the value of co-operation as well as the spirit of competition, hence it helps build the individual’s character.

Teachers rate schools No.1 and No.2 high with regard to student activities indicates that these two schools have properly integrated student activities in their programmes. The sports, music and plays are recreating to both talented and moderately performing students, hence it can occupy most of the students after the normal class hours. It is, therefore, another useful way of training students in techniques of getting along with academic programmes.

Conclusion

In the intra-differences among demonstration schools with respect of teachers’ perception on school climate characteristics, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Teacher of school No.1 (Chiangmai Demonstration School) perceive ‘administration’, ‘guidance’ and ‘student-peer relationships’ sub-variables more favourably than their counterparts of schools No.2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively. The other sub-variables are ‘student academic orientation’ and ‘instructional management’ which are perceived better than schools
No. 3 and 4. The school No. 1 is also better than school No. 2 on parent and community-school relationships sub-variable; better than school No. 3 of student activities sub-variable; and better than school No. 4 in teacher-student relationships variable. Thus school No. 1 as perceived by teachers is significantly better on eight out of ten sub-variables of school climate as compared to other schools. This school, therefore, can be safely said having a healthiest school climate of all the other demonstration schools included in the sample.

2. School No. 2 (Prince Songkhla Demonstration School) closely follows school No. 1 in teachers' perception of security and maintenance of their school as better than schools No. 3, 4 and 5; student activities variables as better than school No. 3; teacher-student relationships and instructional management as better than school No. 4, and student behavioural values better than schools No. 4 and 5. Thus on five of the ten subscales of school climate, school No. 2 has emerged, in teachers' perception, as being more favourably inclined (after school No. 1) as compared to some other demonstration schools.

3. For school No. 3 (Phiboonbumphen Demonstration School) teachers show favourable perception two of the ten sub-variables of school climate namely; parent and community-school relationships variable (better than
4. Parent community-school relationships are also perceived better than school No. 2 by teachers for school No. 4 (Mordindang Demonstration School).

5. Teachers of school No. 5 (Chulalongkorn Demonstration School) perceive guidance being administrated as better than those of school No. 4.

Thus while demonstration school No. 1 closely followed by school No. 2 is more or less consistently better on most of the school climate characteristics as perceived by teachers. Schools No. 3, 4, and 5 which have shown only two or less favourable characteristics (parent and community-school relationships and teacher-student relationships in case of school No. 3, parent and community-school relationships in case of school No. 4, and guidance in case of school No. 5) of school climate need to be strengthened in other school climate characteristics.

4.2.3 Parents' Perception

Table 4.4.1 shows t-ratios for significance of differences between means on various variables of school climate characteristics as perceived by parents of students of demonstration schools. Values of Means and SDs have been presented in table 4.4. Results of t-ratios are not significant at any of the conventionally accepted level (.05 or .01) on six subscales namely; teacher and student relationships (A), administration (C), student behavioural
values (E), guidance (F), student-peer relationships (G), and student activities (J).

The remaining four characteristics of school climate which emerged as being significantly different in parent’s perceptions (when comparison between two schools at a time was made) are discussed in this section.

**Security and Maintenance (B)**

On the characteristic of security and maintenance (B), t-ratio is found to be significant at .05 level for school No. 2 versus school No. 3 (t = 2.27), with mean values as 25.12 and 20.69 respectively. It means that the level of **security and maintenance** of school No. 2 is significantly better than school No. 3 as perceived by parents of students studying in demonstration schools. These parents are of the view that the students, teachers, and workers in school No. 2 feel more secure than their counterparts in school No. 3. The physical facilities are more congenial, and the standard of hygiene maintenance and organization including the school grounds are better in school No. 2.

By implication, the educational policies of school No. 3 need to be reviewed and updated for provision of security and maintenance to the students and the staff. Improvement of the physical infrastructure is needed.
Table 4.4
The Means And SDs Of School Climate Characteristics As Perceived By Parents In Five Demonstration Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate Dimensions</th>
<th>School No 1 M</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>School No 2 M</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>School No 3 M</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>School No 4 M</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>School No 5 M</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>40.45</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>44.52</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>39.52</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>42.05</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>42.21</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>24.52</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>25.12</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>23.42</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.97</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>17.38</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>24.08</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>15.72</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4.1
The t-ratios Among Various 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>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>2-3</th>
<th>2-4</th>
<th>2-5</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| df. | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 42 | 42 | 46 | 46 | 51 | 41 |

* significant at .05 level
** significant at .01 level
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Student Academic Orientation (D)

On student academic orientation (D), which is the fourth subscale of school climate instrument, there exist significant differences at .01 level between $S_2$ and $S_3$ ($t = 3.23$), and $S_2$ and $S_5$ ($t = 4.26$) whereas difference between $S_1$ and $S_2$ ($t=2.14$) and $S_2$ and $S_4$ ($t = 2.62$) are significant at .05 level.

Comparisons of the means by taking two schools at a time show that values are 15.24, 17.28 for school No. 1 and No. 2; 17.28, 14.52 for school No. 2 and 3; 17.28, 15.32 for school No. 2 and 4; and 17.28, 14.21 for school No. 2 and No. 5, respectively. The scrutiny of these values reveals that student academic orientation of school No. 2 (Prince Songkhla Demonstration School) is better than that of its counterparts in schools No. 1, 3, 4 and 5 as perceived by parents of demonstration schools.

Similar to the results obtained for security and maintenance (B) the parents are of the view that compared to all the other four schools, school No. 2 stands the best in terms of positive student academic orientation i.e. students in school No. 2 are; (i) more clear about their objective of being in school; (ii) more motivated to learn new things; (iii) more hardworking, but at the same time indulge in some minimal recreative activities; and (iv) more achievement oriented that is they try more to accomplish their assignments according to targets as compared to other four demonstration schools.
In respect of parent and community-school relationships (H), there exists a significant difference at .05 level between $S_2$ and $S_3$ ($t = 2.07$). The mean values for these two schools are 15.28 and 13.00 respectively. These results indicate that school No. 2 (Prince Songkhla Demonstration School) is perceived by parents much better in respect of relationships among parent, community and school than school No. 3.

This could be attributed mainly to school’s capacity to involve the parents and members of the community in decisions affecting the running of the school. Such a relationship is useful in getting feedback about the impact of the different educational policies on the public or community at large, and hence the school administration is put at a position of advantage in sensing the attitude of the parents. Such an evaluation in turn helps to improve on the subsequent policies and plans. It is also worth observing that teachers and administrators usually serve in a manner that is related to the stimulation they received through interaction within the community.

However, it may be pointed out that an interaction between the community and schools needs to be rationalized as undue criticism may disrupt this harmony. The main aspects of the school system which require such a collaboration include a) Defining the objectives of
education, b) Identifying the students who should be taught, c) Determining the subjects to be taught and who should teach them, d) Deciding the number and qualities of teachers to be hired, e) Deciding the control of education; and f) Financing the education, etc.

Divergent views on these aspects are likely to occur on account of changes taking place in the school and society as a whole. Results clearly point out to the ability of the leadership of school No. 2 to integrate these divergent views and this gives it an advantage over school No. 3 (Phiboonbumphen Demonstration School) in maintaining parent and community school relationships harmoniously.

Instructional Management (I)

On the characteristic of instructional management (I), as perceived by parents of students of demonstration schools, significant differences at .01 level for $S_2$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 2.90$) and for $S_4$ versus $S_5$ ($t = 2.91$) are shown in Table 4.4.1. Values of mean are 24.08, 19.38 for school No. 2 and school No. 5; and 24.11, 19.38 for school No. 4 and school No. 5, respectively meaning thereby that the instructional management of school No. 5 (Chulalongkorn Demonstration School) is perceived by parents as poorer than that of schools No. 2 and No. 4.

Instructional management deserves more emphasis than any other programme in the school as it is the basis of achieving objectives for which school education is planned.
The factors which might have been considered by the parents in rating schools No. 2 and No. 4 to be better than school No. 5 in this respect refer to the presence of lesser disturbance due to noise or any other form of interruptions during classtime.

Provision of information to students about the rules and regulations to follow in order to ensure orderly teaching hours; maximum utilization by teachers of teaching time for learning, and even giving extra assignments to students and assisting them through discussion to solve any unsolved problems.

Conclusion

With respect to parents' perception of inter-school comparison of school climate characteristics of demonstration schools, following conclusions can be drawn:

1. There were no significant differences between various pairs of schools on six of the ten characteristics namely; teacher-student relationships (A), administration (C), student behavioural values (E), guidance (F) student-peer relationships (G), and student activities (J). Moreover, the parents of schools No. 3 and 5 show insignificantly in any subscale.

2. Parents of students studying in school No. 2 feel more satisfied with (a) student academic orientation than those of schools No. 1, 3, 4 and 5; (b) security and maintenance as well as parent and community-
school relationships than those of school No. 3 and (c) instructional management than those of school No. 5.

3. Schools No. 2 and 4 have been more favourably perceived by parents for their perception strongly instructional management as compared to school No. 5.

The intra-differences on school climate characteristics among five demonstration schools in various sets of comparisons as perceived by parents have been presented in Figure 7.
SCHOOL CLIMATE CHARACTERISTICS AS PERCEIVED BY PARENTS IN FIVE 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
H. PARENT AND COMMUNITY–SCHOOL RELATIONSHIPS
I. INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT
J. STUDENT ACTIVITIES

Figure 7
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From the analysis of *intra-differences* in respect of *school climate characteristics* among five demonstration schools of all the three sub-samples (the students, the teachers and the parents) the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Both students and teachers of school No. 1 perceive administration (C), guidance (F) and student activities (J) subscales of school climate characteristics favourably. However, differences in the perception of students and teachers perception exist in respect of teacher-student relationships (A), student academic orientation (D), student-peer relationships (G), parent and community-school relationships (H) and instructional management (I) subscales which teachers perceive these subscales significantly and their students have been found non-significant. In case of parents of students studying in school No. 1 there have been found non-significant in all subscales of school climate characteristics.

2. In case of school No. 2 all the three sub-sample that is students, teachers and parents exhibit their satisfaction through perception of security and maintenance (B) and instructional management (D). Students and teachers of school No. 2 have also perceived significant in favour of student activities subscale (J), moreover, only teachers show their perception significantly different in teacher student relationships subscale (A) and student behavioral
values (E). Likewise, parents show their agreement as far as the characteristics of student academic orientation (D) and parent and community-school relationships (H) are concerned.

3. In school No. 3, there is no agreement between the perception of students’ and teachers’ on various subscales of school climate. Students, however, perceive administration (C) subscale in favourably while teachers are satisfied in their perception of teacher-student relationships (A) and parent and community-school relationships dimension (H). In case of parents of students studying in school No. 3, there have been found non-significant differences on various subscales of school climate.

4. In school No. 4, out of ten school climate characteristics, only three of them i.e. security and maintenance, parent and community-school relationships and instructional management have been perceived favourably by students, teachers and parents respectively.

5. In school No. 5, the students and teachers exhibit their perception in favour of guidance subscale whereas parents do insignificantly.