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The problem with which this investigation is concerned is that of determining the extent to which the elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand, reflect an open or closed organizational climate.

This study has two purposes. The first is to identify the organizational climate of elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand, as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ). The second is to determine the differences between the organizational climate of elementary schools with enrollments of 300 students or less and elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students.

The stratified random sample of thirty-four elementary schools is composed of twenty-two elementary schools with enrollments of 300 students or less, and twelve elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students. A total of thirty-four principals (100 per cent) and 238 teachers (87.82 per cent) completed OCDQ's for this study.

The validity of the instrument (OCDQ) was submitted to a jury panel in Thailand. Approval by five of the seven jury
members were required in order for the item to be included on the final questionnaire.

To fulfill the first purpose of the study, it was found that of the thirty-four elementary schools, two had open climates, eleven had familiar climates, one had a paternal climate, and twenty had closed climates. There were no schools classified as having either autonomous or controlled climates. The findings related to the second purpose of the study, showed that the twenty-two elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less, two schools were classified as open climates, eight as familiar climates, one as a paternal climate, and eleven as closed climates, while the twelve elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students, three schools were classified as familiar climates, and nine with closed climates.

The conclusions of the study indicated that the climate of the elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand tended to be more closed than open. Principals tend to perceive the climate of the school to be more open than do the teachers. Teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less perceived the climate of the schools to be more open than do teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students. And when the school size increases the climate is more likely to be closed.

As a result of the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made.
1. It is recommended that further studies should examine the influence of the student-teacher relationship.

2. Further research should consider a number of potentially significant variables, such as the academic preparation, age, and background of the principals and teachers.

3. It is recommended that training programs for principals and the annual meeting for principals in Thailand sponsored by the Ministry of Education should explore the importance of a school's climate.

4. Further research on the organizational climate should be conducted in all seventy-one provinces of Thailand.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is a fact that schools differ markedly, not merely in their architecture, but in their atmosphere as well (7, p. 167). In addition, there are considerable differences in the behavior of the people in the schools.

According to some authorities, it is possible, even during a short visit, to perceive the uniqueness of a school's atmosphere in terms of its climate and personality. This perceived difference in atmosphere may be caused by variations in the perception of the individual. Two schools may be perceived as more different from each other than they are. On the other hand, two schools may also be perceived as more similar than they are.

Even though differences are realized, the factors which constitute the differences often are difficult to identify. For a long time, the term "climate" has been rather generally used to describe the atmosphere of an organization. The term "organizational climate" has been given somewhat more precise meaning in recent years. In 1963, Halpin and Croft developed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ), which classified a school on a continuum from open to closed (Open, Autonomous, Controlled, Familiar,
Paternal, and Closed), according to the hierarchical structure prevailing within the particular school (4, p. 237).

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to determine the extent to which the elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand, reflect an open or closed organizational climate.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are as follows:

1. To identify the organizational climate of elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand, as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ).

2. To determine the differences between the organizational climate in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 students or less and in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this study are as follows:

Hypothesis I. There is no significant difference between the subtest means of the principals' perception and the teachers' perception of organizational climate in the eight subtest areas:

1. Disengagement
2. Hindrance
3. Esprit
Hypothesis II. There is no significant difference between the subtest mean scores of the teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 students or less and the scores of the teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students in the eight subtest areas:

1. Disengagement
2. Hindrance
3. Esprit
4. Intimacy
5. Aloofness
6. Production Emphasis
7. Thrust
8. Consideration

Hypothesis III. There is no significant difference between the subtest mean scores of the principals in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 students or less and the scores of the principals in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 students in the eight subtest areas:

1. Disengagement
2. Hindrance
3. Esprit
4. Intimacy
5. Aloofness
6. Production Emphasis
7. Thrust
8. Consideration

Background and Significance of the Study

Experimentation and research in education are necessary for solving the problems that occur in school administration, learning, and teaching. In Thailand, because of inadequate financial support from the government and a lack of adequately prepared researchers, there has been little research in educational administration and no research concerning the organizational climate of the schools.

With regard to experimentation and research in education several projects were completed in Thailand between 1963 and 1970. One of the more significant studies was the Preliminary Assessment of Education and Power in Thailand, reported by a joint Thai-USOM Task Force in 1963 (2, p. A). This task force had two recommendations: first, the establishment of an educational planning office in the Ministry of Education and, second, a more intensive study of secondary education, both vocational and academic, with special reference to manpower needs. Based on this major study, six more research projects have been carried out in various areas of Thai education since 1963. The studies include (1) Evaluation of Instruction
in Thailand; (2) Secondary Education, Manpower, and Educational Planning in Thailand; (3) Vocational Counseling in Secondary Education; (4) Teachers in Thailand's Universities; (5) The diffusion of Educational Innovations in the Government Secondary Schools in Thailand; and (6) Students' Background and University Admission in Thailand.

The present study follows the trend of recent research in the area of organizational climate studies in the United States and continues the search for meaningful factors that affect the organizational climate of schools, specifically those in Thailand. It is hoped that this study will stimulate more research studies in the field of educational administration and eventually lead to a strengthening of the educational system of Thailand.

The writing of Halpin and Croft has served as a major impetus for this research project. According to Halpin,

An essential determinant of a school's "effectiveness" as an organization is the principal's ability--or his lack of ability--to create a "climate" in which he, and other group members, can initiate and consummate acts of leadership. One of our guiding assumptions is that a "desirable" organizational climate is one in which it is possible for leadership acts to emerge easily. If an organization is to accomplish its tasks, leadership acts must be initiated. Such acts can be initiated either by the designated leader or by members of the faculty. In this view we have been supported by the central finding that pervades all research on leadership and group behavior: an "effective" group must provide satisfaction to group members giving a sense of task-accomplishments, and by providing members with the social satisfaction that comes from being part of a group (5, p. 30).
The study by Feldvebel (3) had implication for the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. The data were collected with respect to the socioeconomic status of the school's patrons, pupil achievement levels, and organizational climate. Analysis of variance was used to test the relationship between the socioeconomic status of the community and the organizational climate of the school. The study reported that, although neither open nor closed climates showed any tendency to be associated with the social class level of a community, when the global concept of organizational climate was broken down into its elements or subtests (Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, Intimacy, Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration), certain characteristics of the principal's behavior were associated with the socioeconomic status of the community. In the same study, analysis of covariance was used to test the relationship between organizational climate and pupil achievement. No statistically significant relationship, however, was found to exist.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following terms are defined as follows:

Organizational Climate is the organizational "personality" of a school; figuratively, "personality" is to the individual what "climate" is to the organization (6, p. 1).
OCDQ is the Organization Climate Description Questionnaire developed by Halpin and Croft in 1963. It consists of sixty-four items for assessing the organizational climate of a school (4, p. 133).

**Elementary school** is a school in Thailand, comprising Prathom 1 to Prathom 7, which is equivalent to American grades 1 to grade 7. "Prathom" is also the common term for an elementary school in Thailand (1).

**Elementary school principal** is a person appointed by the government to be responsible for the management, organization, and supervision of a school organized as an elementary school.

**Elementary school teacher** is a teacher who is responsible for instruction in the elementary school.

**Sukhothai** is the name of the province, out of seventy-one provinces in Thailand, which is the focus of this study. (See Appendix K).

**Limitation of the Study**

This study is limited to a stratified, random sampling of thirty-four selected public elementary schools organized from Prathom 1 to Prathom 7 (Grades 1 to Grade 7) in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand.

Special attention was given to the fact that the items of the OCDQ were originally developed for the American culture. Consequently, there was a chance that some of the items might have a different connotation in the two cultures.
even if the translation were correct. A jury of professional educators in Thailand was used to reduce the variation caused by culture in its assessment of the translated version of the OCDQ. The correctness of the Thai version was further checked by the Royal Thai Embassy in Washington D.C.

Basic Assumption

It is assumed in this study that the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) has validity as a criterion for assessing the school organizational climate in Thailand as translated by the researcher and verified by a jury of professional educators in Thailand.

Instrument

The instrument in this study is the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) (See Appendix A) developed by Halpin and Croft in 1963. The questionnaire consists of sixty-four items used to establish the organizational climate, as perceived by members of a school's staff. The items were answered on a four-point, forced-choice scale: rarely occurs, sometimes occurs, often occurs, very frequently occurs. The items were assigned a point value of "4" to items identified as "very frequently occurs," "3" to items identified as "often occurs," "2" to items identified as "sometimes occurs," and "1" to items identified as "rarely occurs."
This instrument was translated into the Thai language by the researcher. The correctness of the Thai version was checked and verified by the Royal Thai Embassy in Washington D.C.

The OCDQ was submitted to a jury panel for content validation. The jury panel consisted of three principals who were considered to be specialists in the field of educational administration in Thailand and four teachers who were expert in both English and Thai language. (See Appendix B) Each jury member was asked to consider whether each item was relevant. The members of the jury panel were asked to respond by circling "1" if the item were "relevant" and by circling "2" if the item were irrelevant." Five of the seven jury members were required to approve an item in order for it to be included on the final questionnaire. This procedure provided the validity of the instrument to be used in collecting data for analysis in this study.

Sampling

The population of this study consists of thirty-four elementary schools in Sukhothai, Thailand. (See Appendix C.) These elementary schools were divided into two categories:

1. Elementary schools with enrollments of 300 students or less.

2. Elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students.
In order to assure equal opportunity for each school to be selected for this study, the schools were stratified on a percentage basis. The stratified, random sample of thirty-four elementary schools was composed of twenty-two elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less and twelve elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students. On a percentage basis, the elementary schools with enrollments of 300 students or less made up 6.5 per cent of the total 340 schools, and those with enrollments of more than 300 students made up 3.5 per cent of the total.

The teachers to be included in this study were selected randomly from the alphabetical list of each principal's staff of 50 per cent of the total teacher population in each of the thirty-four selected schools. Each of the principals and the selected teachers from each of thirty-four elementary schools were then requested to complete the questionnaire.

Procedures for Collecting Data

Permission for the researcher, to use, adapt, and translate the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) into Thai language was requested of Macmillan Publishing Company. (See Appendix D.) The Thai version was checked and verified by the Royal Thai Embassy in Washington D.C.

A letter asking permission to collect data and administer the questionnaire to the elementary school principals and the teachers was carried to the Provincial Governor of
Sukhothai, Thailand. (See Appendix E.) After permission was granted, copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the selected principals and teachers by the researcher. The researcher delivered the questionnaire directly to the participating schools, explained the study, and remained while the questionnaire was completed by the principal and teachers. All questionnaire data were computerized at North Texas State University and University of North Carolina.

Procedures for Analyzing Data

To complete the first and second purposes of this study, the researcher followed Halpin and Croft's process for computing the data (4, pp. 166-169).

Step 1--The Construction and Standardization of the School Profiles

The school profile based upon the raw scores of the eight subtests of the OCDQ was constructive and these raw scores were then converted scores which were standardized in two ways: normatively and ipsatively (normatively is concerned with the total example; ipsatively is concerned with each individual school).

Step 2--The Factor Analysis of the Intercorrelations among the Eight Subtests

The researcher factor analyzed the thirty-four school profiles, extracted three profile factors, and found six major patterns of factor loading among the profiles.
Step 3--The Specification of the Six-Prototypic Profiles and Defined the Six Organizational Climates

For each of the six sets of school profiles, each of the school climate profiles were compared with each of the six prototypic climate profiles as developed by Halpin and Croft. (See Appendix I). When the absolute difference between the school climate profile and the six prototypic climate profiles were computed, and when these differences were summed, six similarity scores resulted for each school. The "school climate profile" with the smallest similarity scores indicated the climate which best characterized that school. (See Appendix J.) The six organizational climates were defined in terms of these six prototypics.

To complete the hypotheses testing of this study, the t-test technique was used. The hypotheses were tested at p > .05 level of significance.

Summary

Chapter I consists of an introduction, statement of the problem, purposes of the study, background and significance of the study, definition of terms, limitation of the study, basic assumptions, instrument, sampling, procedures for collecting data, and procedures for analyzing data. Chapter II consists of a review of related literature, gives the evolution of the climate concept and the studies on the organizational climate. Chapter III contains the procedures
for collection of the data. Chapter IV consists of the presentation and analysis of data. Chapter V presents the summary, findings, conclusions, implication, and recommendations.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This review of the literature is divided into two sections. The first section deals with the evolution of the climate concept, while the second section reviews a number of studies on the organization and the organizational climate.

The Evolution of the Climate Concept

The first studies dealing with climate were initiated by Lewin (13) in the 1930's when he attempted to link human behavior to the environment. The theme of the Lewin efforts to unravel and explain organizational climate is found in the following statement:

To characterize properly the psychological field, one has to take into account such specific items as particular goals, stimuli, needs, social relations, as well as more general characteristics of the field as the atmosphere (for instance, the friendly, tense, or hostile atmosphere) or the amount of freedom. These characteristics of the field as a whole are as important in psychology as, for instance, the field of gravity for the explanation of events in classical physics. Psychological atmospheres are empirical realities and are scientifically describably facts (14, p. 241).

From his work Lewin developed a model, the ingredients of which appears in the above statement, which describes the relationships between an individual and his environment. It is as follows:

\[ B = f(P, E) \]
In effect, Lewin's model proposes, for example, that the nurse's behavior (B) in a hospital is influenced significantly by the personality or personal (P) characteristics of the nurse and the hospital's environment or climate (E).

Brunwik (4) also attempted in the 1930's to clarify organizational climate by classifying variables in terms of whether they were input (stimulus) or output (response) variables. He was interested in relationships between the different variables. He also spent considerable effort in understanding how the quality of a climate impacts upon individual behavior.

In addition to the pioneering efforts of Lewin and Brunwik, many of the approaches to management and organizational behavior have nurtured the current concern about organizational climate. A summary of the works of some of the scholars and how their efforts are related to climate is presented in Table I.

The scholars specified in Table I have dealt in various ways with the organizational climate concept. The early writers such as Taylor, did not discuss climate specifically. The major emphasis of these writers was on developing a highly rationalized system of organization. They concentrated on such concepts as division of labor, studying jobs via motion and time study, and structuring the total organization.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory or Concept</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Use of climate concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor (Scientific Management)</td>
<td>Upon a &quot;one best way&quot; system of managing work by encouraging specialization and formal structuring of jobs.</td>
<td>Showed how structuring the job and developing a line of authority leads to working in an environment of certainty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward and Lawrence and Lorch</td>
<td>Upon the interrelationships of environmental forces, technology, structure and performance.</td>
<td>Attempted to show how structural-technical demands describe climate influence largely through job expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybernetic</td>
<td>Upon the fact that man can control and modify his environment.</td>
<td>Showed how information significantly modifies the climate in which an employee operates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockheed span of control model</td>
<td>Concerned with developing a model that highlights the optimal span of control.</td>
<td>Used weighted scale to assess the importance of various climate factors such as the degree of training of managers and the planning atmosphere within the firm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization</td>
<td>Upon the downward delegation of decision-making latitude.</td>
<td>Amount of delegation that is allowed depends upon the thrust and faith that exists within the organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE I--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory or Concept</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Use of climate concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likert (System4)</td>
<td>Processes of grouped interaction as related to participation, communication, and motivation. Leadership style is a crucial factor in determining the degree of interaction.</td>
<td>Attempted to show how a work atmosphere that perpetuates a supportive climate leads to better performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enrichment</td>
<td>Seeks to improve task efficiency and human satisfaction by means of improving the intrinsic features of a job</td>
<td>Attempts to create a climate that provides the employee with responsibility, recognition, and opportunities for advancement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This type of emphasis prohibits extensive consideration of such a personalistic and subjective phenomenon as organizational climate. Of these concepts, however, interact and create a climate within the organization.

The works of Likert (15) touches upon various climate factors. He views the climate as consisting of three component parts—physical environment, cultural environment, and technological environment. The interrelationships among these factors impose certain activities and interactions upon the employees within the company. The activities and interactions, in turn, arouse sentiments among the employees.
According to Likert System 4 environment leads to the most productive mix of activities, interactions, and sentiments.

Lawrence and Lorch (12) distinguish various structural dimensions that significantly influence behavior. The structural factors are believed to be a major force in generating the job expectations that exist within a company. Some of the dimensions they analyze are time span of responsibility, number of levels of hierarchy, span of control, and locus of formal authority.

Studies on Organizational Climate

Organizations have been studied extensively and intensively over the past four decades. Many of the studies have endeavored to bring about understanding of organizational behavior and the forces that serve as predictors of this behavior.

Barnard (2) theoretical contribution to the understanding of the existence of informal organizations, of the need for a cooperative relationship among all members of the organization, and of the significant role of active participation in securing this relationship have been studied widely over the past three decades in many settings and in many organizations. Efficiency, as defined by Barnard and subsequent investigators, is reflected in the organizations structure. This structure designates responsibility, authority, role assignment, a hierachical arrangement of positions, and the
use of resources. It also takes into account specialization in various areas which are reflected in subsystems within the organization. Effectiveness, on the other hand, according to Barnard's theory, seems to be the ability of the organization to obtain maximum energy from all its members toward the achievement of its goals. For this to take place, there must exist a cooperative relationship among all members of the organization, with acceptance of objectives, procedures, and behavioral outcomes, in order that the energy of all members will be directed toward organizational goal achievement. Indication of this relationship is mirrored in the climate of the organization.

Getzel and Guba (9, pp. 235-246) further refined these concepts in a social systems model which allows an organization to be examined according to two classes of phenomena, which are conceptually independent as well as phenomenally interactive. Thus, Barnard's effectiveness concept is a statement of phenomena more fully described by the Getzel-Guba nomothetic dimension, with focus on the elements of "institutional," "role," and "expectation." In contrast, Barnard's concept of efficiency appears to relate to the Getzel-Guba idiographic dimension, which brings the elements of the "individual," "personality," and "needs-disposition" into focus, since both of these classes of phenomena relate to goal-behavior pursuit.
Watkin (22) utilized Fiedler's psychological distance concept and the OCDQ in his study. He administered the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) and the Assumed Similarity of Opposites Scales (ASO) to 48 principals and 1188 professional staff members from 31 White and 17 Black schools. The principals responded to both instruments, while the staff completed only the OCDQ. The research revealed that there was a negative relationship between the ASO concept (psychological distance) of the school principals and the openness of the organizational climate of the schools, as indicated by teacher perception, measured by the OCDQ. It was also found that Black staff perceive their schools to be more closed in their organizational climate and that principals perceive the climate to be more open than did the teachers.

Kenney and Rentz (11, pp. 167-174) conducted a study among similar populations in metropolitan areas in five parts of the country. They concluded that the factor structure of the OCDQ in their urban-school sample was different from the factor structure identified by the originators of the instrument. They concluded from an analysis of their data that different kinds of influence have come to affect the urban teachers' perceptions of their schools. The four factors in their study were as follows. Factor 1, Principal as Authority Figure; Factor 2, Teacher quo Teacher Group Perception; Factor 3, More Classroom
Teachers Satisfaction; and Factor 4, Work Conditions. The tone of the study appears to indicate that the principal in the urban school is perceived as an authority figure, that teachers view the teacher group in a somewhat negative manner, and that teachers derive their satisfaction from nonclassroom activities and view their work conditions in a rather negative way. The results are not encouraging, for teachers seem to display a negative viewpoint, and 73 per cent of the 102 schools in the survey were classified in the closed category.

Argyris (1, pp. 501-502) felt obliged to justify his own earliest investigation of the climate level of analysis with these words:

Anyone who conducts research on human behavior in organizations is always faced with the problems of ordering and conceptualizing a buzzing confusion of simultaneously existing, multilevel, mutually interacting variables. . . . In reality they are mixed beyond classification into any academic compartments, forming a pattern in which each plays a functional role feeding back and upon the others to maintain itself and the pattern. This new and fourth level of analysis we shall define as organizational behavior. It is our intent to show that the organizational behavior level is a discrete legitimate level of analysis. . . .

Barnes' field study (3) compared a classical environment with a human relations one. His monograph included a careful description of two engineering departments and the companies to which they belonged. Department A, which was termed a "closed system," in most respects came near to what has been defined as the classical paradigm. Department B,
roughly comparable in size and technology to A, was depicted by Barnes as an "open system"; approaching the human relations paradigm. In Barnes' research, employees in the closed environment of Department A were found to be more status conscious, cliques often formed, and much competition existed. As anticipated, nothing of this sort was true of Department B. Furthermore, Barnes uncovered a negative relationship between job satisfaction and performance in the closed system, whereas satisfaction was positively related to performance in the open system. And while salary was related to indices of status (e.g., age, education, seniority) in the closed system, salary in the open system was more closely related to actual job performance.

Barnes has demonstrated that variance in total system quality along traditional-modern continuum relates to individual and system outputs. Furthermore, these outputs seem to be preferable in the human relations (open system) climate.

Likert (15) recounted seven field studies carried out under the auspices of the Institute for Social Research which also brought in results strongly favoring a human relations climate. Instead of Barnes' closed-versus-open system classification, Likert used a continuum roughly from "exploitative authoritative" to "participative group." But his intent was the same--to create a dimension of comparative analysis along which total systems would distribute themselves.
Likert developed a questionnaire which was quite reliable, based on workers' perceptions of their environment. He selected several well-managed companies and, using this questionnaire, found that "virtually everyone" in middle and upper management prescribed a participating group climate for his company.

Simon (20, p. 218), in *Administrative Behavior*, noted that a conflict between the role expectation of an organization and the personal needs disposition of the people in the organization constituted alienating forces. To counter these alienating forces, there must be integrating forces in the form of goals and values. He felt that, if the administrator and members of his work group could agree on goals, organizational demands might be seen in a different light, and organizational procedures might be more acceptable. If agreement on goals and values exceeded conflict between role expectations and personal disposition, the behavior of organization members would be such as to help the organization achieve its goals. Agreements on goals and values suggested much regarding communication and participation within the organization.

According to Campbell (5, pp. 107-108), autocratic conditions and leadership create among group members (1) more hostility and rivalry, (2) identification with the leader, (3) aggression toward others, (4) the creation
of scapegoats, (5) overdependence on and submission toward leaders, and (6) rigidity of behavior. He adds that autocratic, directive leadership decreased group cohesion, group moral, and group productivity.

Morphet, John and Rellers (18, p. 104) suggested a democratic type of organizational structure, with the following assumptions:

1. Leadership is not confined to those holding status positions in the power echelon.
2. Good human relations are essential to group production and to meet the needs of individual members of the group.
3. Responsibility, as well as power and authority, can be shared.
4. Those affected by a program or policy should share in decision making with respect to that program or policy.
5. The individual finds security in a dynamic climate in which he shares responsibility for decision making.
6. Unity of purpose is secured through consensus and group loyalty.
7. Maximum production is attained in a threat-free climate.
8. The line-and-staff organization should be used exclusively for the purpose of dividing labor and implementing policies.
9. The situation and not the position determines the right and privilege to exercise authority.
10. The individual in the organization is not expendable.
11. Evaluation is a group responsibility.

Mooney (17, p. 2) described organization this way:

Organization has been termed the formal side of administration, likewise the machinery of organization, the channel through which the measures and policies of administration become effective. . . . Again, organization has been called the framework of every group moving toward an objective. Here . . . it seems to imply that organization referred only to the differentiation of individual duties. . . . But duties
must relate to procedures, and it is here that we find the real dynamics of organization, the motive power through which it moves to its determined objectives.

McGregor recast four principles that outline a new approach to organizational leadership (16, p. 18):

1. The starting point is the clear recognition that, if there is a single assumption which pervades conventional organizational theory, it is that authority is the central, indispensable means of managerial control. McGregor shows the limitations of various forms of organizational authority based on role or status compared with authority based on task or goal demands, i.e., objectives. Under this concept, management by objective comes about through target setting, a joint effort where superior and subordinate attempt to develop the ground rules for work and productivity.

2. There is the principle of interdependence or collaboration between superior and subordinate which is essential if the two parties are to agree on some mutually satisfactory target.

3. Another principle has to do with the belief evidenced in practice that subordinates are capable of learning how to exercise effective self-control. Self-control, because it is not governed by external forces, is apparently one of McGregor's indications of maturity.

4. This position asserts the need for interpretation, i.e., the bringing together and working through of the differences between individual and organizational needs.
According to McGregor: "The central principle which derives from Theory Y is that of integration: the creation of conditions such that members of the organization can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts toward the success of the enterprise.

Garrett's (8) study of the organizational climate of Colorado High Schools made in 1970, had two purposes: (1) to determine the climate of Colorado high school and (2) to determine the relationship between school size and climate in Colorado high schools. The questionnaire was distributed to the faculties and principals of the thirty-six schools. His conclusion about the first purpose was that 60 per cent of the small schools had open climates, 50 per cent of the medium schools had open climates while 50 per cent had closed climates; and 80 per cent of the large schools had closed climates. Garrett's conclusion about the second purpose the Chi Square technique was used; there was no relationship, statistically, between school size and climate: (1) among the three divisions--small versus medium versus large, (2) between the two school divisions--small versus combined medium and large, (3) between the two school divisions--small versus medium and (4) between the two school divisions--medium versus large. There was a relationship, statistically, between school size and climate: (1) between the two school divisions--
combined small and medium versus large and (2) between the two school divisions--small versus large. The investigator concluded that, when school size exceeds 1000 students, the climate is more likely to be closed; therefore, administrators in the large schools need to make greater effort to improve personnel relationships.

Flanders (7) conducted a study concerning the relationship of selected variables of the organizational climate of elementary schools in 1966. The study, based on a sample of 214 schools and 3913 teachers, found significant differences among the perceptions of the faculties of large and small, urban, White schools regarding the organizational climate. Small, urban, White schools were perceived as having an open climate with greater frequency than large, urban, White schools.

Flagg (6) conducted a study to determine the organizational climate of ten elementary schools in New Jersey and the relationships between the organizational climate, pupil achievement in reading, school size, and teacher turnover. He concluded that, as the size of the school increases, the climate tends to become more closed. No relationship between climate and pupil achievement in reading can be said to have been established because of the relative sameness of climate in the schools.

Morris (19) used the OCDQ to classify elementary, secondary, and combined schools in Alberta, Canada. He
found that principals perceived significantly higher esprit and consideration and disengagement and hindrance lower than did the faculties. He also found a greater tendency to openness in the elementary schools, while secondary schools were more closed, and the combined were even more so.

Tveiten's (21) study was intended to replicate the study on organizational climate conducted by Andrew W. Halpin on a sample of Norwegian elementary schools. The population consisted of eighty-one schools. The investigator used the OCDQ to describe the organizational climate of elementary schools in Norway by means of a taxonomy, which emerged from the eight subtests in the original OCDQ. He found that seven subtests emerged in the Norwegian OCDQ. He found that the principals perceived the climate to be more open than did the teachers and that organizational climate tended to be perceived as more open by small faculties than by large faculties.
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CHAPTER III

COLLECTION OF THE DATA

This chapter consists of the following:

1. Characteristics of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ).
2. Translation of the OCDQ.
3. Construction of the Validation of the OCDQ.
4. Selection of the Jury Panel.
5. Construction of the Final OCDQ.
6. Selection of the Sample.
7. Administration of the Final OCDQ.

Characteristics of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) utilized in this study was developed by Halpin and Croft for use in classifying the organizational climate of schools. The specific form used in this study was the final version Form IV, consisting of sixty-four statements which asked the respondent to indicate to what extent each characterized his school. The respondent's answer was defined by four categories: (1) rarely occurs, (2) sometimes occurs, (3) often occurs, (4) very frequently occurs.
The eight dimensions of the organizational climate are used in this study. The first four subtests, which included the areas of disengagement, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy, refer primarily to the behavior of the teacher. The second four, which included the areas of aloofness, production emphasis, thrust, and consideration, refer to the behavior of the principal.

Translation of the OCDQ

Permission to translate and use the OCDQ in Thailand was obtained from McMillan Publishing Company. The researcher translated the questionnaire from English to the Thai language. The Thai version was checked and verified by the Royal Thai Embassy in Washington D.C. (See Appendix F.) The correctness of the language was also verified by a jury panel of educators in Thailand.

Construction of the Validation of the OCDQ

The content validation of the OCDQ for use in Thailand was approved by the Thai jury panel. Each jury member was requested to read each item and decide if the item was relevant. Members of the jury panel were asked to respond by circling "1" if the item were relevant and by circling "2" if the item were irrelevant.

In order for an item to be included on the final OCDQ, five of the seven jury members had to approve it.
Selection of the Jury Panel

The jury panel was composed of seven college professors in Thailand: three former principals and four former teachers. Each jury member was requested directly to participate in the validation procedure by the researcher, who then distributed the original OCDQ form and the translated form of the OCDQ to each jury member.

Construction of the Final OCDQ

The construction of the final OCDQ was based on the response of the validation panel. Items rated "relevant" by five of the seven panel members were included on the final OCDQ. All sixty-four of the original items on the OCDQ received approval by five of seven jury members and therefore, were included in the present study.

Selection of the Sample

There are 340 elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand. In order to assure equal opportunity for each school to be selected for this study, the schools were stratified on a percentage basis, based on 10 per cent of the total. The population of this sample consisted of thirty-four elementary schools. Of the thirty-four schools, twenty-two were elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less, and twelve were elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students.
The number of teachers to be included in this study was selected randomly from the alphabetical list of each principal's staff. The respondents for this study were the thirty-four principals and 50 per cent of the teachers from the thirty-four selected schools. The teachers of the elementary schools with enrollments of 300 students or less numbered 123; and the elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students numbered 148.

Administration of the Final OCDQ

After the final OCDQ has been printed by the researcher, two pieces of written information were prepared:

1. An introductory and explanatory letter to the principals. (See Appendix G.)

2. A letter to each teacher requested to participate in the study. (See Appendix H.)

The researcher carried the translated form of the final OCDQ directly to the selected schools and explained the study and the directions. Respondents were given the OCDQ, along with the letter, during the school day, and the researcher remained in the schools until the respondents completed the questionnaire.

Procedure for Analyzing and Treating the Data

The analytical procedures followed those of Halpin's original study.
Step 1. The construction and standardization of the school-profiles. The researcher constructed the school profiles, based upon the raw scores on the eight subtests of the OCDQ and then converted these raw scores into standardized scores.

Step 2. The factor analysis of the intercorrelation among the eight subtests. The researcher computed the intercorrelations among the eight subtests and factor analyzed the three-factor varimax rotational solution.

Step 3. The specification of the six-prototypic profiles and the definition of six organizational climates. For each of the six sets of school profiles, the researcher compared each school climate profile with each of the six prototypic climate profiles developed by Halpin and Croft. When the absolute difference between the school climate profile and the six prototypic climate profiles was computed and when these differences were summed, six similarity scores resulted for each school. The school climate profile with the smallest similarity scores indicated the climate which best characterized that school. The six organizational climates were defined in terms of these six prototypics.

Machine scoring of the OCDQ was completed by the computer center at North Texas State University and by the computer at the University of North Carolina, which had a computer program for scoring the original form of Halpin's OCDQ. This included the biographical information checklist and
the OCDQ. The sixty-four items were assigned a score of
1 to 4 as follows: 1 = rarely occurs, 2 = sometime occurs,
3 = often occurs, and 4 = very frequently occurs.

The three hypotheses were tested by using the t-test
for two independent samples.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter, which contains an analysis of the data, is divided into three sections. The first section contains the summary of responses to the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ), the second section presents the findings of the data, and the third section reports the hypotheses testing.

Summary of Responses to the OCDQ

This study, based on a 10 per cent stratified random sample of the 340 elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand, included thirty-four elementary schools. Of the thirty-four schools, twenty-two were elementary schools with enrollments of 300 students or less, while twelve were elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students. Each of the thirty-four principals and 271 teachers, representing a 50 per cent random selection of the total teacher population in each of the thirty-four elementary schools, was included in the study. Table II shows the total population and the total number of principals and teachers who completed the OCDQ.
### Table II

**TOTAL POPULATION, TOTAL COMPLETED OCDQ'S, AND PERCENTAGE OF COMPLETED OCDQ'S**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Category</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Total Completed OCDQ'S</th>
<th>Percentage of Completed OCDQ'S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Elementary Schools with enrollments of 300 or less</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Elementary Schools with enrollments of more than 300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II shows that the population of the principals in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less was twenty-two; from this population all twenty-two completed the OCDQ, giving a 100 per cent return. The population of the teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less was 123; from this population 106 completed the OCDQ, giving a 86.18 per cent return. The population of the principals in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 was twelve; from this population all twelve completed the OCDQ, giving a 100 per cent return. The population of the teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more
than 300 was 148; from this population 132 completed the OCDQ, giving a 89.19 per cent return. The result, in a total return from the principals, was 100 per cent; from teachers the total return was 87.82 per cent.

Steps in Analyzing and Reporting the Data

Machine scoring of the OCDQ was completed by the computer center at North Texas State University, and the computer-scoring service for the OCDQ was provided by Dr. Andrew E. Hayes of the Technical Assistance Development Systems at the University of North Carolina. This service analyzed the OCDQ data and categorized the schools according to the climate profile types. Halpin and Croft's process for computing was followed (1, pp. 166-169).

Step 1

The school profiles were based upon the raw scores on the eight subtests of the OCDQ (Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, Intimacy, Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration). These raw scores were then converted into standardized scores in two ways: normatively and ipsatively. (Normative standardization is concerned with the total sample, while ipsative standardization is concerned with each individual school.) For both standardization procedures, the resulting scores were converted to an expected mean of 50 with a standard deviation of 10.
The correlation between the eight subtests scores is presented in Table III.

**TABLE III**

**CORRELATIONS BETWEEN EIGHT SUBTESTS SCORES OF THE OCDQ (N=272)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCDQ Subtest</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Disengagement</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hindrance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Esprit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aloofness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Thrust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The row subtests correspond to the column subtests.

According to Table III, the highest correlation in this study was between the subtests Thrust and Consideration (.80). The greatest negative correlation was between the subtests Hindrance and Esprit (-.51).

**Step 2**

The intercorrelations among the eight subtest scores were factor analyzed by a principal-components method of
analysis. The unrotated factor loading and the corresponding eigenvalues for each of the eight factors are presented in Table IV.

In this study, the eigenvalues for the first three factors shown in Table IV were sufficiently large (approximately 1.00 or higher) to suggest that the best factorial solution would be a three-factor rotational solution (4). The factor three in this study, which had an eigenvalue very close to 1.00 (.94). The researcher performing a three-factor rotational solution for further analysis. The three-factor rotational solution was similar to the finding in Halpin's original study (1, p. 161) in that Halpin's factor three also had an eigenvalue very close to 1.00 (.97).

The three-factor varimax rotational solution and the communalities for the three-factor rotations in this study are presented in Table V.

The factor loading in each subtest of Table V in this study was different from that in Halpin's study (Halpin's study, the highest loading for Factor I, were subtests Intimacy and Consideration, Factor II, were subtests Esprit and Thrust, and Factor III, were subtests Aloofness and Production Emphasis.) For this study, the highest loading for Factor I were the subtest Disengagement (.76) and the subtest Aloofness (.72). The highest loading for Factor II were subtest Thrust (.89) and the subtest Consideration
### TABLE IV

**UNROTATED FACTOR MATRIX FOR EIGHT SUBTESTS**

(N=272)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCDQ Subtest</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>h²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Disengagement</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hindrance</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Esprit</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intimacy</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aloofness</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Production</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Thrust</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eigenvalue</strong></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(.87). The highest loadings for Factor III were the subtest Hindrance (.53) and the subtest Disengagement (.13). The next task for the researcher was to identify the name of these three factors. According to name and definition of the factor, Harman (2, p. 165) indicated that the factor may be named from the nature of the variable of the subtest.

### TABLE V

**THREE-FACTOR VARIMAX ROTATIONAL SOLUTION FOR TOTAL SAMPLE**

(N=272)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCDQ Subtest</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>h²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Disengagement</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hindrance</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Esprit</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intimacy</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aloofness</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Production Emphasis</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Thrust</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the naming of Factor I in this study, the researcher noted, that, the highest loading on this factor included the subtests Disengagement (.76) and Aloofness (.72); therefore Factor I was named Social Control. Disengagement and Aloofness depict behavior which is primarily task-oriented and which is related to a form of social control. Halpin in his study (1, p. 161) also found loadings on subtest Aloofness and Production Emphasis which he named "Social Control."

In naming Factor II in this study, the researcher found that the highest loadings on this factor included the subtests Thrust (.89) and Consideration (.87), therefore, Factor II was named Thrust. These two subtests, Thrust and Consideration, reflect behavior which is task-oriented, though not at the expense of need satisfaction. This factor name was the same as that chosen by Hayes (3) who conducted a reappraisal of the original Halpin and Croft data on organizational climate. Hayes also reported the highest loading on the subtests Thrust and Consideration.

In naming Factor III in this study, the researcher noted that, the highest loadings for Factor III included the subtest loadings for Factor III included the subtest Hindrance (.53) and Disengagement (.13), therefore, Factor III was named Hindrance. These two subtests, Hindrance and Disengagement, reflect teachers' behavior. Hindrance refers to the teachers' feeling that the principals burden them with routine
duties, while Disengagement refers to the teachers' tendency to be remote.

Step 3

The six prototypic profiles were computed, and the six organizational climates were defined. To compute for each of the six sets of school profiles, the researcher compared each school climate profile with each of the six prototypic climate profiles as developed by Halpin and Croft (See prototypic profiles in Appendix I.) When the absolute difference was computed between the school climate profile and the six prototypic climate profiles and when these differences were summed, six similarity scores resulted for each school. The school climate profile with the smallest similarity scores indicated the climate which best characterized that school. (Each school's similarity scores are shown in Appendix J.)

Halpin classified six types of climates on an open-closed continuum. These six types of climates are open, autonomous, controlled, familiar, paternal, and closed. Each of the six different organizational climates is defined, according to Halpin (1, pp. 174-181) as follows:

1. The Open Climate.--This climate depicts a situation in which the members have extremely high Esprit. The teachers work well together without bickering and complaining (low Disengagement). They are not burdened by busy work or by
routine reports; the principal's policies facilitate the teachers' accomplishment of their tasks (low Hindrance). The behavior of the principal represents an integration between his own personality and the role he is required to play as principal. The principal goes out of his way to help teachers (high Thrust and Consideration). The principal is not aloof (low Aloofness) and does not have to emphasize production (low Production Emphasis). The principal possesses personal flexibility.

2. The Autonomous Climate.--The distinguishing feature of this organizational climate is the almost complete freedom that the principal gives to teachers to provide their own structures for interaction so that they can find ways within the group for satisfying their social needs. The score leans slightly more toward social-need satisfaction than toward task achievement (high Esprit and Intimacy). The teachers are engaged in their work; they achieve their goals easily and quickly (low Disengagement). The principal has set up procedures and regulations to facilitate the teachers' tasks (low Hindrance). The principal remains aloof from the teachers (high Aloofness). The principal appears satisfied to let the teachers work at their own speed. He monitors their activities very little (low Production Emphasis). The principal attempts to satisfy the social needs of the teachers as well as most principals
do (average Consideration). The principal is somewhat restricted, compared to the principal in the Open Climate.

3. The Controlled Climate.--This climate is overweighted toward task achievement and away from social-need satisfaction. Nonetheless, since morale is high (Esprit), this climate can be more open than closed. The teachers are engaged in their tasks: they expect to be told personally just how to perform these tasks (low Disengagement). Few procedures have been set up to facilitate their work (high Hindrance). The teachers have little time to establish friendly social relations with each other (low Intimacy). The principal is described as dominating and directive; he allows little flexibility within the organization, and he insists that everything be done his way (high Production Emphasis). The principal does not seek to satisfy the group's social needs (low Consideration). Nevertheless, the principal is trying to move the organization, by working hard (average Thrust).

4. The Familiar Climate.--The main feature of this climate is the conspicuously friendly manner of both the principal and the teachers. The teachers are disengaged and accomplish little in a task-oriented situation because the principal exerts little direction of activities. There are too many people trying to direct activities (high Disengagement). The principal does not burden the teachers with routine reports (low Hindrance). The teachers have
established personal friendships among themselves, and, socially at least, everyone is part of a happy family (high Intimacy). The Esprit that is found in this climate stems almost entirely from social-needs satisfaction. The behavioral theme of the principal is, essentially, one of maintaining a happy, close relationship (high Consideration). The principal is not aloof and not impersonal and official in manner. Few rules and regulations are established as guides for the teachers (low Aloofness). The principal does not emphasize production (low Production Emphasis). There is little done either by direct or by indirect means to evaluate or direct the activities of the teachers.

5. The Paternal Climate.--The paternal climate is characterized by the ineffective attempts of the principal to control the teachers as well as to satisfy their social needs. The principal is perceived by the teachers as non-motivating. This climate is a partly closed one. The teachers do not work well together; group maintenance has not been established because of the principal's inability to control the activities of the teachers (high Disengagement). Few hindrances burden the teachers in the form of routines, reports, and administrative duties, mainly because the principal does a great deal of this busy work himself (low Hindrance). The teachers do not enjoy friendly relationships with each other (low Intimacy). Low esprit results when the teachers obtain inadequate satisfaction in respect to both
task accomplishment and social needs. The principal is the very opposite of aloof; he is everywhere at once, checking, monitoring, and telling people how to function. The principal always emphasizes all the jobs that should be done (Production Emphasis). The principal sets up such items as schedules and class changes personally; he does not let the teachers perform any of these activities.

6. The Closed Climate.--The closed climate marks a situation in which the group members obtain little satisfaction in respect to either task achievement or social needs. The principal is ineffective in directing the activities of the teachers; at the same time, he is not inclined to oversee their personal welfare. The teachers are disengaged and do not work well together (high Disengagement). The principal does not facilitate the task accomplishment of the teachers (high Hindrance). Esprit is at a nadir, reflecting little pleasure in respect to both job satisfaction and social-needs satisfaction, although teachers obtain satisfaction from their friendly relations with other teachers (average Intimacy). The principal is highly aloof and impersonal in controlling and directing the activities of the teachers (high Aloofness). He sets up many rules and regulations, and these are usually arbitrary (high Production Emphasis). The principal possesses little thrust and does not motivate the teachers by setting a good
personal example. He is not concerned with the social needs of teachers; in fact, he can be depicted as inconsiderate (low Consideration). This climate characterizes an organization for which the best prescription is "radical surgery."

Table VI shows the classification of schools according to type of climate.

TABLE VI
CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO TYPE OF CLIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Classification</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the thirty-four schools, two had open climates, eleven had familiar climates, one had a paternal climate, and twenty had closed climates. There were no schools classified as having either autonomous or controlled climates.

The second purpose of this study was to determine the differences between the organizational climate of elementary schools with enrollments of 300 students or less and of elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students.
To complete the second purpose of this study, as reported in Table VII, the climate of the total sample was classified according to climate and enrollment.

**TABLE VII**

CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO CLIMATE AND ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Classification</th>
<th>Elementary Schools with Enrollments of 300 or Less (N=22)</th>
<th>Elementary Schools with Enrollments of More than 300 (N=12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VII indicates that elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less contained two schools classified as open climates, eight as familiar climates, one as a paternal climate, and eleven as closed climates.

Elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 contained three schools classified as familiar climates and nine as closed climates.
Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis I

Hypothesis I stated that there is no significant difference between the subtest means of the principals' perception and the teachers' perception of organizational climate in the eight subtest areas (Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, Intimacy, Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration).

To test the hypotheses of this study, the t-test technique was used. The hypotheses were stated in the null form. The .05 level of significance was selected as the basis for rejecting or retaining the hypotheses. The testing of Hypothesis I is presented in Table VIII.

Inspection of Table VIII indicates that Hypothesis I was rejected on the subtests of Disengagement, Esprit, Intimacy, Aloofness, Thrust, and Consideration. Thus the perception of the organizational climate by principals and teachers was significantly different on six subtests.

According to the findings, the teachers had a higher mean score on the subtests of Disengagement and Aloofness. This mean score indicated that the teachers were generally more disengaged than the principals, and the teachers perceived the principals as more aloof. The principals had a higher mean score on the subtests of Esprit, Intimacy, Thrust, and Consideration. This mean score indicated that
the principals expressed more esprit (high morale), intimacy (friendly social relations), thrust (motivation of teachers) and consideration (human treatment) than the teachers. Since the difference between the mean on the subtests of Hindrance and Production Emphasis is not significant, Hypothesis I was retained on these two subtests. Thus the perception between the principals and teachers was not different in these two areas.

### TABLE VIII

**COMPARISON OF THE PRINCIPALS' AND TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Principal (N=34)</th>
<th>Teacher (N=238)</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>65.41</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>67.68</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>69.68</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>71.19</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>80.12</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>76.65</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>74.16</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>69.64</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>72.50</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>71.73</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>71.35</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>71.73</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>71.35</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>84.79</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>77.23</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>83.67</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>76.09</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant.

**Not Significant
Hypothesis II

Hypothesis II states that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers on the subtests of organizational climate in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less and those of teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students in the eight subtest areas (Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, Intimacy, Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration).

The testing of Hypothesis II is presented in Table IX. The results of comparisons in Table IX indicate that Hypothesis II was rejected on the subtests of Disengagement, Esprit, Production Emphasis, and Consideration. Thus the perceptions of teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less and of teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 were different in the areas of Disengagement, Esprit, Production Emphasis, and Consideration.

According to the findings, teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 had a higher mean score on the subtest of Disengagement than teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less. This mean score indicated that teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 were more disengaged than teachers in elementary schools with an enrollment of 300 or less.
TABLE IX
COMPARISON OF THE TEACHERS' PERCEPTION
OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Teachers in Elementary Schools with Enrollments of 300 or Less (N=106)</th>
<th>Teachers in Elementary Schools with Enrollments of More than 300 (N=132)</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>66.37</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>68.74</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>70.38</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>71.85</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>77.44</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>76.01</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>74.15</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>74.17</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>72.27</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>72.68</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>72.01</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>70.82</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>77.81</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>76.77</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>77.21</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>75.20</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant.

**Not Significant.

Teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less had a higher mean score on the subtests of Esprit, Production Emphasis, and Consideration. This indicated that teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less had more esprit (high morale), production emphasis (close supervision), and consideration (human treatment)
than teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300.

Since the differences on the subtest of Hindrance, Intimacy, Aloofness, and Thrust were not significantly different in the two classification of schools, Hypothesis II was retained on these subtests.

**Hypothesis III**

According to Hypothesis III, there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the principals on the subtests of organizational climate in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less and the scores of the principals of elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students in the eight subtest areas (Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, Intimacy, Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration).

The testing of Hypothesis III is presented in Table X. Table X indicates that no significant differences were found in any of the eight subtests. Hypothesis III was therefore retained. The perception of principals in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less and principals in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students tended to be similar in all respects.
**TABLE X**

**COMPARISON OF PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Principals in Elementary Schools with Enrollments of 300 or Less (N=22)</th>
<th>Principals in Elementary Schools with Enrollments of More than 300 (N=12)</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>65.41</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>65.42</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>69.41</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>70.17</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>80.82</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>78.83</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>75.82</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>69.86</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>69.25</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>71.23</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>72.67</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>84.55</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>85.25</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>84.09</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>82.92</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not Significant**

The analysis of data from Hypothesis III revealed that the principals in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less perceived the same organizational climate in the eight subtests as did the principals in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students. The principals in both types of schools exhibited greater concern with moving the organization toward its goals, as indicated by
the high mean scores on the subtests of Thrust (motivation of the teachers), Consideration (human treatment), and Esprit (high morale).
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to give a brief summary of the study and to report the conclusions based upon the findings. Recommendations for further research and some implications for educational administration in Thailand are included.

Summary

The problem of this study was to determine the type of organizational climate prevailing in elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand. This study had two purposes: first, to identify the organizational climate of elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) and, second, to determine the differences between the organizational climate of elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less students and elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students. This study also tested three hypotheses. The .05 level of significance was selected as the basis for accepting or rejecting the hypotheses. The hypotheses were stated in the null form as follows:
Hypothesis I, stated that there is no significant difference between the subtest means of the principals' perception and the teachers' perception of organizational climate in the eight subtests areas of the OCDQ: Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, Intimacy, Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration.

Hypothesis II stated that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers on the subtest of organizational climate in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less and the scores of teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students in the eight subtest areas: Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, Intimacy, Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration.

Hypothesis III stated that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the principals on the subtest of organizational climate in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less and the scores of the principals in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 in the eight subtest areas: Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, Intimacy, Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration.

A review of the related literature was conducted in order to provide an understanding of the evolution of the climate concept, and relevant studies on organization and organizational climate were reported.
The procedure involved OCDQ administering to the thirty-four principals and 271 randomly selected teachers of the thirty-four elementary schools selected from a stratified random sample of the 340 elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand. Of the thirty-four elementary schools in the study, twenty-two schools had enrollments of 300 or less, and twelve schools had enrollments of more than 300 students. The thirty-four elementary schools in this study represented a 10 per cent sample of the 340 elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand. The percentage of completed OCDQ's was 100 per cent from the principals and 87.82 per cent from the teachers.

Findings

The first purpose of this study was to identify the organizational climate of elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand, as measured by the OCDQ. The findings are summarized as follows:

Of the thirty-four schools, two schools were classified as open climates, eleven as familiar climates, one as a paternal climate, and twenty as closed climates. There were no schools classified as having either autonomous or controlled climates.

The second purpose of this study was to determine the difference between the organizational climate of elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less students and
elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students. The findings are summarized as follows:

1. Of the twenty-two elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less, two schools were classified as open climates, eight as familiar climates, one as a paternal climate, and eleven as closed climates.

2. Of the twelve elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students, three schools were classified as familiar climates and nine as closed climates.

The results of testing the three hypotheses were statistically analyzed, using the t-test technique. A significance level of .05 was required for accepting the hypotheses.

Hypothesis I, which tests for differences between the subtests means of the principals' perception and the teachers' perception of organizational climate, was rejected on the six subtests of Disengagement, Esprit, Intimacy, Aloofness, Thrust, and Consideration. Thus the perception of organizational climate between the principals and teachers was significantly different in all six subtest areas. Hypothesis I, however, was retained for the two subtests of Hindrance and Production Emphasis. Thus the perception between the principals and teachers was not significantly different in either of these two subtests areas.
According to the findings of the mean score, the teachers were more disengaged than the principals, and the teachers perceived the principal as being more aloof. The principals exhibited more esprit, intimacy, thrust, and consideration than did the teachers. These findings revealed that the principals tended to perceive a more open climate than did the teachers.

Hypothesis II, which tested for differences between the subtests means of teachers on the subject of organizational climate in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less and teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students, was rejected on the four subtests of Disengagement, Esprit, Production Emphasis, and Consideration. Thus the perception of organizational climate between the teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less and teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 was significantly different in the four subtest areas. Hypothesis II was retained for the four subtests of Hindrance, Intimacy, Aloofness, and Thrust. Thus the perceptions of teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less and teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 were not significantly different on these subtests. According to the findings of the mean score, teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 were more disengaged than teachers
in elementary schools with an enrollment of 300 or less. Teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less rated higher on esprit, production emphasis, and consideration than did teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students.

Hypothesis III, which tested for differences between the means scores of the principals on the subtests of organizational climate in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less and principals in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300, found no significant difference in any of the eight subtests; therefore, Hypothesis III was retained. The perceptions of principals in elementary schools with enrollments of 300 or less and principals in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students tended to be similar in all eight subtests. The principals in both types of schools exhibited greater concern with moving the organization toward its goals as shown by the high mean scores on the subtests of Thrust, Consideration, and Esprit.

The findings from this study indicated some interesting points concerning the typical organizational pattern of the school system in Thailand. Educational policy directives emanating from the Ministry of Education are sent out to the regions, provinces, and district offices and then into the local schools. In Thailand the pattern of family relationships played a decisive part in influencing administrative
behavior. According to the findings of this study, eleven schools were classified as familiar climate, one school as a paternal climate, and twenty schools as closed climate. Hence the findings from this study reflect the administrative behavior of Thai administrators. It was further noticed that a strong hierarchical pattern among the administrators and teachers exist in Thailand and that the bureaucratic power structure consist of complex official relationships.

Conclusions

The conclusions of this research are as follows:

1. The climate of the schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand, tends to be more closed than open.

2. The principals tend to perceive the climate of the schools to be more open than do the teachers.

3. It can be concluded that teachers in elementary schools with an enrollment of 300 or less perceived the climate of the schools to be more open than do teachers in elementary schools with enrollments of more than 300 students.

4. It can be concluded that when the school size increases the climate is more likely to be closed.

Implications

Much effort has been expended by Thai educators and by many foreign advisors to bring about change within the Thai system of education. During 1964-1967, under the contract
between Thailand and Michigan State University, the Educational Planning Division was assisted in strengthening its original educational plan and executing the programs which are concerned with national policy on the role of educational developments in Thailand (1, p. 320).

Significant changes in education in Thailand will be related to changes in the organizational climate of the schools, since the climate of an organization is the first and most important concern in initiating change from a rather inflexible system to a more flexible one. This study should help the educational planner to be aware of the present organizational climate of the schools; this knowledge, in turn, will assist them in planning appropriate processes for implementing desired change in the educational system of Thailand.

Recommendations

On the basis of this research, the following recommendations were made:

1. Most studies on the organizational climate have concentrated on the teacher-principal relationship. It is recommended that further studies should examine the influence of the student-teacher relationship.

2. Further research should consider a number of potentially significant variables, such as the academic preparation, age, and background of the principals and teachers.
3. There should be training programs for principals, and the annual meeting for principals in Thailand, sponsored by the Ministry of Education, should explore the importance of a school's climate.

4. Further research on the organizational climate should be conducted in all seventy-one provinces of Thailand.
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APPENDIX
APPENDIX A

THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION

QUESTIONNAIRE, (OCDQ)

Directions:

Please read each statement and pick out one alternative that better describes your school. For each numbered item draw a circle around the 1, 2, 3, 4 to indicate the answer you have chosen.

1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

1. The mannerism of teachers at this school are ___ annoying.
2. There is a minority group of teachers who ___ always oppose the majority.
3. Teachers exert group pressure on nonconforming faculty members.
4. Teachers seek special favors from the principal ___
5. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings.
6. Teachers ask nonsensical question in faculty meetings.
7. Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings.
8. Teachers at this school stay by themselves.
9. Teachers talk about leaving the school system.  

10. Teachers socialize together in small select groups.  

11. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.  

12. Teachers have too many committee requirements  

13. Student progress reports require too much work.  

14. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school.  

15. Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports.  

16. Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available.  

17. The morale of the teachers is high.  

18. The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure.  

19. Teachers at this school show much school spirit.  

20. Custodial service is available when needed  

21. Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues.  

22. School supplies are readily available for use in classwork.  

23. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally.  

24. In faculty meetings, there is the feeling of "let's get things done."  

25. Extra books are available for classroom use.  

26. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.  

27. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.
28. Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home.
29. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members.
30. Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members.
31. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time.
32. Teachers work together preparing administrative reports.
33. Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves.
34. Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda.
35. Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings.
36. The principal runs the faculty meetings like a business conference.
37. Teachers leave the grounds during the school day.
38. Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classroom.
39. The rules set by the principal are never questioned.
40. Teachers are contacted by the principal each day.
41. School secretarial service is available for teachers use.
42. Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit.
43. The principal makes all class scheduling decisions.
44. The principal schedules the work for the teachers.
45. The principal checks the subject-matter ability of teachers.
46. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes.
47. The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity.
48. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously.
49. The principal talks a great deal.
50. The principal goes out of his way to help teachers.
51. The principal sets an example by working hard himself.
52. The principal uses constructive criticism.
53. The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions.
54. The principal explains his reasons for criticism to teachers.
55. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.
56. The principal is in the building before teachers arrive.
57. The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across.
58. The principal is easy to understand.
59. The principal helps teachers solve personal problems.
60. The principal does personal favors for teachers.
61. The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work.
62. The principal helps staff members settle minor differences.
63. Teachers help select which courses will be taught.
64. The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers.
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

1. Sex
   Female (  )
   Male   (  )

2. Age
   Between 20-29 years   (  )
   Between 30-39 years   (  )
   Between 40-49 years   (  )
   Between 50-59 years   (  )
   60 or over 60 years   (  )

3. Education
   Less than Bachelor's Degree  (  )
   Bachelor's Degree          (  )
   Master's Degree            (  )
   Higher than Master's Degree (  )

4. Experience
   From 1-4 years           (  )
   5-9 years                (  )
   10-19 years              (  )
   20 years or over         (  )
APPENDIX B

JURY PANEL FOR INSTRUMENT VALIDATION

Former Principals

1. Dr. Panus Hannakin
   Vice President of
   Sri-Nakarinwirot University
   Pitsanuloke, Thailand

2. Dr. Somkiat Srijugawan
   Professor of Education
   Kasetsart University
   Bangkok, Thailand

3. Dr. Sermsak Visaraporn
   Professor of Education
   Sri-Nakarinwirot University
   Pitsanuloke, Thailand

Former Teachers

1. Mrs. Vilas Hunnakin
   Head, Department of English
   Sri-Nakarinwirot University
   Pitsanuloke, Thailand

2. Miss Sunantha Sorach
   Head, Department of Thai
   Language, Sri-Nakarinwirot
   University, Pitsanuloke, Thailand

3. Miss Wanida Likitguntima
   Professor of Thai Language
   Pibulsongkram Teachers
   College
   Pitsanuloke, Thailand

4. Miss Thipsuda Naiyasab
   Professor of Thai Language
   Pibulsongkram Teachers
   College
   Pitsanuloke, Thailand
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ลำยูรี่ในlcทงนิย ลทงย ministers</th>
<th>ลำยูรี่ในlcทงนิย ลทงย ministers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. เนื้องกาย (สิทธิการพิทักษ์)</td>
<td>68. บ้านทองยี่</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. บ้านบนใกล้</td>
<td>69. บ้านออกแบบรีดยี่</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. บ้านใต้บน</td>
<td>70. บ้านทว่าลง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. บ้านต้นบ่อ (กลุ่มประชานุบำรุง)</td>
<td>71. บ้านใต้ (.วชณ.ชิต)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. บ้านกลาง</td>
<td>72. บ้านตรง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ไวยาสุขบุญ</td>
<td>73. บ้านยะลงมราเรีย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. บ้านใต้ (พรมพิจุบัน)</td>
<td>74. บ้านโกล์สแกม</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. น้ำสูงวิทยา</td>
<td>75. บ้านทวัย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. น้ำสาดทอง</td>
<td>76. บ้านโลกล (สิ่งมาร)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. บ้านโลกลง</td>
<td>77. บ้านปักตงเรียะ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. บ้านโลกล่ง</td>
<td>78. บ้านเปรียบพิจุบัน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. บ้านโลกลง</td>
<td>79. บ้านโลกลาภิย📍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. น้ำสาดภูมิ</td>
<td>80. บ้านเสียไปงบัดหาริ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. บ้านเก้าตาเนิยง</td>
<td>81. บ้านบ่น</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. มหาเจริญวิทยา</td>
<td>82. บ้านกีจิ่ง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. โพธิ์วิทยา</td>
<td>83. บ้านเกา</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. โภชีวิทยา</td>
<td>84. บ้านศรอนจิ่ง</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ปรากฏการณ์

( )

( )

( )

( )

( )

( )

( )

( )

( )

( )

( )

( )
เอนหลักเนื้อความ

ให้กระทำแบบสอบถามและขอให้ผู้มีส่วนเกี่ยวข้องติดต่อกับทางผู้ถือในการเรียนรู้ด้านภาษาไทยในโรงเรียนของทาง วงดามยอมตามควรเลย (๑, ๒, ๓, ๔) เพื่อแสดงผลการสอน

๑. แนวเครื่องไถกุทิร
๒. ปรากฏวิชา ๆ ตั้ง
๓. ปรากฏผลการเรียน
๔. ปรากฏผลงาน

๕. ทฤษฎีของภาษาไทยในโรงเรียนที่เล่าถึงภาษาไทย
๖. ในการทำภาษาไทย ๆ มีกลุ่มที่มีความสนใจต่อการสอน
๗. การสอนภาษาไทย
๘. การสอนภาษาไทยที่มีการสอนภาษาไทย
๙. การสอนภาษาไทยที่มีการสอนภาษาไทย
๑๐. การสอนภาษาไทยที่มีการสอนภาษาไทย
๑๑. การสอนภาษาไทยที่มีการสอนภาษาไทย
๑๒. การสอนภาษาไทยที่มีการสอนภาษาไทย
๑๓. การสอนภาษาไทยที่มีการสอนภาษาไทย
๑๔. การสอนภาษาไทยที่มีการสอนภาษาไทย
๑๕. การสอนภาษาไทยที่มีการสอนภาษาไทย
16. ตั้งถิ่นและรักษาการใช้กฎหมายการสอบสวนเกี่ยวกับความถูกต้องการ
17. จดหมายไปเว็บไซต์ที่มีความลับในบริษัทของผู้มี
18. ข้อมูลที่พนักงานได้รับจากสำนักงาน	1 1 1 2
19. ลงในโทรศัพท์มือถือไปยังทางการรัฐบาล
20. รายงานผลลัพธ์การตรวจสอบ	1 1 2 3 4
21. ควบคุมการร้องเรียนและรายงานรายงาน	1 1 2 3 4
22. ตรวจสอบการร้องเรียนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 1 2 3
23. ในกรณีที่มีการประท้วง พร้อมกับการตรวจสอบที่เกี่ยวข้องที่จะทำการ	1 1 2 3 4
24. วิเคราะห์ความถูกต้องการสอบสวนของให้ความถูกต้อง	1 1 2 3 4
25. การในการตรวจในสิ่งที่มีความถูกต้องการสอบสวน	1 1 2 3 4
26. การตรวจสอบที่มีการตรวจในสิ่งที่มีความถูกต้องการสอบสวน	1 1 2 3 4
27. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
28. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
29. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
30. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
31. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
32. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
33. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
34. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
35. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
36. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
37. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
38. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
39. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
40. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
41. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
42. ตรวจสอบการลงทุนของบุคคลนิยม	1 1 2 3 4
42. โครงการฝึกปฏิบัติการช่างการใช้เครื่องมือวัดความต่ำสุดของอากาศ
43. การจัดทำเครื่องมือวัดความดันอากาศ
44. การควบคุมหน่วยงานจัดทำแผน
45. การทำงานฝ่ายบริการจัดการระบายอากาศ
46. การทำงานฝ่ายธุรการจัดการต่างๆ
47. การทำงานฝ่ายควบคุมการจัดการต่างๆ
48. การทำงานฝ่ายควบคุมการจัดการต่างๆ ที่มี
49. การทำงานฝ่ายธุรการจัดการต่างๆ
50. การทำงานฝ่ายบริการจัดการต่างๆ
51. การทำงานฝ่ายบริการจัดการต่างๆ
ที่ ๔๔/๒๔๔๔
รับรองว่าเป็นที่ม่แปลงถูกต้อง
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# APPENDIX I

**PROFILES PREDICTS FOR SIX ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATES RANKED IN RESPECT TO OPENNESS VS. CLOSEDNESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>Group's Characteristics</th>
<th>Leader's Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Engagement</td>
<td>Indirect Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Interactivity</td>
<td>High Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Andrew M. Halpin and Don E. Croft, The Organizational Climate of the School, Cooperative Research Project 543 (St. Louis, Mo: Washington University, 1962), p. 179.*

*The numbers represent double standardized scores (both negatively and positively), with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10.*
## APPENDIX J

INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL SIMILARITY SCORE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Number</th>
<th>Open Climate</th>
<th>Autonomous Climate</th>
<th>Controlled Climate</th>
<th>Familiar Climate</th>
<th>Paternal Climate</th>
<th>Closed Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Number</td>
<td>Open Climate</td>
<td>Autonomous Climate</td>
<td>Controlled Climate</td>
<td>Familiar Climate</td>
<td>Paternal Climate</td>
<td>Closed Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 2 - - 11 1 20

*Underlines score denotes the climate of the individual school.
APPENDIX K
THAILAND

: showing Sukhothai province
PROVINCE OF SUKHOTHAI

Sukthai province is located in the northern part of Thailand. The population is approximately 350,000, with nearly 90 per cent of the people belonging to the Thai group. The Chinese represent the largest minority group with about 10 per cent of the population. Sukhothai province is a center of agricultural and historical interest, and approximately 80 per cent of the population is engaged in agriculture. Retail trade, commerce, and industry are the secondary occupation within the province. Buddhism is the prevailing religion for approximately 89 per cent of the population.

Sukhothai was the first capital of Thailand (Siam) founded before 1350 by King Kunsri-Intrarathit. King Ramhamhaeng originated the written symbols for the Thai language during the period when the capital was located in Sukhothai province. The city is famous for its old Buddhist temple, for its ruins, and pieces of sculpture. The city of Sukhothai was destroyed by the Burmese, and then the capital was moved to Ayuthaya, later to Thomburi, and finally to Bangkok, the present capital of Thailand.

Prior to 1932 the government of Thailand was an absolute monarchy. The executive power was exercised by the king who was advised by the supreme council of state and a cabinet
of ten ministers. In 1932, a constitution opposed to an absolute monarchy was established. In 1946, a more democratic constitution became effective which provided for an elective house of representatives. At present, the constitution is a parliamentary democracy type, the premier and cabinet being responsible to a single-chamber legislature consisting of a house of representatives.

In Thailand all administrative arrangements provide for central control in Bangkok and outward and downward communication to provinces, to amphoe (local), and to villages. The provincial governor is a career civil servant appointed and assigned by the office of the Ministry of the Interior. All central governmental agencies in Bangkok, including the Ministries, address province communications to the governor.

In education, the provincial governor has authority to administer and control all types and levels of schools in his province. All education officers and teachers in the province are under his power and authority. The Ministry of Education has responsibility for compulsory education. The Ministry of Education is charged with control of curriculum and textbooks, with evaluation of education programs, and with their supervision and improvement. Education was made compulsory for children between the ages of 7 and 14 (elementary school from grade 1 to grade 7) in the province of Sukhothai. All children in this province attend public
elementary schools regardless of the economic level of the parents. The provincial governor is in a position to be of great benefit for all educational development within the province. Education is considered of major importance to the people and the government of Thailand.
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