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The problem of this study was to determine the pupil control ideology—conceptualized as a continuum from custodialism to humanism—of principals and teachers in public elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand.

The instrument, the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form), consists of twenty likert-type items. Responses to each statement are indicated on a five-point scale, ranging from "strongly agree" (five points) to "strongly disagree" (one point). Scores derived from the PCI Form were used as indicators of respondents' orientation toward the control of pupils in elementary schools of Sukhothai, Thailand. The reliability coefficient of the PCI Form yielded a Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of .91 and .95 when using the Spearman-Brown formula.

The instrument (PCI Form) was translated into Thai, validated by six judges who were selected on the basis of their positions and knowledge of Thai education. The reliability of the revised questionnaire was determined by
a pilot study (test-retest technique) which involved twenty teachers and ten principals of public schools in Sukhothai, Thailand. The results of the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient gave the correlation of .87 and .93 using the Spearman-Brown formula.

One hundred and ninety-eight teachers and eighty-nine principals returned usable PCI Forms for data assessing. The independent variables employed in this study were sex, educational position, years of experience, and educational preparation.

Based on the analysis of data, the results were as follows.

1. Teachers and principals in this study reported no difference in their pupil control ideology.

2. Teachers with bachelor's degrees were more humanistic in their ideology of pupil control than those teachers with lower educational levels.

3. The statistics about the variables of sex, years of experience, and educational preparation of principals did not yield significant differences among and across groups.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Inherent in this study is the concept of the school as an educational institution and as a system of social interaction. The concept of the school as a social system is becoming increasingly prevalent in educational literature. There is no institution more in need of sociological treatment than the school (20, p. 14). Schools are viewed as one of the various institutions which affect the social education of children; that is, affecting "all purposive adjustments of an educational nature whereby individuals are fitted for more effective group participation" (20, p. 123).

As a social entity, the school is an interdependent network of social relationships which can be distinguished from the larger society by its characteristic mode of social interaction (22, p. 6). Although a set mode of interaction defines the school as a discrete entity, it is, at the same time, affected by its place in society at large. The school exists for the expressed purpose of providing a forum for the giving and receiving of instruction.

The participants that form the network of social relationships within the school include students, teachers,
and principals, who bring into these relationships their individual physical, intellectual, and emotional traits that will, in part, determine the nature of the interaction. The teacher is viewed as the provider of a stimulating learning environment. Students' conduct is influenced by their peer group and the attitudes within their social milieu (22, p. 7). Educators have established their attitudes about appropriate behavior in school interaction. The individual is required to modify his or her personal needs, expectations, and behavior to conform to norms in a classroom situation (3, p. 719; 12, p. 292). Therefore, the nature of the interaction will also be influenced by the attitudes of the participants toward their respective roles.

Since the relative success of the educational process depends on how well the participants play roles, a premium is placed on insuring that participants conform to the behavior appropriate to their roles. There is a built-in hierarchy in the school organization whereby principals are responsible for the behavior of teachers and both principals and teachers are responsible for students' behavior (10, p. 115). "Proper" behavior is controlled by the principals and teachers who control pupils through a system of sanctions. The behavior and ideology of principals and teachers is directly influenced by the attitudes of their peer group (24, p. 41; 25, p. 114).
Research has shown that pupil control is a dominant theme in the organizational life of the public school (26, p. 277). Many researchers have employed the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form) to measure the attitudes of administrators and teachers towards pupil control problems. The PCI Form measures attitudes along a continuum from humanistic to custodial (27).

A humanistic orientation toward pupil control adopts an accepting, trustful view of pupils, and emphasizes their willingness to be self-disciplined and responsible. As related to humanistic treatment, teachers and pupils have an equal opportunity to be trustful and accepting of others (5, p. 2; 11, p. 153; 27, p. 6). At the other end of the scale, a custodial ideology places an emphasis on maintaining order in a highly controlled setting. A custodial orientation is characterized by a moralistic attitude toward deviance from the accepted behavior, a distrust of pupils, and rigid teaching strategies (2, p. 212; 4, p. 1; 12, p. 220). The students are expected to accept the teachers' decisions without question. Primarily, punitive sanctions are used to control student behavior (27, p. 5).

In a large number of educational studies, researchers have investigated the relationship between selected variables and certain personality traits or attitudinal orientations. Some of these variables include dogmatism,
traditionalism in value orientation, status obeisance, local-cosmopolitan orientation, professionalism, and self-actualization. Many of these studies revealed significant correlations between pupil control ideology and the variables as listed above (26, p. 227; 28, p. 107; 29).

Studies investigating pupil control ideology in societies other than the United States are rare. The question has been addressed in the Australian public schools through a program of research at the University of New South Wales (26, p. 229). The present study of pupil control ideology in a province of Thailand contributes to the limited body of knowledge about attitudes toward the control of pupil behaviors outside the United States.

The public school system in Sukhothai, Thailand, has not been investigated from the vantage point of the pupil control ideologies of its educators. The Pupil Control Ideology Form has been used in America to demonstrate the ideological differences between principals and teachers with respect to pupil control. The findings show that in American educational systems, teachers are more custodial in their attitudes towards pupil control than are principals. This is possibly due to the fact that teachers are more directly responsible for controlling pupils than are principals (27, p. 35). Also, female teachers, in general, have been shown to be less custodial than male teachers.
This phenomenon might be explained by the fact that women typically have been found to be more nurturant than men and are thus more supportive of behavior that is self-disciplined. Whether these conjectures hold true for a non-Western school system, has not been determined. It was the purpose of this study to make such determination.

Statement of the Problem

The problem in this study was to determine the pupil control ideology—conceptualized as a continuum from custodialism to humanism—of principals and teachers in public elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand.

Purposes of the Study

The specific purposes of this study were as follows:

1. To determine the pupil control ideology of principals and teachers of public elementary schools in Sukhothai, Thailand, as measured by the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form).

2. To establish whether or not there is a significant difference in pupil control ideology of educators across selected variables.

The dependent variable in this study is Pupil Control Ideology. The independent variables employed in this study are listed as follows:
1. Sex:
   (a) Male
   (b) Female

2. Educational position:
   (a) Elementary teacher
   (b) Elementary principal

3. Years of experience at present position:
   (a) 0 - 5 years
   (b) 6 - 10 years
   (c) 11 - 15 years
   (d) 16 years or more

4. Educational preparation:
   (a) Lower teacher certificate, equivalent or lower
   (b) Higher teacher certificate or equivalent
   (c) Bachelor's degree
   (d) Master's degree or higher

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were adopted for the purposes of this investigation.

Major hypothesis:

H: There will be significant differences in the pupil control ideology of teachers and principals across selected variables, as measured by the Pupil Control Ideology Form.
Sub-hypotheses:

1. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology between principals and teachers.

2. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of teachers grouped according to sex.

3. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to sex.

4. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of teachers grouped according to years of experience.

5. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to years of experience.

6. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of teachers grouped according to educational preparation.

7. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to educational preparation.

Definition of Terms

The following terms used for this study have been defined for clarification.
Pupil control ideology—A typology of control ideology of educators concerned with students' behavior, conceptualized along a continuum ranging from "custodialism" at one extreme to "humanism" at the other. For the purpose of this study, Pupil Control Ideology will be operationalized as measured by the Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) Form. The theoretical range of scores of the PCI Form is twenty to 100; the theoretical mean score is sixty. Scores that cluster around the theoretical mean of sixty which ranges from fifty-five to sixty-five are not clearly custodial or humanistic, but rather they suggest the respondent's control ideology is fairly well integrated between humanistic and custodial.

Custodial ideology—Suggests a concern with the rigid maintenance of order and the adoption of a punitive, moralistic approach to pupil control. For the purpose of this study a high score from sixty-five to 100 on the PCI Form suggests a custodial ideology.

Humanistic ideology—Indicates a democratic approach to control; it emphasizes student responsibility and self-discipline from a tolerant and trusting educator's viewpoint. A low score from twenty to fifty-five on the PCI Form indicated a humanistic attitude toward control of pupils.

Sukhothai—A province in Thailand.
Principal--The primary administrator who is directly responsible for the supervision of teachers and the operation of the public elementary school in Sukhothai, Thailand.

Teacher--One who is responsible for classroom instruction in the public elementary school in Sukhothai, Thailand.

**Lower teacher certificate, equivalent or lower**--
1. Lower teacher certificate is awarded to a teacher who has been graduated from a two-year teacher college;

2. Equivalent refers to a teacher who has been graduated from either a lower or upper secondary school or has attended the first three years of a vocational or technical school, then has passed a selections examination in order to teach in a public elementary school; then he has passed an examination for a teaching certificate, which is given yearly, after he has at least one year of teaching experience;

3. Lower refers to a teacher who graduated from lower or upper secondary school, or has attended a three-year vocational/technical school and has not yet passed the examination for a teaching certificate.

**Higher teacher certificate, or equivalent**--
1. Higher teacher certificate is given to a teacher who continues to study after he has received a lower teacher certificate (for two more years in a four-year teacher college);
2. Equivalent, refers to a teacher who has a lower teacher certificate and has passed an examination for a higher teaching certificate while he is teaching in a public elementary school.

Background and Significance of the Study

Thailand, which has been independent for seven centuries, is a constitutional monarchy located in Southeast Asia. The geographical area of Thailand consists of 198,455 square miles (17), bordered by the Indian Ocean and Burma on the north and Malaysia and the Gulf of Thailand on the south.

The population of Thailand is about 44,160,000. Of these people, 85 per cent are Thai, and the remainder are largely Chinese, Malays, Vietnamese, and Indians. The official language is Thai although English is also widely used. The country's economy is mainly agricultural. The present capital of Thailand is Bangkok, with a population of about 2,000,000, which makes it the largest city (18, p. 121).

Modernization has taken place slowly in the educational system of Thailand. The transition from a traditional to a modern system of education has required hundreds of years and is the product of diverse influences from many countries. The early educational system (1257-1868) in Thailand was similar to that of the period of monastic and cathedral school in Europe during the Middle Ages. The
schools had a definite religious orientation and were centered in the temples. Their main purpose was to provide religious and moral training (8, p. 3).

The first modern school in Thailand was established in 1871 by King Chulalongkorn. Known as the Palace School of the Royal Common School, its purpose was to train young men for government service. It taught, not only reading, writing, and arithmetic, but other subjects had also been added to the curriculum as well. More schools of this type were established in 1884 to meet the increasing need for well-educated government officials (8, p. 4). In 1887, the Department of Education was established; in 1892, its name was changed to the Ministry of Education, with the responsibility for cultural and religious matters as well as the administration of the educational system.

The year 1932 is recognized as the beginning of the modern era in Thai educational history. The Ministry of Education realized the critical need for greater literacy in the adult population. This situation led to the expenditure of a large portion of the education budget for literacy programs at the expense of other branches of the educational systems. The policy of employing vocational school graduates as elementary teachers in the provinces was adopted to encourage students to follow the vocational branch of the educational system.
The 1960's saw many significant administrative reforms, such as the division of the country into twelve educational regions with supervisory centers and regional educational officers. The National Education Council, established in 1959, was designed to coordinate all aspects of the nation's education, although in practice its authority has been limited mainly to higher education (8, pp. 4-7).

The school organization of Thai education has been changed many times. The Reform Committee of Education (1974) in Thailand proposed to restructure the education system (13, p. 94; 15, p. 32). Finally, the new plan for an educational system in Thailand was constructed in 1977 by revising the existing 4-3, 3-2 (primary 4-3, secondary 3-2) to a 6-3-3 plan (primary 6, secondary 3-3) (7; 16, p. 32). The present structure of the education system in Thailand is shown in Appendix A. The new structure of the educational system began in the year 1978 and is planned to be completely implemented in the year 1981 (16, p. 32; 21, p. viii).

The objectives of the new structure of the educational system (1977) are as follows.

1. Pre-school education is aimed at providing for child-rearing and upbringing prior to primary education (7).
2. Primary education is aimed at providing and maintaining literacy and developing in the individual cognitive ability, numerical manipulation and communication skills, adequate knowledge and abilities to apply in future occupational roles. It is also aimed towards personal development and the promotion of citizenry desirable for life in a democratic government (7).

3. Secondary education is aimed at providing appropriate academic and vocational knowledge compatible with the learner's age, needs, interests, skills and aptitudes which ultimately will be beneficial to his chosen career and his society. Secondary education is divided into two segments--lower and upper secondary education, each of which requires three years of study (7).

4. Higher education is aimed at providing for the full development of human intellectual abilities to facilitate the advancement of knowledge and technology. High level academic and professional manpower for national development is to be provided (7).

In addition to the guidelines for the various purposes of Thai education described above, the 1974 constitution of the country contains various provisions which relate directly to education. It provides equal rights to a primary education for all citizens and declares provisions for free education and support for needy students at all
levels. In addition, it provides for the promotion of scientific research as needed for national development and the preservation of national culture (15, p. 1).

The present control of elementary education in Thailand is to some degree both centralized and decentralized. This apparent contradiction exists because of the various agencies to which responsibility for education is assigned (9, p. 1). The central control is in Bangkok, which directly supervises the administrators who operate at the level of the province and district. Elementary education in each province is the responsibility of the Provincial Administrative Authority, which is under the Ministry of the Interior. The Ministry of Education is responsible for secondary education as well as vocational and teachers' colleges. Kindergartens and all private schools are also under this ministry (9, pp. 8-10; 15, p. 3). All educational institutions under the Ministry of Education's jurisdiction in the Bangkok area report to their respective departments within the Ministry of Education. As for the academic and vocational secondary schools in the provinces, the government of each province is authorized to act for the Ministry of Education (15, p. 5). In practice, the governor delegates his authority to the provincial and district education officers (23, pp. 34-35).
At the local level, Bangkok and all municipalities throughout the kingdom are responsible for municipal schools. The Provincial Administrative Authority of each province is responsible for the management of its local elementary schools, with the exception of those under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education. However, all schools which are operated by the Provincial Administrative Authority are still under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education with respect to curriculum, textbooks and educational evaluation (15, p. 5).

While great improvements have been made in the educational system of Thailand during the past hundred years, many problems remain to be solved if the system is to meet the country's ever increasing need for skilled manpower. The major problems facing education in Thailand include a general insufficiency of funds to meet the demand of a rapidly expanding system, difficulty in recruiting teachers for remote areas, and an insufficient number of teachers in certain fields (industrial arts and agriculture, for example). Low quality in rural schools and the rapidly increasing social demand for secondary graduates further complicate the situation (15, p. 12).

Sukhothai, which is known as the first capital of Thailand, is located in the northern part of Thailand, but is no longer the capital. In 1377 the capital was
moved to Ayuthaya, then later to Thornburi, and finally to Bangkok. The present population of Sukhothai is about 350,000. Agriculture is the principal occupation, while retail trade, commerce and industry account for 20 percent of the economy. Sukhothai today is one of the seventy-one provinces in Thailand.

Formal education in Sukhothai began around 1283, when King Ramkhamhang, the third king of Sayam, introduced the alphabet that has been used continuously from then to the present time (23, p. 7). The alphabet has been modified from time to time until the present system of writing was adopted (8, p. 2). The educational system of Sukhothai started with the monastic system, as did the educational system in other parts of the country. This system was maintained for at least six centuries (8, p. 2), until the national education system was changed to the present one as shown in Appendix A.

To date, there has been little research devoted to the problems of public schools in Thailand, due in part to inadequate financial support from the government (6, p. 40). Research in the field of educational administration has been scarce, especially in the areas of school organizational climate and leadership behaviors. This study of pupil control ideology may contribute to the advancement of the Thai educational system by providing an essential foundation
for further studies of that system. For instance, future analyses of the effects of various applications of custodial and humanistic control ideologies may indicate that one ideology produces better learning climates than the other does. Such information could ultimately ameliorate educators' pupil control behaviors and thus contribute to the advancement of the Thai educational system.

Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study was to determine the respective pupil control ideology of principals and teachers of public elementary schools in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand. The findings and conclusions will be generalizable only to the population studied and others that might be similar.

Basic Assumptions

The basic assumption in this study is that attitudes toward pupil control can be measured along a continuum from custodial to humanistic. It is also assumed that the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form) will measure pupil control ideology of public school educators (27, p. 67).
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature related to pupil control ideology. The conceptualization, and the development of pupil control ideology is discussed first. This is followed by the characteristics of custodial and humanistic ideology. And finally, factors related to the pupil control ideology are presented.

Pupil Control Ideology

In many respects, a school may be viewed as a "domesticated organization," for the school has no control over the selection of its "clients," nor do the clients have control over the level of their participation (66; 78, p. 4). In a sense, the school as a domesticated organization has many of the characteristics of a "local monopoly." Except on a limited basis, it is not compelled to compete for resources. It also has a steady flow of "clients," and its survival is guaranteed (28, pp. 128-304). The school is protected by the community which created it and which assures its survival. In most communities, the school does not compete with other organizations for clients. In some respects, schools are like prisons and public mental hospitals, that is, the clients have no control over their
participation; however, organizations such as prisons usually place greater emphasis on control than do schools (10, pp. 3-6).

Individuals in the classroom perceive control in one of two different ways. Some students perceive control as an external factor; such individuals maintain the idea that what happens to them is a result of forces outside of them. Other students perceive control as an internal factor; these individuals see a causal relationship between what happens to them and their own behavior and characteristics (64, p. 15).

As a school organization, a school brings together teachers and students to achieve the goal of socially adjusted graduates. It has been suggested that the product of education is to inspire society's youth to "the essential condition of its own existence" (51, p. 204). It is important to note

Education is the influence exercised by adult generations on those that are not yet ready for social life. Its object is to stimulate and develop in the child a certain number of physical, intellectual and moral states . . . (51, p. 204).

The school organization may be viewed as a network of social relationships or interactions (41, p. 190), which are characterized by group identity, political structure, and a unique culture. The characteristic mode of interaction that distinguishes the school from the community is
classroom interaction and student activities. These enhance interactions, behaviors, ends, roles, status, artifacts, and sentiments of the school which continue beyond the school experience proper (15, p. 1; 40, p. 4; 69, p. 7).

Classroom groups have occasionally been manipulated to achieve the group's goals or purposes. An example of classroom manipulation is where the teacher attempts to get student leaders to help control recalcitrants who display disruptive behavior (66, p. 24; 71, pp. 6-7).

The classroom level of interaction deals with the teacher-student and student-student relationships which are influenced by the decisions of the administrators and teachers respectively. The maintenance of behaviors to meet the social norms requires a system of sanctions or rewards and penalties (8, p. 110; 74, p. 4). The control of a classroom (social control) is based upon sanctions, which deal with the individuals' sense of right or wrong. Internal control indicates the self-discipline of the student. External control involves rules, regulations, and orders which are forms of control methods set in the given social system or in the classroom situation (52, p. 52). Teachers are directly responsible for the control in the classroom, while consideration and support are provided by the administrators.

The central idea in control theory is that "conformity is maintained with conventional social control" (1, pp. 291-
This can be interpreted to mean that socially sanctioned behavior and deviant behavior can be diminished by rewarding conformity and punishing nonconformity.

One way of controlling student conduct is "discipline." Discipline is the part of the social system which is expected to control the behavior of pupils in the classroom and to promote the effectiveness of learning (61, pp. 10-11). Webster (1968) states that "discipline" means the development within individuals of the necessary personal controls which will allow them to be effective (70, p. 4). Discipline structures that are present in model society, promote the formation of self-development or self-discipline; students must work in conjunction with adult guidance toward achieving such goals (63, p. 169; 71, p. 5).

Discipline may also involve punishment. Punishment in the classroom has long been considered a suitable means of handling students whose behavior does not conform. Punishment for inappropriate behavior has been believed to be one of the best methods of discouraging undesirable conduct. Contemporary research in both education and psychology suggests that corporal punishment may be hostile, mean, negative, or even inhumane; furthermore, some studies point out that punishment may actually reinforce the behavior which is inappropriate (35, p. 102; 49, p. 86; 62, p. 66; 71, p. 40).
The view of discipline has shifted from controlling the child's evil nature or protecting his innocence to a new concern for allowing the child to develop freely with adult guidance (59, pp. 70-71). In other words, pupil discipline has become more humane with democratic treatment.

A control philosophy which implies that there are requirements and restraints upon behavior, is an essential ingredient of group life. Concepts such as norms, role expectations, and rules exist in the realm of controlled behavior (78, p. 4). Compliance is assured by a system of natural sanctions or rewards and penalties. The nature of this system of reward and punishment can be used to specify types of control which are more personal and appealing to the individual's sense of "right" and "wrong." The importance of this type of control stresses self-discipline rather than imposed discipline (74, pp. 41-42; 75; 76).

Pupil control ideology has been adopted from a study of the control of mental hospital patients by staff members. Willower, Eidel and Hoy (1967) conceptualized a continuum of control ideology ranging from "custodialism" at one extreme to "humanism" at the other (78). The specific characteristic of custodialism is the rigidly traditional view point while humanism is found in a school in which members learn through interaction and experience.
The extremes of control ideology may be explained in terms of the development of organizational theories. Custodialism resembles classical organizational theories with emphasis on rules, regulations, division of responsibilities and class supervision. Humanism is similar to non-classical (or humanistic) organizational theories with emphasis on self—self-fulfillment, self-direction, self-actualization—and on social interaction (29, pp. 24-26).

Since schools are considered domestic organizations, they can be expected to use control measures relating to the custodial-humanistic ideology. To assess the pupil control ideology in public schools, a twenty-item instrument, called the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form), was developed. It was designed to test the hypothesis that teachers would be more custodial in their pupil control ideology than principals or such specialists as guidance counselors (78, pp. 6-7).

**Characteristics of a Custodial Ideology**

One method of controlling student behavior is to adopt a custodial attitude. A custodial ideology may be related to custodial behavior, but the following discussion refers specifically to ideology alone, as does this study.

Willower, et al. (1967) discussed the model of custodial ideology as a rigidly controlled setting where the maintenance of order is of primary concern. Control of
student behavior is viewed in moralistic terms rather than as a function of psycho-social dynamics. The hierarchy of status is strictly observed; the administrators make the decisions, and the teachers follow these decisions (13, pp. 4-5; 78).

The resolution of a classroom conflict can be accomplished by the use of external control such as coercion, ridicule, or the withholding of rewards (74, pp. 42-43). Schools as social systems differ in the degree to which external use of control is stressed.

The custodial theory is based on the bureaucratic model of an organization. The educational bureaucracy, as characterized by hierarchical authority, is claimed to have a high degree of stability which allows for maximum efficiency by the division of labor. More importantly, the rigidity of the organization promotes the clear delineation of function and status that makes each job seem important (13, p. 4; 37, p. 25; 66, p. 227). The conflict in this situation arises from bureaucratic constraints which are legitimized by functions imposed on the teachers' professional authority (67, p. 229).

In sum, in their relations with students, teachers who hold custodial attitudes are moralistic and very impersonal. Students are viewed stereotypically as irresponsible and undisciplined persons whose behavior must be controlled externally. Maintenance of order is the primary goal.
This adversary position is enforced by the norms of schools which have an autocratic organizational structure, where the teachers must answer to their superiors and their peers for breaches of order (78, p. 5).

**Characteristics of a Humanistic Ideology**

The prototypical model of humanistic ideology views the school as an educational community in which the students learn through interaction and experience (78, p. 5). This integrated style of educational management has been proposed as a means of reducing personal and institutional conflicts (13, p. 2). In this mode, educators see student behavior in a social and psychological context, rather than in a moralistic context (33, p. 25). Misbehavior is not taken as a personal affront. Humanistic teachers embrace the optimistic attitude that students can be taught to be self-disciplined by establishing rapport and harmonious interactions. The humanistic classroom environment is ostensibly more democratic than authoritarian, more flexible and more open to communication than the custodial classroom environment (5, p. 211; 78, p. 5).

Many researchers in educational and organizational management regard humanistic ideology as superior to custodial ideology (39, p. 153). In addition, they believe that humanistic control concepts tend to reduce the inherent conflict between students, teachers, administrators, and
the institution (67, p. 3). Other researchers suggest the humanistic approach to control ideology will not necessarily have a positive effect when consciously applied as a new educational practice because "unanticipated results, unrealistic optimism, and erroneous and misleading generalizations are apt to be produced" (78, p. 41).

Another interesting point is that the aim of education in the United States is to help children learn how to act in light of personal and social goals. Children are responsible for directing their energy toward learning goals, rather than turning that energy against themselves. The teacher is responsible for using methods that will facilitate goals, instead of trying to turn them off. Self-discipline is necessary in order to assure classroom success (64, p. 3). Furthermore, student satisfaction and achievement are emphasized in harmonious relations among teacher effectiveness, classroom interaction (social norms), and subject matter competence (7, p. 226).

The concepts of custodial and humanistic ideology suggest that educators use pupil control in their educational systems. The concept of discipline and punishment, as presented in this section, should be considered as one aspect of pupil control ideology. In a classroom situation, the teacher and students are expected to maintain adequate social relationships among themselves. This is a normal requirement which allows the teacher and the students to
act out their roles within a correct range of behaviors. The humanistic orientation is based on members learning through personal interaction and personal responsibility. In contrast, the custodial orientation is viewed as a rigid traditional orientation, with the primary concern being the maintenance of order (78).

Factors Related to Pupil Control Ideology

A number of factors have been reported as being related to the control ideology in the United States. The degree of direct control over student behavior influences the attitudes toward control. As a result, teachers have been found to be more custodial than principals while counselors are more humanistic than both teachers and principals (78, pp. 5-6). Experience and degree of formal education seems to be correlated with the degree of custodialism. The more experienced (more than five years) the teacher, the more custodial; the higher the level of formal education attained, the less custodial (4, pp. 6-11; 44, p. 294). Female teachers are more humanistic in their pupil control ideology than are their male counterparts. This difference may account for the fact that elementary school faculties, which tend to be predominantly female, are more humanistic in pupil control ideology than are secondary school faculties, which tend to be predominantly male (11, p. 6; 14). It has been observed that the lower the grade
level, the more humanistic the teacher's pupil control ideology became (44, pp. 292-294). Further investigations reported that junior high school teachers were significantly more custodial than either the elementary and the senior high teachers (4, pp. 6-11; 30, pp. 27-31).

Dogmatism has been found to be related to educator's pupil control ideology. Close-minded educators are more custodial than their open-minded counterparts (32, p. 5498; 48, pp. 31-35; 78, pp. 34-35). Positive relationships exist between dogmatism and pupil control attitudes of the public school teachers (47). Close-minded novice teachers are more susceptible to sources of influence in the school socialization context than are open-minded novice teachers (18).

School-socioeconomic-status has been found to correlate to pupil control ideology. Teachers in low socioeconomic schools were more ideologically custodial toward pupils than teachers in middle and upper socioeconomic schools (4, pp. 6-11; 12, pp. 239-246).

The school "Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire"--a measure of school climate--was used to determine the relationship between pupil control ideology and school climate. Humanistic elementary schools had significantly more "open" climates than custodial schools (2, pp. 17-22; 3, pp. 74-85). In a later study, it was
determined that the same relationship exists in secondary schools (48, pp. 31-35; 68).

The pupil control ideology and professional orientation of the school faculties were found to be weakly related to one another, that is, teachers who were more humanistic in their pupil control ideology were higher in professional orientation than those who were more custodial in their ideology (80, pp. 118-123).

In 1971, Helsel investigated value orientation and pupil control ideology of public school educators and found a significant relationship between variables measured by the "Differential Value Inventory (DVI) and PCI Form." He found that traditionalism in educators' values was positively related to custodialism in their pupil control ideology (33, pp. 24-30). Another study by Helsel in 1974 found a direct relationship between teachers' status obeisance (placed on authority, rights, obligations, and the symbols of status) and custodialism. Teachers who had custodial ideology tended to stress social distance and domination of subordinates (34, pp. 38-47).

Job-satisfaction has been found to be directly related to the congruence between teacher pupil control ideology and teacher perceived pupil control ideology of the principals and their colleagues. Teachers' self-reported scores tended to be less custodial than the scores of those
teachers as perceived by others (79, pp. 1-10; 82). In contrast, the amount of congruence concerning pupil control ideology between principals and teachers is not a factor in job-satisfaction (71, p. 4649). No relationship was found between teacher pupil control ideology and teachers' personality dimensions as measured by the Activities Index (45; 46, pp. 57-59).

In the United States the pupil control ideology and aspects of student alienation have also been investigated by the use of the Pupil Attitudes Questionnaire. The custodial pupil control ideology is correlated significantly with student sense of being normless, powerless, and isolated, and provided a composite measure of total alienation. In the same study, there was an attempt to find a relationship between student self-estrangement and pupil control orientation of the school; however, the result was not statistically significant (56, p. 170).

Custodial pupil control ideology of teachers has been found to be associated with a low sense of power whereas a humanistic pupil control ideology is associated with a high sense of power. Additionally, teachers reported a greater feeling of influence in the decision making affairs of their organization when a high relationship level with pupils was present. Therefore, the teachers could be interpreted as being less custodial in their control
ideology (83, p. 6081). It should be noted, however, that personality needs of teachers and pupil control ideology were not found to be related to each other (47, pp. 57-59). Furthermore, principals are not viewed as directly influencing the pupil control ideology in their schools (48, pp. 31-35; 68).

The relationship between the shared misperception of teachers about pupil behavior and pupil control ideology of school personnel has been explored. The results indicated that (1) teachers, principals and counselors perceived teachers and principals to be more custodial than self-reported scores of the teacher and principals in pupil control ideology. (2) Teachers perceived counselors quite accurately; however, principals and counselors perceived counselors as being more humanistic than the counselors actual scores showed (53; 54; 55, pp. 78-87). Teachers perceive other teachers to be more custodial in pupil control ideology than the teachers reported about themselves (50).

The relationship between teachers' morale level and pupil control attitudes has been studied by Goldsmith (1978) by comparing results of data derived from the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and PCI Form. Teachers with high morale and high levels of satisfaction between personal needs and organizational goals related to job factors
were also humanistic in their attitudes toward pupil control. The results of the Goldsmith study were based upon teachers' perceptions and were interpreted to mean that a low success rate with reference to the organizational task-individual need relationship is related to custodial attitudes toward pupil control (24, p. 1219).

Rest's Defining Issue Test and the PCI Form have been used in a study conducted by Bloom (1978). Bloom concluded that attitudes toward discipline are significantly different among teachers who have principled cognitive morale reasoning and teachers who have non-principled cognitive morale reasoning. Persons preferring principled reasons for resolving morale dilemmas have a more democratic-humanistic attitude toward discipline than their less principled reasoning peers (9, pp. 356-359).

Creative teachers reported themselves to be humanistic in their pupil control ideology. Verbal creativity measures of fluency, flexibility, originality, and the creative personality measures had a significant positive relationship to a humanistic orientation in pupil control ideology (26, pp. 282-286).

Public school educators' job-satisfaction and PCI have been investigated by many researchers. In 1969, Eidell, et al. studied the relationships between pupil control ideology and job-satisfaction using an instrument which
ranked satisfaction from highest to lowest. They were multi-unit-experimental, multi-unit-control, individually prescribed instruction (IPI) control, and IPI experimental. The mean scores, ranking from most humanistic to most custodial, indicated the multi-unit-experimental schools as being more humanistic, followed by multi-unit-control, IPI-experimental, and IPI-control (19, pp. 1-12).

Pupils in classrooms of teachers who had a more humanistic pupil control ideology demonstrated a significantly greater number of verbal behaviors than those in classrooms of teachers who were more custodial (22; 23, p. 551). Humanistic elementary teachers utilized a significantly greater number of verbal behaviors categorized as accepting and developing of student ideas than did the custodial teachers who utilized a significantly greater number of verbal behaviors categorized as lecture and giving facts or opinions about content or procedure. The number of student initiated discussions were greater for humanistic teachers than for custodial teachers (17, pp. 76-80). In examining the verbal behavior of secondary teachers, Rexford (1971) pointed out that custodial ideology was more direct in classroom verbal behavior than with teachers with a humanistic ideology (57, p. 103).

Pupil control ideology of teachers and the instructional climate in the classroom has been found to be
significantly related. Higher levels of cognitive activity, opportunity for or tolerance of divergent thinking, tolerance or encouragement of independent and student initiative, and student enthusiasm and excitement seem to be associated with a more humanistic pupil control ideology in contrast to a teacher-dominated, lecture-oriented class climate with a passive listening role for students (6, pp. 61-70).

Pupil control ideology related to the teacher behavior of referring pupils to the administration for disciplinary reasons has been investigated. The results revealed that custodial teachers can be expected to send more pupils to the principal's office than humanistic teachers. Humanistic teachers will attempt to relate to their pupils with more direct contact (20, pp. 104-112).

The relationship between secondary school biology teachers' pupil control ideology and their classroom practices was investigated. Teachers who possessed humanistic pupil control exhibited effective classroom practices to a greater degree than did teachers who possessed the custodial control ideology (38, pp. 71-77; 42; 43, pp. 263-265; 69, pp. 281-285).

A number of researchers have investigated the relationship between pupil control ideology of public school educators and their years of teaching experience. For example, a study of 282 student teachers at Oklahoma State
University showed they became more custodial after student teaching (36, pp. 153-155). Most of the studies seem to agree that beginning teachers become significantly more custodial in their pupil control ideology after the first year of teaching (13; 14, pp. 8-11; 18, pp. 1-10; 21, pp. 43-47; 25, pp. 1-10; 27, p. 645; 58, pp. 315-320; 65, pp. 583-492; 73, pp. 1-6).

There is little research concerning pupil control ideology of public school educators in societies outside the United States. Hassan examined pupil control ideology in secondary school science classes in Khartoum, Sudan, and related his findings to similar studies done in the United States (31). Smyth (1977) investigated pupil control ideology and the characteristics of teacher salience in Australian public schools. It was based upon the teachers' and administrators' biographical variables of sex, age, status (organizational position), teaching experience and educational qualifications. The primary purpose of the study was to examine the importance of these variables in reference to the influence they have on teachers' pupil control ideology. The results of this study revealed that the pupil control ideology of teachers and principals of Australian public schools is significantly similar to those derived from studies done in the United States with American educators (60, pp. 238-247).
In summary, pupil control ideology is also related to
dogmatism (that is, open- or closed-mindedness--custodial
pupil control ideology is equated with closed-mindedness
while humanistic pupil control ideology is related to open-
mindedness) and to school climate (both elementary and
secondary schools whose teachers measure low or tending
toward humanistic on the PCI Form had significantly more
"open" climates than those schools whose teachers measured
high or tending toward custodial on the PCI Form). School
socio-economic status and value orientation, teacher job
satisfaction and personal sense of power as well as morale
level also are related to individual pupil control ideology.
One of the most significant factors which relates to pupil
control ideology is the years of experience of the teacher;
the longer the teaching experience, the greater the tendency
toward custodial pupil control ideology.
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CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is divided into four parts: (1) the instrument, (2) population and sample, (3) data collection procedures, and (4) data analysis procedures.

Instrumentation

This study deals with the pupil control ideology of principals and teachers. The instrument used to measure educators' perception of control vis a vis students' behavior is described as follows.

The Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form)

The Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form) consists of twenty likert-type items which measure an educator's attitudes toward pupil control along a custodial-humanistic continuum (Appendix B). Responses to each statement are indicated on a five-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" (five points) to "strongly disagree" (one point). The range of possible scores is from twenty to 100; high score signifies a more custodial attitude toward pupil control while a low score indicates a more humanistic orientation.
The instrument was devised by Willower, Eidell and Hoy (2), based on their review of relevant literature, their personal experience, and field notes from a previous study. It adopts the concern of client control (ranging from custodial to humanistic) as first proposed for mental hospital personnel by Gilbert and Levinson (2).

The method used by Willower, et al. to validate the PCI Form in the United States was based on the judgment of principals concerning the pupil control ideology of their teachers. Descriptions of custodial and humanistic viewpoints were given to the principals from two secondary and five elementary schools who then functioned as a panel of judges to determine the validity of the PCI Form. The seven principals were then asked to identify a specified number of teachers whose control ideology resembled the two descriptions. Teachers from these same schools were tested using the custodial-humanistic scale; mean scores of the two groups (custodial and humanistic) were then compared.

The prediction that mean scores of teachers judged to be humanistic would differ from those of teachers judged to be custodial was supported at the .01 level, using a t-test for the difference between the means (2, p. 13).

In the original study (Willower, et al.), a split-half reliability coefficient was calculated by the investigators using even-item subscores with odd-item subscores (n = 170), yielding a Pearson product moment coefficient of .91. Use
of the Spearman-Brown formula gave a corrected coefficient of .95 as an indication of the instrument's reliability.

Permission was requested from Willower (Appendix C) to apply the PCI Form in a cross-cultural context. A positive response to the request was provided (Appendix D). In order to administer the PCI Form in Sukhothai, Thailand, the researcher translated the questionnaire into Thai (Appendix E). To determine validity, the translated form was submitted to a panel of judges for validation of content (Appendix F).

Seven educators were selected on the basis of their positions and background of knowledge in Thai education and were invited to serve as judges. Each judge was asked to determine whether the translated form was parallel to the American version, to consider the relevance of each statement to the Thai school system, and to determine the clarity of the translation. A minimum of five judges was required to approve an item before it was included in the final Thai version of the PCI Form. The six judges who responded recommended that the statements which were to be included in the final Thai version were parallel to the American PCI Form and that the PCI Form (Thai translation) was relevant to Thai schools. In addition, they recommended some changes in wording of the form which would enhance its clarity. Their recommended changes were incorporated into the final Thai PCI Form.
The reliability of the revised questionnaire was determined by conducting a pilot study which involved administering the questionnaire to ten principals and twenty teachers of public elementary schools in Sukhothai. These respondents were not included in the sample for this study. The resulting Pearson product moment coefficient, test-retest (three month interval) procedure gave the correlation of .87 and .93 by the application of the Spearman-Brown. To gain information regarding the independent variables (sex, educational position, years of experience and educational preparation), a personal data form was provided. The approved Thai version of the PCI Form and the personal data form were then administered to the elementary school personnel in Sukhothai, Thailand.

Population and Sample

The province of Sukhothai is divided into nine school districts with a total of 380 elementary schools. The sample of this study was drawn from five randomly selected districts. A random sampling technique of principals within each of the five districts was conducted to obtain a sample of 120 principals (twenty-four principals from each of the five school districts). Two hundred and forty teachers (forty-eight teachers from five districts) were randomly selected from the same schools which principals were chosen from. Rosters of school personnel were
provided by the province administrative authority of Sukhothai province.

Procedures for Collecting Data

The following procedures for collecting data were carried out:

1. A letter requesting permission to collect data by administering the questionnaire to the selected elementary school principals and teachers was sent to the governor of the province of Sukhothai. (All letters requesting permission and responses to those requests can be found in Appendix G.)

2. Upon approval by the governor the letters seeking cooperation and participation in administering the questionnaire to principals and teachers were sent to the provincial administrative authority, district officers and principals.

3. With the approval of the provincial administrative authority, the district officers and principals, letters explaining the general purposes of the study and copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the selected principals and teachers by the provincial administrative authority.

4. All questionnaires were sent out to district officers by an authorized person of the provincial
administrative authority; there they were distributed to selected principals and teachers by the district officers.

5. The completed questionnaires were returned to the district officers by the respondents; the forms were then returned to the provincial administrative authority by authorized personnel.

6. The collected forms were then returned to the investigator in the United States for data analysis and interpretation.

Statistical Procedures

All responses of the returned questionnaires were key-punched on machine punch cards at the North Texas State University computer center.

The statistical procedures applied were as follows:

1. Descriptive Statistics:
   (a) Calculation of means and standard deviations of teachers' and principals' control ideology scores;
   (b) Calculation of raw scores of teachers and principals for each selected variable.

2. Inferential Statistics:
   (a) A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether significant differences exist between teachers' and principals'
and then across selected variables within each group.

(b) Scheffé $F$ test was used to evaluate where significant differences are located.

All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance (1).
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The present study investigated the attitudes of educators in Sukhothai, Thailand, regarding the control of students. One major hypothesis and several sub-hypotheses were developed in order to facilitate this investigation.

The major hypothesis was as follows:

$H$: There will be significant differences in the pupil control ideology of teachers and principals across selected variables as measured by the Pupil Control Ideology Form.

To test this major hypothesis, the following sub-hypotheses were developed:

1. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology as perceived by principals and teachers.

2. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of teachers grouped according to sex.

3. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to sex.
4. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of teachers grouped according to years of experience.

5. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to years of experience.

6. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of teachers grouped according to educational preparation.

7. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to educational preparation.

In this chapter, an analysis of the responses of principals and teachers in Sukhothai, Thailand is presented. A total of 240 elementary school teachers and 120 principals in Sukhothai were invited to participate. Each was asked to complete the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form) and return it. Two hundred and eighty-seven (representing 198 teachers and eighty-nine principals) or 80 per cent of the total responded, far exceeding the 55 per cent return rate which had been proposed as sufficient to yield reliable results.

Responses to the PCI Form were punched on computer cards and verified. Analysis of these responses was
performed on the computer automated data processing system at North Texas State University.

The theoretical range of scores on the PCI Form was from twenty to 100; the higher the score, the more custodial the pupil control ideology; the lower the score, the more humanistic the pupil control ideology (18). The actual range of scores in this investigation was from thirty-eight to seventy-eight. The means and standard deviations were computed across each of the selected variables. These variables were educational position at the present, sex, years of experience, and educational preparation. The results of the computation of the means and standard deviations of teachers and principals across selected variables are located in Table I.

As shown in Table I, the mean scores of teachers and principals grouped according to selected variables clustered at the mid-point of the theoretical mean (60) on the PCI Form. As indicated previously, the higher the score, the more custodial the pupil control ideology; the lower the mean score, the more humanistic the control ideology. The data show that teachers' mean score was 59.838, while the principals' mean score was 58.348. These results show that the teachers and principals, in the sample, were clustered near the theoretical mean in their pupil control ideology.
**TABLE I**

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF RESPONDENTS ACROSS SELECTED VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>59.836</td>
<td>5.963</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>58.348</td>
<td>6.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of teachers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex of principals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>59.666</td>
<td>5.779</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58.562</td>
<td>5.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>60.021</td>
<td>6.189</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.444</td>
<td>7.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience at present position of teachers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Years of experience at present position of principals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5 years</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60.430</td>
<td>5.244</td>
<td>0 - 5 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58.500</td>
<td>6.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59.638</td>
<td>6.706</td>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57.800</td>
<td>6.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57.666</td>
<td>5.699</td>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57.066</td>
<td>5.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years or more</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60.692</td>
<td>6.358</td>
<td>16 years or more</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58.788</td>
<td>6.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational preparation of teachers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational preparation of principals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - 1*</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61.075</td>
<td>5.601</td>
<td>G - 1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - 2*</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>61.155</td>
<td>5.583</td>
<td>G - 2*</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58.597</td>
<td>6.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - 3*</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57.480</td>
<td>6.743</td>
<td>G - 3*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57.590</td>
<td>5.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - 4*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>G - 4*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* G - 1  Lower teacher certificate, equivalent or lower
G - 2  Higher teacher certificate or equivalent
G - 3  Bachelor's degree
G - 4  Master's degree or higher
Teachers and principals were divided into groups according to sex, years of experience and educational preparation. The statistical method used in analyzing the differences between the means of the independent samples was the analysis of variance. Results of the test of differences between teachers' and principals' control ideology are found in Table II.

H_1: There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology as perceived by principals and teachers.

**TABLE II**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ONE-WAY DESIGN) OF PRINCIPALS' AND TEACHERS' PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>135.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135.41</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>10251.70</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>35.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10387.11</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of variance was employed to test hypothesis one. With one and 285 degrees of freedom, an F-value of 3.84 was needed for significance at the .05 level. The computed F-ratio of 3.76 was not significant at the .05 level (Table II). Therefore, sub-hypothesis
one was not supported, that is there was no significant
difference between principals' and teachers' pupil control
ideology.

In order to identify the differences in pupil control
ideology of teachers grouped by sex, sub-hypothesis two
was stated as follows:

$H_2$: There will be significant differences in pupil
control ideology of teachers grouped according
to sex.

The results of analysis of variance are indicated in
Table III.

**TABLE III**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHERS' PUPIL CONTROL
IDEOLOGY GROUPED ACCORDING TO SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>$F$ Ratio</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6997.29</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>35.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7003.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With one and 196 degrees of freedom, an $F$-value of
3.88 was needed for significance at the .05 level. The
computed $F$-ratio was 0.17, thus there was no significant
difference at the .05 level. Sub-hypothesis two, there-
fore, was not supported.
The test of this hypothesis indicated that teachers, both male and female, were similar in their ideology which clustered between custodial and humanistic, that is, the pupil control ideology of the teachers did not suffer according to the variable of sex.

In order to determine the differences in pupil control of male and female principals, the analysis of variance was employed. Sub-hypothesis three and the results are as follows.

$H_3$: There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to sex.

TABLE IV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRINCIPALS' PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY GROUPED ACCORDING TO SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>36.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.29</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3211.91</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>36.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3248.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the test for differences in pupil control ideology between male and female principals are given that, with one and eighty-seven degrees of freedom, an
F-value of 3.99 was needed for significance at the .05 level. The computed F-ratio was 0.98 (Table IV) and was not significant at the .05 level. The test of sub-hypothesis three indicated that there were no significant differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to sex.

In order to determine the differences in pupil control ideology of teachers grouped according to years of experience sub-hypothesis four was stated as follows:

\( H_4: \) There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of teachers grouped according to years of experience.

The results of the test for differences in pupil control ideology for groups of teachers with varying years of experience are shown in Table V.

**TABLE V**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHERS' PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY GROUPED ACCORDING TO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>213.64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72.21</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6789.86</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7003.50</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An analysis of variance was employed to test for significant differences among the groups categorized by years of experience (Table I). With three and 194 degrees of freedom, an $F$-value of 2.60 was needed for significance at the .05 level. The results of the test yielded an $F$-ratio of 2.03, and a $P$-value of .11, as shown in Table V. Therefore, sub-hypothesis four was not accepted. These results indicate that there were no significant differences in perception of pupil control ideology among teachers with varying years of experience.

In order to identify the differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to years of experience (Table I), sub-hypothesis five was stated as follows:

$H_5$: There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to years of experience.

The results of the test for differences of pupil control ideology of groups of principals with varying years of experience are displayed in Table VI.

An analysis of variance was employed to test this hypothesis, with three and eighty-five degrees of freedom. An $F$-value of 2.80 was needed for significance at the .05 level. The $F$-ratio was 0.33 which was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, sub-hypothesis five was not supported; there were no significant differences in the
pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to years of experience (Table VI).

### TABLE VI

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRINCIPALS' PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY GROUPED ACCORDING TO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>37.99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3210.21</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3248.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to clarify the differences in pupil control ideology of teachers grouped according to educational preparation, sub-hypothesis six was stated as follows:

\[ H_6: \text{There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of teachers grouped according to educational preparation.}\]

To test sub-hypothesis six, the data were divided into three groups. The means and standard deviations of the three groups are indicated in Table I.

The results of the test for differences in pupil control among groups of teachers with varying degrees of education are shown in Table VII.
TABLE VII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHERS' PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY GROUPED ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>325.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>162.91</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6677.69</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7003.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analysis of variance indicated that with two and 195 degrees of freedom, an F-value of 4.76 was obtained, an F-value of 3.00 was needed for significance at the .05 level. Since the obtained F-ratio was 4.76, the P-value was significant at the .01 level. Therefore significant differences in pupil control ideology of teachers grouped according to educational preparation were found. Hypothesis six therefore, was supported.

The Shceffé F test was employed to identify the significant differences among the three groups (Table I). The results of the test revealed that teachers with bachelor's degrees are more humanistic than those teachers who have lower teacher certificates—equivalent or lower, and higher teacher certificates or equivalent (Table VIII).
TABLE VIII
SCHÉFFÉ TEST OF DIFFERENCES OF TEACHERS' PUPIL
CONTROL IDEOLOGY GROUPED ACCORDING
TO EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lower teacher certificate, equivalent or lower</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Higher teacher certificate or equivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.13*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bachelor's degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

In order to identify the differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped by educational preparation, sub-hypothesis seven was stated as follows:

$H_7$: There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to educational preparation.

The results of the test for differences in pupil control ideology among groups of principals with varying degrees of educational preparation are given in Table IX.

Of the total of eighty-nine principals who responded to the Pupil Control Ideology Form, sixty-seven had an education preparation level of group two (Higher teacher certificate or equivalent) and twenty-two held a bachelor's degree (group three); thus there were no respondents in
either group one or group four. The mean for group two was computed as 58.59 and the standard deviation as 6.35. The mean score for group three was computed as 57.59 and the standard deviation as 5.21 (Table I).

TABLE IX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRINCIPALS’ PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY GROUPED ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3231.44</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3248.21</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With one and eighty-seven degrees of freedom, an F-value of 3.95 was needed for significance at the .05 level. The computed F-ratio was 0.45; the P-value was 0.50. Since the F-ratio and P-value did not indicate a significant difference, sub-hypothesis seven was not supported.

Data analysis, in this study, revealed that the teachers in the sample had a mean PCI Form score of 59.85 while the principals had a mean score of 58.35. This difference was not significant at the .05 level.

There was a significant difference in pupil control ideology among teachers when grouped according to educational
preparation. Teachers with bachelor's degrees demonstrated more humanistic views than teachers with the lower teacher certificate, equivalent or lower and also more humanistic views than teachers with the higher teacher certificate or its equivalent. These significant differences existed at the .01 level.

As indicated, the data confirmed that there was no significant difference in pupil control ideology among teachers and principals when grouped by sex and years of experience. There was no significant difference in principals' pupil control ideology when they were grouped according to educational preparation.
Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the pupil control ideology of public school educators in Sukhothai, Thailand. This inquiry considered the differences among teachers, among principals, and between teachers and principals.

Previous research indicated that the pupil control ideology plays an important part in the interaction between teachers and principals (6). Pupil control is an important part of the school climate. The interactions of social culture and school organization may lead to conflict, which results in teachers having to deal with order and discipline. These interactions may create conflicting experiences among teachers, administrators and students.

Previous studies indicated that those teachers directly responsible for the control of unselected clients would be more custodial in their control ideology than those less directly responsible for client control (6). Custodial pupil control ideology, which corresponds to the rigid traditional school, provides a highly controlled setting
that is primarily concerned with the maintenance of order. Humanistic control is characterized by close personal relationships with students and students' self-discipline; therefore, a democratic classroom climate develops (6, p. 5).

The Pupil Control Ideology Form, by which the data of the present investigation were assessed, was translated in Thai for the study. The Thai version of the PCI Form was validated by a panel of judges and then altered to reflect those changes in wording which the judges felt necessary. A pilot study to determine the reliability of the Thai PCI Form was conducted; a test-retest procedure was used for this pilot study. The Thai version of the PCI Form proved to be a valid instrument and usable in research concerning the pupil control ideology of educators in Sukhothai, Thailand.

The samples were randomly selected; 360 teachers and principals were included in this study. The 287 educators who responded represent an 80 per cent return rate. The one-way analysis of variance was used to determine the differences, between the groups concerning their pupil control ideology. A rejection of the hypotheses was made at the .05 level.

The independent variables used in this study were as follows:
1. Sex:
   (a) Male
   (b) Female

2. Educational position:
   (a) Elementary teacher
   (b) Elementary principal

3. Years of experience at present position:
   (a) 0 - 5 years
   (b) 6 - 10 years
   (c) 11 - 15 years
   (d) 16 years or more

4. Educational preparation:
   (a) Lower teacher certificate; equivalent or lower
   (b) Higher teacher certificate or equivalent
   (c) Bachelor's degree
   (d) Master's degree or higher

The hypotheses of this study are as follows:

**Major hypothesis:**

H: There will be significant differences in the pupil control ideology of teachers and principals across selected variables, as measured by the pupil control ideology form.

**Sub-hypotheses:**

1. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology between principals and teachers.
2. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of teachers grouped according to sex.

3. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to sex.

4. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of teachers grouped according to years of experience.

5. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to experience.

6. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of teachers grouped according to educational preparation.

7. There will be significant differences in pupil control ideology of principals grouped according to educational preparation.

Findings

The findings of this study are summarized as follows:

1. Principals and teachers in public elementary schools in Sukhothai, Thailand were not found to be significantly different in their pupil control ideology.

2. There were no significant differences in the pupil control ideology of teachers or principals when grouped according to sex or years of experience.
3. There were no significant differences in pupil control ideology of principals when grouped according to educational preparation.

4. Teachers grouped according to educational preparation were found to be significantly different in their pupil control ideology. Teachers who have bachelor's degrees were more humanistic in their pupil control ideology than teachers with lower educational levels.

Discussion

The major empirical findings of similar investigations in the United States and Australia showed that teachers in these countries were more custodial in pupil control ideology than were principals, that female teachers tended to be more humanistic than male teachers (3, 6), and that teachers with more experience tend to be more custodial in their ideology in pupil control (1, 3).

The results of this study did not support the hypotheses that there were differences in the pupil control ideology of teachers or principals grouped according to sex, years of experience, and principals' educational preparation, nor were there differences between teachers' and principals' ideology. These results showed that the pupil control ideologies of educators in Sukhothai, Thailand, were not parallel with those of educators in the United States and in Australia. The data analysis revealed that educators in this study
clustered at the theoretical mean (sixty) on the PCI Form. Therefore, their attitudes toward pupil control ideology were not widely spread along the continuum of custodial-humanistic.

Some conjectures need to be made regarding these findings; such factors as social interaction, teacher expectations, cultural and political structure might influence individual educators to produce pupil control ideologies similar to those of their peers.

One conjecture related to role and expectation of educators is that, perhaps, teachers and those principals who also teach have similar degrees of responsibility for controlling students' behaviors and therefore may have similar views. In some schools the principal is responsible for classroom instruction where he or she teaches a subject area in addition to being responsible for administration and supervision. With such close responsibility for students' behavior, teachers and principals might express their attitudes in the same way (5, p. 223).

Student achievement is one of the major concerns of educators in Thailand. Both teachers and principals in this study may have strongly emphasized the requirement for subject-matter competence and discipline along with technical competence as a result of their concern for student achievement. Such an emphasis may produce results which show a clustering of their pupil control ideologies.
Teacher expectations may have influenced the results of this study. It is further observed that in an attempt to reduce pupil failure, a system of controlled automatic promotion (with raises in salary) was recently introduced in Thailand (4). Because both teachers and principals desire to be promoted, their supervision of pupil behavior may be influenced by the system of controlled automatic promotion.

The present control of elementary schools in Sukhothai, Thailand, is in some ways decentralized and in others centralized. The central control, "The Ministry of Interior," directly supervises the administration at the level of province and district. Educational policies have been made by the central administration. This kind of administration makes educational organization in Sukhothai, Thailand, more formal than informal. A policy concerning control of pupil behavior assigned from the top will produce an identical orientation for teachers and principals and could result in a similar pupil control ideology.

The cultural structure of educational traditionalism and progressivism of teachers is positively related to custodial and humanistic ideology in pupil control (2). The educational system of Thailand has been changing slowly from a traditional one to a more modern one. Roles, expectations, and teaching styles of teachers and principals of this sample may be in a transitional state between custodial and
humanistic in pupil control ideology due to the transitional nature of the political and cultural structure and climate. The results of this study indicate that the pupil control ideology of the teachers and principals surveyed clustered between custodial and humanistic.

This study of pupil control ideology revealed a number of interesting findings. One of the primary findings of the study was that Thai educators in the province of Sukhothai were not similar to American or Australian educators whose pupil control ideology had been examined in earlier studies. The present study has shown that Thai teachers and principals expressed similar attitudes in pupil control ideology. The attitudes expressed by teachers and principals in this study, perhaps, emphasized the formal organization of Thai schools, in which rules and regulations play an important role in teacher and principal conduct.

Additionally, the results revealed that the teachers who held bachelor's degrees expressed attitudes that were more humanistic than those who held lower teacher certificates, equivalent or lower as well as those who held higher teacher certificates or equivalent. This result may suggest that teachers' education may be an important indication of control ideology. It is probably that the individual teacher with a higher educational level has attitudes which reflected a humanistic orientation toward students. They are more
likely to have classroom environments in which students tend to engage in open communication, behave in a self disciplined manner, and engage in social interactions that are positive and supportive in nature. It can also be said that teachers who are better educated have successful teaching styles; that is, education indicates an orientation which gives attention to individual students' needs and the creation of an atmosphere conducive to learning. These are the marks of an acceptance of humanistic ideology of educators.

Conclusions

Tests of the hypotheses in this study of pupil control ideology led to the following conclusions. Elementary school educators and principals in Sukhothai, Thailand, tend to have similar pupil control ideologies. Although results grouped by level of educational preparation indicate some differences in pupil control ideology, it does appear that the higher the level of educational preparation of the teachers the more open they feel they can be with the students; this is indicated by their tendency to be more humanistic than are their fellow teachers with less educational preparation.

Implications

The information and the findings of this study suggest several implications for Thai education. These are as follows:
1. The information concerning pupil control ideology derived from a systematic examination of relevant literature can be of service to Thai educators in that it provides a better understanding of the relationships among principals, teachers, and pupils concerning pupil control behavior. Since principals and teachers in the province of Sukhothai, Thailand, have similar opinions and attitudes toward pupil control, it can be anticipated that classroom environments will be reflective of similar control mechanisms used in classes taught by principals and those that are taught by teachers. The interaction among teachers and teacher-principals may have reduced the differences that can occur when those interactions concern control of students' behavior problems. The lack of differences in pupil control ideology between teachers and principals of Sukhothai, Thailand, suggests that they do work together harmoniously.

2. The findings of this study can be a helpful tool for educators in public elementary schools in Thailand because the information identifies their expectations and differentiations in pupil control ideology, as the findings reveal no major differences with relation to pupil control ideology. This can help teachers and principals interact comfortably in an environment of control used to guide their students' behavior in the classroom.

3. The information and the findings of this study can contribute to the advancement of the Thai educational system
by providing additional information in the field of educational administration, school organizational climate, and leadership behaviors.

Recommendations for Future Study

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations for future study are offered.

1. The Thai version of the Pupil Control Ideology Form should be used in future research studies in the area of educational administration to lend support for the validity and reliability established herein.

2. Future studies should investigate relationships between pupil control ideology and school size, location of schools, grade levels, proportion of male and female students in classrooms.

3. Further studies might also test the following hypotheses:
   a. Custodial schools will have less open communication both horizontally and vertically than humanistic schools.
   b. Custodial schools will be characterized by more student alienation than humanistic schools;
   c. Formal leadership patterns will be accepted more readily in humanistic than custodial schools.

4. Investigations of pupil control ideology and dogmatism (open- and close-mindedness), teacher self-
actualization, the salience of teachers' characteristics, status obeisance and teacher job satisfaction should be conducted in Thai schools.

5. The effectiveness of external control by teachers and internal control (self-discipline) related to the displacement of instructional goals should be studied.

6. Pupil control ideology and its relation to role, goal, and personal conflicts of educators should be investigated to ascertain its effect on behavioral problems in the school.
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APPENDIX A

STRUCTURE OF THE THAI EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

APPENDIX B

FORM PCI

Information

On the following, a number of statements about teaching are presented. Our purpose is to gather information regarding the actual attitudes of educators concerning these statements. You will recognize that the statements are of such a nature that there are no correct or incorrect answers. We are interested only in your opinion of them.

Your responses will remain confidential, and no individual or school will be named in the report of this study. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

INSTRUCTIONS: Following are twenty statements about schools, teachers, and pupils. Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by circling the appropriate response at the right of the statement.

1. It is desirable to require pupils to sit in assigned seats during assemblies.  
2. Pupils are usually not capable of solving their problems through logical reasoning.  
3. Directing sarcastic remarks toward a defiant pupil is a good disciplinary technique.
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Beginning teachers are not likely to maintain strict enough control over their pupils.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Teachers should consider revision of their teaching methods if these are criticized by their pupils.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The best principal gives unquestioning support to teachers in disciplining pupils.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Pupils should not be permitted to contradict the statements of a teacher in class.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>It is justifiable to have pupils learn many facts about a subject even if they have no immediate application.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Too much pupil time is spent on guidance and activities and too little on academic preparation.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Being friendly with pupils often leads them to become too familiar.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>It is more important for pupils to learn to obey rules than that they make their own decisions.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Student governments are good &quot;safety valves&quot; but should not have much influence on school policy.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Pupils can be trusted to work together without supervision.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>If a pupil uses obscene or profane language in school, it must be considered a moral offense.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If pupils are allowed to use the laboratory without getting permission, the privilege will be abused.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A few pupils are just young hoodlums and should be treated accordingly.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. It is often necessary to remind pupils that their status in school differs from that of teachers.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A pupil who destroys school material or property should be severely punished.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Pupils cannot perceive the difference between democracy and anarchy in the classroom.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Pupils often misbehave in order to make the teacher look bad.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Donald J. Willower  
Professor of Education  
Rackley Building  
Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802  

October 17, 1979  

Dear Dr. Willower:  

As a graduate student at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, majoring in administrative leadership in public schools, I am about to engage in my doctoral research. I would like to use the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form), an instrument which you developed and published in The Pennsylvania State University Studies No. 24, 1967. My research will be conducted in the public elementary schools of Sukhothai, Thailand, and will test hypotheses regarding the pupil control ideology of educators in that school system. I am also interested in establishing cross-cultural validity of the instrument from which implications regarding other cultures can be made. I am requesting your permission to use the PCI Form as a part of my research study. Additionally, would you advise me of scoring procedures or direct me to a source where I might find some. Your early response would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Dumrong Seefa
APPENDIX D

The Pennsylvania State University
Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802

Mr. Dumrong Seefa
929 W. Mulberry
Denton, Texas 76201

Dear Mr. Seefa:

You have my permission to use the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form). It is scored 5-4-3-2-1 from strongly agree to strongly disagree, except that items 5 and 13 are reverse scored. Please send me a copy of your results.

Good luck.

Sincerely yours,

D. J. Willower
Professor of Education
The Pennsylvania State University
APPENDIX E

THE THAI-VERSION PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY FORM

ที่มา

1. ประชากรที่ที่มีอยู่อยู่ในจังหวัด

2. กลุ่มที่มีอยู่อยู่ในจังหวัด

3. จังหวัดที่มีอยู่อยู่ในจังหวัด

4. ประชากรที่มีอยู่อยู่ในจังหวัด

ที่วิเคราะห์

1. ประชากรที่มีอยู่อยู่ในจังหวัด

2. กลุ่มที่มีอยู่อยู่ในจังหวัด

3. จังหวัดที่มีอยู่อยู่ในจังหวัด

ที่วิเคราะห์

1. ประชากรที่มีอยู่อยู่ในจังหวัด

2. กลุ่มที่มีอยู่อยู่ในจังหวัด

3. จังหวัดที่มีอยู่อยู่ในจังหวัด

ที่วิเคราะห์

1. ประชากรที่มีอยู่อยู่ในจังหวัด

2. กลุ่มที่มีอยู่อยู่ในจังหวัด

3. จังหวัดที่มีอยู่อยู่ในจังหวัด

ที่วิเคราะห์
1. สมุนไพรถั่ว
2. สมุนไพรต้ม
3. สมุนไพรควร
4. สมุนไพรยืน
5. สมุนไพรนั่ง

เห็นต่างบางสิ่ง
เห็นทุกข์
ไม่มี
ไม่เห็น
ไม่เห็นความคิด

6. สมุนไพรลิขัน
7. สมุนไพรยืด
8. สมุนไพรหนึ่ง
9. สมุนไพรสอง
10. สมุนไพรสาม

เห็นต่างบางสิ่ง
เห็นทุกข์
ไม่มี
ไม่เห็น
ไม่เห็นความคิด
13. แม่เรือนผมได้รับงานวิจัยทางชีวิตจากครุ ฝ่ายโดย
หัวเจ้านักเรียนภูษิชัยสัมพันธ์
14. หนึ่งในเรือนมูลฐานวณรเคลิมในเรือน ครุได้รับการ
ก้าวหน้าว่าไม่ "สมบูรณ์"
15. ปรับเรือนให้รับสิทธิ์ที่ได้รับจากเรือนไปทำจริง
ลงที่โดยไม่ได้รับอนุญาตจากครุ นักเรียนอาจใช้
สถิติที่ใช้ในเวลาพิจารณาเรียบวินัย
16. ผู้เรียนที่ไม่ยอมรับการเรียนล่าช้าได้รับการลงบุญ
โดยเจ้านักเรียนและเรียนแผนก
17. การเรียนบ่อยยิ่งเพื่อลดสถิติเรียนให้เรียนได้เรียน
ที่มีผลต่อการประสบการณ์ความเป็นคนและมักเรียน
18. นักเรียนที่ทำลายทรัพย์สินของโรงเรียน ควรถูกลงโทษ
ตามสมควร
19. แม่เรือนไม่ยอมความว่าใช้ความตกgoritของ
แนวประสาท ทายและขั้นต่ำเรียบ
20. แม่เรือนตรวจสอบพฤติกรรมของ ทำให้เปิดหลายครั้ง
ระเบียบของโรงเรียน
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Srinakharinwirot University  
Bangkok, Thailand

Miss Krisana Boriboon  
English Instructor  
Kasetsart University  
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Kasetsart University  
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APPENDIX G

1. A letter requesting permission to administer the questionnaire from the provincial governor, p. 102.

2. A letter in response from the provincial governor, p. 103.

3. A letter requesting permission and cooperation to the provincial administrative authority, p. 104.


5. A letter requesting permission and cooperation to the district officer of education, p. 106.

6. A letter requesting permission and cooperation to the principals, p. 107.

7. A letter explaining the general purposes of the study and instructions to respond to the PCI Form to the selected principals and teachers, p. 108.
Denton, Texas 76201

North Texas State University

Department of Foreign Languages

(Requests for information about the university should be directed to the Office of the Registrar.)

929 W. Mulberry

Denton, Texas 76201

(Phone for assistance in making arrangements for a visit to the university.)
สำนักงานจังหวัดสุรินทร์

เรื่อง ขออนุญาตจัดสมよねตามระเบียบการจัดพิธี

เรียน นายกงาน ศรีรัก

มีเรื่อง รับที่เลิกงานวันที่ 30 ธันวาคม 2561

ตามที่มีต่อที่อาจารย์เรื่อง ขออนุญาตจัดสมเย็นตามระเบียบการจัดพิธี เกี่ยวกับความกิจกรรมการประดิษฐ์ของจังหวัดสุรินทร์ เพื่อเตรียมการจัดงานไว้ตามแผน

จึงขอร้องให้เรียนชุดดังกล่าว ดังนี้ ห้ามนำภาพถ่ายไปเผยแพร่ใด้ ไม่ว่า ใครอย่างไรก็ตามเพื่อมิให้เกิดการเปลี่ยนแปลงหรือสร้างให้เกิดเหตุการณ์ที่ไม่คาดคิดไปตาม

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

[ลายมือ]

(นายแดง เนศกิจวัฒน) ผู้อำนวยการจังหวัดสุรินทร์

สำนักงานจังหวัดสุรินทร์

ปี พ.ศ. 2561
929 W. Mulberry
Denton, Texas 76201

I have learned that

Texas State University

has an interdisciplinary program in computer science and that the following

are some of the courses offered:

1. Algorithm Design
2. Algorithm Analysis
3. Data Structures
4. Computer Networks
5. Operating Systems

I am interested in attending this program because it offers a comprehensive

curriculum that will allow me to develop skills in areas such as

programming and system design.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

[Date]
เรื่อง การวางแผนและพัฒนาการวิจัย

เวียน นายทหาร หรือท่า

นางส่ง หญิงอ่อนวันที่ 3 ธันวาคม ๒๕๔๒

ที่มีนิธิที่อ้างถึง ห้ามคัดออกความร่วมมือให้ส่วนการศึกษาจังหวัดร้อยเอ็ด ฯ ท่านทราบ เหร่ ย็อป ไนส์ ก็ นี้

มีหน้า เรื่องการศึกษา ให้คำแนะนำท่านที่ขอความร่วมมือ และแจ้งแผนส่งเอกนิจ ที่กล่าวไปย่อมอ้างเผื่อท่านนั้น

จึงเรียนมาเพื่อดำาเนิน

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

(นายโยชน์ โพธิ์สุวรรณ)
หัวหน้าส่วนการศึกษาจังหวัดร้อยเอ็ด

ช่วยการศึกษา

โทร. ๒๕๔๔
929 W, Mulberry

Denton, Texas 76201

Dear Professor Smith,

I am writing to express my interest in the computer science program at North Texas State University. I have been a very active student in the computer science department at my current university, and I am very interested in pursuing a degree in computer science.

In my current studies, I have taken several courses in computer science, including programming languages, data structures, and computer networks. I have also completed a project on developing a user interface for a mobile application. I am confident that my skills in computer science will be a valuable asset to your program.

I am very excited about the opportunity to join your program and would be honored to attend North Texas State University. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
เรียน เลขานุการหอสมุดแห่งชาติ

เรียน ดร. ท่าน

ขอขอบคุณท่านสำหรับการที่ท่านได้รับเรื่องของผม ที่ผมส่งไป

ท่านอาจต้องมีข้อสงสัยเกี่ยวกับเรื่องบางอย่างที่ผมส่งไป

ขอให้ท่านมีความสบายในการทำงานของท่าน

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

(นามสกุล ท่าน)
929 W. Mulberry
Denton, Texas 76201

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