#### **INFORMATION TO USERS**

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

- The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
- 4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
- 5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International 300 North Zeeb Road

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA St. John's Road, Tyler's Green High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR 7824585 COOPARAT, PRACOB INTERACTIONS OF DOGMATISM AND SELECTED VARIABLES UPON JOB SATISFACTION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS IN THAILAND. THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA, PH.D., 1978

-----



1978

PRACOB COOPARAT

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

### THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

### GRADUATE COLLECE

# INTERACTIONS OF DOGMATISM AND SELECTED VARIABLES UPON JOB SATISFACTION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS IN THAILAND

## A DISSERTATION

### SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

## in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the

## degree of

## DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

## PRACOB COOPARAT

## Norman, Oklahoma

INTERACTIONS OF DOGMATISM AND SELECTED VARIABLES UPON JOB SATISFACTION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS IN THAILAND

APPROVED BY

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses his gratitude to Dr. John J. Seaberg Jr. for his guidance, encouragement, and unselfish giving of his time to conduct this investigation. Further acknowledgment is extended to Dr. Thomas W. Wiggins, Dr. Mary E. Dewey, and Dr. Omer J. Rupiper for their critique and assistance as members of the committee.

Special appreciation is expressed to the university professors in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand who responded to the questionnaire, Mr. and Mrs. Chu-Sanga Ridhiprasart, Mr. Kuakul Cooparat, relatives, and friends who provided assistance and needed cooperation in Thailand.

Finally, the author expresses gratitude to his wife, Nattanipha, who has been encouraging and helpful; and my daughter, Pam, for her patience throughout his doctoral program.

iii

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1.
Background of the Problem	1 2 3 4 5
II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH	6 8 14 22
as Related to the Study	29 41
III. DESIGN OF STUDY	43
Population and Sampling	43 44 48
IV. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	52
Analysis of Demographic Data	52
Hypotheses	52

.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter																												Page
V.	SUN FOF	íMA KF	RY UR	, TH	DI: ER	SCI S'	US: TUI	SI( DY	DN,	, /	ANI •	D :	SU(	GGI •	ES]	CI( •	ONS •	5	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	87
	S S	Sum Dis Sug	ma cu ge	ry ss st	10: 10:	n ns	f	or	• • Fi	111	the	er	St	tua	ły	•	•	• •	•		•	•	• •	•		• •	• •	87 92 96
REFERENCES	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	98
APPENDICES	•	. 0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	o	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	108
APPENDIX	A	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	108
APPENDIX	В	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	120
APPENDIX	С	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	130
APPENDIX	D	•	•	•	•	•	•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•			•	•	•	139

•

.

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Frequency Counts and Percentages of Demographic Variables	53
2.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differenes in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Major Field	64
3.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Sex	64
4.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the <u>SRS</u> Scores	66
5.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Attitudes toward Banning Students' Political Activities	68
6.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Political Effect (1)	68
7.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Political Effect (2)	69
8.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Numbers of Students Enrolled in their Courses	71
9.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Institution	71

•

Table		Page
10.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Major Field	73
11.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Time Devoted to Administration	73
12.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Income Earned at the Institutions	75
13.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Income Earned outside the Institutions	75
14.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Marital Status	76
15.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the <u>SRS</u>	77
16.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Attitudes toward Banning Students' Political Activities	79
17.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Political Effect (2)	79
18.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and Major Field	81
19.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and the <u>SRS</u> Scores	82
20.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and the	
	rollical Effect (1)	84

• •-

Table		Page
21.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and the Political Effect (2)	85
22.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to 23 Demographic Items	131
23.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Opinions upon Higher Education Issues	134
24.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the JDI Scores of Univeristy Professors Grouped According to 23 Demographic Items	135
25.	One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Opinions upon Higher Education Issues	138
26.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Major Field	140
27.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Dogmatism Scores of Univeristy Professors Grouped According to Sex	140
28.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the <u>SRS</u> Scores	141
29.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Attitudes toward Banning Students' Political Activities	141
30.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Political Effect (1)	142

.

Tab1e		Page
31.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Political Effect (2)	142
32.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Numbers of Students Enrolled in Their Courses	143
33.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Institution	143
34.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Major Field	144
35.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Time Devoted to Administration	144
36.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Income Earned at the Institution	. 145
37.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Income Earned outside the Institution	145
38.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Marital Status	146
39	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to <u>SRS</u> Scores	146
40.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Attitudes toward Banning Students'	1.4.7
41.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped	147
	According to the rollicat Effect (1)	14/

.

.

Table	r	Page
42.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and Major Field	148
43.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and the <u>SRS</u> Scores	149
44.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and the Political Effect (1)	150
45.	Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and the Political Effect (2)	151

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	The Normative and Personal Dimesnions of Social Behavior	7
2,	An illustration of the Cultural Dimension of Behavior in a Social System	24

#### CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

### Background of the Problem

Interest in the study of college faculty and students surged upward in the 1960's with the renewal of a campus political activism. Protests and demonstrations seemingly enveloped American higher education in the late sixties as a reaction to the United States' involvement in the Vietnam War (Ladd & Lipset, 1975). The wave of student unrest which started on the Berkeley campus of the University of California in 1964 spread rapidly to country after country- to Berlin, Amsterdam, the London School of Economics and Essex, to Rome and Turin, to Madrid, to Prague, and to Paris (Embling, 1974). Before the Vietnam era, systematic inquiry into academic life had been mostly neglected by social scientists. Now after a decade of turmoil on campuses world wide, much is being written. However, from a critical survey of literature, noticeably few of the researchers have dealt with the characteristics and behaviors of professors. Understanding politics and student unrest in universities requires taking into account the academic staff (Saha, 1976). Richardson and Blocker (1966) also believed there is still a need to take a closer look at college faculty and learn more about their behavior.

Furthermore, most of the research was done in the United States

and other industrial countries like England, West Germany, the Netherlands, and Australia, where the cultural and environmental factors as well as the tradition of higher education have considerably limited the generalizability of conceptual knowledge to other countries with different backgrounds. For example, in 1969 from the <u>Carnegie Commission Survey of Student and</u> <u>Faculty Opinion</u>, it was found that liberal professors with considerably low authoritarianism were the most satisfied in their academic profession. The researcher doubts that the same questionnaire would yield the same or comparable results if it were administered to professors in a society where the social setting was not as comparatively low in authoritarianism as the colleges and universities of the United States.

### Statement of the Problem

The problem of this research was: What are the interactions of dogmatism and selected variables (such as major fields, self-perceived social responsibilities, and perceived political effects) upon job satisfaction of university professors in Thailand?

More specifically, the researcher investigated the following:

 Are there different levels of dogmatism of university professors in Thailand grouped according to personal characteristics, levels of perceived social responsibilities, and attitudes toward higher education issues?

2. Are there different levels of job satisfaction of university professors in Thailand grouped according to personal characteristics, levels of perceived social responsibilities, and attitudes toward higher education issues?

3. Are there interactions of dogmatism and selected variables (such as major field, self-perceived social responsibilities, and perceived political effects) upon job satisfaction of university professors in Thailand?

#### Definition of Terms

<u>Dogmatism</u>. The term refers to the characteristics of a person's belief-disbelief system as closed; namely, the extent to which the person cannot receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, being encumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside. Synonyms: closed-mindedness, general authoritarianism, general intolerance.

Job satisfaction. The term refers to the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values. Job dissatisfaction is the nonpleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as frustrating or blocking the attainment of one's job values or as entailing disvalues. Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering or entailing (Locke, 1969, p. 316).

Universities. In Thailand, they are universities and equivalent institutions under the supervision of the Office of University Affairs. They are all degree granting and comprehensive institutions offering programs, graduate as well as undergraduate, in various disciplines (Office of the National Education Commission, 1977, p. 11). Synonym: government universities. University professors. The term refers to professional employees who held academic appointments at the universities. This includes professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors. The term excludes teaching assistants and teachers from university demonstration schools. Synonyms: faculty members, university teacher, academics.

## Significance of the Study

While researchers have provided some literature about higher education in the industrial and affluent societies, they have ignored the agrarian and less affluent societies with different cultural backgrounds. It has been apparent that universities are having an increasingly important role in the third world countries in their social, economic, and political development. However, there is such limited conceptual knowledge about academic personnel that it is difficult to establish realistic administrative planning. Assuming that all academics, regardless of their environmental background, have similar characteristics and behaviors is not only incorrect but may lead to the same kind of failure that colonialists introduced to their colonies (Carnoy, 1974). This study of Thai university professors' dogmatism and their social and organizational behaviors is another step in linking the mainstream of knowledge in higher education from affluent societies to others.

In addition, the researcher hopes that the study will suggest how the external constraints such as political atmosphere affect the academic environment in Thailand. It is expected that the study will furnish some valuable data for the parties concerned which may result in

identifying more clearly the role of the university professor in a changing society.

Limitations of the Study

 The study was limited due to the cultural and situational factors. It was conducted while the political situation in Thailand was uncertain. One of the researcher's intentions was to evaluate how extensive the effect of political and social events was upon university professors.

2. The respondents in this study were university professors from selected universities and equivalent institutions within the vicinity of Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City. Though the respondents were randomly selected, it was probable that some faculty members were absent when the questionnaire was administered. Absentees might include a number of faculty who left the institutions for political reasons.

3. Conclusions drawn in this study were within the limits of the items comprising the questionnaire. Especially the Dogmatism Scale utilized in the study evaluated general authoritarianism rather than political attitudes of the left or right.

4. The study had an exploratory design. The researcher intended to use the results of the study as a point of departure for further development of the instruments on organizational behavior for use in future research.

#### CHAPTER II

#### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH

The theoretical framework for this study is primarily based on the social system model developed by Getzels and Guba (1957). The model serves as a basis for describing university professors, their personalities, roles, and organizational behaviors.

By the term "social system" Parsons (1951, pp. 204-205) meant:

... a process of complementary interaction of two or more individual actors in which each conforms with the expectations of the other(s) in such a way that alter's reactions to ego's actions are positive sanctions which serve to reinforce his given need-dispositions and thus to fulfill his given expectations.

This definition can be clearly illustrated by utilizing the social system model (Figure 1). Getzels and Guba (1957) explained that observed or social behavior within a social system is always a function of the interaction between two dimensions, (1) the normative dimensions of behavior and (2) the personal dimension of behavior.

The normative dimension consists of institution, role, and role expectation, each being the analytic unit for the term preceding. The personal dimension consists of individual, personality, and need disposition, each term again serving as the analytic unit for the term preceding it. A given act is conceived as deriving simultaneously from the normative and personal dimensions, and social or organizational





Figure 1 The normative and personal dimensions of social behavior (From J. W. Getzels & E. G. Guba, Social behavior and the administrative process. <u>School Review</u>, 1957, <u>65</u>, pp. 423-441).

behavior in a social system as a function of the interaction between role and personality. Getzels (1957) provided the following equation which were used in this study.

- B = f (R X P), where
- B = observed behavior,
- R = institutional role, and
- P = personality of the role incumbent

The "observed behavior" was mainly determined by university professors' job satisfaction. The "institutional role" was described as how various groups and individuals expect individuals in the role of university professors to behave. Finally, personalities of the role incumbents were evaluated and illustrated by university professors' demographic data, levels of dogmatism, social responsibility, and opinions upon higher education.

The literature was organized according to the social system model. It was divided into four major parts. The first part concerns the normative dimension of university as a social system. It explains characteristics and goals of university in a modern world and how they impose expectations upon the role of university professors. The second is about the personal dimension of the university. It describes individuals assuming the role of university professors, provides a rationale and related research supporting dogmatism as a major determinant of university professor's personalities, and evaluates other demographic variables that may be significant in the study. The third explains how the interaction of the institutional and personal dimensions create organizational behavior, and how role-personality conflict or congruence may result. The fourth examines the cultural and situational dimensions of the study, the role of university professors as determined by culture as well as situations and how role conflicts may result. The last evaluates various variables · that may concern the study.

#### The Normative Dimension

#### The University as an Institution

Institution, according to Etzioni (1964, p. 2) is one of many synonyms for the term, organization. He regarded institution as a term that has various meanings:

> Institution is sometimes used to refer to certain types of organization, either quite respectable ones as in "GM is an institution," or quite unrespectable ones, as in "He is in an institution." Sometimes institution refers to a quite different phenomenon- namely, to a normative principle that culturally defines behavior such as marriage or property.

Hertzler (1929, p. 7) also found the term referring to 25 different meanings. However, Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell (1968, pp. 56-59) insisted on using the word to discriminate the meaning as the normative side of organization. In their framework, institutions have at least five basic properties. They are, (1) purposive, (2) peopled, (3) structural, (4) normative, and (5) sanction-bearing. University as an institution possesses all of these properties which can be illustrated as follows:

The purposes of the university. Universities, like other social systems, are established to carry out certain goals. However, due to diversified characteristics of universities in the modern world, they cannot be described as clearly as other types of organizations. Cohen and March (1974, p. 3) stated that the American college or university "... does not know what it is doing. Its goals are either vague or in dispute." Dodd (1962, pp. 6-8) explained the reason for its lack of objectives, "A true university like most marriages is a unity of diversities." No matter how diverse the goals of university are, some certain purposes can be agreed upon.

Baldridge (1971, pp. 118-123) focused on a large urban university in the development of his political model of university governance. By analyzing the results of the faculty senate survey on that university's goals, he found the most important 9 goals to be as follows: (1) teaching graduate students, (2) teaching undergraduates, (3) research, (4) maintenance of university conditions attractive to excellent scholars, (5) enhancement of the reputation of the university, (6) maintenance of a scholarly atmosphere, (7) preservation of the cultural heritage, (8) application of knowledge to like situations, and (9) solution of problems of great national and international concern. These goals are generalized and it can be fairly said that many universities do share some or all of these.

Ladd and Lipset (1975) believed that generally a university has three functions:

... socialization, in the sense of the transmission of traditional values, whether secular or religious; innovation and scholarship, the support for creative intellectuals in the sciences, humanities, and social sciences who are concerned with advancing the frontiers of knowledge and artistic work; and community service, the application of the knowledge and skills concentrated in the university to achieve objectives set by lay powers, including both government and private institutions (pp. 10-11).

In Thailand, though goals of the university are not clearly written and difficult to pursue, they do not deviate much from the universalistic tendencies of teaching, research and community services. With only one exception, the university is regarded as a conservative agent. A fourth goal, preserving cultural and art heritage for the society, is added.

<u>The university and its people</u>. "If institutions are to carry out their function, human agents are required" (Getzels <u>et al.</u>, 1968, p. 57). A university, like most complex organizations, requires various types of personnel in order to perform its functions. These personnel are such as administrators, academic personnel, specialists, and others who perform maintenance, clerical, food-service, and transportation tasks. However, this study was concentrated only on academic personnel such as professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors.

The structure of the university. Scott and Mitchell (1972, p. 40) defined structure as a term which is applied to the relationships that exist among the various activities performed in a organization. The purpose of structure is to provide an orderly arrangement among functions so the objectives of the organization can be accomplished effectively. Structure implies system and pattern. Etzioni (1964, p. 3) referred to structure as divisions of labor, power, and communication responsibilities. He stated, "... divisions which are not randomly or traditionally patterned, but deliberately planned to enhance the realization of specific goals;...." If the goals of the institution are known, the tasks to achieve them may be specified and organized into relevant roles. Each role is assigned certain responsibilities and concomitant resources including authority for implementing the tasks. In the case of university's organization, because of the diversified and rather anarchic characteristics of modern universities, it is a problem to describe and understand them (Cohen & March, 1974). Corson (1975) commented that it would be misleading to conclude that a university is organized like a corporation or a governmental agency, or even a hospital. Goheen (1969), former president of Princeton University, had a similar opinion, "A university is a loose and peculiar association of persons, assembled for the pursuit of knowledge and understanding ..." (pp. 4-5).

From the beginning of the western world universities have persistently resisted pressures (Goheen, 1969). Unlike the business enterprise, the government bureau, and the military forces which are held together as organizations by an authoritarian system of rules and processes, Clark (1967) believed that a university has been held together rather by shared beliefs, attitudes, and values. Definitely, its loose structure and unique characteristics have an effect upon the role of its academic personnel which will be discussed later.

The university as a normative institution. The fact that tasks for achieving the institutional goals are organized into prescribed roles implies that the roles serve as norms for the behavior of the role incumbents. A norm, according to Bertrand's (1972, p. 34) definition,

means required or acceptable behavior for a given interactional situation. Norms provide standards for behaving as well as standard for judging behavior. University professors, under no exception, must behave in more or less expected ways if they are to retain their legitimate place in a university.

The university and its sanction-bearing nature. The existence of norms is of no consequence unless there is adherence to them. Getzels, et al. (1968, p. 59) stated, "accordingly, institutions must have at their disposal appropriate positive and negative sanctions for insuring compliance, at least within broad limits." Compliance (Etzioni, 1961, p. 3) refers both to "... a relation in which an actor behaves in accordance with a directive supported by another actor's power, and to the orientation of the subordinated actor to the power applied." In a strict sense, every member of a social system has some authority. Baldridge (1971, pp. 151-163) inquired about the resources available to a partisan group of a university- the weapons it can muster to create compliance. He believed four power bases are critical in university politics: bureaucratic, professional, coercive, and personal. Bureaucratic resources may be used by administrators against university professors, such as control of the budget, personnel appointment and removal, the control of legitimate access, and the control of information. University professors, in the reverse direction, can have two important resources of power, such as professional and personal resources. They have their own influence based on the authority of knowledge which others lack, and others allow this influence because they believe that university professors have information they lack. This kind of knowledge, along with personal reputation will

enhance their personal power. There are few cases reported which suggest that academic personnel use coercive power effectively. Students, in the long history of the university of the modern world, seem to be the most frequent utilizers of such power. Furthermore, external partisans may use this coercive power in the university's sanction. For example, the government of a country may order police or national troops to arrest student demonstrators on campus and Marxist-oriented professors wherever they are found.

These kinds of power of all partisans will cause individuals in the role of university professor to comply with the role expectations.

#### The Role of University Teachers

Parsons (1951, pp. 38-39) defined a role as,

... a sector of the total orientation system of an individual actor which is organized about expectations in relation to a particular interaction contest, that is integrated with a particular set of value-standard which govern interaction with one or more alters in the appropriate complimentary role.

Bertrand (1972, p. 35) believed that,

Roles are the second structural unit of social system and consist of a more or less integrated subset of norms. In other words, a role is made up of several related norms, all of which are dedicated to the same function. Roles are thus supportive of social institutions, such as religion, education or the family.

In relation to goals of a university, a role of the university professor may be universally and professionally defined according to Ladd and Lipset (1975) as having three subroles. The first may be identified largely with the professor's role as teacher, the second may be seen in the academic's role as scholar, scientist, or creative artist, and the

third, in the role of consultant or as applied researcher. These functions, among other things, have put some special demands upon the academic Harrison and Weightman (1974) believed that these demands are personnel. not for conformity and acceptance but for rigorous scrutiny and criticism. Blau (1973) believed that the academic standing of institutions of higher education as well as that of individual faculty members depends on their contributions to research and scholarship. Their creative endeavors to provide new insights are so important that they lead the university to accept the paradoxical responsibility to find ways to institutionalize creative scholarship and research. Furthermore, he pointed out that to provide the atmosphere necessary for creativity and scholarship a university cannot rely on conformity to bureaucratic procedure (p. 190). Corson (1975) noted that not only the university but society as well has recognized the function of the university and the non-conforming characteristics of those having the title of professor. So it has accorded to those who perform their duties certain protections that influence the structure and processes of the college and university. Those protections are customarily summed up in the term " academic freedom"the guarantee of freedom of expression and inquiry. This may be in such forms as tenure systems, administrative autonomy, and faculty senates.

#### The Personal Dimension

To understand the specific behavior and social interaction of a particular role incumbent it is necessary to understand the nature of individuals as "flesh and blood" inhabiting the roles, and their modes of perceiving and reacting to the expectations. The individual dimension

can be broken down into component elements of personality and needdispositions.

### Personality

Personality is one of those terms which is seldom defined in exactly the same way by any two authorities (Horton & Hunt, 1976, p. 81). Fromm (1947, pp. 58-59) stated, "The infinite diversity of personlities is in itself characteristic of human existence." Yinger (1965, p. 141) defined personality as, "the totality of behavior of an individual with a given tendency system interacting with a sequence of situation." Bertrand (1972, pp. 5-6) provided a similar definition. From the definitions, it can be seen that human differences such as age, sex, race, and other physical attributes are linked to capacities, drive, and self-conceptions to form personality. These kinds of physical and psychological qualities are characteristic of one individual and make the individual unique. It can also be stated that no two people can have exactly the same personality (Bertrand, 1972, p. 6).

Buhler, Goldstein, Maslow, and other leading psychologists pointed out that personality is not the mere sum of our feelings, volitions, instincts, and conceptions. Laszlo (1969, p. 32) stated:

> Whether we admit that there is such a thing as a subconscious or not, we must admit that we do not possess, say, the capacity to love independently of the capacity to reason, to will, or to worry. All such traits of our personality interact and constitute and integrated "personality syndrome" which acts as a whole and has properties as a whole. This is what we call "my personality" or simply "me".

Finally, Getzels, <u>et al</u>. (1968, p. 70) gave a way to conceptualize personality as follows:

Just as role may be defined by the component expectations, so personality may be defined by the component need-dispositions.

Of course, besides need-dispositions, there are other components significant in determining personality, such as drives, attitudes, interests, perceptual styles, cognitive ability, and belief system. For the purpose of the study, the most often cited need-dispositions in the. social system model were substituted by belief system, attitudes, and opinions.

### Dogmatism as a Major Determinant of University Professors' Personalities

The Dogmatism Scale as a measure of a person's belief system can be significantly contributive to studying personalities of university professors. Rokeach (1954) defined dogmatism as,

> (a) a relatively closed cognitive organization of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, (b) organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority which, in turn, (c) provides a framework for patterns of intolerance ... toward others (p. 195).

From various research, dogmatism was found to relate to many other components of personality. Dogmatism definitely cannot be a measure of the totality of personality, but it has proved to be one of the major personality determinants. The following is the research on dogmatism and authoritarianism that can provide rational support for the main hypothesis of this study.

Compared with low dogmatics, high dogmatics are more anxious (Rokeach, 1960). Rokeach and Restle (1960) wrote that closed-minded or highly dogmatic individuals tend to believe that "the world one lives in or the situation one is in at a particular moment is a threatening one" (p. 56). They also have difficulty and take longer to reach a solution in solving complex problems. This was substantiated by Fillenbaum and Jackson (1961) and (Kemp, 1961; 1962). Robins and Rogers (1975) found an inverse relationship between dogmatism and study time among 11-12th graders. They explained that individuals who are closed-minded have trouble accepting new beliefs or attitudes in social, political, religious, and ethnic differences. This aspect of "closed-mindedness" is what people commonly refer to as a "know-it-all" attitude. Higginbotham (1976) found that dogmatism relates to anxiety as well as irrationality. This was congruent with a previous study done by Norman (1966) involving college women.

High dogmatics tend to overidealize and rely heavily on authority (Vidulich & Kaiman, 1961; Kemp, 1963; McCarthy & Johnson, 1962; Norris, 1965; Direnzo, 1967; Steffensmeier, 1974). Bord (1976), among the latest supporters, found that designated authorities who failed to behave in an authoritative manner were evaluated less favorably by high dogmatics than by low dogmatics. Bord believed the results indicated that dogmatism is a general defense mechanism, with reliance-on-authority functioning to reduce anxiety. This confirmed the previous studies of Rokeach (1960) and Vachhiano, et all (1968). Terhune's (1964) study indicated that highly dogmatic individuals tend to accept group conformity and to value reinforcement by group thinking. Cummings (1975), in studying political ideology and behavior, found that the closed-minded segment of the citizenry is more likely than the open-minded segment not only to resist institutional and policy change but also to support authoritative policies which curtail socio-political deviancy, and serve to perpetuate existing institutions. Renuart (1974) found similar results among the

secondary school teacher population. Steffensmeier (1976), from investigating the relationship between dogmatism and social distance attitudes toward hippies, found that dogmatic persons are generally intolerant of those who hold belief systems different from their own. This was substantiated in Lorentz's (1972) study investigating attitudes toward marijuana.

Jamias and Troldahl (1965) found a -.40 correlation between dogmatism and innovation in a social system where the value for innovation was low. But in a social system where the value for innovation was high the correlation between dogmatism and innovation was only -.09. They concluded that highly dogmatic individuals living in social systems with a high value for innovation will adopt new recommendations more readily than highly dogmatic individuals in social systems having low value for innovation. However, low dogmatic individuals have a relatively high adoption rate regardless of the social system.

Research findings on the relationship between level of dogmatism, and intellectual ability showed much inconsistency (Zagona & Zurcher, 1965). The variability in research findings seemed to be a product of how various researchers operationally defined cognitive ability. That is to say, psychologists did not agree on how to best estimate cognitive ability (Guilford, 1967; Wesman, 1968). Some researchers assumed that cognitive ability is best reflected by the ability to learn. With recognition of this difinition as a basis for measurement, consistently negative relationships were found between dogmatism and cognitive ability (Adams & Vidulich, 1962; Costin, 1965; Ehrlich, 1961; Frumkin, 1961; Rebhun, 1966). But when scores on group administered intelligence tests were used as the index of cognitive ability, no consistent relationship appeared (Christensen, 1963; Ehrlich, 1955; Rokeach, 1960; Zagona & Zurcher, 1965).

Interestingly, when Uhes and Shavers (1970) introduced convergentdivergent operations as the intervening factors, they found that their subjects, high school students with low dogmatism, had superior fluency, flexibility, origniality, and composite divergent ability scores as compared to highly dogmatic students. Mean scores on flexibility, originality, composite divergent, and composite covergent abilities tests were higher for low dogmatic students in homogenious populations in terms of general intelligence. Highly dogmatic students performed convergent operations better than they performed divergent operations, while low dogmatic subjects performed both operations equally well.

Finally, Vacchiano, Strauss, and Schiffman (1968) provided perhaps the most conclusive description of dogmatic individuals as ones who seem to have a need to receive support, encouragement, and understanding from others; intolerance for understanding to feelings and motives of others; and an avoidance in changing their environment or daily routine. Dogmatic subjects lack self-esteem, are doubtful about their own self-worth, are anxious, lack self satisfaction, are non-committal and defensive, and are dissatisfied with their behavior, their physical state, their own personal worth, and their adequacy. Personality maladjestment and instability seem to underlie dogmatism. Dogmatic subjects are low in ego strength, frustrated by changeable conditions, submissive and conforming, restrained, diffident, timid, tense, impatient, and conservative in respect to establishments. In regard to theirconservatism, the dogmatic subjects are confident in what they have been taught to believe, they accept the tried and true despite inconsistencies, and

are cautious and compromising in regard to new ideas, generally going along with tradition.

## Dynamics of Role-Personality Interaction

In order to support the rationale of the study, the researcher employed the concept of role-personality conflict.

Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly (1973, p. 274) stated that rolepersonality conflict "occurs when role requirements violate the basic values, attitudes, and needs of the individual occupying the position." From the literature, it is apparent that with a high level of dogmatism in their belief system, individuals will find their personalities conflicting with the role expectations of university professors. With this kind of personality tendency, it is hard for highly dogmatic university professors to exist in an institution where conformity, authority and conservatism are not highly valued. They would have a difficult time adjusting themselves to tolerate diversified ideas and opinions from their colleagues and students. Without much confidence in themselves, lacking either self-acceptance or self-satisfaction, they doubt their ability to perform their tasks effectively or be satisfied in their jobs.

However, there is limited research directly supporting the relationship between dogmatism and job satisfaction. Nevertheless, the following research deals with the relationship of dogmatism or authoritarianism to various aspects of organizational behaviors which indirectly supports the rationale as well as suggests how the study should be conducted and what aspects should be considered.

Reported research has illustrated the significant relationship between dogmatism and performance. Among college students, Ehrlich (1961) revealed that dogmatism and achievement in an introductory sociology course were negatively related. Christensen (1963) used an essay test as a criterion but found no relationship between dogmatism and achievement. Kemp (1966) illustrated that highly dogmatic students had lower scores on measures of critical thinking than did the low dogmatics. Steininger (1970) also found similar evidence that low dogmatic students tended to have better grade point averages and <u>SAT</u> scores than the highly dogmatic students.

The same nature of relationship was found among older subjects. Victor (1976), introducing field dependence/independence as other intervening factors found that neither dogmatism nor field independence alone predicted the job performance, but the interaction between the two variables significantly predicted the criterion. Among 50 master's level students in an intern training program for teachers of emotionally disturbed children, the field dependent/highly dogmatic person was chosen less often by his peers as competent, while the field independent/low dogmatic person was chosen more often by his peers. Funk and Carters (1971) study, using simple correlation, found only a slight negative relationship (Gamma = -.19) among adult educator subjects. Steffre, King, and Leafgren's study (1962) showed that counselors most chosen by their peers as competent were among the low dogmatics.

Research has been reported substantiating the relationship between dogmatism and interpersonal relationships. Rosenfeld and Nauman (1969) found that dogmatic women in the dormitory situation became

increasingly negatively evaluated by their peers. Yet, dogmatic subjects were able to maintain contact with their peers by initiating most of the interaction because of their interpersonal style, particularly their insensitivity to negative receptions.

There has also been research done by students from the school of "Contigency Approach" to administrative science (Dressler, 1973; Sadler, 1970; Tosi, 1973; Vroom, 1959) who investigated subordinates' authoritarianism and the nature of their job satisfaction. However, most researchers introduced other interactional variables such as types of leadership task or administrative styles. Schuler (1976), among the latest researchers of the school, found that participation was satisfying to low authoritarian subordinates regardless of the degree of the task repetitiveness but was satisfying to high authoritarian subordinates only on tasks with low repetitiveness.

These findings, however, imply that studying the relationship between dogmatism and job satisfaction will not be effective or yield enlightening results unless some interplaying variables are seriously considered. More directly, the study should be conducted to find the interaction of dogmatism and selected variables upon job satisfaction.

The following review of literature suggests that variables related to the cultural and situational dimensions have some significant probabilities of intervening the study.

### Cultural and Situational Dimensions

#### Dogmatism as Determined by Culture

In the previously reviewed literature, open-mindedness was found

to represent a higher level of functioning than closed-mindedness. The open-minded individual was described in the literature as flexible, tolerant of new ideas and changing conditions, efficient, more theoryoriented, adaptable, energetic, outgoing and enterprising, forceful, and not particularly anxious. However, Vande Loo's (1975) view was different. Vande Loo saw open-mindedness as a reflection of a person's adaptation to social force, particularly to contemporary technological society. Fromm (1955), Toffler (1970), Ellul (1964), Mumford (1966), Halberstam (1972), Maccoby (1976) and others commented on the emergence of such values as adaptability, efficiency, detachment, rational intellectual functioning, teamwork and winning, and the ability to sell oneself and one's ideas in the technological society, then those qualities mentioned above in the description of the openminded person become functionally adaptive.

In regarding the society as a social system and using Parsons' (1951) explanation, it can be said that the role-expectations of a citizen in an affluent society do require a low level of dogmatism or authoritarianism in order to function effectively in the system. However, this may not be the case for the less affluent or agrarian society. While there were numerous studies supporting the relationship between dogmatism or authoritarianism and anxiety or neuroticism, Mehryar (1970) found no evidence supporting the implicit association between the two. Noticeably, Mehryar's subjects were from students attending a university in Iran where the general population was considerably authoritarian while the other researchers drew their subjects from a more openminded environment, mostly in the United States. Vande Loo (1975) also concluded that openmindedness
does not necessarily represent a higher, more healthy and productive level of functioning. It reflects an adaptation to the social, economic, and cultural conditions of an affluent, technological, marketing.

## The Role of University Professors as Determined by Culture

In studying the organizational behavior of academic personnel within a university, the external environment, though it is often neglected, is one of the most important factors to consider.

Parsons (1951) observed that "a fundamental principal about the organization of living systems is that their structures are differentiated in regard to the various exigencies imposed upon them by their environment" (p. 8). Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell (1968) stated that the expectations from behavior in a given institution not only derive from the requirements of the social system of which the institution is a part, but also are related to the values of the culture and the environment which is the context for the particular social system (see Figure 3).



Figure 3 An illustration of the cultural dimension of behavior in a social system. From Getzels et al. (1968, p. 105).

In any society and culture, there are always constraints that the environment places on the university or college (Richman & Farmer, 1974). In the United States, though the university has maintained a great deal of autonomy in administration, the constraints are apparently from various groups and organizations. For example,

> ... athletic rules are in part imposed by the relevant conferences; the state legislature imposes money constraints and legal sanctions; the federal government states in its research grants how the money is to be used; private donors give gifts under various conditions (p. 73).

In Thailand where the political culture has not yet been fully developed and political participation is considerably low, the public administration is centralized and in the hands of a few ruling groups. The central government appears to be the major source of constraint on the public universities.

Because of different culture and environment, universities are variously organized. As Goheen (1969) illustrated,

> One can point to the oligarchic self-governance enjoyed by the professors in European countries, or the monarchical presidencies that appeared in certain late nineteenth century American institutions, or to the many forms of academic organization to be found on today's campuses- none quite like the other (p. 7).

Thailand is no exception. With its own unique history of higher education, universities have always been the bureaucratic agents of the government. In the United States and other affluent countries, it is known that colleges have a liberalizing effect on young people (Feldman & Newcomb, 1969). To a much stronger degree, universities in Thailand have been suspected of being the political hotbed of the lefts or the ruling cliques' opponents. It is understandable that the establishment has always been observant regarding the university affairs of most campuses. In the past, the university rectors were among the highest ranking members of the ruling groups, which included premiers, vice premiers, ministers, and sometimes, the Secretary of the Police Department (equivalent to the FBI director in the United States).

The role of university professor in Thailand seems to be in conflict. Universally, like most university professors all over the world, they are expected to be innovative, scholastic, and in some areas, to provide social criticism. On the other hand, locally, as governmental bureaucrats, who are subjected to direct and indirect sanctions from the general public as well as ruling groups, they are expected to perpetuate conformity among their students and colleagues. Apparently, their professional expectations can hardly be congruent with the role of bureaucrats or "hands" of the establishments. This, according to Parsons' (1951) explanation, is called "role conflict" which means,

> ... the exposure of the actor to conflicting sets of legitimized role expectations such that complete fulfillment of both is realistically impossible.

Parsons further explained that it is necessary to compromise, that is, to sacrifice at least some of both sets of expectations, or to choose one alternative and sacrifice the other. In any case the actors, the university professors, are exposed to negative sanctions. Exposure to role conflict is an obvious source of strain and frustration in that it creates a situation "incompatible with a harmonious integration of personality with the interaction system" (Parsons, 1951, p. 282). So it is concluded that university professors in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand, who are exposed to the role-conflict situation will have

more frustration in their jobs. That means they will have a lower level of job satisfaction than the others.

However, not all university professors are exposed to the same level of such role conflict. Among all fields of teaching and specialization, social sciences, especially economics and political sciences, are the ones most likely subjected to the role conflict (Ladd & Lipset, 1975).

The cultural impact not only creates role conflict, but may cause role-personality conflicts also. Opinions upon their teaching and higher education in general may be influential factors. Campbell (1958) found that teachers at the grade school level, with a low degree of self-role conflict in the teaching situation, rate themselves higher in teaching satisfaction. University professors who have opinions about their teaching and higher education conflicting with the expectations of the ruling groups may be found expressing a low level of job satisfaction.

## The Situational Dimension

To perform social research in a society that has so much uncertainty in its politics like Thailand, the researcher has to regard political happenings as a significant factor of the study. Since the 1932 Revolution which brought an end to the absolute monarchy, the country has been plagued by coups d' etat and power seizures by the military. The "Student Revolution" (Zimmerman, 1974) of October 14, 1973, brought a change to Thailand's political history by, at least, wresting the power from the military establishment. In the process a new pattern of politics has been created and the Thai political equation is unlikely to ever be the same again. Among the higher education circuits, universities in

Thailand have benefited from their greater role in the national economic and social development since the early 1970's. The greatly increased student population required more and better educated personnel and eventually resulted in relaxing the rigid centralization. Universities have gradually gained autonomy in their own affairs, but this cannot be compared to the change after the "Student Revolution" which marked the highest point in the evolution of university administration. The political pressure from the leftists, liberals, and constitutional democrats forced the universities to change their administrative styles. Some administrators, known for their paternalistic behaviors, were ousted. The faculty, along with students, gained much more power in university affairs. The election system was introduced to many campuses replacing the old process of selecting important administrators such as rectors, deans, and department heads. Political pressure seemed to change the university administration from the bureaucratic model to the "collegium" or perhaps the "anarchic model" during the three years after the "Student Revolution." Though the internal conflicts ran high, many led to constructive solutions such as the creation of faculty senates and "due process" in disciplinary administration. During this period, university professors enjoyed great academic freedom. The elected civilian governments, either wanting to show their open-mindedness in a democratic fashion or being busy in political turbulence, did not interfere with the university administration.

On October 6, 1976, the political unrest ended, at least in the metropolitan area, as well as the experiment in democracy. The National Administrative Reform Council, composed of high ranking military officers, staged another coup d' etat. To many foreign observers as well as Thai

liberal sectors, the return of authoritarian military rule was a disappointing setback in the long and painful struggle toward some form of democracy. But to the rightists or conservative groups, it brought a sigh of relief, and the end of increasing political instability and "incipient anarchy" (Darling, 1977). However, universities had to pay their tolls for this external occurrence. Some prominent professors. including a rector, fled abroad. Some new rules and policies were imposed upon teaching in sensitive fields such as political sciences and economics. University professors, by order from the Office of University Affairs, were to follow the new guidelines carefully in teaching in such areas. Any violation might result in imprisionent or other form of disciplinary action for the charge of being "dangerous to society" or "communist instigators." However, this period, as termed by some observers the "Witch Hunt Era," did not last long. The civil government backed by the military establishment was becoming more and more alienated from even their own supporters. Finally, on October 20, 1977, the same group of military officers that supported the civil cabinet staged another coup d' etat and ended one of the most repressive periods of the country.

During this period it can be explained that the role of university professors as the arm of the establishment was revitalized while the role of researchers, innovators, and social critiques was suppressed.

## Consideration of the Other Variables as Related to the Study

Besides the cultural and situational dimensions already discussed previously, there are still other variables worth consideration for study. They are: (1) rank and appointment, (2) nature of work and work load,

(3) institutional characteristics, (4) education, (5) years of experience,
(6) teaching vs. research orientations, (7) income, (8) marital status
and number of children, (9) age, and (10) sex. These will be discussed
in the subsequent sections.

#### Rank and Appointment

Lichtman (1970) studied correlation of the organizational rank in a group of government employees and found that significant differences existed in job satisfaction by rank, and that the higher the rank, the higher the level of job satisfaction. Sprague's (1974) research indicated that among the faculty members at a large state university in the United States, tenured members were significantly more satisfied with their work and their pay than non-tenured members.

In Thailand where most university professors tend to be more localistic and bureaucratic, and less research-oriented than professors of most large state universities in the United States, rank seems to be a major determinant of job satisfaction. The higher the academic rank one has, the higher will be job satisfaction.

#### The Nature of Work and Work Load

Cohen's (1972) study of working efficiency illustrated that the faster the work pace, the poorer the performance. Athan and McCord (1973) found that, at a newly established teaching hospital in California, 77 percent of employees and 85 percent of administrators favored some form of reduced workweek schedules if it did not reduce their income. Work load seems to be an indicator of job satisfaction in most organizations if other factors are held constant. Some indicators of work load of university professors can be identified as (1) hours spent in formal instruction, and (2) total number of students at all levels enrolling in their courses. In the university system in Thailand, teaching load is usually standardized and distributed among teaching staff. Some staff have less or no teaching mostly because of these reasons; (1) assuming administrative positions, (2) doing research, (3) being newcomers and not yet assigned teaching jobs, and (4) serving the government in other capacities, mainly as consultants and committee members.

Besides their teaching load, the nature of their work may determine university professors' job satisfaction as well. In most universities, the prestige and challenge of working with advanced students seems to be a major source of job satisfaction among qualified faculty members (Blau, 1973, p. 90). Sprague's (1974) study was also found to be supportive of this statement. It indicated that faculty who were full members of the graduate faculty were more satisfied with promotion than those faculty who were associated members or not members of the graduate faculty.

## Institutional Differences

Though all institutions selected for the study share similar characteristics, they do have differences deserving consideration. Among all universities in Thailand, Thammasat University was apparently most affected by the political events. During the first week of October, 1976 its campus was occupied by thousands of student demonstrators. On October 6, 1976 at least 30 casualities were the result of police raids, and rightists' retaliation; several hundreds were wounded, and approximately

3,000 demonstrators were arrested (Nations, 1976). All took place on the Thammasat University's campus. This university was the last to reopen after the incident. Its faculty members were most affected. The student-elected rector fled abroad while his close associates were demoralized by the organizational shake-up, internal conflict, and close observation from the secret agents. It is assumed that the Thammasat faculty members would have lower job satisfaction than others.

## Education

The education of university professors can be classified into at least three different aspects such as: (1) years of educational training, (2) field of the educational training, and (3) location of the educational training.

In Thailand, years of training or earning advanced degrees, especially doctoral degrees, is not just considered on the basis of its functional value; it is equated with prestige as well. Dhirabegin's (1973, pp. 29-30) study indicated that now a doctorate has become a status symbol as much as the title of the <u>Sakti Na</u> system (the privilege of land holding according to the aristocratic hierarchy) of the absolute monarchy era. It pointed out that among Thai bureaucratic elites, there is a strong relationship between the level of education of the elite and political attitudes- the more educated, the more liberal. Among various studies of dogmatism, it is often found that level of education is negatively related to dogmatism. It is concluded that years of educational experience not only indicate the level of job satisfaction but also the level of dogmatism.

Field of educational training was found to relate to dogmatism and job satisfaction. An early study on occupational membership and dogmatism by Kemp (1957) showed that people with a closed, or dogmatic belief system, concentrate on commercial pursuits, lean toward military careers, and enter administrative fields. Open, or less dogmatic, subjects pursue occupations such as medicine, ministry, social work, psychology, occupational therapy, and teaching. Hansen and Johansson(1974, pp. 196-201) found persons with closed or dogmatic systems congregated on conventional and realistic occupations that are preferred by those who are rigid and dominant, who avoid abstract thought, and who work in technical, skilled trades or computational occupations. Non-dogmatic persons with open belief systems entered artistic and investigative occupations. These persons may be described as analytical, imaginative, introspective, and sensitive, choosing work in academic, musical, artistic, and writing fields.

Emmerson (1968) found that fields of study relate to political beliefs too.

Evidence from 19 countries show, on the whole, students in the social sciences, low, and the humanities are more likely to be politicized and leftist than their colleagues in the natural and applied sciences" (p. 403).

Within a university system, field of study has shown a significant relationship to the belief system as well as political opinions. Ladd and Lipset (1975, p. 69) explained that a discipline's subject matter requires a professional work experience, defines the groups and interests which serve as point of reference and association, and seems to attract people of a particular value orientation; together these factors contribute to the formation of distinctive discipline subcultures. Once formed, such subcultures apparently become more than the sum of their contributing parts.

There is some research supporting the relationship between field of study and job satisfaction. Rada (1975) found that community college instructors with occupational orientations are more satisfied with their jobs than instructors with academic orientations. At the university level, the result may be found to be the opposite because of different role expectations. Sprague (1974, p. 98) indicated that, within a university, the colleges in which salary was the most important predictor of faculty satisfaction were those in which college teaching is about the highest salaried and most prestigious effort that this group can obtain. It can be explained that, for example, a Ph. D. in History, Philosophy, or Arts can hardly find other jobs more prestigious or better paid than teaching in a university. On the other hand, those colleges in which length of experience was the most important satisfaction variable tended to be those with a professional orientation, such as Dentistry, Medicine, Economics, and Business. Sprague explained that these faculty members were not interested in money or they would not have been in a university setting in the first place. They would make more money practicing their professions in the outside world.

Location of the educational training can be significantly related to dogmatism and job satisfaction of university professors in the societal setting of Thailand. Students from a comparatively authoritarian society like Thailand may find themselves accepting beliefs and values of affluent

society, such as democracy, political tolerance, and academic freedom while living in the academic environment of the western countries with comparatively low-authoritarian atmospheres. Conversely, students who have all their educational experience within an authoritarian society may find themselves accepting the local beliefs and values, and even though they have an opportunity to study western thought, beliefs, and values, they tend to reject them. It is assumed that university professors' educational experience abroad may have an impact upon their belief systems such as dogmatism.

While Thai people tend to reject western values different from their own, they accept education from the western world as a symbol of status and prestige. Degrees and educational experience from the western countries are always highly valued among business as well as governmental circles. It is expected that studying abroad may be a source of job satisfaction.

## Working Experience

While it has been found that the working experience of blue-collar workers with highly repetitive tasks is negatively associated with job satisfaction, Sprague (1974) is one of many researchers who found that the experience of managerial and professional personnel is positively associated with job satisfaction. Sprague indicated that the more total professional teaching experience university professors had, the more they were satisfied with their work, pay, and supervision. This finding is compatible with that of Rempel and Bentley (1970) who found increasing satisfaction among secondary teachers with long terms of experience.

#### Teaching vs. Research Orientation

Caplow and McGee (1958, p. 82) stated,

It is neither an overgeneralization nor an oversimplification to state that in the faculties of major universities in the United States today (1956) the evaluation of performance is based almost exclusively on publication of scholarly books or articles in professional journals as evidence of research activities.

Ladd and Lipset (1975, p. 144) also categorized professors according to their professional achievement into "high achievers" and "low achievers." Higher achievers are faculty who have gained positions at major universities and also maintain a high level of scholarly productivity, and low achievers are faculty at institutions of lowest quality who have contributed little to active scholarship. They found the "research culture" as an expression of intellectuality that fosters a critical and, in the American context, a liberal politics, whereas the "teaching culture" associated with the transmission of knowledge rather than original inquiry, sustains more conservative orientations.

In Thailand, though the research function of the university has not been emphasized, research oriented instructors tend to find greater achievement and satisfaction than teaching oriented instructors. Furthermore, because of the education and values of intellectuality and academic freedom of research oriented instructors, it is believed that "research culture" will be negatively related to dogmatism.

## Income

Lipset (1959, p. 485) stated that the poorer strata everywhere are more liberal or leftist on economic issues; they favor more welfare state measures, higher wages, graduated income taxes, and support of

of trade unions. However, Tygart (1975, pp. 298-308) seemed to reject the statement after finding that, for highly educated individuals such as university or college students, the multidimensional concept of political liberalism-conservatism appears unwarranted on the individual level of analysis. Tygart believed Lipset's classic "working class authoritarianism" had probably emphasized the wrong variables. Social class or income tended to have similar effects for middle as well as working-class individuals for political issues and behavior generally. Tygart's finding supported Gabennesch's (1972, pp. 857-875) contention that authoritarian is a world view irrespective of social class of correspondents. However, income is to some degree related to the level of education which means the better educated population will have greater capacity to earn more. As it was found that the level of education negatively related to authoritarianism, such as in the comparison of British university students and blue-collar workers (Rokeach, 1960), it is assumed that the negative relationship between dogmatism and income mayalso be found among the university professor population.

## Marital Status and Number of Children

Having spouses or children means an added responsibility that can affect persons' belief systems as well as their job attitude. Freedman and Coombs (1966) and Saxton (1972, p. 309) observed that those who have children after marriage find themselves under great economic pressure, particularly if they marry at an early age. The teaching profession in Thailand is not particularly well paid. Most university professors with spouses, especially non-working spouses, and children will find themselves

having greater need for income, limited opportunities for education, or difficult decisions involving present sacrifices for future gains. It is assumed that marital status and the number of children will have an effect upon university professors' job satisfaction.

#### Age

It is generally argued that as a person becomes older, he tends to become more conservative and intolerant toward differences of ideas, preferring the maintenance of the status quo, stability and security (Downs, 1967, pp. 267-268). Stouffer's (1955) cross-national survey of attitudes in the United States was one of the early studies supporting this argument. It was found that older people were less tolerant toward non-conformists and other related issues. This was true even for the upper educational groups. Birren (1964, p. 189) was among many researchers who discovered the relationship between dogmatism and rigidity. In Thailand, Dhirabegin (1973, p. 40) showed that, among the studied elite bureaucrats, there is an association between age and conservatism. Perhaps, it might be suggested that among university professors, age could be significantly related to the belief system, such as general authoritarianism or dogmatism.

Age was a significant variable in predicting satisfaction with pay and promotion among university professors (Sprague, 1974). The older the faculty members, the greater their satisfaction with pay. On the other hand, the older they were, the less satisfaction they tended to have with promotions.

Caplow and McGee (1958, p. 226) stated, "Women scholars are not taken seriously and cannot look forward to a normal professional career." In the late 1960, Bayer and Astin (1968, pp. 191-199) indicated that female scientists earned less than male scientists independent of field of specialization, employment setting, and academic rank. La Sorte (1971, p. 267) also supported the argument that men are always rewarded above women regardless of whether they do research in addition to teaching or teaching only.

Because of the disadvantageous position women have in the working world, they are known to exhibit lower levels of job satisfaction than men (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). However, Centers and Bugental (1966) and Meier (1964) showed that when treated as equal to males, females had equal or possibly higher levels of satisfaction. Sprague's study also supported this content among the university professor groups.

In Thailand, university teaching is comparatively non-discriminatory toward women (unlike other bureaucratic jobs such as judicial, local administrative, and military careers). In fact, in some areas such as education, and especially elementary education, women have exhibited dominant roles and accomplishment. It is assumed that women, in some areas of specialization, may exhibit greater job satisfaction than men. It can be said that sex is a significant variable in this study.

From the theoretical framework and supporting literature, it can be concluded that university professors are "ideally" and "manifestly" expected to be nonconforming, innovative, and openminded. Consequently, when individuals in the roles of university professors possess these

Sex

qualities which are congruent to the role expectations, they are likely to be satisfied with their jobs. Conversely, those who possess the opposite qualities, such as having conforming, non-innovative, and closed-minded tendencies, they are likely to be dissatisfied with their jobs. However, not all aspects of role expectations are manifest nor universalistic. Thailand, an agrarian society having a comparatively authoritarian culture, provided a kind of external environment that is different from that of the west. Eventually, it creates discrepancy of role expectations of university professors. The rather localistic roles expected by the conservative ruling groups are incompatible with the universalistic and ideal roles cherished by academics. This discrepancy was even more extended because of the political happenings during the last five years and resulted in role and role-personality conflicts among some segments of university faculty. So it is predicted that there are some culturally and situationally related variables having interactional effects upon the relationship between dogmatism and job satisfaction. The researcher also reviewed other variables such as rank and appointment, nature of work and work load, institutional characteristics, education, years of experience, teaching vs. research orientations, income, marital status and number of children, age, and sex. These variables are found to relate either or both to dogmatism and job satisfaction. Some may have an intervening effect on the study and should be statistically controlled.

#### Hypotheses

1. <u>General hypothesis</u>. Considering the theoretical framework and related literature, it may be hypothesized that there are interactions between dogmatism and selected variables upon job satisfaction of university professors in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand.

2. <u>Specific hypotheses</u>. In order to facilitate analyzing the data derived from this study nine conceptual hypotheses were tested. They are as follows:

- There are differences in levels of dogmatism of university professors, in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand, grouped according to each of 23 demographic items.
- There are differences in levels of dogmatism of university professors, in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand, grouped according to the levels of perceived social responsibilities.
- 3. There are differences in levels of dogmatism of university professors, in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand, grouped according to the opinions upon higher education issues.
- 4. There are differences in levels of job satisfaction of university professors, in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand, grouped according to each of 23 demographic items.
- 5. There are differences in levels of job satisfaction of university professors, in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan

City, Thailand, grouped according to the perceived social responsibilities.

6. There are differences in levels of job satisfaction of university professors, in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand, grouped according to the opinions upon higher education issues.

The reviewed literature suggests that demographic, political, and situational factors may have some impact upon the study. This will involve variables such as field of study, self-perceived social responsibilities, and the perceived effects. These can be conceptually predicted as follows:

- 7. There is an interaction between the major field of study and dogmatism upon job satisfaction of university professors in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand.
- There is interaction between the self-perceived social responsibilities and dogmatism upon job satisfaction of university professors in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand.
- 9. There are interactions between perceived political effects and dogmatism upon job satisfaction of university professors in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand.

#### CHAPTER III

## DESIGN OF STUDY

#### Population and Sampling

The development of higher education in Thailand, like many other small countries with administrative centralization, has always been urban oriented. Most universities are located in the metropolitan area of Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, the capital of the country. The researcher considered political impact upon universities as a major factor in this study, therefore, the plan was to exclude institutions outside the vicinity of Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City where the faculty and student population have experienced much less political impact because of comparatively isolated locations.

The sample size of 600, or 10 percent, of the usable population was randomly selected from the list of academic personnel of higher institutions located in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City obtained from the Office of University Affairs. All academic personnel included in this study represent the following titles: (1) professors, (2) associate professors, (3) assistant professors, and (4) instructors. These included academic personnel who also assume administrative positions such as rector, dean, and department head. Since academic personnel of the university demonstration schools and graduate assistants have different characteristics

from the defined "university professors," they were excluded from the study.

## Procedure for Collecting Data

## Instruments

A survey was made to find suitable and valid instruments for the purpose of the study. A questionnaire of 151 items was constructed, with some adaptation for easy scoring, for indices of each of the independent and dependent variables. They were as follows:

1. <u>Demographics</u> (1-23). The first 23 items were selected and adapted from Ladd and Lipset's (1975) study of academic personnel and their political beliefs. The questions were designed to gather more detailed information than the usual age, sex, and level of education. Sprague (1974), Rada (1975), and Stephens (1974) were among many researchers who found these items important in studying characteristics of academic personnel and their job satisfaction. The researcher decided to construct the demographic part with three purposes: (1) to understand the diversified characteristics of university professors, (2) to test hypotheses concerning differences in dogmatism and job satisfaction among various groups, and (3) to utilize the understanding in controlling the possible variables intervening between dogmatism and job satisfaction.

2. <u>Dogmatism Scale</u> (24-63). All of the 40 items were from Form E of the Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1956). The scale was designed to measure individual differences in openness or closedness of belief systems. Form E was comprised of the 40 most validated items from 89 items totally used throughout various revisions. Each item went beyond any specific belief content to penetrate the structure of how the belief was held. People who held viewpoints as diverse as communism, capitalism, or catholicism, should all score on one end of the continuum on the D Scale.

In this questionnaire, the scores were converted to a 1 to 7 scale, as suggested by Rokeach (1960), with the following assignment:

- (1) I agree very much. = 7
- (2) I agree on the whole. = 6
- (3) I agree a little. = 5
- (4) I disagree a little. = 3
- (5) I disagree on the whole. = 2
- (6) I disagree very much. = 1

Administering Form E of the <u>D</u> Scale to 80 students at Berbeck College in England and 60 English workers, the split-half reliabilities were reported at the levels of .81 and .78 accordingly (Rokeach, 1960). In determining the validity of the <u>D</u> Scale, it was found to be correlated with the <u>F</u> Scale (Adorno, 1950) at the level of .62 for the English College student group and .77 for the English worker group.

The <u>D</u> Scale as intended by Rokeach did not have the discriminant value in determining political beliefs like the <u>F</u> Scale. Rokeach constructed the <u>D</u> Scale to be a measure of general authoritarianism or closed-mindedness. It differed from the <u>F</u> Scale in that general authoritarianism was viewed as concerning the way an individual adhered to a belief and not the specific content of that belief. He claimed that the <u>F</u> Scale was concerned with the specific content of a belief, such as authoritarianism of the right or fascism. The research data seemed to support Rokeach's intention (Robinson & Shaver, 1976, pp. 418-429). 3. <u>Social Responsibility Scale</u> (64-71). Berkowitz and Lutterman (1968) constructed this scale in an attempt to assess a person's traditional social responsibility, and orientation toward helping others even when there is nothing to be gained from them. The total 8 items of the scale are especially tied into traditional values and are therefore, likely to have essentially a conservative individualist theme. The scale is also conceived of as a polar opposite of alienation. The original five response options were adapted to fit the format of parts 2 and 3 of the questionnaire which have 6 options. The "responsible" direction is: agreeing on items 65, 68, 70, and 71; and disagreeing on items 64, 66, 67, and 69.

The internal consistency of the scale, as administered it to 766 Wisconsin adults in early fall, 1963 was "very satisfactory," although no statistical data were reported. No test-retest data were apparently collected. Berkowitz and Lutterman also found some behavioral correlates. Since these are based on respondent descriptions, they cannot be considered as completely objective estimates of validity. Among both working class and middle-class respondents, those scoring high on the scale were more likely to: (1) make financial contributions to educational or religious institutions, (2) be active in organizations or church work, (3) show great interest in national and local politics and to be active politically, and (4) to vote in elections and know the name of candidates for office.

It was concluded that all in all, persons having high scores on the scale generally were least inclined to deviate from the political

traditions of their class and community.

4. <u>Opinions upon Higher Education Issues</u> (72-79). The first 6 items of this part were selected from Ladd and Lipset's (1975) book, <u>The</u> <u>Divided Academy: Professors and Politics</u>. They were constructed to evaluate university professors' opinions upon higher education issues such as, the role of institution in student's personal and intellectual development, faculty-student relation, institutional roles of social and community involvement, student politics on campus, and academic freedom. The last two items (78 and 79) are to appraise the political impact upon the work of university professors during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 and after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977.

There were no reliabilities and validities of these items reported. However these questions are necessary in assessing the university professors' roles, and their job satisfaction.

5. Job Description Index (80-151). The JDI (Smith, et al, 1965) was designed to measure job satisfaction in the areas of pay, promotion, supervision, type of work, and the people on the job. The instrument consists of 72 items-- 18 in each area of work, supervision, and people subscales and 9 each in pay and promotions. Each grouping consists of a list of adjectives or descriptive phrases. The respondents were asked to write "1" for each item which describes his pay (promotion, etc.), "2" on which they could not decide, and "3" for each item which did not describe it. When the respondent answered "1" (yes) to a positive item or "3" (no) to a negative item on the test he received three points. If the respondent put a "2" (undecided) to any item he received two points. item.

In determining its reliability, various researchers found its corrected split-half internal consistency coefficients exceed .80 (Hulin, 1966). Its validity was determined by Hulin's observation of its correlation to turnover and a correlation coefficient of -.27 was reported among the population of female clerical employees.

#### Administration of Instruments

After reviewing various techniques and a careful consideration of plans for the administration of instruments, the researcher was convinced that mailing was the most appropriate technique for the nature of the study and situation. Because of the extremity of political happenings during the last five years and especially after October 6, 1976 many university professors were reluctant to express their viewpoints concerning political and social problems openly or candidly. Mailing was selected as the method to assure confidentiality of responses. A total of 600 unmarked questionnaire packages were distributed to the randomly selected university professors during January 1978. Within the period of 60 days, 360 returns were collected and 335 or 55.83 percent of the total packages were usable.

## Treatment of the Data

The primary interest of the researcher was to evaluate the interactions of dogmatism and selected variables upon job satisfaction of university professors in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Factorial Analysis of Variance were utilized as the major tools for the analyses of the data. Their definitions and applications to the study are presented as follows:

## Analysis of Variance (One-Way)

It is a technique that is used to determine the significance of difference between more than two means. In Analysis of Variance, however, there is no direct comparison of means. Instead there is an inference about the difference between means by comparing the variance with samples to the variance between the sample means (Gellman, 1973, pp. 187-188). The following is the One-Way Analysis of Variance formula:

> Among-Groups Variance Estimate:  $S_A^2 = \sum n_i (\bar{x} - \bar{\bar{x}})^2$ Subgroups of Unequal Size

 $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i}$  = the mean of the *i*th subgroup  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$  = the number of the combined distribution of scores  $n_{i}$  = the number of scores in the *i*th subgroup

#### Factorial Analysis of Variance

Factorial Analysis of Variance is the method that analyzes the independent and interactive effects of two or more independent variables on a dependent variable (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 245). It has various advantages over One-Way Analysis of Variance such as: (1) It enables the researcher to manipulate and control two or more variables simultaneously. (2) Variables that are not manipulated can be controlled. (3) It is more precise than a one-way analysis. And (4) perhaps most important, it enables the researcher to hypothesize interactions because the interaction effects can be directly tested (pp. 257-258).

Two-Way Analysis of Variance seems to fit the design of this

study well. In this method, the total sum of square  $(SS_T)$  will be divided into four components:

$$SS_T = SS_c + SS_R + SS_{R\times c} + SS_{wc}$$

 $SS_T$  = the total sum of squares, generated from the deviation of each score from the mean of all scores,  $(x - \overline{x})$ 

SS<sub>c</sub> = the sum of squares for columns, generated from  
the deviation of each column mean from the mean of  
all scores, 
$$(\bar{x}, -\bar{x})$$

 $SS_R$  = the sum of squares for rows, generated from the deviation of each row mean from the mean of all scores,  $(\hat{x}_{R_1}, \hat{x})$ 

$$SS_{wc}$$
 = the sum of squares within cells, generated from  
the deviation of each score from its cell mean,  
 $(x - \bar{x})$ 

Total Sum of Squares

 $SS_{T} = \Sigma \times^{2} - \frac{(\Sigma \times)^{2}}{n}$ (Nimium, 1970, p. 371)

Two-Way Analysis of Variance, or Two-Way ANOVA, was used in analyzing and testing Hypotheses Seven, Eight, and Nine.

#### Posteriori Analyses

When the over-all  $\underline{F}$  ratio was significant and there were more than two groups in the comparison, Scheffe's (1953) test was used to make all possible comparisons amog means.

Scheffe has shown that the probability is  $I - \propto$  that all possible contrasts will be captured by a set of intervals as presented by Kirk

(1968, p. 91) in the following formula:

nj

$$\begin{split} & \psi - S \neq \psi \neq \psi + S \\ & \text{where } \psi \text{ and } \psi \text{ refer to a population comparison and an estimate} \\ & \text{of the comparison, respectively. } S \text{ is given by} \\ & S = \int (k-1) F_{\alpha}; v_1, v_2 \qquad \int MS_{ERROR} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{(c_j)^2}{n_j} \right] \\ & \text{Where } F_{\alpha}; v_1, v_2 \qquad = \text{tabled value of } \underline{F} \text{ for } V_1 \text{ and } V_2 \text{ degrees} \\ & \text{ of freedom,} \\ & k \qquad = \text{ number of treatment levels,} \\ & C_j \qquad = \text{ coefficient of the contrast, and} \end{split}$$

In order for a comparison to be significant, it must be larger than S as defined above.

level.

= number of scores in the jth treatment

The significance level of .05 and beyond was selected for all hypothesis testings and posteriori analyses.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents the analysis of the data collected in this study. The analysis pertains to demographic data and the nine hypotheses as stated in Chapter Three.

## Analysis of Demographic Data

Demographic data were gathered from each of 335 university professors responding to the first 23 items of the questionnaire. All questionnaire returns were gathered during two periods: 245 were collected prior to the mid of January 1978 and 90 were gathered during the period of six weeks after. There was no significant difference in the way sample subjects of the two data collection periods responded to the questionnaire items. The information includes rank, appointment, nature of work, work load, institutional characteristics, education, years of experience, teaching vs. research orientations, income, marital status, number of children, age, and sex. These data are presented in Table 1, along with frequencies in each category and the total percentages.

#### Analysis of Data Related to the Hypotheses

This part deals with the statistical analysis of the problem of the study as stated in Chapter One. Nine hypotheses were tested and related statistical data were analyzed.

# Table 1

# Frequency Counts and Percentages of Demographic Variables

Demographic		f	f <sup>v</sup>	f`	Percentage
		N=245	N=90	N=335	N=335
1	What is your present rank?				
T. 6	(1) Instructor	145	75	220	65 67
	(1)  Assistant Professor	24J 27	10	220 0/	28.06
	(2) Associate Professor	7	12	94 Q	20.00
	(b)  Professor	7	1	11	200
	(4)  FICLESSOF	9	2	11	J.20
	(5) No response	2	-	2	.59
2.	What kind of appointment do you have here?				
	(1) Regular with tenure	234	68	302	90.15
	(2) Regular without tenure	5	13	18	5.37
	(3) Special	1	-3	8	2.39
	(4) Visiting	1	2	3	.90
	(5) No response	4		4	1.19
3.	During the regular term, how many hours per				
	week are you spending in formal instruction?				
	(Give actual, not credit hours.)				
	(1) None	9	4	13	• 3.88
	(2) 1-4	53	23	76	22.69
	(3) 5-6	59	32	91	27.16
	(4) 7-8	35	4	39	11.64
	(-7) $(-7)$	48	10	58	17.31
	$(3)  7^{-10}$	10	10	23	6 87
	(0) 11-14 (7) 19 14	17	4 5	2.5 1/1	4 18
	(/) 13-10	7	ز	14	4.10

Note. <sup>a</sup> Data from the first collection; <sup>b</sup>data from the second collection; <sup>c</sup>total

	Demographic	$\frac{f}{N=245}$	$\frac{f}{N=90}$	$\frac{f}{N=335}$	Percent N=335
(8)	17-20	8	1	9	2.69
(9)	21 or more	3	7	10	2.99
(10)	No response	2	-	2	.60
4. What are	your teaching responsibilities this				
academic	year?				
(1)	Entirely undergraduate	144	62	206	61.49
(2)	Some undergraduate, some graduate	78	13	91	27.10
(3)	Entirely graduate	12	10	23	6.8
(4)	Not teaching this year	9	4	13	3.8
(5)	No response	1	1	2	• 61
5. About how	many students, at all levels, are				
enrolled	in your courses this term?				
(1)	None	12	4	16	4.73
(2)	Under 25	25	10	35	10,4
(3)	25-49	33	12	45	13.4
(4)	50–99	57	17	74	22.0
(5)	100-249	74	25	99	29.5
(6)	250-399	15	5	20	5.9
(7)	400–999	15	7	22	6.5
(8)	1,000 or more	11	9	20	5.9
(9)	No response	3	1	4	1.1
6. At what 1	nstitution are you employed?				
(1)	Kasetsat University	57	12	69	19.1
(2)	Chulalongkorn University	37	6	43	12.8
• •					

	Demographic	$\frac{f}{N=245}$	$\frac{f}{N=90}$	$\frac{f}{N-335}$	Percentage
		N=245	N-30		
	(4) Ramkamhaeng University	16	19	35	10.45
	(5) Silpakorn University	45	8	53	15.82
	(6) Sir-Nakarin University	12	4	16	4.78
	(7) Thammasat University	15	19	34	10.15
	(8) NIDA	4	6	10	2.99
	(9) MIT	9		9	2.69
	(10) No response	1	1	2	.60
7. Wha	at is your highest educational attainment?				
	(1) Associate degree or equivalent	2	1	3	.90
	(2) Bachelor's degree or equivalent	40	16	56	16.72
	(3) Master's degree or equivalent	158	63	221	65.97
	(4) Ph. D. or equivalent	44	5	49	14.63
	(5) No response	1	5	6	1.79
8. Ide	entify major field of study in your last deg	ree.			
	(1) Agriculture/Forestry	13	2	15	4.48
	(2) Accounting, Commerce, and Business				
	Administration	9	6	15	4.48
	(3) Education	47	12	59	17.61
	(4) Engineering	7	3	10	2.99
	(5) Fine Arts, Drama, and Music	10	19	29	8.66
	(6) Geography	4	1	5	1.49
	(7) Medicine	25	-	25	7.46
	(8) Nursing	5		5	1.49
	(9) Public Health Education	11	-	11	3.28
	(10) Pharmacy	4	-	4	2.39
	(11) Medical Sciences	8	-	8	2,39
	(12) Home Economics	. –	1	1	. 39

•

Demographic	<u>f</u>	f	<u>f</u>	Percentage
	N=245	N=90	N=335	:
(13) Humanities	11	5	16	4.78
(14) Industrial Arts	4		4	1.19
(15) Journalism	-		-	-
(16) Law	3	1	4	1.19
(17) Library Science	4	-	4	1.19
(18) Pure Sciences	41	10	51	15.22
(19) Archeology	1	5	6	1.79
(20) Anthropology	3	1	4	1.19
(21) Economics	7	1	8	2.39
(22) Political Science, Government	9	18	27	8.06
(23) Sociology	7	3	10	2.99
(24) Others	12	2	14	4.18
9. Have you ever had educational training abroad	1?			
(If yes, please also answer 10 and 11.)				
(1) Yes	156	61	217	64.78
(2) No	88	28	116	34.63
(3) No response	1	1	2	.60
10. In what country did you have your educational	L			
training? (In case more than one country, p	lease			
indicate where you stayed the longest.)				
(1) The United States, Canada	98	52	150	44.78
(2) European countries	28	9	37	11.04
(3) Asian countries	19	2	21	6.27
(4) Australia, New Zealand	8	2	10	2.99
(5) others	6	-	6	1.79
(6) No response	86	25	111	33.13

.

Table 1 (Continued)

	Demographic	f	f	f	Percentage
		N=245	<u>N=90</u>	N=335	N=335
11.	How many years did you study abroad?				<u></u>
	(1) Less than 1 year	24	1	25	7.46
	(2) 1-2	61	37	98	29.25
	(3) 3-4	37	18	55	16.42
	(4) 5 years or more	35	7	42	12.54
	(5) No response	88	27	115	34.33
12.	How long have you worked in the field of	education?			
	(1) 1 year or less	6	19	25	7.46
	(2) 2-3	27	28	55	16.42
	(3) 4-6	66 5	23	89	26.57
	(4) 7-9	47	13	60	17.91
	(5) 10-14	49	2	51	15.22
	(6) 15-19	22	2	24	7.16
	(7) 20-29	20	2	22	6.57
	(8) 30 or more	6	-	6	1.79
	(9) No response	2	1	3	<b>.</b> '90
13.	How long have you worked at this institut	ion?			
	(1) 1 year or less	9	18	27	8.06
	(2) 2-3	38	30	68	20.00
	(3) 4-6	. 70	24	94	28.06
	(4) 7-9	43	12	55	16.41
	(5) 10-14	47	3	50	14.93
	(6) 15-19	18	2	20	5.97
	(7) 20-29	18	-	18	5.37
	(8) 30 or more	2	-	2	.60
	(9) No response	-	1	1	.30

•

Table 1 (Continued)

	Demographic	<u>f</u> N=245	$\frac{f}{N=90}$	$\frac{f}{N=335}$	Percentage N=335
14.	In a normal week, what proportion of your we	ork			
	time is devoted to administration. (Depart	mental			
	or institutional, including committee work)				
	(1) None	47	24	71	21.19
	(2) 1-10%	101	44	145	43.28
	(3) 11–20%	53	11	64	19.10
	(4) 21-40%	20	5	25	7.46
	(5) 41-60%	12	3	15	4.48
	(6) 61-80%	9	3	12	3.58
	(7) 81-100%	1	-	1	.30
	(8) No response	2	-	2	.60
15.	How many articles have you published in acad	demic			
	(1) None	80	20	119	35 99
	(1) None (2) $1-2$	69 /0	22	81	26 18
	(2)  1-2 (3) $3-4$	49	2C 8	51	15 22
	(3)  5-4 (4)  5-10	45	12		14 63
	(4) $5^{-10}$ (5) 11 or more	25	0	37	14.05
	(6) No response	2	-	2	.60
16.	How many books or monographs have you public	shed or			
	edited, alone or in collaboration?				
	(1) None	99	35	134	40.00
	(2) 1-2	91	36	127	37.91
	(3) 3-4	32	14	46	13.73
	(4) 5-10	16	4	20	5.97
	(5) 11 or more	5	-	5	1.49
	(6) No response	2	1	3	.90

Table 1 (Continued)

		Demographic	f	f	f	Percentage
			N=245	N=90	N=335	N=335
17.	Does your	interest lie primarily in teaching				
2	or in res	search?				
	(1)	Very heavily in research	9	16	25	7.46
	(2)	In both, but leaning toward research	88	22	110	32.84
	$(\overline{3})$	In both but leaning toward teaching	130	31	161	48.06
	(4)	Very heavily in teaching	16	19	35	10.45
	(5)	No response	2	2	4	1.19
18.	What is y	our total income at this institution,				
	for the a	cademic year?				
	(1)	15,000 bahts* or less	5	7	12	3.58
	(2)	15,001-20,000	5	3	8	2.39
	(3)	20,001-25,000	22	8	30	8.96
	(4)	25,001-30,000	35	14	49	14.63
	(5)	30,001-40,000	63	35	98	29.25
	(6)	40,001-50,000	57	9	66	19.70
	(7)	50,001-70,000	36	8	44	13.13
	(8)	70,001 or more	21	5	26	7.76
	(9)	No response	1	1	2	.60
19.	What is y	your annual income <u>earned outside</u> this				
	instituti	on? (academic and non-academic)				
	(1)	3,000 bahts or less	153	25	178	53.13
	(2)	3,001-5,000	15	8	23	6.87
	(3)	5,001-10,000	16	22	38	11.34
	(4)	10,001-30,000	14	17	31	9.25

•

.

Note. \*20 bahts = 1 U.S. dollar

.

-

•
Demographic	<b>f</b>	f	f	Percentage
	N=245	N=90	N=335	N=335
(5) 30.001-50.000		10	28	8.36
(6) 50,001 or more	15	4	19	5.67
(7) No response	14	4	18	5.37
20. What is your marital status?				
(1) Single	84	39	123	36.72
(2) Married	158	49	207	61.79
(3) No response	3	2	5	1.49
21. How many children do you have?				
(1) None	80	36	116	34.63
(2) 1	37	22	59	17.61
(3) 2	56	14	70	20.90
(4) 3	27	4	31	9.25
(5) 4 or more	15		15	4.48
(6) No response	30	14	44	13.13
22. How old are you?				
(1) 24 years or younger	2	5	7	2.09
(2) 25-29	49	34	83	24.78
(3) 30-34	68	31	99	29.55
(4) 35-39	59	4	63	18.81
(5) 40-44	34	6	40	11.94
(6) 45-49	23	1	24	7.16
(7) 50-54	7	4	11	3.28
(8) 55 or older	3	-	3	.90
(9) No response	-	5	5	1.49

•

Table 1 (Continued)

Demographic	$\frac{f}{N=245}$	<u>f</u> N=90	<u>f</u> N=335	Percentage N=335
<pre>23. What is your sex? (1) Male (2) Female</pre>	122	46	168	50.15
	122	44	166	49.55

### Preliminary Arrangement of the Data

From the preliminary analysis of responses by frequency counts, according to choices within each item, as illustrated in Table 1, it was found necessary to rearrange the data to meet the assumption of the analysis of variance testing statistic. To provide the required homogeneity of variance; subgroups with less than 20 counts were regrouped with the next subgroups, subgroups that had less than 20 counts were regrouped with the next subgroups, subgroups that had less than 20 counts and had distinct properties that could not be regrouped with others were eliminated from the related hypothesis testings.

#### Results of Testing Hypothesis Number One

The null form of the first hypothesis was stated and tested as follows:

Ho 1 There are no statistically significant differences in levels of dogmatism of university professors, in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand, grouped according to each of 23 demographic items.

This hypothesis was tested by comparing the means of the Dogmatism scores of university professors grouped according to their responses to each of the 23 items. This was accomplished through the use of a one-way analysis of variance. The summary results of these calculations appear as the <u>F</u> ratio in Table 22 (Appendix C). From a total of 23 sub-hypotheses tested two were found to have significant differences at the level of .05 and beyond. Results are presented as follows:

1. The F ratio in Table 2 indicates that there was a statistically

significant difference in the Dogmatism scores of university professors divided into two groups according to major field (F = 4.983; df = 1/319; p < .05). Frequency counts, means and standard deviations concerning the Dogmatism scores of the two university professor groups appear in Table 26 (Appendix D). The group having major fields of last degrees in Social Sciences (Anthropology, Archeology, Political Science, Economics, and Sociology) had a lower mean Dogmatism score (156.76) than the group having major fields of last degrees in non-Social Sciences (166.11).

2. The <u>F</u> ratio in Table 3 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in the Dogmatism scores of university professors divided into two groups according to sex (F = 8.643; df = 1/332; p  $\lt$ .01). Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the Dogmatism scores of the two university professor groups appear in Table 27 (Appendix D). The male group had a higher mean Dogmatism score (168.57) than the female group (159.56).

3. There was no statistically significant differences in the Dogmatism scores of university professors grouped according to the other 21 demographic items namely, rank and appointment, nature of work and work load, institution, education, years of experience, teaching vs. research orientations, income, marital status and number of children, and age.

The first null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that university professors' dogmatism differed by major field of last degree and sex.

# One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Major Field

Item	Source of wire Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
8	Between Within Total	1 319 320	3983.85 255042.03 259025.88	3983.85 799.51	4.983*

<u>Note</u>. \*p < .05

# Table 3

# One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Sex

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
23	Between		6771 41	6771 41	8 646**
23	Within	332	260004.91	783.15	0.040
	Total	333	266776.31		

Note. \*\*p < .01

#### Results of Testing Hypothesis Number Two

The null form of the second hypothesis was stated and tested as follows:

Ho<sub>2</sub> There is no statistically significant difference in levels of dogmatism of university professors, in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand, grouped according to levels of the perceived social responsibilities.

This hypothesis was tested by comparing the means of the Dogmatism scores of university professors divided into two groups at the total mean of the Social Responsibility Scale (20.41). The testing was accomplished through the use of a one-way analysis of variance. The summary results of these calculations appear as the  $\underline{F}$  ratio in Table 4.

Results of testing the second null hypothesis indicate that the computed <u>F</u> ratio was significant (F = 6.826; df = 1/333; p  $\leq$  .01). The results allowed the researcher to reject the null hypothesis and it was concluded that there was a significance difference in dogmatism of university professors grouped according to the perceived social responsibilities. Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the Dogmatism scores of the two university professor groups appear in Table 28 (Appendix D). The low mean <u>SRS</u> score group had a lower mean Dogmatism score (160.76) than the high mean SRS score group (168.90).

#### Results of Testing Hypothesis Number Three

The null form of the third hypothesis was stated and tested as follows:

Ho<sub>3</sub> There are no statistically significant differences in levels of dogmatism of university professors, in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand, grouped according to the opinions upon higher education issues.

## One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the SRS Scores

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
<u>SRS</u>	Between Within Total	1 333 334	1701.98 274007.13 275709.06	1701.98 822.84	2.068*

Note. \*p < .05

This hypothesis was tested by comparing the means of the Dogmatism scores of university professors grouped according to their responses to each of the 8 items concerning the opinions upon higher education issues. This was accomplished through the use of a one-way analysis of variance. The summary results of these calculations appear as the <u>F</u> ratio in Table 23 (Appendix C). From a total of 8 sub-hypotheses tested, three were found to have the significant differences at the levels of .01 or beyond. Results are presented as follows:

1. The <u>F</u> ratio in Table 5 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in the Dogmatism scores of university professors divided into two groups according to opinions toward banning political activities on a university campus (F = 11.199; df = 1/330; p  $\lt$ .01). Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the Dogmatism scores of the two university professor groups appear in Table 29 (Appendix D). The group agreeing on banning the political activities on a university

campus had a higher mean Dogmatism score (170.27) than the disagreeing group (159.87).

2. The <u>F</u> ratio in Table 6 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in the Dogmatism scores of university professors divided into three groups according to opinions toward political and social effects during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 on their work (F = 4.758; df = 2/326; p  $\leq$  .01). Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the Dogmatism scores of the three university professor groups appear in Table 30 (Appendix D). Since there were more than two groups in the testing of significant difference, Scheffe's test was computed to locate the area of difference. The <u>S</u> test revealed that the group indicating the situation had no effect on their work had a significantly lower mean Dogmatism score (151.27) than the group indicating the situation had a harmful effect (173.76).

3. The <u>F</u> ratio in Table 7 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in the Dogmatism scores of university professors divided into three groups according to opinions toward political and social effects after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977 on their work (F = 11.008; df = 2/327; p  $\langle$  .001). Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the Dogmatism scores of the three university professor groups appear in Table 31 (Appendix D). The <u>S</u> Test was computed to locate the area of significant difference. It revealed that the group indicating the situation had a favorable effect on their work had a significantly higher mean Dogmatism score (181.44) than the group indicating "no effect" (161.34) and the group indicating harmful (160.86).

١

# One-Way Analysis of Variance; Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Attitudes toward Banning Students' Political Activities

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
76	Between Within Total	1 330 331	8572.26 252593.38 261165.63	8572.26 765.43	11.199***

Note. \*\*\*p < .001

## Table 6

One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Political Effect<sup>a</sup>

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
78	Between	2	7480.79	3740.39	4.758**
	Within	326	256264.57	786.09	
	Total	328	263745.31		

Note. \*\*p < .01

<sup>a</sup>From October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976

## One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Political Effect<sup>a</sup>

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
79	Between Within Total	2 327 329	16710.88 248209.63 264920.50	8355.44	11.008***

Note. \*\*\*p < .001

<sup>a</sup>After October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977

4. There were no statistically significant differences in the Dogmatism scores of university professors grouped according to other opinions toward higher education issues: namely, the institutions' concern for students' personal values; faculty-student relation; institutional engagement in solving social problems; students' practical training in the community; and academic freedom of faculty.

The null hypothesis was rejected. It was concluded that university professors' dogmatism differed on three items of opinions toward higher education issues: namely, banning students' political activities on a university campus; political and social effects during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 on their work; and political and social effects after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977 on their work.

## Results of Testings Hypothesis Number Four

The null form of the fourth hypothesis was stated and tested as follows:

Ho 4 There are no statistically significant differences in levels of job satisfaction of university professors, in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand, grouped according to each of 23 demographic items.

This hypothesis was tested by comparing the means of the <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors grouped according to their responses to each of the 23 items. This was accomplished through the use of a oneway analysis of variance. The summary results of these calculations appear as the <u>F</u> ratio in Table 24. From a total of 23 sub-hypotheses tested seven were found to have the significant differences at the level of .05 and beyond. Results are presented as follows:

1. The <u>F</u> ratio in Table 8 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in the <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors divided into five groups according to numbers of students enrolled in their courses during the second semester of 1977 academic year (F = 3.717; df = 4/310; p  $\langle .01 \rangle$ . Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the <u>JDI</u> scores of the 5 university professor groups appear in Table 32 (Appendix D). Since there were more than two groups in the testing of significant difference, the <u>S</u> test was computed to locate the area of difference. The test revealed that the group having less than 25 students enrolled in their courses had a significantly lower mean <u>JDI</u> score (150.00) than the group having 250 and more (167.16). No other significant differences were indicated.

2. The <u>F</u> ratio in Table 9 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in the JDI scores of university professors divided

# One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Numbers of Students Enrolled in their Courses

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
5	Between	4	6776.17	1694.04	3.717**
	Within	310	141291.82	455.78	
	Total	314	148067.94		

<u>Note</u>. \*\*p < .01

# Table 9

# One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Institution

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
6	Between Within Total	6 326 332	11515.11 145775.50 157290.56	1919.19 447.16	4.292***

Note. \*\*\*p < .001

into seven groups according to institutions in which they were employed (F = 4.292; df = 6/327; p  $\langle$ .001). Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the <u>JDI</u> scores of the seven university professor groups appear in Table 33 (Appendix D). The <u>S</u> test was computed to locate the area of significant difference, and its results indicated that the university professor group employed at Thammasat University had a lower mean <u>JDI</u> score (150.24) than the university professors groups employed at Ramkamhaeng University (170.00) and the group employed at the other three institutions combined (169.17) namely Sri-Nakarin University, NIDA, and MIT.

3. The <u>F</u> ratio in Table 10 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in the <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors divided into two groups according to major field of last degree (F = 8.145; df = 1/319; p  $\langle .01 \rangle$ . Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the <u>JDI</u> scores of the two university professor groups appear in Table 34 (Appendix D). The group of Social Sciences majors, composed of Archeology, Anthropology, Economics, Political Science, Government, and Sociology, had a higher mean <u>JDI</u> (168.65) than the non-Social Sciences group (159.44).

4. The <u>F</u> ratio in Table 11 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in the <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors divided into five groups according to the time devoted to administration (F = 4.427; df = 4/328; p  $\langle .01 \rangle$ ). Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the <u>JDI</u> scores of the five university professor groups appear in Table 35 (Appendix D). The <u>S</u> test indicated that the group having no proportion of their time devoted to administration had a

# One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Major Field

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
8	Between Within Total	1 319 320	3866.59 151443.04 155309.56	3866.59 474.74	8.145**

<u>Note</u>. \*\*p < .01

## Table 11

One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Time Devoted to Administration

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
14	Between Within Total	4 328 332	8033.02 148810.01 156843.00	2008.26 453.69	4.427**

Note. \*\*p < .01

significantly lower mean <u>JDI</u> score (152.10) than the group devoting 1-10 percent (162.73) and the group devoting 41 percent or more of their time (169.14).

5. The <u>F</u> ratio in Table 12 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in the <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors divided . into seven groups according to income earned at the institutions (F = 2.575; df = 6/326; p  $\langle .05 \rangle$ ). Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the <u>JDI</u> scores of the seven university professor group appear in Table 36 (Appendix D). However, the <u>S</u> test failed to locate the area of significant difference.

6. The <u>F</u> ratio in Table 13 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in the <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors divided into three groups according to income earned outside the institutions  $(F = 4.606; df = 2/314; p \lt .01)$ . Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the <u>JDI</u> scores of the three university professor groups appear in Table 37 (Appendix D). The <u>S</u> test indicated that the group earning less than 3,000 bahts in a year outside the institutions of employment had a significantly lower mean <u>JDI</u> score (157.47) than the group earning 3,000 to 10,000 bahts (164.03) and the group earning 10,001 and more (165.56).

7. The <u>F</u> ratio in Table 14 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in the <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors divided into two groups according to marital status (F = 4.761; df = 1/328; p < .05). Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the two university professor group appear in Table 38 (Appendix D). The single group had a lower mean JDI score (157.64) than the married group (163.01).

## One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Income Earned at the Institutions

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
18	Between Within Total	6 326 332	7166.09 151199.16 158365.19	1194.35 463.80	2.575*

<u>Note</u>. \*p < .05

### Table 13

One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Income Earned outside the Institutions

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
19	Between	2	4383.68	2190.84	4.606**
	Within	314	149431.37	475.90	
	Total	316	153815.00		

<u>Note</u>. \*\*p < .01

## One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Marital Status

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
20	Between Within Total	1 328 329	2226.56 153408.75 155635.25	2226.56 467.71	4.761*

Note. \*p < .05

8. There were no statistically significant differences in the <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors grouped according to other items of the demographics namely rank and appointment, nature of work, education, years of experience, teaching vs. research orientations, number of children, age, and sex.

The null hypothesis was rejected. It was concluded that university professors' job satisfaction differed by number of students enrolled in their courses, institutions in which they were employed, major field of last degree, proportion of time devoted to administration, income earned at the institutions, income earned outside the institutions, and marital status.

#### Results of Testings Hypothesis Number Five

The null form of the fifth hypothesis was stated and tested as follows:

## One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the <u>SRS</u> Scores

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
SRS	Between Within Total	1 333 334	8761.07 149795.95 279800.19	8761.07 449.84	19.476***

Note. \*\*\*p **< .001** 

Ho There are no statistically significant differences in levels of 5 job satisfaction of university professors, in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand, grouped according to the perceived social responsibilities.

This hypothesis was tested by comparing the means of the <u>JD1</u> scores of university professors divided into two groups at the total mean <u>SRS</u> score of 20.41. The testing was accomplished through the use of a one-way analysis of variance. The summary results of these calculations appear as the F ratio in Table 15.

Results of testing the fifth null hypothesis indicated that the computed <u>F</u> ratio was significant (F = 19.476; df = 1/333; p  $\lt$  .001). The null hypothesis was rejected. It was concluded that university professors' job satisfaction differed by levels of perceived social responsibilities. Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the <u>JDI</u> scores of the two university professor groups appear in Table 39 (Appendix D). The university group having low <u>SRS</u> scores had a higher mean <u>JDI</u> (165.09) than the group having high SRS scores (154.68).

#### Results of Testings Hypothesis Number Six

The null form of the sixth hypothesis was stated and tested as follows:

Ho<sub>6</sub> There are no statistically significant differences in levels of job satisfaction of university professors, in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand, grouped according to the opinions upon higher education issues.

This hypothesis was tested by comparing the mean <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors grouped according to their responses to each of the 8 items concerning the opinions upon higher education issues. This was accomplished through the use of a one-way analysis of variance. The summary results of these calculations appear as the <u>F</u> ratio in Table 24. From a total of 8 sub-hypotheses tested, two were found to have significant differences at the levels .05 and beyond. Results are presented as follows:

1. The <u>F</u> ratio in Table 16 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in the <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors divided into six groups according to opinions toward banning political activities on a university campus (F = 2.697; df = 5/326; p  $\langle .05 \rangle$ ). Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the <u>JDI</u> scores of the six university professor groups appear in Table 40 (Appendix D). However, the <u>S</u> test failed to indicate the area of significant difference.

2. The <u>F</u> ratio in Table 17 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in the <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors divided into three groups according to opinions toward the social and political effects during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1977 on their work (F = 7.464; df = 2/326; p  $\lt$  .001). Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the <u>JDI</u> scores of the three university professor

# One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Attitudes toward Banning Students' Political Activities

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
76	Between Within Total	5 326 331	6281.06 151817.26 158098.31	1256.21 465.70	2.697*

<u>Note</u>. \*p < .05

### Table 17

One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Political Effect<sup>a</sup>

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
78 Between Within Total	Between	2	6780.56	3390.28	7.464***
	Within 326 148074.19	454.22			
	Total	328	154854.69		

Note. \*\*\*p < .001

<sup>a</sup>After October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977

groups appear in Table 41 (Appendix D). The <u>S</u> test indicated that the group perceiving the effects as harmful had a significantly lower mean <u>JDI</u> score (150.45) than the group perceiving "favorable" (163.52).

3. There were no statistically significant differences in the <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors grouped according to other items of the opinions toward higher education issues; namely, institutions' concern for students' personal values; faculty-student relation; students' practical training in the community; institutional engagement in solving social problems; academic freedom; and political and social effects after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977.

The null hypothesis was rejected. It was concluded that university professors' job satisfaction differed in 2 areas of the opinions upon higher education issues: banning students' political activities on a university campus; and the political and social effects during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976.

#### Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Seven

The null form of the seventh hypothesis was stated and tested as follows:

Ho 7 There is no interaction between the major field of study and dogmatism upon job satisfaction of university professors in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand.

The seventh null hypothesis was tested by comparing the <u>JDI</u> scores of individuals within each of the six subgroups. This was accomplished through the use of a two-way analysis of variance, and appears as the F ratio of the two-way interactions Table 18.

The results presented in Table 18 indicate that there was not a

Source of	D.F.	Sum of	Mean	F Ratio
Variation		Squares	Squares	
Main Effects	3	7252.68	2417.56	5.251***
Dogmatism	2	3307.29	1653.64	3.592*
Demographic 8	1	3302.28	3302.28	7.172
Two-Way Interactions	2	423.67	211.83	•632
Residual	327	150556.31	460.42	
Fotal	332	158232.69	460.42	

## Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and Major Field

Note. \*p <.05; \*\*p <.01; \*\*\*p <.001

significant interaction between the two independent variables of the major field of last degree and Dogmatism scores upon the <u>JDI</u> scores (F = 0.632; df = 2/332; p > .05). These results would not allow the researcher to reject the seventh null hypothesis.

However, further data from the two-way analysis of variance indicate interesting findings. The <u>F</u> ratio of the main effects of the Dogmatism scores at 3.592 (p  $\langle .05 \rangle$ ) shows that, when the major field variable was controlled, there was a significant difference in the <u>JDI</u> score of university professors grouped according to their levels of dogmatism. Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations of the <u>JDI</u> scores six university teacher groups appear in Table 42 (Appendix D).

## Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and the <u>SRS</u> Scores

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Main Effects Dogmatism <u>SRS</u> Two-Way Interactions Residual	3 2 1 2 329	11193.15 2431.60 7306.94 77.86 147281.63	3731.05 1215.80 7306.94 38.93 447.66	8.334*** 2.716 16.322*** .087
Total	334	158552.69		

Note. \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001

### Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Eight

The null form of the eighth hypothesis was stated and tested as follows:

Ho<sub>8</sub> There is no interaction between self-perceived social responsibilities and dogmatism upon job satisfaction of university professors in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand.

The eighth null hypothesis was tested by comparing the <u>JDI</u> scores of individuals within each of the six subgroups. This was accomplished through the use of a two-way analysis of variance, and appears as the <u>F</u> ratio of the two-way interactions in Table 19.

The results presented in Table 19 indicate that there was not a significant interaction between the two independent variables, the <u>SRS</u> scores and Dogmatism scores, upon the <u>JDI</u> scores (F = 0.087; df = 2/324; p > .05). These results would not allow the researcher to reject the

eighth null hypothesis.

Further data from Table 19 indicate interesting findings. Unlike related finding from the testing of the seventh hypothesis, there was no significant difference in the <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors grouped according to their level of dogmatism when the <u>SRS</u> score variable was controlled (F = 2.716; df = 2/329; p >.05). Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the <u>JDI</u> scores of the six university professor groups appear in Table 43 (Appendix D).

#### Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Nine

The null form of the ninth hypothesis was stated and tested as follows:

Ho<sub>9</sub> There is no interaction between the perceived political effects and dogmatism upon job satisfaction of university professors in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand.

Because there were two different political situations as mentioned earlier in the related literature, the null hypothesis had to be separately restated and tested as follows:

Ho<sub>9.1</sub>There is no interaction between the perceived political effects during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 and dogmatism upon job satisfaction of university professors in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand.

This sub-hypothesis was tested by comparing the <u>JDI</u> scores of individuals within each of the nine subgroups. This was accomplished through the use of a two-way analysis of variance and appears as the <u>F</u> ratio of the two-way interactions in Table 20. The results presented in Table 20 indicate that there was not a significant interaction between the two independent variables of the perceived political effects during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 and Dogmatism scores upon the JDI

## Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and the Political Effects<sup>a</sup>

Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Main Effects Dogmatism Political Effects	4 2 2	9965.93 3184.98 5565.20	2491.48 1592.49 2782.60	5.586*** 3.571* 6.239**
Two-Way Interactions	4	2166.49	541.62	1.214
Residual	320	142718.50	446.00	
Total	328	154850.94	472.11	

Note. \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001

<sup>a</sup>The political and social effects during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 on their work

scores (F = 1.214; df = 4/328; p > .05). These results would not allow the researcher to reject the first part of the ninth null hypothesis.

Further data from Table 20 indicate interesting findings. There was a significant difference in the <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors grouped according to their levels of dogmatism when the variable of the opinions toward political effects on their work during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 was controlled (F = 3.571; df = 2/320; p  $\lt$ .05). Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the <u>JDI</u> scores of the nine university professor groups appear in Table 44 (Appendix D).

Ho<sub>9.2</sub> There is no interaction between the perceived political effects after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977 and dogmatism upon job satisfaction of university professors in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand.

## Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and the Political Effects<sup>a</sup>

• Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Main Effects	4	5657.22	1414.31	3.026*
Dogmatism	2	4321.42	2160.71	4.623**
Political Effects	2	1560.06	780.03	1.669
Two-Way Interactions	4	1746.70	436.68	.934
Residual	321	150022.50	467.36	
Total	329	157426.44	478.50	

Note. \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01

<sup>a</sup>The political and social effects after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977 on their work

This sub-hypothesis was tested by comparing the <u>JDI</u> scores of individuals within each of the nine subgroups. This was accomplished through the use of a two-way analysis of variance, and appears as the <u>F</u> ratio of the two-way interactions in Table 21.

The results presented in Table 21 indicate that there was not a significant interaction between the two independent variables, the perceived political effects after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977 and Dogmatism scores, upon the <u>JDI</u> scores (F = 0.934; df = 4/329; p > .05). These results would not allow the researcher to reject the second part of the ninth null hypothesis.

Further data from Table 21 indicate interesting findings. There

was a significant difference in the <u>JDI</u> scores of university professors grouped according to their levels of dogmatism when the variable of opinions toward political effect upon their work after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977 was controlled (F = 4.623; df = 2/321; p  $\leq$  .01). Frequency counts, means, and standard deviations concerning the <u>JDI</u> scores of the nine university teacher groups appear in Table 45 (Appendix D).

### CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND SUGGESTIONS

FOR FURTHER STUDY

#### Summary

The problem of the study was to determine what the interactions of dogmatism and selected variables (such as major field, self-perceived social responsibilities, and perceived political effects) upon job satisfaction of university professors in Thailand are. More specifically, the researcher investigated (1) whether there are different levels of dogmatism of university professors in Thailand grouped according to personal characteristics, levels of perceived social responsibilities, and attitudes toward higher education issues, (2) whether there are different levels of job satisfaction of university professors in Thailand grouped according to personal characteristics, levels of perceived social responsibilities, and attitudes toward higher education issues, and (3) whether there are interactions of dogmatism and selected variables upon job satisfaction of university professors in Thailand.

The importance of the study derived from Getzels and Guba's Social System model used in the theoretical framework. Because of the role expectations of university professors are for innovation, criticism,

non-conformism, and tolerance toward ambiguity, individuals with personalities congruent to such expectations are likely to be satisfied in their professional job. The related literature suggested that, in this case, low dogmatics are expected to have higher job satisfaction than high dogmatics. However, because of the non-experimental nature of the study, the relationship between dogmatism and job satisfaction might be clouded by interactional effects of uncontrolled variables.

The Dogmatism Scale, Social Responsibility Scale, and the Job Description Index were included in the questionnaire package of 151 items. The total of 600 questionnaires were randomly administered to university professors in Bangkok-Thonburi Metropolitan City, Thailand, 335 or 55.8 were returned. Nine null hypotheses were tested and the results were as follows:

Hypothesis one: There were significant differences in dogmatism of university professors grouped according to two demographic variables namely major field of study and sex: (1) The university professors having their last degrees in Social Sciences (Antropology, Archeology, Political Sciences, Economics, and Sociology) were less dogmatic than university professors having their last degrees in other fields. (2) Female university professors were found less dogmatic than male university professors. There were no significant differences in dogmatism of university professors grouped according to other demographic variables such as rank and appointment, nature of work and work load, institutional characteristics, education, years of experience, teaching vs. research orientations, income, marital status and number of children, and age.

<u>Hypothesis two</u>: There was a significant difference in dogmatism of university professors grouped according to the perceived social responsibilities. University professors perceiving themselves as having low social responsibilities were less dogmatic than those perceiving themselves as having high social responsibilities.

Hypothesis three: There were significant differences in dogmatism of university professors grouped according to opinions toward higher education issues in three areas: (1) University professors supporting banning the students' political activities on a university campus were more dogmatic than the university professors opposing such banning. (2) University professors reporting the political situation during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 had no effect on their work were less dogmatic than the group reporting the situation was "harmful." (3) Conversely, university professor reporting the political situation after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977 had no effect or harmful to their work were less dogmatic than those reporting the situation was favorable. There were no differences in dogmatism of university professors grouped according to opinions toward other issues in higher education such as the institutions' concern for personal values, faculty-student relation, institutional engagement in solving social problem, students practical training in the community, and academic freedom.

Hypothesis four: There were significant differences in dogmatism grouped according to seven demographic variables namely students' enrollment in their courses, institution, major field of last degree, time devoted to administration, income earned within and outside the institutions, and marital status: (1) University professors with less than 25 students

enrolled in their courses were less satisfied in their jobs than those having 250 and more. (2) University professors employed at Thammasat University were less satisfied in their job than those employed at Ramkamhaeng University and other three university combined (MIT, Sri-Nakarin University, and NIDA). (3) University professors having last degrees in Social Sciences were more satisfied in their jobs than those having last degrees in non-Social Sciences fields. (4) University professors devoting no time to administrative tasks were less satisfied in their jobs than those devoting 1 to 10 percent and those devoting 41 percent or more of th cinistration. (5) Though the ce in university professors' analysis of varianc d the area of difference job satisfactior (6) University professors according to ir itutions were less satisfied earning less th and more. (7) The single in their jobs the in their jobs than those who university professo were married. There were no significant differences in job satisfaction of university professors grouped according to other demographic variables namely, rank and appointment, nature of work, education, years of experience, teaching vs. research orientations, number of children, age, and sex.

<u>Hypothesis five</u>: There was a significant difference in job satisfaction of university professors grouped according to the perceived social responsibilities. Those perceiving themselves as having low social responsibilities were more satisfied in their job than those perceiving themselves as having high social responsibilities.

enrolled in their courses were less satisfied in their jobs than those having 250 and more. (2) University professors employed at Thammasat University were less satisfied in their job than those employed at Ramkamhaeng University and other three university combined (MIT, Sri-Nakarin University, and NIDA). (3) University professors having last degrees in Social Sciences were more satisfied in their jobs than those having last degrees in non-Social Sciences fields. (4) University professors devoting no time to administrative tasks were less satisfied in their jobs than those devoting 1 to 10 percent and those devoting 41 percent or more of their time to administration. (5) Though the analysis of variance indicated the difference in university professors' job satisfaction, the S test failed to located the area of difference according to income within the institutions. (6) University professors earning less than 3,000 bahts outside the institutions were less satisfied in their jobs than those earning 3,000 bahts and more. (7) The single university professors were less satisfied in their jobs than those who were married. There were no significant differences in job satisfaction of university professors grouped according to other demographic variables namely, rank and appointment, nature of work, education, years of experience, teaching vs. research orientations, number of children, age, and sex.

<u>Hypothesis five</u>: There was a significant difference in job satisfaction of university professors grouped according to the perceived social responsibilities. Those perceiving themselves as having low social responsibilities were more satisfied in their job than those perceiving themselves as having high social responsibilities.

Hypothesis six: There were significant differences in job satisfaction of university professors grouped according to two variables concerning opinions toward higher education issues. (1) Though the analysis of variance indicated that there was a difference, the S test could not located the area of such difference in job satisfaction of university professors grouped according to their opinion toward banning the political activities on a university campus. (2) University professors perceiving the political situation during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 as having a harmful effect on their work were less satisfied in their jobs than those perceiving the situation as having no effect or favorable. There were no significant differences in job satisfaction of university professors grouped according to other variables of opinions toward higher education issues such as students' personal values, faculty-student relation, institutional engagement in solving social problems, students' practical training in the community, academic freedom, and the effect of the political situation after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977 on their work.

<u>Hypothesis seven</u>: There was no significant interaction between major field and dogmatism upon job satisfaction of university professors.

<u>Hypothesis eight</u>: There was no significant interaction between the self-perceived social responsibilities and dogmatism upon job satisfaction of university professors.

<u>Hypothesis nine</u> (part one): There was no significant interaction between the perceived political effect during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 and dogmatism upon job satisfaction of university professors. <u>Hypothesis nine</u> (part two): There was no significant interaction of the perceived political effect after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977 and dogmatism upon job satisfaction of university professors.

<u>Related findings</u>: Further two-way analysis of variance testings for the seventh, eighth, and ninth hypotheses revealed significant differences in job satisfaction of university professors grouped according to dogmatism in three out of four testings. Regardless of selected variables, low dogmatic university professors were more satisfied in their jobs than highly dogmatic university professors.

### Discussion

The social system model used as the theoretical framework of the study led to the logical hypothesis that university professors, if expected to be satisfied in their jobs in the academic community, have to have beliefs, attitudes, or values congruent to the role expectations of university professors. As mentioned by Ladd and Lipset (1975), university professors may be defined as having three subroles: namely teacher, scholar, and researcher. These subroles have put special demands upon university professors for rigorous scrutiny, criticism, and tolerance toward ambiguity. Related research concerning dogmatism indicated that low dogmatics tended to have personalities more congruent to such demands of university professors than high dogmatics. These studies suggested that individuals being low in dogmatism (open-minded) would have less conflict in the role of university professor and were expected to be more satisfied in their jobs. However, because of the non-experimental nature of the study where extraneous variables were not controlled, the

relationship between dogmatism and job satisfaction of university professors might be clouded by effects of uncontrolled variables. From reviewing the literature concerning previous related research, the researcher suspected that political effect of the "experimental democracy" and "coup d'etat" might have impact upon such relationships. Findings from testing the first six hypotheses indicated that the political turbulence had an effect upon university professors. The evidence is presented as follows: (1) Thammasat University as a place of employment had shown an effect upon university professors' job satisfaction. Its ranking as the lowest of all nine institutions in term of university professors' job satisfaction indicated that the exile of the student-andfaculty-elected rector and the bloodshed incident during October 6, 1976 on the university campus might have been causal. (2) The "Student Revolution" era seemed to disturb high dogmatic university professors while the others did not feel the effect or saw it as favorable to their work. Conversely, high dogmatics tended to see the repressive period after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977 as favorable to their work while low dogmatics saw it as having no effect or harmful to their work.

Though findings indicated university professors perceived themselves as being effected by the political situations there were still questions whether the situations had interactional effects upon the relationship between dogmatism and job satisfaction. Related literature led the researcher to suspect that politically related variables such as major field of last degree, perceived social responsibilities, and political effects of the "experimental democracy" and "coup d'etat" might have an impact upon the relationship. Two-way analysis of variance was utilized . to evaluated the interactional effect between such selected variables and dogmatism upon job satisfaction. The results from testing Hypotheses Seven, Eight, and Nine indicated that there were no such interactional effects. Further data analyses as by-product of the statistical testings revealed information way analysis of variance testings, university professors' job satisfaction was found to differ by levels of dogmatism. Simply stated, low dogmatic university professors tended to be more satisfied in their work than the highly dogmatic university professors regardless of political or situational impacts. The findings substantially supported the assumption that open-mindedness or low dogmatism is an essence in the role expectations of university professors.

A question emerged from the finding: Why did the political situation after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1976 which turned the country to a repressive period, not cause the low dogmatic university professors to be less satisfied in their job than the highly dogmatic university professors? (Low dogmatics, more than high dogmatics, expressed the "repressive period" as harmful to their work.) Different aspects of answers are provided as follows: (1) During the short period of repression, there was little opportunity for the regime to intervene in the internal affairs of university administration. Only at Thammasat University where the rectorship was vacant, because the former rector went into exile, could the regime select their own replacement. However, after October 20, 1977 when the military government provided a more permissive atmosphere, the new rector was forced to resign by the pressure from instructors within the university. (2) The practice of tenure system in the Thai bureaucracy
provided university professors adequate protection against the external threat. Practically, all university professors will be granted tenureship after a probationary period of six to nine months. Further, university professors always enjoy a privilege over other governmental offocers. They are granted "automatic promotion" while other regular bureaucrats are requaied to pass an examination in order to be promoted from the bottom (3) After October 14, 1973 university professors had gained more up. power in decision making in both academic as well as administrative areas. Faculty senates and due process emerged during this anarchic period to provide needed protection for academic freedom. (4) The low dogmatic university professors, according to their SRS scores, were socially and politically alienated toward the existing tradition. They tended to care less what the political grocess was going to be, to feel unobligated to any social or political happenings, and should be characterized as observers rather than participants. (5) The D Scale, though it has a high correlation level with the F Scale of Adorno (1950), was not designed to detect political ideologies. If the  $\underline{F}$  Scale were used instead of the  $\underline{D}$  Scale, the outcome might have been different. (6) The population in this study did not include a number of faculty who went into exile or, who resigned to run for political offices during the "experimental democracy," or who resigned because of dissatisfaction toward the dictatorial regime. These people, according to their reasons for leaving institutions, should be among the more politically oriented group, and some of them might have been low dogmatic.

#### Sugrestions for Further Study

To the researcher's knowledge, this study was the first in administering the Dogmatism Scale to any group of the Thai population. Though the <u>D</u> Scale was translated into Thai and pretested for linguistic accuracy, questions could still be raised concerning validity. The success of the English version has been proven in psychological and social research in the United States and other English speaking countries. Its prospective contribution should be motivating to future Thai researchers to improve its Thai version. The test should be administered to various other groups. The <u>D</u> Scale could be strengthened by improving or eliminating the inconsistent items. The correlational matrix was recommended in locating the area of inconsistency.

Among the demographic variables used in this type of study, socio-economic background was important but could not be included in this study. However, it cannot be gathered by the use of a questionnaire due to its secrecy and embarrassment. Since interviews seemed to be a more effective technique for data gathering than the paper-and-pencil-type questionnaire, it is suggested that this method be used in further study applying socio-economic background as a research variable.

If there is no need to compare the degree of job satisfaction among personnel of various organizations, such as in business and industry, with university professors, then parts of the <u>JDI</u> should be selectively used For example, "work" showed a high internal correlation and can be nearly as effective as the total <u>JDI</u> and, at the same time, more convenient for respondents to answer. The <u>JDI</u>, though effective and easy to answer, was too general for administering specifically to academic personnel. Additional questions could be constructed to elicit information concerning the work of academic personnel, namely instruction, research, and service to the society.

••

REFERENCES

#### REFERENCES

- Adams, H. E., & Vidulich, R. N. Dogmatism and belief consequence in paired-associate learning. <u>Psychological Reports</u>, 1962, <u>10</u>, 91-94.
- Adorno, T. et al. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper, 1950.
  - Athan, P. W., & McCord, L. C. The implications for reduced working hours in a hospital setting (Doctoral dissertation, United International University, 1973). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 1973, <u>33</u>(7), 3364A.
  - Baldridge, J. V. <u>Power and conflict in the university: Research in</u> <u>the sociology of complex organizations</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971.
  - Bayer, A. E., & Astin, H. S. Sex differences in academic rank and salary among science doctorates in teaching. <u>Journal of Human Resources</u>, 1968, <u>3</u>, 191-199.
  - Berkowitz, L., & Lutterman, K. Social Responsibility Scale in the traditionally socially responsible personality. <u>Public Opinion</u> <u>Quarterly</u>, 1968, 32, 169-185.
  - Bertrand, A. L. <u>Social organization: A general systems and role theory</u> <u>perspective</u>. Arlington Heights, Ill.: AHM Publishing Corporation, 1972.
  - Birren, J. E. <u>The psychology of aging</u>. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
  - Blau, P. M. <u>The organization of academic work</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973.

Bord, R. J. Impact of dogmatism on reactions to validated authority and anti-authority. <u>Psychological Reports</u>, 1976, <u>38</u>, 1219-1222.

Campbell, M. V. <u>Self-role conflict among teachers and its relationship</u> to satisfaction, effectiveness, and confidence in leadership. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.

- Caplow, T. & McGee, R. J. <u>The academic marketplace</u>. New York: Basic Books, 1958.
- Carnoy, M. <u>Education as cultural imperialism</u>. New York: David McKay Company, 1974.
- Centers, R., & Bugental, D. E. Intrinsic and extrinsic job motivations among different segments of the working population. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50, 193-197.
- Christensen, C. M. A note on "Dogmatism and Learning." Journal of <u>Abnormal and Social Psychology</u>, 1963, 66(1), 75-76.
- Clark, B. R. Belief and loyality in college organization. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Higher Education</u>, June 1967, 499-515.
- Cohen, H. V. Working efficiency as a function of noise level, work pace, and time at work (Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, 1972). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 1972, <u>33</u>, 3975B.
- Cohen, M. O., & March, J. G. <u>Leadership and ambiguity: The American</u> <u>college president</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Corson, J. J. <u>The governance of colleges and universities</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Costin, F. Dogmatism and learning: A follow-up of contradictory findings. Journal of Educational Researchers, 1965, 59, 186-188.
- Cummings, M. S. Dogmatism, ideology, and political behavior (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1975). <u>Dissertation Abstracts</u> <u>International</u>, 1975, <u>35</u>, 7973A.
- Darling, F. C. Thailand in 1976: Another defeat for constitutional democracy. Asian Survey, 1977, 17(2), 116-132.
- Dhiravegin, L. <u>Political attitudes of the bureaucratic elite and</u> <u>modernization in Thailand</u>. Bangkok, Thailand: Thai Watana Panich Press Co., 1973.
- DiRenzo, G. J. Dogmatism and orientations toward liturgical change. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religions, 1967, 7, 278.
- Dodds, H. W. <u>The academic president:</u> Educator or caretaker. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Downs, A. Inside bureaucracy. Bostón: Little, Brown, & Co. Inc., 1967.

- Dressler, G. <u>A test of the path-goal theory of leadership</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, City University of New York, 1973.
- Ehrlich, H. J. <u>Dogmatism and intellectual change</u>. Unpublished Master of Arts thesis, Ohio State University, 1955.
  - \_\_\_\_\_\_. Dogmatism and learning. <u>Journal of Abnormal and Social</u> <u>Psychology</u>, 1961, <u>62</u>, 148-149.
- Ellul, J. The technological society. New York: Vintage Books, 1964.
- Embling, J. F. <u>A fresh look at higher education: European implications</u> of the Canegie Commission Reports. Amsterdams: Elsevier Scientific Publ. Co., 1974.
- Emmerson, D. K. <u>Students and politics in developing nations</u>. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1968.
- Etzioni, A. <u>A comparative analysis of complex organizations:</u> On power, involvement, and their correlates. New York: Free Press, 1961.

. <u>Modern organizations</u>. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentic-Hall, Inc., 1964.

- Feldman, D. A., & Newcomb, T. M. <u>The impact of college on students</u> (Vol. 1). San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1969.
- Fillenbaum L., & Jackson, A. Dogmatism and anxiety in relation to problem solving: An extension of Rokeach's results. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 212-214.
- Freedman, R., & Coombs, L. Childspacing and family economic position. American Sociological Review, 1966, 31, 631-648.
- Fromm, E. Man for himself. New York: Fawcett Publications, 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_. <u>The same society</u>. Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications, 1955.
- Frumkin, R. M. Dogmatism, social class, values, and academic achievement in sociology. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1961, 34, 398-403.
- Funk, C. D., & Carter, G. L. The relationship between Dogmatism scores and performance ratings among adult educators. <u>Adult Education</u> <u>Journal</u>, 1971, <u>11</u>(2), 46-55.
- Gabennesch, H. Authoritarian as world view. <u>American Journal of</u> <u>Sociology</u>, 1972, <u>77</u>, 857-875.
- Gellman, E. S. <u>Statistics for teachers</u>. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1973.

- Getzels, J. W. Conflict and role behavior in the educational setting. In W. W. Charters & N. L. Gage (Eds.), <u>Readings in the social</u> psychology of education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_, & Guba, E. G. Social behavior and the administrative process. School Review, 1957, 65, 423-441.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Lipham, J. M., & Campbell, R. F. <u>Educational administration</u> as a social process: Theory, research, practice. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., & Donnelly, J. H. <u>Organizations:</u> <u>Structure, processes, behavior</u>. Dallas, Texas: Business Publications, Inc., 1973.
- Goheen, R. F. <u>The human nature of a university</u>. Princeton, N. J.: University of Princeton Press, 1969.
- Guilford, J. P. The nature of human intelligence. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Halberstam, D. The best and the brightest. New York: Random House, 1972.
- Hansen, J. I., & Johansson, C. B. Strong vocational interest blank and dogmatism. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 2(3), 196.
- Harrison, M. J., & Weightman, K. Academic freedom in England and higher education. <u>British Journal of Sociology</u>, 1974, 25, 32-46.
- Hertzler, J. O. Social institutions. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1929.
- Higginbotham, T. E. Irrationality in college students. <u>Rational Living</u>, 1976, <u>11(1)</u>, 34.
- Horton, P. B., & Hunt, C. L. Sociology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- Hulin, C. L. Job satisfaction and turnover in female clerical population. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, <u>50</u>, 280-285.
- Jamias, J. F., & Trodahl, V. C. <u>Dogmatism</u>, tradition, and general <u>innovativeness</u>. Unpublished manuscript, 1965.
- Kemp, C. G. Influence of dogmatism on counseling. <u>Personnel and</u> <u>Guidance Journal</u>, 1961, <u>39</u>, 662-665.
  - \_\_\_\_\_. Critical thinking: Open and closed minds. <u>American</u> <u>Behavioral Scientist</u>, 1962, <u>5</u>, 10-15.
  - \_\_\_\_\_\_. Perception of authority in relation to open and closed belief systems. <u>Science Education</u>, 1963, <u>47</u>, 482-484.

- Kemp, C. G. Effect of dogmatism on critical thinking. <u>School Sciences</u> and <u>Mathematic</u>, 1966, <u>63</u>, 380-392.
- Kerlinger, F. N. <u>Foundations of behavioral research</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1973.
- La Sorte, M. A. Academic women's salaries: Equal pay for equal work. Journal of Higher Education, 1971, <u>42</u>(4), 265.

. Sex differences in salary among academic sociology teachers. <u>American Sociology</u>, 1971, <u>6(4)</u>, 304.

Ladd, E. C., & Lipset, S. M. Politics of academic natural scientists and engineers. <u>Science</u>, 1972, <u>176</u>, 1091-1100.

> . The divided academy: Professors and politics. New York: Norton, 1975.

- Laszlo, E. The systems view of the world. New York: George Braziller, 1972.
- Lichtman, C. M. Some interpersonal response correlates of organizational rank. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54(1), 77-80.
- Lipset, S. M. Democracy and working-class authoritarianism. <u>American</u> <u>Sociological Review</u>, 1959, <u>24</u>, 482-501.
- Locke, E. A. What is job satisfaction? <u>Organizational Behavioral and</u> <u>Human Performance</u>, 1969, 4, 309-336.
- . Smith, P. C., & Hulin, C. L. <u>Cornell studies of job</u> <u>V. scale characteristics of the Job Description Index</u>. Mimeo, Cornell University, circa 1965.
- Lorentz, R. J. Levels of dogmatism and attitudes toward marijuana. <u>Psychological Reports</u>, 1972, <u>30</u>(1), 75-78.
- Maccoby, M. <u>The gamesman, the new corporate leaders</u>. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1976.
- Meier, G. M. (Ed.). Leading issues in development economics. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- McCarthy, J., & Johnson, R. C. Interpretation of the "City Hall Riots" as a function of general dogmatism. <u>Psychological Reports</u>, 1962, <u>11</u>, 243-245.
- Mehryar, A. H. Authoritarianism, rigidity, and Eyesenck's E. and N. dimensions in an authoritarian culture. <u>Psychological Reports</u>, 1970, <u>27</u>, 326.

- Minium, E. W. <u>Statistical reasoning in psychology & education</u>. New York: John & Sons, Inc., 1970.
- Mumford, L. <u>The myth of the machine</u>. New York: Hartcourt, Brace & World, 1966.
- Nations, R. October Revolution- Part II. <u>Far Eastern Economic Review</u>, 1976, <u>94</u>(October 15), 10-11.
- Norman, R. P. Dogmatism and psychoneurosis in college women. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Consulting Psychology</u>, 1966, <u>30</u>(3), 278.
- Norris, E. L. Attitude change as a function of opening and closed-mindedness. <u>Journalism Quarterly</u>, 1965, <u>42</u>, 571-575.
- Office of the National Education Commission (Thailand). <u>A research report</u> on higher education system: A case study of Thailand. 1977.
- Parsons, T. The social system. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951.
- Rada, A. <u>A study of factors influencing job satisfactions of community</u> <u>college teachers</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Pacific, 1975.
- Rebhun, M. T. Dogmatism and test anxiety. <u>Journal of Psychology</u>, 1966, <u>62</u>, 39-40.
- Renuart, W. R. A comparison of teacher dogmatism with administrators' perceptions of teacher behavior and with teachers' receptivity to change (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34, 3786A.
- Richardson, R. C. & Blocker, C. L. An item factorization of the faculty attitude survey. <u>Journal of Experimental Education</u>, 1966, <u>34</u>(4), 89-93.
- Richman, B. M., & Farmer, R. N. Leadership, goals, and power in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Robins, G. E., & Rogers, D. E. Dogmatism and study time in high school students: Better to be wrong than long. <u>Journal of Educational</u> <u>Research</u>, 1975, <u>69</u>(3), 120-121.
- Robinson J. P., Shaver P. R. <u>Measures of social psychological attitudes</u>. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, 1976.
- Rokeach, M. The nature and meaning of dogmatism. <u>Psychological Review</u>, 1954, <u>61</u>, 194-204.

- Rokeach, M. Political and religious dogmatism: An alternative to the authoritarian personality. <u>Psychological Monograph</u>, No. 425, 1956, <u>43</u>, 70.
- (Ed.). The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- In pursuit of the creative process. In G. A. Steiner (Ed.), <u>The creative organization</u>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.•
- , & Restle, F. A fundamental distinction between open and closed systems. In M. Rokeach (Ed.), <u>The open and closed mind</u>. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Rempel, A., & Bentley, R. R. Teacher morale relationship with selected factors. <u>The Journal of Teacher Education</u>, 1970, 21(4), 534-539.
- Rose, A. A systematic summary of symbolic interactionist theory. In A. Rose (Ed.), <u>Human behaviour and social processes</u>. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962.
- Rosenfeld, H. M., & Nauman, D. J. Effects of dogmatism on the development of informal relationship among women. <u>Journal of Personality</u>, 1969, <u>37</u>, 497-511.
- Sakler, J. Leadership, confidence in management and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1970, 6, 3-19.
- Saha, L. J. How divisive are left-wing academics: Australian test. Sociology of Education, 1976, 49(1), 80-89.
- Saxton, L. <u>The individual, marriage, and the family</u>. Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1972.
- Schuler, R. S. Participation with supervisor and subordinate authoritarianism: A path-goal theory reconciliation. <u>Administrative</u> <u>Science Quarterly</u>, 1976, 21, 320-325.
- Scott, W. G., & Mitchell, T. R. <u>Organizational theory: A structural and</u> behavioral analysis. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1972.
- Smith, P. C., et al. <u>Cornell studies of job satisfaction: I, II, III,</u> Mimeo, Cornell University, circa 1965.

•	The	meas	uremen	it of	sat:	isfaction	in	work	and
retirement.	Chica	igo:	Rand	McNa	11y,	1969.			

Sprague, B. Q. Job satisfaction and university faculty. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1974.

Steffensmeier, D. J. Levels of dogmatism and attitudes toward law and order. <u>Psychological Reports</u>, 1974, <u>34</u>, 151-153.

Levels of dogmatism and social distance attitudes toward hippies. <u>Psychological Reports</u>, 1976, 38, 222.

- Steffre, B., King, P., & Leafgren, F. Characteristics of counselors judged effective by their peers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 335-340.
- Steininger, M. Aptitude, dogmatism and college press as codeterminants of academic achievement. Journal of Social Psychology, 1970, 80, 229-230.
- Stephens, W. E. <u>Need levels, need satisfactions, and need deficiencies in</u> <u>college teachers</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1974.
- Stouffer, S. A. <u>Communism</u>, conformity, and civil liberties: A crosssection of the nation speaks its mind. New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1955.
- Terhune, K. W. Self and nation: A study of the psychological nature of nationalism and patriotism. <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 1964, <u>24</u>, 3004A-3005A.
- Toffler, A. Future shock. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Tosi, H. L. A re-examination of personality as a determinant of the effect of participations. <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 1973, <u>26</u>, 339-350.
- Tygart, C. E. Political liberalism-conservatism among university students: The question of dimensionality. Youth & Society, 1975, <u>6</u>(3), 298-308.
- Uhes, M. J., & Shaver, J. P. Dogmatism and divergent-convergent abilities. <u>The Journal of Psychology</u>, 1970, 75, 3-11.
- Vacchiano, R. B., Strauss, D. D., & Schiffman, D. C. Personality correlates of dogmatism. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, <u>32</u>, 83-85.
- Vande Loo, R. J. <u>A social character analysis of individuals scoring open-</u> <u>minded on the Dogmatism Scale</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the Catholic University of America, 1975.
- Victor, J. B. Peer judgements of teaching competence as a function of independence and dogmatism. <u>Journal of Experimental Education</u>, 1976, <u>44</u>(3), 10-13.

- Vidulich, R. N., & Kaiman, I. P. The effects of information sources, status, and dogmatism upon conformity behavior. <u>Journal cf</u> <u>Abnormal and Social Psychology</u>, 1961, 63, 639-642.
- Vroom, V. Some personality determinants of the effects of participation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1959, <u>59</u>, 322-327.
- Wesman, A. G. Intelligence testing. <u>American Psychology</u>, 1968, <u>23</u>, 267-274.
- Yinger, J. M. <u>Toward a field theory of behavior</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1965.
- Zagona, S. W., & Zurcher, L. A. The relationships of verbal ability and other cognitive variables to the open-closed cognitive dimension. Journal of Psychology, 1965, <u>60</u>, 213-219.
- Zimmerman, R. F. Student revolution in Thailand: End of Thai bureaucratic polity. <u>Asian Survey</u>, 1974, <u>14(6)</u>, 509.

APPENDIX A

.

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

ENGLISH VERSION

### FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire represents an attempt to survey the opinion of university professors upon society, higher education, and their professional positions. Your candid responses are very necessary to the study. The information you supply will be kept absolutely confidential.

ART	I DEMOGRAPHIC DATA (1-23)
	Please answer the following questions.
1.	What is your present rank?(1) Instructor(2) Assistant Professor(3) Associate Professor(4) Professor
2.	What kind of appointment do you have here? (1) Regular with tenure (2) Regular without tenure (3) Special (4) Visiting
3.	During the regular term, how many hours per week are you spendingin formal instruction? (Give actual, not credit hours.)(1) None(2) $1-4$ (3) $5-6$ (4) $7-8$ (5) $9-10$ (6) $11-12$ (7) $13-16$ (8) $17-20$ (9) 21 or more
4.	What are your teaching responsibilities this academic year? (1) Entirely undergraduate (2) Some undergraduate, some graduate (3) Entirely graduate (4) Not teaching this year
5.	About how many students, at all levels, are enrolled in your courses this term? (1) None (2) Under 25 (3) 25-49 (4) 50-99 (5) 100-249 (6) 250-399 (7) 400-999 (8) 1,000 or more
6.	At what institution are you employed?(1) Kasetsat University(2) Chulalongkorn University(3) Mahidol University(4) Ramkamhaeng University(5) Silpakorn University(6) Sri-nakarin University(7) Thammasat University(8) NIDA
7.	<pre>What is your highest educational attainment?   (1) Assoicate degree or equivalent   (2) Bachelor's degree or equivalent   (3) Master's degree or equivalent</pre>

(4) Ph. D. or equivalent

- 8. Identify major field of study in your last degree.
  - (1) Agriculture/Forestry
  - (2) Accounting, Commerce, and Business Administration
  - (3) Education
  - (4) Engineering
  - (5) Fine Arts, Drama, and Music
  - (6) Geography
  - (7) Medicine
  - (8) Nursing
  - (9) Public Health, Health Education
  - (10) Pharmacy
  - (11) Medical Science
  - (12) Home Economics
  - (13) Humanities
  - (14) Industrial Arts
  - (15) Journalism
  - (16) Law
  - (17) Library Science
  - (18) Sciences (Pure)
  - (19) Archeology
  - (20) Anthropology
  - (21) Economics
  - (22) Political Science, Government
  - (23) Sociology
  - (24) Others
- 9. Have you ever had educational training abroad? (If yes, please also answer 10 and 11.)
  - (1) Yes

(2) No

- 10. In what country did you have your educational training? (In case more than one country, please indicate where you stayed the longest.)
  - (1) The United States, Canada
  - (2) European countries
  - (3) Asian countries
  - (4) Australia, New Zealand
  - (5) Others

(1)

(3)

(5)

### 11. How many years did you study abroad?

- (1) Less than 1 year (2) 1-2
- (3) 3-4 (4) 5 years or more

12. How long have you worked in the field of education?

- 1 year or less (2) 2-3
- 4-6 (4) 7-9
- 10-14 (6) 15-19
- (7) 20-29 (8) 30 or more

- 13. How long have you worked at this institution? (1) 1 year or less (2) 2-3 (3) 4-6 (4) 7-9
  - (5) 10-14 (6) 15-19
  - (7) 20-29 (8) 30 or more
- 14. In a normal week, what proportion of your work time is devoted to administration. (Departmental or institutional, including committee work)
  - (1) None
     (2) 1-10%

     (3) 11-20%
     (4) 21-40%

     (5) 41-60%
     (6) 61-80%

     (7) 81-100%
     (6) 61-80%
- 15. How many <u>articles</u> have you published in academic or professional journals?

(1)	None	(2)	1-2
(3)	3-4	(4)	5-10
(5)	11 or more		

16. How many books or monographs have you published or edited, alone or in collaboration?

(1)	None	(2)	1-2
(3)	3-4	(4)	5-10
(5)	11 or more		

- 17. Does your interest lie primarily in teaching or
  - Does your interest lie primarily in teaching or in research?
    - (1) Very heavily in research
    - (2) In both, but leaning toward research
    - (3) In both, but leaning toward teaching
    - (4) Very heavily in teaching

18. What is your total income at <u>this institution</u>, for the academic year?

- (1) 15,000bahts or less (2) 15,001-20,000
- $(3) \quad 20,001-25,000 \qquad (4) \quad 25,001-30,000$
- (5) 30,001-40,000 (6) 40,001-50,000
- (7) 50,001-70,000 (8) 70,001 or more

 19. What is your annual income earned outside this institution?

 (1) 3,000 bahts or less
 (2) 3,001-5,000

 (3) 5,001-10,000
 (4) 10,001-30,000

 (5) 30,001-50,000
 (6) 50,001 or more

20. What is your marital status?<br/>(1) Single(2) Married

21.	How many children	do you have?		
	(1) None	(2) 1	(3)	2
	(4) 3	(5) 4 or more		

- 22. How old are you?
  - (1) 24 years or younger
  - (3) 30-34
  - (5) 40-44
  - (7) 50-54

- (2) 25-29 (4) 35-39
  (6) 45-49
- (8) 55 or older

23. What is your sex? (1) Male

(2) Female

#### PART II YOUR OPINION UPON SELVES AND SOCIETY (24-71)

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your <u>personal opinion</u>. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view. You may find yourself agreeding strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others. Whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you.

Write the number of your choice according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please answer every question.

1:	I AGREE VERY MUCH	2:	I AGREE ON	THE WHOLE
3:	I AGREE A LITTLE	4:	I DISAGREE	A LITTLE
5:	I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE	6:	I DISAGREE	VERY MUCH

- 24. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.
- 25. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.
- 26. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goals, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.
- 27. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in that with ideas he opposes.
- 28. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.
- 29. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.
- 30. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.
- 31. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.
- 32. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.
- 33. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.
- 34. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.
- 35. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.

1:	I AGREE VERY MUCH	2:	I AGREE ON THE WHOLE
3:	I AGREE A LITTLE	4:	I DISAGREE A LITTLE
5:	I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE	6:	I DISAGREE VERY MUCH

- 36. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what others are saying.
- 37. It is better to be a dead hero than a live coward.
- 38. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.
- 39. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.
- 40. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.
- 41. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.
- 42. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.
- 43. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.
- 44. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.
- 45. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.
- 46. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.
- 47. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
- 48. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.
- 49. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.
- 50. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.

1:	I AGREE VERY MUCH	2:	I AGREE ON	THE WHOLE
3:	I AGREE A LITTLE	4;	I DISAGREE	A LITTLE
5:	I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE	6:	I DISAGREE	VERY MUCH

- 51. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.
- 52. A group which tolerates too many differences of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.
- 53. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.
- 54. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.
- 55. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.
- 56. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.
- 57. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.
- 58. It is often desirable to reserve judgement about what is going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.
- 59. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.
- 60. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.
- 61. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."
- 62. Unfornately a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.
- 63. Most people just don't know what's good for them.
- 64. It is no use worrying about current events or public affairs; I can't do anything about them anyway.
- 65. Every person should give some of his time for the good of his town or country.

1:	I AGREE VERY MUCH	2:	I AGREE ON	THE WHOLE
3:	I AGREE A LITTLE	4:	I DISAGREE	A LITTLE
5:	I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE	6;	I DISAGREE	VERY MUCH

- 66. Our country would be a lot better off if we didn't have so many elections and people didn't have to vote so often.
- 67. Letting your friends down is not so bad because you can't do good all the time for everybody.
- 68. It is the duty of each person to do his job the very best he can.
- 69. People would be a lot better off if they could live far away from other people and never have to do anything for them.
- 70. At school I usually volunteered for special projects.
- 71. I feel very bad when I have failed to finish a job I promised I would do.

PART III YOUR OPINION UPON HIGHER EDUCATION (72-79)

- 72. This institution should be as concerned about students' personal values as it is with their intellectual development.
- 73. A man can be an effective teacher without personally involving himself with his students.
- 74. This institution should be actively engaged in solving social problems.
- 75. Our higher education would much improve if students were required to spend 1 year of practical training in the community.
- 76. We should not allow any political activities on a university campus.
- 77. Faculty members should be free to present in class any idea that they consider relevant.

For items 78 and 79, select the number of your choice below.

1: VERY FAVORABLE 2: FAIRLY FAVORABLE 3: NO EFFECT 4: FAIRLY HARMFUL 5: VERY HARMFUL

- 78. What effect did political and social situations during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 have on your work?
- 79. What effect have political and social situations after October 14, 1976 to October 20, 1976 have on your work?

PART IV YOUR JOB DESCRIPTION (80-151)

Select "1" if the item describes a particular aspect of your job (e.g., work, pay, etc.), "2" if you cannot decide, or "3" if the item does not describe that aspect.

Work

		•	
80.	Fascinating	81.	Routine
82.	Satisfying	83.	Boring
84.	Good	85.	Creative
86.	Respected	87.	Hot
88.	Pleasant	89.	Useful
90.	Tiresome	91.	Healthful
92.	Challenging	93.	On your feet
94.	Frustrating	95.	Simple
96.	Endless	97.	Give sense of accomplishment

Supervisor

98.	Asks my advice	99.	Hard to please
100.	Impolite	101.	Praises good work
102.	Tactful	103.	Influential
104.	Up-to-date	105.	Doesn't supervise enough
106.	Quick-tempered	107.	Tells me where I stand
108.	Annoying	109.	Stubborn
110.	Knows job well	111.	Bad
112.	Intelligent	113.	Leaves me on my own
114.	Around when needed	115.	Lazy

# People

116.	Stimulating	117.	Boring
118.	Slow	119.	Ambitious
120.	Stupid	121.	Responsible
122.	Fast	123.	Intelligent
124.	Easy to make enemies	125.	Talk too much
126.	Smart	127.	Lazy
128.	Unpleasant	129.	No privacy
130.	Active	131.	Narrow interests
132.	Loyal	133.	Hard to meet

.

.

# Pay

134.	Income adequate for normal expenses	135.	Satisfactory profit sharing
136.	Barely live on income	137.	Bad
138.	Income provides luxuries	139.	Insecure
140.	Less than I deserve	141.	Highly paid
142.	Underpaid		

## Promotions

143.	Good opportunity for advancement	144.	Opportunity somewhat limited		
145.	Promotion on ability	146.	Dead-end job		
147.	Good chance for promotion	148.	Unfair promotion policy		
149.	Infrequent promotions	150.	Regular promotions		
151.	Fairly good chance for promotion				

APPENDIX B

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

THAI VERSION

₽. <u>ь</u> ŝ ч • N • • มมาสอบถามนิจัครินี้ ได้ เราจกวามคิดเห็นเกี่ยวกับความ่าน สภาพการทำงาน การอุกมศึกษา ปริญญาทรี
 มิโทหาการสอนในปีนี้ หานกำลังทำงานอยู่ ณ สถาบันแหงใก (1) 197311 Bitela (1) **ก่าแหนงในปัจจุบันรองหาน**คืออะไ*ร* (7) มหาวิทยาลัยรรมศาสกร์ (4) 50 - 99 Mu ในการสอนภาคเรียนนี้ มีนักเรียนลงทะเบียนเรียนกับทานทั้งลิ้นก็คน(ทุกวิชารวมกัน) ท้านรับผิดชอบในการสอนระกับใด ้และสภาพสังคมโดยทั่วไป การแสดงออกซึ่งความคิดเห็นอย่างเปิดเผยและกรงกับความเป็น (4) บทาวิทยาลัยราบกำแหง (1) จุฬาลงกรณมหาวิทยาลัย (7) 400 - 999 Au (1) ใมมิเลย (1) มีใกห่าการสอนเฉย ในภาคการศึกษาปกทิ (1) ประจำสามัญ <u>ขณะนี้หานเป็นอาจารย์ประเภทใก</u> (4) ศาสกราจารย์ การวิจัยเหานั้น จริงของทานเป็นสิ่งที่จำเป็นอย่างยิ่งสำหรับงานวิจัยรินน์ (7) 13 - 16 ชั่วโบง (4) 7 - 8 ชั่วไบง (4) แอกเปลี่ยน ้ หานหาการสอนจริงสัปกาห์ละก็ชั่วโมง(ชั่วโมงสอนจริง (8) สถาบันพัฒนบริหารศาสตร์ (a) 1,000 คน หรือมากกว่า (5) มหาวิทยาลัยศรินครินทรวิไรธ(6) มหาวิทยาลัยศิลปากร (2) มหาวิทยาลัยเกษทรศาสกร์ (2) UBBNJJ 25 HU (5) 100 - 249 Au (2) ปริญญาทรินละไท (8) 17 - 20 III (5) 9 - 10 371uv (2) 1 - 4 ชั่วใบง (2) ประจำวิสามัญ ตรเนนนนนแนะนี่ (2) . 1 ขังเราจะถือเป็นกวามลับและใชเทอ (3) บหาวิทยาลัยมหิกล (3) ปริญญาโทลิ้นไป (9) 21 ซั่วโมงหรือมากกวา (6) 250 – 399 nu (3) 25 - 49 hu (6) 11 - 12 รัวโมง (3) 5 - 6 ซ้าโมง (3) **ลิเ**ศษ ร) รองศาสกราจารย (3) ไม่ใช่จำนวนหน่วยกิก)

7. ปริญญาสูงสุดที่ท่านได้รับ หรือ เพียบเท่า (2) ปริญญาทริ (1) อนุปรีตูญา .) ปริญญาโท (4) ปริญญาเอก ไปรุกแจงสาขาวิชาที่ท่านได้รับปริญญาสูงสุก (กอบเพียงขอเกียว) (1) เกษตรศาสตร/ป่าไม้ (2) บัญชี การก้า และบริหารธุรกิจ (4) วิศวกรรมศาสตร์ (3) การศึกษา (5) คือปลาสตร์ (6) ภูมิศาสตร์ (7) แพทยศาสตร์ (8) พยาบาล (9) สาขารณสุขศาสตร์ (10) เภสัชศาสตร์ (11) วิทยาศาสทร์การแพทย์ (12) เกหเสรษฐศาสกร (13) มนุษยศาสกร (14) อุกสาหกรรมศาสตร์ (15) วารสารศาสตร์ สื่อมวลชน (16) กฎหมาย (17) บรรณรักษ์ศาสตร์ (18) วิทยาศาสตร์ (19) โบราณกกี่ (20) มนุษยวิทยา (22) รัฐศาสกร์ รัฐประศาสนศาสกร์ (21) เสรษฐศาสตร์ (23) สังคบวิทยา 9. หานเลยได้รับการศึกษาหรือผู้กอบรมจากต่างประเทศหรือไม่(หากเลยไปรดดอบขอ 10 และ 11 ก้วย) / , ไมเคย (1) เกย 10. ท่านเลยได้รับการศึกษาหรือปีกอบรมจากประเทศใก(ในกรณีเกินกว่า 1 แห่ง โปรกตอบประเทศที่อยู นานที่สุก) (1) ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา หรือ แคนาดา (2) ประเทศในทวีปยุโรป (3) ประเทศในทวีปเอเชีย (4) ประเทศออสเตรเลีย หรือ นิวซีแอนด์ (5) ประเทศอื่นๆ 11. ทานใช้เวลาในการศึกษาหรือฝึกอบรมในต่างประเทศทั้งสิ้นกี่ปี (1) กำกว่า 1 ปี (2) 1 - 2 ปี (3) 3 - 4 1 (4) 5 ปีหรือนานกว่า

า2.ทานได้ทำงานเกี่ยวกับการสอนหรือการศึกษาเป็นเวลานานเท่าใด

(1) 1 ปีหรือนอยกวา.  $(2)^{2} - 3^{1}$ (3) 4 - 6 1 (4) 7 - 9 1 (5) 10 - 14 1(6) 15 - 19 ปี (7) 20 - 29 1 (8) 30 ปี หรือมากกว่า 13.ท่านได้เข้าทำงาน a สถาบันแห่งนี้ เป็นเวลานานเท่าใด (1) 1 ปีหรือนอยกว่า (2) 2 - 3 1 (3) 4 - 6 1(4) 7 - 9 1 (6) 15 - 19 1 (5) 10 - 14 1 (7) 20 - 29 1 (8) 30 ปี หรือมากกว่า 14.ในสับกาห์ปกที่ ห่านใช้เวลาสำหรับงานเกี่ยวกับการบริหาร เป็นอักราส่วนเท่าใก (ของภาล แผนก กณะ สถาบัน รวมทั้งงานประชุมของกณะกรรมการกางๆ) (1) ไมมีเลย (2) 1 - 20 %(3) 21 - 40 %(4) 41 - 60 % (5) 61 - 80 % (6) 81 - 100 % 15.ท่านเลยเขียนบทลวามลงในวารสารทางวิชาการกิบทลวาบ (1) ไมเกยเชียน (2) 1 - 2 บทกวาม (3) 3 - 4 บทความ (4) 5 - 10 บทความ (5) 11 บทความหรือมากกวา 16.ทานเลยเชียน รวมเชียน หรือเป็นบรรณาธิการ คำราเรียน หรือ หนังสือทางวิชาการรวมกี่เว่ม (1) ไมเลยเชียน (2) 1 - 2 1 au(3) 3 - 4 1 au(4) 5 - 10 (a) (5) 11 หรือมากกว่า 17.ทันนมีความสนใจหนักไปในทางงานสอนหรืองานค้นควา (1) สนใจงานคนความาก (2) สนใจทั้งสองด้าน และนักทางลานงานลินลวา (3) สนใจทั้งสองด้วย แต่หนักทางด้วยงายสอบ (4) สนใจงานสอบบาก

	۰	•		•	• ·
	•	· . . ·	•	· •	
				•	
		•	\$	•	
	. ទប្រក	(2)		RLE (1)	
	· •	••••	<b>ង</b> ភីអន វ		•
	LIULIT ETH T CC	(8)			i. ·
		(0)			
		(9)		(2) 40 - 44	
	jt 65 - 35	(7)		(2) 20 - 24 J	
	<u>r</u> 62 - 22	(2)	LCU	(1) S4 UNION	
			นโยก	ck=tulprodurn	• 22
			LEUULT	Gin un 4 (3)	
	nu e	(7)	·	(2) S UN .	
	nu i	(3)		(1) asjnn	
			นยุบ	ากธิรอบรถุนั้นการ	• 1S
	CENTLAND	(3)	r	ubj (1)	
	<b>&amp;</b> ?		CENTLINUI	nethubinutu .	• 02
	CCURTERINCE TOO, 02	(9)	4LL 000'05	- 100'02 (5)	
	κυπ 000'02 - 100'01	(7)	NTU 000,01	$-100^{4}$ (5)	
	ALT 000 C - 400 C	(7)	ula (		
		165			• 6 1
	(chopsconcrucing				
	trinewor 100.07	(8)	<b>KCH 000-07</b>	- 100-05 (1)	
	461 000.02 - 100.04	(9)	MUL D00.04	- 100.05 (2)	
	aru 000,05 - 100,25	(7)	RCU 000, 25	- 100,02 (T)	
• •	HUR 000'02 - 100'SL	(5)	ULL OC	$30^{4}$ SL - 0 (L)	••
	(เกษะอม นหาศักรษ นอดีา	มคราวสุรักษาสุด	นอานันแหงนรวมหาสน	menluriture.	81

• .

.

•

. .

· .

•

2

, •

คำถามท่อไปนี้เป็นการสารวจกวามรู้สึกของท่านเกี่ยวกับสังคมและส่วนกัว ไม่มีสำตอบที่ถูกหรือผิด ทั้งหมดเป็นลวามเห็นส่วนทัวของท่าน จากลักษณะคำถาม เราได้พยายามลรอบคลุมทัศนะที่แกกล่าง กันออกไป ท่านอาจจะพบว้าบางประโยกทานเห็นก้วยเป็นอย่างยิ่ง บางประโยกท่านก็ไม้เห็นก้วย บางประโยกท่านก็ไม่แน่ใจ ไม่ว่าท่านจะมีความรู้สึกอย่างไรกับกำถามเหล่านี้ ไปรกแน่ใจไก้เลยว่า มิคนอีกเป็นจำนวนมากที่มีความรู้สึกเช่นเกี่ยวกับท่าน โปรดดอบกำถามทุกรอ (1) เห็นกวยอยางยิ่ง (2) เห็นกวย (3) เห็นดวยเป็นบางสวน (6) ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง (4) ไมเห็นกวยเป็นบางส่วน (5) ไมเห็นกวย 24. ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกาและรัสเซียแทบจะไม่มีอะไรเหมือนกัน 25. รัฐบาลที่ก็ที่สุกก็อรัฐบาลในระบอบประชาธิปไทย และรูปแบบที่ก็ที่สุกก็ก็อก้องปกกรองโดยคนที่ฉลากที่สุก 26. ถึงแม้ว่าการให้เสริภาพในการพูกแก่กลุ่มชนทุกกลุ่มจะเป็นของดีก็ตาม แก่ก็ควรยกเว้นเอาไว้สำหรับ กลุ่มการเมืองบางกลุ่ม 27. เป็นธรรมกาที่มนุษย์จะให้ความสนใจต่อแนวกวามคิกที่โราเห็นด้วยมากกว่าแนวกวามคิกที่เราต่อต้าน 28. มนุษย์โดยลำพังแล้วช่วยตัวเองไม่ได้และนาสงสาร 29 โดยมูลฐานแล้ว โลกที่เราอาศัยอยู่นี่ลอนข้างอ้างว้าง 30. คนโดยทั่วไปไม่ค่อยจะสนใจหรอกว่าคนอื่นจะเป็นอย่างไรกันบ้าง 31. ฉันอยากหาใครสักคนที่จะช่วยแก้ปัญหาให้ฉัน 32. โดยรรรมชาติ มนุษย์ขอมหวาดกลัวตออนาลล 33. เรายังมีอะไรหี่ก้องทำอีกมาก แต่เรามีเวลาเหลืออยู่น้อยเหลือเกิน 34. ในยามที่มีการโค้เถียงกัน ฉันมักหยุกไม่ค่อยได้ 35. ในการอภิปรายหรือสนทนากัน ฉันพบว่าจำเป็นที่จะก้องพูกซ้ำหลายๆ ครั้ง เพื่อให้เข้าใจ 36. ในการอภิปรายอย่างเน็กร้อน ฉันมักจะกั้งใจที่จะหูกจนกระทั่งลืมไปว่าคนอื่นไก้หูกอะไรกันบ้าง 37. " กายอย่างวิรบุรุษดีกว่าอยู่อย่างกนซื้อลาก " 38. ถึงแม้ว่าฉันจะไม่อยากยอมรับ แก่ความจริงแล้วฉันผันอยากเป็นคนที่ยิ่งใหญ่อย่าง ไอสไทน์ เปโซเฟน หรือ เชกเบียร์ 39. กวามสำคัญของชีวิกเราก็คือต้องทำอะไรบางอย่างที่สำคัญ ๆ 40. หากมีโอกาส ฉันอยากทำอะไรบางอย่างที่เป็นประโยชน์ทอโลกนี้บ้าง 41. ในประวัติศาสตร์ของมนุษย์ ดูเหมือนจะมีนักคิดที่สำคัญๆ เพียงไม่ถื่อนเท่านั้น

42. มีคนจำพวกหนึ่งที่ฉันไม่ชอบเพราะมีความเชื่อไม่เหมือนกัน 43. คนที่ไม่มีความเชื่อในหลักการใก้บ้างก็เหมือนกับคนที่ไม่มีชีวิก 44. ชีวิทนี้จะมีความหมายก็กอเมื่อมนุษย์ไก้อุทิศกันเพื่ออุกมการณ์ของเขา 45. ในปรัชญาที่แทกทางและซักแยงกันนั้น บางที่มีถูกท้องไก้เพียงอันเกียวเทานั้น 46. คนที่ชื่นชมในอุคมการณ์เกินไปเป็นคนที่เพื่อเจ้อ 47. การประณีประนอมกับการปฏิบักษ์ทางการเมืองเป็นอันตราย เพราะมักนำไปสู่การทรยศพวกเคียวกัน 48. ในกรณีที่มีการนับถือสาสนานกกทางกัน เราท้องระวังความกิกเห็นที่จะไม่คล้อยตามพวกที่นับถือสาสนา ทางไปจากเรา 49. ในภาวะการเช่นปัจจุบัน คนที่เห็นแก่ความสุขส่วนกนเป็นสำคัญคือคนที่เห็นแก่คัว 50. กวามผิดที่เลวร้ายที่สุดก็คือการกล่าวโทษโจมก็แม้แต่คนที่มีความเชื่อเหมือนกัน 51. ในภาวะเช่นนี้ ควรจะควบคุมความคิดของพวกคนเองเสียยิ่งกว่าปายตรงขาม 52. กลุ่มขนใกที่ปล่อยให้มีความคิดเห็นแกลกางกันมากๆ มักจะไปไม่รอก 53. มนุษย์ในโลกนี้มีอยู่ 2 พวก คือพวกที่ก้องการกวามจริง และ พวกที่ไม่กองการกวามจริง 54. ฉันมักจะโกรซอย่างรุนแรง เมื่อเจอคนที่ทำผิกแล้วไม่ยอมรับผิก 55. คนที่คิดแต่จะหาลวามสุขส่วนกัวลวรได้รับการประนาม 56. ชื่อคิกข้อเชียนในปัจจุบันแทบจะหาสาระอะไรไม่ไก้ 57. ในโลกที่สับสนอย่างปัจจุบัน มีทางเกี่ยวที่เราจะรู้ว่าอะไรเป็นอะไรก็คือต้องเชื่อผู้นำ หรือ ผู้เชี่ยว ชาญที่ไวใจได

- 58. โดยที่ถูกที่สวรแล้ว เรายังไม่ลวรทักสินอะไรลงไป จนถว่าจะได้รับพังลวามเห็นจากลนที่เราเชื่อถือ เสียก่อน
- 59. สำหรับผลในระยะยาว ทางที่กี่ที่สุกควรเลือกคบแต่คนที่มีความคิดและรสนิยมคล้ายๆ กัน
- 60. ปัจจุบันชีวิกนี้ล่อนขางชมขึ้น แก่อนาลกเท่านั้นที่เป็นเลรื่องกักสิน
- 61. การที่คนเราจะคำเนินการใกๆ ในชีวิต บางทีก็ต้องเสี่ยงให้ "รู้คำรู้แคง" จึงจะสำเร็จ
- 62. นาอนาถที่คนส่วนใหญ่ที่ฉันได้มีโอกาสสนทนาเกี่ยวกับบัญหาทางสังคมและศีลษรรมด้วย ยังไม่เข้าใจ สภาพข้อเท็จจริง
- 63. กนส่วนใหญ่ยังไม่รู้ว่าอะไรดีหรือไม่ก็สำหรับกนเอง
- . 64. ไม่มีประโยชน์อะไรที่จะมานั้งเป็นหวงสภาพหรือบัญหาของปวงชน ถึงอย่างไรฉันก็ชวยอะไรไม่ได้

65. ทุกคนควรอุทิกความสุขสวนกัวบางเพื่อบาเพ็ญประโยชน์ทอชุมชนและประเทศชาติ 66. ประเทศซาดิจะเจริญกว่านี้มาก หากประชาชนเล็กวุนวายกับการเมือง 67. การทอกทิ้งเพื่อนก็ไม่ใช้สิ่งเลวร้ายอะไรนัก เพราะไม่มีใครจะให้ความช่วยเหลือทุกคนได้คลอดเวลา 68. เป็นหน้าที่ของแก่ละกนที่จะก้องทำงานของถนให้ก็ที่สุก 69. ประชาชนจะเจริญกว่านี้มาก หากได้มีโอกาสแยกยายกันอยู่และไม่ต้องมาเกี่ยวของกัน 70. เมื่อกอนยังเรียนหนังสืออยู่ ฉันชอบอาสาทำกิจกรรมพิเศษอยู่เสมอ 71. ฉันรูสึกเสียใจมาก หากไม่สามารถทำงานให้สาเร็จไก้ตามสัญญา ทานมีลวามลิดเห็นอย่างไรต่อกำถามเกี่ยวกับการอุดมศึกษา และ สถาบันของท่านกังก่อไปนี้ (1) เห็นดวยอยางยิ่ง (3) เห็นด้วยเป็นบางส่วน (2) เ**ท**ินเ (4) ไม่เห็นด้วยเป็นบางส่วน (5) ไมเห็นกวย (6) ไมเห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง 72. สถาบันแห่งนี้ควรให้ความสำคัญก่อการพัฒนาคุณค่าส่วนทั่วมากๆ เท่ากับการพัฒนาสติบัญญา 73. การเป็นครูที่มีประสิทธิภาพไม่จำเป็นก้องเกี่ยวของกับนักศึกษาเป็นส่วนตัว 74. สถาบันแห่งนี้ควรมีส่วนร่วมในการแก้ปัญหาสังคมอย่างจริงจัง 75. การอุกมศึกษาของประเทศจะพัฒนามากกวานี้หากมีการกำหนดให้นักศึกษาออกไปยึกงานในชุมชน อนละ 1 ปี 76. เราไม่ควรปล้อยใหม่กิจกรรมการเมืองของนักศึกษาในบริเวณมหาวิทยาลัย 77. คณาจารย์ควรเป็นอิสระในการสอนเกี่ยวกับแนวความคิดใดๆ ที่เห็นว่าเหมาะสบ 78. ในช่วงภายหลัง 14 กุลาคม พ.ศ. 2516 จนถึง 6 กุลาคม พ.ศ. 2519 สภาพการเมืองและสังลม มีผลกอการทำงานของทานอย่างไรบ้าง (3) ไม่มีผลแลอย่างใด (2) เป็นผลกิ (1) เป็นผลดีมาก (4) เป็นแลราย (5) เป็นแลรายมาก 79. ระหว่าง 6 กูลาคม พ.ศ. 2519 จนถึง 20 กูลาคม พ.ศ. 2520 สภาพการเมืองและสังคมมินลกอกาะ ทำงานของท่านอย่างใรบาง (1) เป็นผลกี่มาก (2) เป็นผลกึ (3) ไมมีผลและยางใด (4) เป็นผลราย (5) เป็นขลรายมาก

ท่าน	มีความคิดเห็นเกี่ยวกับในเรื่อ	เงทอไร	น้อยางไร		
(1)	สอกลอองกับความรูสึก	(2)	ไม่สามารถทักสินใจไก้	(3)	ไม่สอกกล้องกับกวามรู้สึก
<u>n15</u>	<u>งานของทาน</u> มิชักษณะ <i>กังก</i> อ	ไปนี้			
80.	เป็นที่ประทับใจ	81.	เป็นกิจวัทรเรื่อยๆ	82.	เป็นที่นาพอใจ
83.	น่าเบื้อ	84.	ń.	85.	นาสรางธรร
86.	ได้รับการยกย่อง	87.	รอน	88.	สนุก
89.	เป็นประโยชน์	90.	นาเหนือย.	91.	ถูกสุขลักษณะ
92.	ท้าทาย	93.	ทองยืนเป็นประจำ	94•	อัดอันกันใจ
95.	ที่มา	96.	ไมรูจบสิ้น	97.	ประสบกวามสำเร็จ
นบัง	<u>ดับมัญชา</u> (เลือกเอาบุกค <del>อ</del> ที่เ	ส์ ก็ยวขา	องมากที่สุด) มีอักษณะดังตอ	ไปนี้	
- 98.	ขอคำปรึกษาจากฉัน	99•	เอาใจยาก	100.	ไมสุภาพ
101.	<b>ยมเมื่อท</b> ำงานกี	102.	มื่อกเอน	103.	บิบทบาทสาคัญ
104.	ทันสมัย	105.	<b>ไม่ให้การนิเทศเพียงพอ</b>	106.	อารมณ์เสียงาย
107.	กิดตามแลงานและบอกให้รู้	108.	นาราลาญ	109 .	พัวก็อ
110.	รูจักงวนดี	111.	เลว	112.	นอาก
113.	ให้อิสระในการทำงาน	114.	ลอยชวยเหลือเมื่อตองการ	115.	ขึ้งก็ยจ
เพื่อน	<u>ร่วมงาน</u> มิลักษณะกังคอโปน	-	•	. • •	
116.	กอยให้กำลังใจ	117-	นาเบอ	118.	11
119.	รักลวามกาวหน้า	120.	โงเปลา	121.	มีกวามรับผิดขอบก็
122.	รวกเร็ว	123.	รอบรู้ หรือ ปราคเปรื่อง	124.	ชอบสรางศักรู 1
125.	พูดบาณเถินไป	126.	นอาก	127.	ชิ้เกียจ
128.	ใบนาริบชม	129.	ไม่ให้ความเป็นกันเอง	130.	นถูกมูกก่อง
131.	มีความสนใจแลย	132.	จริงใจทอกับ	133.	หาศัวยาก
รายไ	คจากสถาบัน มีลักษณะคังตอ	ไปนี้		•	
134 .	เพียงพอสำหรับใช้จาย	135.	ไลรับสวนแบ่งอย่างยุลิธรรม	<b>1136</b> .	แหบไม่ตอยาโล้
137.	130	138.	มาถตอที่จะฟุ่มเสือยได้	139-	ไมคอยแนนอน

.

140. ไม่คุมกับที่ทำงาน141. จ่ายให้อย่างสูง142. จ่ายให้มอยไปการพิจารณาเลื่อนขั้นหรือกำแหน่งมีลักษณะกังก่อไปนี้145. ให้โอกาสก้าวหน้าเป็นอย่างกี144. โอกาสต่อนข้างจำกัก145. พีจารณากวามสามารถ146. พีจารณากามกวามสามารถ147. มีโอกาสเลื่อนขั้นหรือกำแหน่งก็148. นโยบายการเลือนขั้นขากกวามยุกิชรรม149. นานๆ จึงจะมีโอกาสเลื่อนขั้น150. ไก้เลื่อนขั้นเสมอๆ

ขอขอบพระกุณมากกรับ ที่กรุณาร่วมมือในการคอบแบบสอบถามเป็นอย่างคื ขอให้ส่งคืน เฉพาะกระกาษกำตอบ ส่วนกระกาษกำถามนี้ไม่ท้องส่งกิน APPENDIX C

SUMMARY TABLES OF ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to 23 Demographic Items

Item	Source of	D.F.	Sum of	Mean	F Ratio
	Variation		Squares	Sqaures	
-			-	-	
1	Between	1	2261 78	2261 78	2 848
Ŧ	Within	331	262866 92	794 16	2:040
	Total	332	265128 69	//4+10	
	10697	552	203120.07		
2	Between	1	194.73	1904.73	2.377
	Within	329	263586.84	801.18	
	Total	330	265491.56		
3	Between	5	1372,16	274.43	.338
0	Within	314	255212.06	812.78	
	Total	319	256584.19		
	10002	019			
4	Between	2	2956.41	1478.20	1.928
	Within	316	242277.29	766.70	
	Total	318	245233.69		
5	Between	4	916.35	229.09	.284
	Within	310	250276.32	807.34	
	Total	314	251192.63		
6	Pottoon	6	091 01	163 65	203
0	Delween	216	262120 77	207 15	• 203
	WICHIH Total	333	203130.77	007.15	
	IOCAL	222	204112.09		
7	Between	2	437.93	218.96	.275
	Within	326	259381.84	795.65	
	Total	328	259819.75		
8	Between	1	3083 85	3983 85	4 983*
U	Within	310	255042 03	799.51	4.905
	Total	320	259025 88	777.51	
	TAFGT	520			
9	Between	1	884.92	884.92	1.103
	Within	331	265634.25	802.52	
	Total	332	266519.13		

.

Item	Source of	D.F.	Sum of	Mean	F Ratio
	Variation		Squares	Squares	
10	Between	2	2871.10	1435.55	1.805
	Within	332	264009.25	795.21	
	Total	334	266880.31		
11		2	064 57	00.10	100
11	Between	د ۲۰	264.57	88.19	.109
	Within	210	174203.80	806.79	
	Total	219	174530.31		
12	Between	6	6724.88	1120.81	1.416
	Within	325	257217.71	791.44	
	Total	331	263942.56		•
10	Detres	c	0077 (0	470 61	505
13	Berween	207	20//.09	4/9.01	• 292
	Within	327	203313.73	003.00	
	Total	333	200393.38		
14	Between	4	2918.61	729.65	.913
	Within	328	262214.43	799.43	
	Total	332	265133.00		
15	Between	4	6409,99	1602.50	2.018
10	Within	328	260417.42	793.96	21020
	Total	332	266827.38	775170	
	10002	554	200027.00		
16	Between	3	2057.93	. 685.98	.853
	Within	328	263775.72	804.19	
	Total	331	265833.63		
17	Between	3	4007-05	1335-68	1,692
	Within	327	258159.92	789.48	
	Total	330	262166.94		
. 10		<i>,</i>			706
18	Between	6	3414.46	569.08	.706
	Within	326	262961.17	806.63	
	Total	332	266375.63		
19	Between	2	923.27	461.64	.613
	Within	314	236608.81	753.53	
	Total	316	237532.06		

Table 22 (Continued)

. 5

The second	<u>G</u> f	D E	Cum of	16	77 Dette
Ltem	Source or	D.F.	Sum or	Mean	r katio
	Variation		Squares	Squares	
20	Pottoon	1	18 14	18 1/	023
20	Detween	220	10.14	10.14	•023
	Within	328	202000.30	801.49	
	Total	329	262906.50		
	_		1544 00		(70
21	Between	3	1566.20	522.07	.6/3
	Within	287	222653.66	775.80	
	Total	290	224219.81		
22	Between	4	6668.86	1667.21	2.093
	Within	325	258885.49	796.57	
	Total	329	265554.31		
23	Between	1	6771.41	6771.41	8.646*
	Within	332	260004.94	783.15	
	Total	33%	266776 31		
	TOCAL	<b>JJ</b> <i>J</i>	200770191		
	•				

.

.

Table 22 (Continued)

<u>Note</u>. \*p **<** .05; \*\*p **<** .01

# One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Opinions upon Higher Education Issues

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of	Mean	F Ratio
	Variation			Dyuares	
70	Between	1	124 28	124 28	154
12	Within	328	263966 29	804 78	• 134
	Total	329	264090.56	004.70	
	10 Cui	527	20-10/01/00		
73	Between	1	1118.02	1118.02	1.401
	Within	333	265759.81	798.08	
	Total	334	266877.81		
<b>-</b> ;	Detresses	•	355 <b>7</b> 0	255 70	140
74	Between	1	300.19	355.79	• 448
	Within	331	203148.42	795.01	
	IOTAL	332	203304.19		
75	Between	<u>.</u>	358.22	358.22	.452
	Within	332	263152.23	792.63	-
	Total	333	263510.44		
76	Battana	t	8572 26	8572 26	11 100***
70	Within	330	252593 38	765 43	11.199
	Total	331	252595.50	102+43	
	IULAL	JJ1	201103.03		
77	Between	1	432.09	432.09	.545
	Within	332	263077.42	792.40	
	Total	333	263509.50		
78	Between	2	7480,79	3740.39	4.758**
70	Within	326	256264.57	786.09	
	Total	328	263745.31		
78	Between	2	16710.88	8355.44	11.008***
	Within	327	248209.63	759.05	
	Total	329	264920.50		

<u>Note</u>. \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001

٥

## One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to 23 Demographic Items

Item	Source of	D.F.	Sum of	Mean	F Ratio
	Variation		Squares	Squares	
	De 1170 e 1	1	050 00	050 00	1 001
T	Within	221	156800 88	633.00	1.001
	Total	335	157753 75	4/4.02	
	IOCAL	202	1)/////////////////////////////////////		
2	Between	1	982.67	982.67	2.087
	Within	329	154900.41	470.82	
	Total	330	155883.06		
2	Patrican	5	267/ 00	525 00	1 197
2	Detween	ر ۱۲	2074.99	JJJ.00 /7/ 92	1.121
	WILHIN Totol	210	149093.07	4/4.02	
	IULAL	212	101100+00		
4	Between	2	1159.80	579.90	1.221
	Within	316	150122.50	475.07	
	Total	318	151282.25		
5	Patrzoon	/.	6776 17	1604 04	2 717**
5	Detween	4 210	0//0.1/	1094.04	2./1/44
	WILHIN Totol	314	141291.02	455.70	
	IULAL	514	140007.94		
6	Between	6	11515.11	1919.19	4.292***
	Within	326	145775.50	447.16	
	Total	332	157290.56		
7	Potroon	2	1266 40	633 25	1 225
,	Within	326	154587 98	474 20	1.555
	Total	328	155854.44	777,20	
	IUCAL	520	199094144		
8	Between	1	3866.59	3866.59	8.145**
	Within	319	151443.04	474.74	
	Total	320	155309.56		
9	Between	1	915,10	915,10	1.925
	Within	331	157369.57	475.44	~ • > ==>
	Total	332	158284-63	,, <b>,,,</b> ,,,,,	
	20 662				

<u>Note</u>. \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001

	Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
6	10	Between Within	2 332	1735.89 156822.73	867.95 472.36	1.837
		Total	334	158558.56		
	11	Between	3	1529.58	509.86	1.104
		Within	216	99766.63	461.89	
		Total	219	101296.19		
	12	Between	6	5008.37	834.73	1.783
		Within	325	152150.39	468.16	
		Total	331	157158.75		
	13	Between	6	3593.61	598.93	1.265
		Within	327	154772.52	473.31	
		Total	333	158366.06		
	14	Between	4	8033.02	2008.26	4.427**
		Within	328	148810.01	453.69	
		Total	332	156843.00		
	15	Between	4	4312.26	1078.06	2.293
		Within	328	154242.59	470.25	
		Total	328	158554.81		
	16	Between	3	874.88	291.63	.616
		Within	328	155388.43	473.75	
		Total	331	156263.25		
	17	Between	3	2454.22	818.07	1.722
		Within	327	155335.00	475.03	
		Total	330	157789.19		
	18	Between	6	7166.09	1194.35	2.575*
		Within	326	151199.16	463.80	
		Total	332	158365.19		

Table 24 (Continued)

Note. \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001

•

6

Item	Source of Variation	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
	······································			0100 0/	
19	Between	2	4383.68	2190.84	4.606**
	Within	314	149431.37	475.90	
	Total	316	153815.00		
20	Between	1	2226.56	2226.56	4.761*
	Within	328	153408.75	467.71	
	Total	329	155635.25		
21	Between	3	639.36	213.12	.423
	Within	287	144670.34	504.08	
	Total	290	145309.69		
22	Between	4	2834.15	708.54	1.496
	Within	325	153949.81	473.69	
	Total	329	156783.94		
23	Between	1	1005.23	1005.23	2.131
	Within	332	156579.70	471.63	
	Total	333	15758/ 88	,, 2000	

Table 24 (Continued)

3

<u>Note</u>. \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001

137

## One-Way Analysis of Variance: Differences in the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Opinions upon Higher Education Issues

Item	Source of	D.F.	Sum of	Mean	F Ratio
	Variation		Squares	Squares	
72	Between	1	57.53	57.53	.120
	Within	328	157231.43	479.36	
	Total	329	157288.94		
70	<b>D</b> .		1100.00	1100 00	0 617
73	Between	1	1189.30	1189.30	2.517
	Within	333	15/36/.56	472.58	
	Total	334	158556.81		
74	Between	1	38.44	38.44	.080
	Within	331	158275.59	478.17	•
	Total	332	158314.00		
75	Between	1	138.72	138.72	.291
	Within	332	158187.43	476.47	
	Total	333	158326.13		
76	De terre e u	F	(001.0)	1056 01	0 (07#
70	Between	200	0201.00	1250.21	2.09/*
	Witnin	320	151817.20	405.70	
	Total	331	128098.31		
77	Between	1	695.21	695.21	1.464
	Within	332	157629.82	474.78	
	Total	<u>333</u>	158325.00		
-0	_	-			
78	Between	2	6780.56	3390.28	7.464***
	Within	326	148074.19	454.22	
	Total	328	154854.69		
79	Between	2	1336.15	668.08	1.400
-	Within	327	156094.68	477.35	
	Total	329	157430.81		

<u>Note</u>. \*p **<** .05; \*\*\*p **<** .001

# APPENDIX D

# FREQUENCY COUNTS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

#### Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Major Field<sup>a</sup>

Group •	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Non-Social Sciences Social Sciences <sup>b</sup>	266 55	166.11 156.16	28.66 26.30
Total	321	164.51	28.45

Note. <sup>a</sup>Major field of last degree

<sup>b</sup>Archeology, Anthropology, Economics, Political Science, Government, and Sociology

#### Table 27

Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Sex

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Male Female	168 166	168.57 159.57	27.81 28.16	
Total	334	164.10	28.30	

Table	28
-------	----

## Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the SRS Scores

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Low <u>SRS</u> High <u>SRS</u>	199 136	160.76 168.90	28.75 26.93
Total	335	164.07	28.27

#### Table 29

# Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Attitudes toward Banning Students' Political Activities

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Agree Disagree	131 210	170.27 159.87	24.80 29.38
Total	332	163.97	28.10

Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Political Effect

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Favorable	50	168.34	30.16
No Effect	228	161.27	27.42
Harmful	51	173.76	28.63
Total	329	164.28	28.36

Note. <sup>a</sup>The political and social effects during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 on their work

#### Table 31

Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Political Effect<sup>a</sup>

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Favorable	48	181.44	24.38
No Effect	232	161.34	28.42
larmful	50	160.86	26.24
fotal	330	164.19	28.38

Note.

<sup>a</sup>The political and social effects after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977 on their work

#### Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Dogmatism Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Numbers of Students Enrolled in Their Courses

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Under 25	35	150.00	21.60
25-49	45	160.00	22.68
50-99	74	161.50	21.43
100-249	99	162.54	20.92
250 and more	62	167.16	20.79
Total	315	161.50	21.72

## Table 33

#### Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Institution

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
asetsat University	69	157.58	22.52
Chulalongkorn University	43	159.35	18.40
Mahidol University	64	158.77	20.75
Ramkamhaeng University	35	171.00	18.66
Silpakorn University	53	164.06	21.51
Thammasat University	34	150.24	24.33
Others Combined	35	169.17	20.64
Total	333	160.95	21.77

#### Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Major Field

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Non-Social Sciences Social Sciences <sup>a</sup>	266 55	159.44 168.65	21.60 22.70
Total	321	161.02	22.03

Note. <sup>a</sup>Archeology, Anthropology, Economics, Political Science, Government, and Sociology

#### Table 35

#### Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Time Devoted to Administration

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
None	71	152.10	20.87
1-10%	145	162.73	19.90
11-20%	64	161.86	23.88
21-40%	25	162.76	21.83
41% and more	28	169.14	22.06
Total	333	160.84	21.74

#### Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Income Earned at the Institution

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
0,000 bahts or less	20	165.65	21.69
20.001-25,000	30	149.93	20.22
25,001-30,000	49	155.27	20.76
30,001-40,000	98	162.01	23.42
0,001-50,000	66	162.82	18.69
50,001-70,000	44	163.98	20.40
70,001 or more	26	166.35	25.24
fotal	333	160.91	21.84

Note. 20 bahts = 1 U.S. dollar

## Table 37

Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Income Earned outside the Institution

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
3,000 bahts or less	178	157.47	21.95
3,001-10,000	61	164.03	21.81
10,001 or more	78	165.56	21.50
Total	317	160.72	22.06

Note. 20 bahts = 1 U.S. dollar

# Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Marital Status

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Single Married	123 207	157.64 163.01	21.62 21.63
Total	330	161.01	21.75

# Table 39

# Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deivations of the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the <u>SRS</u> Scores

Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
199 136	165.09 154.68	21.72 20.44
335	160.86	21.79
	Count 199 136 335	Count Mean 199 165.09 136 154.68 335 160.86

#### Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to Attitudes toward Banning Students' Political Activities

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Agree very much	20	152.90	20.31
Agree on the whole	33	156.09	19.49
Agree a little	78	167.32	22.18
Disagree a little	66	158.20	22.89
Disagree on the whole	83	158.99	21.17
Disagree very much	52	163.06	21.29
<b>Total</b>	332	160.77	21.85

#### Table 41

Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Political Effects<sup>a</sup>

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Favorable	50	163.52	25.03
io effect	22 <b>8</b>	162.86	20.55
larmful	51	150.45	20.73
fotal	329	161.04	21.73

Note.

<sup>a</sup>The political and social effects during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 on their work

# Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the <u>JDI</u> Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and Major Field

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Low Dogmatic Non-Social Sciences	86	163.12	20.28
Low Dogmatic Social Sciences	26	168.65	23.09
Medium Dogmatic Non-Social Sciences	86	161.26	20.54
Medium Dogmatic Social Sciences	13	170.00	15.42
High Dogmatic Non-Social Sciences	106	154.84	22.16
High Dogmatic Social Sicences	16	167.56	27.81
Total	333	160.92	21.46

# Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and the <u>SRS</u> Scores

Group *	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Low Dogmatic Low <u>SRS</u>	71	168.41	21.01
Low Dogmatic High <u>SRS</u>	42	157.55	19.05
Medium Dogmatic Low <u>SRS</u>	69	164.78	20.68
Medium Dogmatic High <u>SRS</u>	31	156.48	17.70
High Dogmatic Low <u>SRS</u>	59	161.46	23.43
High Dogmatic High <u>SRS</u>	63	151.87	22.42
Total	335	160.86	21.79

# Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and the Political Effect<sup>a</sup>

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Low Dogmatic Favorable	11	176.55	23.65
Low Dogmatic No Effect	87	164.38	19.87
Low Dogmatic Harmful	13	158.62	21.41
Medium Dogmatic Favorable	18	164.56	24.02
Medium Dogmatic No Effect	68	164.26	18.58
Medium Dogmatic Harmful	11	146.91	13.23
High Dogmatic Favorable	21	155.81	24.66
High Dogmatic No Effect	73	159.74	22.90
High Dogmatic Harmful	27	147.96	22.41
Total	329	161.04	21.73

Note.

<sup>a</sup>The political and social effects during October 14, 1973 to October 6, 1976 on their work

# Frequency Counts, Means, and Standard Deviations of the JDI Scores of University Professors Grouped According to the Dogmatism Scores and the Political Effect<sup>a</sup>

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Low Dogmatic Favorable	4	183.50	16.05
Low Dogmatic No Effect	90	164.71	20.25
Low Dogmatic Harmful	18	160.11	22.87
Medium Dogmatic Favorable	13	163.69	20.48
Medium Dogmatic No Effect	67	162.90	18.94
Medium Dogmatic Harmful	17	160.24	25.95
High Dogmatic Favorable	31	156.42	25.18
High Dogmatic No Effect	75	158.37	23.03
High Dogmatic Harmful	15	147.80	20.89
Total	330	161.06	21.88

Note.

<sup>a</sup>The political and social effects after October 6, 1976 to October 20, 1977 on their work