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Abstract
The objectives of this research were (1) to study faculty members’ opinions toward faculty administration in Dharmacacy and (2) to study the differences of personal factors in faculty members’ opinions toward faculty administration in Dharmacacy. The research samples were 250 Rangsit University faculty members. The data collection tool was a questionnaire. The data was analyzed via descriptive statistics which were frequency, percentage, means, and standard deviation to describe and summarize the data. Analysis of Variances (ANOVA) was used to study the differences between independent variables and dependent variables. The statistical difference was set at 0.05.

The results showed that most of the samples were female, aged between 31–40 years, employed in a teaching position, educated at the master degree level, with work experience between 5–9 years, and associated with the faculty of business administration. The understanding level of Dharmacacy was at the mean of 4.28 out of 5, rated as very understanding. The level of opinions toward the faculty administration in Dharmacacy was at the mean of 3.94 out of 5, rated as agreed. Differences in personal factors, work experience, and faculties statistically significantly affected the opinions toward faculty administration in Dharmacacy.
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Introduction
“Dharmacratic society” is an equal society where democracy, virtue, ethics and Dharmma are centered. It is a society where money is not important. The benefits of the people are emphasized but number of people is not. If considering the principle, the above meaning demonstrates a good, desired and ideal society. However, it seems to be an intangible matter. This is an ideal society because there has been strong materialism and consumerism in the current society. As a result, it is questioned about characteristics and elements of Dharmacratic society. In addition, whether it is able to create and how to build Dharmacratic society solidly are doubted. A successful guideline to build such society solidly is to demonstrate concrete sample through various media continually, use Subdistrict Administrative Organization (SAO) and Provincial Administrative Organization (PAO) mechanisms to dissimilate knowledge and use educational institutions for training (Woravit Avirutworakul, 2009).

Universities are higher educational institutions which play roles in producing quality human resource for the country. Rangsit University is one of the educational institutions which has a mission for Thai society, is determined to build the youth and the country under Dharmacracy. Rangsit University aims to enhance knowledge, product graduates to serve and participate in the public and foster Dharmacratic society to become successful within 10 years since 2009. Rangsit University should create Dharmacratic society from internal organizations in both administrative and teaching aspects (Dharmacratic Society Committee, 2009). This policy is supported by Prof. Dr. Prawet Wasi, a senior citizen and one of Rangsit University Council committees. He states at Rangsit University Academic Conference 2010 that an announcement of being a Dharmacratic society of Rangsit University is a good idea essential to development through focusing on Dharma. Dharma refers to rightness occurring from proper behaviors. It is a good matter with sustainability, normality and happiness (Retrieved from http://www.atnnonline.com, on 9 August 2011).

A research project titled “Faculty Members’ Opinions toward Faculty Administration in Dharmacracy in Rangsit University” has initiated to respond to the mission and determination to create Dharmacratic society and to expand the results among universities. Rangsit University is an educational institute which has formulated the policy about building Dharmacratic society. The university aims to increase knowledge about Dharmacracy and dissimilate knowledge which raises awareness of Dharmacracy and Dharmacratic society, how Dharmacracy ensures the people’s fairness and happiness and how to build Dharmacracy solidly. As mentions above, the researcher is interested in investigating Dharmacracy, opinions of personnel being a part of Dharmacracy and effective application of Dharmacracy in faculty administration in Rangsit University. The study could provide useful data and be a guideline for university administration in Dharmacracy in the future.

Objectives of the research
1. To study faculty members’ opinions toward faculty administration in Dharmacracy in Rangsit University
2. To study the differences of personal factors in faculty members’ opinions toward faculty administration in Dharmacracy

Research hypothesis
Faculty members with different demographic data have different opinions toward faculty administration in Dharmacracy.
Conceptual framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic data</td>
<td>Faculty members’ opinions toward faculty administration in Dharmacracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gender</td>
<td>- Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Age</td>
<td>- Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Position</td>
<td>- Responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education</td>
<td>- Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Experience</td>
<td>- Transparency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research methodology

1. Population and sample
The population in this study included 1,335 academic personnel who taught at different faculties in Rangsit University. The sample of the study included 308 lecturers with reliability at 95% (Yamane, 1973). The sample was selected by Stratified Random Sampling.

2. Research instruments
Questionnaires were utilized to collect data. The questionnaires were divided into parts as follows.

Part1 Demographic data including gender, age, position, education and experience
Part2 Faculty members’ opinions toward faculty administration in Dharmacracy in Rangsit University

The study applied 10 principles of Dharmacracy to define variables for faculty administration in Dharmacracy. The variables included; 1) Effectiveness; 2) Efficiency; 3) Responsiveness; 4) Accountability; 5) Transparency; 6) Participation; 7) Decentralization; 8) Rule of Law; 9) Equity and; 10) Consensus Oriented. Questionnaire items in Part 2 were 5-Rating Scale. That is, 5 refers to totally agree and 1 refers to totally disagree.

3. Data analysis
3.1 Personal factors of the respondents were divided by demographic data including gender, age, position, education and experience. The collected data was analyzed by frequency and percentage.
3.2 Opinions of personnel in Rangsit University toward administration in Dharmacracy. The collected data was analyzed by mean to show levels of opinions toward administration in Dharmacracy.
3.3 Hypothesis testing, opinions of personnel in Rangsit University toward administration in Dharmacracy were analyzed by t-test and One-way analysis of variance.

Results
1. Demographic data
The data show that a majority of the sample were females. 146 participants or 58.4 percent were females. 91 participants or 36.4 percent were between 31 – 40 years old. 198 participants or 79.2 percent were lecturers. 160 participants or 64 percent graduated master’s degrees. 76 participants or 30.4 percent had 5-7 years of experience. A majority of participants which included 32 participants or 9.2 percent were from a faculty of Business Administration.

2. Faculty members’ opinions toward faculty administration in Dharmacracy
The study reveals that overall faculty members’ opinions toward faculty administration in Dharmacracy were at a high level with an average of 3.94. The average was ranked as follows. 1) Effectiveness was 4.04; 2) Decentralization was 4.03; 3) Responsiveness was 4.00; 4) Rule of Law was 3.95; 5) Accountability was 3.91; 6) Transparency and Participation were 3.91; 7) Equity and Consensus Oriented were 3.91 and 8) Efficiency was 3.86

3. Summary of hypothesis testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration in Dharmacracy</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of Law</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus-Oriented</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Refer to Difference on demographic data not affecting opinions toward administration in Dharmacracy

✓ Refer to Difference on demographic data affecting opinions toward administration in Dharmacracy

Discussion
It was found that the faculty members in Rangsit University had understanding about Dharmacracy at a highest level and had opinions toward their faculty administration in Dharmacracy at a high level. This covered both overall and individual aspects. Of the 10 items, an average of the first three ranked items included; 1) Effectiveness; 2) Decentralization and; 3) Responsiveness. The results could be one of indicators which
identifies success of building Dharmocratic society of Rangsit University in the past 5 years. In addition, the results demonstrate that only policy for structural development and Dharmocracy administration mechanisms are not sufficient to drive the university to become Dharmocratic society where the principles, rightness and virtue are focused if the people in the society lack righteousness in management, administration and participation. This is consistent with a study of Intarat Yodbangtoei. The study stated that to create good governance requires good administration mechanisms and to enable the people in the society to have righteousness in administration and participation (Intarat Yodbangtoei, 2006).

The results about faculty members’ opinions who did not hold faculty executive positions show that the executive board had administration in Dharmacracy at a high level. This means that the executive board and the faculty members had characteristics of Dharmacracy. They followed the principles of righteousness, virtue, the benefit of the public and made decision wisely without focusing on a majority that was not justified. This supports the principles stated by PhraPhromKunaporn (PorOrPayutto) and PhraDharmakosajarn (Prayuth Dhammacitto) in Dharmacracy and Administration in Dharmacracy.

**Suggestions for further studies**

1. Population should be further expanded by collecting data from population in universities so that data on administration in Dharmacracy can be obtained and related to Dharmocratic society in institutions.

2. A relationship between administration in Dharmacracy and happiness of personnel in Rangsit University should be investigated.
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