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7.1. PROBLEM:

Why does the school experience generate satisfaction in a few and dissatisfaction in others, has been a guessing game for parents, teachers and administrators alike. But, an empirical answer to the question to establish the "best guesses" has not been conclusively attempted. Therefore, this study proposes to look for the sources of satisfaction - dissatisfaction within the individual himself - his functioning in relation to the climate of the school which consists of among other things, the interactions of the teachers and the principal.

7.2. METHOD:

A. Sample

College Sample includes nineteen male intermediate colleges (6 rural and 13 urban) of the Allahabad district having science curriculum upto to intermediate classes. These colleges were selected randomly.

Teachers sample comprises of 480 teachers (141 rural and 339 urban). The selection is based on the criterion of teaching classes IX to XI and having at least two-year stay in the college.

Student sample includes 900 students (291 rural and 609 urban) of the science curriculum reading in class X and XI who had either passed or failed at high school examination of 1978. In order to select students, cluster and random sampling technique has been used. Students with at least two years stay at the college were included in the sample.
B. Tools used:

B.1. For the administration on Student Sample:

(a) Ravens' Standard Progressive Matrices (SPM).

(b) Joshi's Group Test of Mental Ability (GTMA).

(c) Verma, Sherry and Goswami: Measure of Self-concept (MSC).

(d) Sinha Anxiety Scale (SAS).

(e) Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS).

(f) Ansaris' L.A. Coding Test of Level of Aspiration (LACT).

(g) Varma and Saxena: Socio-Economic Status Index (SES).

(h) Measure of classroom Functioning: Total Aggregate Marks at Boards' High School Examination.

(i) Santosh - Asantosh Mapni (SAM) (School Satisfaction - dissatisfaction Scale): Constructed by the investigator.

B.2. For the administration on Teacher Sample:

(j) Sharmas' School Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (SOCIQ).

C. Procedure:

C.1. To find out the Organizational Climate of Schools:

SOCIQ has been administered on teacher sample. Test scores have been averaged for each college separately, and doubly standardized, first normatively and then ipsatively. Similarity score for each college have been calculated. Finally, on the basis of scores on 'Esprit' sub-test in comparison to those of Sharma's SOCDQ profile, different colleges have
been assigned to respective climates. Similarity scores gave an idea of the proximity or deviation of each college from the respective climate allotted to it. Only five out of six organizational climates have been found: open, autonomous, familiar, paternal, and closed. No college was found to have controlled climate.

C.2. Administration of the tests, scoring and preparation of the data sheet:

(a) All the tests have been administered on students in a group situation in four testing sessions conducted in two days.

(b) Scoring of different test answer sheets has been done as per keys provided in the manual.

(c) Master data sheet has been prepared for the scores of all the 900 students on all tests.

(d) The scores have been rearranged according to the needs of the study.

(e) Criterion groups: Highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups have been sorted on the basis of 27% top and 27% bottom scores on satisfaction - dissatisfaction (Kelley, 1939).

C.3. Analyses used:

(a) Means, S.Ds, S.E, for scores on all tests for total sample, climate-wise scores on all tests, rural - urban groups, and for the two criterion groups have been calculated.

(b) Analysis of Variance.

(c) C. R. test.
(d) Zero-order Correlations, Second-order partial correlations.

(e) Linear regression and multiple correlation.

(f) Factor analysis including factor validity coefficients for different variables.

C.4. Control Variables:

SES and intelligence have been controlled statistically.

C.5. Level of Significance:

The confidence levels established are .05 for significant and .01 for highly significant differences.

7.3. FINDINGS:

A. School Organizational Climate - Students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with School / College:

1.(a) Students differ significantly on their satisfaction - dissatisfaction in school / colleges grouped under different school organizational climates (p. < .01).

(b) Students also differ significantly on the five school areas of the S-D measure.

2.(a) Students differ significantly on their satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college between the two extremes of climate continuum: open climate and closed climate schools; and between open and paternal climate schools. But this difference has been found to become non-significant as the two compared climates are nearer to each other on the climate continuum.
(b) The above pattern of differences seem to be true for different sub-areas of the S-D measure as well.

3. (a) Students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school is significantly and negatively related with 'Intimacy' sub-test of the School Organizational climate, while its other sub-tests are not found significantly related to it. Likewise, total climate score is not related significantly with student's satisfaction - dissatisfaction.

(b) Except for students' S-D area B, other areas (A, C, D and E) are also significantly and negatively with 'Intimacy' sub-test. With other sub-tests or total climate scores these sub-areas are not found significantly related.

B. Class-room Functioning and Satisfaction - dissatisfaction:

1. Relationship between class-room functioning and students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction is negative, and non-significant. Likewise, its relationship with all the five S-D areas is found non-significant. The above trend of relationship is maintained even when effect of intelligence / SES is controlled, or when the effect of all other variables is held constant.

2. It is not found significantly related with S-D scores among highly satisfied group of students. The above trend of relationship is maintained even when effect of intelligence / SES is controlled. But, it is found significantly, though negatively related with S-D scores among highly dissatisfied students (p. < .05). This trend of relationship is maintained when the effect of SES is partialled out, but it becomes non-existant when intelligence is controlled.
3. Its relationship with S-D scores in highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups when compared has not been found significant.

4. Students of different satisfaction levels have not been found to vary significantly on their classroom functioning.

5. Rural and Urban students differ significantly on classroom functioning (p < .05). The Urban students have comparatively higher mean score on this variable.

6. Rural highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied, as well as urban highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students are homogeneous on classroom functioning.

7. Rural and Urban highly satisfied as well as Rural and Urban highly dissatisfied students are not significantly different on classroom functioning.

8. Its contribution to variance in Student's satisfaction - dissatisfaction is negative and non-significant, (r = .152%).

C. Self-concept and Satisfaction - dissatisfaction:

1. Self-concept is significantly and positively related to students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college (p < .01).

2.(a) It is not found to be significantly related with S-D scores in highly satisfied students, though this relationship remains positive.
But this relationship becomes significant when intelligence is controlled. Among highly dissatisfied students, there exists no relationship with S-D scores.

(b) Its relationship with S-D scores in the two groups - highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied is not significantly different.

3. (a) This variable differentiates the students of different satisfaction - dissatisfaction levels (highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups).

(b) Highly satisfied group has significantly higher mean score on self concept as compared to highly dissatisfied group.

4. Rural and Urban students are not significantly different on this variable.

5. Rural highly satisfied students have significantly higher self-concept than their highly dissatisfied counterpart (p. < .01). The same is true for urban highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students.

6. Urban - Rural highly satisfied students are not significantly different on their self-concept, while urban - rural highly dissatisfied students differ significantly on it (p. < .01) with higher mean for the urban ones.

7. The self-concept contributes 5.418 % to the total variance in students' S-D with School / College.

D. Level of Aspiration and Satisfaction - dissatisfaction:

1. (a) Level of Aspiration does not hold significant relationship with sat. - dissat. of students. Its relationship with all the five sat. - dissat. areas is also found non - significant. This non - significant rela-
tionship remains as such, when the effect of SES / intelligence or all other variables is held constant.

2. It is not found to be significantly related with S-D scores in both highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups. The relationship remains as such, when SES / intelligence is controlled.

3. This variable is not found to differentiate the students of different satisfaction - dissatisfaction levels (highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups).

4. Rural students have significantly higher level of aspiration than the urban students (p < .01).

5. In rural as well as in urban setting the highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students differ significantly on their level of aspiration (p < .01) with higher mean score for the latter.

6. The rural highly satisfied students are not significantly different on this variable from their urban counterpart. But, the rural highly dissatisfied students are significantly different from urban highly dissatisfied students on this variable (p < .01), the former having higher level of aspiration than the latter.

7. Level of aspiration contributes almost nothing to the variance in students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college.

E. Anxiety and Satisfaction - dissatisfaction:

1.(a) Anxiety is found negatively related with sat. - dissat. of students, though the relationship is non - significant. However, this relationship becomes significant, though remains negative, when SES or intelligence is held constant (p < .05 or p < .01).
(b) Its relationship with all the sat. - dissat. areas except area 
'E' is negligible and non - significant. With sat. - dissat. $\gamma_{\text{sex}}$, its 
relationship has been found negative and significant ( $p. < .01$ ).

2. This variable is not found related significantly with S-D scores 
in both highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups of students.

3. This variable is not found to differentiate the students of differ-
ent satisfaction - dissatisfaction levels ( highly satisfied, normally 
satisfied and highly dissatisfied ).

4. Rural students have significantly higher anxiety than the urban 
students ( $p. < .01$ ).

5. In rural as well as in urban setting separately, the highly satis-
fied and highly dissatisfied students differ significantly on this vari-
able ( $p. < .01$ ), with higher mean score for the latter.

6. The rural highly satisfied students are significantly different on 
anxiety from their urban counterpart ( $p. < .01$ ), with higher mean for 
the former. The same trend is also found in rural - urban highly dis-
satisfied students ( $p. < .01$ ).

7. Anxiety contributes very little to the total variance in students'
satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college ( -.139 % ).

F. EPPS NEEDS :

F.1. n-Achievement -

(a) Need Achievement is related significantly and positively with 
satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students ( $p. < .01$ ). This relation-
ship continues to exist at the same level of confidence, when SES / intelli-
gence is held constant. Its partialled 'R' value is also found significant 
( $p. < .01$ ).
(b) Its relationship with all the five S-D areas is significant and positive either at .05 or .01 levels of confidence.

2. It is significantly and positively related with S-D scores in highly satisfied group (p < .01). This relationship also exists when SES/intelligence is held constant. But, its relationship with S-D scores among highly dissatisfied students is not found significant, and this relationship remains non-significant, when the effect of SES or intelligence is kept controlled.

3. Its relationships with S-D scores ('Z' values) in highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups differ significantly when compared.

4. This need is differentiated significantly in groups of students classified on the basis of their satisfaction-dissatisfaction level (p < .01).

5. Highly satisfied students have significantly higher need, than the highly dissatisfied students (p < .01).

6. Rural and Urban students are significantly different on this need (p < .01) with higher mean in the latter case.

7. The rural highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students are not significantly different on this need, while in case of urban students, the two extreme groups differ significantly (p < .01), with higher mean in case of highly satisfied students.

8. The rural and urban highly satisfied students, have almost the same intensity of this need. The same is true for rural-urban highly dissatisfied students as well.
9. This need contributes significantly to the variance in satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students with school/college (3.710%).

F.2. n-Deference:

1. (a) Need Deference is related significantly and positively with satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students (p < .01). The nature of relationship does not change, when the effect of SES/intelligence is held constant. Likewise, its partialled 'R' value is also found significant (p < .01).

(b) Its relationship with all the five sat. - dissat. sub-areas is also found significant and positive (p < .05 or p < .01).

2. This need is not found significantly related with S-D scores either in the highly satisfied or in highly dissatisfied groups. Partialling out of SES or intelligence does not change this relationship.

3. This need is differentiated significantly in groups of students classified on the basis of their level of satisfaction - dissatisfaction (p < .01).

4. This need differs significantly between highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students (p < .01), with higher mean for the former.

5. Rural and urban groups are not significantly different on this need.

6. The rural highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students are alike on this need, while those belonging to urban setting differ significantly (p < .05) with higher mean score for the highly satisfied students.
7. The rural - urban highly satisfied students are alike on this
need. This is also true for rural - urban highly dissatisfied students.

8. Need-deference contributes 1.522% to the total variance in stu-
dents' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school.

F.3. n-Order:

1. (a) There exists a significant and positive relationship between need-
order and students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college
( p* < .01 ). The same relationship stands when the SES or intelligence
is held constant. Similarly, when the effect of all other variables is
partialed out, the relationship between this variable and students'
satisfaction - dissatisfaction remains significant ( p* < .01 ).

(b) Its' relationship with the five S-D areas has also been found
significant and positive except for area 'B' ( p* < .05 or p* < .01 ).

2. It is significantly and positively related with S-D scores in the
highly satisfied group ( p* < .01 ). This significant relationship
continues to exist, when SES or intelligence is controlled. But, its
relationship with S-D scores among highly dissatisfied students is not
found significant both under uncontrolled conditions.

3. The relationship of need-order with S-D scores ('Z' values)
differ significantly between highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied
group ( p* < .01 ).

4. This need is significantly differentiated in groups classified
as highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied ( p* <
.01 ).
5. The highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students differ significantly on this need (p. < .01), with higher mean score for the former.

6. Rural students have significantly higher n-order as compared to urban students (p. < .01).

7. In rural setting the highly satisfied and the highly dissatisfied students are not significantly different on this need, while the two groups differ significantly (p. < .01) in urban setting with higher mean for the highly satisfied ones.

8. The rural - urban highly satisfied, as well as rural - urban highly dissatisfied students are almost similar on this need.

9. n-Order contributes significantly (4.862%) to the total variance in satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students with school / college.

F.4. n-Exhibition:

1. (a) Significant and positive relationship exists between need-Exhibition and students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college (p. < .01). The relationship remains unchanged, when the effect of SES or intelligence is controlled. But, its independent relationship (part. 'R') is found significant at .05 levels.

(b) Its' relationship with areas B and E only of the S-D measure is also significant, though negatively (p. < .01 and p. < .05 respectively).

2. It is significantly related with S-D scores in highly satisfied group (p. < .01), while its relationship is found non - significant in highly dissatisfied group. These relationships remain unchanged when SES or intelligence is kept constant.
3. Its relationship with S-D scores ('Z' value) in highly satisfied group differs significantly from that in the highly dissatisfied group (p. < .01).

4. This need is not significantly differentiated in groups of students classified on the basis of their level of satisfaction - dissatisfaction viz., highly satisfied, normally satisfied and the highly dissatisfied. The highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students also differ significantly on this need (p. < .05), with higher mean score for highly dissatisfied group.

5. The rural and urban students are homogeneous in respect of this need.

6. Rural highly dissatisfied students are significantly higher on this need than their highly satisfied counterpart (p. < .05). But the two groups are almost alike in urban setting.

7. The rural - urban highly satisfied students are not significantly different on this need. The rural - urban highly dissatisfied students are likewise alike on this need.

8. The contribution of need-Exhibition to the total variance in students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college is almost negligible (0.573).

F.5. n-Autonomy:

1. (a) Need-Autonomy holds negative and non significant relationship with satisfaction - dissatisfaction, when control is applied or not. Likewise, its independent relationship with S-D is non-significant.
(b) Its relationship with the five S-D areas is also found non-significant, except for area A, with which it is related significantly and negatively (p. < .05).

2. It is also not related significantly with S-D scores either in highly satisfied or in highly dissatisfied groups. Partailling out the effect of SES or intelligence does not change the nature of this relationship.

3. It is not differentiated significantly in groups of students classified on the basis of their level of satisfaction - dissatisfaction (highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied).

4. It is not significantly different among rural and urban students.

5. Rural highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students are almost similar on this need. The same is true for the urban highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students as well.

6. The rural - urban highly satisfied as well as rural - urban highly dissatisfied students are not significantly different from each other on this need.

7. The need-autonomy contributes almost negligible (≈0.260%) to the total variance in students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school/college.

F.6. **n-Affiliation**:

1.(a) Need-Affiliation is significantly and positively related with satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students (p. < .01). The relationship stands as such, when SES or intelligence is held constant. But, its independent relationship with S-D is found non-significant.
(b) It is related significantly and positively with area C and negatively with areas A, B and E (p < .05 or p < .01). Its relationship with area D is found not significant.

2. Its relationship with S-D scores in highly satisfied students is positive and significant but not in highly dissatisfied students. The nature of relationship in both the cases remains unchanged when the effect of SES and intelligence is held constant.

3. The 'Z' values for the highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups are found significantly different (p < .01).

4. It is not significantly differentiated in the groups of students classified on the basis of their S-D level (highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups).

5. The rural and urban students are almost similar in respect of this need.

6. The rural highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students, as well as, urban highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students are almost alike on this need.

7. The rural - urban highly satisfied students are not significantly different from each other on this need. The same is true for rural - urban highly dissatisfied students also.

8. The contribution of n-affiliation to the total variance in students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college is negligible (0.831%).
F.7. *n-Intraception*:

1. (a) Need-Intraception is significantly and positively related with satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students (p. < .05). This relationship becomes more pronounced when SES, intelligence or the rest 20 variables are held constant (p. < .01).

   (b) It holds significant and positive relationship with area 'D' only of the S-D measure (p. < .05).

2. It is not significantly related with S-D scores either in highly satisfied or in highly dissatisfied groups. But, in highly satisfied group, its relationship is found significant (p. < .01) when intelligence is controlled.

3. Similarly the 'Z' values for highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups are not found to differ significantly, but when the control on intelligence is applied, the difference between the two 'Z' values is found significant (p. < .05).

4. It is not differentiated significantly in groups of students classified as highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied.

5. The rural and urban students do not differ significantly on this need.

6. Highly satisfied students whether they belong to rural or urban setting, are not significantly different on this need from their highly dissatisfied counterparts.

7. Rural - urban highly satisfied students are not significantly different from each other on this need. This trend also exists in rural - urban highly dissatisfied students.
8. The need-Intraception also does not contribute appreciably to the variance in satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students, its contribution being .770% only.

8. p-Succorance:

1.(a) Need-Succorance does not hold significant relationship with satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students. Control of SES or intelligence does not seem to change the nature of this relationship. But, it is found significantly related with satisfaction - dissatisfaction, when the effect of all the rest 20 variables is partialled out ( p. < .01 ).

(b) Its relationships with all the five S-D areas have been found not significant.

2. It is related significantly and positively with S-D scores in highly satisfied group ( p. < .01 ), but not in highly dissatisfied group. The partialling out of the effect of SES or intelligence does not change the nature of relationship in both the cases.

3. The 'Z' values for the two groups viz., highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied differ significantly ( p. < .05 ).

4. It is not differentiated significantly in groups of students, classified as highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied.

5. Rural - urban dichotomy is not found in case of this need.

6. Highly satisfied students and highly dissatisfied students in rural and urban settings separately, are not significantly different from each other on this need.
7. Rural - urban highly satisfied students are almost alike on this need. Likewise, rural highly dissatisfied students are not significantly different from urban highly dissatisfied ones.

8. The contribution of n-succorance to the variance in satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students with school / college is very little (0.606%).

F.8. n-Dominance:

1.(a) Need-Dominance is significantly and positively related with satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students (p < .01). This significant relationship remains unchanged, when SES or intelligence is held constant or the effect of all other variables is also kept controlled.

(b) This need is significantly related with only two out of the five areas of the S-D measure (positively with area 'D' and negatively with area 'E', p < .05).

2. It is significantly and positively related with S-D scores in the highly satisfied group (p < .01), but not in highly dissatisfied group. This significant relationship remains unchanged when the effect of SES or intelligence is kept controlled.

3. Its relationships with S-D scores (Z values) are significantly different in highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups (p < .01).

4. It is not significantly differentiated in groups of students classified as highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied.

5. Rural and urban students are not significantly different from each other on this need.

6. The rural highly satisfied students are not significantly different from their highly dissatisfied counterparts. The same is true for the urban highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students as well.
7. The rural - urban highly satisfied students are almost alike on this need. Likewise, rural - urban highly dissatisfied students are also similar on this need.

8. n-Dominance contributes significantly (3.821%) to the total variance in satisfaction - dissatisfaction in students with school / college.

F.10. n-Abasement:

1.(a) n-Abasement is significantly and positively related with satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students (p. < .01). The significant relationship remains unaffected when SES or intelligence is controlled. It also remains significant when the effect of rest 20 variables is eliminated (p. < .01).

(b) It holds significant and positive relationship with only two out of five areas of the S-D measure viz., areas C and D (p. < .01).

2. Its relationship with S-D scores in highly satisfied group is found significant and positive (p. < .01), but not in highly dissatisfied group. The partialling out of the effect of SES or intelligence makes no appreciable change in the nature of these relationships.

3. Its relationships with S-D scores (Z values) in both the extreme groups differ significantly (p. < .01), when compared.

4. It is not significantly differentiated in groups of students classified on the basis of their satisfaction - dissatisfaction level viz., highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied.

5. Rural and urban students are almost alike on this need.

6. The rural highly satisfied students are not significantly different from the rural highly dissatisfied ones on this need. The same is true for urban highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students.
7. Rural - urban highly satisfied students are alike on this need. Likewise, the rural - urban highly dissatisfied students are also not significantly different on this need.

8. The n-Abasement contributes 1.528% to the total variance in satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students with school / college.

F.11. n-Nurturance:

1. (a) Need-Nurturance relates significantly and positively with students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school (p < .01). This relationship remains significant, when SES, intelligence or the rest 20 variables are held constant (p < .01).

   (b) The same pattern is maintained with respect to its relationship with all the five areas of the S-D measure (p < .01).

2. It is not related significantly with S-D scores in both highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups.

3. It is differentiated significantly in groups of students classified as highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied (p < .01).

4. The highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students differ significantly on this need (p < .01), with higher mean score for the former.

5. The rural and urban students do not differ significantly on this need.

6. Highly satisfied students in both rural as well as in urban setting are significantly higher on this need than the highly dissatisfied ones (p < .01 and p < .05 respectively).
7. Rural - urban highly satisfied students are not significantly
different on this need. The same is true for rural - urban highly dis-
satisfied students as well.

8. n-Nurturance contributes 2.011% to the total variance in sati-
sfaction - dissatisfaction of students with school / college.

F.12. n-Change:

1. (a) Need-Change is related significantly and positively to students'
satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college ( p. < .01 ). This
relationship remains significant, when the effect of SES, intelligence
or the rest 20 variables is held constant ( p. < .01 ).

(b) It relates significantly with only two out of the five areas of
S-D measure, viz. areas B and E ( p. < .01 ), though the relationship in
both the cases is negative.

2. It is not related significantly with S-D scores in both highly
satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups of students.

3. It is not significantly differentiated in groups of students classi-
fied as highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied.

4. Rural and Urban students are not significantly different on this
need.

5. In the rural setting, the highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied
students are not significantly different on this need, while in urban
setting, the two groups differ significantly ( p. < .01 ) with higher
mean in case of the former ( p. < .01 ).
6. The urban highly satisfied students have significantly higher mean on this need as compared to rural ones (p. < .01), while the highly dissatisfied students belonging to urban and rural settings are almost alike on this need.

7. n-Change contributes 1.186% to the total variance in students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college.

F.13. n-Endurance:

1. (a) Need-endurance is significantly and positively related with satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students with school / college (p. < .01). This relationship is maintained when SES / intelligence is controlled, or when the effect of all other variables is kept constant (p. < .01).

(b) It holds significant and positive relationship with only two out of five areas of the S-D measure viz. areas 'C' and 'D' (p. < .05 and p. < .01 respectively).

2. It relates significantly and positively with S-D scores in highly only dissatisfied group. This relationship remains unchanged, when SES or intelligence is held constant.

3. It is differentiated significantly in groups of students classified as highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied (p. < .01).

4. The highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students also differ significantly on this need with higher mean for the former (p. < .01).

5. The rural students have significantly higher n-end as compared to the urban students (p. < .01).
6. The urban highly satisfied students have significantly higher n-end than the highly dissatisfied counterparts (p. < .01). But in rural setting the two groups are almost homogeneous on this need.

7. Highly satisfied students, whether they belong to rural or the urban setting are almost similar on this need. Similarly, the highly dissatisfied ones belonging to the two settings are also alike.

8. n-Endurance contributes 2.221% to the variance in students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college.

F.14. n-Heterosexuality:

1. (a) It is not significantly related to satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students with school / college. The same trend is maintained when SES or intelligence is kept controlled. But, its independent relationship with S-D, after all other variables are kept constant, is found significant (p. < .01).

(b) It holds significant but negative relationship with all the five areas of the S-D measure (p. < .01).

2. It relates significantly and positively with S-D scores in highly satisfied group (p. < .01), but not in highly dissatisfied group. The relationship remain unchanged in both cases, when the effect of SES or intelligence is partialed out.

3. The 'Z' values for the two groups of students viz., highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied have been found to differ significantly (p. < .01).

4. It is differentiated in groups of students classified as highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied (p. < .01).
5. The highly dissatisfied students have significantly higher n-hat, as compared to highly satisfied ones. (p. < .01).

6. The urban students have significantly higher n-hat, as compared to rural students (p. < .01).

7. In urban setting the highly dissatisfied students have higher n-hat, as compared to highly satisfied students (p. < .01). But in rural setting the two groups are almost homogeneous on this need.

8. Urban - rural highly satisfied students have almost the same intensity of this need. Likewise, urban - rural highly dissatisfied students are similar on this need.

9. n-Heterosexuality contributes almost negligible to the total variance in students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college (-0.319 %).

F.15. n-Aggression:

1. (a) n-Aggression relates significantly and positively with students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college (p. < .01). The relationship remains unchanged when SES or intelligence is controlled, but, this relationship becomes non-significant when the effect of rest 20 variables is partialled out.

(b) Its relationship with all the five S-D areas except area - D is significant, though negative (p. < .01).

2. It is significantly and positively related with S-D scores in highly satisfied group (p. < .01), but not in highly dissatisfied group. This significant relationship remains intact when SES or intelligence is held constant (p. < .01).
3. Relationships of this need with S-D scores ('Z' values) in highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups have been found to differ significantly (p. < .01), when compared.

4. It is differentiated significantly in groups of students classified as highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied (p. < .01).

5. The highly dissatisfied group has significantly higher n-agg than the highly satisfied (p. < .01).

6. The urban students have significantly higher n-aggression than the rural students (p. < .01).

7. The highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students in the rural setting are almost alike, while those belonging to urban setting differ significantly on this need (p. < .01). In this case, the highly dissatisfied students have higher n-agg.

8. The rural-urban highly satisfied students are almost alike on this need, while highly dissatisfied students in the rural and urban setting are significantly different on this need (p. < .01). The urban ones have higher n-aggression as well.

G. **Satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school**. (Rural - Urban):

Rural students are significantly more satisfied with their school / college than the urban students (p. < .01). They are also comparatively more satisfied in respect of the five aspects of the school included in the S-D measure than the urban ones (p. < .01).
H. Factor Analytic study:

On the basis of the factor analysis of total sample, highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups; three common factors have emerged viz. (a) 'Unconducive School Conditions' factor, (b) 'Social class Belonging' factor, and (c) 'Scholastic Potential' factor. Of these, the last two factors are not found to have meaningful or significant relationship with students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school/college.

'Unconducive School Conditions' factor seems to be greatly responsible for the generation of dissatisfaction among students in total sample, as well as in highly dissatisfied group. But, in case of highly satisfied group, this factor seems to generate high satisfaction only to a moderate degree.

In the highly satisfied group, 'Psychological and School Needs Satisfaction' factor (with high loadings on sat. - dissat., n-exh., n-aff., n-dom., n-agg., n-chg., n-ach., n-ord., n-aba., and n-end.) seems to generate satisfaction in them to a greater degree. Another need dominated factor 'Reverence - non-succorant = non erotic psychological Health' factor consisting of n-def., n-suc., n-dom., n-agg., n-int., and n-het. with high or moderate loadings seems to affect satisfaction very little in highly satisfied students.

The factorial pattern for both highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups of students are different from each other. In case of highly satisfied group, Sat. - dissat. is found to be related to psychological needs while it is otherwise in case of dissatisfied group.
I. Multiple Linear Regression and Multiple Correlation:

1.1. On the basis of multiple linear regression analysis, it may be said
(a) that all the variables do not contribute equally to the variance
in satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students with school / college.
Self-concept contributes maximum (5.418%) followed by n-ord. (4.862%),
n-dom. (3.821%), n-sch. (3.710%), n-end. (2.221%), n-nur. (2.011%),
n-chg. (1.186%), n-aba. (1.528%), n-def. (1.522%). Other needs
contribute less than 1%. Classroom functioning, anxiety, n-het., and
n-aut., contribute to a negligible degree. Level of Aspiration does not
contribute at all to the variance in satisfaction - dissatisfaction,
(b) that MOPS needs and self concept of students are the chief intrinsic
contributors to the variance in students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction
with school.

1.2. Multiple Correlation results revealed that all the variables to-
gether are significantly correlated with students satisfaction - dissatis-
faction with school (R = .566, p < .01) and contribute collectively
33.814% to variance in students satisfaction - dissatisfaction. This
shows that a curvilinear relationship exists between the variables
studied and the satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students in relation
to school / college.

7.4. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS:

Satisfaction - dissatisfaction is a psychological construct. One
may be satisfied or dissatisfied with any particular area of life, age,
job or any other thing which comes within his life space (psychological
environment). For school going students of the age group 14+ - 18+,
whose most of the time is spent either in school or in its related activ-
ities admist their elders and peers, perceive them on the basis of the
inner dynamics of psychological constructs prevailing within each individual student and the climate or the environment created by different factors influencing the school. Therefore, the total resultant personality of an student is a composite organization of the psychological constructs operating within him (organism) and the environment to which he is exposed for a longer duration.

The conclusions, generalization, and inferences drawn on the basis of the test findings are being presented here in three parts - (a) Organizational climate of schools and students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school, (b) Psychological health of the students and their satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school, and (c) class-room functioning of students and their satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school.

(a) Organizational climate of Schools and Students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with School:

Organizational climate of schools as a whole does not seem to be related significantly to students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school. However, social needs' satisfaction among teachers seems to be negatively and significantly related to students' satisfaction with school.

Students vary in their satisfaction - dissatisfaction with the variance in Organizational climate in schools. They are found more satisfied in schools having open and autonomous, climates, while they seem to be least satisfied in closed climate schools.

(b) Psychological Health of Students and their satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school:

Student's self-concept and many of the psychological needs viz., achievement, deference, order, exhibition, affiliation, intraception,
dominance, abasement, nurturance, change, endurance, hetero-sexuality, and aggression seem to be significantly and positively related with their satisfaction - dissatisfaction. However, anxiety also seems to be significantly related with students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school, but its relationship is found negative. All these relationships, whether positive or negative, are either moderate or negligible. Students' Level of aspiration and their satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school are not found related with each other. Further probe indicated that in case of needs, these relationship (between different needs and satisfaction - dissatisfaction) are highly significant in case of highly satisfied students, but are non-significant in case of highly dissatisfied students.

The two groups - highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied have different factorial patterns. Most of the needs (n-exh., n-aff., n-dom., n-agg., n-chg., n-ach., n-ord., n-aba., and n-end.) cluster with students' satisfaction (both with high loadings) to form a 'Need - Satisfaction Syndrome' in case of highly satisfied students, while such syndrome is not found in case of highly dissatisfied students.

Needs and self concept have been found to be the chief contributors to the variance in students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school.

The highly satisfied students tend to obtain significantly higher mean score than the highly dissatisfied students on self-concept, and the needs of achievement, deference, order, nurturance, and endurance, but the former have been found to obtain significantly lower mean scores on the needs of exhibition, hetero-sexuality and aggression than the latter.
(c) Classroom functioning of students and their satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school:

Students' classroom functioning and their satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school do not seem to be related with each other. The relationship between the two has been found significant in case of highly dissatisfied students only, but it is negative as well as negligible. Classroom functioning has not been found to differ significantly between the highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups of students. Likewise, it contributes almost negligible to the variance in students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction.

All the variables taken together show highly significant relationship with satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students in relation to their schools and also contribute significantly to the variances in it. This shows that a curvilinear relationship exists between the variables studied and the students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school.

The two controls viz, intelligence and SES are found significantly related to satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students. However, the relationship in both the cases have been found negative and low. Both these controls intervene in the relationship of anxiety and students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction. The partialling out of these two controls separately indicate significant, though negative relationship between anxiety and students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school. Intervening effect of these two variables in respect of other variables have not been found significant.

The factorial validity coefficients have confirmed the obtained relationships by correlational analysis, except for n-ag, in the total
sample and in highly dissatisfied group (the relationship became non-significant in case of former and negatively significant in the case of latter), and self-concept and n-def. in case of highly satisfied group (which have shown significant and positive relationship with satisfaction - dissatisfaction).

An overview of Highly Satisfied and Highly Dissatisfied Students:

On the basis of the above description, it can be safely concluded that highly satisfied students have higher self-concept. They seem to accomplish task requiring skill and efforts, accomplish something of great significance, do a difficult job well, and solve difficult problems. They have greater desire to get suggestions from supervisors, to find out what others think on different problems, to follow instructions given by superiors, to accept the leadership of others, to conform to custom and to avoid the unconventional. They may tend to be more orderly in every sphere of life. They may be found to show greater eagerness to help friends when they are in trouble, to assist others less fortunate, to treat others with kindness and sympathy. They show great deal of affection towards others. They have also greater endurance to keep themselves at a job until it is finished, or even if no progress is felt.

On the contrary, the highly dissatisfied students have comparatively lower self concept, and seem to have exhibitive nature. They say witty and clever things, tell amusing jokes and stories, verbalise more their personal adventures, experiences, and personal achievements, and mix with opposite sex with less inhibition. They are also found to make obscene sketches, to pass obscene remarks and read books and novels involving sex.
7.5. **EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

The results arrived at, and conclusions drawn from the present study indicate that satisfaction - dissatisfaction and the organizational climate of schools are intertwined. The students have been found more satisfied in schools having open and autonomous climates than those in school having paternal and the closed climates. This shows that educators, administrators, and the educational planners need to take such steps which may change the attitude and behaviour of the principals and teachers in order to develop open / autonomous climate in schools.

The principals need to abandon the coercive and authoritarian style of functioning. Rather they should create a democratic, and cooperative climate within the school. They should adopt such innovative strategies which may give more freedom to the teachers to devote their energies for the welfare of students, and the teachers may expose their leadership qualities to benefit the students as an independent entity. The boss-subordinate relationship between principal and teachers should be discarded and such atmosphere be created, where the teachers may derive maximum satisfaction from their job, and also their social needs may be satisfied. Therefore, schools should be transformed into open climate schools, and to achieve this, effective measures are to be taken at all levels and implemented, so that the output in terms of satisfaction - dissatisfaction may increase.

This study has indicated that social needs' satisfaction among teachers bears an inverse and significant relationship with students' satisfaction. Therefore, educators need to devise ways and means so that, they may not confine themselves to satisfy their own social needs through trade unionism, self contained and satisfying - activities only. But,
they should look to the welfare of the students and school on a priority basis which may go a long way to satisfy the students with the school.

The other findings suggest that self-concept, anxiety as well as most of the needs are significantly related to students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school. The educators, as well as administrators should infuse such stimuli within the school as to provide such environmental conditions which may offer greater chances for the outlet of the psychological needs to develop positive self-concept, reduce anxiety in students, and to generate greater satisfaction in them.

They should also remain sensitive to the problem of good psychological health of the students. Good psychological health of students will help them to perceive more satisfying experiences from the school situation. Steps should also be taken to bring about radical changes in school policies, administration, teachers' and principals' behaviour, their working style, as well as in inter-personal relationship among themselves and with the students. Changes should also be made in the content of the curriculum and school related activities to satisfy the students' needs and to reduce the chances of growing dissatisfaction among students from school. Likewise, the school campus, school buildings and other amenities provided, should be such as to meet the minimum needs of the students.

As dissatisfaction leads to frustration, while satisfaction helps in the formation of positive attitudes, there should be an in-built system in the school itself which may from time to time assess the psychological health of students and provide remedial measures. The teachers' training programme should concern with the guidance of students as well as of the effective teaching - learning situations. For regular psychologi-
cal assessment, some sort of psychological corporation should be built up which may take these programmes on a large scale. The state as well as Central Government, and other agencies engaged in the welfare of students, should open psychological clinics and guidance cells to help the students in their selection of schools, courses, and future vocations on the basis of their psychological make-up. The government should also provide better school campus environment, buildings, libraries, laboratories and workshops, and equipment to meet the growing needs of the students in the context of fast changing life.

A thorough screening of the administrators and teachers is needed before handing over them the responsibility of educating the students. Those, who are not only physically fit and academically good, but are also psychologically and mentally fit, soft in handling the students, and sympathetic towards them, should be appointed as teachers and administrators in schools.

7.6. **SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**:

In the preceding paragraphs, it has been attempted to review the main conclusions, draw some inferences and make a few generalizations. These inferences and generalizations based on the data of the present study cannot possibly be taken as final. In a way, the present study is probably the first attempt of its kind in this country and so before the findings are finally accepted as reliable, there is need of cross-validation of the reported results with larger samples from similar and somewhat different populations tested by means of carefully evaluated personality tests.
This problem deserves further probing based on case history method, using projective techniques like Rorschach and T.A.T. The two groups - highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied should be matched for sex, age, intelligence, grade level, family size, family vocation, family income, family social status, etc.

On the problem of students’ satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school, with which the present study is concerned, further researches can be planned and conducted in the following broad areas:


2. Students’ satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school in different types of schools viz. state owned, denominational, privately managed, and public schools, etc.

3. Satisfaction - dissatisfaction among students of different grades with in a school as well as in a cross - section of schools.

4. Relationship of students’ perception of the school climate and their satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school.

5. Relationship of students’ satisfaction - dissatisfaction with creativity, attitudes, values, study habits, vocational choice, and various other personality characteristics.

6. Relationship of parental environment, their attitudes, and values with students’ satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school.

7. Relationship of teacher behaviour, and teacher effectiveness with students’ satisfaction - dissatisfaction from school.
8. Relationship of drop-out and delinquency with students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction from school.


10. Relationship of alienation and frustration among students with their satisfaction - dissatisfaction from school.

11. Curvilinear relationship between psychological health, class-room functioning and satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students in different climates.

These are the broad heads suggested for exploration. They may be further divided into small projects for investigation. The researches should be conducted both longitudinally and cross-sectionally.

Besides what has been suggested above, a large number of piece meal researches and larger projects on the problem of students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school, its sources and remedial measures can be taken up both individually and on group basis. But, at all stages there is a great need of co-ordination in order to check wasteful overlapping of work.