CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION, PROBLEM, AND OBJECTIVES
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION:

Most youngsters between the ages of six and eighteen spend a greater portion of their working hours as 'students' in schools. The students' response to the school is the result of the interaction between his own individual personality and his assigned role as a student in a complex organizational structure. It is the interactive process which is important and has always been a subject of fascinating study because, individuals use organizations to fulfil their needs and simultaneously the organizations use the individuals to achieve the goals. Optimum self-actualization for both is what the equation, when balanced would yield. Dissatisfaction on either end suggests short circuiting in the fusion process.

An important function of school seems to be sorting out students according to their potential for upward mobility. But, the mechanism used, has an inbuilt bias in curriculum, teaching methods, and evaluation, generating tension in students. Life at school is particularly difficult for students who have to respond to new stimuli. Those who are slow in adapting to changes in their environment are frequently found to show negative moods. The demands of schooling restrict the expression of the urges felt by individuals, and thereby, produce intra-personal and inter-personal tensions. Schools set up norms and institutional barriers which may serve to block the satisfaction of the individual. But those who are either adequately equipped to respond to the school situation or to whom the school does not appear to set thwarting barriers of expression or set norms that are too high, respond to the new stimuli by enthusiastically participating
in teaching learning situation thereby maximising their satisfaction.

Musgrave\(^1\) (1972) noted that the importance of the school as a socializing agency has grown over the last century because the family has had less influence on the social development of the child. School exercises some sort of psychological impact. They 'affect the lives and functioning of children in ways, that were pervasive and perhaps profound' (Minuchin, Biber, Shapiro, and Zimiles\(^2\), 1969).

When a school responds to an individual's behaviour consistently for a long time, the individual acquires relatively stable pattern of reaction. But when the offerings of the school are dull, uninteresting, frustrating and anxiety producing, the student feels at odd with school and has difficulty in functioning. A conflict is likely to arise, when school activities are incompatible among themselves, block and interfere with, or in some way make a second activity less pleasing or less effective.

Conflict, generating dissatisfaction from the environment is also there in the roles of the teachers and the pupils (Waller, 1965). The wishes of the teachers and the students are necessarily divergent. Those who are in tune with the roles and wishes of the teacher feel satisfied; those who are in constant conflict tend to feel dissatisfied; because the student culture and the adult culture are at variance. Students within a school group themselves into sub-groups which vary in status and favoured activities. These groups and sub-groups interact and

these interactions generate satisfaction in some and dissatisfaction in others. Those who fit in the school would feel satisfied, while others remain dissatisfied. Gusick's (1973) study has revealed that students' behavior is more influenced by the peer group than his teachers. It seems that inter-personal relations among peer group play a significant role in the generation of satisfaction or dissatisfaction among students.

During the last decade, secondary school educators in India have been challenged by the general restiveness and dissatisfaction with school exhibited by many students. Conflicts and dissatisfaction within the school and class-rooms are inevitable, they will occur, no matter, what school personnel and students do. Dissatisfaction among school personnel, between students and the school staff, and among students are a moment of truth, a test of health of the relationships within the class-room and school. They are critical events that may bring increased learning, creative insight, high quality problem-solving, constructive changes and closer relationships; or, they bring lasting resentment, smoulder hostility, psychological scars, closed mind, and a refusal to perform responsibilities. Dissatisfaction have the potential for producing highly constructive and highly destructive consequences depending upon how they are managed. Concerted efforts have been made to reduce student dissatisfaction through curricular revisions and improved guidance procedures. However, the continued unrest among secondary school students suggest that educators have not identified all of the factors which influence adolescents to experience a general satisfaction with school. Researches have recurrently tried to piece together some of the links in the usual
chain of antecedent events that lead to satisfaction - dissatisfaction with schools. La Folette, William and Sims (1975) supported climate - causes satisfaction hypothesis. Avlin (1975) found internals more satisfied in open and low-structured environments. Hornstein, et. al., (1968) found that teacher - principal relationship is associated with higher student satisfaction.

A survey of 512 high schools in thirty states revealed that more than 90% of the students believed the schools to be overwhelmingly "unsatisfactory". The students maintained that courses were irrelevant, teachers were incompetent, too much stress was placed on grades, and school was boring (Parker, 1970). Hurlock (1976) reported that majority of adolescent boys and girls expressed dissatisfaction with their educational experiences. It varies in a predictable way according to sex, intelligence level, and socio-economic status. Hatcher (1975) reported significant relationship between personality and other characteristics, and college student's satisfaction. Waterman and Waterman (1971) concluded the existence of several variables which relate to satisfaction with specific aspects of the college environment. Parkin (1977) did not find similarity of value as a significant determinant of satisfaction with college. Shah (1973) observed that students showed their maximum dissatisfaction towards students' welfare services, curriculum, examination, discipline, and inter-personal relations with school. Bryant (1970) found lack of communication between students and school authorities as a major cause for students' dissatisfaction and activism; Pathak (1975), Raghavulu, Reddy and Rao (1967) found that students in general were dissatisfied with the system of education, courses of study, system of examina-
tion and class-lectures. Life (1969) reported that more than 50% of students are unhappy with their school.

Students show their dissatisfaction with school in many ways; they are often hyper-critical of their school and college. They find fault with everything, their studies, their teachers, the extra curricular activities, their classmates and the administrative policies. Many researches conclude that alienation among students results from dissatisfaction and they manifest their alienation through conflict, unrest and retreatism. Failure to see relevance of education, and inability of school curriculum to deal with the realities of modern life, feeling among students that they are being prepared as waste, institutional control, school regulations, administrative lapses, dearth of school amenities and school plant including reading room, student's recreation room, etc., examination system and various other school related affairs are hypothesised as possible dissatisfiers with school.

Dissatisfaction with education or refusal to benefit from the tool of learning and other experiences that schools provide, lowers the student's motivation, and his performance, both quantitatively and qualitatively much below his capacity. His performance will also probably be below that of others of equal or inferior ability who are not dissatisfied, and this has serious implication for educators.

The basic premise of the 'Human Relations School of Organizational thought' is that in industrial setting productivity is best attained by satisfied workers, conversely, less satisfied workers will produce less. Extending this assumption to school setting, teachers satisfied with the leadership of their principals, with their peer
group relations, and satisfied with a combination of economic and non-
economic rewards will make up a climate that is conducive to better
classroom functioning, greater need satisfaction, higher aspiration,
positive self-concept and as an end result greater satisfaction of
students with their school experiences. The dissatisfied teachers on
the other hand will produce a climate which will infest students with
dissatisfaction, lower achievement status and unstable psychological
health. A significant element of individual's interaction with the
environment is the concept of the self. Satisfaction is maximised when
there is maximum of congruence among variables in the intra-personal
relationship and self-concept. Similarly, satisfaction of needs
active in the organism to put forth higher drive level to achieve and
derive satisfaction. Aspirations too, so long as, they are not un-
realistic serve as motivational variable, but when it turns un-realistic,
it generates dissatisfaction. Theoretically and logically satis-
faction - dissatisfaction seems to be the part of the psychological
self as much as a product of the environment.

Success and satisfaction are bound together by logic if not by
fact. In educational terms, students who are doing well in school
might be expected to express contentment when asked to describe their
school experience and those who are doing poorly might be expected to
express discontentment. Surprisingly, however, educational research
has not yet provided a confirmation of this logically compelling ex-
ppectation. Scholastic weakness and educational discontent, unrealistic
aspiration, poor self-concept have been assumed to co-exist and to re-
inforce one another.
Why school experience generates satisfaction in few and cause dissatisfaction among others has been a guessing game for parents, teachers and administrators alike despite all the research attempts made so far. But an empirical answer to the question to establish the "best guesses" has not been conclusively attempted. Schools should stimulate learning and ensure incremental growth of pupils' healthy personality. Dissatisfaction with school nullifies this thesis. If the role expectancy from them remains unfulfilled, an important educational controversy crops up. Should schools be treated as scrapes and written off from the educational process? What makes a school ineffective and how to diagnose it, are some of the questions that irritates society and administrators both.

Theoretically, dissatisfaction becomes part of a broader area of inquiry which aims at an understanding of the individual's psychological make up - cognitive and affective, the inner forces that he can bring upon to cope with the demands of the school, his functioning in an institutional setting inferred by teacher's and the Principal's behaviour, staff morale, role-conflict, and the like. At the practical level, the question of why children like or dislike school is directly related to the immediate problems of teaching - learning and their outcomes.

Despite considerable theoretical and supportive evidence from the industrial psychology and elsewhere, comparatively little effort and thinking seems to have been done to build up systematic knowledge about satisfaction and dissatisfaction among students in relation to their school experience involving organizational climate of school, psychological health as represented by their needs, self-concept,
level of aspiration, and anxiety, and the class-room functioning as denoted by their academic achievement.

Therefore, this study proposes to look for the sources of satisfaction - dissatisfaction within the individual himself, his functioning in relation to the school climate which the teachers' and principals' make.

THE PROBLEM for the present study is:

"School climate, Psychological health and class-room functioning of students in relation to their satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school."

It seeks to study: (a) students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school in different organizational climates, (b) the school climate, psychological health of students, and their class-room functioning in relation to their satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school, (c) to compare 'highly satisfied' and 'highly dissatisfied' students on psychological health variables and their class-room functioning.

Objectives:

Broadly speaking the following are the main and subsidiary objectives of the study:

A. Main objectives:

1. To find out the differences in satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students due to organizational climates.

---

1. Satisfaction - dissatisfaction means student's satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school.
2. To find out the relationship between school climate (total scores and sub-test scores of school climate) and students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction.

3. To find out the relationship of students' psychological health and classroom functioning with their satisfaction - dissatisfaction.

4. To find out the contribution of psychological health variables and classroom functioning to the variances in satisfaction - dissatisfaction.

5. To find out the relationship of psychological health, and classroom functioning with high satisfaction - and high dissatisfaction, and to test the significance of difference of relationships in the two criterion groups.

6. To find the factorial structure of different variables in total sample, highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups, and to compare them.

7. To find out the factorial validity coefficients of different variables in relation to satisfaction - dissatisfaction in total sample, highly satisfied and dissatisfied groups, and to compare them with their zero-order correlations.

B. Subsidiary Objectives:

8. (a) To determine the relationship of psychological health and classroom functioning with students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction after partialing out the effect of intelligence and SES.
(b) To study the independent relationship of each variable after partialling out the effect of other variables.

9. To compare the psychological health and class-room functioning profiles of highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups and normally satisfied students.

10. To compare the satisfaction - dissatisfaction, psychological health and class-room functioning profiles of rural and urban students.

11. (a) To compare the satisfaction - dissatisfaction profiles of high, average and low intelligence and SES groups separately.

(b) The find out the relationship of intelligence and SES (control variables) with satisfaction - dissatisfaction.

HYPOTHESES:

The following null hypotheses have been formulated, on the strength of the review and its discussion presented in Chapter II and the objectives of the study, for testing:

Under Main Objective I and II

H⁰ - Satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students will not vary significantly with variance in school climate.

1. Satisfaction - dissatisfaction includes scores on five sub-areas as well as their total (S - D Score).
H1 - Satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students will not be positively and significantly related to school climate \(^1\) (total and sub-test score)

Under Main Objectives III to VII

A - Correlational Study:

H2 - Satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students will not be positively and significantly related to their (a) classroom functioning, (b) self-concept, (c) level of aspiration, (d) anxiety, and (e) fifteen EPFS needs (b to e are psychological health variables).

H3 - (a) Classroom functioning, (b) self-concept, (c) level of aspiration, (d) anxiety and (e) fifteen EPFS needs will not be positively and significantly related with high satisfaction \(^2\) of students.

H4 - (a) Classroom functioning, (b) Self-concept, (c) level of aspiration, (d) anxiety and (e) fifteen EPFS needs will not be positively and significantly related with high dissatisfaction \(^3\) of students.

---

1. School climate means five organizational climates (See Chapter III page 104).

2. High satisfaction means S - D scores for highly satisfied students.

3. High Dissatisfaction means S - D Scores for highly dissatisfied students.
H₅ - Relationship of (a) class-room functioning, (b) Self-concept, (c) level of aspiration, (d) anxiety, and (c) EPS needs with S - D scores (Converted to 'Z' values) will not be significantly different in highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups.

B - Multiple Correlation and Regression:

H₆ - Class-room functioning; psychological health; and SES and intelligence (control variables) conjointly will not be significantly related to students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college.

H₇ - (a) Class-room functioning; psychological health; and SES and intelligence (control variables) together will not contribute positively and significantly to the variances in students' satisfaction with school / college.

(b) All the variables will not contribute equally to the variances in satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students with school / college.

C - Factor Analytic Study:

H₈ - All the variables will not be clustered into one single factor in (a) total sample (b) highly satisfied, and (c) highly dissatisfied groups.

H₉ - No single factor having exclusive relevance to satisfaction / dissatisfaction will evolve as a result of factor analysis in (a) total sample, (b) highly satisfied and (c) highly dissatisfied groups.
$H_{10}$ - Factor structure of highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups will not be different from each other.

$H_{11}$ - Factorial validity coefficients for different variables in relation to satisfaction - dissatisfaction will not differ from their Zero - order correlation coefficients in (a) their level of significance and (b) nature of relationship.

**Under subsidiary objectives VIII to XI**

$H_{12}$ - (a) Zero - order and part. $r$ values between different variables and satisfaction - dissatisfaction will not be different in nature of relationship and level of significance.

(b) Part. 'R' values for different variables (after regression of the rest 20 variables) will not differ from their Zero - order correlation coefficients in their level of significance or the nature of relationship.

$H_{13}$ - The control variables viz (a) SES, and (b) Intelligence, will not be significantly related with the satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students.

**D - Differential study:**

$H_{14}$ - (a) Students will not vary in their psychological health variables and classroom functioning due to variance in their satisfaction - dissatisfaction.
(b) Psychological health and classroom functioning profiles of highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students will not differ significantly.

\[ H_{15} \quad (a) \text{Satisfaction - dissatisfaction,} \quad (b) \text{psychological health and} \quad (c) \text{classroom functioning profiles for rural and urban students will not differ significantly.} \]

\[ H_{16} \quad \text{Rural highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students will not differ significantly with respect to their} \]
\[ (a) \text{psychological health, and} \quad (b) \text{classroom functioning.} \]

\[ H_{17} \quad \text{Urban highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students will not differ significantly with respect to their} \]
\[ (a) \text{psychological health, and} \quad (b) \text{classroom functioning.} \]

\[ H_{18} \quad (a) \text{Rural - Urban highly satisfied students will not differ on their psychological health and classroom functioning.} \]
\[ (b) \text{Rural - Urban highly dissatisfied students will not differ on their psychological health and classroom functioning.} \]

\[ H_{19} \quad \text{Satisfaction - dissatisfaction will not vary significantly with variance in students' (a) SES level, and (b) intelligence level.} \]
Delimitation:

(a) The study is limited to intermediate colleges of Allahabad.

(b) It is limited to science curriculum only.

(c) In order to control the sex variable only male students have been included in the present study.
CONCEPTS DEFINED:

A. SATISFACTION - DISSATISFACTION

Strong\(^1\) (1958, p. 449) doubted if any ten experts would agree on a specific definition of the term "satisfaction". Most of the definitions of satisfaction, emphasise on three aspects: first, arrival at a goal; second, pleasant feelings or contentment; and third, a relatively quiescent condition. Similarly, dissatisfaction arises when the individual is prevented from reaching his goal. Failure to attain the goal, consequential unpleasant feeling and a relatively disquiet condition are the state of affairs denoted by dissatisfaction. Satisfaction - dissatisfaction centres round the goal which the individual sets in relation to his environment and is a resultant of goal directed activity.

Dewey\(^2\) (1922) considered, satisfaction as the fulfilment of a specific demand. Dissatisfaction seems to be opposite of satisfaction as far as feeling goes, though the overt activities accompanying satisfaction are not much different from those of dissatisfaction.

Boles and Devanport\(^3\) (1975, p. 398) state "the satisfaction that one may expect from finding and seizing opportunities to lead, probably, depend on the values that are dominant in one's life. If an individual's

dominant values relate to motivation needs, one may experience quite different satisfactions than if one's values relate to maintenance needs or to perceptual needs."

Morse (1953, p. 38) thought, "The greater the amount the individual gets, the greater his satisfaction, and, at the same time, the more the individual still desires, the less his satisfaction." Thus, an individual's satisfaction seems to be a function not only of how much he receives from the environment, but also of where he stands with respect to his level of aspiration. When the environment provides little possibility for need satisfaction, those with the strongest desires, or highest aspirations will be least happy.

Satisfaction is a function of need gratification (Secord, Backman and Slavitt, 1968), but to understand satisfaction in a task situation, it is useful to distinguish among needs according to the source of rewards that lead to their satisfaction. One such source is obvious - the individual rewards offered in exchange for the task done, which include monetary gain, elevated status, social approval, and other psychic awards. A second source of reward lies in the features of the task itself, features that allow for the satisfaction of such individual needs as those for self-expression, self-development and self-dominance.

The satisfactions, individuals receive are more than simply a function of the amount of the reward obtained in a group. The amount of

award that satisfies one person may not satisfy another. Individuals 

vary in their need. They also vary in the number of possible alter-

natives for need gratification. Adams (1965), Romans (1961), and 

Patchen (1958) argue that the variance in level of satisfaction cannot 

be explained merely in terms of the absolute magnitude of the reward.

Birney and Taylor (1959) assumed that both a diversity of rewards 

within the college environment, and the student will orient towards that 

aspect of the environment, in which he obtains maximum reward. Pace 

(1960) suggested that the press of the environment as the student sees 

it, defines what he must cope with, and clarifies for him the direction, 

his behaviour must take, if he is to find reward and satisfaction with 

the dominant culture of the college.

Maslow (1954) assumed that as one goes up in the need heirarchy, 

the criterion for judging whether one’s need has been fulfilled becomes 

less self-dependent and more other dependent.

Murray (1938) expanded Lewin’s formulation that behaviour could 

best be considered by analysis of the interaction between person – 

environmental factors and presented a need – press model, where environ-

ment potentially satisfies or frustrates organism’s needs. Stern, Stein, 

and Bloom (1956) added to it the social demands of the situation. 

Leavitt (1965), Likert (1967), Tannenbaum (1967) suggested that 

the difference between perceived and perceived influence over one’s 

work environment is an important determinant of motivation, performance 


ted that satisfaction is a function of the person and the environment 

\( S = f (P, E) \), (where ‘S’ is satisfaction, ‘P’ is person and ‘E’ is 

environment).
Alkinson (1957), Edward (1954), Lewin, Festinger, Dembo and Sears (1944), Rotter (1954), and Tolman (1959) suggested that attractiveness of a given option is seen as a multiplicative function of the valences of the outcomes associated with the option and the subjective probability. When subjective probability is held constant, an increase in valence produces an increase in satisfaction. Likewise, when valence is held constant, an increase in subjective probability produces an increase in satisfaction.

Research evidence shows that men experience intrinsic satisfactions in at least three domains viz., (a) achievements, (b) affiliation, and (c) influence or power (Foa, 1960, Schmuck and Runkel, 1970).

If major motives are satisfied in the context of school experiences, and personal aspirations, then satisfaction with school would be a function of the degree of discrepancy between personal needs and perceived potential of the school for satisfying needs. Jersild (1974) thinks that a major source of satisfaction comes from opportunities to put their abilities to use. Barton (1961), Astin and Panos (1968), and Sjogern (1970), suggested that input, social and psychological context should be considered when we examine the college characteristics and students' satisfaction.

In the industrial context, Herzberg et. al. (1959) conceptualized that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not at the two extremities of a continuum. Some factors are satisfiers (motivator factors)


when present, but not dissatisfiers when absent; while other factors (hygiene factors) are dissatisfiers, but when eliminated as dissatisfiers, do not result in satisfaction. Gregalimanas and Herzberg (1971), Bealick (1973) and Feather (1973) found that the two types of factors also exist in the colleges as in other organizations. Holland (1966) maintained that the satisfaction or dissatisfaction can be predicted on the basis of knowledge concerning the congruence between personality type and environment. Davis (1958) suggested that a lack of fit between student and college characteristics lead to some kind of dissatisfaction with the college experience. Pervin (1967, 1968), Pervin and Rubin (1967) concluded that discrepancies between the students' perception of himself and his college environment would be related to his dissatisfaction. Richardson (1970) suggested that congruence of student role orientation and the prevailing patterns of the institutional environment constitutes the student-college fit, and his findings indicated that fit and satisfaction were intertwined. While Jahoda (1962), Mc Fee (1976) emphasized the need for a 'best-fit' between individual and the situation to reduce dissatisfaction.

Midler (1970) considered variety, outdoor, and travels as sources of satisfaction. In a school situation, if a student finds variety, such as number of courses, various types of school-activities, and large choice of selection, he feels satisfied. Likewise he may


derive satisfaction, if there are outings, or one gets the opportunity of visiting other places and in travels arranged by school authorities.

There exists some difference between 'global satisfaction' and 'facet satisfaction'. The fact is that a student can be satisfied in general with his school as a whole ('global satisfaction'), and yet he may be quite dissatisfied with certain aspects of the school functioning ('facet satisfaction').

Therefore, satisfaction with school may be conceptualized as a personalistic evaluation of conditions existing in the school ('teaching-learning situation') or outcomes that arise as a result of achievement in school related activities. Satisfaction with school consists of filtered and processed perceptions, perceptions filtered through the individual's system of norms, values, needs, expectation, and so forth.

For the purpose of this study, the term 'satisfaction - dissatisfaction' includes filtered perceptions of students in various areas of schools viz., school policy, administration, teachers, peers, curriculum, school activities, campus and school plant, etc.

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE OF SCHOOLS

Researchers in the past have looked at 'Organizational climate of schools' from different angles. Some have considered it as 'the feel' of the school; others have referred to it as 'school personality', while still others have called it "atmosphere", "environment", "tone" and even "morale". Even, some have termed it as institutional climate' to distinguish the 'school climate' from the 'climate of other
types of organizations'. The term 'Organizational climate of schools' is a combination of three: 'Organization', 'climate', and 'Schools'.

"Organization, simple or complex, is always an impersonal system of coordinated efforts; always there is purpose as the coordinating and unifying principle, always there is indispensable ability to communicate, always the necessity for the personal willingness, and for effectiveness and efficiency in maintaining the integrity of purposes and continuity of contribution" (Barnard¹, 1938). Schein² (1969, p. 8) holds that an organization is the rational coordination of the activities of a number of people for the achievement of some common and explicit purpose or goal through division of labour and through a hierarchy of authority and responsibility.

Griffiths³ (1964, pp. 430 - 441) regarded school as an open social system. Getzels and Cuba⁴ (1957) also perceived school and college as an organization. Each category of actors like principal, teachers, pupils, office-staff has different sets of expectations from one another.


Rice (1963) talked about two models of Organization namely, open and closed. According to him, open system imports various things from the environment, utilizes these imports in some kind of conversion process and then exports product, services and waste materials which result from the conversion process.

It is to be noted that in coercive authority system the involvement of participants is usually of alienative category. Closed climate of Halpin and Croft is similar to Etzioni’s (1961) coercive authority. Therefore, in closed climate schools, the teachers will feel alienated from school work. Likewise, Etzioni’s normative authority is very much similar to Halpin and Crofts’ (1963, 1966) ‘open climate’.

According to Tagiuri (1968), "Organizational climate is a relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization that: (a) is experienced by its members, that (b) influences their behaviour and that (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics ( or attributes ) of the organization" (p. 126).

Stern (1970) formulated the ‘Need - Press’ Model to conceptualize ‘Organizational Climate’. He referred to needs as organizational tendencies which appear to give unity and direction to a person’s behav-


violur", while the concept of organizational press provides an external situational counterpart to internalized needs. Press includes conditions that represent 'impediments to a need' as well as of those that give rise to 'organizational climate'.

Campbell et al., ¹ (1970, p. 390), defined organizational climate differently. According to them, it is "a set of attributes specified to a particular organization that may be induced from the way the organization deals with its members and its environment. For the individual member within an Organization, climate takes the form of a set of attitudes and expectancies which describe the organization in terms of both static characteristics (such as degree of autonomy) and behaviour-outcome, and outcome-outcome contingencies." (p. 390).

Schneider and Hall² (1972) described Organizational climate as a set of summary or global perception held by individuals about their organizational environment. James and Jones (1974, p. 1107), while reviewing the theories of organizational climate indicated that situation and individual characteristics interact to produce a third set of perceptual, intervening variables.

'Organizational climate', need not be confounded with 'Psychological climate'. James and Jones³ (1974) stated that when climate is


regarded as an organizational attribute, the term 'Organizational climate' appears appropriate. It refers to organizational attributes, main effects or stimuli. When, climate is regarded as an individual attribute, the term 'Psychological Climate' be employed. It refers to individual attributes namely, the intervening psychological process where by the individual translates the interaction between perceived organizational attributes and individual characteristics into a set of expectancies, attitudes, and behaviour etc.

Sargent\(^1\) (1966) defined, School organizational climate as a concept which embraces the milieu of personalities - principal and teachers interacting within the sociological and psychological frame work of an institution such as the public high school. Sharma\(^2\) (1971), interprets the concept of school Organizational climate as the resulting condition with in the school from the social interaction between the teachers and the principal.

In schools, the organizational climate is the resultant accumulated effect of the ways in which the principal interacts with teachers and teachers interact among themselves and with the principal. These variables have also their impact on the climate as they are reflected in the interaction process that goes on in the school and the relation-


ships that accrue within school community. Argyris (1962) reported, declining task effectiveness in organizations as a result of deteriorating inter-personal relationship. In short, there is ample precedent for accepting that over-all satisfaction with educational process should be heavily dependent upon the quality of Principal - faculty and faculty - student relationships.

But for the purpose of the present study, therefore, the organizational climate of the school (School climate) has been operationally defined as the relationship between the principal and the teachers and among the teachers themselves. In short, the organizational climate has been taken as a concept which embraces the milieu of personalities - principal and teachers interacting within the sociological and psychological frame work of an educational institution, as perceived by the teachers.

C. PSYCHOLOGICAL HEALTH

Good and Merkel¹ (1973) define health as, "the condition of a human organization which measures the degree to which its aggregate powers are able to function so as to bring physical, social, and emotional well being". Physical health relates to the weight, height, breadth and other physical aspects. The social and emotional part of the health includes all such psychological aspects which control or influence individuals' social and emotional well being.

It is the totality of the physical, social and emotional aspects of the personality which from the basis of psychological Health. In

the present study, the interaction of all these aspects have been taken together which reflect in the status of self-concept, level of aspiration, feelings and emotions, needs, interests, anxiety and attitudes of the individual.

It has been estimated that most of the people's ills are caused by anxieties, conflicts, low self-concept, unrealistic high level of aspiration, non-fulfilment of different needs etc. The psychological health factors have the potentiality of affecting the physical health as well as the chemical reactions within an individual. Good physical health contributes to good psychological health and vice versa. Studies have revealed that anxiety, grief, bitterness, rage and others help to develop a composition of gastric juices within the stomach, which consumes the tissues of the stomach and cause sore. Likewise, a poor self-image and feelings of inferiority reflect a difficult and serious condition that leads to physical ill health. A person who is chronically dissatisfied with himself and the role he is expected to play in life, sooner or later develops sickness both physical and psychological.

Satisfaction depends largely on whether the person's life pattern meets his needs, interests, and aspirations. Caven (1952) has emphasized that a well-adjusted person is able to satisfy his needs quickly and adequately within the system of controls and outlets provided by the culture.

The kind of personality pattern, the person develops, depends largely on his life experiences. If these experiences provide satisfaction, the personality will be healthy. If they are dissatisfying,
the chances are that a sick personality will develop. Both healthy and sick personalities result from physical and psychological aspects of the individuals' experiences. Both play major roles in the life of the individual, but psychological component appears to predominate in the total complex known as "Psychological Health".

In this study therefore, psychological health corresponds to Garrison's¹ (1956, p. 217) third aspect of personality which includes self-concept, level of aspiration, anxiety and the fifteen psychological needs (EPPS needs). These have been operationally defined as:

(a) **Self concept** is considered as a person's perceptions of his own health and physique, tempramental qualities, academic status, intellectual abilities, habits and behaviours, emotional tendencies, mental health and socio-economic status.

(b) **Level of aspiration** is the discrepancy between an individual's immediate performance and his aspiration.

(c) **Anxiety** has been used in the present study in the sense in which it was used by Sinha² (1968, p. 2) in manual for 'Anxiety' scale.

(d) **Needs** are used in the sense in which Edward³ (1959), has defined in his manual for Edward Personal Preference Schedule (1959, p. 11).

---


D. CLASS ROOM FUNCTIONING

Classroom functioning means how much one gains from the classroom activities. It includes over all academic achievement in all the subjects studied by the student.

Researches reveal that motives and needs play an important role in achievement. And, a number of elements go to contribute to the complex process that leads to successful achievement - the 'Achievement syndrome'. It is made of three elements viz. aspiration, motivation, and achievement value. The student may have sufficient ability but might not be knowing, how to mobilize his energies and use them effectively. As a result, he often gains satisfaction in imaginary successes or his dissatisfaction is reflected when he blames himself and others for his short comings. Whether the achievement syndrome leads to success or failure depends on many conditions, as students' ability, the use of his ability, and the presence or absence of obstacles. These obstacles may originate in the student himself, such as limited physical or mental abilities, and / or may originate in the school environment like prejudice and discrimination, etc. He must experience to enjoy wide and varied activities. It seems that the central element in the achievement syndrome is 'motivation'. Greater motivation and satisfaction come from a job which provides a feeling of achievement, responsibility, growth, advancement, earned recognition, and enjoyment from the work itself.

A persons' attitudes towards his achievements and the degree of satisfaction he derives from them may have a far reaching effect on his self-concept (Horlock, 1976).

It may be said that classroom functioning is a student's effectiveness in handling and grasping the scholastic material. As such it is reflected in his scholastic achievement.

Scholastic achievement is the proficiency attained by a student in school subjects. In other words, it is the actualization of the mental potentialities of a student at school level through the process of schooling. For the purpose of this study, classroom functioning in its concrete form, is measured in terms of the total aggregate marks obtained by a student at the high School Examination, 1978 of the U.P. Board.

**OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS:**

The socio-economic status of students is one's status with respect to the size of the family, family member's education, occupation, income, dwelling space, and the social status in the society.