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SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

Education is not only one of the foundation stones of a national life, but also one of the greatest instruments of social change. Education, therefore, is a crucial factor in the development of a nation. As a matter of fact, the prosperity, mental development and behaviour of people are determined by their education. Education at its best is a dynamic process involving individuals and groups reflecting upon their lives and the society in which they live. Thus, education is a living process, which must be refined by the understanding of those involved and by the changing demands of the present. The new generation is curiously interested in schooling because they realize that anyone with more education tends to earn more than others. The Indian Education Commission (1964-66) remarked that the destiny a nation is shaped in her classrooms. So education is the standard measure indicating the quality of the people and the development of the country. It is a great tool to guarantee success in life.

Virtually every nation is taking steps to improve its education policy. Not only is there an acute concern to achieve hundred percent literacy, but also a desire to increase the duration of compulsory education so that every individual develops according to his/her optimum potential. Education does not merely impart knowledge and skills but increases the efficiency and productive capacity of both the individual and the nation.

Secondary education is concerned with exploring and developing the interests and aptitudes among boys and girls along with providing knowledge and skills to enable them to enter either vocational or academic stream.

The resolution of National Policy on Education (1986) outlined the following principles for secondary education.

- Education opportunity at the secondary level is a major instrument of social change and transformation. Facilities for secondary education should accordingly be extended expeditiously to areas and classes, which have been denied it.

- There is need to increase facilities for technical and vocational education.
In order to consolidate the education on new lines, it was recommended that 10+2+3 pattern be adopted throughout the country. At +2 level vocationalization of education should take place and by the year 1990, around 10% students be diverted to vocational channels and by the year 1995, around 25% of the Students should go in for academic channels. None of these targets have been achieved. Vocational education was made a terminus so that one can join an occupation after completing that or go in for further technical education or go in for academic channel. This too has not been possible because the skills acquired by the students of these vocational schools are not commensurate with the market requirement.

National Policy on Education (1986) observed it has been advantageous to have broadly uniform educational structure in all parts of the country. The ultimate objective should be to adopt the 10+2+3 pattern, the higher secondary stage of two years being located in schools, colleges or both according to local conditions.

The school and the teacher play an important role in providing a supportive environment that encourages students’ motivation, self-confidence, curiosity and desire to learn. Therefore a climate that is sensitive, flexible and responsive to the learners’ needs should be provided. Review of literature has identified that modeling and practicing-learning skills are important wherein students are taught activities through modeling, demonstration and direct instruction of learning skills by the teacher who monitors students’ progress. The teacher’s positive attitude as well as good knowledge of the needs, interests and abilities of the individual student enhances this shift. Teachers need to develop a good understanding of their student’s strengths and weaknesses: socially, emotionally, intellectually and physically, exceptionalities, health, and cultural backgrounds. This will help teachers motivate their students effectively and successfully. A teacher must try to facilitate learning in a variety of ways, which are age-appropriate, subject-appropriate, related to available resources, and related to student’s need for a balance between structured experience and independence. Support and encouragement to students is vital. The teacher’s role is to be a facilitator, showing students how to learn effectively, encouraging them, providing feedback and supporting their efforts. It is responsibility of the educator to foster the developmental process of instruction.

Teachers need to assist students in mastering the instructional process. Teachers not only should encourage students to acquire knowledge but also help them to find out their own attitudes, interests and requirements. This process surely leads to a more
meaningful learning experience for the students and produces good individual members of society.

From the above observations, it is therefore, contended that secondary education is of utmost importance in the development of any country. To study satisfaction and dissatisfaction with school of tenth grade students assumes a great significance.

Some of the problems associated with secondary education in India are:

- Students do not get opportunity to select subjects according to their interests and aptitudes.
- Their curriculum is not related to their environment and practical life.
- Present educational system, examination system, aimlessness of education etc. are the factors responsible for the indiscipline among the students.
- After independence, the Government have mainly concentrated their attention towards the expansion of education and have not devoted their proper attention towards the qualitative progress of education.
- Teachers do not get sufficient salaries.
- There are many schools, which have insufficient money to make proper provision for building and other amenities necessary for providing education.
- System of examination at secondary level has many drawbacks.
- A school, its teachers and its students are tested in accordance with their success in examinations. Only that school is considered best which is able to secure good results in the examination.
- Instead of getting real benefits from education and knowledge, the students cram their books mechanically so that they may obtain good marks in the examination. Consequently, development of their mind and personality is hampered.
- There is absence of well-organized community life in the secondary schools in India.
- Total absence of religious and moral education in the schools.
The problem of wastage and stagnation in the secondary education is a difficult and complicated problem.

At present, there are three types of secondary schools that are imparting education at the secondary stage:

(a) Government schools,
(b) District board and municipal board school, and
(c) Schools run by private bodies. So far as the question of schools run by private bodies is concerned, they are commercial ventures and are the important means of income of their managers. Since they are being run on profit basis, they cannot be expected to render the real service.

SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION

Satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the students with the school refers to the unhappy conditions encountered by the students both in their studies and in their school activities. As high school students are adolescents and still flexible, they have to adjust quickly to an alien, modern and challenging world. They often find the conditions in their schools confusing and this can lead to their dissatisfaction. In high school, each student has to cope with more and more difficult situations. He must know how to make a wise curricular choice so that he may have they necessary prerequisite for whatever post-high school he wishes to enter. He must acquire and develop enough basic study skills for optimum achievement. He has to adjust to the pressure and demands of his peers and still satisfy the expectation of his parents. He has to learn how to best spend his leisure time.

Jersild (1980) has also observed that the learners’ emotions are involved in all his activities at school. If the school programme is suited to him, he will derive joy from his achievements and look forward with pleasure to the stimulating tasks that lie ahead. On the other hand, annoyances and irritations are bound to occur even in the best school, and some features of the school programmes are likely to arouse fear, especially if they threaten the learner with failure or threaten to expose weakness within him that he prefers to hide from himself and others.

Butler (1987) supported the above observation by noting that, when teachers understand the concept of learning styles and apply that knowledge in their interaction
with students, those students are more likely to enjoy their school experiences and to achieve academic success.

In school, the students, therefore, gain not only from the teacher’s academic instructions but also develop psychological guidelines for living.

In the present study, Secondary school students’ satisfaction and dissatisfaction has been studied along eight dimensions;

- **Teacher**: the professional behaviour of teacher
- **Fellow student**: peer group relationship in school, especially with regards to class work.
- **School Work**: the range of courses and the nature of class work in school, including teacher’s assignments.
- **Student activities**: the number and type of school-sponsored activities and with opportunities for student participation in curricular activities.
- **Student discipline**: the degree to which the school is not an orderly and safe environment.
- **Decision making opportunities**: student’s satisfaction with the opportunities to influence decision about school policy such as curriculum, school events, activities, etc.
- **School building, Supplies and upkeep**: the quality and availability of library resources, learning materials and supplies, and with the upkeep of the building and grounds.
- **Communication**: the availability of information and opportunities for interpersonal Communications.

In addition of this, some other factors are also important in the study of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among the students. Students at any age vary widely in intellectual abilities and characteristics. Psychomotor abilities, personality, affective characteristics, health and socioeconomic status, home and neighborhood conditions etc.

In the present study, **effort was made to understand the role of socio-economic status and intelligence in satisfaction and dissatisfaction with school.**
Education and economy go hand in hand. Education is an important ingredient for economic development. It is the education alone that can help in transforming the society and in improving economic status of a country.

**SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS**

Socio economic status consists of a cluster of factors, which includes occupation, income, and cultural features of home. Considering the importance of home in the educational development of the child, researchers have attempted to analyze home environment in terms of structural, attitudinal and process dimensions. The most frequently examined educational environment of the home is that involving structural variables where in socio-economic status is one of the principal variables. The structural variables may not influence educational outcomes directly. Yet, they are correlated with other dimension of environment and may be seen as exerting an indirect influence.

The socio-economic status in a layman’s way of thinking would simply refer to the stratification of the society into three main categories viz. high, middle and low.

Socio-economic status has usually been confined to five components:
- Education of the parents and other members of the family.
- Profession of parents and other family members.
- Income of the family from all sources.
- Size of the family.
- Total status of the family.

Socio-economic status of the family not only helps a student in getting higher education but it also helps in academic achievement, because higher the socio-economic status better the educational facilities available, together with more intellectual stimulation which is not present with socio-economically deprived children. Socio-economic status seems to influence students’ attitudes, interests, values, motivation etc, and thus his academic accomplishment. In this respect Vernon (1986) found that social class is so closely associated with cultural level and to attitudes towards education that it has a marked effect on educational progress. **Thus it was thought prudent to study the socio economic status while studying the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the students.**

Galler (1951) found that large majority of both boys and girls in the age of twelve to fourteen years of age, from upper and middle class, sought the professional and
managerial occupations. Among the lower class children, the boys were divided about one-third each between the professional and managerial occupation and the clerical and skilled occupations, while the overwhelming majority of the girls choose clerical occupation.

INTELLIGENCE

Intelligence means not only intellectual activities but also the capacity for solving practical problems of life as well. Intelligence is considered as an ability to adjust to environment. **Terman (1925)** has defined intelligence as ability to do abstract thinking. In simple words, intelligence means intellect as is applied in practice.

On the physiological side, intelligence means the facility and vigor with which the nervous system can adopt it to normal situation of life. Thus, we may say that intelligence is an indicator of the ability to cope successfully with novel situations.

Psychologists differ among themselves in defining intelligence, but they agree in reading it as the ability (1) to carry on the higher process of thinking and (2) to learn, (3) to adopt oneself to novel situations.

**Binet** (1905a, 1905b) opined that; “to judge well, to understand properly, to reason well, are the essential springs of intelligence.”

Intelligence is the very important part of every child’s education because his interest as well as learning abilities are dependent on his I.Q. level. Different children have different I.Q. and it is necessary that their subject matter should be according to their intelligence level otherwise they may be dissatisfied. In schools it is necessary that studies should be according to the student’s needs, only then we can achieve the goals of education.
STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

To study Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with School of tenth grade students in relation to their Socio-economic Status and Intelligence.

OBJECTIVES

The study was conducted with the following objectives:

1. To study and compare the Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with School (Government and Private) of Tenth Grade Students in Chandigarh (in respect of Total scores as well as on Teacher Dimension, Fellow Student Dimension, School Work Dimension, Students Activities Dimension, Discipline Dimension, Decision Making Opportunities Dimension, School Building, Supplies and Up-keep Dimension and Communication Dimension).

2. To study Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with School (Government and Private) of Tenth Grade Students in relation to their Intelligence (in respect of Total scores as well as Teacher Dimension, Fellow Student Dimension, School Work Dimension, Students Activities Dimension, Discipline Dimension, Decision Making Opportunities Dimension, School Building, Supplies and Up-keep Dimension and Communication Dimension).

3. To study Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with School (Government and Private) of Tenth Grade Students in relation to their Socio-Economic Status (in respect of Total scores as well as Teacher Dimension, Fellow Student Dimension, School Work Dimension, Students Activities Dimension, Discipline Dimension, Decision Making Opportunities Dimension, School Building, Supplies and Up-keep Dimension and Communication Dimension).

4. To study the interactive effects of School Management, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Tenth Grade Students with school (in respect of Total scores as well as Teacher Dimension, Fellow Student Dimension, School Work Dimension, Students Activities Dimension, Discipline Dimension, Decision Making Opportunities Dimension, School Building, Supplies and Up-keep Dimension and Communication Dimension).
5. To study and compare the Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with School of Tenth Grade Students (Boys and Girls) in Chandigarh (in respect of Total scores as well as Teacher Dimension, Fellow Student Dimension, School Work Dimension, Students Activities Dimension, Discipline Dimension, Decision Making Opportunities Dimension, School Building, Supplies and Up-keep Dimension and Communication Dimension).

6. To study Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with School of Tenth Grade Students (Boys and Girls) in relation to their Intelligence (in respect of Total scores as well as Teacher Dimension, Fellow Student Dimension, School Work Dimension, Students Activities Dimension, Discipline Dimension, Decision Making Opportunities Dimension, School Building, Supplies and Up-keep Dimension and Communication Dimension).

7. To study Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with School of Tenth Grade Students (Boys and Girls) in relation to their Socio-Economic Status (in respect of Total scores as well as Teacher Dimension, Fellow Student Dimension, School Work Dimension, Students Activities Dimension, Discipline Dimension, Decision Making Opportunities Dimension, School Building, Supplies and Up-keep Dimension and Communication Dimension).

8. To study the interactive effects of Gender, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Tenth Grade Students with school (in respect of Total scores as well as Teacher Dimension, Fellow Student Dimension, School Work Dimension, Students Activities Dimension, Discipline Dimension, Decision Making Opportunities Dimension, School Building, Supplies and Up-keep Dimension and Communication Dimension).

**HYPOTHESES**

In order to achieve the desired objectives, following Hypotheses were formulated:

- **Ho.1**: There is no significant difference in Total Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores of students studying in Government and Private schools.

- **Ho.2**: There is no significant difference in Total Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence.
• **Ho.3:** There is no significant difference in Total Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status.

• **Ho.4:** There is no significant difference in total Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Intelligence.

• **Ho.5:** There is no significant difference in total Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status.

• **Ho.6:** There is no significant difference in Total Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Intelligence, with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status.

• **Ho.7:** There is no interaction effect of school management, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on Total Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade student.

• **Ho.8:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students studying in Government and Private schools relating to Teacher Dimension.

• **Ho.9:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Teacher Dimension

• **Ho.10:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Teacher Dimension.

• **Ho.11:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Teacher Dimension.

• **Ho.12:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Teacher Dimension.

• **Ho.13:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Teacher Dimension.
Intelligence with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Teacher Dimension.

- **Ho.14**: There is no interaction effect in scores of School Management, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade students relating to Teacher Dimension.

- **Ho.15**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students studying in Government and Private schools relating to Fellow Students.

- **Ho.16**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Fellow Students.

- **Ho.17**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Fellow Students.

- **Ho.18**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Fellow Students.

- **Ho.19**: There are no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Fellow Students.

- **Ho.20**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Intelligence, with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Fellow Students.

- **Ho.21**: There is no interaction effect of School Management, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade student relating to Fellow Students.

- **Ho.22**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students studying in Government and Private schools relating to Schoolwork.
• **Ho.23**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Schoolwork.

• **Ho.24**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Schoolwork.

• **Ho.25**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Schoolwork.

• **Ho.26**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Schoolwork.

• **Ho.27**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, average and Low Intelligence, with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Schoolwork.

• **Ho.28**: There is no interaction effect of School Management, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade students relating to Schoolwork.

• **Ho.29**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students studying in Government and Private schools relating to Student’s Activities.

• **Ho.30**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Student’s Activities.

• **Ho.31**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Student’s Activities.

• **Ho.32**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Student’s Activities.
• **Ho.33**: There is no significant difference scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children and High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Student’s Activities.

• **Ho.34**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Intelligence with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Student’s Activities.

• **Ho.35**: There is no interaction effect of School Management, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade student relating to Student’s Activities.

• **Ho.36**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students studying in Government and Private schools relating to Students’ Discipline.

• **Ho.37**: There is no significance in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Students’ Discipline.

• **Ho.38**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Students’ Discipline.

• **Ho.39**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Students’ Discipline.

• **Ho.40**: There are no significant difference scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Students’ Discipline.

• **Ho.41**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Intelligence, with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Students’ Discipline.

• **Ho.42**: There is no interaction effect of School Management, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade student relating to Students’ Discipline.
• **Ho.43**: There is not significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students studying in Government and Private schools relating to Decision Making Opportunities.

• **Ho.44**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Decision Making Opportunities.

• **Ho.45**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Decision Making Opportunities.

• **Ho.46**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction with Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Decision Making Opportunities.

• **Ho.47**: There are no significant difference scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Decision Making Opportunities.

• **Ho.48**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Intelligence, with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Decision Making Opportunities.

• **Ho.49**: There is no interaction effect of School Management, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade student relating to Decision Making Opportunities.

• **Ho.50**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students studying in Government and Private schools relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

• **Ho.51**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

• **Ho.52**: There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.
• **Ho. 53:** There is no significant difference in of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

• **Ho.54:** There is no significant difference of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

• **Ho.55:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Intelligence with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

• **Ho.56:** There is no interaction effect of School Management, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade students relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

• **Ho.57:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students studying in Government and Private schools relating to Communication.

• **Ho.58:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence schools relating to Communication.

• **Ho.59:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status schools relating to Communication.

• **Ho.60:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status schools relating to Communication.

• **Ho.61:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Government and Private school children with High, Average and Low Intelligence schools relating to Communication.

• **Ho.62:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average And Low
Intelligence, with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status schools relating to Communication.

- **Ho.63:** There is no interaction effect of School Management, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade student schools relating to Communication.

- **Ho.64:** There is no significant difference in Total Scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade schools.

- **Ho.65:** There is no significant difference in Total Scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls with High, Average and Low Intelligence.

- **Ho.66:** There is no significant difference in Total Scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status.

- **Ho.67:** There is no significant difference in Total Scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Intelligence.

- **Ho.68:** There is no significant difference in Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status.

- **Ho.69:** There is no significant difference in Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Intelligence, with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status.

- **Ho.70:** There is no interaction effect of Gender, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on Total Scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade students.

- **Ho.71:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade on Teacher Dimension.

- **Ho.72:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence on Teacher Dimension.
• **Ho.73:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status on Teacher Dimension.

• **Ho.74:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Intelligence on Teacher Dimension.

• **Ho.75:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status on Teacher Dimension.

• **Ho.76:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Intelligence, with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status on Teacher Dimension.

• **Ho.77:** There is no interaction effect of Gender, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade students on Teacher Dimension.

• **Ho.78:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls studying in tenth grade relating to Fellow Students.

• **Ho.79:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Fellow Students.

• **Ho.80:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Fellow Students.

• **Ho.81:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Fellow Students.

• **Ho.82:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Fellow Students.
• **Ho.83:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Intelligence, with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Fellow Students.

• **Ho.84:** There is no interaction effect of Gender, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade students relating to Fellow Students.

• **Ho.85:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores among Boys and Girls of tenth grade schools relating to Schoolwork.

• **Ho.86:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Schoolwork.

• **Ho.87:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Schoolwork.

• **Ho.88:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Schoolwork.

• **Ho.89:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Schoolwork.

• **Ho.90:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Intelligence, with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Schoolwork.

• **Ho.91:** There is no interaction effect of Gender, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade students relating to Schoolwork.
• **Ho.92:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade schools relating to Students Activities.

• **Ho.93:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Students Activities.

• **Ho.94:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Students Activities.

• **Ho.95:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Students Activities.

• **Ho.96:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Students Activities.

• **Ho.97:** There is no difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Intelligence, with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Students Activities.

• **Ho.98:** There is no interaction effect of gender, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade student relating to Students Activities.

• **Ho.99:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores among Boys and Girls of tenth grade schools relating to Students Discipline.

• **Ho.100:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with high, average, and low Intelligence relating to Students Discipline.

• **Ho.101:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Students Discipline.
• **Ho.102:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Students Discipline.

• **Ho.103:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Students Discipline.

• **Ho.104:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Intelligence with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Students Discipline.

• **Ho.105:** There is no interaction effect of Gender, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade student relating to Students Discipline.

• **Ho.106:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade schools relating to Decision Making Opportunities.

• **Ho.107:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Decision Making Opportunities.

• **Ho.108:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Decision Making Opportunities.

• **Ho.109:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Decision Making Opportunities.

• **Ho.110:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Decision Making Opportunities.

• **Ho.111:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Decision Making Opportunities.
Intelligence with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Decision Making Opportunities.

- **Ho.112:** There is no interaction effect of Gender, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade student relating to Decision Making Opportunities.

- **Ho.113:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade schools relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

- **Ho.114:** There is not significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

- **Ho.115:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

- **Ho.116:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

- **Ho.117:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

- **Ho.118:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Intelligence, with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

- **Ho.119:** There is no interaction effect of gender, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade student relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

- **Ho.120:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade schools relating to Communication.
• **Ho.121:** There is no significant different in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Communication.

• **Ho.122:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Communication.

• **Ho.123:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Intelligence relating to Communication.

• **Ho.124:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Communication.

• **Ho.125:** There is no significant difference in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade school children of High, Average and Low Intelligence, with High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status relating to Communication.

• **Ho.126:** There is no interaction effect of gender, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade students relating to Communication.

### DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

In the field of research, delimitation occupies a prominent position. Without it, the investigator can neither be clear nor effective. This study, too, has not been planned without the boundary and the delimitation.

The present study has been delimited in respect of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school of tenth grade students in relation to their Gender, Socio-Economic Status and Intelligence viz:

1. The study was limited to secondary school students of class X only.

2. The study was confined to the secondary schools of Chandigarh only.
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DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In the present study, the Descriptive method of research has been employed. Best and Kahn (1995) considered behavioral research studies as non experimental because they deal with the relationship between non-manipulated variable in a natural rather than artificial setting. According to them, method of descriptive research is particularly appropriate in the behavioural sciences because many of the types of behaviour that interest the researcher cannot be arranged in an artificial setting. Types of behaviour under the natural conditions occur in the school. In fact, what is observed and described would have happened even though there had been no observation or analysis. Descriptive research also involves events that have already existed and may be related to present condition. This method was chosen because of these distinctive advantages for the various aspects of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of students with school. The criterion variable of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction was studied as a whole (total scores) and separately on different dimensions.

The variable under the study were: School Management, Intelligence and Socio Economic status. Study was focused around.

(i) Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade students of Government and Private Schools.

(ii) According to Intelligence level (High, Average and Low) of students.

(iii) According to Socio-Economic Status level (High, average and low) of students.

Each of the independent variables were studied at three levels viz. High, Average and Low whereas variable of School Management was two levels i.e. Govt. and Private was studied. A 2x3x3 design was employed on scores of Satisfaction Dissatisfaction in relation to School Management, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status.

Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of the students (total scores) and on various dimensions was studied in relation to School Management.
A 2x3x3 design was also employed on scores of Satisfaction Dissatisfaction in relation to Gender, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status.

Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of the students (total scores) and on various dimensions was studied in relation to Gender.
Sampling

The primary purpose of any research is to discover principles that have universal application, but sometimes the population is so large that it becomes impossible to take the whole ambit. In this regard sampling plays an important role in the research. Sampling is an important aspect of life in general and enquiry in particular. We make judgements about people, places and things on the basis of fragmentary evidence Garret (1981), Smith (1975), Edwards (1968).

A sample is a small proportion of a population selected for analysis. If the means for two different normal proportion of a population are not known, the alternative is to investigate the two populations by selecting a random sample from each population Jacobson (1976). According to Best and Kahn (1995) the process of sampling makes it possible to draw valid differences of generalizations on the basis of careful observation or manipulation of variables within a relatively small portion of the population.

The sample in the present investigation was drawn at two levels-
• The school sample
• The student sample

THE SCHOOL SAMPLE:

The school sample was drawn randomly from the list of secondary schools of Chandigarh. Two lists of schools were prepared from master lists of the schools procured from the D.E.O. Office. One list numbered government schools and in the second list private schools were numbered. Then by random sampling (lottery system) five govt. schools and five private schools were selected. The list have been given below in Table No. 5.1 and 5.2

Table 5.1
Name and Locations of Selected Govt. Schools in Chandigarh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Name of the Schools</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Govt. Model Senior Secondary School</td>
<td>Sector 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Govt. Model Senior Secondary School</td>
<td>Sector 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Govt. Model Senior Secondary School</td>
<td>Sector 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Govt. Model Senior Secondary School</td>
<td>Sector 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE STUDENT SAMPLE

The Principals of these selected schools were approached and all the ten Principals welcomed the idea and promised to co-operate very enthusiastically. Hence two sections were randomly selected from each school. The distribution of initial sample has been presented in the table 5.3 and table 5.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Name of the Schools</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>D.A.V. Model School</td>
<td>Sector 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Shishu Niketan Public School</td>
<td>Sector 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bhawan Vidyalaya</td>
<td>Sector 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Shivalik Public School</td>
<td>Sector 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Sharda Sarvhitkari</td>
<td>Sector 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>N = 286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3

Distribution of the initial sample of students from Govt. Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Name of the Govt. School</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Govt. Model Sr. Sec. School, Sector 16</td>
<td>N = 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Govt. Model Sr. Sec. School, Sector 37</td>
<td>N = 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Govt. Model Sr. Sec. School, Sector 22</td>
<td>N = 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Govt. Model Sr. Sec. School, Sector 15</td>
<td>N = 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Govt. Model Sr. Sec. School, Sector 40</td>
<td>N = 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>N = 286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4

Distribution of the initial sample of schools from Private Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Name of the private school</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Shivalik Public School, Sector 40</td>
<td>N = 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Shishu Niketan, Sector 22</td>
<td>N = 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bhawan Vidyalaya, Sector 27</td>
<td>N = 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>D.A.V. Model School, Sector 15</td>
<td>N = 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Sharda Sarvhitkari, Sector 40</td>
<td>N = 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL SAMPLE OF THE STUDY**

The total process of the study lasted about nine months. Hence there were some dropouts in the sample because of absence at one or the other stages. These students were therefore dropped at the time of analysis. The final sample on which the analysis was done have been presented in the table 5.5 and 5.6

Table 5.5

Distribution of the Final Sample from Govt. Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Name of the Govt. School</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Govt. Model Sr. Sec. School, Sector 16</td>
<td>N = 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Govt. Model Sr. Sec. School, Sector 37</td>
<td>N = 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Govt. Model Sr. Sec. School, Sector 22</td>
<td>N = 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Govt. Model Sr. Sec. School, Sector 15</td>
<td>N = 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Govt. Model Sr. Sec. School, Sector 40</td>
<td>N = 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6

Distribution of the Final Sample from Private School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.No.</th>
<th>Name of the private school</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Shivalik Public School, Sector 40</td>
<td>N = 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Shishu Niketan, Sector 22</td>
<td>N = 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bhawan Vidyalaya, Sector 27</td>
<td>N = 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>D.A.V. Model, Sector 15</td>
<td>N = 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Sharda Sarvhitkari, Sector 40</td>
<td>N = 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 273</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOOLS USED FOR THE STUDY

- Student satisfactory survey Form A: an instrument developed by Neal Schmitt and Bria-Locher (1987) was used.

PROCEDURE FOR THE STUDY

Tool – 1: Socio-Economics Scale by Deo and Mohan (1972)

The Socio Economic Status scale developed by Deo and Mohan (1972) comprises items of bio-data of students and their family data on occupation, education and income etc. It consists of instruction for the students to be read before filling in the particulars. To assess the S.E.S. scores, there are 12 items in all. First 3 items deal with the academic qualifications of the members of the family, professional occupation of the members of the family and income of the family members. The items 4-12 deal with the landed property, means or conveyance, place/nature of residence, means of recreation, library of home, newspaper, magazines, journal etc. The number of members in a family is divided by the total scores of the first three items. This is because income and the
number of family members are taken into consideration in his scale. This gives comprehensive information about S.E.S. The rest of the items were scored individually. Scoring of the items was done in accordance with the scoring procedure given in the manual of the tool.

For the SES scores, average score of education, occupation and income were taken. The total scores were calculated by adding the scores of education, occupation and family income divided by the number of family members in that family to calculate the average scores.

As reported by the author, Deo-Mohan Scale (1972 revised) has a Test-Retest reliability of 0.91 established with an interval of 6 weeks on 190 students (both school and college). The validity of 0.94 and the total number of subjects selected for the same is 145. The scale is validated against Kukoo Swami Scale in terms of Education, Occupation and Income.

Norms of SES scale show that the scale had a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 0.25 for the college group. The scale has been widely used by several researchers in similar studies. A few names are Prabhjeet Kaur (1989-90) Nain Singh (1989-90), Sanjeeta Chhabra (1989-90), Ritu Sharma (1990-91), Shikha Aggarwal (1997-98) etc.

Scoring of Deo-Mohan SES Scale was done according to the division of marks of SES scale, average score of education, occupation and income of all the members of family were divided by the family size. Tables were consulted to get the total scores of education, occupation, income number of rooms, rent-paid and area of the total house.

**Tool-II: Group Test of General Mental Ability by Dr. S. Jalota (1972)**

Difference in intelligence was measured with the help of General Mental Ability test designed and constructed by Dr. S. Jalota (1972). The General Mental Ability Test involves verbal, numerical and reasoning tasks. It incorporated the most striking arrangement of a few types of test items, suited to each of many year ages – groups. For each age, there were about five different types of questions, with suitable alternatives, to make any case of failure confirm itself beyond all reasonable doubt. Here, in this test too the questions for the assessment of intelligence, or mental age, form a mixed up lot of several different types of items for each age group. This test has a sufficient number of items arranged in an order of graduate difficulty or complexity, ranging all the way from
very easy to most difficult. The different types of test items are mixed up according to empirically determined order of increasing difficulty. One hundred items selected included 10 similar, 10 Opposites, 20 Classifications, 20 Number Series, 10 Best Answers, 10 Reasoning, and 20 Analogies items. These items were mixed according to estimated order of difficulty, from the minimum to the maximum difficulty. This is time bound test and is to be finished in twenty minutes. The author has claimed that the test was standardized on eight, ninth and tenth class students and the revised test was suitable for the age range of 12 to 18 years.

The reliability of the test scores has been calculated by finding the correlation between the odd and even halves scores by the tested population. These correlation co-efficient were corrected the length with the Spearman-Brown Formula. The reliability co-efficient found are uniformly high ranging from 0.703 to 0.979 for various age groups in different classes. The author recommended the test is quite reliable for undergraduate population.

The validity of the test has been established by factor analysis of the inter element scores. Three simple structures were identified viz., verbal, numerical and reasoning.

Determination is quite low, the contributions of the specific Verbal, Numerical, and Reasoning components, indicates a fair distribution. So the author recommended this test not merely as a tool for the assessment of general mental ability, but also as a fruitful tool for the prognosis of verbal, numerical and reasoning abilities, as well as for appropriate education counseling and vocational guidance.

**Tool-III: Student Satisfaction Survey Form A**

This instrument was developed by Schmitt and Loher (1987). This instrument is both a mediating variable and an outcome measure. It allows for comparison of perceptions between and among groups. This can be, thus, very useful in planning to improve school conditions. This questionnaire consists of 8 subscales, 46 statements and each statement calls for a response on five point scale namely; very unhappy (very dissatisfied), unhappy (dissatisfied), neither happy nor unhappy (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied), happy (satisfied), and very happy (very satisfied). The respondents have to select the one that best describes how they feel about each item.

The student Satisfaction Survey provides perception on the following subscales:-

(i) **Teacher:** Student satisfaction with the professional conduct.
(ii) **Fellow Students:** Student satisfaction regarding peer group relationships in school, especially with regards to school work.

(iii) **School Work:** Student satisfaction with the range of course and the nature of class work provided in the school, including teacher’s assignments.

(iv) **Student Activities:** Student satisfactions with the number and types of school activities as well as the opportunities for student participation.

(v) **Student Discipline:** Student satisfaction with rules and regulation in school contributing to an orderly and safe environment.

(vi) **Decision Making Opportunities:** Student satisfaction with the opportunities to influence decisions about school policy such as curriculum, school events, activities, etc.

(vii) **School Buildings, Supplies And Upkeep:** Student satisfaction with the quality and availability of library resources, learning materials and supplies, as well as the upkeep of the buildings and grounds.

(viii) **Communication:** Student satisfaction with the availability of interaction and opportunities to communicate with other school events.

The reliability for the purpose of present study was worked out using the internal consistency of coefficient alpha, in view of its simplicity and effectiveness for intra-class correlation. The average co-efficient of reliability of the student satisfaction survey is 0.58 (with a range from 0.48 to 0.65 for subscales).

**STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES**

Statistical tests are a major aid for data interpretation. By statistical testing, a research can compare groups of data to determine the probability to the effect that differences between them are based on chance, thereby proving evidence for judging the validity of a hypothesis or inference (Tuchman, 1972). In the present study, the following descriptive as well as inferential statistical techniques were employed for analyzing the collected data:

- **Descriptive Statistics** i.e. frequency, percentages, mean, median, standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, were used for analysis of the demographic characteristics of participants as well as nature of distribution of scores.
Analysis of variance (2x3x3) was applied to study significance of difference in satisfaction and dissatisfaction and school management. Second set of scores of satisfaction and dissatisfaction of students was also analysed through ANOVA in relation to gender, I.Q. and SES of various groups of intelligence and socio-economic status of the students.

The t-test was used to examine the difference in means wherever required. t-test was also used to follow-up significant F-ratios derived through analysis of variance.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

SUMMARY OF THE RESULT BASED ON SECTION –A:

CONCLUSIONS BASED ON ANALYSIS OF SCORES OF SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION WITH SCHOOL

Results based on 2x3x3 ANOVA of Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in relation to School Management, Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status.

- The Private School Management yielded Lower Satisfaction scores among tenth grade students than the Government schools (Total scores).

- The students with High, Average and Low Intelligence were not equal in respect of Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school.
  - The students Average Intelligence were more satisfied with school than the students having High Intelligence.
  - The students having Low Intelligence were more satisfied with school as compared to those having High Intelligence
  - The Students with Average and Low Intelligence were equal on Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores.
• The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect of Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with schools.

• There was no interaction between the two variables: School Management and Intelligence to yield different on Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with schools.

• The tenth grade students of Government Schools having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction as compared to their counterparts from Private Schools.

• The tenth grade students having High, Average and Low Intelligence and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect of their Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction.

• The Total mean scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade students of Government and Private schools belonging to different levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different.

Results based on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Teacher Dimension of Government and Private school children in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status.

• The Private School Management yielded Lower Satisfaction scores among tenth grade students than the Government schools on Teacher Dimension.

• The students having High, Average and Low Intelligence were not equal in respect of scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school Teacher Dimension.
  o The students having Average Intelligence were more satisfied with school than the students having High Intelligence scores on Teacher Dimension.
  o The Students of Government and Private Schools having Low Intelligence were more satisfied with school as compared to those having High Intelligence on Teacher Dimension.
  o The Average and Low Intelligence tenth grade students were not different on their scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school on Teacher Dimension.
The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect of scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction on Teacher Dimension.

There was no interaction between the two variables: School Management and Intelligence to yield different Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with schools on Teacher Dimension.

The tenth grade students of Government Schools having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores related to Teacher Dimension as compared to their counterparts from Private schools.

The tenth grade students having High, Average and Low Intelligence and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect of their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores on Teacher Dimension.

The mean scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade students of Government and Private schools belonging to different levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different on Teacher Dimension.

Results based on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Fellow students of Government and Private school children in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status.

The students of Government and Private School are similar on their scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school relating to Fellow Students Dimension.

The students studying in Government and Private Schools having High, Average and Low Intelligence were almost equal in respect of Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school relating to Fellow Students Dimension.

The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect of scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school relating to Fellow Students Dimension.
• There was no interaction between the two variables: School Management and Intelligence to yield different Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with schools relating to Fellow Students Dimension.

• There was not interaction between the two variables; School Management and Socio-Economic Status to yield different mean scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school relating to Fellow Students Dimension.

• The tenth grade students having High, Average and Low Intelligence and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect of their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Fellow Students Dimension.

• The mean scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade students of Government and Private schools belonging to different levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different on Fellow Students Dimension.

Results based on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Schoolwork Dimension of Government and Private school children in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status.

• The Private Schools yielded Lower Satisfaction scores among tenth grade students than the Government schools relating to Schoolwork Dimension.

• The students studying in Government and Private Schools having High, Average and Low Intelligence were not equal in respect of Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school on Schoolwork Dimension.
  
  o The students of Government and Private Schools having Average Intelligence were more satisfied with school on Schoolwork Dimension than the students having High Intelligence scores.

  o The Students of Government and Private Schools having Low Intelligence were more satisfied with school on Schoolwork Dimension as compared to those having High Intelligence
The Average and Low Intelligence tenth grade students were not different on Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores with school on Schoolwork Dimension.

- The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect of scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores with school relating to Schoolwork Dimension.

- There was no interaction between the two variables: School Management and Intelligence to yield different Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores with school on Schoolwork Dimension.

- The tenth grade students of Government Schools having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school relating to Schoolwork scores as compared to their counterparts from Private schools.

- The tenth grade students having High, Average and Low Intelligence and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect of their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Schoolwork Dimension.

- The mean scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade students of Government and Private schools belonging to different levels of Intelligence and Socio Economic Status were not statistically different on Schoolwork Dimension.

Results based on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Student’s Activity Dimension of Government and Private school children in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status.

- The student of Government and Private School are similar in their scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Student’s Activities Dimension

- The High, Average and Low Intelligence groups scored almost equal in respect of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Student’s Activities Dimension.
• The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Student’s Activities Dimension.

• There was no interaction between the two variables: School Management and Intelligence to yield different Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Student’s Activities Dimension.

• The tenth grade students of Government Schools having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Student’s Activities Dimension as compared to their counterparts from Private schools.

• The tenth grade students having High, Average and Low Intelligence and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect of their scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction on Student’s Activities Dimension.

• The mean scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade students of Government and Private schools belonging to different levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different on Student’s Activities Dimension.

Results based on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Students Discipline Dimension of Government and Private school children in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status.

• The students of Government and Private Schools are similar on the scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school on Students’ Discipline Dimension.

• The High, Average and Low Intelligence groups scored almost equal in respect to Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores on Students’ Discipline Dimension.

• The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect to Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores on Students’ Discipline Dimension.
• There was no interaction between the two variables: School Management and Intelligence to yield different Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores on Students’ Discipline Dimension.

• The tenth grade students of Government Schools having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores related to Students’ Discipline Dimension as compared to their counterparts from Private schools.

• The tenth grade students having High, Average and Low Intelligence and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect to their scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction on Students’ Discipline Dimension.

• The Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction mean scores of tenth grade students of Government relating and Private schools, levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different on Students’ Discipline Dimension.

Results based on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Decision-Making Opportunity of Government and Private school children in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status.

• The students of Government and Private Schools are similar on the scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction related to Decision Making Opportunity.

• The High, Average and Low Intelligence groups scored almost equal in respect to Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Decision Making Opportunity.

• The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect to Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Decision Making Opportunity.

• There was no interaction between the two variables: School Management and Intelligence to yield different Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Decision Making Opportunity.
- The tenth grade students of Government Schools having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Decision Making Opportunity as compared to their counterparts from Private schools.

- The tenth grade students having High, Average and Low Intelligence and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect to their scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction on Decision Making Opportunity.

- The Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction mean scores relating to Decision Making Opportunity of tenth grade students of Government and Private schools; levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different.

Results based on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with School Building, Supplies and Upkeep Dimension of Government and Private school children in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status.

- The students of Government and Private Schools are similar on the scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

- The High, Average and Low Intelligence groups scored almost equal in respect to Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

- The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect to Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

- There was no interaction between the two variables: School Management and Intelligence to yield different Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

- The tenth grade students of Government Schools having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction
scores relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep as compared to their counterparts from Private schools.

- The tenth grade students having High, Average and Low Intelligence and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect to their scores on Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

- The Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction mean scores relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep Dimension of tenth grade students of Government and Private schools, levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different.

- The students of Government and Private Schools are similar in the scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Communication Dimension.

- The High, Average and Low Intelligence groups scored almost equal in respect to Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Communication Dimension.

- The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect to Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Communication Dimension.

- There was no interaction between the two variables: School Management and Intelligence to yield different Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Communication Dimension.

- The tenth grade students of Government Schools having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Communication Dimension as compared to their counterparts from Private schools.

- The tenth grade students having High, Average and Low Intelligence and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect to their scores relating to Communication Dimension of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction.

- The Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction mean scores relating to Communication Dimension of tenth grade students of Government and Private schools; levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different.
SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS BASED ON SECTION –B:

CONCLUSIONS BASED ON ANALYSIS ON SCORES OF SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION WITH SCHOOL ON THE BASIS OF GENDER

Results based on Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status.

- The levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction (Total scores) among Boys and Girls of tenth grade were equal.

- The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ were not equal in respect of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school (Total scores).
  - The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Average IQ were more satisfied with school as compared to those having High IQ.
  - The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Low IQ were more satisfied with school as compared to those having High IQ.
  - The Average IQ and Low IQ students exhibited equal levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction.

- The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect of Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction.

- There was no interaction between the two variables: Gender and Intelligence to yield difference in Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction.

- The tenth grade Boys belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores as compared to Girls belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status.

- The tenth grade Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect of their Total scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction.
• The Total mean scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade Boys and Girls belonging to different levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different.

Results based on scores of Teacher Dimension of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status.

• The levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade were equal on Teacher Dimension.

• The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ were not equal in respect of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school relating to Teacher Dimension.
  o The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Average IQ were more satisfied with Teachers than the Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High IQ scores.
  o The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Low IQ were more satisfied with Teachers as compared to those having High IQ.
  o The Average IQ and Low IQ Boys and Girls of tenth grade were found to exhibit equal levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Teacher.

• The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect of scores on Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction on Teacher Dimension.

• There was no interaction between the two variables: Gender and Intelligence to yield differences in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction on Teacher Dimension.

• The tenth grade Boys having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores as compared to Girls belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status on Teachers Dimension.

• The tenth grade Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect of their scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Teachers Dimension.
• The mean scores relating to Teacher Dimension of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of tenth grade Boys and Girls belonging to different levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different.

Results based on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on Fellow Students Dimension.

• The boys yielded lower scores on Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Fellow Students Dimension as compared to Girl students.

• The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ were almost equal in respect of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school relating to Fellow Students Dimension.

• The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect of scores on Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Fellow Students Dimension.

• There was no interaction between the two variables: Gender and Intelligence to yield differences in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Fellow Students Dimension.

• The tenth grade Boys having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Fellow Students Dimension as compared to Girls belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status.

• The tenth grade Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect of their scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Fellow Students Dimension.

• The mean scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Fellow Student Dimension of tenth grade Boys and Girls belonging to different levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different.
Results based on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic on Status Schoolwork Dimension.

- The levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Schoolwork among Boys and Girls of tenth grade were equal.

- The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ were not equal in respect of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school relating to Schoolwork Dimension.
  - The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Average IQ were more satisfied with Schoolwork than the Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High IQ scores.
  - The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Low IQ were more satisfied with Schoolwork as compared to those having High IQ.
  - The Average IQ and Low IQ Boys and Girls of tenth grade were found to exhibit equal levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Schoolwork.

- The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal on Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Schoolwork Dimension.

- There was no interaction between the two variables: Gender and Intelligence to yield differences in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Schoolwork Dimension.

- The tenth grade Boys having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Schoolwork Dimension as compared to Girls belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status.

- Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect of their scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Schoolwork Dimension.
• The mean scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Schoolwork of tenth grade Boys and Girls belonging to different levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different.

Results based on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on Students’ activity Dimension.

• The levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade were equal on Students’ Activities Dimension.

• The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ were not equal in respect of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school relating to Students’ Activities Dimension.
  o The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High IQ and Average IQ scored almost similar on Students’ Activities.
  o The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Low IQ were more satisfied with Students’ Activities as compared to those having High IQ.
  o The Average IQ and Low IQ Boys and Girls of tenth grade were found to exhibit equal levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Students’ Activities.

• The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect of scores on Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Students’ Activities Dimension.

• There was no interaction between the two variables: Gender and Intelligence to yield differences in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Students’ Activities Dimension.

• The tenth grade Boys having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Students’ Activities Dimension as compared to Girls belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status.
• The tenth grade Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect of their scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Students’ Activities Dimension.

• The mean scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Students’ Activities of tenth grade Boys and Girls belonging to different levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different.

Results based on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status Students’ Discipline Dimension.

• The levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Students’ Discipline Dimension among Boys and Girls of tenth grade were equal.

• The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ were not equal in respect of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school relating to Students’ Discipline Dimension.
  
  o The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High IQ and Average IQ scored almost similar of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction on Students’ Discipline Dimension.
  
  o The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Low IQ were more satisfied with Students’ Discipline as compared to those having High IQ.
  
  o The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Average IQ and Low IQ were found to exhibit equal levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Students’ Discipline.

• The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal on Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Students’ Discipline Dimension.

• There was no interaction between the two variables: Gender and Intelligence to yield differences in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Students’ Discipline Dimension.
• The tenth grade Boys having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Students’ Discipline Dimension as compared to Girls belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status.

• The tenth grade Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect of their scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Students’ Discipline Dimension.

• The mean scores Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Students’ Discipline of tenth grade Boys and Girls belonging to different levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different.

Results based on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status on Decision Making Opportunity Dimension.

• The levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade were equal on Decision Making Opportunities Dimension.

• The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ were not equal in respect of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school on Decision Making Opportunities Dimension.
  o The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Average IQ were more satisfied with Decision Making Opportunities as compared to those having High IQ.
  o The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Low IQ were more satisfied with Decision Making Opportunities as compared to those having High IQ.
  o The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Average IQ and Low IQ were found to exhibit equal levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction on Decision Making Opportunities.
• The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect of scores on Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction on Decision Making Opportunities.

• There was no interaction between the two variables: Gender and Intelligence to yield differences in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction on Decision Making Opportunities.

• The tenth grade Boys having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores on Decision Making Opportunities as compared to Girls belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status.

• The tenth grade Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect of their scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction on Decision Making Opportunities.

• The mean scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Decision Making Opportunities of tenth grade Boys and Girls belonging to different levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different.

Results based on scores of School Building, Supplies and Upkeep Dimension of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status.

• The levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep Dimension among Boys and Girls of tenth grade were equal.

• The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ were not equal in respect of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

  o The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Average IQ were more satisfied with School Building, Supplies and Upkeep as compared to those having High IQ.
o The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Low IQ were more satisfied with School Building, Supplies and Upkeep as compared to those having High IQ.

o The both the Average IQ and Low IQ Boys and Girls of tenth grade were found to exhibit equal levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

• The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect of scores on Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

• There was no interaction between the two variables: Gender and Intelligence to yield differences in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with School Building, Supplies and Upkeep.

• The tenth grade Boys having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different on their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores on School Building, Supplies and Upkeep Dimension as compared to Girls belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status.

• The tenth grade Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect of their scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction on School Building, Supplies and Upkeep Dimension.

• The mean scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to School Building, Supplies and Upkeep of tenth grade Boys and Girls belonging to different levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different.

**Results based on scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade in relation to their Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status Communication Dimension.**

• The levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Boys and Girls of tenth grade were equal on Communication Dimension.
• The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ were not equal in respect of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with school relating to Communication.
  o The both the High IQ and Average IQ Boys and Girls of tenth grade were found to exhibit equal levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Communication Dimension.
  o The Boys and Girls of tenth grade having Low IQ were more satisfied with Communication as compared to those having High IQ.
  o The both the Average IQ and Low IQ Boys and Girls of tenth grade were found to exhibit equal levels of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Communication dimension.

• The High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status groups of tenth graders scored almost equal in respect of scores on Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction on Communication Dimension.

• There was no interaction between the two variables: Gender and Intelligence to yield differences in scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction on Communication Dimension.

• The tenth grade Boys having High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in their Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction scores relating to Communication Dimension as compared to Girls belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status.

• The tenth grade Boys and Girls of tenth grade having High, Average and Low IQ and belonging to High, Average and Low Socio-Economic Status were not different in respect of their scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Communication Dimension.

• The mean scores of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction relating to Communication of tenth grade Boys and Girls belonging to different levels of Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status were not statistically different.
EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH

Measurement of Student satisfaction is a sine qua non of any comprehensive educational plan, as it helps in accurate needs assessment. Satisfaction assessment enables schools to strategically and tactically target areas in need of immediate improvement. It facilitates the development of planning and intervention priorities, and it helps schools examine student transaction with all major aspects of their experience, including academic, co-curricular, general services, etc.

Student satisfaction assessment should be an integral part of the assessment regularly conducted by schools. Schools must understand how satisfied students are with their educational experience, both inside and outside of the classroom. By collecting satisfaction data from students on a regular basis, schools are able to determine where they are best serving students and where there are areas for improvement. Satisfied students are more likely to be successful students. Satisfaction with a school includes a combination of academic factors as well as areas related to student life. School needs to identify issues that are relevant to students. These include their interaction with teacher, as well as the service they receive from staff and administrators; the physical resources in school like- computers, play ground etc; policies that are in place and their overall feeling of being nurtured in school.

Satisfaction assessment is further refined by capturing student’s level of importance (or expectation) with various components of school management. Importance rating provides schools with valuable data on the areas that matter most to the students. With this information, schools may be able to identify areas that have high satisfaction to the students. It is also appropriate to note that satisfaction assessment should be a systematic process in schools, not a one-time event. Shifts in satisfaction and expectations that are continuously monitored can help identify whether school is responding appropriately and what new issues are current priorities of the students. Data that is timely and relevant will make the desired impact. Students’ characteristics and perceptions change frequently, and school administration has to understand these changes in order to meet the transforming needs and circumstances of students.

Results of the present study have implications for teacher student relationship indicating that teachers and students be involved in the selection of the instructional materials wherever necessary, training programmes should be organized for the teachers in
order to orient them to evoke greater participation of learners in the use of learning materials. Further, in order to make the activities meaningful, it is necessary for the teachers or administrators to discover the interests and needs of the groups, as interested students usually try to get meaning from what they do through listening, reading, exploring and practising. Students should be encouraged to participate in such activities.

Results of the present study can be utilized to strengthen both the government and private schools in their areas of deficits. Thus, there is a need to strengthen the government school in the areas of teacher – student relationships, security and maintenance, administration, instructional management, student behavioural values for bringing improvement in their school climate. Similarly there is a need to impart behavioural values and improve instructional management in private schools.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

- The present study can be replicated at other levels of education system, be it primary or higher secondary level. Similarly different streams of education can be investigated.
- The present study can be replicated at the larger level, by investigating it at the state or national level.
- The scope of the study can be further enhanced to incorporate parents’ aspirations, family involvement etc.
- Satisfaction variables, which have been taken as mediating variables in the present study, can be investigated as output variables.
- A study to examine differences between various types of schools of rural and urban areas and vocational institutes can be investigated.