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INTRODUCTION

“The destiny of a nation is shaped in her classrooms”

Indian Education Commission (1964-1966)

The aim of education is the all round development of the child’s personality and that is possible only if a conducive environment is provided in the school. The schools have to provide students with knowledge and working skills suitable for their age, needs, interest and aptitudes. When students come to school and encounter teaching-learning situations, they have their own interests and needs. School is a place where formal situations are created to facilitate teaching-learning process among young minds so as to draw out best of them. School is an integrating part of the entire social fabric of the society. It is the most important agent of socialization, which brings about the development of child’s natural, intellectual, emotional, and physical potentialities.

Indian Education Commission (1964-1966) has also observed “in a world based on science and technology it is education that determines the level of prosperity, welfare and security of the people and nations as a whole”. On the quality and number of persons coming out of schools and colleges, will depend success of the great enterprises of national reconstruction.

School is the most important educational agency where the new generation is trained for certain types of activities that forms part of the society. It is very important for a school to maintain itself as institution sensitive to the realities of its surroundings. The children of the community are greatly influenced by the environment in which they grow up and are taught. The genuine demands, which confront participation in the situation, are reflected in the actual practices, which characterize the interaction process. The types of tasks in which students must engage; the typical relationships that prevail between faculty and students and behavioural trends, which are consistently permitted or encouraged, indicate the true purpose of the institutions. Thus, the educational environment of a school may be described as one in which intellectual, creative, physical and productive powers of students blossom and flower to their full (Khera, 1979).
Even in the modern era, the goals of education are not limited to the student’s knowledge or intellectual development but they may extend to their physical, social, moral and psychological development for national and international understanding. The schools are the most important elements in teaching-learning transitions. The school atmosphere, curriculum, teaching methods, classroom climate and teachers views have a measurable effect on the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the students.

**EDUCATION IN INDIA**

With a tradition of learning and education as old as the history of civilization, India presents a picture of impressive scientific and technological progress side by side with massive illiteracy and a weak educational system. In terms of numbers of institutions, students and teachers, as well as in the variety of educational activity, the Indian educational system is highly diversified and one of the largest in the world. However, in spite of lot of efforts, it remains divorced from the overall objectives of the country’s Socio-Economic development.

With an area of 32,87,263 square kilometers (1,269,000 square miles), India is the seventh largest country in the world. According to 1991 census, about 82.41 percent of population are Hindu, and 11.00 percent are Muslims. There are also Christians, Sikhs, Buddhists, Jains, and other minorities. India’s population as on 1st March 2001 stood at 1,027 million with 5,313 million males and 4,957 million females (*The Europe World Year Book, 2004*).

**The Formal System of Education**

Since 1947, there has been an attempt to have a common structure of the educational system for primary, secondary and tertiary education. The *Education Commission (1964-66)* had recommended a 10+2 +3 pattern, which was adopted in the 1968 educational policy. The emphasis in this pattern is on a common school curriculum up to class X, with vocational and technical courses starting at the Secondary stage. Professional courses for primary teacher training, medicine, and engineering commence after the two-year senior secondary course.
Wide disparities in facilities and standards of various types of institution have been observed. At one extreme are the **public schools** after their British models, and the newly established Navodaya Vidyalayas. At the other extreme are the ill-equipped, insufficiently staffed, and poorly supervised government rural or municipal schools. In between these extremes are a variety of private schools, the well-funded **central schools** mainly for the children of government employees.

School sessions commence at the end of the summer, and there are autumn and summer vacations. Generally speaking, the number of working days are about 200 in an academic year; the four-year secondary stage is equally divided between the secondary and senior secondary levels.

General higher education is provided in universities and colleges. All central universities and a few others are primarily residential, about 83 percent of enrollment in higher education is in affiliated colleges. Technical and Professional courses range from three to five years for a first-degree course and from two to three years for a post degree course. Admission requirements in general education courses are not very demanding, but admission to engineering and medical courses are very competitive. Universities also provide facilities for research and many of them, particularly the agricultural universities, have developed strong extension programs.
ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONS OF EDUCATION IN INDIA

The government in India is federal in character. Although under the constitution, the central and the state governments have joint responsibility for education, it is essentially treated as a state matter except in some well-defined areas. The responsibility of the central government is for educational planning and policy, for co-ordination and maintenance of standards in higher and technical education, for promotion of research and training relating to school education, adult education and promotion of languages and so on. The Ministry of Human Resource Development (which comprises the Department of Education, Culture, Youth Affairs, and Sports and the Department of Woman and Child Development) has the principal responsibility in respect of education.

The central government has set up three national agencies, which help it in its work.

(i) The National Council of Education Research and Training (NCERT) has the mandate of improving the quality of school education. Its salient contribution has been in the sphere of curriculum design, production of textbooks and examination reforms.

(ii) The National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA) undertakes diverse programs of research, extension, training and consultancy. It plays an important role in educational reforms and much of the professional support for the implementation of the new education policy.

(iii) The National Institute of Adult Education is responsible for providing research support to literacy and adult education programmes.

In each state, there is a secretariat for education and separate directorates for higher education, school education, technical education, and adult and non-formal education. The state level administrator lays down policies and regulates the educational system. At the head of the district education administration is a district education officer with several deputies and sub-deputies who together inspect and supervise the schools. Given the emphasis of National Policy of Education, 1986 on decentralized micro-level planning and management of education, the infrastructure and institutional support is being strengthened at the district level. The heads of schools set school timetables, attend to discipline among pupils and supervise the work of teachers.
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION IN CHANDIGARH

The Home Secretary is the Administrative Secretary of this department, assisting him are two directors, Public Instruction (DPI) – one for colleges and one for schools. Other senior officers of this department include an Assistant Controller (Finance and Administration) and two Registrars, one for colleges and one for schools.

Chandigarh has emerged as a center for excellent educational facilities both for elementary and higher education. As per the National Policy on Education (1986), the 10+2+3 pattern of education is being followed. All government schools are affiliated with the CBSE and colleges are affiliated with Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Schools in Chandigarh

The table 1.1: Indicates the number of schools in various sectors;

Table 1.1:
Details about Schools in Chandigarh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>No. of schools</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>No. of students Boys/Girls</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government School</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3706</td>
<td>48664(B) 22952(G)</td>
<td>71,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Schools (aided)</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3529(B) 3017(G)</td>
<td>6,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Schools (Un-aided)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2153</td>
<td>33576(B) 27091(G)</td>
<td>60,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Selected educational statistics MHRD, 2000

Primary Education in Chandigarh

The drop out rate in Chandigarh up to middle level is 1.8%. To impart education to these, there are 107 non-formal education centers running in slum/ rural areas of Chandigarh under a centrally sponsored scheme. Under the scheme the teachers are designated as Instructors. Each center has an instructor with the students in age group from 6-14 yrs. For every 15 centers, there is a supervisor.
Secondary Education in Chandigarh

Secondary education is the transitional level of schooling leading to higher studies both in the academic and vocational areas. Good (1973) defined Secondary Education as “The private and public education arrangements for the children aged between 7-12 or 9-12 in accordance with individual differences, needs and interests”.

There are three factors influencing effective instructions and higher academic achievement at the secondary level.

a. Learning Environment

Children enter the formal education process as intuitive, independent learners. The teacher plays an important role in providing a supportive environment that encourages student’s motivation, self-confidence, curiosity and desire to learn. Therefore, a climate that is sensitive, flexible and responsive to the learners’ need should be provided.

b. Teaching and Modeling Skills

There are five principles of teaching and modeling skills adapted from Herber and Herber (1996).

- **Modeling and practicing learning skills** – The teacher who monitors students’ progress teaches students activities through modeling, demonstration and direct instruction of learning skills. The learners will eventually make their own decision, connect what they have already known with what they are learning, making judgments and inferences, apply new ideas and derive pleasure from learning.

- **Transfer of responsibility from teacher to learner** – The transfer of decision-making responsibility from teacher to student is a key part of the teacher’s role; the transfer needs to be accomplished without either, over or under controlling the process. A teacher’s positive attitude as well as a good knowledge of the needs, interest and abilities of the individual student enhances this shift. The transfer of control is crucial; it leads to students discovering how their efforts can affect their learning.

- **Knowledge and understanding of students** – It is a proactive principle to help the students succeed. The teacher needs to anticipate difficulties and offer support
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at crucial intervals. Teacher needs to develop a good understanding of their students’ strengths and weakness, socially, emotionally, intellectually, and physically their exceptionalities, their health, and their cultural backgrounds. Teachers, then, can motivate their students effectively and successfully.

- **Modeling and practicing learning skills** – Effective instruction cannot be carried out in isolation. It includes co-operative, small group and whole class learning. 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 students’ need for a balance between structured experience and independence.

- **Support to encouragement to students** – The teacher’s role is to be a patient facilitator, showing students how to learn effectively, encouraging them, providing feedback and supporting their efforts. It is the responsibility of educator to foster the developmental process of instruction.

c. **Role of the Teacher**

In their role in the classroom, teachers link students, other teachers, school administrators, families, and community members together to foster the learning success and healthy development of their students. The teacher’s role in creating an environment and building relationships conducive to learning goes beyond the traditional academic duties to include the provision of additional support and care. By developing positive, nurturing relationships with their students teachers can buffer the impact of certain basic factors that may have negative impact on a students’ academic achievement.

**IMPORTANCE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS AND STUDENTS**

The relationship between the teacher and the student has been a focus of writing and inquiry for more than 2000 years. Although the emphasis of this relationship has changed and evolved over time, the centrality of the teacher’s role in affecting student learning has remained constant.

**Plato, Socrates and Confucious** established much of the philosophical guidelines for teaching. Emphasizing the acquisition of knowledge through dialogue, these philosophers stressed a commitment to the teacher student relationship. Each of them as teachers questioned and pushed his pupils to look within themselves for answers. **Plato**
served as guide for his students to think independently and to question. Socrates made famous the method of teaching through direct questioning. And Confucious manifested his belief in teaching through his own pursuit of truth and harmony with the world. Central to each approach is the powerful connection between student and teacher and the effect of this relationship on a student’s acquisition of knowledge, skills and character. Centuries later, in the age of enlightenment, Jean-Jacques Rousseau posited the idea that children learn from their own exploration and that a child should be allowed to progress in accordance with his or her own nature.

In the twentieth century ideas about teacher-student relationship have proliferated. Echoing the sentiments of Rousseau, John Dewey and other progressive educators of the early twentieth century theorized that children flourish if allowed to grow freely in their own way and their own time without being forced or limited by too much teaching. Maria Montessori similarly argued that children should discover knowledge for themselves and learn by doing with a clear emphasis on sensory perceptions.

In the 1920’s, proponents of stimulus-response learning theory, such as E.L. Thorndike and B.F. Skinner defined teachers as transmitters of knowledge and students as passive recipients. According to their respective theories of associationism and behaviourism, the classroom teacher presented content to children and conducted drill and review as children memorized the material.

The relationship between teacher and student was redefined with the advent of cognitive psychology. Following the principles of constructivism, teachers and students were said to construct knowledge jointly. Teacher and students were believed to constitute a community of teachers that engages in social discourse and produces common understandings. Teachers were seen as facilitators who encourage, guide and enrich children’s learning activities, with students serving as co-contributors to the learning process.

Co-relational and descriptive studies of the classroom promoted a view of student-teacher relationships in terms of the nature, amount and quality of interaction (Brophy and Good; 1986). These studies noted the positive effects of active instruction on student achievement. Teachers should be engaged and work directly with their students rather than requiring students to learn on their own through seatwork. Teacher-student interaction of particular importance included the questions teacher ask, the corrective feedback they
provide and the use of praise and reinforcement. The authors have opined that when soliciting information from the students, teachers must consider both the level of difficulty of the questions and its cognitive level. Although teachers do not necessarily need to constantly praise students for performance, they should acknowledge correct answers and provide critical feedback to students. Information on the particulars of students and teacher interactions has led to new and more specific understandings about how teachers affect student’s cognitive, affective and behavioral outcomes.

Psychologists have recently addressed the psycho-social dimensions of teacher’s relationship with students. Research on resilience indicates that caring teachers who express concern for students and act as confidants, role models and mentors can contribute to children’s capacity to overcome personal vulnerabilities and environmental adversities (Wang et al. 1994). Warner (1989) showed that supportive teacher relationships greatly benefit students, particularly those at risk of school failure. Over the long term, focusing on the psychosocial aspects of teaching is especially important with older children. Close, caring relationships with teachers facilitate children’s successful transition from elementary to junior high school. Unfortunately although teachers are relatively well connected with elementary children as children get older. Teachers have less close contact with them and fewer resources are available to promote healthy development of the teacher student relationships contrary to the traditional notion that adolescents are abbreviated and rebellious, recent work shows that they need and desire guidance from respected members of the community, specifically their teachers (Temple; 1993).

Teacher assists students in mastering the instructional process. Teachers not only encourage students to acquire knowledge but also help them to find out their own attitudes, interests and requirements. The process surely leads to a more meaningful learning experience for the students and produced good individual member of society. From the above comments, it is therefore, contended that secondary education is of utmost importance in the development of any country. To study satisfaction and dissatisfaction of tenth grade students with school assumes a great significance as it would help in identifying problems associated with imparting quality education.
Satisfaction is a concept we all value, we are all pleased with a positive outcome, a wish fulfilled, a job well done. A satisfying experience is one that we remember fondly that we wish to repeat, that we hope to share with others. Satisfaction, results occur when positive expectations are fulfilled or exceeded (Oliver; 1993). Satisfaction is the sum of an individual’s negative and positive feelings to a set of variables. Three common variables are:

- Status consensus
- Goal accomplishment or progress towards the goal and
- Participation.

Goldenson (1984) stated that Satisfaction in psychoanalysis is the gratification of basic needs such as hunger, thirst, sex, aggression, which discharge tension, eliminate pleasure and restore the organism to balanced state.

Schmitt and Lohar (1987) defined satisfaction as the personal and affective response of the individual to a specific situation or condition.

According to Webseter (1992), “Satisfaction means the fulfillment of a need or desire. Satisfaction sometimes refers to an overall feeling or satisfaction with situation as a whole”.

Thus, *Satisfaction is derived from being engaged in a piece of work or in any pursuit of a higher order. It is essentially related to human needs and their fulfillment through work.*

Inherent in the concept of satisfaction are three pillars according to psychologists, there are a number of needs and motives that underlie the feelings, thinking and overt behaviour of children. These needs, urges and the drivers are the base of personal adjustment and are the forces which cause children to learn and to work. These terms belong to the same family because their meanings are closely related. They are mutually dependent on each other and have cause and effect relationship.

a. **Need** indicates a lack of something which is useful or desired. A person has a need for food when he is hungry, water when he is thirsty, clothing when he feels cold, and medical care when he is in pain. A person has need for company when he is lonesome,
entertainment and excitement when bored by monotony, praise and success when he feels inadequate, and activity when he has been sedentary in his living.

b. **Want** is very closely related to need. An individual has want for safety, income, friendship, importance, variety, rest or freedom in order to be healthy and happy. These are his wants because of his need for them. According to the individual’s physical and psychological conditions, he will have drive or urge for eating, sexual activity, achieving distinction, gaining liberty, taking a brisk walk, becoming wealthy, or being very careful to avoid accident.

c. **Motive** is thought, feeling, or condition that causes one to act. It is a need or organic state that prompts us to action. We think motive as a condition or a state, which functions as a prevailing force for more than just a short time. For example a person is motivated to practice singing and to try to become an excellent singer because he feels that he can make a good living as a singer. A young man works hard to achieve economic status because he was poor as a boy and he does not want to remain in that condition.

Our thoughts, feelings and conditions will at certain times cause us to lie down and rest, at other times to take a few cold drinks so that we will get rid of our tensions and feel better, or to work overtime to earn some extra money, to invite friends over to dinner, or to try to become wealthy, write a book, give a speech, or do something that will attract favorable attention and thus give us recognition and prestige. We have the urge or drive to do these things.

The human organism has various needs, wants and motives. They are not separate or distinct but closely inter-related and inter-dependent. They are the dynamic forces. An individual may have following types of needs, want and motives:

(i) **The need to Live:** It means food, clothing and shelter. It also means struggle against disease. Everyone wants to live. We are terribly afraid when our lives are threatened. When seriously ill, we are greatly concerned about getting well because we do not want to die. This strong urge to live has been called the instinct of self-preservation-the instinct to preserve oneself or to keep on living. If we want to live, we must be free from illness. Children must keep clean in order to avoid infection, eat good food because they will feel better and live longer, and avoid the use of liquor and other narcotics because they can cause illness and shorten life. Everybody has a desire for long life.
(ii) **The Need for Economic Security**

*This means the avoidance of poverty.* It also means:

- A job and income.
- Life free from poverty.
- Building, land, equipment, animals, trees, etc.
- Money in the bank.

People desire to earn good wages and have adequate income so that they will be secure economically. They want enough money so that they can have good clothing and shelter. They save money in order to have security in their old age, when their earning power has been lost. When children are asked as to why they go to school and why they want to get good marks in the school they say that an education will help them in getting better jobs and that if their marks are good they will get better recommendation from their teachers and principals. Economic security makes people better and happier and has a good influence on their personalities.

(iii) **The Need of Social Security**

*This means the avoidance of solitude and lonesomeness.* It also means:

- Belongingness
- Social acceptance
- Friendship
- Love
- Affection
- Companionship

Among organizations for obtaining social security are:

- The family
- Teams
- Clubs
- Unions
- Congregation
- The School
- Gangs
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By the need for social security we mean the want for friends and companionship and the desire to be with other people. This desire to be and the practice of being in a circle or friends or in a group, audience, or crowd are called gregariousness. Connected with this is our desire to be liked by others. We want to be well of, and we are deeply concerned about what others think of us.

Those pupils who are socially secure in their family because of harmonious living and because they get love, generosity and justice are likely to be emotionally healthy. However, those who are insecure in their family life because of parental dissension, overseverity, poverty and parental neglect, may be shy, fearful, depressed and troublesome. Security or insecurity in home has a very strong bearing on a child’s personality.

Pupils want to be respected members of their classes. They want the approval and friendship of their teachers as well as of their classmates. Each pupil wants the feeling of security, of being an active and successful member of his class.

The teacher too should want the friendship and approval of his pupils. His or her personal relationship with his or her pupils should be so successful that she has their goodwill and confidence. Such a relationship gives the teacher a feeling of social security and this is conducive to good teaching and happy living.

(iv) The Need for Personal Worth and Superiority

This means the avoidance of shame and inferiority. This also means:

- Success.
- Leadership.
- Mastery and power.
- Favorable attentions or recognition.
- Prestige-good status.
- Higher standing/ self-enhancement.
- Approval
- Importance.
- Self-respect/ esteem.
- Worthiness.
- Self-satisfaction.
- Honour
Every human being wants to have a feeling of personal worth, recognition to be well thought of and to have standing. When a person buys a large expensive car, he does so not only for the extra riding comfort such a car gives him. He wants the admiring attention of the people who see him in the car. He wants the prestige and the attention that the ownership of a big expensive car gives.

The child in the cradle wants attention. If attention is given to someone else in his presence, the young child will feel insecure. When children go to school they seek the appreciation of their teachers and fellow pupils. They like to have their work displayed and achieve recognition.

All through life, people seek rewards, prizes and recognitions. Many want to be leaders because leadership has ego value. We like praise and recognition that enhances our value of self-esteem. A feeling of value and importance makes us feel happy, and a feeling of unworthiness and inferiority makes us unhappy. We are willing to work hard to achieve a feeling of worth, but often we engage in tricks and dodges in trying to achieve it.

The means used by teachers and the school such as prizes, praise, school marks, honour rolls, being made a leader, being as the head of the class, being chosen for the team and other recognitions appeal to the feeling of personal worth and superiority. They also give a feeling of security, which in turn contributes to a feeling of worth, but the important problem is to have all pupils achieve enough recognition and success.

Care needs to be exercised in any appeal to the feeling of worth lest a child become egoistic or conceited. It is well to achieve a healthy feeling of worth or importance but such a feeling, if too strong, invades the feeling of other people and generates antagonism. Everyone should feel worthy but accompanying this should be modesty that invites the goodwill of others.

The development of feelings of personal worth and superiority has more to do with personality and emotional health than anything else.

(v) The Need for Health, Comfort and Feeling of Well-being (the Avoidance of Illness, Discomfort and Pain)

This also means:

- Body needs and process.
- Air breathing.
So, uppermost is the idea of health. Comfort and feeling of well-being are important both psychologically and physically. Mind and body are not separate in this respect, although one may be more involved in illness. It is common for us to think of health and feeling of well-being largely in terms of the avoidance of fevers, colds, and stomach-pains. A good state of health that everyone seeks is accompanied by a feeling of well being. A poor state of health is accompanied by pains. Thus, two factors that influence behaviour a great deal are a feeling of well-being on the one hand, and pain on the other. The one is positive, and the other is negative.

Life is controlled to a great extent by a feeling of well-being or satisfaction and avoiding those experiences which give us dissatisfaction or pain.

The need and want for a healthy painless life is strong. Every school should offer adequate health services so that the studies can have attention to the following:

- Mental and emotional problems.
- Sensory defects – eyes, ears, nose, etc.
- Nutrition.
- Healthful exercise.
- Skin diseases.
- Headaches and their causes.
- Fatigue.
- Other health needs.

In the classroom the teacher should be alert to lighting, seating, ventilation, and other conditions that contribute to the comfort of the surroundings. Parents should study
health education and should acquire the attitudes and knowledge, which will enable them to take care of the health needs of their children.

(vi) The Need for Stimulation, Activity, Enjoyment and Satisfaction (the Avoidance of Monotony and Boredom)

This also means:

- Work.
- Play.
- Reading.
- Music.
- Painting.
- Travel.
- Visiting.
- Oral expression speaking, singing and shouting.
- Drinking and Eating.
- Manipulation.

The individual wants to be stimulated interestingly and satisfyingly and, therefore, he tries to engage in and to watch enjoyable activities. Much happiness is derived when a person places himself in situations, which are stimulating and satisfying. Monotony and boredom are depressing. The human organism with its eyes, ears, nose, taste buds and skin craves a variety of pleasing stimulations. People spend almost limitless amount of money for pictures, for concerts, the theatre, ball games, horse racing, motoring and traveling-all in the pursuit of pleasure and excitement. We want variety to prevent monotony and boredom. In order to be healthy, we must engage in many pleasant activities.

We like to be in a situation where there is “something doing” as we say. We like to be stimulated, to see people, things, and interesting actions, such as races and games to hear music, speeches and conversations, to feel the presence of others, to feel a warm sun and soothing breeze, and to taste, to eat and to drink.

We not only want to be stimulated pleasantly through our senses, we want to be in action ourselves. We crave to be up and doing. We want to be with people and to talk to them. We want to play games, to dance. We want to be on the move, walking or riding.
In the growth and development of a person, learning is a major contributor, and it is controlled by satisfaction and dissatisfaction. We are attracted to and tend to learn what gives us satisfaction and avoid learning that which is unsatisfying. The human organism grows and develops through stimulation and action. We learn by doing but we also learn because of what we see, feel, taste and so on.

Children have more urges for stimulation and action than those of any other age group. This urge or drive cannot be suppressed. The parents should utilize it and work with it rather than against it. If teaching is reasonably interesting, children will pay attention. If, what they are doing stimulate them, they are going to be completely absorbed in the lessons, projects or activities. In the school, children have a tremendous urge for action and for doing; they should not be expected to sit rigidly in their seats for long periods. The time table should be organized so that they can work in groups, so that there is educational handwork, so that they can talk, participate in discussion, play games, and work at the blackboard.

In old schools of India, an attempt was made to repress this craving for activity. The result was that the children were always annoying the teacher with their restlessness and would often break out into the more dramatic forms of pranks and mischief. The fact is that children cannot be repressed. This means that they cannot or should not be controlled but that it is best to utilize their want to be stimulated and to be doing. In the typical modern schools, games, sports, athletics, dramas, parties and fun full activities are enjoyed by most of the students of all ages and grades. In stimulating them, visual aids make an appeal. The uses of films, both sound, and silent, slides, radio; photographs, demonstration, apparatus, objects, tools and materials satisfy the natural want of children and contribute to effective teaching.

(vii) The Need for Freedom and Liberty – Individuality

This means the avoidance of regimentation, control and imprisonment. This also means:

- To think.
- To create.
- To do.
- To express oneself.
• To make decisions.
• To determine one’s course of action.
• Self-government
• Equality of the individual.

We always see that when an infant or young child is held firmly so that he cannot move, he will cry and struggle to be free. He resists restraint.

Thus, in school, children want the right to do their own thinking and express themselves freely. They do not like to be governed by rules and regulations whose purpose they do not understand. But fundamentally neither do they enjoy in a school where there is so much freedom or when there is disorder. Children find fault with a teacher in whose room they can behave in a disorderly fashion. Certain objectives of education will vary according to the child’s stage of development. It also implies that at each stage certain objectives will be central and other peripheral and that there will be changes in the central objective of education according to the level of development the child has reached.

Running through Malsow’s higher needs there is a considerable emphasis upon what Murray (1938) and McClelland et al. (1953) had stressed the need for children to achieve in skills and activities held in esteem by the peer group and by the adult groups. Through achievements, especially those in reading, arithmetic, spelling (the school subjects generally) and in play and sporting activities, the child comes to a feeling of inner strength. The acquisition of skills aids the child’s personality development and adjustment. Usually total personality development is regarded as one of the over-all aims of education and the claim advanced here is that achievements in valued activities and skills promote this end. Skills are thought of as complex patterns of highly efficient behaviour which may be physical, social, verbal, scientific, mathematical, and above all that most complex and all-embracing activity which we call thinking. It remains to determine that the skills acquired are those that have social and psychological significance, which will cause them to be valued by the community. The acquisition of skills implies careful and painstaking teaching and learning. This does not rule out the possibility of high interest level and even of an inspirational handling of skills—indeed both are highly desirable—but it does point to the need for patient careful work and to the necessity to judge and reward teacher effort in terms of fundamental and lasting contributions to development, rather than in things that are showy and ephemeral.
The needs of primary school children were examined by Lobdell and Van Ness (1962). They pointed out the need for children to have access to and association with their peers in achievement, not just their peers in age. This gives recognition to the established facts of individual differences in achievement (and therefore in needs) and the possibility of these differences being met, at least in part, by techniques of organization such as non-grading, cross-grading, subject grading, and schemes for individual progression.

- The first step in school learning is to meet the school emotional needs of the child.
- The task of greatest importance is to develop in children, skills and competence, which are valued by the children and by the community.
- Throughout this learning it must always be remembered that the social-emotional factors can quickly disrupt learning, while a good adjustment permits learning to proceed. It is equally true that good progress in learning makes for a good adjustment. Because social, emotional and learning factors interlock the school course and should be such as to promote satisfactory adjustment in both of these areas. This means that ‘dead-wood’ should be cut away so that the school course is essentially interesting, realistic, related to felt social needs and oriented to practical everyday problems.
- Proper socialization of the child means.
  a. That he learns social skills and forms social relationships; and
  b. That he learns to achieve a degree of freedom and independence from group domination, which we call inner-directedness.
- The human behaviour is dynamic and certain energies and forces impel it. What people do can be explained and understood best in terms of needs and motives. The teacher can understand the responses of his pupils and how to teach them most effectively when he knows their needs and motives.
- In the field of education, the area of emotional health and learning is of utmost importance. Understanding our basic wants and needs helps us to improve our learning and mental health. In a general sense, if we can gratify our needs and motives, we shall be emotionally healthy and happy. In order to understand why and how we learn, we need to understand the fundamental motives that underlie learning.
People have a need and want for economic security. Therefore, they work and save so that they will have the means for acquiring the food, shelter and clothing and other things they need. A shortage threatens life, and being without it, brings death. Thus, economic security and security of life are closely related. If a person builds up his economic security he gains a standing and prestige. Consequently, he develops a higher self-esteem and feeling of greater personal worth. Similarly, the urge and want for companionship and friendship results in a feeling of belonging, and enhances the sense of importance. In similar ways, the needs and wants for stimulating activities, health and comfort, freedom and liberty can also be shown to be related with the other needs and, drives. Without the basic needs there would be no human beings for there would be no forces to keep them in existence. If we get along well with people, have a variety of interesting experiences, are in good health and are free from undue restraint, we are likely to be happy and wholesome. Our wants, urges and drives will be satisfied. We shall have a feeling of security and life will not be dull. There will be comparatively little pain, life will be comfortable and freedom will be enjoyed. And with all these satisfactions will go the feeling of personal worth-or satisfactory ego value.

When a need existed and is unsatisfied, the individual becomes restless and tense. He seeks some goals which will reduce the state of imbalance which exists within him, when a need is completely satisfied a temporary or momentary state of equilibrium is established, and activity towards the appropriate goal ceases.

Maslow (1964) indicated that satisfied needs no longer serve as determinants of behaviour, but dissatisfied needs dominate instrumental behaviour leading to satisfaction. Higher order needs are activated upon gratification of lower order needs. This dynamic process deprivation – satisfaction – activation continues until physiological safety, socialization and self-esteem needs have been gratified, and the self-actualization need is activated. In essence, satisfaction of a need reduces its importance as a motivator, but it activates an unfulfilled need to motivate the person.

According to Maslow’s theory (1964, 1967, 1970) needs are arranged in a hierarchy of pre potency or dominance, the order from most to least pre-potent being given about-physiological needs are inferred from physical states that indicates a lack of something. Similarly, an individual desires or wishes to master things and ideas to experience success and to avoid failure. Also the students set a goal in consultation with
the teacher and try hard to attain it. Desires, wishes and aspirations are also classified as need-motives. Need characteristically are experienced for a while, satisfied and then experienced again. The duration or cycle of need-satisfaction-need varies greatly. The cycle for oxygen is very short; for food and water it is longer, and it may be much longer for success in business or a vocation. According to Maslow, the less proponent needs are neither desired nor sought until the more proponent needs are satisfied or fulfilled.

Maslow (1964) has pointed out that needs are organized in a series of levels, called the hierarchy of needs or the hierarchy of relative potency. The six set of needs listed are –

Low order
- Physiological Needs
- Security needs
- Social Needs

High Order
- Self Esteem needs
- Self-actualization needs
- Need to know and understand

![Fig. 1.2: Maslow's hierarchy of needs](image-url)
The serial order of the categories of needs is important, for they must normally be satisfied in the order given, that is physiological needs must be satisfied before there can be satisfaction of the safety needs; similarly the safety needs must be met before the needs for love and belonging comes into play. However once the need lower in the sequence are satisfied, the one higher up may energize and direct behaviour. These ideas have important implication for education. For example, the teacher wants the pupil to acquire certain knowledge, but a particular child’s needs for love or esteem may not be satisfied. The child’s goals to satisfy these needs take precedence in energizing and directing his behaviour.

However Atkinson (1965) developed an outline for a theory of achievement oriented activity, which is more directly related to the need to achieve success and the need to avoid failure in learning tasks in school setting. Atkinson proposed that the tendency to achieve success is a learned motivational disposition. The strength of this disposition is related to the individual’s interest in more specific tasks and his performance related to them. This tendency to achieve success various markedly among individuals and also in the same individual from situation to situation.

Bruce (1959) opined that each girl and boy is seeking to become an individual person having a healthy physique, a growing intellectual ability, a greater degree of emotional poise, an increased participation in social groups etc.

Taylor (1970) gave his opinion that at each moment of life, any person is in the process of changing into something a little different from what he now is. The whole pattern is changing, and it is important to keep in mind at one time both the fact of the pattern and the fact of the change. Development is a one way street.”

SATISFACTION WITH SCHOOL

Satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the students in school refers to the happy or unhappy conditions faced 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 & challenging world. They often find the conditions in their school 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 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) also revealed that the learner’s 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 simulating tasks that lie ahead. On the other hand annoyances and irritations are bound to occur even in the best school, and some feature 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.

Bagler (1987) supported the above statement by saying when teachers understand the concept of learning styles and apply that knowledge in their interaction with students, these students are more likely to enjoy their school experiences and to achieve academic success. In school, the students, therefore, gain from the teacher’s not only academic instruction but also acquire psychological guidelines for living.

It is accepted that the teacher is the key person or the great crucial factor, which leads to the growth of the nation.

Perusal of existing literature reveals that secondary school student’s dissatisfaction can be divided into eight main areas:

a. Teacher
b. Fellow students
c. Schoolwork
d. Student activities
e. Student discipline
f. Decision making opportunities
g. School buildings, supplies and up keeping
h. Communication

a. **Teacher:** The teacher’s place in society is of vital importance. He (she) acts as the pivot for the transmission of intellectual traditions and skills from generation too generation and help to keep the lamp of civilization burning. – Dr. Radha Krishnan.

Clark (1983) and Miles et al. (1967) have shown that when teachers and students understand the objectives achievement is increased markedly. The teacher is the main predictor in ensuring satisfaction among the students.
Barn (1985) reported that the teacher who is skilled evaluator would be needed to pinpoint concepts and skills missing in a student’s background, to plan remediation, to recognize a willingness to learn and encourage it. Teacher may also modify student’s interest and needs.

Neumann (1994), William & Ceci (1997) have reported that students satisfaction is highly correlated with the performance of the teacher particularly with his or her availability and response time. De Bourgh (1999); feel that teacher must be available if students have questions and must be flexible. Moorey & Kearsley (1996) opined that the teacher not only becomes a facilitator of learning but also a motivator for the student. The teacher’s feedback is the most important factor in satisfaction with instructions. Feedback on assignments must be in a timely manner to keep learners involved and motivated (Smith & Dillon; 1999).

b. Fellow Student: Peter (1956) concluded that an adolescent wishes to follow the behaviour pattern of his peers in matters of dress, manners and values of life. The quality of children’s interpersonal relationships is certainly a strong determinant of both present and future social adjustment (Hartup; 1982). Recent research suggests that children’s peer relationship can promote literacy development (Daiute; 1990). However, the sorts of interaction between friends such as conflicts and resolutions, which are an aspect of reciprocity, seem especially important for education.

c. Schoolwork: Students tend to easily get dissatisfied with the curricular choices in school, the tests, assignments and schoolwork. Students should realize and understand what they are doing and that these are the essential requirements of their development. So completing classroom and homework assignments, paying attention and participating in class are traditional objectives for teachers, parents, and students, most of whom believe that this behaviour will result in better work (Brookhart; 1998).

d. Student’s Activities: Krugs (1950) stated that the most important aspect of school programme is Student’s activities. He revealed that the purposes of the school life are broader than those of mere study. This implies that scholastic and co-curricular activities should no longer be allowed to conflict with each other.

e. Student’s Discipline: Williams (1964) stated that the attitude of the staff toward student action should reflect kindness as well as impartial firmness. Students should be given every opportunity to know where they stand in relation to acceptable standards of school conduct.
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f. Decision Making Opportunities: Opportunities for students to participate in decision-making was a construct measured in two variables, both of which were aspects of a larger construct. Eccles and Harold (1996) describe the combination of similar items as “school’s facilitation of autonomy.” In addition to the items similar to the ones described, there are items that ask whether students can design independent projects and teachers listen to student’s suggestions. Brown and Evans (2002) examination of school connection included this construct within the power variable. Students valued the principal asking about their ideas and providing students with opportunities to make decisions.

g. School Buildings, Supplies And Up Keeping: Rosenthal (1974) stated that adequate material resources enhance the quality of teaching and learning. Two facts make it important to devote one’s best effort to sound planning.

First, the investment in school-houses, grounds, and equipments is a substantial capital investment. Secondly, school-houses are of a relatively permanent nature. This necessitates good planning so that they will not become obsolete or unsafe before the end of their normal functional life.

h. Communication: As the nerve center of the school, the office should be adequately equipped with an intercom, bulletin boards, and a conference room in which personal interaction can be facilitated. Thus, communication is a process crucial to the central idea to work. Mood (1995) felt course goals and objectives should be clearly communicated to the students at the beginning of the course.

It is generally understood that children’s growth, both mental and physiological proceeds at widely different rates. Further more, these students are still the chief targets of the schooling process. The purpose of present investigation is to identify student’s dissatisfaction so that ways and means can be found to improve the system to reach their optimum potential and become productive members of the nation. In addition to 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 viz. psychomotor abilities, personality, affective characteristics, health and socioeconomic status. Also their home and neighborhood conditions vary. Thus, in the present investigation the role of socio-economic status and intelligence in satisfaction and dissatisfaction with school has been studied.
The intelligence and ability are used interchangeably to denote the powers or capacities of an individual. Such powers or capacities differ from one individual to another or from one species to another in terms of the range and depth of their operation. The term intelligence is vague and ambiguous in its meaning. Psychologists have been interpreting the term in different ways and are in disagreement on the meaning of term intelligence. Intelligence has been defined by a number of authors in different ways. The following definitions of intelligence support this proposition.

In the words of Binet and Simons (1905) intelligence refers to judgement, good sense, initiative, and the ability to comprehend and to reason well and to adapt one’s self to circumstances.

In the opinion of Terman (1925, 37) intelligence is the ability to carryout abstract thinking.

Peterson (1925) contends that intelligence is a mechanical means for adjustment and control.

Freeman (1926, 1939) divided definition of intelligence into three major categories:

- Those emphasizing power of adaptation of the environment.
- Capacity for learning, and
- Ability for abstract thinking.

Thordike (1927) holds that intelligence is the power of good response from the point of view of truth or fact.

Stern (1927) describes intelligence as a general capacity of an individual consciously to adjust his thinking to requirements.

Shaffer (1936) defined intelligence as the degree of availability of one’s experience for the solution of immediate problems and the anticipation of future ones.

Stoddard (1942) define intelligence as the ability to undertake activities that are characterized by difficulty, complexity, adaptiveness to a goal, social value and the emergence of originals and to maintain such activities under conditions that demand a concentration of energy and resistance to emotional forces.
Shaffer (1944) affirm intelligence as a composite or organization of abilities to learn, to grasp broad and subtle facts, especially abstract facts, with alertness and accuracy, to exercise mental control and to display flexibility and ingenuity in speaking the solution of the problems.

Burt (1947) is of the view that intelligence is power of readjustment to relatively novel situation by organizing new psycho-physical combinations.

Garrett (1950) states that intelligence are the abilities demanded in the solution of problems which require the comprehension and use of symbols i.e. words, numbers, diagrams, equations and formulae.

Wechsler (1974) gave one of the most complete definitions of intelligence. He states that Intelligence is the aggregate or global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally and to deal effectively with his environment.

Intelligence should not be confused with learning, thinking problem solving, concept attainment and achievement. It is none of these but it affects them all in a positive way i.e. it improves performance.

Pandey (1983) states that in view of historical perspective, the concept of intelligence developed during the last eighty years or so, may be summarized as (i) product, (ii) possession (iii) process and (iv) judgement.

According to Learner’s English Dictionary (1998), Intelligence is a level of someone’s ability to learn and understand.

According to Encyclopedia of Psychology (2000), Intelligence may be described as one thing a general ability, or as several different things a set of different abilities.

According to Dictionary of Psychology (2001), The faculty of reasoning and understanding, an distinct from feeling and wishing; a term used in general discourse for what in psychology is usually called intelligence.

According to Encyclopedia of Psychological and Behavioural Sciences (2001), Intelligence is a term referring to complex mental abilities of individuals. It is a term which indicates the amount of knowledge available and the speed with which the new knowledge is acquired; the ability to adapt to new situations and to handle concepts, relationships and abstract symbols.
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To wind up it may be concluded that intelligence may be viewed as global as well as comprising a number of specific abilities. It is of different kinds and underlies predominantly every intellectual activity.

Theories of Intelligence

Philosophers and psychologists developed various theories as regards the nature of intelligence. The representative theories of intelligence include:

(i) Faculty Theory: This is the oldest theory regarding the nature of intelligence. According to this theory, mind is made up of different faculties like reasoning, memory, and discrimination an imagination etc. These faculties are independent of each other and can be developed by rigorous of the difficult subject matter. This theory had been under criticism by experimental psychologists who disproved the existence of independent faculties in the brain.

(ii) Spearman’s Two-Factor Theory: This theory was developed by Charles Spearman (1923). He postulated that there is a general factor ‘g’, underlying all mental functions and multitude of factor ‘s’ specific to given tasks. According to Spearman, individual differences in intelligence depend upon the extent to which individuals of given group possess factor ‘g’. An individual’s ability to learn science would depend upon the quality of his ‘g’ and of his ‘s’ factors in dealing with the different problems in science. A pupil superior in ‘g’ factor can be inferior in ‘s’ factor. However, since the ‘g’ factor permeates all tasks, it would be most unlikely that a person inferior in ‘g’ would be especially capable in the learning of a specific task.

(iii) Thorndike’s Multi-Factor Theory: E.L. Thorndike, an American Psychologist (1927) opposed the theory of general intelligence. He proposed that there are specific stimuli and specific mental responses. Based upon research evidence and usefulness, Thorndike classified intelligence as abstract (ability to deal with ideas and symbols), mechanical (ability to deal with mechanics and things) and social (ability to deal with people). The correlation between tests of these three categories, however, tends to be high because common elements are involved. Tests of abstract intelligence correlate highest with scholastic achievement.
Thorndike (1927) has classified intelligence into three categories which are as following:

- **Concrete Intelligence:** It means intelligence in relation to concrete materials. It is the ability of an individual to comprehend actual situations and react to them adequately. The concrete intelligence is evident in various activities of daily life.

- **Abstract Intelligence:** It is the ability to respond to words, numbers and letters etc. Abstract intelligence is required in the ordinary academic subjects in schools, such as reading, writing and history and so on. The highest level of abstract intelligence is manifested in the thought of philosophers and in the use of mathematical formula.

- **Social Intelligence:** It means the ability of an individual to react to social situations of daily life. It does not include the feelings or emotions aroused in us by other people, but merely our ability to understand others and to react in such a way towards them that the ends desired should be attained. Adequate adjustment in social situations in the index of social intelligence.

(iv) **Thurston’s Theory:** According to this theory, intelligence neither consists two factors as proposed by Spearman nor multi-factors as developed by Thorndike. Somewhere between these views is a middle-of-the-road view proposed by Thurstone. According to Thurstone (1938), there is no general factor, but rather intelligence is made up of a number of Primary Mental Abilities (PMA). Intelligent behaviour results from the operation of certain primary abilities essential for the performance of a given task.

(v) **Burt and Vernon’s Hierarchy Theory:** Burt in 1940 separated statistically four factors of intellect, namely:

- **General factors** which are common to all traits
- **Group factors** common to some of the traits
- **Specific factors** limited to each trait wherever it is measured
- **Error factor** limited to each on each particular occasion it is measured.

He proposed a five level hierarchical model which is as following:

- Human mind
Vernon (1961) developed another factor analytic view of the organization of intelligence. He conducted extensive research and on the basis of empirical data, he proposed hierarchical group factor theory.

Vernon’s theory suggests that intelligence measure an overall factor ‘G’ as well as two main types of mental abilities. The major group factors are:-

- Ved: Verbal, numerical and educational
- KM: Practical, mechanical, spatial and physical

Cattell and Horn’s Theory: L Cattell (1965) and Horn (1978) proposed a theory of intelligence by distinguishing between two types of intelligence i.e. fluid intelligence and crystallized intelligence. Although viewed as different and distinct, these two types of intelligence intermingle and interact to produce overall intelligence.

Guilford’s Theory: Guilford (1985) expanded the theories of Thurstone and Spearman based on further factor analytic studies. He has classified the factors of intellect according to (1) the kind of process or operation performed by the individual, (2) the kind the material or the content involved and (3) the kinds of products involved.

Fluid intelligence is considered to be the mental capacity of an individual, which is required for learning and problem solving. It is derived more from biological and genetic factors and is less influenced by training and experience. This type of intelligence is put to use when facing new and strange situations requiring adaptation, comprehension, reasoning, problem solving and identifying relationships etc. It reaches full development by the end of an individual’s adolescence.

Crystallized intelligence, on the other hand, is not a function of one’s neural development and therefore is not innate or unlearned like fluid intelligence. It is specially learned and is, therefore, dependent on education and culture. It involves one’s acquired
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fund of general information consisting of knowledge and skills essential for performing different tasks in one’s day-to-day life.

Thus while fluid intelligence is characterized in abstraction, thinking, reasoning and imagination, crystallized intelligence is known for its evolution through experience, training and interaction with one’s environment over a number of years.

(viii) Mayer and Salovery’s Theory of Emotional Intelligence: Emotion refers to feeling with its distinctive thoughts, psychological and biological states and ranges of propensities to act. The term emotional intelligence has been rooted from the social intelligence, which was first coined by Thorndike (1927). Emotional Quotient (EQ) is used interchangeable with Emotional Intelligence. Mayer and Salovey (1997) conceptualized the term emotional intelligence that consisted to three different categories of adaptive abilities. Firstly, it is appraisal and expression in the self as well as others. In the self there are verbal and non-verbal components, in the other there are non-verbal perceptions and empathy. Secondly, there is a regulation of emotions in the self and others. Thirdly, it is utilization of emotion that includes flexible planning, creative thinking, redirected attention and motivation. Goleman (1996) then subsumed this definition with a lot of personality characteristics, which he believed would contribute positively to success in any domain of life. Further, Mayer and Salovey (1997) revised their own definition stressing the cognitive components of emotional intelligence and described emotional intelligence involves the ability to assess and/or generate feelings, when they facilitate through, the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growths. This definition was referred to the mental abilities of the organism. In general we can define emotional intelligence as the accumulation of all-cognitive, non-cognitive and non-physical capabilities, competencies and skills a person has that help him/her to deal with the demands and pressures of every day life.

In the light of above discussion it can be defined that emotional intelligence is the ability to understand emotions and their causes, the capability to effectively regulate these emotions in oneself and in others and most importantly being able to use the emotions as a source of information for problem solving, being creative and dealing with social situations.
The basic difference between the general intelligence and emotional intelligence is that intelligence is the aggregate or global capacity of an individual to act purposefully, to think rationally and to deal effectively with his environment whereas emotional intelligence is the capacity or ability to understand to one’s own emotions, the emotions of other and act appropriately based on these emotions. Level of general intelligence is genetically fixed, whereas emotional intelligence is neither genetically fixed nor does it develops only in early childhood, but develops throughout life.

(ix) **Gardner’s Theory:** Howard Gardner (1983) propounded a unique contemporary theory of intelligence known as *Theory of Multiple Intelligence*. According to Gardner there are following types of intelligence or categories of human abilities:

- **Logical – Mathematical Intelligence:** It is responsible for all types of abilities, talents and skills in areas related to logic and mathematics. It has to do with numerical ability, such as solving logical puzzles and mathematical problems. It can be divided into components like (i) Deductive reasoning (ii) Inductive reasoning and (iii) Scientific thinking. Professionals like scientists, mathematicians and philosophers have this type of intelligence in abundance.

- **Linguistic Intelligence:** It is generally called verbal ability. It is responsible for all kind of linguistic competence, abilities, talents and skills, available in human beings. It is a person’s ability to deal with grammar and in speech. It can be divided into components like (i) Syntax, (ii) Semantics, (iii) Pragmatics and (iv) more school-oriented skills. This type of intelligence is most visible in professionals like lawyers, lecturers, writers, lyricists and journalists.

- **Musical Intelligence:** It is concerned with the abilities, talents and skills pertaining to the field of music. It may be well demonstrated through one’s abilities to produce and appreciate rhythm, pitch, texture and appreciation of the forms of musical expressiveness. This type of intelligence is visible in a quite large proportion in professionals like musicians and composers.

- **Spatial Intelligence:** It is concerned with the abilities, talents and skills involving the representation and manipulation of spatial configuration and relationship. This intelligence is mainly concerned with orientation in space: map reading, visual arts and playing chess. Many persons like painters.
architects, engineers, mechanics, surveyors, navigators, sculptors and chess players use spatial intelligence in their fields of work.

- **Bodily Kinesthetic Intelligence:** It is concerned with the set of abilities, talents and skills involved in using one’s body or its various parts to perform skillful and purposeful movements. Professionals like athletes, dancers, actors and surgeons may be seen to demonstrate a high degree of bodily kinesthetic intelligence in their respective fields.

- **Inter-Personal Intelligence:** It consists of the knowledge of the internal aspects of oneself (understanding of self); access to one’s own feelings and emotions. It includes knowledge and understanding of one’s own cognitive strengths, styles and mental functioning as well as one’s feelings, range of emotions and skills to utilize one’s fund of knowledge in practical situations. It is, therefore said to be the most private of the intelligence that a person possesses. The access to this type of intelligence in an individual is available only through self-expression i.e. language, music, visual art and similar other forms of expression. In our practical life, this type of intelligence is demonstrated by saints, mahatmas, rishis and yogis.

In this way Gardner’s theory of intelligence provides a broad and comprehensive view of human abilities, extending from linguistic and logical-mathematical abilities on the one hand, to intrapersonal and interpersonal abilities on the other. As far as the broader and global assessment of one’s intellectual competencies and abilities is concerned, there is sufficient truth in the assertion of Gardner’s theory that knowledge of all the six types of intelligence is essential for the true assessment of one’s level of intellectual functioning.

**(x) Sternberg’s Theory:** The most recent acceptable theory of intelligence has been put forward by American psychologist Robert Sternberg (1994, 97) by adopting an information processing approach to cognition or problem solving. The information processing approach is the manner in which one problem from the time one comes across it, gathers information and makes use of this information for completing the task or solving the problem in hand. The theory propagated by Sternberg identified the following steps in the way one processes information.

- **Encoding** (identifying the relevant available information in the mind).
- **Inferring** (drawing the necessary inference).
• **Mapping** (establishing the relationship between a previous situation and the present one).
• **Application** (applying the inferred relationship).
• **Justification** (justifying the analyzed solution of the problem).
• **Response** (provides the best possible solution).

Considering the way human beings process information in executing a mental task, Sternberg laid down a triarchic structure for this theory of intelligence based on three sub-theories namely (a) component theory, (b) experimental sub-theory and (c) contextual sub-theory.

(xii) **Component Sub-Theory**: This is the core of Sternberg’s theory. He advocates that a person’s intellectual functioning is decided mainly by the components. He listed three types of components serving distinct functions:

- **Meta component** that represent higher order executive processes employed by planning, monitoring and regulating the execution of a task such as analysis of the problem, selection of strategies, monitoring of the possible solutions and interpretation of the feedback about performance etc.

- **Performance component** that represent the actual mental processes used for the execution of a task like task perception, concept identification and response making etc.

- **Knowledge acquisition components** that represent the processes used in acquiring new information such a synthesizing old ideas in some original and creative ways.

(xii) **Experimental Sub-Theory**: By this sub theory Sternberg proposed that intelligence represents the ability or capacity of an individual to deal with new tasks, problems and situations by adopting an information processing approach with as little conscious effort as possible. This sub-theory has thus led psychologists and researchers to identify specific tasks and situations, which may be utilized as reliable yardsticks for measuring intelligence.

(xiii) **Contextual Sub-Theory**: While proposing this sub-theory, Sternberg declared that intelligence should be regarded as a mental activity directed toward purposive adaptation to, and selection and shaping of, real-world environments relevant to one’s life.
This declaration made out intelligence to be a factor of a practical nature rather than a mere abstraction. He, in fact, sought the real function and purpose of human intelligence by considering it as a proper instrument for adaptation and the selection and shaping of one’s environment. The concept and structure of intelligence proposed by Sternberg thus went beyond the concept of I.Q. measurement and traditional cognitive processes as it gave greater freedom and power to an individual to solve his day-to-day problems and become the master of his destiny.

As we can see from different concepts of intelligence that there is no general agreement among theorists concerning the nature of intelligence. Instead, in each case, the measure of intelligence is actually based upon the ability of the individual to function in a certain test situation.

Intelligence as an inborn ability, to a large degree, is an abstraction and is not directly subject to measurement. It can only be inferred from one’s responses in test situations. Furthermore, intelligence is the product of the interaction between innate and environmental stimuli.

Importance of Intelligence

Intelligence is a key factor in the life of an individual. No sector of life is untouched from the effect of intelligence. The importance of intelligence can be highlighted in the following manner:

- Intelligence helps an individual to adapt himself adequately to relatively new situations in life.
- It helps an individual to adjust his thinking according to new requirements.
- Intelligence is very helpful in making readjustment to relatively novel situations by organizing new psychological combinations.
- Intelligence helps in making judgments, good sense, initiative, comprehending, and reasoning and in adapting an individual according to circumstances.
- It is only intelligence through which an individual acquires the techniques for processing information supplied by his senses.
- Intelligence helps in carrying out abstract thinking.
- It helps an individual to behave effectively with the people.
• Through intelligence an individual can be divided into normal, sub-normal, dull or bright etc and a proper caring treatment can be given to dull for making a positive improvement in him.

• Achievement of an individual can be calculated through intelligence.

• Intelligence helps the teachers in providing the right or vocational guidance to their pupils.

• It is the intelligence only which helps in emphasizing the necessity of providing the superior individual with adequate opportunities for proper development.

• Intelligence helps in problem-solving, choice making, advancing the arguments academics and reasoning etc.

Thus intelligence is an important factor, which contributes to the success in life.

The most important problem in intelligence is its measurement. This has led to the emergence of a new branch of psychology, which is known as test psychology. In the 19th century Gall used to measure intelligence by studying the prominent part of the brain. He was a psychologist, but such measurements suffer from the personal equation of the psychologist. New types of intelligence test in psychology aim at devising objective test and measurement of intelligence. Sir Francis Galton (1907) in his *Hereditary Genius* called attention to the scientific investigation of intelligence measurement. He showed different levels of intelligence from the genius to the idiot in the normal distribution curve, which has been diagrammatically presented in figure 1.3.

The genius and the idiot occupy the extremes of the normal distribution curve. The number of genius as well as the idiot is the smallest. At the mid point of it are situated individuals of normal intelligence who out-number the former (genius as well as idiot).

The great German psychologist, Ebbinghaus (1908, 1973), prepared the ground for the measurement of intelligence in his completion test, but it was Binet (1905), who revolutionized the measurement of intelligence. In Paris, educational authorities, while anxious on the backwardness of many pupils at the local municipal school, entrusted Binet with the responsibility of finding out the reasons of this backwardness.
Binet (1905) came to the conclusion that the intelligence of a normal child develops without school education and prepared a number of simple tests meant for measuring the intelligence of children of each age level and applied these to them. Binet (1905) discovered three groups of tests and on the basis of his findings, he divided the age of the testees into chronological age or physical age, and mental age. Chronological age or physical age is measured from the testee’s date of birth and the second, i.e., the mental age is measured from the standpoint of his mental abbreviation form of chronological age is C.A. and that of mental age is M.A. Thus, M.A. indicates that the child has reached a point of intellectual development comparable to that of the child of the equal age group and C.A. refers and C.A. refers to the actual age since birth. His findings are represented in figure 1.4.
He devised different tests for the measurement of intelligence for various groups and age level; He standardized these tests and distinguished between chronological age and mental age and lastly (which is the most important contribution) he found the intelligence quotient based on the ratio of two kinds of age level.

I.Q. is a ratio between mental age and chronological age, multiplied by 100

\[ I.Q. = \frac{M.A.}{C.A.} \times 100 \]

The I.Q. indicates the rate of mental growth of a child. It expresses size of the yearly increments that are made to a child’s mental level. By indicating the rate of mental growth, the I.A. may also be regarded as an index of brightness. Children may have same I.Q. but have different C.A.’s or may have some M.A. but different I.Q.’s.

Criteria of Classification of Intelligence:

Various attempts have been made to classify intelligence according to the I.Q. Table 1.2. gives the Terman’s Classification of Intelligence by I.Q. Levels.

Table 1.2

Terman’s Classification of Intelligence by I.Q. Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.Q.</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above 140</td>
<td>Near genius or genius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 – 140</td>
<td>Very superior intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 – 120</td>
<td>Superior intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 – 110</td>
<td>Normal or average intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 – 90</td>
<td>Dullness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 – 80</td>
<td>Border line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 70</td>
<td>Definite feeble – mindedness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Terman and Merill (1937)
The M.A. of the Imbecile again is about 8 and his I.Q. varies from 25 to 50. Thirdly, the Moron is only 11 in M.A. and from 50 to 70 in I.Q. The idiot resembles the ass in intelligence. Left to himself, he is not capable of carrying on even the elementary functions of self-preservation, like feeding, dressing and bathing himself and avoiding the common danger of life. The Imbecile can be taught the above functions, though he cannot be taught to read and write and the higher processes of thinking.

**Table 1.3**

Wechsler’s classification of Intelligence according to IQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.Q. Limits</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128 and over</td>
<td>Very Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 to 127</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 to 119</td>
<td>Bright Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 to 100</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 90</td>
<td>Dull Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 to 79</td>
<td>Border Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 and below</td>
<td>Defective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Wechsler (1974, 1975)

The Moron can by training and education, learn to read and write. The dull can rise up to the level of a graduate by dint of hard work and perseverance. The normal can carry on all intelligence functions. The bright and the very bright can do intelligence work with greater ease and facilities. The Genius and the extra-Genius show originality and creativity in every intelligent work that they do.

There is difference of opinion among test psychologists with regard to the distribution of I.Q. on the basis of percentage. The Table 1.4 gives the distribution of the I.Q. on the basis of percentage number of children on IQ levels (Terman and Merril; 1937).
Table 1.4:
The distribution of Children on the basis of IQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.Q.</th>
<th>Number of children per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56–65</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66–75</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76–85</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86–95</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96–106</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107–115</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116–125</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126–135</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136–145</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (Terman and Merrill; 1937)

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS**

Socio-economic status consists of a cluster of factors which includes occupation, income and cultural features of home.

A family’s socio-economic status is based on family income, parental education level, parental occupation and social status in the community, such as, contacts within the community, group associations, and the community’s perception of the family. According to Demarest et al. (1993), 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.
The socio-economic status, thus, refers to the stratification of the society into three main categories viz. high, middle and low. 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 the involving structural variables and socio-economic status, one of the principal variables in this investigation. 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.

Families with high socio-economic status often have more success in preparing their young children for school because they typically have access to a wide range of resources to promote and support young children’s development. Also, they have easy access to information regarding their children’s health, as well as social, emotional and cognitive development. In addition, families with high socio-economic status often seek out information to help them better prepare their young children for school.

Crinic and Lambetty (1994) examined the impact of socio-economic status on children’s readiness for school. The segregating nature of social class, ethnicity and race may well reduce the variety of enriching experiences thought to be prerequisite for creating readiness to learn among children. Social class, ethnicity and race entail a set of contextual givens’ that dictate neighbourhood, housing and access to resources that affect enrichment or deprivation as well as the acquisition of specific value system.

Ramey and Ramey (1994) describe that across all socio-economic group, parents face major challenges when it comes to providing optimal care and education for their children. From families in poverty, these challenges can be formidable. Sometimes when basic necessities are lacking, parents must place top priority on housing, food, clothing, and health care, educational toys, games, and books may appear to be luxuries, and parents may not have the time, energy or knowledge to find innovation and less-expensive way to foster young children’s development.

Even in the families with above-average incomes, parents often lack the time and energy to invest fully in their children’s preparation for school, and they sometimes face a limited array of options for high-quality child care both before their children starts school.
and during the early school years. Kindergarten teachers throughout the country report that children are increasingly arriving at school inadequately prepared.

Families with low socio-economic status often lack the financial, social and educational support that characterized families with high socioeconomic status. Poor families also may have inadequate or limited access to community resources that promote and support children’s development and school readiness.

Zill (1995) stated that low maternal education and minority language status are most consistently associated with fewer signs of emerging literacy and a greater number of difficulties in scholars.

Education and economy go hand in hand. Education is an important ingredient for economic development. 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 will be the educational facilities available to the child, together with more intellectual stimulation, which is not available to socio-economically deprived children. Socio-economic status seems to influence student’s attitudes, interests, values, motivation etc. and thus his academic accomplishment. That’s why it is necessary to study the socio-economic status while researching on the satisfaction and dissatisfaction levels of the students.

The increasing cost of colleges and universities seems to be a deterrent for students of lower socio-economic status. Students may feel that cost itself would hold them back. This belief, although commonly held, might be overcome if the students were counseled to find economic assistance through scholarships and loans. Children whose parents are of a higher socio-economic status are more likely to have higher IQs, test better, and advance their education further than those of a lower socio-economic status. This may be due to several reasons. First, there is genetics: if the parents received advanced education, they are probably intelligent and therefore passed that on to their children. These parents are more likely to value education because of their experience in the effects of higher education. Students whose parents don’t have advanced degrees don’t have time or money to spend on helping their children advance to a higher level. Therefore, a cycle is created where in middle and lower classes generally stay in those classes.
Lower socio-economic status can be a factor in poor health. Studies have shown mental health to be impaired due to the daily stress due to unemployment, economic displacement and housing dislocation, including homelessness. In addition, it is more difficult to provide healthy food, safe communities and clean work environments in areas of lower socio-economic status. On the flip side, those people with higher socio-economic status have more exposure to health care and information that promotes healthy behaviors.

In today’s society, students of lower socio-economic background are generally lacking the technology needed to keep up with the general population. The obvious reason is the high price of technology. Studies have shown that by using computers and the internet in the classroom helps to equalize students of all socio-economic backgrounds. It allows students to be more involved academically and professionally in their futures. They may even become as technologically literate as their more economically advantaged peers.

Social class or status of the family refers to the hierarchical distinctions between individuals or groups in societies or cultures. Social class influences socio-economic status because of how people are treated depending on the class they come from, which may be determined by various factors. Socio-economic status strongly influences the varying student perspectives on the value and attainability of higher education. The probability of students attending schools of higher education is more likely in students from higher socio-economic backgrounds. Education and increase opportunities for income and job security. One’s level of education can also be an indicator of socio-economic status. Socio-economic status is based on income, but too often is connected to race as well.
Introduction

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH LITERATURE

According to Tuckman (1972), the purpose of review of literature is to expand upon the context and background of the study, to help further define the problem, and to provide an empirical bases for subsequent development of hypothesis.

- It relates a study to the larger, ongoing dialogue in the literature about a topic, filling in gaps and extending prior studies (Marshall and Rossmann; 1996).
- It shares with the reader the results of other studies that are closely related to the study being reported (Freankel and Wallen; 2002).
- The review of literature provides the background and context for the research problem (Wiersma; 2005).
- It provides a framework for establishing the importance of the study, as well as a benchmark for comparing the results of a study with other findings.

According to Best (1995), a familiarity with the literature in any problem helps the researcher to discover what is already known, what others have attempted to find out, what attacking methods have been promising and disappointing and what problems remain to be solved. Unlike other animals that start afresh with each generation, man builds upon the accumulated and recorded knowledge of the past, his constant adaptation in all possible areas of human endeavor. Although the general purpose of review is to help the researcher develop a thorough understanding and insight into previous work, the can also help in reaching a number of important specific goals.

In the present research, investigator focused on the study of satisfaction and dissatisfaction of students with school in relation to their intelligence and socio-economic status. The review of literature has been classified under the three main subheads-

- Review of research studies related to satisfaction and dissatisfaction of students.
- Review of research studies related to intelligence.
- Review of research studies related to Socio-Economic Status of students.
Research Studies Related to Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

Intara (1990) made a study entitled “Students Satisfaction of Secondary Schools in Changmai”. She found that there is a significant difference between urban and rural students. Urban students felt more satisfied than rural counterparts, especially with the school administrative set up.

Fine (1986) measured correlates of school satisfaction among adolescents through a large scale survey of 5,545 public high school. In that study, students were asked to rate their levels of Satisfaction with respect to five specific domains family, friends, school, self and living environment as well as their overall life satisfaction. Most of the adolescents reported positive levels of satisfaction for the five domains and global satisfaction. However, although the students typically reported Satisfaction above the neutral point on the school scale, 23% of the students reported some level of dissatisfaction (below the neutral point) with their school experiences; 9% described their feelings as terrible, 7% as unhappy and other 7% as mostly dissatisfied. School experiences may be a significant source of stress and decreased quality of life for a significant number of high school students. Although the literature has been sparse, school dissatisfaction has been linked with various negative outcomes, including poor school achievement and behaviour as well as disengagement and dropping out of school. The study suggested that growth was related to climate and Satisfaction as there was a significant positive correlation between climate and Satisfaction. Similar findings have been reported by Ainley (1991), Epstein and McPartland (1976).

Bowman and Tinsley (1991) examined “The Development of Vocational Realism in Black American College Student. Black college students (n=172) completed survey of biographical, educational and vocational information about themselves and immediate relatives. Results indicated that educational realism tended to increase across college years. The researchers found no difference in satisfaction with school or intent to leave school as function of educational or salary realism. Vocationally realistic males and females did not differ in age.

Fielstein and Lammers (1992) conducted study on Relationship of Student Satisfaction with Advising to Administrative Support for Advising Services. Study of 90 sophomores and seniors in university’s colleges of agriculture/home economics, arts/sciences, and business investigated whether associate deans’ perceptions of advising
agreed with students' perceptions and to discover the philosophy of advising in each college. Student satisfaction with devising appears to be linked to administrative policies and practices.

**Harnash – Glezer and Meyer (1991)** conducted study on *Dimensions of Satisfaction with College Education*. Factor analysis of a survey of 2072 students in 176 courses in 4 departments of an Israeli community college revealed similarities in student satisfaction among departments with the teacher and interpersonal relationships between students as the major contributing factors. Results suggested that an evaluation tool appropriate for many courses or curricula is possible but should be multidimensional.

**Kerr et al. (1992)** examined *Characteristics of Academically Talented Minority Students*. They analyzed data for all students scoring 95 percentile and above on American College Test (ACT) composite scores in spring of 1988. From this data, they profiled approximately 3,545 minority students. They examined relationship of specific minority group membership and gender, postsecondary educational plans, career interests, needs for services, desires for extracurricular activities, and satisfaction with educational experiences.

**Pust and Moher (1992)** conducted a survey on *Core Curriculum for International Health: Evaluating Ten Years’ Experience at the University of Arizona*. A survey of 154 graduates of University of Arizona medical school curriculum in international health found (1) a high proportion of women graduates; (2) higher than expected number of graduates entering family practice and pediatrics; (3) completion of a field experience in a developing nation by 73 percent; and (4) participant satisfaction with the course.

**Ramaswamy (1992)** explored on *Enhancing Business School Effectiveness: A Multiple-Constituency Approach*. He examined 23 business schools and found that students’ perceptions of school effectiveness differed from those of faculty and the business community. Diversity of student body and acceptance rate significantly influenced student satisfaction. Satisfaction was more with class size and faculty-student ratios.

**Andrews (1993)** conducted his study on *Grade organization patterns and ninth-grade students in The University of Missouri Columbia*. His findings were

- The grade organization pattern established for the ninth grade students in a district may make a difference in participation in school activities, social self
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esteem, total self esteem, and satisfaction with teachers, fellow students, school work, students activities decision making opportunities, buildings and communities.

- Ninth grade schools appear to be less desirable than junior high schools or senior high schools for the placement of ninth grade students.

Blank (1993) studied factors associated with job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among college students affair and professional staff at the University of Northern Colorado. He found recognition and advancement were identified as job dissatisfiers rather than satisfier. Interpersonal relations with students and peers were identified as job satisfier rather than dis-satisfier. Significant difference in job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction were found within categories of position type, education attainment and salary level.

Dew and Huebner (1994) in their research entitled “Adolescents’ Perceived Quality of Life: an Exploratory Investigation” studied psychometric properties and correlates of Student’s Life Satisfaction Scale with adolescent sample (n=222). Individual differences in global life satisfaction were not associated with age, grade, or gender but were associated moderately with socioeconomic status. Measures of family-related self-concept were greater predictors of life satisfaction than were peer and academic self-concept measures across adolescence.

Perrucci and Hu (1995) studied Satisfaction with Social and Educational Experience among International Graduate Students and concurred that satisfaction among approximately 600 international graduate students at university focused on academic program, academic appointment, and nonacademic social relationships. Analysis revealed academic satisfaction was most strongly related to contact with U.S. students, language skills and perceived discrimination. Social satisfaction was linked with these factors and marital status. Gender, grades, aspirations, and financial situation were unrelated.

Neumann (1994) as well as William and Ceci (1997) conducted a Study on Student Satisfaction with Performance of Instructor and found that the student Satisfaction is highly correlated with the performance of the instructor, particularly with his or her availability and response-time. The instructors feedback is most important factor in satisfaction with instruction. Feedback as assignments must be in a timely manner to keep learners involvement and motivation communication must be on a regular basis, otherwise
student can experience a great level of frustration. In addition, feedback gives students the opportunity to revise assignments which acts as reinforcement of concepts introduced in the course.

**Fujiki et al. (1996)** studied *Social Skills of Children with Specific Language Impairment*. The social skills of 19 elementary school children with specific language impairment (SLI) were compared to those of a matched control group using 3 different measures. Results indicated the SLI children had poorer social skills, fewer peer relationships, and less satisfaction with their peer relationships than classmates without specific language impairment.

**Olaniran (1996)** presented a model of individual member satisfaction in the group decision making process. Satisfaction is the sum of an individual’s negative and positive feelings to a set of variables, and tends to revolve around three common variables (a) status consensus (b) goal accomplishment or progress towards the group goal, and (c) participation. Participation represents the level of individual contribution to the communication process and satisfaction depends on participation. Therefore, satisfaction is high when members feel included and think they have participated. Conversely, satisfaction is low when members feel excluded and think they have not participated.

Using confirmatory factor analysis, **Voelkl (1996)** tested whether school belonging and valuing school were two dependent measures of student relationships with school or if both were more accurately reflected in on measure identification with school. The belonging scale included items that asked students if they liked being at school, participated and were treated with respect. Valuing was measured with items that asked about the importance of school. Identification with school was a combination of all the items from two scales. Analysis demonstrated the two measures were correlated at 0.85 and do not appear to better explain the correlation among the items than the single scale.

**Robins et al. (1997)** developed *A Predictive Model of Student Satisfaction with the Medical School Learning Environment*. A study of 430 University of Michigan first-year medical student’s satisfaction with their learning environment resulted in a predictive model using gender and minority group (excluding Asians) status. Results suggest curriculum structure and students’ perceptions of faculty priorities are prominent predictors of student satisfaction across subgroups. However, student perceptions of the environment as comfortable for all subgroups did discriminate among subgroups.
Baker (1998) studied *The Social Context of School Satisfaction among Urban, Low-Income, African – American Students*. Classroom social climate, stress, social support, quality of family life, psychological distress and academic self-concept were modeled in a path analysis as predictors of school satisfaction (N=129). A caring, supportive school community was most predictive of students’ satisfaction.

Baker (1999) examined *Teacher-Student Interaction in Urban At-Risk Classrooms: Differential Behavior, Relationship Quality and Student Satisfaction with School*. He examined teacher-student interactions and relationship quality among poor, urban, African-American third through fifth graders expressing differential school satisfaction. The research found that perception of a caring, supportive relationship with a teacher and a positive classroom environment were related to school satisfaction as early as third grade. Students with high and low school satisfaction interacted differently with teachers.

Goldring and Hausman (1999) studied *Reasons for Parental Choice of Urban Schools*. They explored differences in race, Socioeconomic Status, and reasons for choice among parents in an urban school district with a controlled-choice plan. Parental background characteristics, parents’ reasons for choosing a school, satisfaction with public schools, and geographical distance differentiate among parents choosing magnets from those choosing non-magnets and non-choosers.

Gulino and Valentine (1999) investigated *Middle School Programmatic Practices and Student Satisfaction with School* and concurred that relationships exist among student’s engagement in five selected programmatic practices in 62 Missouri middle schools and student satisfaction with school. Although a curriculum based on young adolescents’ developmental needs predicts students’ satisfaction with school, more specific program concepts do not correlate with student satisfaction.

Samdal et al. (1999) examined *Relationship between Students’ Perceptions of School Environment, Their Satisfaction with School and Perceived Academic Achievement: An International Study*. They found the adult work environment to school children’s daily lives, using health survey data from 11, 13, and 15 years old students in Finland, Latvia, Norway, and Slovakia. The most important school-setting predictor of students’ perception of their academic achievement is satisfaction with school, teachers, and classmates.
Cox-Peterson et al. (2001) undertook *An Investigation of Student and Adult Docents during Guided School Tours* and found differences and similarities between adult-led docent museum tours and those led by junior docents (high school students) based on their interactions with elementary school groups and strategies for presenting exhibits using several data-collection instruments. The study found greater student and teacher satisfaction with junior docents than with adult counterparts. Discusses benefits of Junior docent program.

Malin and Linnakyla (2001) undertook research on *Multilevel Modeling in Repeated Measures of the Quality of Finnish School Life*. They studied the advantages and disadvantages of using multilevel models and the statistical program MLwiN in analyzing large-scale educational data with repeated measures. The research used data from Finnish eighth graders in 1991 (n=1,123) and 1995 (n=1,113) to study the quality of school life over time. The results exhibited the usefulness of the multilevel statistical analysis and demonstrated changes in general school satisfaction and teacher-student relations.

Ryan and Patrick (2001) also measured teacher support separately to determine if it was related to changes in student motivation and engagement in school. School supported variable items included student perceptions of the extent to which their math teacher respected students opinion, understood how students felt, and helped when students are upset.

Horn (2002) exhibited *Applying Customer Satisfaction Theory to Community College Planning of Counseling Services*. He developed framework in which a researcher may apply a customer satisfaction model to the planning of counseling services at the community college level. He reviewed some historical work on satisfaction research with the unique environment of student services in two-year colleges. He discussed three major points concerning the application of customer satisfaction theory to community college planning of counseling services, including: (1) defining student satisfaction; (2) adapting the customer satisfaction model for student services; and (3) policy implications for using the customer satisfaction model in student services at community colleges. The researcher recommended that college administrators should use the student satisfaction research as an improvement tool, not as a staff evaluation tool. He has also described the limitations of student satisfaction research to only measure some of the factors that contribute to a student’s satisfaction as the school cannot control all factors related to student satisfaction.
He has also discussed possible reasons for delaying or rejecting the implementation of the customer satisfaction model in student service and counseling research.

**Lin et al. (2002)** studied *Student Attitudes toward Networked Peer Assessment: Case Studies of Undergraduate Students and Senior High School Students* in Taiwan. They investigated networked peer assessment with high school and undergraduate students. The focus of the study was on student attitudes toward peer assessment; peer-tutor correlation; and measure of student satisfaction with networked peer assessment activities.

**Miller et al. (2002)** studied *New Student Satisfaction with an Orientation Program: Creating Effective Learning Transitions*. They evaluated a freshman orientation program at a southeastern research university through questionnaires completed by 1,048 (80%) of the entering freshman class. The study revealed that students themselves are not sure what orientation programs do or are supposed to do, although they were generally satisfied with the program.

**The University Writing Center (2003)** conducted its tri-annual *survey of student Satisfaction*. Students were asked to find out a survey upon completion of each session in the Center. The nine categories had four response choices: strongly disagree; agree; strongly agree. The three hundred twenty-two valid response sheets were then analyzed to provide a mean (out of four) and percentages of those who answered agreement versus disagreement for each category. The data were further separated to reveal significant differences in the responses of native versus non-native speakers and of first-time versus repeat respondents. The results of all analyses revealed a positive impression of the Center’s services overall; while there were fluctuations in numbers. The purpose of this study was to investigate key factors influencing student Satisfaction of online students. The Binet instrument (1993) was modified to accommodate questions relating to online courses. A total of 105 respondents from a sample of 303 online learners completed the online survey. The results indicated student Satisfaction in online courses in influenced by 3 constructs; (a) instructor variables, (b) technical issues, and (c) interactivity. Results indicate the modified survey is a valid measure of student Satisfaction in the online learning environment.

**Zhai (2003)** was entrusted responsibility for *Developing and Conducting a Student Satisfaction Survey*. As part of the ongoing effort to provide and maintain quality
educational programs and services for students, the San Diego Community College District conducted a comprehensive student satisfaction survey. Development of the student satisfaction survey instrument was based on the matriculation components, the district’s previous accreditation survey, and accreditation standards. Survey responses were collected from 50% of classes randomly selected and a total of 9,024 responses were obtained district wide. Correlation analyses, t-tests and one-way ANOVA tests were performed. Results showed that students with high satisfaction with the campus climate theme were also satisfied with curriculum and instruction, physical facilities, academic development, and personal development themes. African Americans and Hispanics generally expressed higher satisfaction, while whites reported lower satisfaction with their college experience.

Beesley (2004) highlighted *Teachers’ Perceptions of School Counselor Effectiveness: Collaborating for Student Success*. He designed a study to survey K-12 classroom teachers (N=188) across the Southwest as to perceptions of the effectiveness of school counseling services in their educational setting. The results revealed that overall teachers reported satisfaction with counseling services, although satisfaction did vary across levels (elementary, middle school/ junior high, high school) depending on the specific service area. He reported that despite rating certain service areas as strengths, teachers still saw considerable room for improvement in a variety of specific areas in order for school counselors to work more effectively and successfully with all students in the new millennium.

Ejich (2004-05) evaluated *Factors Associated with Student Mobility in Nigerian Secondary School* and found out why secondary school students changed schools as well as the trends and the frequency of change of school among them. The data was collected by means of a set of questionnaires administered to 251 final-year students who had moved from one school to another in the course of their secondary education. Analysis showed that most students changed school mainly because of factors such as lack of, or inadequate, libraries, laboratories and workshops and dissatisfaction with the quality of teaching. Most of them changed school in the first years of both the junior and the senior secondary courses.

Noel-Levitz (2004) presented *National Satisfaction and Priorities Report*. Students Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) of more than 6,90,000 students from more than 850 four-years, public and private institutions across North America was compiled. The results
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included student responses over a three-year academic time period. The major points of discussions were reputations of teachers and the academic progress of children. It was reported that the characteristics of social networks tended to reduce the flow of school-related information to parents from the lower socioeconomic groups and increased it to parents of higher status. Teachers tend to perceive, believe, and act in accordance with the structures, policies, and traditions of their workplace. As organization members, teachers define the conditions of their work according to a shared set of assumptions about the kinds of attitudes and behaviors that are appropriate to the school setting. Teacher's subjective perceptions of their working conditions – namely, what should be performed, how it should be performed, and what represents successful performance – are strongly influenced by the internal structural arrangements of the school. The surveys compared Easter students’ Satisfaction level with that of students from other schools.

Hudson (2004) conducted a study entitled “Students live on campus for an average of two and a half years”. Students were most satisfied with the areas of helpfulness of school staff (91%), Teacher-student relationship (91%), and academic instrument (87%). Specific items where Satisfaction was high included: “There is an adult at school to take care of me when I am hurt or sick” (96%), “My teachers expect me to do well in class” (97%), and “My teachers do a good job teaching reading, writing, and math” (95%) Students were less satisfied with the ease of talking with teachers about personal problems (69%) and with lack of interesting homework (65%). Fewer students expressed satisfaction in the areas of school facilities (78%) and school/ classroom safety and discipline (72%) However, even in these areas, student Satisfaction with individual survey items was generally high. Especially, “School bathrooms are neat and well supplied” (35%), “Students in this school follow rules” (57%) and “I can work in my classroom without being bothered by other students” (57%).

Michalos and Orlando (2006) analyzed Student’s Quality of Life. An aggregated sample of students (n = 3407) from the University of Northern British Columbia covering 7 of the 8 years from 1998 to 2005 showed the relative and combined explanatory power of some life domain (e.g., satisfaction with family relations) and university-related variables (e.g., satisfaction with UNBC instructors) on some global quality of life variables (e.g., life satisfaction). It was found that, combination with the life domain variables, the university related variables added practically nothing to our
explanatory power. The most powerful university-related variable was students' satisfaction with their instructors.

**Hendel (2007)** examined the *Efficacy of Participating in a First-Year Seminar on Student Satisfaction and Retention*, at a Research extensive, urban and Public land-grant university. This study used survey data to compare satisfaction levels from a random sample of first-year students with those of students who had enrolled in a first year seminar. A logistic regression model was used to determine if seminar participation affected retention. Results indicated statistically significant differences at p less than or equal to 0.05 for 15 of the 92 Satisfaction items; more positive responses came from students enrolled in a first year seminar. Results of the logistic regression analysis indicated that participation did not increase the probability of retention; only high school rank was a significant contributor to the prediction of retention.

**Suhure and Jansen (2007)** explored the *Impact of Degree program Satisfaction on the persistence of college students*. The impact of degree program satisfaction was studied within a multi-theoretical framework. The results of the study show that student accomplishment not only depends on differences in academic ability but also on degree program satisfaction. Decreased degree program Satisfaction appears to diminish both study motivation and study behavior.

**Zhao et al. (2007)** described *How Advisor Choice and Advisor Behavior Affect Doctoral Student Satisfaction* and found a satisfactory relationship between doctoral students and their advisors as an essential component of successful doctoral training. Using responses to a national survey of doctoral students in the US from 27 universities and 11 disciplines, this paper explored factors affecting students’ satisfaction with the advising relationship. They found that both the criteria used in selecting an advisor and reported advisor behaviors influence satisfaction. Moreover, there are pronounced disciplinary differences in both choice criteria and advisor behavior, and these were more robust predictors of satisfaction than individual characteristics.

**Betoret (2007)** examined *The Influence of Students’ and Teachers’ thinking Styles on Student Course Satisfaction and on Their Learning Process*. The sample was made up of 102 instructional psychology college students who responded to two administrations of the Thinking Style Inventory, one about their teacher and another about themselves, to a satisfaction scale referring to the instructional process, and finally to a scale designed
measure the time and effort they devoted to the learning process. Multivariate regression analyses were carried out. Results reveal that both teachers’ and students’ thinking styles are good predictors of students’ satisfaction and their involvement in the learning process.

Hallam and Ireson (2007) explored Secondary School Pupils’ Satisfaction with Their Ability Grouping Placements. They studied the extent to which pupils are happy with their placement, and the reasons they give for wanting to move to another class or set. The sample (n=5000) comprised year 9 pupils (aged 13-14 years) in 45 mixed secondary comprehensive schools in England. The schools represented three levels of ability grouping in the lower school (years 7 to 9). Pupils responded to a questionnaire which explored their current set placement, their satisfaction with it, and their reasons for wanting to change. A substantial proportion of pupils expressed a wish to change set, most in an upward direction, mainly because the level of work was inappropriate.

Chow (2005) conducted a survey on Satisfaction among University Students in a Canadian Prairie City. The results demonstrated that a significant proportion of the 315 respondents were satisfied with their lives (N = 240, 76.2%). With regard to degree of satisfaction with different aspects of life, respondents expressed that they were most satisfied with relationship with mother, living environment, relationship with close friends, relationships with siblings, and living arrangement. Multiple ordinary least squares regression analysis revealed that respondents who indicated a higher Socio-Economic Status, achieved a higher grade point average, and were more satisfied with their academic experience, self-esteem, relationship with significant other, and living conditions; expressed a markedly higher level of satisfaction with life.

Perusal of literature reveals that Satisfaction for the teacher in relationships with her/his peers depends upon professional involvement with them. Sharing ideas and working collaboratively were mentioned as sources of satisfaction. Satisfaction for the teacher in relationships with the student depends upon student involvement. Lessons that are student centered rather than teacher-centered tend to be greater sources of satisfaction for teachers. Satisfaction to the teachers also comes from the profession itself. Recognition, staff development activities, the freedom and autonomy of the classroom brings Satisfaction to the teacher.
Research Studies Related with Intelligence

Das (1978) examined the relationship between information processing style and cognitive abilities. Non-verbal Intelligence measured through Raven’s Coloured Progressive thinking styles revealed positive correlation with legislative, judicial, monarchic, oligarchic, internal and external thinking styles.

Stewart (1979) investigated the difference in preferred learning styles between gifted and students of general population. He found that level of IQ had an effect on learning style preference.

Ricca (1983) carried out an investigation to explore the degree of difference in gifted students and general population students. The findings revealed that IQ was most highly related to negative preference for structure and preference for adult motivation.

Vignia (1983) conducted an investigation to identify the learning styles differences between gifted and non-gifted high school students. The result indicated that gifted high school students scored higher than non-gifted high school students on cognitive characteristics. The elements that were preferred by gifted high school students were presence of authority figure, visual, kinesthetic and late morning for studying.

Cody (1983) evaluated thinking styles of average, gifted and highly gifted students. The investigator explored that average intelligent students showed more integrated and left hemispheric style and gifted students had higher level of integrated style and right hemispheric style of thinking. Additionally highly gifted students point out more integrated and right hemispheric style.

Perrin (1984) carried out an investigation to analyze the relationship between Intelligence levels and learning styles of gifted and normal primary school children. The analysis of the data of this experimental study yielded no significant differences between Intelligence level and learning styles.

Sinatra et al. (1986) studied the relationship between learning style and Intelligence of reading disabled students. Intelligence was found to be positively related in case of formal design.

Hackman (1988) undertook a study to determine whether differences exist between gifted and non-gifted students in their learning style preferences. Findings of the study revealed that significant learning style differences existed between gifted and non
gifted students. Gifted students, as opposed to their non gifted peers, expressed strong positive preferences for a cluster of self directed instructional activities (independent study, discussion and teaching games) and strong negative preferences for several teacher directed activities (lecture and programmed instruction) whereas on the other hand non-gifted students showed positive preferences for a cluster of teacher-directed activities (programmed instruction, lecture and teaching games) and milder preferences for instructional activities (Project and discussion). From this, it may be inferred that intelligence has a relation with learning style.

Miller-Jones (1989) examined the relationship between Intelligence and hemispheric processing preference. The most discriminating function was not found to be significant.

Verma and Tiku (1990) ascertained the effect of Socio-Economic Status and general Intelligence on learning styles of high school students. It was observed that the main effect of general intelligence on learning styles did not come out to be significant except in case of avoidant learning style. The low intelligent students showed greater mean score on avoidant learning style as compared to high intelligent students. Another finding revealed that there was no significant interaction between socio-economic status and general intelligence with regard to independent, dependent, participant, collaborative, competitive and avoidant learning styles of high school students.

Gallucci (1991) investigated the relationship among the learning style preferences and Intelligence of gifted and normal intermediate students. The data revealed that among the fourth grader, the normal students were discriminated from the gifted students on the variables of noise and responsibility on LSI scales whereas for fifth and sixth grade gifted and normal students, data indicated that gifted students scored higher on the LSI scales: persistence, structure, evening and afternoon at 0.03 level.

Kagan (1992) observed that high school students with average I.Q. preferred instruction while discussion and independent study were preferred more by gifted high school students.

Livengood (1992) studied Student’s Motivational Goals and Beliefs about Effort and Ability as They Relate to College Academic Success. Study of 125 first-year students at Peabody College (Vanderbilt University, Tennessee) investigated psychological processes underlying college success. Results indicated students’ rules of reasoning about
effort and ability, motivational goals, and confidence in their intelligence were strongly related to types of participation in college and levels of satisfaction.

Reyes and Jason (1993), conducted *Pilot Study Examining Factors Associated with Academic Success for Hispanic High School Students*. They found characteristics distinguishing successful and failing Hispanic innercity high school students, using 24 high dropout-risk and 24 low dropout-risk Hispanic tenth graders (22 males and 26 females). When compared to high-risk counterparts, low-risk students were more satisfied with their school and maintained social groups predominantly free of gang members.

Stenberg and Grigorenko (1993) explored the thinking styles of the gifted children. The findings of the study revealed the correlation of the measure of mental self-government with IQ. Three styles correlated significantly with scholastic aptitude of math (judicial, global and liberal, all positively), but not with SAT verbal. There was no difference between gifted and non-gifted children. On the other hand, on requiring children actually to do tasks, the gifted children proved to be more legislative, judicial and liberal than non-gifted children, while non-gifted were more executive.

Kumari (1995) investigated the learning styles of Socio-Economically advantaged and disadvantaged adolescents. She found a close connection between intelligence and school performance in plethora.

O’Neil (1996) opined that emotional intelligence involves a cluster of skills, including self-control, zeal, persistence, and self-motivation. Every child must be taught the essentials of handling anger, managing conflicts, developing empathy, and controlling impulses. Schools must help children recognize and manage their emotions. Educators should model emotional intelligence in caring, respectful interactions with students.

Fujiki et al. (1996) reported that convergent and divergent learning styles were significantly related to stronger verbal versus non-verbal reasoning.

Goleman (1996) concluded IQ contributes about 20% to the factors that determine life success, which leaves 80% to other forces.

Verma (1996) explored the differences in learning style preferences of the gifted adolescents. The results revealed that intellectually gifted adolescents as a group had preference for individualistic, flexible, visual, field-independent, long attention span, motivation centered and environment oriented learning style over non-individualistic,
aural, field-dependent, short attention span, motivation non-centered and environment free learning style respectively.

Sternberg (1997) reported that the ability test scores were positively correlated with legislative and the judicial styles. The correlations were modest, however, for the legislative, 0.17 with analytical thinking. 0.19 with creative thinking, for the judicial students in relation to intelligence, locus of control and personality types. She reported that intelligence was found to be related to short attention span vs. long attention span learning style in case of socio-economically advantaged students. High intelligence students preferred short attention span whereas low intelligence students exhibited their preference for long attention span style of learning.

Marton (1997) observed that there were significant differences between the high verbal ability low performance and high performance low verbal ability groups on the left-brain style and integrated-brain style across. Latter group tended to be more integrated in style of thinking former group.

Nelson (1999) conducted an exploratory study on Middle School Improvement Initiatives. A study of 358 students at a western middle school examined academic, general, home, and social variables. Regarding self-esteem, girls viewed themselves more positively than boys in social experiences. Low achievers were not as satisfied with school facilities as high-and middle-achievers.

Woolfolk (2001) was of the opinion that when the number of years of education is held constant, IQ scores and school achievement are not highly correlated with income and success in later life. The recent evidence indicating that boys learn differently from girls has been provided by Gurian and Henley (2001); Hawkes (2001); Noble and Bradford (2000) etc. Besag (1997) found that boys inappropriate school behavior is generally more physically and verbally abusive than that of girls; Martino and Pallotta-Chiarolli (2001) in their study included gender as a variable for consideration. They studied 87 students in the age group 7-8 years across four schools in Perth, Western Australia. The four schools were chosen to investigate possible socio-economic differences, as well as differences between the government and non-government sector. Both non-government schools were Catholic, and together with the government schools, were selected using convenience sampling techniques within predetermined SES areas.
A low correlation was found between general behaviour ranking and academic performance ranking because of the influence of other significant factors such as personal attribution; the influence of SES; and speculative factors underlying the concepts under.

**Vandna (2004)** investigated the relationship between emotional Intelligence critical thinking, personality types, learning styles of prospective secondary teachers and reported that low emotional intelligent prospective secondary teachers had higher level of reflective, intuition and verbal learning style than high emotional intelligent prospective secondary teachers. High critical thinking prospective secondary teachers tended to use active and sequential learning style more than low critical thinking prospective secondary teachers. Low critical thinking prospective secondary teachers tended to employ verbal learning style more than high critical thinking prospective secondary teachers. Style, 0.15 with analytical thinking, 0.20 with creative thinking, 0.23 with practical thinking. The executive style, in contrast, was negatively correlated with the scores on the test – 0.15 with analytical thinking, and – 0.16 with creative thinking.

**Nettelback (2005)** reviewed past and current psychometric theories about intelligence and critically evaluated the usefulness of modern IQ tests in guiding decisions within an educational context. Current evidence supports the importance of general ability, as well as several different specific abilities, although whether emotional intelligence can yet be affirmed is not clear. Despite strong evidence that Intelligence and IQ must be different constructs, he suggested that the latter provides the best available means for investigating and making decisions about the former, with higher validity for this purpose than has frequently been released. He has recommended aptitude and achievement testing as useful tools for educational settings, provided they sample a broad range of different intellectual domains in addition to general ability. He has emphasised the importance of such tests being culturally compatible with the child’s background.

**Kroners (2005)** undertook Intelligence assessment with computer simulations. He investigated relationship between Intelligence and computer-simulated tasks that mimic real-world problem-solving behaviour and has discussed design requirements that simulations have to meet in order to be suitable for intelligence assessment. One hundred one participants took a test of inductive reasoning (BIS-K) and used the simulation MultiFlux (Intelligenzdiagnostik per Computer simulation i.e. intelligence assessment via computer simulation) designed to reduce the uncontrolled influence of prior knowledge, provide an evaluation-free exploration phase, and incorporate measures that are based on a
theoretical model of simulation performance (Kroner; 2001). Reliabilities of MultiFlux simulation performance scores were above .90, and the correlation of MultiFlux scores with BIS-K intelligence was (with r=65; adjusted r=75) comparable to typical correlations among traditional intelligence tests. SEM analysis favored theoretical performance model with three latent MultiFlux variables over a model with a single factor.

Furham (2006) conducted a study on Sex Differences in Parents’ Estimations of Their own and Their Children’s Intelligence. In this study, 141 British parents estimated their own and one of their children’s IQ on their overall intelligence as well as Gardner’s (1983) “seven multiple intelligence”. Replicating previous studies, fathers gave higher self-estimates on overall, mathematical and spatial intelligence than did mothers. Factor analysis of the seven self-estimates yielded two factors: cognitive and non-cognitive intelligence and there was a significant difference on the former with fathers giving higher self-estimates than mothers. Parental estimates of children’s overall intelligence were shown to significantly correlate with children’s actual IQ score (r=0.44), derived from standardized tests of verbal, numerical and perceptual ability. The male advantage for overall intelligence estimates, which was hypothesized, was shown for parental self-estimations but not for estimation of children’s intelligence, which showed a female advantage perhaps because girls in this sample actually had higher IQs.

Schmidt and Cagran (2006) investigated Classroom Climate in Regular Primary School Settings with Children with Special Needs. They studied the classroom climate in two settings of the 6th-grade class (a setting of children with special needs and a setting without children with special needs), focusing on aspects of satisfaction and cohesiveness on one side and friction, competitiveness and difficulties on the other. The study results indicate the existence of both positive and negative consequences of the integration of hearing-impaired pupils. Heterogeneity achieved by the presence of children with special needs included positive benefits for all pupils in the mainstream classroom and helped to prevent friction and a competitive atmosphere, and provided opportunities for accepting exceptionalities, and developing social skills, ethical values and empathic abilities among school peers. On the other hand was concern related to difficulties of cognition, the only dimension on which comparative settings statistically and significantly differed concerning the classroom climate with integrated pupils.

Van Der Mass and Dolan (2006) have presented a Dynamical Model of General Intelligence: The Positive Manifold of Intelligence by Mutualism. Scores on cognitive
tasks used in intelligence tests correlate positively with each other. The positive manifold is often explained by posting a dominant latent variable, the g factor, associated with a single quantitative cognitive or biological process or capacity. They have proposed a new explanation of the positive manifold based on a dynamical model, in which reciprocal causation or mutualism plays a central role. It is shown that the positive manifold emerges purely by positive beneficial interactions between cognitive processes during development. A single underlying g factor plays no role in the model. The model offers explanations of important findings in intelligence research, such as the hierarchical factor structure of intelligence, the low predictability of intelligence from early childhood performance, the integration/differentiation effect, the increase in heritability of g and the Jensen effect besides being consistent with current explanations of the Flynn effect.

Ojo et al. (2006) examined the nature of open and distance learning institutions as organizations where synergy of efforts of all personnel is required in order to achieve the aims and objectives of the institutions. They explored the huge infrastructural and personnel requirements of distance learning institutions, especially at inception, and the wherewithal needed for the institutions to survive the challenges of the contemporary knowledge milieu and stand the test of time while ensuring the quality and standard of all the certificates that will be awarded over time. The author sought to evaluate the role of multiple-intelligence in the administration of open and distance learning institutions, given that multiple-intelligence allows for improvement in achievement, performance and skills. Sternberg et al. (1994, 97) concluded that the importance of multiple intelligence in the actualization of the broad goals and the specific objectives of distance learning institutions cannot be overemphasized in the various aspects of the institutions framework of distance learning.

Humphrey and Curran (2007) have noted that there has been an increased interest in the role of emotional intelligence in both the academic success of students and their emotional adjustment in school. However, promotion of emotional intelligence in schools has proven a controversial pursuit, challenging as it does traditional “rationalist” views of education. Furthermore, research findings in this area have been inconsistent at best.

Colom and Fbores (2007) explored whether or not Intelligence tests’ scores predict individual differences in scholastic achievement irrespective of SES factors such parents income and education. The variables of interest were analyzed considering three
independent samples of participants comprising a total 641 children. The participants belonged to a Brazilian School characterized by broad and comprehensive ranges in intelligence, scholastic achievement and SES factors. The results indicated that SES factors do not predict children differences in scholastic achievement, whereas children’s intelligence tests' scores predict their scholastic differences. These results underscore personal intelligence as a “genuine” predictor of individual differences in scholastic achievement.

Fagan and Holland (2007) studied Racial Equality in Intelligence: Predictions from a Theory of Intelligence as Processing. African-Americans and Whites were asked to solve problems typical of those administered on standard tests of Intelligence. Half of the problems were solvable on the basis of information generally available to either race and/or on the basis of information newly learned. Such knowledge did not vary with race. Other problems were only solvable on the basis of specific previous knowledge such as that tested on conventional IQ tests. Such specific knowledge did vary with race and was shown to be subject to test bias. Differences in knowledge within a race and differences in knowledge between races were found to have different determinants. Race was unrelated to the “g” factor. Cultural differences in the provision of information account for racial differences in IQ.

Research Studies Related to Socio-Economic Status

Kaeley (1990) investigated The Influence of Socio-Economic Status, Entry Style and Instructional Variables on the Learning of Mathematics in a Neo-Literate Society. The influence of socio-economic status, entry style and instructional variables on post-secondary mathematics performance of students in New Guinea was investigated. The pattern of results indicated that the performance of students could be more meaningfully grouped based on entry style rather than on mode of instruction.

Adogke (1992) examined Relationship between Parental Socio-economic Status, Sex and Initial Pubertal Problems among School-Going Adolescents in Nigeria and found the relationship between parental socio-economic status (SES), sex and initial pubertal problems among Nigerian adolescents (n=700). He found that boys from low SES groups experienced more physical problems than other groups. Low SES students experienced more health problems and boys experienced more problems than girls. Sex was important factor in the experience of social problems.
Riverin-Simard (1992) conducted studies on Career paths and socio-economic status. Interviews with 786 adults, randomly assigned after stratifying according to 3 socio-economic classes, 9 age strata, 2 genders, and 3 working sectors. He identified three vocational trajectories within the three social classes, each comprising nine phases of working life. Implications concern equilibrated integration of adaptive and creative functions and vocational continuity within time-spaces.

- Bryant et al. (1994) as well as Stipek and Ryan (1997) reported that SES differences in these literacy skills emerge very early. Low SES children enter school, on average, with skills dramatically below their higher SES peers, and they tend to remain behind. In a NCES survey (2000), only 38% of children entering kindergarten whose mothers had less education were able to recognize letters, compared to 86% of children with highly educated mothers.

- Sammons (1995) undertook research on Gender, Ethnic, and Socio-Economic Differences in attainment and Progress: A longitudinal Analysis of Student Achievement over 9 years, and discovered that, although differences in achievement related to gender and socioeconomic factors remained consistent and generally increased over time, greater change was found in patterns of ethnic differences.

- Pearson et al. (2000) summarized that the educational attitudes and expectations differ with SES, as do parent’s educational behaviors such as early reading and attention to language. Children from low SES families may receive, on average, a total of only 25 hours of one-on one picture book reading by school entry, compared to 1000 to 1700 hours for middle class children.

National Science Foundation (2001) reported that overall achievement of low SES boys is poorer than that of girls. This difference is likely due, at least in part, to high rates of externalizing problems. At the same time, females are generally unlikely to pursue math and science related careers. The purpose of this research was to establish the relationship between Socio-Economic Status and participation and achievement in the vocational education and training (VET) sector. The research investigated the extent to which training opportunities provided by the public VET system are taken up by people from different socio-economic backgrounds. This research found a strong relationship between participation and socio economic status in Australian VET sector. VET participation was greatest in low socio-economic areas (12.7 students per 100 population),
a figure significantly higher than the national participation rate (10.8%). By contrast, high socio-economic status areas recorded a significantly lower participation rate (8.7%) compared with the national average and other socio-economic regions.

The over-representation of students from low socio-economic areas is partly due to the high participation of students from regions outside the capital cities, which tend to be low socioeconomic areas. Students from remote (16.4%) and rural (13.8%) regions have significantly greater VET participation than students from non capital metropolitan area (10.6%) and capital cities (9.5%). Students from low socio-economic areas are more likely to study lower level qualification, especially non award/miscellaneous education (32.5%) and certificate I and II levels (31.8% combined) rather than certificate III and IV levels (28.7% combined) or diploma or higher levels (6.8%). Research found that students from lower socio-economic areas obtain better than average achievements. Students from low socio-economic areas were awarded a higher proportion of qualification (30.5%) than their share of total enrolment (28.8%).

- **Vitaro et al. (2001)** investigated *Negative Social Experiences and Dropping Out of School*. They developed a prediction model of early withdrawal from school, using a sample of low Socio-Economic Status (SES) boys (n=751), with emphasis on the role of peer related variables. They found that power of early disruptiveness and early academic performance predicted dropout; but the effects of these variables were dependent upon the dropout age.

- **Pianta et al. (2002)** found that the quality of preschool, kindergarten and grade schools have all been linked to achievement, and low SES children tend to have less access to quality education. These findings have been consistent across wide definitions and measures of quality, including physical classroom. Clearer differentiation of the most important specific factors could guide resource allocation. Studies focusing on teachers have indicated the importance of their role, and teachers have lower expectations and more negative perceptions of low SES students than their higher SES peers.

**Young and Johnson (2004)** studied *The Impact of an SES based Model on a College’s Undergraduate Admissions Outcomes*. Findings revealed that use of the SES-based model would have led to a more academically qualified class than in the original admitted class while maintaining substantially greater student diversity that was found under the academic model. An admissions policy based on preferences for socio-
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economically disadvantaged applicants appears to hold promise for other colleges and universities with similar institutional and applicant characteristics.

**Torimiro et al. (2004)** investigated the perceived roles of African rural parents in child education and development. It examined among other things, some selected personal and socio-economic characteristics of parents and their level of role performance in the education and development of their children and recommendations were made for enhancing adequate educational development of African children. The study was conducted in rural communities of Oyo State in Southwestern Nigeria with the use of an interview schedule to source information from 186 parents (and their children aged 11-18 years). The parents were randomly selected from each of the four zones (Oyo, Saki, Ibadan/Ibarapa and Ogbomoso) in the study area. Pearson’s correlation and Spearman’s rank correlation analyses were used to determine the relationship between the socio-economic characteristics of parents and the level of development of the school child, and the congruence between role perception and role performance of parents. The study revealed that variables such as educational level ($r=0.188$), income level ($r=0.172$), cosmpoliteness ($r=0.088$) and membership of the Parents-Teachers’ Association ($r=0.162$) had a positive and significant relationship with their level of role performance. Also, a highly significant relationship was established between the level of education and development of a rural child and the level of role performance by the parents ($r=0.118$).

**Nittrouer and Burton (2005)** analyzed The role of Early Language Experience in the Development of Speech Perception and Phonological Processing Abilities. The evidence was collected from 5-years-olds with histories of otitis media with effusion and low socio-economic status. They tested the hypothesis that early language experience facilitates the development of language specific perceptual weighting strategies believed to be critical for accessing phonetic structure. In turn, that structure allows for efficient storage and retrieval of words in verbal working memory, which is necessary for sentence comprehension. Forty-nine Participants were evenly distributed among four groups: those with chronic otitis media with effusion (“OME”), low socio-economic Status (“low-SES”), both conditions (“both”), or neither condition (“control”). All children participated in tasks of speech perception and phonological awareness. Children in the “control” and “OME” groups participated in additional tasks examining verbal working memory, sentence comprehension, and temporal processing. The temporal tasks could be explained...
by temporal-processing deficits. Children in the three experimental groups demonstrated similar results to each other, but different from the “control” group for speech perception and phonological awareness. Children in the “OME” group differed from those in the “control” group on tasks involving verbal working memory and sentence comprehension, but not temporal processing. Overall these results supported the major hypothesis explored, but failed to support the hypothesis that language problems are explained to any extent by temporal processing problems.

Walker et al. (2005) undertook a Genetically Sensitive Investigation of the Effects of the School Environment and Socio-Economic Status on Academic Achievement in Seven years old. Although it is well established that school characteristics (SCH) and socio-economic Status (SES) are associated with academic achievement (ACH), these correlations are not necessarily causal. As academic achievement shows substantial genetic influence, it is useful to embed such investigations in genetically sensitive designs in order to examine environment influences more precisely by controlling genetic influences on ACH. In the first study of this kind for academic achievement, data were collected for 1,063 same sex pairs of seven year old MZ and DZ twins for teacher assessed ACH, UK statistics on SCH, and parent reported SES. Exclusive of genetic influence on school achievement, shared environment (environmental influences that make siblings similar) accounts for 12% of the variance in academic achievement. SCH accounts for 17% and SES accounts for 83% of this shared environmental variance. Exclusive of genetic and shared environment influence including SCH and SES, non-shared environment (environmental influences that do not make siblings similar) accounts for 19% of the variance in academic achievement.

Casanova et al. (2005) examined Influence of Family and Socio-Demographic Variables on Students with Low Academic Achievement. They compared distribution of parental educational styles and the scores reported both by parents and students for various family characteristics (acceptance, control, involvement, and expectations) and socio demographic factors (socio economic status, family structure, number of children, and order of birth of the children) in a group of adolescents with normal achievement (n=105) and in a group which present low achievement (n=205). Similarly, they examined which variables best predict academic achievement in the two groups and of adolescents. The results indicated differences in the distribution of parental styles in the two groups for the majority of the variables analyzed. They also observed a differential pattern in the
prediction of academic success. In the group of adolescents with normal academic achievement, socio demographic variables better predict achievement; for students with low achievement, family variables play a more important role in predicting achievement.

Fransoo et al. (2005) reported in the book “The whole Truth: Socioeconomic Status and Educational Outcomes” that the educators have long known that children from families of lower socio-economic status do not do as well in school as those from wealthier families. This relationship is not deterministic; many children from disadvantage backgrounds do perform well, and many children from advantaged backgrounds struggle. But the overall trend in clear and its influence is powerful. Indeed, in many studies of student performance, family background is the strongest single predictor of educational outcomes.

Korat (2005) ascertained role of Contextual and Non-Contextual Knowledge in Emergent Literacy Development and undertook comparison between Children from Low SES and Middle SES communities. This research had three aims: first, to examine the relationship between two components of emergent literacy: contextual (environmental print, print functions, identifying literacy activities) and non contextual knowledge (e.g., letters’ names, phonemic awareness, concept of print, etc.); second, to explore the relationship between children’s knowledge of each of the two components and their socio economic status (SES) level in the community; and third, to study if and how these two components predict children’s word recognition and emergent writing. The sample included 70 kindergarteners from two communities: 34 from a low SES community and 36 from a middle SES community. Results confirmed the existence of the two proposed distinct components of emergent literacy knowledge: the contextual and non contextual. Compared with their higher SES peers, low SES children had poorer contextual and non contextual knowledge. Finally, word recognition and emergent writing were predicted by non contextual components: phonemic awareness, letters’ names, and concept of print knowledge, and not by contextual knowledge, age, or SES group.

Commons et al. (2006) reviewed the Leadership, Cross-Cultural contact, Socio-Economic Status, and formal Operational Reasoning about Moral Dilemmas among Mexican Non-Literate Adults and High school Students and proposed that various cultural, social and educational factors may influence moral reasoning. Two studies on moral reasoning were conducted in a Mexican – United States border city. The first study found that even some unschooled, non-literate adults reason at a high stage (formal operations).
Exposure to different cultural and organizational contexts, in addition to assumption of leadership roles, was associated with such reasoning. Likewise, the second study found that high school students who were identified as leaders, especially those with cross-cultural contact and those who were of high socio-economic status, reasoned at higher stages than those who were not. Overall, stage of reasoning increased with age.

Aharony (2006) carried out a investigation on The use of Deep and Surface Learning Strategies among Students Learning English as a Foreign Language in an Internet Environment. This learning process was based on the Biggs and Moore’s teaching-learning model (Biggs and Moore, 1993). The research was aimed to explore the use of the deep and surface strategies in an internet environment among EFL students who come from different socio-economic backgrounds. One hundred forty eight Israeli junior and high school students participated in this research. The methodology was based on special computer software: Screen Cam, which recorded the students’ learning process. In addition, expert judges completed a questionnaire which examined and categorized the student’ learning strategies. The research findings show a clear preference of participants from all socio-economic backgrounds towards the surface learning strategy. The findings also showed that students from the medium to high socio-economic background used both learning strategies more frequently than low socio-economic students. The results reflect the habits that students acquire during their adjustment process throughout their education careers.

Korat, Ofra; Shamir, A. (2007) investigated Electronic Books versus adult reader – effects on children’s Emergent literacy as a Function of social class. The study was conducted on 128, 5-to 6-year-old Kindergarteners; 64 children from each of two socio-economic status (SES) groups: low (LSES) and middle (MSES). In each group, children were randomly assigned to one of three subgroups. The two intervention groups included three book reading sessions each; children in one group individually read the electronic book; in the second group, the children read the same printed book by an adult; children in the third group, which served as a control, received the regular kindergarten programme. Pre and post intervention emergent literacy measures included vocabulary, word recognition and phonological awareness. Compared with the control group, the children’s vocabulary scores in both intervention groups improved following reading activity. Children from both interventions groups and both SES groups showed a similarly good level of story’s comprehension.
**Introduction**

Dar and Getz (2007) conducted studies on *Learning socio-economic status and student placement of undergraduate studies in Israel*. Among students of higher ability, those of higher SES opt for prestigious professions, such as medicine, law, natural or social sciences while those of lower SES choose economics, management, computer science, paramedical professions and engineering. For students of lower learning ability, the differentiating effect of SES is smaller. Those of higher SES prefer university to college, even if they have to study in a less prestigious field, such as education or humanities. On the other hand, students of lower ability and lower SES apply to colleges for studies such as education, social sciences, computer science economics, management and engineering. Overall, students who master financial resources and higher cultural capital prefer more “theoretical” fields in a more extended course of study, while students of lower SES assume more practical studies, which will enable them a faster entry to paying positions on the job market.

Mcleod (2007) explored the prevalence of communication disorders compared with other learning needs in 14,500 primary and secondary school students. Overall 5309 students were identified as having some area of learning need in the first year and 4845 students were identified two years later. In order of prevalence, the areas of learning need were: specific learning difficulty (17.93% in wave 1; 19.10% in wave 2), communication disorder (13.04%; 12.40%), English as a second or other language (9.16%; 5.80%), behavioral/emotional difficulty (8.16%; 6.10%), early achiever/advanced learner (7.30%; 5.50%), physical/medical disability (1.52%; 1.40%), intellectual disability (1.38%; 1.20%), hearing impairment (0.96%; 0.80%), and visual impairment (0.16%; 0.30%). The male: female ratio for all children was 1.57:1 (wave 1) and 1.66:1 (wave 2) and was the highest for the categories of behavioral/emotional difficulty, communication disorders. There were significant differences between learning need and Socio-Economic Status quantile for all areas except early achievers/advanced learners and physical/medical disability. There was a higher prevalence of behavioral/emotional difficulty, and intellectual disability, in the lower socio economic status quantiles and a higher prevalence of communication disorders in the mid to high socio economic status quantiles. More children were identified as having an additional learning need in grades 1-3 (5-9 years of age). The children who were perceived as requiring the highest level of teacher support were those with an intellectual disability.
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

School plays a critical role in educating adolescents to lead them to their destiny. The life of the student is getting more complex everyday. It is a nation’s responsibility to provide an effective educational system. It is very true that today wasted effort in education is increasing day by day. The rate of failure is rising and creating serious problems of dissatisfaction with education and school system itself.

It is the direct responsibility of each school to provide adequate academic curriculum and co-curriculum choices as well as facilities for both teachers and students in order to infuse in them a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction on all dimensions of life including school. Various factors have been found to cause dissatisfaction among the students. As far as the tenth grade students are concerned, it is a very crucial point of the studies, where they have to be cautious in their decision because it will be a decisive factor for whole of their lives. Whether he will go to arts, science or commerce stream is not very clear to him. Neither does he know whether to opt for vocational courses. He is in a transient phase of career, which would have an over-riding impact on his whole life. The secondary educational goals can be grouped into two main points:

- To encourage students to pursue their higher studies.
- To encourage students to know how to make decisions correctly to choose suitable educational field according to their interests and needs.

It is expected that education would support socio-economic changes in a systematic and harmonious pattern, corresponding to the limitation of resources and needs of individuals, communities and societies.

Identifying ways and means to decrease such dissatisfaction and problems will help educational administration to improve the educational system. The present investigation has been undertaken with the aim of providing a base of ideas, suggestion and solutions, which could be meaningful to the educators, schools and policy makers, especially the government set up of education.

Hence, it is necessary to investigate the satisfaction and dissatisfaction among student arising out of deficiencies, if at all, of socio-economic status and intelligence. The present investigation is an humble attempt to examine the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of tenth grade students with school in relation to their socio-economic status and intelligence.
STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

TO STUDY SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION WITH SCHOOL OF TENTH GRADE STUDENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND INTELLIGENCE

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

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).

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.

HYPOTHESES

- 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 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.
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• **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 Socio-Economic Status relating to Students’ Discipline.
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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.
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- **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 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 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 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.