LANGUAGE IN INDIA Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow Volume 12 : 3 March 2012 ISSN 1930-2940

Managing Editor: M. S. Thirumalai, Ph.D. Editors: B. Mallikarjun, Ph.D. Sam Mohanlal, Ph.D. B. A. Sharada, Ph.D. A. R. Fatihi, Ph.D. Lakhan Gusain, Ph.D. Jennifer Marie Bayer, Ph.D. S. M. Ravichandran, Ph.D. G. Baskaran, Ph.D. L. Ramamoorthy, Ph.D.

Exploring the Preferences of Safety & Security Needs of Secondary School Students

Abdul Ghafoor Nasir Muhammad Mirza, Ph.D.

Abstract

It is a reality that in other countries, the researchers, psychologists and educationists have gone deep to explore the potentials of variety of needs. But in Pakistan, neither any commission on national education nor any education policy proposed or recommended research studies to assess and identify the Preferences of Safety & Security Needs of the students. Due to which after a short time all curricula have lost their values and slowed down the achievement of educational objectives.

So this present study was designed to identify the Preferences of Safety & Security Needs of students of ages of 14+ to 16+ year that may influence curriculum development for classes (IX & X) of the schools located in the district Faisalabad. The data were collected from 10% of students of urban & rural secondary schools. So the total strength of students of sample of urban secondary schools was 248 and rural secondary school was 198. The total strength of students of the sample was 446. The questionnaires were used as a research instruments. The responses were fathered through a structured questionnaires which had propositions (statements) for which the respondents had to indicate their opinions in terms of strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree' (i.e., 5 point scale) about the factors.

The means of the samples were tested on t and F tests of significance. The means of various groups of each sample were also compared to see the effects of intervening variables. For Language in India <u>www.languageinindia.com</u> 12 : 3 March 2012 Abdul Ghafoor Nasir Exploring the Preferences of Safety & Security Needs of Secondary School Students 310 the identification of importance, existence, availability and non-availability of need influencing development of curriculum. The frequencies of responses from each sample of respondents on choices (strongly agree to strongly disagree) were tested on chi-square test of significance to see that there were no chance discrepancies between responses and to find out that the groups significantly agreed or disagreed with the statements in the instrument.

Keywords: Exploring the preferences of Safety & Security Needs curriculum development.

Introduction

All curricula are subject-centered. They may be provided a compulsory core of subjects to give every pupil, the knowledge; he needs to live a useful and happy life in the fast developing society. But they are not individual centered, as the individual is a centre of learning, a mean of national progress and the owner of the future.

Neither any education policy or commission, nor any curriculum worker dared to peep into the individual's miserable living, worst poverty and frustration; not any survey is being made to identify the preferences of Belongingness Needs of the individual that are the actual sources of motivation and the sure foundations of curriculum development process.

Thus the information about the Belongingness Needs of the learner is an important source for curriculum development. So the focus of the study is upon the identification of Belongingness needs of the students, which are always imperative too and may influence curriculum development. The identification of those needs is also necessary before a suitable strategy for the process of development of the curriculum starts because the curriculum is the nerve system of education.

The question that remains to be answered is:

What are the students "Safety & Security Needs" which may serve as pre-requisites for the successful development of curriculum? Hence the researcher undertook this study to answer the question.

Review of Related Literature

To drive a set of students Safety & Security Needs, the researchers, educationists and psychologists have long speculated about the fundamental psychological needs of learners, beginning with McDougall (1908), Freud (1920), Jung (1933), Murray (1938), Havighurst (1949), Hull (1951), Maslow (1954), Bloom (1956), Erikson (1963), Luella Cole (1988), Greenberg (1995), Reis, (1996), Caspi (2000), Brewer (2001), Sheldon (2001), Gray (2002), Robert (2002), Davis (2003), Kenrick (2003), Thomas (2003), to the present day, Pintrich, (2003: 667) concluded that the research identified and classified a vast realm of student needs to make fruitful teaching & learning strategies. In addition, researchers and educators focused on the development of new instructional interventions, design projects, reform curricula and innovative technological tools confront problems of student motivation to learn from all of these

reform efforts. (Pintrich, 2003:325).

It is a reality that in other countries, the researchers, psychologists and educationists have gone deep to explore the potentials of variety of needs. But in Pakistan, neither any commission on national education nor any education policy proposed or recommended research studies to assess and identify the student needs, wants, urges, aims and motives etc. Due to which after a short time all curricula have lost their values and slowed down the achievement of educational objectives.

These needs emerge primarily, when the physiological and safety needs have been met. An individual motivated on this level longs for affectionate relationships with others, for a place in his or her family and, or reference groups. Group membership becomes a dominant goal for the individual.

Maslow (1970:176) cleared that, "the organism is so designed that it needs love, in the same way that automobiles are so designed that they need gas and oil". In school level belongingness and love have great values". Bryce, B. Hudgins (1983:296) explained that "school settings, attempts to satisfy affiliation need is translated into goals to make friends, to be included in group activities and to be accepted by others. When children's needs for love and affection are frustrated and they fail to develop friendship or aggressive toward others and the system, or they may withdraw".

Lindgren (1973:24) expressed that, "the need for love or attention appears at times as a need for maintenance and at other times as a need for enhancement. An individual is more competent and effective if he feels be "really belongs" and if he is able to function as a group member". Hijelle, Larry A. (1981:371) pointed out that "accordingly, a person will feel keenly the pangs of loneliness, social ostracism, friendlessness, and rejection, especially when induced by absence of friends, relatives, a spouse, or children".

Then the reflection of biological and psychological theories was adopted as a basic ground for the study. Henry A. Murray (1938:152-266) "A Need Theory of Personality" drew a biological sketch of human needs. Researcher also drew from Maslow (1970:35-51). A Humanistic Theory of Personality presented a novel hierarchical theory of Human needs for the identification of students needs. Bloom, (1956:1-4) and Krathwohl, (1964) analyzed the cognitive domain and affective domain and psychomotor domain for knowledge and understanding perception.

The researcher drew from Kennon, M. Sheldon, Andrew, J. Elliot Youngmee Kim (2001:325)who compared three studies of 10 canditate psychological needs in a attempt to determine which are truly most frindamental for human,. They enaluated 10 needs of the candidates comparetively "what is satisfying about satisfy events"? Then researcher drew from Jhan,W.Santrock (2001:417) the need of affiliatin . This need involves the motive to be with others. Sand (2000:193)denoted that affiliation refers to the needs connect and relate to others.

Reseacher derived the needs of associaton and group decision making, for this, Manas

Ray (2006:36-37) also presents the social development of the individual according to his social needs.

Thus the information about the nature of the learner is an important source for curriculum development. So the focus of the study is upon the identification of self- esteem needs, which are always imperative too and may influence curriculum development. The identification of those preferences of Safety & Security needs is also necessary before a suitable strategy for the process of development of the curriculum starts because the curriculum is the nerve system of education.

The social security, economic security and schooling security are the factors, which create confidence and harmony for life. Belongingness, social acceptance friendship, love, affection, companionship among the organizations, "the family, teams, clubs, union, congregation, class, the school", are the aspects of safety needs.

Charles, J. Kokaska and Donn, E. Brolin (1985:155) denoted that "As students acquire personal-social skills of self-confidence, socially responsible behavior, interpersonal skills, independence and problem solving then they should be able to determine whether needs such as high pay, independence, achievement, praise, responsibility, authority, use of talents and abilities, advancement, security, social services, variety and social status are major importance in this future work."

In a class each pupil wants, security, of being an active and successful member of his classes. He wants the approval and friendship of his teacher and peer friends. The related literature was reviewed and the safety & security needs were summed up as parental love, self-assertion, environment, funding facility, poverty, retardation, financial helps, gregariousness, schooling security, appreciation, interaction, learning community, punishment, frustration, self-recognition, competency, affection, expectation, fulfillment, satisfaction, placement, Conveyance, acceptance, expression, aggression, rejection, honor, protection, scolding, money, logo and flag and tuition fund.

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to identify the Preferences of safety and security Needs of boys of ages 14^+ to 16^+ year that may influence curriculum development for classes (ix & x) of the schools located under the jurisdiction of Board of Intermediate & Secondary Education Faisalabad

Method

The study was conducted on the basis of cross-sectional survey research. The data was collected from 10% of students of urban & rural secondary schools. So the total strength of students of sample of urban secondary schools was 248 and the total strength of students of sample of rural secondary school was 198. The total strength of students of the samples was 446. Lack of an adequate instrument to measure the importance, existence, availability or non-availability of students needs, a Self-Reporting Rating Scale (SRRS) was developed. This

instrument was included items constructed on the basis of likert scale. This measure was to ask the respondents to respond to a series of 9 items by indicating their level of satisfaction on a five point scale from "Strongly agree" to strongly agree" to "strongly disagree".

The responses of the samples were, then tested on chi-square test of significance for the elimination of chance discrepancies between responses on the both sides of agreement - disagreement continuum. The data was analyzed by applying F test, t test to see how far the responses were comparable and dependable. The criterion for F test, t test and chi-square was set at .01 and .05. Frequencies of responses to each item were calculated with their percentages; Means of responses were calculated in case of rating scale; Means were calculated for responses from all the two samples (i.e. Teachers and Students). As the sample was divided into two groups, correlation among various groups was determined to establish relationship among the groups.

The responses for all items were rank ordered according to their frequencies, means and percentages to determine their importance, existence and availability; Correlation among responses from students and teachers of secondary schools was determined to establish nearness and relationship of data. The responses of the samples were, then tested on chi-square test of significance for the elimination of chance discrepancies between responses on the both sides of agreement—disagreement continuum. The data was analyzed by applying F test, t test to see how far the responses were comparable and dependable. The criterion for F test, t test and chi-square was set at .01 and .05. Frequencies of responses to each item were calculated with their percentages; Means of responses were calculated in case of rating scale; Means were calculated for responses from all the two samples (i.e. Teachers and Students). As the sample was divided into two groups, correlation among various groups was determined to establish relationship among the groups.

The responses for all items were rank ordered according to their frequencies, means and percentages to determine their importance, existence and availability; Correlation among responses from students and teachers of secondary schools was determined to establish nearness and relationship of data.

Results

The samples were randomly selected. The questionnaires based on "SRRS" according to the belongingness needs of the students, were delivered to the samples of the students of urban and rural secondary schools of the district Faisalabad. The returns from students were 446. The frequencies of responses to each item were calculated with item percentages. Means were computed for responses from all the two samples (students of urban and rural secondary schools). As the samples were divided into two groups, correlations among various groups were determined to establish representative ness of the responses and relationship among the groups. The responses for all items were rank ordered according to their frequencies, means and percentages to determine their importance existence and availability. Correlation among the responses from students and teachers of secondary schools was determined to establish nearness and relationship of data. Chi-square test of significance was use to test the frequencies of the

responses. The researcher, on the basis of such results, will be able to draw provable inferences and generalizations about the influence of needs on the curriculum development.

Table No. 1

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF OPINIONS OF STUDENTS OF THE SAMPLE OF URBAN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF DISTRICT FAISALABAD ON IMPORTANCE, EXISTENCE AND AVAILABILITY OF SAFETY OR SECURITY NEEDS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE ON CHI-SQUARE AT .05

	Needs	SA(%)	A(%)	U(%)	D(%)	SD(%)	df	\square^2	<u>P</u>
1.	Parental lov	e 193	34	8	9	4	247	529.54	.05
		(77.82)	(13.71)	(3.23)	(3.63)	(1.61)			
2.	Self-assertio	on 186	18	11	15	18	247	469.54	.05
		(75.00)	(7.29)	(4.44)	(6.05)	(7.29)			
3.	Environmen	t 114	28	21	15	65	242	141.17	NS
		(46.91)	(11.52)	(8.64)	(6.17)	(26.75)			
4.	Funding	130	4	7	11	96	247	282.28	NS
	C	(52.42)	(1.61)	(2.82)	(4.44)	(38.71)			
5.	Poverty	63	9	12	21	143	247	257.72	NS
	2	(25.40)	(3.63)	(4.84)	(8.47)	(57.66)			
6.	Financial he	lp 194	28	6	7	13	247	531.71	.05
		(78.23)	(11.29)	(2.42)	(2.82)	(5.24)			
7.	Gregariousn	less 181	37	6	9	15	247	447.00	.05
	e	(72.98)	(14.92)	(2.42)	(3.63)	(6.05)			
8.	Schooling se	ecurity	194	25	10	9	10	247	529.05.05
	U	(78.23)	(10.08)	(4.03)	(3.63)	(4.03)			
9.	Appreciation	n 166	29	29	12	12	247	347.28	.05
		(66.94)	(11.69)	(11.69)	(4.84)	(4.84)			
10.	Interaction	159	25	46	7	11	247	320.38	.05
		(64.11)	(10.08)	(18.55)	(2.82)	(4.44)			
11.	Learning co	mmunity	71	17	32	5	123	247	185.62 NS
	U	(28.63)	(6.85)	(12.90)	(2.02)	(49.50)			
12.	Punishment	170	43	9	8	18	247	381.39	.05
		(68.55)	(17.34)	(3.63)	(3.23)	(7.26)			
13.	Frustration	68	15	10	17	138	247	241.55	NS
		(27.42)	(6.05)	(4.03)	(6.85)	(55.65)			
14.	Self-recogni	` '	23	17	8	7	247	521.75	.05
	U	(77.82)	(9.27)	(6.85)	(3.23)	(2.82)			
15.	Competency	```	26	13	2	4	247	600.26	.05
	÷	(81.85)	(10.48)	(5.24)	(0.81)	(1.61)			
16.	Affection	205	15	13	7	8	247	609.50	.05
		(82.66)	(6.05)	(5.24)	(2.82)	(3.23)			
17.	Expectation	, ,	38	5	8	4	247	534.21	.05
	1	(77.82)	(15.32)	(2.02)	(3.23)	(1.61)			
		(,,,,02)	(10.02)	(2.02)	(0.20)	(1.01)			

Language in India <u>www.languageinindia.com</u>

12:3 March 2012

Abdul Ghafoor Nasir

Exploring the Preferences of Safety & Security Needs of Secondary School Students

10	Enlfilment	102	24	6	6	10	247	522.00	05
18.	Fulfillment		34		6	10	247	522.00	.05
10		(77.42)	. ,	(2.42)			0.47	452.07	05
19.	Satisfaction		36	2	15	13	247	453.97	.05
•	DI	(73.39)	, ,	. ,	. ,	(5.24)	2.45		210
20.	Placement	80	10	10	16		247	241.51	NS
	_	(32.26)	· /	(4.03)	. ,	· ,			
21.	Conveyance		29	4	10		247	297.76	.05
		(61.69)	, ,	. ,	. ,	· ,			
22.	Acceptance			3	1	13	247	602.24	.05
		(81.85)	(11.29)	(1.21)	(0.40)	(5.24)			
23.	Expression	177	34	8	4	25	247	421.15	.05
		(71.37)	(13.71)	(3.23)	(1.61)	(10.08)			
24.	Aggression	88	10	5	11	134	247	275.10	NS
		(35.48)	(4.03)	(2.02)	(4.44)	(54.03)			
25.	Rejection	80	13	2	5	148	247	326.63	.05
	0	(32.26)	(5.24)	(0.81)	(2.02)	(59.68)			
26.	Honor	192	22	7	0	27	247	520.66	.05
		(77.42)	(8.87)	(2.82)	(0.00)	(10.89)			
27.	Protection	84	4	Ò Ó	10	· ,	247	350.22	.05
		(33.87)	(1.61)	(0.00)	(4.03)	(60.48)			
28.	Scolding	17	10	9	. ,	5	247	417.80	.05
	8	(71.37)		(4.03)	(3.63)	(14.11)			
29.	Financial se	` '	· /	· ,	. ,	· ,	18	247	491.35.05
		(76.21)		(6.85)		(7.26)	10		
30.	Logo and fla	, ,	. ,	· ,	3	47	247	413.57	.05
50.	2050 und 11	(70.16)		(3.22)			2.7	110.07	
31.	Tuition fund	` '	25		(1.21)	62	247	303.16	.05
51.	i union i uno	(60.89)					<i>ΔΤ</i> /	505.10	.05
		(00.07)	(10.08)	(0.00)	(3.23)	(23.00)			

Table No.1 Shows that:

Among the students 91.53% agree and strongly agree that their parents loved them.

Among the students 82.29% agree and strongly agree that their parents stressed them to go to their schools but 13.31% disagree and strongly disagree that their parents stressed them to go to their schools.

Among the students 58.43% agree and strongly agree but 41.57% disagree that their school had attractive environment.

Among the students 54.03 agree and strongly agree but 45.97% disagree that their parents compelled them to give up their studies.

Among the students 29.03% agree and strongly agree and strongly disagree that their parents were poor and they could not educate them.

Among the students 89.52% agree and strongly agree that their parents provided financial help.

Among the students 87.90% agree and strongly agree that they liked to sit among their fellow mates.

Among the students 88.31% agree and strongly agree that their schools were like their own homes.

Among the students 78.63% agree and strongly that their teachers admired their views.

Among the students 74.19% agree and strongly agree that they learnt through interaction with their teachers.

Among the students 35.48% agree and strongly agree but 64.52% disagree that their classes were learning community.

Among the students 85.89% agree and strongly agree that their teachers punished them.

Among the students 33.47% agree and strongly agree but 66.53% disagree that they had no any friend in Their School.

Among the students 87.09% agree and strongly agree that they wanted to become good citizens.

Among the students 92.33% agree and strongly agree that they had ability to do their jobs.

Among the students 88.71% agree and strongly agree that they sought beloved teachers.

Among the students 93.14% agree and strongly agree that they strived for good friendship.

Among the students 81.13% agree and strongly agree that their schools should provide them stationery. Among the students 87.91% agreed strongly agree that their teachers admired their views.

Among the students 36.29% agree and strongly agree but 63.71% disagree that their teachers stressed them to choose the subjects.

Among the students 73.38% agree and strongly agree that they come to school on their own conveyance.

Among the students 93.14 agree and strongly agree that they wanted love and care in schools.

Among the students 85.08 agree and strongly agree that they were given chances to express

their ideas.

Among the students 39.51% agree and strong agree but 60.49% disagree that fund was collected forcefully from the students.

Among the students 37.50% agree and strongly agree but 62.50% disagree that they hated their schools.

Among the students 86.29% agree and strongly agree that they got due prestige in their schools.

Among the students 35.48% agree and strongly agree but 64.51% disagree that their schools had no boundary walls.

Among the students 78.22% agree and strongly agree that sometime their teachers scolded them.

Among the student 83.06 agree and strongly agree that they had enough money.

Among the students 76.61% agree and strongly agree that schools had own logos, and flags.

Among the students 70.97% agree and strongly agree but 28.22% disagree and strongly disagree that they were always in need of money to pay their tuition fee.

Table No. 2

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF OPINIONS OF STUDENTS OF THE SAMPLE OF RURAL SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF DISTRICT FAISALABAD ON IMPORTANCE, EXISTENCE AND AVAILABILITY OF SAFETY OR SECURITY NEEDS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE ON CHI-SQUARE AT 0.5:

	Needs	SA(%)	A(%)	U(%)	D(%)	SD(%)	df	\square^2	Р	
1.	Parental lo	ve 148	35	4	5	6	197	388.01	.05	
		(74.75)	(17.68)	(2.02)	(2.53)	3.03)				
2.	Self-assert	tion 137	38	6	7	10	197	317.10	.05	
		(69.19)	(19.19)	(3.03)	(3.54)	5.05)				
3.	Environm	ent 138	31	6	14	9	197	315.08	.05	
		(69.70)	(15.66)	(3.03)	(7.07)	4.55)				
4.	Funding	57	9	2	10	120	197	252.35	.05	
		(28.79)	(4.55)	(1.01)	(5.05)	60.61)				
5.	Poverty	44	9	8	39	98	197	135.48	.05	
		(22.22)	(4.55)	(4.04)	(19.70)	49.49)				
6.	Financial h	elp 116	37	6	14	25	197	198.01	.05	
		(58.59)	(18.69)	(3.03)	(7.07)	12.63)				
7.	Gregarious	ness117	63	5	8	5	197	250.78	.05	

Language in India <u>www.languageinindia.com</u>

12 : 3 March 2012

Abdul Ghafoor Nasir

Exploring the Preferences of Safety & Security Needs of Secondary School Students

	(59.09)	(31.82)	(2.53)	(4.04)	2.53)			
8.	Schooling security	103	72	10	6	7	197	205.48.05
0.	(52.02)			(3.03)	3.54)			200110100
9.	Appreciation 123	58		2	1	197	274.07	.05
	(62.12)				0.51)			
10.	Interaction 94	70	12	8	14	197	159.07	.05
	(47.47)	(35.35)			7.07)			
11	Community 130	36	16	7	9	197	271.24	.05
	(65.66)	(18.18)	(8.08)	(3.54)	4.55)			
12.	Punishment 84	65	16	26	7	197	111.64	.05
	(42.42)	(32.83)	(8.08)	(13.13)	3.54)			
13.	Frustration 112	45	0	22	19	197	191.24	.05
	(56.57)	(22.77)	(0.00)	(11.11)	9.60)			
14.	Self-recognition129	53	15	0	1	197	298.86	.05
	(65.15)	(26.77)	(7.58)	(0.00)	0.51)			
15.	Competency 124	45	5	14	10	197	249.52	.05
	(62.63)	(22.73)	(2.53)	(7.07)	5.05)			
16.	Affection 147	21	12	14	4	197	367.80	.05
	(74.24)	(10.61)	(6.06)	(7.07)	2.02)			
17.	Expectation 121	43	20	6	8	197	231.04	.05
	(61.11)	(21.72)	(10.10)	(3.03)	4.04)			
18.	Fulfillment 128	45	14	3	8	197	273.66	.05
	(64.65)	(22.73)	(7.07)	(1.52)	4.04)			
19	Satisfaction 86	27	23	16	46	197	80.43	.05
	(43.43)	(13.64)	(11.62)	. ,	23.23)			
20.	Placement 97	27	15	19	40	197	113.21	.05
	(48.99)	. ,		. ,	20.20)			
21.	Conveyance 103	34	16	7	38	197	143.26	.05
	(52.02)	, ,		(3.54)	19.19)			
22.	Acceptance 93	18	22	11	54	197	117.50	.05
	(46.97)	(9.09)	. ,	· /	,	4.6 -	10/	- -
23.	Expression 92	14	19	24	49	197	104.98	.05
	(46.46)	(7.07)	(9.60)	(12.12)	24.75)	10-	0 - 00	0 .
24.	Aggression 53	23	11	24	87	197	95.03	.05
0.7	(26.77)	(11.62)	(5.56)	(12.12)	43.94)	107	100 5 4	05
25.	Rejection 54	20	2	28	94	197	128.76	.05
0.5	(27.27)	(10.10)	(1.01)	(14.14)	47.47)	107	100 55	0.5
26.	Honor 49	21	13	22	93	197	108.66	.05
27	(24.75)	(10.61)	(6.57)	(11.11)	46.97)	107	115 00	0.5
27.	Protection 75	22	6	18	77	197	115.08	.05
00	(37.88)	(11.11)	(3.03)	(9.09)	38.89)	107	70 11	05
28.	Scolding 83	35	16	19	45	197	73.61	.05
	(41.92)	(17.68)	(8.08)	(9.60)	22.73)	~~	107	150.01.05
29.	Financial security	110	22	14	25	27	197	158.91.05
	(55.56)	(11.11)	(7.07)	(12.63)	13.64)			

Language in India <u>www.languageinindia.com</u>

12 : 3 March 2012

Abdul Ghafoor Nasir

Exploring the Preferences of Safety & Security Needs of Secondary School Students

30.	Logo and flag 103	48	8	12	27	197	151.74	.05	
	(52.02)	(24.24)	(4.04)	(6.06)	13.64)				
31.	Tuition fund 78	23	17	34	46	197	58.91	.05	
	(39.39)	(11.61)	(8.59)	(17.17)	23.23)				

Table No.2 Shows that:

Among the students 92.43% agree and strongly agree that their parents loved them.

Among the students 88.38% agree and strongly agree that their parents stressed them to go to their schools but 13.31% disagree and strongly disagree that their parents stressed them to go to their schools.

Among the students 85.36% agree and strongly agree but their schools had attractive environment.

Among the students 33.34% agree and strongly agree but 65.65% disagree and strongly disagree that their parents compelled them to give up their studies.

Among the students 26.77% agree and strongly agree but 73.23% disagree that their parents were poor and they could not educate them.

Among the students 77.28% agree and strongly agree but 22.72% disagree that their parents provided financial help.

Among the students 90.91% agree and strongly agree that they liked to sit among their fellow mates.

Among the students 88.38% agree and strongly agree that their schools were like their own homes.

Among the students 91.41% agree and strongly agree that their teachers admired their views.

Among the students 82.82% agree and strongly agree that they learnt through interaction with their teachers. Among the students 83.84% agree and strongly agree that their classes were learning communities.

Among the students 75.25% agree and strongly agree but 24.75% disagree and that their teachers punished them.

Among the students 79.34% and agree and strongly agree that they had no any friend in the school.

Among the students 91.92% agree and strongly agree that they wanted to become good citizens.

Among the students 85.36% agree and strongly agree that they had ability to do their jobs.

Among the students 84.85% agree and strongly agree that they sought beloved teachers.

Among the students 82.83% agree and strongly agree that they strived for good friendship.

Among the students 87.38% agree and strongly agree that their schools should provide them stationery.

Among the students 57.07% agree and strongly agree but 42.93% disagree that their teachers admired their views.

Among the students 62.63% agree and strongly agree but 37.37% disagree that their teachers stressed them to choose the subjects.

Among the students 69.19% agree and strongly agree but 30.81% disagree that they come to school on their own conveyance.

Among the students 56.06% agree and strongly agree but 43.94% disagree that they wanted love and care in schools.

Among the students 53.53% agree and strongly agree but 46.47% disagree that they were given chances to express their ideas.

Among the students 38.39% agree and strongly agree but 61.61% disagree that fund was collected forcefully from the students.

Among the students 37.37% agree and strongly agree but 62.63% disagree that they hated their schools.

Among the students 35.35% agree and strongly agree but 64.65% disagree that they got due prestige in their schools.

Among the students 48.99% agree and strongly agree but 51.01% disagree that their schools had no boundary walls.

Among the students 59.60% agree and strongly agree but 40.40% disagree that sometime their teachers scolded them.

Among the students 66.67% agree and strongly agree but 33.33% disagree that they had enough money.

Among the students 76.26% agree and strongly agree that schools had their own logos and flags.

Among the students 51% agree and strongly agree but 49% disagree that they were always in need of money to pay their tuition fee.

Table No. 3

Comparison of mean ratings of the statements relating to the preferences of Safety & Security needs by students of the samples of urban & rural secondary schools of the District Faisalabad:

		Faisalabad		
		Urban	Rural	
1	Parental Love	4.63	4.59	4.61
2	Self-Assertion	4.37	4.44	4.40
3	Environment	3.46	4.39	3.92
4	Funding Facility	3.25	2.36	2.80
5	Poverty	2.31	2.30	2.30
6	Financial	4.54	4.03	4.28
7	Gregariousness	4.45	4.40	4.42
8	Schooling security	4.55	4.31	4.43
9	Appreciation	4.31	4.52	4.41
10	Interaction	4.27	4.12	4.19
11	Learning Community	2.63	4.36	3.37
12	Punishment	4.37	3.97	3.98
13	Frustration	2.43	4.05	3.24
14	Self-Recognition	4.56	4.56	4.56
15	Competency	4.70	4.30	4.5
16	Affection	4.62	4.48	4.55
17	Expectation	4.64	4.33	4.48
18	Fulfillment	4.58	4.42	4.51
19	Satisfaction	4.45	4.46	4.45
20	Placement	2.56	3.62	3.06
21	Conveyance	3.89	3.79	3.84
22	Acceptance	4.64	3.43	4.03
23	Expression	4.35	3.38	3.85
24	Aggression	2.63	2.65	2.64
25	Rejection	2.48	2.55	2.51
26	Honor	4.42	2.55	3.48
27	Protection	2.44	3.00	2.72
28	Scolding	4.18	3.46	3.82
29	Financial	4.42	3.82	4.12
30	Logo and flag	4.08	3.94	4.01
31	Tuition fund	3.79	3.26	3.52

Table No. 4

Now the assessed needs are rank ordered as given below:

S/No	Needs	Mean Scores
1	Poverty	2.30
2	Rejection	2.51
3	Aggression	2.64
4	Protection	2.72
5	Funding Facility	2.80
6	Placement	3.06
7	Frustration	3.24
8	Learning Community	3.37
9	Honor	3.48
10	Tuition fund	3.52
11	Scolding	3.82
12	Conveyance	3.84
13	Expression	3.85
14	Environment	3.92
15	Punishment	3.98
16	Logo and flag	4.01
17	Acceptance	4.03
18	Financial	4.12
19	Interaction	4.19
20	Financial	4.28
21	Self-Assertion	4.40
22	Appreciation	4.41
23	Gregariousness	4.42
24	Schooling security	4.43
25	Satisfaction	4.45
26	Expectation	4.48
27	Competency	4.5
28	Fulfillment	4.51
29	Affection	4.55
30	Self-Recognition	4.56
31	Parental Love	4.61

Now this vast list of Safety & Security needs is focused to play a pivotal role to achieve a better standard of living, quality education and to play a basic role from poverty to parental love in modernization of curriculum at secondary level.

Discussion

General agreement was found to the inadequacy of facilities such as funding facility, friendship, learning through interaction, schooling security, lack of appreciation, class as a learning community. The significant majority of the students of the samples disagreed to the points that they were not punished in the schools. In the realm of safety or security needs, the poverty, scolding, corporal punishment, illegal funding, placement of subject forcefully, non-availability of conveyance and tuition strain are the deficit traits for growth motivations. In rural areas the teachers and students of the sample were agreed that there is no any Logo and Flag presentation. All the respondents agreed that environment pollution was causing serious problem. Logo and flag is a prominent figure to create "self and unity".

Recommendations

Once the physiological needs have been satisfied, an individual becomes concerned with a new set of needs, often called the safety or security needs. The primary motivation force here is to ensure a reasonable degree of certainty, order, structure and predictability in one's environment. In this part of needs affection, gregariousness, fulfillment, acceptance, protection, placement of subjects, learning through interaction and discussion, class like a community, financial, schooling and parental security, self-assertion, honor, competency, appreciation are the bases of safety or security needs. The safety or security needs may be given a special place in the curriculum as shown below:

- a. Parents and schools may provide physical, social and financial security to the students and the curriculum may define the ways of safety or security needs.
- b. Curriculum may sketch out the traits of affection and love in tangible state as stories and poetry writing to sublimate the emotions of the young ones.
- c. It may present the activities or plan to be fulfilled by the pupils for social harmony, brotherhood and selflessness.
- d. It may sketch out activities for discussion and interaction in tangible state in general and science languages.
- e. It may define the habits, attitudes, behavior, honor and social status of the respectable personalities.
- f. It may create mutual co-operation, as working and doing in a community by arranging different tasks and activities.

The students may be encouraged and trained to interact with each other as in team work or group work, listen to each other and to bear up each individual's viewpoints.

References

Bloom, B.S., (1956) *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook 1: Cognitive Domain.* New York: Longman Green.

- Doane D.C. (1942) *The Needs of Youth. Teacher College Columbia University, Contribution to Education,* Bureau of publications, Teacher College, Columbia University, New York.
- Gray, J. R. (2002). Does a Prosocial-selfish Distinction Help Explain the Biological Affects? *Journal of Psychological Review*, (Oct 2002) Vol. 109 No. 4. American Psychological Association: Inc.
- Havighurst R. J. (1920) *Developmental Tasks and Education*, (2nd ed.), New York: David McKay Co.
- Hjelle Larry, A. (1981). *Personality Theories: Basic Assumptions, Research and Application,* Singapore: B & Jo Enterprise PTE, Ltd.
- Kokaska, C.J. and Brolin, D.E. (1985), *Career Education for Handicapped Individuals*, (2nd ed) Charles, E. Merrill Publishing Company, A Bell & Howell Company Columbus Toronto London Sydney.
- Luella Cole, (1988) Psychology of Adolescence, (5th ed.) New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Lurry, L. and Alberty, E. (1957) *Developing a High School Core Program*, Macmillan Company, New York.
- Maslow, A. (1954). Motivation and Personality, New York: Harper & Row.
- Maslow, A. (1970) Motivation and Personality, (2nd ed.) New York Harper & Row.
- McDougall, W. (1908). Introduction to Social Psychology, London: Methuen.
- Marrison, G.S. (1998) Early Childhood Education Today, (7thed.) Prentice Hall, Inc. New York.
- Murray, H. (1938). Explorations in Personality, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ray, M. (2006) Aspect of Rural Communication, A Study on the Ethnography of Communication of the Santals of Eastern India, Serials Publications New Delhi.
- Robert, R. et al. (2002) Personality Traits Development from Age 12 to 18: Longitudinal, Cross Sectional and Cross Cultural Analyses *Journal of Pesonality and Social Psychology*, (Dec. 2002) Vol. 83 No. 6. American Psychological Association: Inc.
- Sand, D.J., Kozleski, E.B. and French, N.K. (2000), *Inclusive Education for the 21st Century, A New Introduction to Special Education*, Printed in the United States of America, Wadsworth Thomson Learning.

Santrock, J.W. (2001) Educational Psychology, New York: McGraw. Hill Company Inc.

Sheldon, K.M., Elliot, A. J. and Kim, Y. (2001) What is Satisfying about Satisfying Events? Testing 10 Candidates Psychological Needs, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (Feb. 2001) Vol. 80. American Psychological Association: Inc.

Abdul Ghafoor Nasir Government Higher Secondary School 452 / G. B. Faisalabad Pakistan <u>ghafoornasir@yahoo.com</u>

Muhammad Mirza, Ph.D. Professor of Education (Retired) Government College of Education for Men Lahore Pakistan