

Impact of Parents' Socio-economic Status on Students' Socio-emotional Intelligence at Secondary Level

Tahir Farooqi Khan

Assistatn Professor, University of Education, Okara Campus, Okara

Abstract

The current study was planned to explore the impact of parents' socio-economic status on students' socio-emotional intelligence at secondary level. The study was correlational in nature. Survey technique was used to collect data. Data were collected through self developed questionnaires, i.e. Socio-economic Status Scale (SESS) and Socio-emotional Intelligence Scale (SEIS). Four hundred respondents (Male=200 & Female=200) of 9th and 10th class (session 2016) enrolled in public secondary schools from Sahiwal division and their parents were randomly selected as sample of study. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. In order to measure the relationship between parents' socio-economic status (IV) and students' socio-emotional intelligence (DV), Pearson r was computed. To investigate the impact of parents' socio-economic status at students' socio-emotional intelligence, regression analysis applied. A significant relationship was found between parents' socio-economic status and students' socio-emotional intelligence. Interpretation of regression analysis exposed that Family Background, Social Prestige and Home Environment can nurture the students' socio-emotional intelligence. Economic status of parents has no significant contribution in developing students' socio-emotional intelligence.

Key Words: Socio-economic Status, Socio-emotional intelligence, Secondary School Students.

Introduction

Twentieth century was marked as an era of social confrontation which leads towards social stratification. According to Johnson (2013) social stratification is a process to categorize people in society on the basis of wealth and social status. Prior to this, Mitzman (1985) made an attempt to translate the views of Max Weber about social stratification and concluded that ownership of production is not a single indicator of a person's social status. The other indicators are power and prestige of a person. Moreover, Max Weber added that foundation of social stratification is socio-economic status and sometimes socio-economic status is disturbed by social mobility. Sen (2000) defined the term social mobility as transmission of a person's status from

one economic condition to another. Behrman (2000) argued that social mobility is a process in which a person travels from one entity to another at socio-economic status ladder.

Inequality in polarization of wealth is a major cause of socio-economic mobility. Thus, social mobility is movement of a person from one status to another (Fields, 2000). Ascribed parents' socio-economic status is an important parameter to enrich an environment. There are two types of status. Linton (1936) signified the terms ascribed and achieved status. Hampden, Turner, and Trompenaars (2002) denoted that ascribed status is a position in society which he/she got from their parents while achieved status is the result of self-struggle. Socio-economic status (SES) is a combination of economic status, home environment, social prestige and family background.

Economic status

Quality of basic needs (food and shelter) provided to the children depend upon parents' economic status (Eze, 1996). Rothstein (2004) stated that economic status is the foremost factor of parents' socio-economic status. It has certain characteristics such as income, occupation, wealth and land etc.

Family background

Development of any society lies in family norms. When a family is succeeded to nurture the child with good values, in fact, that is solid contribution in making an excellent society. Orhunger (1990) asserted that family and its socializing process virtually develop the personality of a child.

Social prestige

Social prestige refers to a person's honour or popularity in society (Chan & Goldthorpe 2007). Sennett (2003) coined the term "scarce good" for social prestige. According to him a person's social prestige is the regard that he/she holds in eyes of others. Lipset and Bendix (1960) proposed a logical definition of social prestige that when a person is interconnected with authority, respect and influence he/she will be recognized as socially prestigious. Berger and Zelditch (1998) advocated that social prestige is desire of an individual to become a respectable

person in his/her social capital. Ortner (1984) argued that building blocks of social prestige are income, political power and social skills.

Socio-emotional Intelligence (SEI)

Human being is the super most creatures among all creatures at earth. Superiority of human being is due to intellect not by physical power. Intellect is a great gift of Almighty Allah. Human interaction within a society considered as a basic need to develop the socio-emotional intelligence. History of socio-emotional intelligence can be traced back to the idea of Moss and Hunt (1927) through which researcher revealed that SEI is the skill of a person to adapt to a critical situation. Later on Vernon (1933) conceptualized a more comprehensive definition of SEI as the ability of a person to cope up with people of different mentality i.e. an effort to maintain a social capital and into the thinking of other people. In recent times, Marsh (2001) propagated that SEI is a capability to regulate the personal emotions according to present situation and understanding of others' emotions. Devi and Uma (2005) defined EI as a trait of a person to regulate his/her emotions in undesired situations.

Self-awareness

Self awareness can be described as an intrapersonal skill which is essential to get awareness about one's own emotions (Singh, 2010). Self-awareness is an orderly process in which a person successfully process information from the environment and use them in relatively new situations (Natsoulas, 1996). If we peep into the history of self awareness, Mead and Mind (1934) asserted two terms outward and inward awareness i.e. outward awareness is the consciousness about environment and inward is self-awareness.

Social awareness

A fundamental aspect of socio-emotional intelligence is social awareness. It plays a considerable role in work environment (Cekmecelioglu, Gonsel, and Ulutas, 2012), developing social skills (Christie, Jordan, Troth, & Lawrence, 2007) and strengthen occupational competence. Emmerling and Goleman (2005) stated that development of social skills enables a person to meet, argue, influence, and control others in society.

Self management

Self-management is a trait to monitor emotional responses in order to sustain acceptable behavior in society (Barlow, Wright, Sheasby, Turner & Hainsworth, 2002). Self-management is a social skill used to express behavior that a person perform to manage interaction within society (Creer, Renne, & Christian, 1976). DiClemente, Fairhurst, Piotrowski, and Maddux, (1995) stated that self-management is a capacity to overcome the emotions so that emotions do not control you. Self-management enables an individual to make honest assessment of his/her own conduct and after identifying weaknesses of conduct, remedy is necessary (Funnell & Anderson, 2004).

Relationship management

Relationship- management refers to shape relationship between person and community members (Harding, 2003). Drucker (1955) considered that relationship- management is a two way bridge, first to manage him/her in society and second strengthen the mutual understanding between person and society. Healthy human interaction works like backbone in the skelton of a society, when every person works for mutual benefits it is relationship management (Baritz, 1960).

Statement of the Problem

The study was conducted to investigate the impact of parents' socio-economic status at students' socio-emotional intelligence at secondary level.

Objectives of the Study

Following were the objectives of the study:

1. To explore the relationship between parents' socio-economic status and students' socio-emotional intelligence.
2. To find out the impact of parents' socio-economic status at students' socio-emotional intelligence.

Research Questions

Following were the research questions of the study:

1. Does there any significant relationship exist between parents' socio-economic status and students' socio-emotional intelligence?
2. Does there any significant impact of parents' socio-economic status on public secondary school students' socio-emotional intelligence exists?

Delimitations

Study at hand was delimited to the students of 10th grade (session, 2016) enrolled in public sector secondary schools of the Punjab province of Pakistan.

Methodology

The study was correlational by nature and survey technique was used. Louis, Lawrence and Keith (2007) argued that survey research depicts the current characteristics of a population. Moreover, it is a useful technique to get access to a large population. Target population of study encompasses of all those male and female students of 10th grade who were enrolled in all public sector secondary schools of Punjab province (session 2015-2016). There are 6,266 public sector secondary schools (Male =3,387, Female =2879) in Punjab province with 3750205 (Male=2168715, Female=1581390) students enrolled in these schools (School Education Department).

It was not feasible for the researchers to access such a large and scattered population. Thus multi-stage random sampling technique was used. At the first stage, among nine divisions of the Punjab province, Sahiwal division was randomly selected. Moreover, 30 male and 30 female students were randomly selected at the second stage from three districts of Sahiwal division i.e. Okara, Pakpattan and Sahiwal. There are 439 public sector secondary schools in Sahiwal division (268 Male & 171 Female) having 276529 students (Male =173004 & Female=103525) enrolled.

Table1

Summary of the Selected Public Sector Secondary Schools from Sahiwal Division

| District Secondary Schools | | Gender | Public Sector | | |
|----------------------------|--------|---------------|---------------|-------|----|
| | | | Total | Rural | |
| Urban | | | | | |
| Sahiwal | Male | | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| | Female | | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Okara | Male | | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| | Female | | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Pakpattan | Male | | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| | Female | | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Total | | Male & Female | 30 | 30 | 60 |

Male Public Secondary Schools=30 Female Public Secondary Schools=30

From the above table, it is revealed that five male and five female public secondary schools were selected randomly from each locale. Total sample was comprised of 60 schools (30 male schools & 30female schools).

Table 2

Summary of Randomly Selected Sample

| Districts | Gender | Approached Schools | Public Secondary School Respondents | | Total Respondents |
|-----------|--------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|-------------------|
| | | | Urban | Rural | |
| Sahiwal | Male | | 35 | 35 | 70 |
| | Female | 160 | 35 | 35 | 70 |
| Okara | Male | | 30 | 30 | 60 |
| | Female | 160 | 20 | 25 | 45 |
| Pakpattan | Male | | 35 | 35 | 70 |
| | Female | 160 | 45 | 40 | 85 |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Total Respondents | Male & Female | 480 | 200 | 200 | 400 |
|-------------------|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|

Sample from Sahiwal district consisted of 70 Male respondents (35rural & 35 urban) and 70 Female respondents (35 rural & 35 urban). Sample from district Okara was selected having 60 Male respondents (30 rural &30 urban) and 45 Female respondents (20 rural & 25 urban). Sample selected from Pakpattan district was comprised of 70 Male respondents (35 rural & 35 urban) and 85 Female respondents (40 rural & 45 urban). Total 200 respondents (students) were from rural areas and 200 respondents (students) from urban areas. Four hundred respondents (Male=200 & Female=200) of 9th and 10th class (session 2015-2016) and their parents constituted the sample of study. Table no 2 draws the whole picture of Sampling.

Instrumentation

Major objective of the study was to investigate the impact of parents’ socio-economic status at students’ socio-emotional intelligence enrolled in public sector secondary school of Punjab (Pakistan). Two types of information were required to achieve the objectives i.e. students’ socio-emotional intelligence and parents’ socio-economic status. Data were collected through two questionnaires i.e. SESS (Socio-Economic Status Scale) and SEIS (Socio-Emotional Intelligence Scale). Both questionnaires were developed by the researchers. Cronbach Alpha Reliability of SESS was 0.89 and SEI was 0.78. Experts’ opinion was taken to ensure the validity of questionnaires. Both questionnaires were bilingually (Urdu & English) translated so that selected students and their parents can understand the statements. SESS comprised of 21 items and SEIS consisted of 22 statements.

Data Collection

To collect data, researchers personally visited the selected schools of district Sahiwal, Okara and Pakpattan. Instructions about filling research instruments were given by researchers to the participants before administration of the instruments.

Analysis of the Data

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 and MS. Excel 2008 were used to analyze the collected data.

Table 3
Relationship between SES of Parents and SEI of Students

| Variables | N | M | S.D | Correlation(r) | p-Value |
|-----------|-----|------|-----|----------------|---------|
| SES | 400 | 2.18 | .21 | 0.124** | 0.006 |
| SEI | 400 | 2.46 | .23 | | |

** $p < 0.01$

Table 3 shows a statistical significant and positive relationship between parents’ socioeconomic status and students’ socioemotional intelligence with Pearson Correlation “r” value (.124**) and $p=0.006$ at significant level $\alpha=0.01$. So, it is concluded that parents’ socio-economic status and respondents’ socio-emotional intelligence enrolled in public sector secondary schools are correlated to each other.

Table 4
Correlation Matrix between Factors of Socio-economic Status and Socio-emotional Intelligence

| SES Factors | Factors of SEI | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|------|-------------------------|-------|------------------|------|-----------------|-------|
| | Self Awareness | | Relationship Management | | Social Awareness | | Self Management | |
| | r-value | Sig. | r-value | Sig. | r-value | Sig. | r-value | Sig. |
| Economic Status | 0.81 | 0.2 | 0.63 | 0.41 | 0.91* | 0.03 | 0.023 | 0.33 |
| Family Background | 0.56* | 0.03 | 0.105* | 0.018 | 0.75 | 0.06 | 0.50 | 0.159 |
| Social Prestige | 0.23* | .000 | 0.107* | .016 | 0.197* | .000 | 0.65 | 0.194 |
| Home Environment | 0.98* | .002 | -1.09* | .015 | 0.37* | .035 | 0.45* | 0.04 |

$N=400$. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

It is depicted in the table 4 that there was not statistically significant relationship found between parents’ economic status and respondents’

self-awareness at ($r=0.81$ & $p=0.2>0.05$), relationship-management ($r=0.63$ & $p=0.4>0.05$), social-awareness ($r=0.91^*$ & $p=0.03<0.05$) and self- management has inverse relationship ($r=-0.023$ & $p=0.33>0.05$). It can be admitted that parents’ economic status had noteworthy affect at respondents’ socio-emotional intelligence enrolled in public secondary schools. Family background is positively correlated with the factors of SEI of public secondary schools respondents such as self awareness ($r=0.56^*$ & $p=0.03<0.05$), relationship management ($r=0.105^*$ & $p=0.01<0.05$), social awareness ($r=0.75^*$ & $p=0.06>0.05$) and self management ($r=0.50$ & $p=0.15>0.05$). So, parents’ family back ground nurtures the respondents’ socio-emotional intelligence to some extent.

Social Prestige of parents is positively and statically correlated to self -awareness ($r=0.23^{**}$ & $p=.000<0.01$), relationship- management ($r=0.107^*$ & $p=0.01<0.05$) and social- awareness ($r=0.197^{**}$ & $p=.000<0.01$). Although, self- management ($r=0.65$ & $p=.194<0.01$) was positively correlated to social prestige of parents but had not statistically significant effect. It can be revealed that respondents’ socio-emotional intelligence improved by social prestige of parents to some extent.

Home Environment has an inverse but statistically significant relation with Self- Awareness ($r=-0.98^*$ & $p=0.02<0.05$) and strong positive correlation with Relationship- Management ($r=1.09$ & $p=0.01<0.05$). Furthermore, Home Environment has positive and statistical significant relation with Social Awareness ($r=0.37^*$ & $p=0.03<0.05$) and Self Management ($r=0.45^*$ & $p=0.04<0.05$). So, it was concluded that parents’ SES is a building block of self -management and social -awareness.

Table 5

Simple Correlation” Standardized Regression Weights “β” and Multiple Correlations “r”

| Factors | Socio-emotional Intelligence | |
|-------------------|------------------------------|--------|
| | R | B |
| Economic Status | 0.046 | 0.000 |
| Family Background | 0.108* | 0.100 |
| Social Prestige | 0.244** | 0.236 |
| Home Environment | -0.042* | -0.107 |

Multiple Correlation R
0.28**

N=400. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The multiple correlation score (R=0.28, p<0.01) of socio-emotional intelligence scale with the four subscales of SESS is significant. So, it is concluded that there is a statistically significant relationship found between parents’ socio-economic status and respondents’ socio-emotional intelligence.

Furthermore, factor wise correlation was also calculated between parents’ socio-economic status and students’ socio-emotional intelligence. Simple correlation “r” reported in table 5 reflects that Family Background (r=.108, p<0.05), Social Prestige (r=0.244, p<0.01) scales of SESS are significantly and positively correlated with the socio-emotional intelligence of respondents. On the other hand the subscale Home Environment (r=-.107, p<0.05) has inverse correlation to the respondents’ socio-emotional intelligence enrolled in rural and urban public secondary schools.

The standardized *Beta* weights exposed that Family Background (β=0.10, p<0.05), Social Prestige (β=0.236, p<0.01) and Home Environment (β=-0.107, p<0.05) have considerable effects and contribute significantly in maintaining the socio-emotional intelligence level in respondents.

Findings

1. The findings indicate that correlation between parents’ SES and students’ SEI enrolled in public secondary schools was statically significant with correlation value (r=.124**) and probability value (p=0.006<0.01).

2. Analyses declared that Economic Status strongly correlated to Self Awareness of students ($r=0.81^*$, $p=0.02<0.05$) and had very strong positive correlation to Social Awareness ($r=0.91^*$, $p=0.03<0.05$).
3. It can be elaborated that parents' Family Background was moderately correlated with students' Self Awareness ($r=0.56^*$, $p=0.03<0.05$).
4. It was inferred from ($r=0.07$, $p=0.06>0.05$) findings that there is no statically relationship found between parents' Family Background and students' Social Awareness.
5. The results indicated that social prestige was weakly correlated ($r=0.23^{**}$, $p=0.00 <0.01$) with students' Self -Awareness.
6. There is a significant impact of parents' socio-economic status on students' socio-emotional intelligence found as Multiple Correlation value ($R=0.28$, $p<0.01$) is significant. Simple correlation and standardized beta weights depicts that Economic status ($r=0.046$, $\beta=0.000$, $p>0.05$), Family Background ($r=0.108$, $\beta=0.100$, $p<0.05$) and Social Prestige ($r=0.25$, $\beta=0.34$, $p<0.01$) are significantly correlated to socio-emotional intelligence of students whereas Home Environment ($r=-0.42$, $\beta=-0.107$, $p<0.05$) is significantly and negatively correlated with socio-emotional intelligence of students. These subscales have considerable effects and contributing a lot in defining the dependent variable.

Conclusion

1. Parents' socio-economic status is correlated to students' socio-emotional intelligence
2. Economic status, home environment, family back ground and social prestige of parents are correlated to students' self-awareness, relationship- management, social-awareness and self -management.
3. Family background, social prestige and home environment contribute in developing the students' socio-emotional intelligence.

Discussion

Investigation about the relationship among subscales of SESS and SEIS expressed that parents' economic status; family

background and social prestige have a positive and significant relationship with students' self-awareness, relationship-management and social-awareness. The results are partially in line with the findings of the studies of Namdar, et.al (2008) in they found a sound relationship between students' emotional intelligence and parents' socio-economic status. Home environment has an inverse but significant relationship with relationship-management of students but positively correlated to other three subscales of SEIS as Kaur and Jaswal (2005) assessed the strategic emotional intelligence and found that home environment nourish the ability to face the strange situation intelligently. Moreover, Rani (1998) found the fact that children from favorable home environment are more socially intelligent. The results make it clear that development of socio-emotional intelligence depends upon students' interaction with society. So, parents' sound socio-economic status paved a path for their children to interact with society.

The results of study at hand reveals that background, social prestige and home environment are the vital components of parent s' socio-economic status to develop the students' socio-emotional intelligence. Whereas, economic status which is considered as a central part of socio-economic status is not a strong factor in developing students' socio-emotional intelligence so, present results of this study is in contradiction with the findings of Elksnin and Elksnin (2003) who stressed a strong positive correlation with home environment and social-emotional intelligence of students. Conger, et al (1994) also contradicted the results of present study by saying that financial strains can cause demoralizing of students' social behavior. The Reason is that advancements in electronic media and social media networks decrease the distance among people. Status quo having its roots in economic power is swiftly losing its value because low cost interaction among people has decreased the weightage of economic status in defining socio-emotional intelligence. Parents' economic status has positive association with the development of students' socio-emotional intelligence but it not statically significant.

Recommendations

1. To generalize the results of this study further substantiation is needed. For this purpose, qualitative data collection methods such as observations and interviews should be conducted.
2. Socio-emotional intelligence is relatively a new term in the field of psychology. So, more researches should be the need of time like effects of socio-emotional intelligence at academic achievements of students, impact of socio-economic status of parents at physical health of students etc.

References

- Barlow, J., Wright, C., Sheasby, J., Turner, A., & Hainsworth, J. (2002). Self-management approaches for people with chronic conditions: a review. *Patient education and counseling*, 48(2), 177-187.
- Baritz, L. (1960). *The Servants of Power: A History of the Use of Social Science in American Industry*, by Loren Baritz. Wesleyan University Press.
- Behrman, J. R. (2000). Social Mobility: Concepts and Measurement. In *New markets, new opportunities? Economic and social mobility in a changing world*, .69-100. The Brooking Institution and the Cmeppgie Endowment for International Press washington DC.
- Berger, J. & Zelditch, M, Jr. (1998) *Status, Power and Legitimacy. Strategies and Theories*. Transaction Publishers , New Brunswick.
- Cekmecelioglu, H.G., Gonsel, A. and Ulutas, T. (2012). Effects of emotional intelligence on job satisfaction: An empirical study on call center employees. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 58 (1), 363 – 369

Tahir

- Chan, T. W., & Goldthorpe, J. H. (2007). Class and status: The conceptual distinction and its empirical relevance. *American sociological review*, 72(4), 512-532.
- Christie, A., Jordan, P., Troth, A., & Lawrence, S. (2007). Testing the links between emotional intelligence and motivation. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 13(03), 212-226.
- Creer, T. L., Renne, C. M., & Christian, W. P. (1976). Behavioral contributions to rehabilitation and childhood asthma. *Rehabilitation Literature*, 37 (8), 226-232, 247. doi: 10.1007/BF02991197
- Conger, R. D., Ge, X., Elder, G. H., Lorenz, F. O., & Simons, R. L. (1994). Economic stress, coercive family process, and developmental problems of adolescents. *Child development*, 65(2), 541-561.
- Devi, U. L. and Uma, M. (2005). Relationship between the dimensions of emotional intelligence of adolescents and certain personal social variables. *Indian Psychological Review* 64, 01,11-20. doi: 10.12691/education-1-6-8.
- DiClemente, C. C., Fairhurst, S. K., Piotrowski, N. A., & Maddux, J. E. (1995). Self-efficacy, adaptation and adjustment: theory, research and application. *Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment: Theory, research, and application*.
- Drucker, P. F. (1955). Management Science and the Manager. *Management Science*, 1(2), 115-126. : doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1.2.115
- Elksnin, L., & Elksnin, N. (2003). Fostering social-emotional learning in the classroom. *Education*, 124,.63-68.

- Emmerling, R. J., & Goleman, D. (2005). Leading with Emotion Emotional intelligence predicts success. *Leadership Excellence*, 22(7), 9. doi: 10.1177/1523422308323542
- Eze, O.M. (2002). The effects of parental economic status and pupil sex on school achievement in English language. *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education in Nigeria*.A.b.U Zaria. 3(3). 27
- Fields, G. S. (2000). Income Mobility: Concepts and Measures. In *New markets, new opportunities? Economic and social mobility in a changing world*, 101-132. Washington, D.C.: 2000.
- Funnell, M. M., & Anderson, R. M. (2004). Empowerment and self-management of diabetes. *Clinical diabetes*, 22(3), 123-127.
- Hampden-Turner, C. M., & Trompenaars, F. (2002). *Building cross-cultural competence: How to create wealth from conflicting values*. Yale University Press
- Harding, N. (2003). On the manager's body as an aesthetics of control. In *Art and Aesthetics at Work*. (115-132). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Hossein, N, Mohammad S, Hossein, E. & Azad, R. (2008). Assessing emotional intelligence and its relationship with demographic factors of nursing students. *IJNMR, Autumn, 13* (4) 145-149
- Johnson, L. A. (2013). Social Stratification. *Biblical Theology Bulletin: Journal of Bible and Culture*, 43(3), 155-168.
- Kaur, R. & Jaswal, S. (2005) Relationship between strategic emotional intelligence and family climate of Punjabi adolescents. *Anthropologist*, 7(4) 293-298
- Kohn, M. (1991). Social-class and parent-child relationships. *American Journal of Sociology*, 68, 471-480.

Tahir

Linton, R. (1936). *The study of man: an introduction*. Appleton-Century. New York.

Lipset., & Bendix. R. (1960). *Social Mobility in Industrial Society*. Berkeley, Calif.

Louis, C., Lawrence, M., & Keith, M. (2007). *Research methods in education*. New York: Routledge.

Marsh, G. R., (2001). Cognitive behavioral therapy for treatment of chronic primary insomnia: a randomized controlled trial. *Jama*, 285(14), 1856-1864. doi: 10.1001/jama.285.14.1856

Mead, G. H., & Mind, H. (1934). *Self and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 173-175.

Mitzman, A. (1985). *The iron cage: An historical interpretation of Max Weber*. New Brunswick NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Moss, F. A., & Hunt, T. (1927). Are you socially intelligent? *Scientific American*, 137(2), 108-110. doi:10.1038/scientificamerican0827-108

Natsoulas, T. (1996). The stream of consciousness: XI. A critique of James's aendage theory of consciousness (second part). *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 16(1), 63-82. doi:10.2190/KCUD-FDNM-RDYV-HBN1

Rothstein, R. (2004). Class and schools using social economic and educational reforms to close the white and black achievement gap. *Economic Policy Institute*, U.S.A

Orhunger. M. M. (1990). *Educational Trinity: Home, Child, School*. Jos: FabArichNig. Ltd.

Tahir

Ortner, S. B. (1984). Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties. *Comparative studies in society and history*, 26(1),126-166. URL:<http://www.jstor.org/stable/178524>

Rani, S. (1998). A study of public school children's psychological development in relation to home environment. *J. Indian Ed.* 27(1), 16-23.

Schools information. (n.d). Retrieved April 6, 2016, from School Education Department website, <http://schools.punjab.gov.pk>

Sen, A. (2000). Merit and justice. *Meritocracy and economic inequality*, 5-16.Princeton, N.J. :, 2000.

Sennett, R. (2003). *Respect in a World of Inequality*. WW Norton & Company, New York4.

Singh, K. (2010). Developing human capital by linking emotional intelligence with personal competencies in Indian business organizations. *Int. Journal of Business Science and Applied Management* 5(2), 29-42

Vernon, P. E. (1933). *Some characteristics of the good judge of personality*. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 4(1), 42-57.doi.org/10.1037/h0044999