

Vol.IV

Number-1

ISSN No.2321-0885

Jan. -Dec.2015

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EDUCATION, TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIAL MEDIA

A Peer Reviewed Journal

APH PUBLISHING CORPORATION

Principal
St. Xavier's College of Education
(Autonomous)
Palayamkottai - 627 002

Personal Values of B.Ed. Teacher Trainees <i>A. Jesintha Rani</i>	70
A Study on Mindfulness among First Generation Women B.Ed. Teacher Trainees <i>Dr. Mrs. Joseph Catherine and Mrs. Lanciyet Betzy L.</i>	77
The Personality Dimension of Higher Secondary School Students <i>S. Meenakshi</i>	84
A Study on Optimism of Adolescent Students <i>Dr. K. A. Sheeba and O. M. A. Noorunissa</i>	89
Adjustment Behaviour of XI Standard Students <i>A. S. Revathi</i>	96
Building Self-esteem for Cognitive Reflection <i>R. Muthulakshmi</i>	102
Multiple Intelligence of In-service Teachers <i>K. Mangai</i>	107
Effective Role of Assistive Technology for Diverse Learners <i>Dr. Vijula Suresh</i>	115
A Study on Academic Stress among Higher Secondary Students of Working and Nonworking Mothers in Relationship with their Academic Achievement in Chennai District <i>Dr. Jain Shanthini and P.S. Jayasree</i>	122
The Women Writer's Contribution to Sanskrit Literature <i>Dr. S. Chinna Reddaiah</i>	129
Indian Electoral System: Need for Reforms <i>Dr. C. Ramana Reddy</i>	135
Impact of Education on the Social Development of Tribes <i>Kulwant Singh</i>	141
Women Education and West Bengal (Rammohan Roy, Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar & Swami Vivekananda) <i>Dr. Amit Bhowmick</i>	168
The Concept of Self-Efficacy and its Significance <i>Mr. Rajasekhar Charugundla</i>	172
The Pleasure of Teaching English Poetry <i>Mr. Satyanarayana Chittaluri</i>	180
A Study of Teachers on Implementation of Continuous Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) In Schools <i>Mr. Madhukar</i>	187

Home Environment of High School Students

Ceema Nair J.* and Rev. Dr. I. Jesudoss S. J.**

ABSTRACT

This study deals with the home environment of high school students. The sample consists of 1049 high school students from Kanyakumari, Tirunelveli and Thoothukudi Districts. The tool for home environment was prepared and validated by the investigator and the guide. Stratified random sampling technique was used for the selection of the sample. This study shows that there is significant difference between male and female high school students in their home environment and its dimensions – family affiliation, family nature, parental involvement and educational resources.

INTRODUCTION

Home is the place where a child begins to learn. It is the basic source of informal and incidental learning which subsequently determines their progress on different fronts. The term "home environment" refers to all the objects, forces and conditions in the home which influence the child physically, intellectually and emotionally. Family with its physical, intellectual and emotional aspects shapes a child's life in the journey towards self-fulfilment. Individual differences owe their origin mostly to a number of variables created at home, which may help or hinder the progressive growth of the child. Family relationships and the behaviour of family members also contribute to the child's achievements. The child learns by observing and participating in the activities of family members. Moulding the child's culture, harmonious adjustment with surrounding atmosphere and character formation depends largely upon the family. Family nature refers to the atmosphere prevailing at home where children naturally spend most of their time. Children should be provided a quiet place to study with sufficient time. It is very important to maintain a warm and supportive home, show interest in children's progress, helping with home work, discussing the value of a good education and possible career options. Parental involvement include monitoring children's activities outside home and school, setting rules, helping children with school work, holding high educational expectations, discussing future plans with children, helping them with important decision making, participating in school-related activities, reading to children and engaging in enrichment or leisure activities together.

The privileged homes and well-to-do families are able to provide **the best amenities** of life and good education to their children. Children belonging to poor families, **on the other hand**, are denied even the basic necessities. Besides poverty, the intellectual inferiority and illiteracy of the parents also contribute towards sub-normal educational attainment of the children. Some parents have neither a positive attitude towards education nor the ability to guide and help the children in their studies. Researchers highlight that Asian families tend to take more active role in creating environment with educational resources for their children which results in higher student achievement (Muller & Kerbow, 1993; Stevenson & Stigler, 1992). Educational CDs, books, dictionary, newspapers, calculators and computers are the resources conducive to learning.

*Ph.D., Research Scholar, St. Xavier's College of Education (Autonomous), Palayamkottai (T.N.).

**Associate Professor and Research Supervisor, St. Xavier's College of Education (Autonomous), Palayamkottai (T.N.).

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Home environments vary with the level of family size, parents' education, economic status, occupational status, religious background, attitudes, values, interests and parents' expectations of their children. Children coming from different home environments are affected differently by such variations. In well-adjusted families, a child easily finds opportunities for full expression of his talents and development of his personality, but when family life is not harmonious it has unhealthy effects on his development. The results of several studies have indicated that the progress of a child in the school is more closely related with factors in the home environment rather than his intelligence. Parents are not only the first companions but also the first teachers of the children. The success of any educational programme stipulates healthy home influence in the early life of the student. Healthy home environment is the prerequisite for developing good academic performance. In this background the investigator wants to find the home environment of high schools students.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To find out whether there is any significant difference between male and female high school students in their home environment and its dimensions.
2. To find out whether there is any significant difference between rural and urban high school students in their home environment and its dimensions.

HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY

1. There is no significant difference between male and female high school students in their family affiliation, family nature, parental involvement, economic status and educational resources.
2. There is no significant difference between rural and urban high school students in their family affiliation, family nature, parental involvement, economic status and educational resources.

METHOD OF STUDY

The normative survey method was used to examine the home environment of high school students.

POPULATION

The population of the study comprises of high school students from Kanyakumari, Tirunelveli and Thoothukudi districts.

SAMPLE

For this study stratified random sampling technique was used for selection of the sample. The sample consists of 1049 high school students from Kanyakumari, Tirunelveli and Thoothukudi districts.

TOOL USED

Home environment inventory was developed and standardized by the investigator and the guide.

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED

Mean, standard deviation and t-test.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference between male and female high school students in their family affiliation, family nature, parental involvement, economic status and educational resources.

Table-1: Difference between male and female high school students in their home environment

Home Environment and its Dimensions	Gender	Mean	S.D.	Calculated 't' value	Remarks at 5% level
Family affiliation	Male (N=550)	12.33	1.35	-6.80	S
	Female (N=499)	12.86	1.18		
Family nature	Male (N=550)	12.00	1.33	-1.96	S
	Female (N=499)	12.16	1.23		
Parental involvement	Male (N=550)	12.11	1.69	-3.77	S
	Female (N=499)	12.49	1.55		
Economic status	Male (N=550)	13.61	1.81	-1.89	NS
	Female (N=499)	13.84	1.97		
Educational resources	Male (N=550)	16.15	2.22	-5.31	S
	Female (N=499)	16.89	2.32		
Home environment in Total	Male (N=550)	66.20	5.88	-5.47	S
	Female (N=499)	68.23	6.12		

At 5% level of significance, the table value of 't' is 1.96

It is inferred from the table that there is no significant difference between male and female high school students in their economic status but there is a significant difference between male and female high school students in their family affiliation, family nature, parental involvement, educational resources and home environment.

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference between rural and urban high school students in their family affiliation, family nature, parental involvement, economic status and educational resources.

Table 2: Difference between rural and urban high school students in their home environment

Home Environment and its Dimensions	Locality of school	Mean	S.D.	Calculated 't' value	Remarks at 5% level
Family affiliation	Rural (N=352)	12.38	1.34	-3.51	S
	Urban (N=697)	12.68	1.26		

Family nature	Rural (N=352)	11.85	1.38	-3.90	S
	Urban (N=697)	12.19	1.22		
Parental involvement	Rural (N=352)	11.64	1.84	-8.66	S
	Urban (N=697)	12.61	1.42		
Economic status	Rural (N=352)	13.22	1.89	-6.16	S
	Urban (N=697)	13.97	1.84		
Educational resources	Rural (N=352)	16.09	2.26	-4.18	S
	Urban (N=697)	16.71	2.29		
Home environment in Total	Rural (N=352)	65.18	6.37	-7.43	S
	Urban (N=697)	68.17	5.68		

At 5% level of significance, the table value of 't' is 1.96

It is inferred from the table that there is a significant difference between rural and urban high school students in their family affiliation, family nature, parental involvement, economic status, educational resources and home environment. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

1. There is no significant difference between male and female high school students in their economic status but there is a significant difference between male and female high school students in their family affiliation, family nature, parental involvement, educational resources and home environment.
2. There is a significant difference between rural and urban high school students in their family affiliation, family nature, parental involvement, economic status, educational resources and home environment.

INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

While comparing the mean scores of male high school students (12.33,12.00,12.11, 16.15,66.20) and female high school students (12.86,12.16,12.49,16.89,68.23), female students have better family affiliation, family nature, parental involvement, educational resources and home environment than male students. This may be because female students spend most of their time in home and fully utilize the resources available at home. They are more attached to the family members than male students.

While comparing the mean scores of rural high school students (12.38,11.85,11.64, 13.22,16.09,65.18) and urban high school students (12.68,12.19,12.61,13.97,16.71,68.17), urban students have better family affiliation, family nature, parental involvement, economic status, educational resources and home environment than rural students. This may be because parents of urban students have better jobs and buying power. Further, in an urban family setting, parents show higher responsibility and allot time for family bonding.

CONCLUSION

The present study brings out the home environment of high school students. Gender wise and locality wise analysis has been made with the dimensions of home environment. This finding will help the researchers in the field of education.

REFERENCES

- Garrett, Henry E. (2013). *Statistics in psychology and education*. Delhi: Surjeet Publications.
- Kochhar, S.K. (2010). *Secondary school administration*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited.
- Mangal, S.K. (October 2010). *Advanced educational psychology*. New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.
- Muller, Chandra and David Kerbow. (1993). "Parent Involvement in the Home, School and Community." Pp. 13-42. In *Parents, Their Children and Schools*, edited by Barbara Schneider and James S. Coleman. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Muola, J. M. (May, 2010). A study of the relationship between academic achievement motivation and home environment among standard eight pupils. *Educational Research and Reviews* 5 (5), pp. 213-217. Retrieved July 5, 2014 from http://www.academicjournals.org/article/article1379607738_Muola.pdf
- Sivarajan, K. (2004). *Education in the emerging Indian society*. Calicut: Calicut University.
- Stevenson, Harold W. and James W. Stigler. (1992). *The learning gap: why our schools are failing and what we can learn from Japanese and Chinese Education*. New York: Summit Books.