A STUDY ON SCHOOL ROBUSTNESS AND FAMILY ENVIRONMENT OF HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS

Mr. M. Suresh[1] & (Mrs.) Doreen Gnanam[2], Ph. D.

[1]*PhD – Research scholar, Associate Professor in EMH, Bharathiar University Meston College of Education, Coimbatore-46 Royapettah, Chennai -14*

[2]*Assistant professor, AKT. Memorial College of Education, Kallakurichi, Villupuram district*

Abstract

The present study was conducted to study the family environment and school robustness of higher secondary students. The samples of the study were 400 higher secondary students which were selected randomly employed to collect the necessary data. The investigator has used the family environmental scale constructed and standardized by Dr. Harpret Bhatta and Dr. N. K. Chadha (1999) and school robustness scale prepared by the investigator (2016).Here descriptive survey methods were employed to analyze the data. Mean, Median, S.D, product movement correlation and t-ratios technique were employed to analyze the data. The present study reveals that the school robustness of school students helps the parents to provide them better family environment in order to make their school robustness and emotional intelligence.

Keywords: Family Environment, School Robustness and Higher Secondary Students.

INTRODUCTION

A country's development is depended on the school and school going student's family situation, Emotional intelligence by keeping this as main theme school robustness can make a student and the society. Because students studying in the school is from different society, Culture and tradition. By this researcher analyze the individual ability, as school robustness can be prepared and understand. Ability, as school robustness can be prepared and understand.

SCHOOL ROBUSTNESS

In the words of Nunn (1963), school robustness consists in the submission of one's impulses and powers to a regulation which imposes from chaos and brings efficiency and economy where there would otherwise be ineffective and waste. Though part of our nature resist this control, its acceptance must on the whole be a willing acceptance, the spontaneous movement of a nature in which there is an inborn imposes towards greater perfection.

Implementing systems to better communicate risks and streamline established processes: The communication of school risks and their mitigating actions is a critical

component of the process of embedding into daily school activities. An on-line risk management system can facilitate schools in addressing this component because there's one centralized location for individuals to communicate risks when they are identified. The tool used should be a comprehensive, single repository for all the school's risk registers and highlight outstanding actions to support effective monitoring. There should also be clear robust reporting for management and the board in addition to support for monitoring and testing of individual risks and controls.

FAMILY ENVIRONMENT

The family shall be the natural protection and support of the state for its establishment and development. The family is the fundamental group of society and the natural environment for the growth and well-being of all its members and particularly children. The child, for the full and harmonious development of his or her personality, should grow up in a family environment, in an atmosphere of happiness, love and understanding. Good two-way communication between families and school is necessary for your student's success.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

➢ To study the relationship between school robustness and family environment of higher secondary students.

➢ To study the difference between school robustness of higher secondary boys and girls.

➢ To study the difference between school robustness of higher secondary government and private school students.

➢ To study the difference between family environment of higher secondary boys and girls.

➢ To study the difference between family environment of higher secondary government and private school students.

HYPOTHESIS

➢ There is significant relationship between school robustness and family environment of higher secondary school students.

➢ There is no significant difference in school robustness of higher secondary school boys and girls.

➢ There is no significant difference in school robustness of higher secondary government and private school students.

- There is no significant difference in family environment of higher secondary school boys and girls.
- There is no significant difference in family environment of higher secondary government and private school students.

METHOD USED

Descriptive survey methods was employed to analyze the data

SAMPLE

400 higher secondary students are selected randomly from Villupuram district in Tamilnadu state.

TOOLS USED

The investigator has used the family environmental scale constructed and standardized by Dr.Harpret Bhatta and Dr.N.K.Chadha (1999) and school robustness scale prepared by the investigator (2016).

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED

Mean, median, S.D, t-ratios and product movement correlation were used to analyze the data.

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

The obtained results have been summarized as under.

Table-1

Showing the mean, SD and r-value to locate significant relationship between family environment and school robustness of higher secondary school students.

Variable	Sample	Mean	SD	R
Family Environment	400	217.74	30.31	
vs	400	130.20	19.92	0.112**
School Robustness				

** Significant at 0.01 level

Table -1, shows that co-efficient of correlation for relationship between family environment and school robustness of higher secondary students at 0.01 levels. In the view of this the hypothesis no. 1 stated as 'There is significant relationship between family environment and school robustness of higher secondary school students' was rejected. Therefore better the family environment, high school robustness capacity the students will have. When parents are providing better environment at home, this will develop qualities like school robustness capacity.

Table -2

Showing the mean, SD.S.ED and t-value to locate difference between boys and girls on the variable of school robustness of whole sample.

Sex	Sample	Mean	SD	SED	t-value
Boys	200	131.40	16.50	1.83	0.32
Girls	200	130.83	19.72		(NS)

NS Significant at 0.05 levels of significance

It is clear from table – 2 that t-value comes out to be 0.32, which is insignificant at both 0.05 and 0.01 levels. Therefore hypothesis No.2, "There is no significant difference in the mean score of school robustness of boys and girls" was accepted. The parents are also now giving equal importance to the boys as well as girls. So the development is of similar type and of same level.

Table 3

Showing the mean, SD.SED and t-value to locate difference between government and private higher secondary school students on the variable of school robustness

School	Sample	Mean	SD	SED	t-value
Private	200	130.20	19.19		1.92
Government	200	129.56	19.40	1.93	(NS)

NS Significant at 0.05 levels of significance

It is evident from the table-3 that the calculated t-value is 1.92, which is insignificant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels. Therefore hypothesis no.3, 'There is no significant difference in the mean score of school robustness of government and private managed higher secondary students' was accepted. This means that private and government higher secondary students do not differ in their school robustness.

Table 4

Showing the mean, SD, SED and t-value to locate difference between boys and girls on the variable of family environment

Sex	Sample	Mean	SD	SED	t-value
Boys	200	217.16	29.32	2.90	0.32
Girls	200	218.21	274.74		(NS)

NS at 0.05 and 0.01 levels of significance

Table -4 clearly indicates that the calculate t-value is insignificant at both 0.05 and 0.01 levels. Therefore hypothesis No.4, 'There is no significant difference in the mean score of family environment of boys' and girls' was accepted. It mean girls and boys do not differ in their family environment.

Table 5

Showing the mean, SD, SED and t-value to locate difference between government and private higher secondary school students on the variable of family environment

School	Sample	Mean	SD	SED	t-value
Private	200	218.40	23.12	2.88	0.44
Government	200	219.18	23.46		(NS)

Ns Significant at 0.05 levels of significance

The table-5 shows that the calculated t-value comes out to be 0.44 which is insignificant at both 0.05 and 0.01 levels. Therefore hypothesis No.5 stated as, 'There is no significant difference in the mean score of family environment of government and private managed higher secondary students' was accepted. It means that private and government higher secondary school students do not differ in their family environment.

CONCLUSION

❖ There is a significant relationship between school robustness and family environment of higher secondary students.

❖ There is no significant relationship between school robustness of higher secondary boys and girls.

❖ The difference between government and private higher secondary students on school robustness is found to be insignificant.

❖ There is no significant difference has found on family environment of boys and girls of the whole sample.

❖ The difference between the government and private higher secondary students on family environment is found to be insignificant.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATION

✓ The present study would useful in understanding the school robustness and family environment of the higher secondary students.

✓ School robustness of higher secondary students help the parents, teachers and school administration to guide them.

✓ School robustness of higher secondary students helps the parents to provide them better family environment in order to make their school robustness. Moreover parent's school will not differentiates their sons and daughters in area of school robustness.

✓ Teachers are able to correlation the higher secondary school student's level of family environment and school robustness.

Reference

Stein and book (2000) Effect of school organizational climate and academic stress on academic success among adolescents. Journal of Community Guidance & Research, 27(1), 53-61.

Dar, O.H; Alam, S. and Lone, Z.A. (2011) Relationship between school environmental and psychological well being of male police personnel. School robustness Journal of Humanities and Social Science. 11(3).

Reddy, B. S. and Venu, P. (2010) Impact of gender and locality on school climate of secondary school students. Journal of Community Guidance & Research. 27(3), 331-336.

Devi, D. (2014) Institutional climate and leadership behavior at work: A professional guide. A division of Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.

www.google.com

www.googlescholar.com