



A STUDY ON HOME ENVIRONMENT AMONG HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS

Mrs. M. Maria Jeslin*

(Reg.No: 20124011042010)**Ph.D Scholar (Part-time), Department of Education, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli – 627 012.*

&

Dr. K. R. Selvakumar**

***Assistant Professor, Department of Education (DD&CE-B.Ed), Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli – 627 012.*

Abstract

In this study the home environment of higher secondary students of Kanniyakumari District in Tamil Nadu was focused. The main objectives of the study were to find out the level of home environment of higher secondary students and to find out the significant difference in home environment with regard to gender. 609 samples were selected by simple random sampling technique. Home environment inventory developed and validated by Basil Gagarin and Selvakumar(2019) was used to collect the data. Statistical techniques used in this study were percentage analysis and t-test to find out the significant difference in home environment with regard to gender. The results indicated that there was significant difference in the home environment of higher secondary students irrespective of their gender

Key words: Home environment, Higher secondary students, Kanniyakumari, Simple random sampling technique, Gender.

DOI: Number: 10.48047/nq.2022.20.22.NQ10476

NeuroQuantology 2022; 20(22): 4721-4726

4721

Introduction

“Rousseau says, “Mother is the true nurse and Father is the true teacher”. Home and school are two important agencies of education for personality development. Home is the social institution, which has an influence on the development of the child. Home is the external school of the life of a child. The foundation of education is laid in the home and the school and teachers simply work on it. Home is the first institution that is responsible for the education of the child and parents are actually the child’s first educators. The parents are educated; naturally, they will be interested in the education of their children. The influence of family greatly affects the personality development of the child. Home environment,

upkeep, sanitation, and decoration all influence the growth of the child. Some of the students do not enjoy school because they do not know to study and perform in the examinations. For them, learning becomes drudgery to them. Crow and Crow have pointed out that “unfortunate is the educational influence of the home in which parents disagree in the presence of the child concerning what constitutes desirable child behaviour.

Significance of the Study

Home is the social institution, which has the most of teaching influence on the development of the child. In view of the great significance of the family in shaping of children’s personality development, numerous researches attempted to study the several



factors of family ecology in relation of children’s development and scholastic achievement. It is often said that home is the first institution and the mother is the first teacher of the child. Family as the first teacher educates the child in his health, habit, speech, pattern, basic ideas and the many fold attitudes towards himself and the associates. In fact, the family provides the foundation on which future of the child’s education is constructed. As long as the child is dependent on his/her parents, they have to work for satisfying their economic needs. They have to provide their food, clothing, education, recreation and various other needs. Not only this, they have to train him for some occupation in life. Physical care of the child is the first important responsibility of the family. Physical health also depends upon good health habits such as regular brushing of teeth, proper sleep and regular exercises. The family gives early training in these health rules to enable the child to develop sound physical health and hence personality. Parents are always interested in their child’s work at school. The school can elicit the faith and co-operation of the parent by sending a detailed report of the child to his parents. These reports will invite parent’s opinion and advice in the well-being of the child

Study conducted by Clark, Goyder and Bissel (2007) also agreed that positive domestic environment is the prominent indicator of students’ success in their academics. They further added that teaching learning process carried out at school is incomplete without the support of home environment. Parents who take responsibility for children learning result in

Objective:1

The level of home environment and its dimensions of higher secondary students with respect to Gender

Table 1: Level of Home environment and its dimensions of higher secondary students with respect to Gender

| Dimension | Gender | N | Low | | Moderate | | High | |
|----------------|--------|-----|-----|------|----------|------|------|------|
| | | | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Control | Male | 217 | 39 | 18.0 | 145 | 66.8 | 33 | 15.2 |
| | Female | 392 | 81 | 20.7 | 267 | 68.1 | 44 | 11.2 |
| Protectiveness | Male | 217 | 32 | 14.7 | 160 | 73.7 | 25 | 11.5 |
| | Female | 392 | 55 | 14.0 | 279 | 71.2 | 58 | 14.8 |
| Punishment | Male | 217 | 29 | 13.4 | 165 | 76.0 | 23 | 10.6 |
| | Female | 392 | 47 | 12.0 | 299 | 76.3 | 46 | 11.7 |

increasing their kids interest in the studies. Although its role has been accepted and proved by different researchers (Parveen, 2007; Moula, 2010; Bandhana & Sharma, 2012) the present study intent to explore home environment and its dimensions with students’ academic achievement. Therefore, this study was aimed to investigate the relationship of home environment and the academic achievement of higher secondary students.

Objectives

1. To find out the level of home environment among higher secondary students with respect to gender; and
2. To find out the significant difference in home environment and its dimensions among higher secondary students with respect to gender.

Hypothesis

1. There is no significant difference between Home Environment and its dimensions of higher secondary school students and to Gender.

Methodology

The researcher has chosen the survey method to study the home environment of higher secondary students. Home Environment Inventory (HEI) developed and validated by Basil Gagarin and Selvakumar (2019) was used for collecting the required data. A sample of 609 students studying in various higher secondary students in Kanniyakumari district was selected using simple random sampling technique. The collected data was analyzed using mean, S.D, ‘t’ test and Percentage Analysis



| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------|-----|----|------|-----|------|----|------|
| Conformity | Male | 217 | 41 | 18.9 | 152 | 70.0 | 24 | 11.1 |
| | Female | 392 | 63 | 16.1 | 282 | 71.9 | 47 | 12.0 |
| Socialisolation | Male | 217 | 25 | 11.5 | 138 | 63.6 | 54 | 24.9 |
| | Female | 392 | 71 | 18.1 | 256 | 65.3 | 65 | 16.6 |
| Reward | Male | 217 | 45 | 20.7 | 147 | 67.7 | 25 | 11.5 |
| | Female | 392 | 53 | 13.5 | 282 | 71.9 | 57 | 14.5 |
| Deprivation of Privileges | Male | 217 | 23 | 10.6 | 137 | 63.1 | 57 | 26.3 |
| | Female | 392 | 50 | 12.8 | 273 | 69.6 | 69 | 17.6 |
| Nurturance | Male | 217 | 25 | 11.5 | 167 | 77.0 | 25 | 11.5 |
| | Female | 392 | 60 | 15.3 | 269 | 68.6 | 63 | 16.1 |
| Rejection | Male | 217 | 34 | 15.7 | 137 | 63.1 | 46 | 21.2 |
| | Female | 392 | 69 | 17.6 | 274 | 69.9 | 49 | 12.5 |
| Permissiveness | Male | 217 | 26 | 12.0 | 166 | 76.5 | 25 | 11.5 |
| | Female | 392 | 47 | 12.0 | 309 | 78.8 | 36 | 9.2 |
| Home Environment | Male | 217 | 32 | 14.7 | 151 | 69.6 | 34 | 15.7 |
| | Female | 392 | 60 | 15.3 | 281 | 71.6 | 53 | 13.5 |

From the above table it is inferred that 14.7% of male higher secondary students have low,69.6% of them have average and 15.7% of them have high level of Home environment. With respect to female students, 15.3% of them have low,71.6% of them have average,

and13.5% of them have high level of Home environment.

Differential Analysis

Hypothesis-I

There is no significant difference between Home Environment and its dimensions of higher secondary school students and to Gender.

4723

Table 2: Significant difference between Home Environment and its dimensions of higher secondary school students and to Gender

| Dimension | Gender | N | Mean | SD | Calculated value of 't'test | Remark at 5%level |
|---------------------------|--------|-----|-------|-------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Control | Male | 217 | 28.62 | 6.347 | 0.722 | NS |
| | Female | 392 | 28.24 | 5.743 | | |
| Protectiveness | Male | 217 | 35.99 | 6.955 | 1.438 | NS |
| | Female | 392 | 36.83 | 6.892 | | |
| Punishment | Male | 217 | 34.17 | 9.507 | 0.910 | NS |
| | Female | 392 | 33.48 | 7.629 | | |
| Conformity | Male | 217 | 36.46 | 6.325 | 2.242 | S |
| | Female | 392 | 37.70 | 6.947 | | |
| Social isolation | Male | 217 | 25.56 | 8.446 | 3.606 | S |
| | Female | 392 | 23.06 | 7.656 | | |
| Reward | Male | 217 | 39.14 | 7.048 | 2.663 | S |
| | Female | 392 | 40.69 | 6.601 | | |
| Deprivation of Privileges | Male | 217 | 23.71 | 9.260 | 3.800 | S |
| | Female | 392 | 20.82 | 8.528 | | |
| Nurturance | Male | 217 | 33.98 | 6.556 | 0.088 | NS |
| | Female | 392 | 34.03 | 7.464 | | |
| Rejection | Male | 217 | 25.82 | 8.637 | 3.267 | S |
| | Female | 392 | 23.53 | 7.523 | | |



| | | | | | | |
|------------------|--------|-----|--------|--------|-------|----|
| Permissiveness | Male | 217 | 32.14 | 6.830 | 0.064 | NS |
| | Female | 392 | 31.66 | 5.842 | | |
| Home Environment | Male | 217 | 315.58 | 36.661 | 1.814 | NS |
| | Female | 392 | 310.06 | 34.648 | | |

(At 5% level of significance, the table value is 1.96)

NS- Not significant, S- Significant

It is inferred from table 2 that calculated value of 't' 0.722, .38, 0.10, 2.242, 3.606, 2.663, 3.800, 0.088, 3.267, 0.064, and 1.814) is greater than the table value (1.96) for df 607 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. This shows that there is no significant difference between male and female higher secondary students in their home environment and its dimensions except conformity, social isolation, reward, deprivation of privilege and rejection.

Findings

The interpretations are made based on the findings from the above tables:

The percentage analysis shows that the majority of the higher secondary students express moderate level of home environment. Male students have better home environment and its dimensions' control, social, Deprivation of privileges, rejection and permissiveness. Generally male students have high control home environment. It indicates the autocratic atmosphere in which many restrictions are imposed on children by the parents in order to monitor and discipline them.

Social isolation is also high compare to female students, the reason may be male students don't share their ideas in their family members, because the adolescent period the friends circle dominate major role deprivation of privileges is taking something away from the child as a consequence when the child misbehaves. This types of activities highly provided to male students because in this adolescent period they have argumentative and disobedient with their parent. Deprivation of privilege helps children learn the difference between acceptable and unacceptable behavior.

Rejection refers to withdrawal of affection, love or warmth by the child towards

their parents. It means a conditional love recognizing that the child has no rights as a person, no right to express his feelings, no right to uniqueness and no right to become an autonomous individual". The reason may be the generation gap between the parents and the children. Permissiveness is a type of parenting style and characterized by low demands with high responsiveness. These parents tend to be very loving and provide few guidelines and rules. These parents provide opportunities to the child to express views freely and act according to desires.

There is no significant difference between male and female higher secondary students in their home environment and its dimensions except conformity, social isolation, reward and deprivation of privilege and rejection. Conforming to the opinions of others can help us enhance and protect ourselves by providing us with important and accurate information and can help us better relate to others. On average, men and women have different levels of self-concern and other-concern. Men are, on average, more concerned about appearing to have high status and may be able to demonstrate this status by acting independently from the opinions of others. On the other hand, and again although there are substantial individual differences among them, women are, on average, more concerned with connecting to others and maintaining group harmony.

There is significant difference between male and female higher secondary students in their social isolation. The female higher secondary students have more social movement than male students. This may due to the fact that lack of peer group connection, lack of social movement, public examination fear, under academic achievement are the major



reason for social isolation. It will be rectifying through building healthy peer relationships, promoting family connectedness, and developing school-based interventions are discussed.

There is significant difference between male and female higher secondary students in their reward, deprivation of privilege and rejection. Reward includes the material as well as symbolic rewards given to children to strengthen or increase the probability of desired behavior. Deprivation of privilege is taking something away from the child as a consequence when the child misbehaves. Deprivation of privilege helps children learn the difference between acceptable and unacceptable behavior. Rejection refers to withdrawal of affection, love or warmth by the child towards their parents. It means a conditional love recognizing that the child has no rights as a person, no right to express his feelings, no right to uniqueness and no right to become an autonomous individual. The result reveals that the parents and the home environment have gender discrimination.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis and interpretation following conclusions were drawn; there is no significant difference between male and female higher secondary students in their home environment and its dimensions except conformity, social isolation, reward, deprivation of privilege and rejection. Children educational activities at home are based on the physical environment of their home. Home facilities of children enable and restrain them in practicing educational activities at home. Class preparation and practice at home are fundamental for child, as a child spends only five and six hours at school and the remaining time is spent at home which needs to be utilized properly. The proper utilization of home time of child means provision of educational environment at home, which plays a dominant role in improving the educational performances of children. The establishment of Parents' Teacher Councils/ Associations at school is an important step toward increased parent's involvement in the educational

activities of children (Hussain & Naz, 2013; Cooper, Robinson, & Patall, 2006; Davis-Kean, 2005). Machet (2002) further presented more detailed description of home environment and its influences on the educational performances of students. The power of imitation enables the children to learn from their parents and elders. Parents watching TV, having lunch, dinner and breakfast and other activities at home provide numerous learning opportunities for children from parents and other family members. Majority of the students were lacking study room facility, they were not allowed to take participation in domestic issues but they showed satisfaction from the physical facilities, self-esteem and family interactions.

Recommendations

Keeping in view the above mentioned findings, the recommendations are given as below;

- i. Home environment is recommended that students should be provided a serene home environment for studies which could help to promote student's overall development. The most suitable mean is to give proper time to children, and an educative environment at home.
- ii. Family member's interactions at home are a great source of development for children. It provides a source for the social and intellectual development of children. It also enhances children confidence level. It is therefore recommended that students should be exposed to inner interactions of family; they should be allowed to express their view point on different family matters and might be treated as a functional member of the family.

Reference

- Bandhana & Sharma, D. P. (2012). Home Environment, Mental Health and Academic Achievement Among Higher Secondary School Students. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*. 2 (5); 1-4.
- Clark, H. & Goyder, E. (2007). How do Parents' Child-Feeding Behaviours Influence Child. *Journal of Public Health*. 3 (1); 21-24.
- Hussain, S. (2013). The Impact of Peer Groups On the Academic Achievements of Secondary



School Students. Journal of American Science 9(11). <http://www.jofamericanscience.org>
Machet, M. P. (2002). Addressing problems of literacy in disadvantaged communities. The online platform for Taylor and Francis Group content. 33(1); 1-46.
Muola, J. (2010). A Study of the Relationship Between Academic Achievement Motivation and Home Environment Among standard eight

pupils. Journals of educational Research and Reviews. 5(5); 213-217.
Parveen, A. (2007). Effects of Home Environment on Personality and Academic Achievements of Students of Grade 12 in Rawalpindi Division. Research thesis, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, 32-41.

