

“A study of School Environment among school student” (Effect of organizations and sex as factors among environmental problems of Urban and Rural school student)

¹Dr.S.M.Makvana, ²P.G.Department

¹(M.Phil, Ph.D) Associate Professor,

²Psychology, Sardar Patel University, VallabhVidyaNagar, Gujarat.

I. Introduction:

Main aim of the present study has been to find out the relationship and role of School environment as under the study has been examined among Secondary and higher secondary urban and rural school students. Student study in secondary 8th, 9th and 10th and higher secondary 11th and 12th school in urban and rural area of Anand district. "School level variables that related directly to the school environment as well as followers of Student, Peon, and cleark. Who are the School environment policy maker as a school teachers, curriculum co-coordinator, principal and also reflected policies created at the school, district or community level that impact the entire school faculty, parents and students."

M.Mishra (1971) "The term which refers to generalize attitudes towards the teacher and the class that the pupils share in common despite individual differences. The development of those attitudes is an outgrowth of classroom social interaction. Because of participating in classroom activities pupils soon develop common attitudes about how they like their class, the kind of person the teacher is, and how he will act in certain situations.

Fundamentally, environmental influences consist of four factors, **Physical**, (Physiological growth and health depend in large part on his immediate surroundings) **Family**, (As a primary group, the family exercises its influence on each member, especially on young children, in many ways) **Cultural** (culture is a pattern of a people's life seen in terms of organizations and achievements marking related communities or societies) and **School Environment** (In the school situation, the child must function independent of family support and must learn to accept authority outside the family unit, as well as competition. Group dynamics at school are more complex from those of his neighborhood associations. It is a situation conducive to further steps in the never-ending process of socialization) Recent research has linked the school environment with rural and urban school student. Teacher assaults are associated with a higher percentage male faculty, a higher proportion of male students, and a higher proportion of students receiving free or reduced cost or high lunch (an indicator of poverty). In general, a large male population, higher grade levels, a history of high levels of disciplinary problems in the school and small male population but higher grade levels a history of, high student to teacher ratios, and an urban location are related to negative effect after created violence in schools. In students, academic performance is inversely related to antisocial conduct. The research by Hirschi and others, cited above in the section on the home and school environment, is also consistent with the view that **lack of attachment to school is associated with increased risk of antisocial conduct**. Some intervention programs are aimed at *improving family relationships*. There is some evidence that such intervention strategies have modest effects on the behavior of children in the short and long term. Patterson's home intervention program involving mothers has been shown to reduce aggressive conduct in children. An important question concerns the extent to which the influence of the program carries over into the child's conduct in school.

The French Education Minister claimed in 2000 that 39 out of 75,000 state schools were "seriously violent" and 300 were "somewhat violent". Japan country survey by the Education Ministry showed that students at public schools were involved in a record number of violent incidents in 2007—52,756 cases, an increase of some 8,000 on the previous year. In almost 7,000 of these incidents, teachers were the target of assault. **Poland**-In 2006, in response to the suicide of a girl after she was sexually molested in school, the Polish Minister of Education, **Roman Giertych**, launched a "**zero tolerance**" school reform Under this plan, teachers would have the legal status of **civil servants**, making violent crimes against them punishable by higher penalties. **Head teachers** (equivalent to principals in the US) will be, in theory, able to send aggressive pupils to perform **community service** and these students' parents may also be fined. Teachers who fail to report violent acts in school could face a **prison sentence**. **South African** Human Rights Commission has found that 40% of children interviewed said they had been the victims of crime at school. More than a fifth of sexual assaults on South African children were found to have taken place in schools. Exposure to domestic violence, gangster's,

and drugs have had a substantial impact on student performance. **United Kingdom**-A government inquiry in 1989 found that 2% of teachers had reported facing physical aggression. In 2007 a survey of 6,000 teachers by the teachers' trade union NASUWT found that over 16% claimed to have been physically assaulted by students in the previous two years. On the basis of police statistics found through a Freedom of Information request, in 2007 there were more than 7,000 cases of the police being called to deal with violence in schools in England. In April 2009 another teachers' union, the Association of Teachers and Lecturers, released details of a survey of over 1,000 of its members which found that nearly one quarter of them had been on the receiving end of physical violence by a student. In Wales, a 2009 survey found that two-fifths of teachers reported having been assaulted in the classroom. 49% had been threatened with assault. **United States**, According to the U.S. **National Center for Education Statistics**, school violence is a serious problem. In 2007, the latest year for which comprehensive data were available, a nationwide survey, conducted biennially by the **Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)** and involving representative samples of U.S. high school students, found that 5.9% of students carried a weapon (e.g. gun, knife, etc.) on school property during the 30 days antedating the survey. The rate was three times higher among males than among females. In the 12 months antedating the survey, 7.8% of high school students reported having been threatened or injured with a weapon on school property at least once, with the prevalence rate among males twice that as among females. In the 12 months antedating the survey, 12.4% of students had been in a physical fight on school property at least once. The rate among males was twice the rate found among females. In the 30 days antedating the survey, 5.5% of students reported that because they did not feel safe, they did not go to school on at least one day. The rates for males and females were approximately equal.

The most recent U.S. data on violent crime in which teachers were targeted indicate that 7%(10 % in urban schools) of teachers in 2003 were subject to threats of injury by students. 5% of teachers in urban schools were physically attacked, with smaller percentages in suburban and rural schools. Other members of school staffs are also at risk for violent attack, with school bus drivers being particularly vulnerable. The other factors like Aggression, frustration, conflict are reducing than creating good school environment and , if appropriate created good environment is Motivation or motivating (reward system), Temperament, competition, and more given achievement of school student are also responsible for developing school environment.

II. Objectives:

In the present research, the role of school environment under the study has been examined in the following context.

1. To find out the interactive effect between (A X B) school environment of types of school(institutions) and types of areas(Habitat) among different types school students
2. To find out the interactive effect between (A X C) school environment of types of school(institutions) and types of sex among different types school students
3. To examine the relative effects of (B X C) school environment of types of areas(Habitat) and types of sex among different types school students
4. To Explanation and effective relationship of (A X B X C) types of school, types of areas and types of sex on school environment among different types school institution students

III. Methodology:

3. 1: Sample:

For the purpose of present study Two level of types of institution were considered in the group of secondary and higher secondary school students, two level of areas were considered in the group of Urban and Rural school students and Two level of types of Sex were considered in the group of Male and female school students. In all samples are selected randomly again the respondents are equal number of distributed to select secondary and higher secondary School students from Anand, district. In all 240 respondents were selected as a final sample of the research.

3. 2: Tools: following tools were used

Personal data sheet: For information school environment regarding types of school institution students, types of area and type of Gender (Male and Female as well as sex) were collected data by Personal data sheet.

Used of Scale: For the present investigation, tool were used of the scales namely School environment inventory reliability of different factors of school environment as well as General reliability was 0.79, and the scale was constructed (SEI) consists of 70 items with six dimensions of school environment by **Dr. Karuna Shankar Misra (1983)**, and high face validity is established.

3.3: Hypotheses:

Following major hypothesis tested in present research.

H 01: There is no significant mean difference between the mean of the score on the **School environment** of **type of organizations** among different types school students.

H 02: There is no significant mean difference between the mean of the score on the **school environment** of **types of Areas** among different types school students.

H 03: There is no significant mean difference between the mean of the score on the **school environment** of **types of Sex** among different types school students

H 04: There is no significant mean difference between the mean of the score on the **school environment** of **Organizations and Areas** among different types school students

H 05: There is no significant difference between the mean of the scores of the interactive effect between on **school environment** of **Organization and Sex** among different types school students

H 06: There is no significant relationship between the mean of the scores of the relative effects on school environment of **Areas and Sex** among different types school students

H 07: There is no significant interactive effect between the means of the scores of Explanation and effective relationship of **Organizations, Areas and Sex on** school environment among different types school students

3. 4: Variable of the study:

Dependent variables: Score on School environment studied as dependent variables.

Independent variables: The variable of Organization, Areas (Habitata) and Sex.

3. 5: Research design:

The 2x2x2 factorial research design was adopted in the research.

The factorial research design was simple for studied of three independent variables in that each cell of two samples and dependent variables varied in following ways by shown

Table No : 1: Give about the Distribution of the Sample

Main variables:	Organizations				Total Number of Sample
	Secondary schools		Higher schools	Secondary	
Sex/Genders	Male	Female	Male	Famale	
Urban Areas	30	30	30	30	120
Rural Areas	30	30	30	30	120
Cell & Variables wise Total Number of Sample	60	60	60	60	240

3. 6: Major statistical techniques used:

To analyze the data with related variables of 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design the ANOVA was applied

IV. Results And Discussion:-

The scores on school environment was analyzed in factorial design and basic statistics in terms of mean and sample are summarized in table given as below.

Table No.2:

The Organizations, mean difference and ANOVA of School environment.

Source of Variable	Independent Variable	Mean	Difference	S.S (SSa*)	df	Mean S.S	f-Value & LS
A	1.S.S. (N=120)	175.99	16.01	15392.02	01	15392.02	16.80**
	2.H.S. (N=120)	192.01					

(Source: @>Non-significance, *> 0.05 - level, **> 0.01 - level.)

H 01: There is no significant mean difference between the mean of the score on the **School environment** of **type of organizations** among different types school students.

It is observed that Organizations plays a very crucial role in connection with Created good School environment. There are several schools which provide many facilities (including sport tools, Games tools, and familiar cartoon) to the student and they may have good aspiration, expectation for betterment and active participation of school. Above Table no: 2 shown that mean score of secondary school students was M=**175.99** (N=120) and higher secondary school students mean was =**192.01** (N=120) and both are differences of the

group, comparative differences of **16.01**. The both schools variable differences are differ and analysis was more satisfied of Urban Higher secondary school students among Rural secondary school student.

It is natural to expect that the secondary and higher secondary school as differ in there school environment. It is observed many researchers are that individual perception about both school students of school environment. Both school has some direct or indirect impact on School environment, so this observation was tested by Ho1. it was found that the (mean ss 15392.02) ‘F’ value is 16.80 for the type s of institution. which are significant of 0.01 level of types of institution and school environment by statistical analysis. Therefor the above, **H₀₁** null-hypothesis was rejected and it was held that secondary and higher secondary school student are at par with regard to school environment. Both the results are closure in the level of school environment of secondary and higher secondary schools.

The result supported to S.viswanathareddy and B.nagarathnamma “Relationship between.....school children.”-1994(JCGR) are accepted and significant co relation to above research.

Table No.: 3: Areas (Habitate), samples, mean difference and ANOVA of School environment

Source of Variable	Independent Variable	Mean	Difference	S.S (SSb*)	df	Mean S.S	f-Value & LS
B	1 U.A. (N=120)	181.89	4.22	1066.82	01	1066.82	1.16-@
	2 R.A..(N=120)	186.11					

(Source: @>Non-significance, *> 0.05 - level, **> 0.01 - level.)

H 02: There is no significant mean difference between the mean of the score on the **school environment of types of Areas** among different types school students.

It was observed that individuals perception about his School environment will have some direct or indirect impact on School environment results have seen from table No.3. Both the levels of type of areas (B1-urban and B2- rural areas school students) of School environment are not effective from above variables of B1- and B2, so that observation was tested by **H02**. the table No. 3 was formulated and it was found that the (mean ss 1066.82) ‘F’ value is 1.16 for the type of areas. which is not significant of areas of School environment. Above Table no: 3, shown that mean of score of, B1, Urban areas students was 181.89 and B2- rural students was 186.11, both the group was having the difference is 4.22. It means rural areas school students are having more developed School environment compared toward Urban areas school students. But the difference was negligible. Therefor the above table shows, that there is no significant in school environment as far as urban and rural are is concern the **H₀₂** null-hypothesis was accepted and concluded that both the groups did not differ significantly on School environment.

Table No. : 4 : Sex, samples, mean difference and ANOVA of School environment

Source of Variable	Independent Variable	Mean	Diff.	S.S (SSc*)	df	Mean S.S	f-Value & LS
C	1-Male (N=120)	179.39	9.22	5096.82	01	5096.82	5.56*
	2-Female (N=120)	188.61					

(Source: @>Non-significance, *> 0.05 - level, **> 0.01 - level.)

H 03: There is no significant mean difference between the mean of the score on the **school environment of types of Sex** among different types school students

Above observation (**H3**, null- hypotheses) was tested by table No. 4, indicates that the Mean scores of **male was 179.39 and female was 188.61**, both the **Sex** mean difference was 9.22 regarding School environment. The both the male and female was well correlated between the School environment, and it was significantly connected. The nature of correlation indicates the level of appraisal support of Female school student shows that the male students have more School environment compared to male the mean different was 9.22.. Table No.4 was formulated and found that the ‘f’ ratio was school environment of gender was 5.56, which is significant at 0.05 level. Therefore, the above table shows that there is significant in school environment as far as Male and Female concern, is means null-hypotheses was rejected and it held that Sex (male and female school student) are having different School environment. Both the indipendendt variables results are vary closure in the School environment of Male and female school students. This indicates that Sex with School environment both are related to that context. **It means Female school students significantly differ in relation to School environment compared to Male school students.** However, the present results, was supported by the researches of Chuhan.V.L and Sisodia.D.S “social responsibility and School environment among.....military personal-1992 (JCGR)”.

Table No. : 5 : Organizations and Area mean, and ANOVA of School environment

Source of Variable	Independent Variable	Mean	Diff.	S.S (SSAXB)	df	Mean S.S	f-Value & LS
A X B	A = (N=240)	184.00	1.00	33891.27	01	33891.27	36.99**
	B = (N=240)	184.00					

(Source: @>Non-significance, *> 0.05 - level, **> 0.01 - level.)

H 04: There is no significant mean difference between the mean of the score on the **school environment of Organizations and Areas** among different types school students

Looking to the above table number 5, it can be observed that the interaction between organizations and Area (Mean ss 184.00 and 184.00) and ‘F’ value of 36.99, which was significant role of both independent variables. Therefore the above, **H₀₄** null-hypothesis was rejected and regard per that both the groups is differ significantly on School environment scores. The above table No. 6, shows that there is the scores pertaining to interaction between Organizations and Areas of School environment. Both the independent variables results was comes to very high renking, valided and very crucial role and conecntion with closure to the school environment. This indicates that the Organizations Areas of School environment differences was differe. The results do not supported to Subhash chandra Agarwal and Alok kumar mishra “impact of parent.....school environment”-2005 (IJPD)

Table No. : 6 : Organizations, and sex mean difference and ANOVA of School environment

Source of Variable	Independent Variable	Mean	Difference	S.S (SSb*)	df	Mean S.S	f-Value & LS
A X C	A = (N=240)	184.00	1.00	1197.07	01	1197.07	1.31
	C = (N=240)	184.00					

(Source: @>Non-significance, *> 0.05 - level, **> 0.01 - level.)

H 05: There is no significant difference between the mean of the scores of the interactive effect between on **school environment of Organization and Sex** among different types school students

Above table No. 6 shown that there is no significant in school environment as far as **Organizations, and sex are is concern.** It can be observed that there is on significant role and interaction between **Organizations, and sex** Mean ss was, 184.00 and 184.00 and both interactional variables ‘F’ value was 1.31, which was not significant .Therefore the above, **H₀₅** null-hypothesis was accepted and concluded that both the groups did not differ significantly on school environment scores. Both the independent variables results was not closure in the dependent variables of School environment.

Table No. : 7 : The Areas and Sex, mean and ANOVA of School environment

Source of Variable	Independent Variable	Mean	Difference	S.S (SSb*)	df	Mean S.S	f-Value & LS
B X C	B = (N=240)	184.00	1.00	4717.07	01	4717.07	5.15*
	C = (N=240)	184.00					

(Source: @>Non-significance, *> 0.05 - level, **> 0.01 - level.)

H 06: There is no significant relationship between the mean of the scores of the relative effects on school environment of **Areas and Sex** among different types school students

Looking to the table number, 7, it is observed that the ‘f’ value of interactional between Areas and Sex School environment both variables mean score was 184.00.and 184.00 and ‘F’ Value is 5.15, which was significant level at 0.05. Hence, the above, **H₀₆** null-hypothesis was rejected and it was held that Areas and Sex among School environment was at par with regard to School environment. Both the results are closure in the School environment among Independednt variables.

Table No. : 8 : The Organizations, Area and Sex, Mean and ANOVA of School environment

Source of Variable	Independent Variable	Mean	Difference		S.S (SSb*)	df	Mean S.S	f-Value & LS
A X B X C	A = (N=240)	184.00	1.00	1.00	1550.42	01	1550.42	1.69
	B = (N=240)	184.00						
	C = (N=240)	184.00						

(Source: @>Non-significance, *> 0.05 - level, **> 0.01 - level.)

H 07: There is no significant interactive effect between the means of the scores of Explanation and effective relationship of

It is observed that the table number 8, that there is no significant interaction between Organizations, Areas and Sex (Mean of all source was ss 184.00) and ‘F’ value 1.69 which was not significant. That means above table shown that there is no significant in school environment as far as independent variables of **Organizations, Areas and Sex. it means H₀₇** null-hypothesis was accepted and concluded that the groups did not differ significantly on School environment scores. Both the results are not closure in the School environment of **Organizations, Areas and Sex.**

V. Conclusions: (Main results of the study;)

The statistical analysis and discussion as well as interpretation of the results in earlier following conclusions,

1. The students of higher secondary are more developed with respect, reliable, and valid to School environment compared to secondary school students.
2. The students of Rural area was more developed compared to student of Urban areas in relation to School environment
3. The School environment more developed and free from female students was found higher score compared to male school students
4. The Organizations and Areas was very highly respected of School environment. Both the independent variables results was comes to very high ranking, valid and very crucial role and connection with closure to the school environment
5. Areas and Sex among School environment was at par with regard and highly respected with developed to School environment.
6. The other factors like time, duration, motivation (aggression), Temperament, Aptitude, proficiency, competence, and achievement are also responsible for developing School environment, if appropriate environment is created.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:-

Following are the limitations of the present study

- The sample is drawn from Secondary and higher secondary school student situated at Anand district of Gujarat State, other institutions like higher primary school std. 8 and primary school, military school, colleges and decent school student are not included.
- Only Gujarat State are involve, other states are not included in the sample so the results are restricted up to Anand and Gujarat state, and may not be generalized for whole country (Nation).

SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER STUDY:

Following are the suggestion for further study

- may be drawn from the whole state areas so as to remove effect of areas on results.

IMPLICATION OF THE STUDY:

- A profile of the secondary and higher secondary school students may be prepared to solve the problem of School environment and develop the group of students.
- The impact of School environment can be predicted with the help of results and can be manipulated effectively so as to get better results with respect to achievement motivation, intelligence, emotional maturity, feeling, competition, awareness of self activities, dream and good environment.
- The students having less School environment may be traced out and can be given intensive training so as to increase School environment.

Readings:

Bhawna Sharma (2008): Indian Journal of Psychometric and School Environment. Vol 39 (1), 88-90.

C.Khusbu soni (2011) : “To Study The.....School Students” Un publish M.Phil dissertation: S.P.University, Vallabhvidyanagar, Dist-Anand, Gujarat, INDIA

1. AskDrSears.com.

2. enterprise.tatateservices.com

3. Facebook.com/KotakItsgrt2b25

4. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/School_violence#Home_environment

5. <http://WWW.Pick> the brain. Com.

6. www.alsglobal.com

1. Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged © HarperCollins Publishers 1991, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2003