

A study of student problems and family environment

URVASHI KHANNA

Government Home Science College, Sector 10D
Chandigarh (U.T.) India

ABSTRACT

The present investigation aimed to get an insight into student problems among adolescent boys and girls in relationship with Family Environment. The study was carried out in the schools of Chandigarh on a sample of 200 adolescents (100 Boys + 100 Girls) from four Schools were randomly selected. The tools used in the investigation were the socio-personal profile developed by the investigator, The Problem Checklist (Bhagia, 1970) and Family Environment (Vohra, 1998). The finding revealed irrespective of caste and religion, majority of girls had academic problems while boys had social problems, personal problems and school administration problems. It was also found that highly significant difference existed between the two samples with regard to competitive framework, independence, recreational organization. Finding showed that as student problems increased when the scores on family environment decreased.

Key Words : Student problems, Family environment

INTRODUCTION

Students play a significant role in the development of its nation in holistic way. The most critical phase of students in their life is when they enter adolescence. As adolescence is considered to be a period of stress and storm and storm and strives because it involves multiple changes both psychological and physiological. It is found that by grade 8, 31.5% use alcohol and 26.2% smoke cigarettes monthly, 44.2% have been in a physical fight in the past year, and truancy, bullying, theft and vandalism are common. Poor environment at home may have mental health problems like loneliness, anxiety, stress, depression and blackout at student's life. Adolescents whose parents are demanding, involved and supportive are at lower risk of engaging in problem behaviour than adolescents whose parents are uninvolved and unsupportive (Baumrind, 1991). Mostly students are afraid of failing. They are afraid of letting their parents and family down. Some people find exam time so stressful that they become ill, both mentally and physically (Daulta, 2008). Family where children's educational interest are not motivated or valued by parents, it negatively affects student's interest towards

education and school. Candle (2012) studies have found that children living in poverty often confront learning and developmental problems throughout childhood and continue to face setbacks in adulthood. These challenges can include behavioural problems, learning deficiencies, poor employment quality and low earnings.

Family is a small unit of society, scholastic system determining the performance of the child, child care and socialization. Child ability, skill, adjustment capacity, self esteem, safety, and behavioural activities are determining in family climate. These aspects enhance their learning performance. It is the primary institute where a child gets an opportunity to learn interact and socialize with other members. Studies (Baharudin and Luster, 1998) have shown that the home environment affects the academic achievement in children. The childhood experiences have a big influence in building child's personality. Good family environment can motivate children to develop themselves and improve their capabilities and potential. Meanwhile, when the family neglect their children, this condition gives negative effects on a child's personality. The loss sense of love and family causing bad result in education. They feel neglected and

abandoned and thus it hinders its ability to foster a sense of self-esteem that can benefit him/her and the community around it.

Objectives :

- To determine the problems of 8th grade students.
- To access the family environment of students of 8th grade.
- To find out gender difference, if any, in student problems and home environment.
- To find out inter-correlation among various variables of the study.

METHODOLOGY

A comprehensive study was conducted in the selected Government Model and Private Schools of Chandigarh (U.T.). A list of all Government Model and Private Schools of Chandigarh was obtained. From this list, 2 Government and 2 Private schools were selected randomly. The selected schools were Government Model School, Sector- 10 Chandigarh, Government Model High School, Sector- 11 Chandigarh, Ankur Public School Sector- 14, Chandigarh and D.A.V School Sector -8, Chandigarh. From each selected school, 25 Boys and 25 Girls were selected randomly from Class 8th, irrespective of their caste, creed, economic status and ordinal position. Thus, the final sample size comprised of 200 students 100 Girls and 100 Boys.

Psychological tool used :

The problem checklist :

For identifying the perception of students regarding their problems, a standardized problem checklist was used developed by Bhagia (1970) the problem checklist explores the problems and difficulties felt by school students. It has 5 categories academic, social, problems related to teachers, administration problems and personal problems.

Family environment :

Family environment scale was developed as a means to get information about the family environment in a rapid, objective and standardized manner. The scale has no time bound. Total 98 statement based items are included in the item sheet. Each statement has 2 possible answers. It is based on Seven (07) dimensions were covered. Competitive Framework (Cf), Cohesion (Co), Expression (Ex), Independence (In), Organisation (Or), Recreational

Orientation (Ro).

Statistical analysis :

The data was analyzed. To find out the difference in mean scores of various variables in boys and girls, t-test was used. Karl Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation was applied to find out inter correlation among various variables of the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Difference in various variables of the study :

In order to find out the difference between boys and girls with regard to scores of various variables of the study- student problems and family environment of 8th class students, t- test was applied. Mean, standard deviation and t- values were calculated and data have been incorporated in Table 1.

Result presented in the Table 1 revealed that highly significant differences were found in mean scores of boys and girls related to academics problems ($t=3.460, p<0.01$) and personal problems ($t=2.925, p<0.01$). Significant difference between mean scores of boys and girls were found with regard to social problems ($t=2.319, p<0.05$) and problems related to school ($t=2.086, p<0.05$). Girls were found to have more of academic problems and lesser of personal problems as compared to boys while boys were found to have more of social, school administration problems and personal problems as compared to girls.

The obtained results showing higher mean scores of girls in academic problems as compared to those of boys get support of finding Kimbal (1989), Wilberg and Lynn (1999) and Hartley and Sutton (2013). However, contrary have been reported by North *et al.* (2003), revealing no gender difference in academic problems of students.

A glance over the Table 2 clearly indicates that highly significant difference existed between the mean score of boys and girls with regard to competitive framework ($t=5.281, p<0.01$), and total family environment ($t=2.804^{**}, p<0.01$) while significant differences existed between with regard to independence ($t=2.058, p<0.05$) and recreational orientation ($t=2.352, p<0.05$). Girls as compared to boys were found to have more competitive framework, independence, and recreational orientation.

The present results showing higher competitive framework, independence, recreational orientation and positive family environment for girls than that of boys are in the lines findings of Makwana and Kaji (2014) and

Latha (2014).

Girls as compare to boys perceived more emphasis given to competition in their families and they also perceived their family more positive as compare to boys. Significant difference between boys and girls were found with regard to independence, recreational orientation. Girls as compare to boys were found to perceive more of independent and emphasis given on recreational activities in their families.

The present result revealing girls perceiving more emphasis on competitive framework, independence and recreational orientation as well as positive environment

in their families as compare to boys could be due to the fact that parents have started giving their daughters more independence emphasis on competition as well as recreational activities because now they consider their daughter as par with sons and are interested in their holistic development.

Inter - correlation among various variables of the study :

In order to find out the inter- correlations among various variables of the study of total sample, Karl Pearson’s Coefficient of Correlations was used and the

Table 1 : Significance of Mean Difference between for Score of Boys and Girls Student Problems

Variable	Components	Categories	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean	t-value
Student Problems	Academics	Boys	7.8400	2.33861	.23386	3.460**
		Girls	8.9200	2.06794	.20679	
	Social Problems	Boys	11.7800	4.58055	.45805	2.3198*
		Girls	10.3100	4.38015	.43802	
	Teacher Problems	Boys	14.1200	7.62765	.76267	1.022
		Girls	13.0500	7.17934	.71793	
	Problems related	Boys	12.0500	4.80609	.42061	2.086*
		Girls	10.6600	4.61491	.46149	
	School Administration	Boys	10.6200	3.80266	.38027	2.925**
		Girls	9.1500	3.28564	.32856	
	Personal Problems	Boys	56.4100	18.61253	1.86125	.895
		Girls	52.0900	16.40282	1.64028	

*Significance at 0.05 level
 ** Significance at 0.01 level

Table 2 : Significance of Mean Difference between Boys and Girls Scores for Family Environment

Variable	Components	Categories	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean	t-value
Family environment	Competitive	Boys	6.7100	1.48593	.14859	5.281**
		Girls	7.7800	1.56589	.15659	
	Framework	Boys	7.1600	1.46832	.14683	1.416
		Girls	7.4600	1.52700	.15200	
	Cohesion	Boys	7.9000	1.79505	.17951	1.201
		Girls	8.1800	1.48650	.14865	
	Expression	Boys	5.8500	1.69384	.16720	2.058*
		Girls	6.4000	2.08409	.20841	
	Independence	Boys	7.3600	1.68487	.16849	.769
		Girls	7.5300	1.47244	.14316	
	Moral Orientation	Boys	7.2700	1.75726	.17573	.269
		Girls	7.2100	1.37286	.13729	
	Organisation	Boys	5.8200	1.54645	.15465	2.352*
		Girls	6.3600	1.69682	.16968	
	Recreational	Boys	48.0700	7.19463	.71946	2.804**
		Girls	50.9200	7.17836	.71784	
Orientation	Boys					
	Girls					
Total Family	Boys					
	Girls					
Environment	Boys					
	Girls					

*Significance at 0.05 level
 ** Significance at 0.01 level

coefficient have been furnished in Table 3.

Variables	Student Problems	Family Environment
Student Problems	1	-.368**
Family Environment		1

*Significance at 0.05 level

** Significance at 0.01 level

It is clear from Table 3 that there existed a highly significant negative correlation between student problem and family environment ($r=-.368^{**}$, $p<0.01$). It states that when the scores of student problems increase if scores of family environment decrease.

The present result revealing that poorer will be the family environment of boys and girls , higher will be the student problems get support of findings of Coach (2000), Baker and Jansen (2000), Haladyna *et al.* (1982). The probable reason of the result could be the fact that family helps in building holistic development of the child. Naturally in families with poorer environment parents are not able to develop the right kind of copying strategies in phase of problem such children lack in problem solving abilities and experience more problem everywhere including school.

Summary and Conclusion :

Majority of girls had academic problems while boys

had social problems, personal problems and school administration problems.

It was also found that highly significant difference existed between the two samples with regard to competitive framework, independence, recreational organization. Finding showed that as student problems increased when the scores on family environment decreased.

REFERENCES

- Baumrind, D. (1991) Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. In Cowan, P. E. and Hetherington, E. M. (eds), *Advances in Family Research*. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 111–163.
- Daulta, M.S. (2008). Academic success of students at risk of school failure. Retrieved on February 23, 2107 from Impact of Home Environment on the Scholastic Achievement of Children. *The Journal of Human Ecology*, **23**(1) : 75-77.
- Hartley, A. and Sutton, G. (2013). Analysis on gender stereotypes. Retrieved on March 21, 2017 from <http://educatingchildren-for.blogspot.com/2013/01/important-role-in-educating-child.html>
- North, B. Colley., H. and Hargreaves, G. (2003). Women social hierarchies with peer. Retrieved on March 12, 2017 from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/2158244012447299>.
- Vohra, S. (1997). *Manual of Family Environment Scale*. New Delhi: Psy- com service , New Delhi.
