Himachal Journal of Agricultural Research 38(2): 139-142 (2012)

Short Note

Relationship of school environment with personality pattern of socio-economically deprived adolescents in Kangra district of Himachal Pradesh

Shashi Seema Katoch, Raj Pathania, Ruchi Thakur and Shubhangna Sharma
Department of Human Development
CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidalaya, Palampur-176 062, India.

Manuscript Received : 14.06.2012; Accepted : 26.07.2012

Abstract

The present study was undertaken to find out the contribution of School-environment towards personality pattern of socio-economically deprived adolescents in two blocks of Kangra district. namely Panchrukhi and Nagrota- Bagwan. Sample size consisted of 200 adolescents in the age group of 13-17 yrs. belonging to socio-economically deprived background. The tools used for study were interview schedule and SEI (School-Environment Inventory) and HSPQ (High School Personality Questionnaire). SEI was used to asses the School-environment of the socio-economically deprived adolescents. Overall results obtained revealed that the level of creative stimulation, cognitive encouragement, rejection and control were average, where as, acceptance and permissiveness varied between high to average level in case of majority of the respondents. Relationship between all the school environment variables namely creative stimulation, cognitive encouragement, permissiveness, acceptance, rejection and control and their personality pattern was found to be statistically significant.

Key words: Social, economic, school, environment, personality, adolescents.

The surroundings and the various interacting patterns that the child faces from the beginning of life determine the dynamics of personality. School environment provides a measure of the quality and quantity of the cognitive, emotional and social support that has been available to the students during their social life in terms of teacher-pupil interactions. Purpose of education and the school is to change the thoughts, feelings and actions of the students . Family income had a profound influence on the educational opportunities available to adolescents. Due to residential stratification and segregation, low-income students usually attend schools with lower funding levels. The effects of concentrated poverty in schools may include disciplinary problems and chaotic learning environments. School characteristics, combined with limited parental involvement in adolescents' education, have serious consequences and low-income adolescents have reduced achievement motivation and much higher risk of educational failure

The present study was conducted in two blocks of Kangra district namely Panchrukhi and Nagrota-Bagwan in 10 schools each on 200 adolescents in the age group of 13-17 years which consist of 100 males and 100 females belonging to socio-economically deprived background. A self devised interview schedule was used for data collection along with standardised scale namely SEI (School-Environment Inventory) by Mishra (1983) and HSPQ (High School Personality Questionnaire) by institute for Personality and Ability testing U.S.A (1968). The data obtained was compiled and tabulated. Analysis of the data were done by working out frequencies percentages and correlation (r).

Table 1 revealed that 37.00 per cent of the male respondents and 25.00 per cent of the female respondents felt that in school level of creative

Table 1. School environment indices of respondents

School environment		Level		
		High	Average	Low
Creative stimulation	Male	37 (37.00)	57 (57.00)	06 (06.00)
	Female	25 (25.00)	64 (64.00)	11 (11.00)
	Overall	62 (31.00)	121 (60.50)	17 (08.50)
Cognitive encouragement	Male	20 (20.00)	64 (64.00)	16 (16.00)
	Female	08 (08.00)	71 (71.00)	21 (21.00)
	Overall	28 (14.00)	135 (67.50)	37 (18.50)
Acceptance	Male	10 (10.00)	28 (28.00)	62 (62.00)
	Female	57 (57.00)	35 (35.00)	08 (08.00)
	Overall	67 (33.50)	63 (31.50)	70 (35.00)
Permissiveness	Male	28 (28.00)	54 (54.00)	18 (18.00)
	Female	57 (57.00)	33 (33.00)	10 (10.00)
	Overall	85 (42.50)	87 (43.50)	28 (14.00)
Rejection	Male	43 (43.00)	46 (46.00)	11 (11.00)
	Female	24 (24.00)	56 (56.00)	20 (20.00)
	Overall	67 (33.50)	102 (51.00)	31 (15.50)
Control	Male	32 (32.00)	55 (55.00)	13 (13.00)
	Female	38 (38.00)	48 (48.00)	14 (14.00)
	Overall	70 (35.00)	103 (51.50)	27 (13.50)

Figure in parentheses indicate percentage

stimulation was high followed by 6.00 per cent of the male and 11.00 per cent female respondents who reported low level of creative stimulation . Out of the total sample 31.00 per cent respondents felt that the level of creative stimulation was very high in school, followed by average (60.50 %) and low (8.50%). Majority of the male respondents and female respondents felt that average level of the cognitive encouragement is provided in schools (64% and 71%). Majority of the female respondents (57%) reporting high level of accepting environment in school against 62% male respondents reporting low level of acceptance in school. Majority of the respondents were of the view that the level of cognitive encouragement was average (67.50%) at school. Majority of the female respondents i.e 56 per cent perceived having average level of rejection followed by 46.00 per cent of the male respondents. Level of control reported to be average by majority of the male and female respondents. According to 33.50 per cent respondents, the level of rejection was very high in school, 51.00 per cent felt as average and only 15.50 per cent as low. Overall 35.00 per cent respondents felt the level of control as very high in school, 51.50 per cent respondents felt it was average and only 13.50 per cent respondents felt it was low.

Results in Table 2 revealed that the correlation (r) value between male and female perception of

Table 2. Association between school environment indices with personality pattern of male and female respondents

Sr. No.		Correlation matrix Personality pattern	
		Male	Female
Indices	School Environment Variable	0.326217 *	0.337398 *
A	Creative stimulation	0.2125 **	0.2115 **
B	Cognitive encouragement	0.2938*	0.2058 **
C	Permissiveness	0.17812 ***	0.1969 **
D	Acceptance	0.1274 NS	0.42328 *
E	Rejection	0.20361 **	0.247 *
F	Control	0.2239564 **	0.2145 **

*Significant at 1 per cent level. ** Significant at 5 per cent level *** Significant at 10 per cent level

N.S. Non Significant

school environment and their personality pattern was found to be statistically significant (P<0.05) and positive (r-0.32 and 0.33 respectively). Further, the correlation (r) values between school environment variables namely Creative stimulation (Male:0.21, Female: 0.21), Cognitive encouragement (Male: 0.29, Female: 0.20), Permissiveness (Male: 0.17, Female: 0.19), Rejection (Male: 0.20, Female: 0.24) and control (Male: 0.22, Female: 0.21) and their personality pattern was found to be statistically significant, Where as, SEI variable namely Acceptance (Male:0.12, Female: 0.42) were found to be statistically significant (P<0.05) only in case of females.

School is the first institution where child goes after spending initial stages of life at home. When a child joins school, it has in built traits developed from home environment and then further traits are developed from school environment. The present study conducted has reinforced the fact that school environment has a significant and positive relationship irrespective of the gender with the personality pattern of the socio -economically deprived adolescents. The results are supported by the findings of Benjamin (1981) who expressed that the purpose of education and the schools is to change the thoughts, feelings and action of students. Results are also supported by the findings of Khokhar (2005) who found that the children who had insufficient fresh air to breath, open ground to play and healthy environment surroundings were unable to promote social and psychological interaction and developed ultimate inferiority. Present investigation is also supported by study of Samdal *et al.* (1999) who found that students who tend to experience more satisfaction with their schools, when treated fairly and were supported by their teachers felt safe. They also concluded that students who were dissatisfied with their schools because of low student autonomy and unreasonable teacher expectations, were more likely to be engaged in smoking and drinking affecting their personality.

Role of school as agent of socialization goes beyond teaching the standard subject. So the good school reflect good personality development of children, because such institution instead of emphasizing on grades, teach individualistic values of competition and achievements. It is fair to conclude that role of school as agent of socialization goes beyond teaching the standard subject specially to socio-economically deprived children who lack confidence and have lowered self esteem to shape their personality.

References

Benjamin Bloom 1981. All our children learning. Mc Graw Hill, NewYork; 180.

Khokhar, CP 2007. Poor physical environment & adjustment of adolescents. Europe's Journal of Psychology.http://ejop.psychopen.eu/article/view/407/306.Vol:3,No.3 (2007).

Samdal O, Wold B, and Bronis M 1999. Relationship between students' perceptions of school environment, their satisfaction with school and perceived academic achievement: An International Study. School Effectiveness and School Improvement 10 (3): 296–320.

Mishra KS 1983. School-Environment Inventory Published by Ankur Psychological agency, 22/481, Indira Nagar, Lucknow.

Kapoor SD, Srivastava SS and Srivastava GNP 1968. High School Personality Questionnaire. Hindi Edition. Published by institute for Personality and Ability testing U.S.A.

VIR SOFTECH