



SOCIAL ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS

D. Sudha

Research Scholar, Department of Education, Tamil University.

ABSTRACT :

Education is the key – stone of the arch of good life. Events of history has also demonstrated that the tone of life – personality, happiness, mutual helpfulness, social service – is affected as much by education as by the economic factor. The sample of the study, tools used for the collection of data, collections, scoring and the statistical techniques used for the analysis of data.



KEYWORDS : *life – personality, happiness, mutual helpfulness, social service.*

INTRODUCTION:

It is very difficult to define education in a manner that may satisfy every body. However, educators have defined education in many different ways. Some important definitions of the Indian and western thinkers are:

An adolescent sometimes fails to adjust himself to the conditions at home, school and community. He has a desire for independence rigid restrictions imposed by the parents may not satisfy him, as they are against his nature. He may not be able to pull on with his class fellows. He may have academic problems; failure to adjust with the parents may result in revolving against parents and authority. Some adolescent react by dropping out, withdrawing into a non-demanding and non-working world of pleasure and satisfaction. For giving a solution to these problems, the environment is to be made congenial. It is the duty of the parents, teachers to understand the problem and help the adolescent in the adjustment at different life situations.

MCINTOSH, H. (2003) has made a study on adolescent problems through fantasies. The sample comprised 800 adolescents of 400 boys and 400 girls. The materials used for the study were picture story test and verbal projection test. The results show that the adolescent belonging to families of low socio-economy expressed problems in adjustment with family members than those coming from families of high socio-economic status. In school environment mere failure in examination belongs to low socio-economic status than those from families of upper socio-economic status and it further reveals problems of adjustment to the members of the opposite sex differed with age and socio-economic status.

DESLANDES et.al (2002) conducted a study in home adjustment of adolescent students to assess that effect of family climate on home adjustment of adolescents from the tools of family climate scale and social economic status. The study reveals that home adjustment of the students having highly satisfactory family climate is far superior t highly dissatisfactory family climate. And it further reveals that sex is an important determination of one's home adjustment.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

To find out the significance of the mean difference of the problem score of the

- Below poverty & Lower Middle Class
- Below Poverty & Upper Middle Class

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Name of the Study : This study is Normative Study

Sample: The sample for the study was drawn from 5 schools in the urban and rural areas of Thiruvaiyaru. These school; were selected, because of their accessibility and availability of the required sample, and co-operation ensured by the principal, teachers and students of the schools. The schools were selected on the basis of the nature of the area in which the schools were situated. Out of 300 students comprising the sample of the study, 100 students belonged to rural and 200 students belonged to urban area, 150 students in Government schools and 150 students in private schools were selected as sample for this study.

Mean, SD, 't' Value for Problems of Below Poverty and Lower Middle Class Higher Secondary Students

Problems	Below Poverty			Lower Middle Class			't' Value	Significant level 0.05
	Number	Mean	SD	Number	Mean	SD		
A Personal Problems	58	31.11	2.61	191	29.92	3.17	0.023	N.S
B Family problems	58	26.83	4.29	191	28.60	5.04	0.034	N.S
C Socio-emotional problems	58	35.02	3.60	191	35.16	2.51	0.764	N.S
D Educational Problems	58	17.16	1.92	191	17.31	1.83	0.616	N.S
Total Problems	58	110.44	9.26	191	111.20	9.23	0.623	N.S

S – Significant NS – Not-significant

There is difference between the mean scores of 'A', personal problems, of the pupils of Below poverty (31.11) and Lower middle class (29.92). However, the difference is not significant at 5% level of significance.

Hence, they do not differ in the personal problems.

There is difference between the mean scores of 'B', family problems, of the pupils of Below poverty (26.83) and Lower middle class (28.60). However, the difference is not significant at 5% level of significance.

Hence, they do not differ in the family problems.

There is difference between the mean scores of 'C', socio-emotional problems, of the pupils of Below poverty (35.02) and Lower middle class (35.16). However, the difference is not significant at 5% level of significance.

Hence, they do not differ in the socio-emotional problems.

There is difference between the mean score of 'D', educational problems, of the pupils Below poverty (17.16) and Lower middle class (17.31). However, the difference is not significant at 5% level of significance.

Hence, they do not differ in the educational problems.

The mean scores of the elements of the overall problems of two groups Below poverty (110.44) and Lower middle class (111.20) differ. However, the difference is not significant at 5% level of significance.

Hence, Below poverty and Lower middle class students do not differ significantly in the elements of overall problems.

The calculated 't' value is lower than the table value for $df=247$ at 5% level of significance for overall problems.

There is difference between the mean scores of 'A', personal problems, of the pupils of Below poverty (31.11) and Upper middle class (29.42). However, the difference is not significant at 5% level of significance.

Hence, they do not differ in the personal problems.

There is difference between the mean scores of 'B', family problems, of the pupils of Below poverty (26.83) and Upper middle class (26.54). However, the difference is not significant at 5% level of significance.

Hence, they do not differ in the family problems.

There is difference between the mean scores of 'C', socio-emotional problems, of the pupils of Below poverty (35.02) and Upper middle class (35.16). However, the difference is not significant at 5% level of significance.

Hence, they do not differ in the socio-emotional problems.

There is difference between the mean scores of 'D', educational problems, of the pupils Below poverty (17.16) and Upper middle class (17.58). However, the difference is not significant at 5% level of significance.

Hence, they do not differ in the educational problems.

The mean scores of the elements of the overall problems of two groups Below poverty (110.44) and Upper middle class (108.92) differ. However, the difference is not significant at 5% level of significance.

Hence, Below poverty and Upper middle class students do not differ significantly in the elements of overall problems.

The calculated 't' value is lower than the table value for $df=107$ at 5% level of significance for overall problems.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above findings of the study, certain conclusion are drawn along with the statement acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses formulated.

To achieve the objective of knowing the economic background of pupils' difference regarding problems, the fifth hypothesis was formulated and tested. The fifth hypothesis was: "There is no significant relationship between economic background of the students and their problem" To test the above hypothesis, the significance of difference between the means scores obtained on problems by the pupils of below poverty and lower middle class differences, the pupils of below poverty and upper middle class differences, pupils of lower middle class upper middle class differences, were found out. It is found out that all the above three groups did not differ significantly in respect of problem. Hence the sixth hypothesis is accepted.

REFERENCES

1. Ebel R.L (Ed), *Encyclopedia of Educational Research* (Fourth Edition), The Macmillan Company, London 1969.
2. Good, Carter V., *Dictionary of Educational*, Mc Graw Hill Book Company, Third Edition 1673.
3. Guilford, J.P., *Personality*, N.Y., Mc Graw Hill 1959.
4. Haviland, Scarborough, *Adolescent Development in Contemporary Society*, D. Van Nostrand Company, Network, 1981 pg 70 – 83.
5. Henry Garrett G., *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, Vakils, Febber and Simon Pvt. Ltd, Bombay 1971.
6. Hurlock, Elizabeth B, *Developmental Psychology*, Tata McGraw – Hill Publishing co – Ltd, New Delhi 1989, pg 221 -259.