5.1 Introduction:

This chapter presents a brief summary of the study. It outlines the title of the study, the objectives, the hypotheses, the methodology and procedures followed in the collection of data, the statistical analysis of the data and the major findings of the study.

5.2 Statement of the Problem:

The title of the present study is:

A Study of Environmental Awareness amongst Higher Secondary School Students in Aizawl & Lunglei Districts of Mizoram.

5.3 Operational Definitions of Important Terms:

Environmental Awareness:

‘Environmental Awareness’ in the present study refers to the knowledge which the students have acquired about the total environment and its allied problems.

Higher Secondary School Students:

The Higher Secondary School Students in the present study include students studying in class XI and class XII.
5.4 Objectives of the Study:

The objectives of the study are:

(i) To develop a test to find out the level of environmental awareness amongst the higher secondary school students in Aizawl and Lunglei districts of Mizoram.

(ii) To study the level of environmental awareness amongst the higher secondary school students in Aizawl and Lunglei districts of Mizoram.

(iii) To compare the level of environmental awareness of the higher secondary school students in Aizawl and Lunglei districts of Mizoram based on gender, type of school, areas and streams.

(iv) To compare the level of environmental awareness between the higher secondary school students in Aizawl district and Lunglei districts of Mizoram.

5.5 Statement of Hypotheses:

Hypotheses are developed for objective (iii) and objective (iv). They are:

Objective (iii):

1. There is no significant difference between Male and Female higher secondary school students in their level of environmental awareness.
2. There is no significant difference between higher secondary school students studying in Government schools and Deficit schools in their level of environmental awareness.

3. There is no significant difference between higher secondary school students studying in Government schools and Private-Aided schools in their level of environmental awareness.

4. There is no significant difference between higher secondary school students studying in Government schools and Private-Unaided schools students in their level of environmental awareness.

5. There is no significant difference between higher secondary schools students studying in Deficit schools and Private-Aided schools in their level of environmental awareness.

6. There is no significant difference between higher secondary schools students studying in Deficit schools and Private-Unaided schools in their level of environmental awareness.

7. There is no significant difference between higher secondary schools students studying in Private-Aided and Private-Unaided schools in their level of environmental awareness.

8. There is no significant difference between higher secondary schools students coming from the Rural areas and the Urban areas in their level of environmental awareness.
9. There is no significant difference between higher secondary schools students studying in Arts stream and Science stream in their level of environmental awareness.

10. There is no significant difference between higher secondary schools students studying in Arts stream and Commerce stream in their level of environmental awareness.

11. There is no significant difference between higher secondary schools students studying in Science stream and Commerce stream in their level of environmental awareness.

Objective (iv):

12. There is no significant difference between higher secondary schools students studying in Aizawl district and Lunglei district in their level of environmental awareness.

5.6 Population:

The population of the study comprised the students of class XI and class XII of the higher secondary schools studying in different streams like arts, science and commerce in Aizawl and Lunglei district of Mizoram. The population included both male and female students studying in different type of schools, viz. government schools, deficit schools, private-aided schools, private-unaided schools and from the rural areas and the urban areas. The total number of
population of this study was 10087 students of higher secondary school in Aizawl and Lunglei district of Mizoram.

5.7 Sample:

The final sample for the study comprised 500 male and 500 female higher secondary school students from the arts stream, the science stream and the commerce stream. The samples were taken from the students studying in the government schools, deficit schools, private-aided schools and private-unaided schools in the rural areas and the urban areas. The total number of the higher secondary school students taken for the study was 1000.

5.8 Instrument of the Study:

In the present study, an Environmental Awareness Test (EAT) was developed and standardized. Data were collected by administering the Environmental Awareness Test (EAT) on the sample selected from the higher secondary schools in Aizawl and Lunglei district of Mizoram.

5.9 Delimitations of the Study:

The study is delimited to the following:

i. The study is delimited to only Aizawl district and Lunglei district of Mizoram.

ii. The study is also delimited to only arts, science and commerce students.

iii. The study does not include students studying in the vocational stream.
iv. The study also does not include the central school in Aizawl district.

v. The study is delimited to variables like gender, type of school, area, streams and districts.

5.10 Statistical Treatment of the Data:

The scores obtained from the final administration of the test were subjected to necessary statistical computation. To find out the level of environmental awareness, the obtained scores were analyzed by computing percentages, mean, median, mode, and standard deviation for the entire sample as well as for male; female; students studying in government, deficit, private-aided, private-unaided schools; students coming from rural and urban areas; students studying in arts, science and commerce streams; and students in Aizawl and Lunglei district. The reliability of the test was computed by the test-retest method. Content validity was also established.

The differences in the level of environmental awareness was computed by applying ‘t’ test. The level of significance was taken at 0.01 level. The differences were computed using gender, type of school, areas, steams and districts as the basis for comparison.
5.11 Major Findings of the Study:

Based on objective (i) To develop a test to find out the level of environmental awareness amongst the higher secondary school students in Aizawl and Lunglei district of Mizoram - This objective is discussed in Chapter III.

Based on Objective (ii) of the study, the following summarizes the major findings of the study of the level of environmental awareness amongst the higher secondary school students in Aizawl and Lunglei district of Mizoram. The findings of this objective were calculated using percentages and by grouping the obtained scores into frequency distributions:

1) The overall level of environmental awareness of higher secondary school students was found to be good. The frequency distribution when calculated showed mean, median and mode from the obtained scores as 34.71, 36 and 40 respectively. The value of standard deviation was 7.39.

2) The level of environmental awareness of the male higher secondary school students was found to be good. The mean, median and mode of the scores of the male students were 35.29, 36.50 and 39 respectively. The value of standard deviation was 7.17.

3) The level of environmental awareness of the female higher secondary school students was found to be good. The mean, median and mode of the
scores were 34.13, 35 and 40 respectively. The standard deviation was found to be 7.57.

4) The level of environmental awareness of higher secondary school students studying in government schools was found to be good. The mean was 33.50, the median was 34 and the mode was 39. The value of standard deviation was 7.43.

5) The level of environmental awareness of the higher secondary school students studying in deficit schools was found to be good. The mean, median and mode of the scores of the students were 39.10, 40 and 40 respectively. The value of standard deviation was 5.92.

6) The level of environmental awareness of higher secondary school students studying in private-aided schools was found to be satisfactory. The mean, median and mode were 31.07, 30 and 29 respectively. Standard deviation was 6.10.

7) The level of environmental awareness of higher secondary school students studying in private-unaided schools was found to be good. The mean was found to be 33.83, median was 36 and mode was 39. The value of standard deviation was 7.14.

8) The level of environmental awareness of higher secondary school students coming from the rural areas was found to be good. The mean, median and mode were 33.88, 34.50 and 29 respectively. Standard deviation was 5.21.
9) The level of environmental awareness of higher secondary school students coming from the urban areas was found to be good. The mean, median and mode were 34.80, 36 and 40 respectively. The value of standard deviation was 7.59.

10) The level of environmental awareness of higher secondary school students studying in the arts stream was found to be satisfactory. The mean, median and mode were 32.30, 32.50 and 39 respectively. The value of standard deviation was 7.26.

11) The level of environmental awareness of higher secondary school students studying in the science stream was found to be good. The mean, median and mode were found to be 38.75, 40 and 40 respectively. The value of standard deviation was 5.94.

12) The level of environmental awareness of higher secondary school students studying in the commerce stream was found to be good. The mean, median and mode were 33.29, 34 and 29 respectively. The value of standard deviation was 6.88.

13) The level of environmental awareness of higher secondary school students studying in Aizawl district was found to be good. The mean, median and mode were 35.18, 37 and 40 respectively. The value of standard deviation was 7.06.
14) The level of environmental awareness of higher secondary school students studying in Lunglei district was found to be good. The mean was 34, median was 34 and mode was 29. Standard deviation was 7.82.

Based on Objective (iii) of the study and the hypotheses developed, the following summarizes the major findings from the comparative analysis of the level of environmental awareness of the higher secondary school students in Aizawl and Lunglei district of Mizoram:

a) The male students had a mean score of 35.29 and SD of 7.17 and the female students had a mean score of 34.13 and SD of 7.57. It indicates that the male students had a slightly higher mean score than the female students. The value of ‘t’ is 2.48. The difference in the means of the scores of male and female higher secondary school students is not statistically significant at 0.01 level. There is no significant difference between the male students and the female students in the level of environmental awareness. Thus, the null hypothesis is retained.

b) The students studying in government schools had a mean score of 33.50 and SD of 7.43. Students studying in deficit schools had a mean score of 39.10 and SD of 5.92. The students studying in deficit schools had a higher mean score. The difference in the means of the scores of students studying in government schools and students studying in deficit schools is statistically significant. The ‘t’ being 10.39 is significant at 0.01 level. It
indicates that students studying in deficit schools exhibited a higher environmental awareness level than the students studying in government schools. The null hypothesis is thus rejected.

c) The mean score and SD of students studying in government schools were 33.50 and 7.43 respectively. Students studying in private-aided schools had a mean score of 31.07 and SD of 6.10. The difference in the means of the scores of students studying in government schools and students studying in private-aided schools is statistically significant. The ‘t’ being 3.07 is significant at 0.01 level. It indicates that there is significant difference between the students studying in government schools and the students studying in private-aided schools in the level of environmental awareness. The null hypothesis is thus rejected.

d) The students studying in government schools had a mean score of 33.50 and SD of 7.43. Students studying in private-unaided schools had a mean score of 33.83 and SD of 7.14. The difference in the means of the scores of students studying in government schools and students studying in private-unaided schools is not statistically significant. The ‘t’ being 0.49 is not significant at 0.01 level. This shows that there is no significant difference in the environmental awareness level of the students studying in government schools and the students studying in private-unaided schools. Thus, the null hypothesis is retained.
e) The deficit schools students had a mean score of 39.10 and SD of 5.92. Students studying in private-aided schools had a mean score of 31.07 and SD of 6.10. The difference in the means of the scores of students studying in deficit schools and students studying in private-aided schools is statistically significant. The ‘t’ being 11.37 is significant at 0.01 level. This denotes that the students studying in deficit schools showed a higher environmental awareness level than the students studying in private-aided schools. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected.

f) The mean score of students studying in deficit schools was 39.10 with SD of 5.92. The mean score of students studying in private-unaided schools was 33.83 with SD of 7.14. The difference in the means of the scores of students studying in deficit schools and students studying in private-unaided schools is statistically significant. The ‘t’ being 7.96 is significant at 0.01 level. It is evident that the students studying in deficit schools exhibited a higher environmental awareness level than the students studying in private-unaided schools. The null hypothesis is thus rejected.

g) The students studying in private-aided schools had a mean score of 31.07 and SD of 6.10. Students studying in private-unaided schools had a mean score of 33.83 and SD of 7.14. The mean difference of students studying in private-aided schools and students studying in private-unaided schools is statistically significant. The ‘t’ being 3.17 is significant at 0.01 level. It can be seen that the students studying in private-unaided schools showed
a higher level of environmental awareness than the private-aided school students. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

h) The students coming from the rural areas had a mean score of 33.88 and SD of 5.21. The students coming from the urban areas had a mean score of 34.80 and SD of 7.59. The difference in the means of the scores of students coming from the rural areas and students coming from the urban areas is not statistically significant. The ‘t’ being 1.18 is not significant at 0.01 level. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of environmental awareness between the students coming from the urban areas the students coming from the rural areas. The null hypothesis is therefore retained.

i) The students studying in arts stream had a mean score of 32.30 and SD of 7.26. Students studying in science stream had a mean score of 38.75 and SD of 5.94. The difference in the means of the scores of students studying in arts stream and of the students studying in science stream is statistically significant. The ‘t’ value is 13.73 which is significant at 0.01 level. It indicates that the students studying in science stream showed a higher environmental awareness level than the students studying in arts stream. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

j) The mean score of students studying in arts stream was 32.30 and SD was 7.26. The students studying in commerce stream had a mean score of 33.29 and SD of 6.88. The difference in the means of the scores of
students studying in arts stream and students studying in commerce stream is not statistically significant. The ‘t’ being 1.49 is not significant at 0.01 level. This shows that there is no significant difference in the level of environmental awareness between the students studying in arts stream and the students studying in commerce stream. The null hypothesis is thus retained.

k) The science students had a mean score of 38.75 and SD of 5.94. The commerce students had a mean score of 33.29 and SD of 6.88. This difference in the means of the scores of students studying in science stream and students studying in commerce stream is statistically significant. The value of ‘t’ is 8.98 and is significant at 0.01 level. It is evident that the students studying in science stream exhibited a higher level of environmental awareness than the students studying in commerce stream. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Based on Objective (iv) of the study and the hypothesis developed, the following summarizes the major findings from the comparative analysis of the level of environmental awareness between the higher secondary school students in Aizawl district and Lunglei district of Mizoram:

i. The students studying in Aizawl district had a mean score of 35.18 and SD of 7.06 and students studying in Lunglei district had a mean score of 34.00 and SD of 7.82. The difference in the means of the scores of
students studying in Aizawl district and students studying in Lunglei
district is not statistically significant. The ‘t’ value which is 2.47 is not
significant at 0.01 level. Therefore, this reveals that there existed no
difference in the level of environmental awareness of the students
studying in Aizawl district and in Lunglei district. The null hypothesis is
thus retained.