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A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF HOME ENVIRONMENT, ADJUSTMENT AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOLS STUDENTS

1. INTRODUCTION:

Home environment plays a major role in the mental and social development of the child. Among the social groups that nurture a human being, family plays the most important role; especially, the behavior patterns of parents clearly affect the child's personality. If deprivation and shocking experiences occur during a child's growth, they deeply affect his mental makeup. Studies have shown that the child who is rear up by mother with deep affection warmth and care, grows up in a desirable manner. A child who does not get warmth and loving care from mother is very adversely affected in his development. A study of children who grew up in institution as mother were not able to rear them up, showed that more than 60% of them could not sit till they were 2 years of age and more than 85% of them could not walk till 4 years of age. When they attained the age of 18 to 20 years, their development was recorded of them, 21% had psychosis, 4% had character disorder, 4% were mentally retarded and 2% had psychoneurosis. Only 7% of them could attain a healthy adjustment of life.

Provence and Lipton (1963) compared children reared up under warmth of mother to children reared up in institution under less attention or warmth. Institutionally brought up children did not have any hunger for getting love. They were neutral in attitude towards adults. Their language development was very retarded. Their play with toys was of a very low level. On the other hand, children grown up under love in family had a keep interest, curiosity and a tendency to try out and experiment. These traits were absent among children reared up in institutions. Such children find it very difficult to enter into loving relationships when they grow up.

In USA, there are about 1 crore children who miss right from childhood one of their parents, either due to divorce, separation, death or such reasons. i.e. one in
seven children are thus deprived, such events or experiences are most damaging when they occur during the child’s tender age.

When a child is developing, he internalizes his parents’ image and initiates them. But when he is deprived of such experiences, he remains always from an important adult (ideal) example. So he is unable to achieve healthy development and experience difficulty in adjustment. For this very reason, the family is said to play very important role in healthy mental development of a child. If the child is deprived from such an environment, a number of psychological problems arise.

After birth, the child’s initial interactions are with his parents. With passage of time, a definite relationship is established between the child and parents. Interaction between the child and parents is considered very important for his development. According to an estimate, even in USA, at least 25% families have failed to establish healthy and development-promoting relations with the child. Parents’ behaviour patterns and home environment are important in such defective relations.

In 1997 Sharma studied frustration and adjustment in family relations on 100 college students. Results show that their family relations affected college students’ frustrations. Girls had more acceptance than boy students; while boys had more indifference than girls.

In 1994, Pramanik found that girls reared up in restrictive environment were in a more indifferent relation with their parents, while girls reared up in a more liberal environment had more mutually accepting relation with parents.

Independent as well as interaction effects of socio-economic status and parent-child relations were important. None of the above variables had significant effect on enmity.

In 1996 Kaur and Singh studied 50 boys and 50 girls between 13 and 15 years’ age. They investigated effect of personal and social variables like socio-economic status of family. Child birth order, type of family and educational level of parents on the techniques of discipline used by parents of urban adolescents. They found no significant relation of such factors with the methods of discipline the child used by parents as perceived by these students.

In 1997, Bakshi studied effect of parents’ attitudes on their children’s personality development (N=400). They found that (i) Adverse parental attitudes
negatively affected. The children’s performance (ii) Parents’ unattached attitude negatively affected their children’s social skills, emotional attachment to parents, development of egoideal and growth of concepts about physical and social reality. (iii) Feeling of self-rejection, general defects of feeling and defects in achievement developed among children rejected by their parents.

In 2008, Bonson and Jean studied problem behavior arising among 1893 students between 10 and 13 years’ age, due to quarrels and aggressive attitudes in their parents. They found that parents’ behavior affected both internal and external problem behavior among these adolescents. For external problem behavior like smoking the mother’s strictness and rudeness was mostly responsible. For internal problem of adolescents, like fretting and fidgeting, dislike and lack of acceptance by mother was responsible. Thus, emotional immaturity of mother of equally related to internal as well as external expression of children.

In 2003, Patel studied 526 students of std. 8, 9 and 10 from various schools of Rajkot for identifying some family variables which can predict depression among adolescents. They were asked to write their responses to item in personal data sheet, child behavior check list of H.N. Beck, Family relations scale of Sherry and Sinha, and family environment scale of Moose and Moose. Results reveal that out of the 21 independent variables, 6 Ivs significantly predicted adolescents' depression, negate and rejection by parents (lack of) unity in family, over emphasis on moral and religious matters, control and educational qualification of parents.

In 2001, Purohit and Nehra studied relation between parents’ behavior and personality of school going adolescents. Data was collected on 240 subjects from std. XI of 3 higher secondary schools of Jaipur. It was found that (i) father's role is important in developing extroversion among adolescents, (ii) parental indifference and rejection had significant positive correlation with development of psychoneurosis among adolescents, (iii) too much love and indulgence in mother had negative correlation with mild abnormality among adolescents, while such behavior by fathers had no significant correlation with neurotic behavior in adolescents.

Forehand (1992) found that after divorce, problem of adjustment in child arises not immediately, but after some years. Woody’s (1994), Wilner’s (1985) and Forehand Long and Meteron’s (1987) studies emphasis that parents’ divorce lead
to maladjustment among children. Fitzgerald (1992) found that after parents’ divorce, the prominent emotional responses among children is sorrow rather than anger or tendency to crime.

Ghosh and Kapoor’s (1996) studies show that in various adjustment areas anxiety, self acceptance and others acceptance there is significant difference between children of intact families and divorced families. Galkhar and Aseema (2004) found that (i) compared to urban adolescents, rural adolescents have higher educational achievement. (ii) There are main and interaction effects between areas of residence and sex of the students. (iii) Educational achievement of logical ability. Pareira (1974)’s study found significant correlation between intelligence and educational achievement of maladjusted children. But there was no significant correlation between intelligence and educational achievement among children of well adjusted groups.

Observations of Gupta Mukherji and Chatterji show that rural/urban area is a separate factor contributing to prediction of educational achievement. Intelligence, childhood experiences and travel are important for predicting edu. Achievement of rural students; while intelligence, home environment and experience of nature are important for urban students. Intelligence, home environment and motivational experiences are important for rural girls.

2. PROBLEM OF THE STUDY :

The problem has been selected by keeping in focus the home environment, various areas of adjustment and academic achievement of the students during schooling. The main problem of present study is as follows:

"A comparative study of home environment, adjustment and academic achievement of higher secondary schools students"

3. OBJECTIVES:

Major objectives of the present research were as under:

1. To study and compare various dimensions of home environment like Control, Protectiveness, Punishment, Conformity, Social Isolation, Reward,
Deprivation of Privilege, Nurture and rejection and permissiveness of urban and rural higher secondary school students.

2. To study and compare various dimensions of home environment like Control, Protectiveness, Punishment, Conformity, Social Isolation, Reward, Deprivation of Privilege, Nurture and rejection and permissiveness of male and female higher secondary school students.

3. To study interaction effect between habitat and gender with regards to various dimensions of home environment like Control, Protectiveness, Punishment, Conformity, Social Isolation, Reward, Deprivation of Privilege, Nurture and rejection and permissiveness.

4. To study and compare home adjustment, health adjustment, emotional adjustment, social adjustment and total adjustment of urban and rural higher secondary school students.

5. To study and compare home adjustment, health adjustment, emotional adjustment, social adjustment and total adjustment of male and female higher secondary school students.

6. To study interaction effect between habitat and gender with regards to home adjustment, health adjustment, emotional adjustment, social adjustment and total adjustment.

7. To study and compare academic achievement of urban and rural higher secondary school students.

8. To study and compare academic achievement of male and female higher secondary school students.

9. To study interaction effect between habitat and gender with regards to academic achievement

4. HYPOTHESES:

Major hypotheses of the present research were as under:

1. There will be no significant difference between urban and rural higher secondary schools students with regards to various dimensions of home environment like Control, Protectiveness, Punishment, Conformity, Social
Isolation, Reward, Deprivation of Privilege, Nurture and rejection and permissiveness.

2. There will be no significant difference between male and female higher secondary schools students with regards to various dimensions of home environment like Control, Protectiveness, Punishment, Conformity, Social Isolation, Reward, Deprivation of Privilege, Nurture and rejection and permissiveness.

3. There will be no significant interaction effect between habitat and gender of higher secondary schools students with regards to various dimensions of home environment like Control, Protectiveness, Punishment, Conformity, Social Isolation, Reward, Deprivation of Privilege, Nurture and rejection and permissiveness.

4. There will be no significant difference between urban and rural higher secondary schools students with regards to home adjustment, health adjustment, emotional adjustment, social adjustment and total adjustment.

5. There will be no significant difference between male and female higher secondary schools students with regards to home adjustment, health adjustment, emotional adjustment, social adjustment and total adjustment.

6. There will be no significant interaction effect between habitat and gender of higher secondary schools students with regards to home adjustment, health adjustment, emotional adjustment, social adjustment and total adjustment.

7. There will be no significant difference between urban and rural higher secondary schools students with regards to academic achievement.

8. There will be no significant difference between male and female higher secondary schools students with regards to academic achievement.

9. There will be no significant interaction effect between habitat and gender of higher secondary schools students with regards to academic achievement.
5. VARIABLES:

The nature and levels of variables of the present research work are as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Name of Variables</th>
<th>Nature of Variables</th>
<th>Numbers of Level</th>
<th>Name of Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Urban Students Rural Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male Students Female Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Home Environment</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>10 Dimensions</td>
<td>Scores of Various Dimension of Home Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>Dependents Variables</td>
<td>5 Areas</td>
<td>Scores of Various areas of Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Last three years results of annual examination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. SAMPLE:

For the present research sample were selected randomly from urban and / rural higher secondary schools of Ahmedabad, Gandhinagar and Mehsana District. Total sample is categorized as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. TOOLS:

1). Home Environment Inventory by K.S. Mishra

The present home environment inventory is an instrument designed to measure psycho social climate of home as perceived by children. It provides a measure of quality and quantity of the cognitive, emotional and social support that has been available to the child within the home. HEI has 100 items belonging to the ten dimensions of home environment. Operational definitions of these dimensions are as follows.
(A) **Control**:  
It indicates autocratic atmosphere in which many restrictions are imposed on children by the parents in order to discipline them.

(B) **Protectiveness**:  
It implies prevention of independent behavior and prolongation of infantile care.

(C) **Punishment**:  
It includes physical as well as affective punishment to avoid the occurrence of undesirable behavior.

(D) **Conformity**:  
It indicates parents directions and commands or orders with which child is expected to comply by actions. It refers to demands to work according to parents desires and expectations.

(E) **Social Isolation**:  
It indicates the use of isolations from beloved person except family members for negative sanctions.

(F) **Reward**:  
It includes material as well as symbolic rewards to strengthen or increase the probability of desired behavior.

(G) **Deprivation of Privilege**:  
It implies controlling children behavior by depriving them or their rights to seek love, respect and child care from parents.

(H) **Nurturance**:  
It indicates existence of excessive unconditional, physical and emotional attachment of parents with the child. Parents have a keen interest in and love for the child.

(I) **Rejection**:  
It implies conditional love recognizing that the child has no right as a person, no right to express his feeling, no right to uniqueness and no right to become autonomous individual.

(J) **Permissiveness**:  
It includes provision of opportunity to child to express his views freely and act accordingly to his desire with no interference from parents.
• **Description Of The Inventory:**

HEI contained 100 items related to above-mentioned ten dimensions of home environment. The instrument requires students to tell the frequency with which a particular parents/child interactional behavior has been observed by them in their homes. It is 5 point scale from mostly to never.

HEI can use individual or in group setting. Test has 5 cell point marking system for score is allotted by constructor, 4 marks to mostly, 3 marks to often, 2 marks to some times, 1 mark to least and 0 marks to never.

The item wise “t” value is found out from the test constructor.

• **Reliability:**

The home environment inventory’s reliability was found out by split half method, and worked out separately for all the ten dimensions. The split half reliability of various dimensions of HEI are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Inventory dimension</th>
<th>Reliability co-efficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Protectiveness</td>
<td>0.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Social isolation</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Deprivation of privileges</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Nurture</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>0.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Permissiveness</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inter correlation is also counted by Dr Karunashankar Mishra in between 10 dimensions.

**Validity of HEI:**

Home environment inventory has been found to possess content validity is measured with the help of views expressed by judges. Criterion related validity could not be established because of the lack of appropriate external criteria.
Norms:

HEI has different norms for boys and girls. Scores are counted in percentile.

If > P 90 Percentile Very high
If P 75 – 90 Percentile High
If P 50 – 75 Percentile Slightly above average
If P 25 – 50 Percentile Average
If P 10 – 25 Percentile Slightly below average

2) ADJUSTMENT INVENTORY:

In order to measure the adjustment of higher secondary school students, the Adjustment Inventory by R.K. Oza was used. It measures (i) Family (ii) Health (iii) Social (iv) Emotional and (v) Overall adjustment.

- Reliability and Validity:

Reliability of this test has been measured by split half and test-retest method by using spearman and brown formula split half reliability index of family adjustment is 0.84, health adjustment is 0.81, social adjustment is 0.89 and Emotional adjustment is 0.92.

To measure validity the results were correlated with Kumar Adjustment inventory. Validity index of family : 0.72, health : 0.79, social 0.82 and emotional : 0.81 (all high) were found.

- Method of scoring:

The present inventory is a negative measure. When the respondent says 'Yes', it indicates his adjustment problem, and when say 'No', it indicates absence of adjustment problem, 'Yes' response is scored as 1. No or '?' responses do not get any score. Thus, high total score indicates mala adjustment.

3) ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT:

Means scores of results of last three years annual examination of each student were considered as Academic achievement.
8. PROCEDURE:

The main purpose of the present research is to study home environment, adjustment and academic achievement of higher secondary school students. For that higher secondary school of urban and rural areas of Mehsana, Gandhinagr and Ahmedabad district were randomly selected. Principals of selected schools were personally contacted. They informed about the purpose of study their permission for collecting data from students of their school was obtained.

Then 250 boys and 250 girls studying in urban higher secondary school were randomly selected. Similarly, 250 boys and 250 girls students of rural higher secondary schools were randomly chosen. A time table was prepared according to be schedule, the selected students were called in small groups. Rapport was established with them they were instructed about the tools which were being used. Then step wise the randomly chosen respondents were given the booklets, and answer sheets. After the data collection, the responses were checked for completeness and scores were assigned according to instructions in the manuals of each test.

9. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:

Keeping in view the purpose and null hypotheses, in order to know whether habitat and gender of respondents affect the main and interaction effects on various dimensions of home environment, areas of adjustment and academic achievement, 2 x 2 factorial design was used. Two ways analysis of variance was used for statistical analysis.
10. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

Table 1
Summary, Results of ANOVA of various dimensions of Home Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>A (Control)</th>
<th>B (Protectiveness)</th>
<th>C (Punishment)</th>
<th>D (Conformity)</th>
<th>E (Social Isolation)</th>
<th>F (Reward)</th>
<th>G (Deprivation of Privilege)</th>
<th>H (Nurture)</th>
<th>I (Rejection)</th>
<th>J (Permisiveness)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.33**</td>
<td>74.18**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>124.43**</td>
<td>80.66**</td>
<td>37.24**</td>
<td>64.38**</td>
<td>5.67*</td>
<td>119.94**</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.30**</td>
<td>46.00**</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>165.23**</td>
<td>66.03**</td>
<td>40.33**</td>
<td>63.94**</td>
<td>12.45**</td>
<td>125.95**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass X Bss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.93**</td>
<td>105.56**</td>
<td>8.82**</td>
<td>127.73**</td>
<td>203.57**</td>
<td>46.72**</td>
<td>133.52**</td>
<td>8.48**</td>
<td>244.16**</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level.
** Significant at 0.01 level.

The results of ANOVA of Home Environment of students of various groups shows that F ratio for HEI Dimension A(Control) of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 11.33 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions A(Control) as compared to rural students. F ratio for HEI Dimension A(Control) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 10.30 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions A(Control) as compared to female students. F ratio for HEI Dimension A(Control) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 26.93 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension A(Control).
The results of ANOVA of Home Environment of students of various groups shows that F ratio for HEI Dimension B (Protectiveness) of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 74.18 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions B (Protectiveness) as compare to rural students. F ratio for HEI Dimension B (Protectiveness) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 46.00 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions B (Protectiveness) as compare to female students. F ratio for HEI Dimension B (Protectiveness) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 105.56 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension B (Protectiveness).

The results of ANOVA of Home Environment of students of various groups shows that F ratio for HEI Dimension C (Punishment) of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 0.07 which is not significant. It means urban students do not differ on HEI dimensions C (Punishment) as compare to rural students. F ratio for HEI Dimension C (Punishment) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 1.08 which is not significant. It means male students do not differ on HEI dimensions C (Punishment) as compare to female students. F ratio for HEI Dimension C (Punishment) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 8.82 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension C (Punishment).

The results of ANOVA of Home Environment of students of various groups shows that F ratio for HEI Dimension D (Conformity) of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 124.43 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions D (Conformity) as compare to rural students. F ratio for HEI Dimension D (Conformity) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 165.23 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions D (Conformity) as compare to female students. F ratio for HEI Dimension D (Conformity) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 127.73 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension D (Conformity).

The results of ANOVA of Home Environment of students of various groups shows that F ratio for HEI Dimension E (Social Isolation) of Habitat of Students (Ass)
is 80.66 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions E (Social Isolation) as compare to rural students. F ratio for HEI Dimension E (Social Isolation) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 66.03 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions E (Social Isolation) as compare to female students. F ratio for HEI Dimension E (Social Isolation) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 203.57 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension E (Social Isolation).

The results of ANOVA of Home Environment of students of various groups shows that F ratio for HEI Dimension F (Reward) of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 37.24 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions F (Reward) as compare to rural students. F ratio for HEI Dimension F (Reward) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 40.33 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions F (Reward) as compare to female students. F ratio for HEI Dimension F (Reward) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 46.72 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension F (Reward).

The results of ANOVA of Home Environment of students of various groups shows that F ratio for HEI Dimension G (Deprivation of Privilege) of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 64.38 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions G (Deprivation of Privilege) as compare to rural students. F ratio for HEI Dimension G (Deprivation of Privilege) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 63.94 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions G (Deprivation of Privilege) as compare to female students. F ratio for HEI Dimension G (Deprivation of Privilege) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 133.52 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension G (Deprivation of Privilege).

The results of ANOVA of Home Environment of students of various groups shows that F ratio for HEI Dimension H (Nurture) of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 5.67 which is significant at 0.05 level. It means urban students significantly differ on HEI...
dimensions H (Nurture) as compare to rural students. F ratio for HEI Dimension H (Nurture) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 12.45 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions H (Nurture) as compare to female students. F ratio for HEI Dimension H (Nurture) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 8.48 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension H (Nurture).

The results of ANOVA of Home Environment of students of various groups shows that F ratio for HEI Dimension I (Rejection) of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 119.94 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions I (Rejection) as compare to rural students. F ratio for HEI Dimension I (Rejection) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 125.95 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions I (Rejection) as compare to female students. F ratio for HEI Dimension I (Rejection) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 244.16 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension I (Rejection).

The results of ANOVA of Home Environment of students of various groups shows that F ratio for HEI Dimension J (Permissiveness) of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 1.54 which is not significant. It means urban students do not differ on HEI dimensions J (Permissiveness) as compare to rural students. F ratio for HEI Dimension J (Permissiveness) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 0.01 which is not significant. It means male students do not differ on HEI dimensions J (Permissiveness) as compare to female students. F ratio for HEI Dimension J (Permissiveness) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 1.17 which is not significant. It means significant interaction effect is not existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension J (Permissiveness).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>A (Home Adjustment)</th>
<th>B (Health Adjustment)</th>
<th>C (Emotional Adjustment)</th>
<th>D (Social Adjustment)</th>
<th>E (Overall Adjustment)</th>
<th>Academic Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.76**</td>
<td>55.32**</td>
<td>12.07**</td>
<td>401.45**</td>
<td>192.20**</td>
<td>11.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.25*</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass X Bss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70.13**</td>
<td>26.28**</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>22.64**</td>
<td>38.54**</td>
<td>5.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level.
** Significant at 0.01 level.

The results of ANOVA of various areas of Adjustment shows that F ratio for A (Home Adjustment) of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 6.76 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means urban students significantly differ on A (Home Adjustment) as compare to rural students. F ratio for A (Home Adjustment) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 4.25 which is significant at 0.05 level. It means male students significantly differ on A (Home Adjustment) as compare to female students. F ratio for A (Home Adjustment) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 70.13 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on A (Home Adjustment).

The results of ANOVA of various areas of Adjustment shows that F ratio for B (Health Adjustment) of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 55.32 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means urban students significantly differ on B (Health Adjustment) as compare to rural students. F ratio for B (Health Adjustment) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 0.50 which is not significant. It means male students do not differ on B (Health Adjustment) as compare to female students. F ratio for B (Health Adjustment) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 26.28 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on B (Health Adjustment).
The results of ANOVA of various areas of Adjustment shows that F ratio for C (Emotional Adjustment) of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 12.07 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means urban students significantly differ on C (Emotional Adjustment) as compare to rural students. F ratio for C (Emotional Adjustment) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 2.33 which is not significant. It means male students do not differ on C (Emotional Adjustment) as compare to female students. F ratio for C (Emotional Adjustment) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 0.19 which is not significant. It means significant interaction effect is not existed between habitat and gender of the students on C (Emotional Adjustment).

The results of ANOVA of various areas of Adjustment shows that F ratio for D (Social Adjustment) of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 401.45 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means urban students significantly differ on D (Social Adjustment) as compare to rural students. F ratio for D (Social Adjustment) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 0.35 which is not significant. It means male students do not differ on D (Social Adjustment) as compare to female students. F ratio for D (Social Adjustment) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 22.64 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on D (Social Adjustment).

The results of ANOVA of various areas of Adjustment shows that F ratio for E (Overall Adjustment) of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 192.20 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means urban students significantly differ on E (Overall Adjustment) as compare to rural students. F ratio for E (Overall Adjustment) of Gender of Students (Bss) is 1.04 which is not significant. It means male students do not differ on E (Overall Adjustment) as compare to female students. F ratio for E (Overall Adjustment) of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 38.54 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on E (Overall Adjustment).

The results of ANOVA of Academic Achievement shows that F ratio of Habitat of Students (Ass) is 11.35 which is significant at 0.01 level. It means urban students significantly differ on academic achievement as compare to rural students.

F ratio for Academic Achievement of Gender of Students (Bss) is 3.21 which is not significant. It means male students do not differ on academic achievement as
compare to female students. F ratio for Academic Adjustment of Habitat and Gender of Students (AxB) is 5.27 which is significant at 0.05 level. It means significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on academic achievement.

Results are discussed in detail in the main body of the thesis.

11. CONCLUSIONS:

1. Urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions A(Control) as compare to rural students.
2. Male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions A(Control) as compare to female students.
3. Significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension A(Control).
4. Urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions B (Protectiveness) as compare to rural students.
5. Male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions B (Protectiveness) as compare to female students.
6. Significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension B (Protectiveness).
7. Urban students do not differ on HEI dimensions C (Punishment) as compare to rural students.
8. Male students do not differ on HEI dimensions C (Punishment) as compare to female students.
9. Significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension C (Punishment).
10. Urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions D (Conformity) as compare to rural students.
11. Male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions D (Conformity) as compare to female students.
12. Significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension D (Conformity).
13. Urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions E (Social Isolation) as compare to rural students.
14. Male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions E (Social Isolation) as compare to female students.
15. Significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension E (Social Isolation).
16. Urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions F (Reward) as compare to rural students.
17. Male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions F (Reward) as compare to female students.
18. Significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension F (Reward).
19. Urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions G (Deprivation of Privilege) as compare to rural students.
20. Male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions G (Deprivation of Privilege) as compare to female students.
21. Significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension G (Deprivation of Privilege).
22. Urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions H (Nurture) as compare to rural students.
23. Male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions H (Nurture) as compare to female students.
24. Significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension H (Nurture).
25. Urban students significantly differ on HEI dimensions I (Rejection) as compare to rural students.
26. Male students significantly differ on HEI dimensions I (Rejection) as compare to female students.
27. Significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension I (Rejection).
28. Urban students do not differ on HEI dimensions J (Permissiveness) as compare to rural students.
29. Male students do not differ on HEI dimensions J (Permissiveness) as compare to female students.
30. Significant interaction effect is not existed between habitat and gender of the students on HEI Dimension J (Permissiveness).
31. Urban students significantly differ on A (Home Adjustment) as compare to rural students.
32. Male students significantly differ on A (Home Adjustment) as compare to female students.
33. Significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on A (Home Adjustment).
34. Urban students significantly differ on B (Health Adjustment) as compare to rural students.
35. Male students do not differ on B (Health Adjustment) as compare to female students.
36. Significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on B (Health Adjustment).
37. Urban students significantly differ on C (Emotional Adjustment) as compare to rural students.
38. Male students do not differ on C (Emotional Adjustment) as compare to female students.
39. Significant interaction effect is not existed between habitat and gender of the students on C (Emotional Adjustment).
40. Urban students significantly differ on D (Social Adjustment) as compare to rural students.
41. Male students do not differ on D (Social Adjustment) as compare to female students.
42. Significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on D (Social Adjustment).
43. Urban students significantly differ on E (Overall Adjustment) as compare to rural students.
44. Male students do not differ on E (Overall Adjustment) as compare to female students.
45. Significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on E (Overall Adjustment).

46. Urban students significantly differ on academic achievement as compare to rural students.

47. Male students do not differ on academic achievement as compare to female students.

48. Significant interaction effect is existed between habitat and gender of the students on academic achievement.

12. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY:

(1) A similar study can be done on secondary school students.
(2) A similar study can be done on college students.
(3) A study on personality dimensions of higher secondary students can be undertaken.
(4) A study of IQ, problem solving ability and academic achievement of higher secondary students can be done.
(5) A study of effect of socio-economic status of students on their home adjustment and academic achievement can be done.
(6) A comparative study of academic stress and achievement of government and private school students can be done.
(7) A study of personality dimensions of higher secondary students.
(8) A comparative study of academic performance of higher secondary student of CBSE board and Gujarat Board can be done.
(9) A similar study can be done on sample from other areas from Gujarat state: particularly Saurashtra, East Gujarat, South Gujarat and North Gujarat.
(10) A Similar study can be done on sample taken from other states of India and results can be compared with those of the present study.

13. IMPLICATIONS OF THE PRESENT STUDY:

(1) For parents of Urban higher secondary students: Keep a rational and reasonable amount of control over your children. Punish them if necessary. Allow them freedom but point out the risks. Protect them, but develop in
them ability to judge results of their actions. Train them to conform with rules of home. Give them opportunity to mix and interact with an acceptable social group. Reward them for each good behavior. If you have to deprive them of privileges, explain reasons. Don’t reject them. Permit their reasonable requests.

(2) For rural HS Student’s parents: Protect them and urge them to conform with rules of home often provide them opportunity to meet members of larger joint family, to reduce their social isolation. Notice their good work and reward them. Don’t deprive them of privileges. Develop in them emotional maturity. Provide favorable home environment for academic achievement.

(3) For parents of male HS students: Watch and control undesirable behavior. Emphasize need to maintain health in family. By keeping frequent contacts within the family, improve their social adjustment, appreciate their academic achievement.

(4) For parents of female HS students: Keep watch but control them reasonably. Protect them when threatening situations arise. Provide them opportunities of social contact within the larger joint family, to reduce, their social isolation. Reward than for good behavior. Don’t deprive them of privileges. Don’t reject them. Praise their academic achievement.

(5) For teachers of Urban HS Students: Urban higher secondary students are significantly less controlled and less protected in home. So in the school they should be tactfully handled. They have a lower adjustment in their home. As they eat fast foods and sleep late, their health adjustment is also poor. So teacher should treat them sympathetically. As they face frequent irritations and are occasionally involved in quarrels, their emotional and social adjustment is also lower. So teachers should tell them how to handle such situations effectively, and to arrive at mutual understanding with co-students. Teachers should encourage such students for better academic performance by using techniques of understanding the lessons and remembering the details.

(6) For teachers of Rural HS Students: As rural students are less conforming their teachers should be more careful in dealing with them about observance of
school rules. As they experience more social isolation and are less rewarded in their home, teachers should deal with than sympathetically. Rural students should be praised for their superior social and emotional adjustments. As they have better health adjustment teachers should encourage such students to undertake physical activities games and sports and to excel in them.

Research topics for finding out solutions to explain the results obtained:

1. Why are rural students less protected in homes?
2. Why are female students less protected in homes?
3. Why are urban students more conforming in home than rural students?
4. Why are male students more conforming in home than female students?
5. Test whether, compared to urban students, rural students feel more social isolation at home because of sharp difference in their social milieu.
6. Test whether urban parents are more particular about giving reward to their studying children than rural parents.
7. Test whether parenting style in rural homes is stricter than in urban homes.
8. Find out in what respects is the practice of nurturance in urban home different from that in rural homes?
9. As compared to urban students, rural students have better home adjustment. It is because they are brought up that way right from infancy stage? Test this hypothesis.
10. Test whether better health adjustment of rural students is due to more nutrient food and cleaner air in rural homes?
11. Test whether rural students have better emotional adjustment because from their early age, they are trained for emotional maturity?
12. Test whether better social adjustment of rural students is due to their getting more opportunities in adjusting socially?
13. Test whether better academic achievement of rural students is due to more peaceful and irritation-less home environment.

14. IMPLEMENTATION OF FINDINGS:

1. A seminar, with a question-answer session, for parents of Urban Higher secondary students should be arranged. A team of experiences psychologists
should guide them about how to exercise control over their children in the home.

(2) A list of situations in home in which protection of children is needed should be prepared with the help of psychologists. The list should also suggest ways in which protection is to be given. The list should be given to parents of rural and female higher secondary students. They should be asked to record their experience.

(3) A list of ideal and values of the home should be prepared by parents. A checklist of the students desirable behavior in home should be developed and a list of rewards for the same should also be made. These lists should be given to parents for recording and giving rewards. They should be helped by psychologists if required ways in which encouragement can be given to children for conforming with these ideal should be recorded. Specially, Rural higher secondary students acts of conforming with the ideals of home should be recorded.

(4) A team of voluntary social workers should be formed. It should regularly check homes, to locate cases of deprivation of privileges of rural and female higher secondary students. Parents should be counseled in ways of preventing/removing such deprivations.

(5) A team of psychologists should be formed, to find out homes in which the environment leads to rejection of the students. Type and frequency of rejection should be recorded. Then psychologists should provide appropriate guidance to the parents.

(6) A team of psychological assistants should be formed. It should investigate. For urban and female higher secondary students, failure in home adjustment. Psychologists should analyse the data to provide advice to the students and parents.

(7) A group of doctors should be formed to investigate, in homes of higher secondary students, the degree of health adjustment achieved by the student. Cases of poor health adjustment, with causes should be recorded. Remedies to be prescribed.
(8) A checklist for testing emotional adjustment should be prepared, with a list of causes and occasions for poor emotional adjustment. Psychologists should fill in details for each higher secondary student, to find out degree of emotional adjustment.

(9) A list of occasions of situations in home, where social adjustment is required from the family member and behaviour by which such adjustment is expressed should be prepared. A team of observers for such behaviour should be formed. They should be asked to record for each such occasion and for the family members, HS students in particular, the behaviour expressing his/her social adjustment.

    If a student member of the family gets poor social adjustment score, he should be advised to see a psychologist to find how he/she can be socially more adjusting.

(10) A list of variables that help good academic achievement should be prepared, especially, variables related to the home school and teachers, family members, the intelligence of student, his method of study and of writing answers. Each higher secondary student should be rated on these variables. His total score should be found and compared to his actual academic performance.

15. LIMITATIONS

(1) The sample was taken from Ahmedabad to Mehsana and Gandhinagar district only.
(2) Only Gujarati medium student were taken in this research.
(3) Type of school was not taken as independent variables.
(4) For data analysis only 2 way analysis of variance was done.
(5) Sample was taken from only Arts and Commerce faculties.
(6) Sample was taken from the Gujarat State Board Schools only.
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