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I. INTRODUCTION
Christenson, Rounds & Gorney (1992) research findings indicate that parental involvement makes a positive contribution to children’s educational achievement. Shek (1997) has found that family factors play an important role in influencing the psychosocial adjustment, particularly the positive mental health, of Chinese adolescents. Whether parents are involved in and support their adolescents’ school life can directly affect their personal and social development as well as their academic success. Bandhana Bandhana, Darshana P. Sharma (2012) results revealed that the students with high home environment have higher level of reasoning ability in comparison to one’s having low home environment. Furthermore, it was revealed that private school students have higher level of reasoning ability in comparison to the one’s belonging to the government schools. Clarissa (1992) in Barbados examined home environmental factors that have a positive influence on achievement of secondary students. She observed that family stability, unity, and security had a positive influence on school achievement. Data was collected from a sample of 105 form-four students with 40% boys and 60% girls. S. Jaikumar and R. Muthumanickam (2010) found that there is a significant difference between male and female students who are in the first and second birth order and third and above birth order on their family environment. There is no significant difference between joint family and nuclear family students on their family environment. Senthilnathan (2008) conducted “A study of self-regulated learning of higher secondary students in relation to their family environment” and found that self-regulated learning of higher secondary students is closely related to their family environment. Venkatesan (2008) conducted a study on “academic achievement of IX standard students in relation to their family environment” and found that there is a significant relationship exists between the IXth standard students academic achievement and their family environment.

II. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM
In the present research main aim is to study and compare various dimensions of home environment among students with regard to gender. The exact problem of the present research is as under: “A study of various dimensions of home environment among higher secondary school students in relation to gender”

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
The main objective of the present research is to study and compare various dimensions such as control, protectiveness, punishment, conformity, social isolation, reward, deprivation of privilege, nurturance, rejection and permissiveness between male and female student of higher secondary school.

IV. HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY
The main hypothesis of the present research is as under: There will be no significant difference between male and female students of higher secondary schools with regard to their various dimensions of home environment such as control, protectiveness, punishment, conformity, social isolation, and reward, deprivation of privilege, nurturance, rejection and permissiveness.

V. SAMPLE OF THE STUDY
In the present research 100 male and 100 female students were randomly selected from the various higher secondary schools of Ahmedabad city.

VI. VARIABLE OF THE STUDY
In the present research gender is considered as independent variable and scores of various dimensions of home environment inventory is considered as dependent variable.

VII. TOOLS
In the present research Home Environment Inventory by K.S. Misra was used for data collection.

A. Reliability and Validity
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 is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Inventory dimension</th>
<th>Reliability coefficient</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>
</tbody>
</table>
The inter correlation is also counted by Dr Karunashankar Mishra in between 10 dimensions.

Validity:
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.

VIII. PROCEDURE
The main aim of the present research is to study various dimensions of home environment of higher secondary schools students with regard to gender. 250 male and 250 female students from were selected randomly from the various higher secondary schools of Ahmedabad city. Principals of the selected school were personally contacted. Permission was taken for data collection from the student of their institution. In small manageable group of students rapport was established with them. They were instructed about the inventory which was being used for data collection. They were given home environment inventory and answer sheet. After the completion of data collection the responses of each test were assigned scores according to the manual of home environment inventory.

IX. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
To find out the significance mean difference between male and female student of higher secondary schools with regards to the scores of various dimensions of home environment 't' test was used.

X. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Mean SD and 't' value of male and female higher secondary school student on various dimensions of home environment.

<p>| Table 1: t-test for comparison of male and female students on various dimensions of home environment. |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean SD</th>
<th>'t'</th>
<th>Level of Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.23 6.6</td>
<td><strong>4.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>.01</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.60 5.0</td>
<td><strong>4.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>.01</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Protectiveness</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.06 7.5</td>
<td><strong>0.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>NS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.46 5.9</td>
<td><strong>5.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>.01</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In above Table an attempt is made to find out the significant difference between male and female higher secondary school students on various dimensions of home environment such as control, protectiveness, punishment, conformity, social isolation, reward, deprivation of privilege, nurturance, rejection and permissiveness. Mean scores of male higher secondary school students on control is 21.23 and SD is 6.69 and mean scores of female higher secondary school students on control is 17.60 and SD is 5.09. The 't' value is 4.32 which are significant at .01 levels. It means male higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on control. Higher Secondary male students differ significantly than female students on the dimension of control because usually female students are controller in a more strict ways than male students in our Indian society. Mean scores of male higher secondary school students on protectiveness is 28.06 and SD is 7.51 and mean scores of female higher secondary school students on protectiveness is 28.46 and SD is 5.92. The 't' value is 0.42 which is not significant. It means male higher secondary school students do not differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on protectiveness. On the dimensions of protectiveness, there is no significant difference between males and females. In the practice of protecting the children males females are usually treated equally. We cannot do that particularly gender of children is protection more or less. Mean scores of male higher secondary school students on punishment is 23.26 and SD is 5.93 and mean scores of female higher secondary school students on punishment is 20.40 and SD is 6.03. The
‘t’ value is 3.38 which is significant at .01 level. It means male higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on punishment. On the dimensions of punishment, significant difference is found between modes of punishment for males and females. Some of the parents are more punitive to females than males. Hence, difference is found between the two genders. Mean scores of male higher secondary school students on conformity is 30.61 and SD is 5.79 and mean scores of female higher secondary school students on conformity is 31.24 and SD is 5.07. The ‘t’ value is 0.82 which is not significant. It means male higher secondary school students do not differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on conformity. In respect of conformity, there is no difference between males and females. It may be that both male and female are socialized in equal pattern and therefore both the genders learn to confirm to social norms. Mean scores of male higher secondary school students on social isolation is 14.38 and SD is 7.26 and mean scores of female higher secondary school students on social isolation is 8.84 and SD is 5.79. The ‘t’ value is 5.97 Which is significant at .01 level. It means male higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on social isolation. The statistical analyses show that the social isolation value of females is less than that of males. The females are socially more isolated than that man because the parents allow males more to mix with the society than females. Mean scores of male higher secondary school students on reward is 30.61 and SD is 5.55 and mean scores of female higher secondary school students on reward is 32.14 and SD is 5.11. The ‘t’ value is 2.03 which is significant at .05 level. It means male higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on reward. On the dimension of reward, there is a significant difference between males and females. It seems females are rewards more by parents and teachers than males. Mean scores of male higher secondary school students on deprivation of privilege is 11.33 and SD is 7.10 and mean scores of female higher secondary school students on deprivation of privilege is 5.64 and SD is 4.36. The ‘t’ value is 6.83 which is significant at .01 level. It means male higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on deprivation of privilege. On deprivation of privileges, males and females differ significantly. It seems this is the result of our social pattern. In our society males are given more privilege than females. It is the practice from very childhood. Mean scores of male higher secondary school students on nurturance is 24.01 and SD is 6.02 and mean scores of female higher secondary school students on nurturance is 24.29 and SD is 5.57. The ‘t’ value is 0.34 which is not significant. It means male higher secondary school students do not differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on nurturance. On nurturance, the significant difference is not found between males and females. In modern society. The boys and girls are nurturance in equal ways. In ancient times, there was a partial treatment of boys and girls. Mean scores of male higher secondary school students on rejection is 11.65 and SD is 7.59 and mean scores of female higher secondary school students on rejection is 6.84 and SD is 5.53. The ‘t’ value is 4.62 which are significant at .01 levels. It means male higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on rejection. On rejection, there is a significant difference between males and females usually females are regarded more by parents than males. Parents and family accept boys more than the girls. Some families regarded girls totally. It is the usual practice. Mean scores of male higher secondary school students on permissiveness is 21.25 and SD is 5.63 and mean scores of female higher secondary school students on permissiveness is 22.84 and SD is 5.83. The ‘t’ value is 1.96 which is significant at .05 level. It means male higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on permissiveness. On permissiveness the males and females differ significantly. We can observe the practices prevailing in many families that parents are more permissive to males than females. Males usually get permission of parents to move anywhere, compared to females.

**XI. CONCLUSIONS**

- Male higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on control.
- Male higher secondary school students do not differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on protectiveness.
- Male higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on punishment.
- Male higher secondary school students do not differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on conformity.
- Male higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on reward.
- Male higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on social isolation.
- Male higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on rejection.
- Male higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to female higher secondary school students on nurturance.
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I. INTRODUCTION
M.V.R. Raju and T. Khaja Rahamtulla (2007) to examine the adjustment problems of school students from urban and rural schools of Visakhapatnam district. Adjustment is a process by which a living organism maintains a balance between the needs and the circumstances. The variables included for the study apart from adjustment (family, social, academic, financial and emotional) are age, gender, class, type of school etc. The study was conducted on a sample of 461 students (197 boys, 264 girls) randomly selected from the various government and private schools from urban and rural areas of Visakhapatnam district, Andhra Pradesh. A standardized questionnaire developed by Jain (1972) was adopted for this study. The data was analyzed to examine the influence of individual factors on adjustment variables. The major findings of the study have shown that adjustment of school children is primarily dependent on the school variables like the class in which they are studying, the medium of instruction present in the school, and the type of management of the school. Parental education and occupation of the school children also significantly influenced adjustment. Manju Gehlawat (2011) to study the adjustment among high school students with respect to their gender. No significant differences were found in the emotional, social, educational and the total adjustment of students with respect to their gender. Thomas W. Farmer, Matthew J. Irvin, Jana H. Thompson (2006) examined the relationship between end-of-year grades and the academic, behavioral, and social characteristics of rural African American youth. Participants included 392 7th and 8th grade students from 2 rural middle schools in the south. Participants were African American and were from 2 communities that have child poverty rates exceeding 50% for public school students. Girls were more likely to have positive characteristics than boys. Academic, behavioral, and social difficulties were linked to low end-of-year grades, and positive characteristics were linked to high grades. Implications for supporting low-achieving African American students from low-resource communities are discussed. Dr. M.Y. Ganai and Muhammad Ashraf Mir (2013) were found No significant difference between male and female college students in terms of total scores obtained on the adjustment scale. The two groups also do not differ in terms of scores obtained separately on any dimension of the adjustment scale. Furthermore the two groups showed no significant difference in terms of their academic achievement. Yellaiah (2012) found that adjustment and academic achievement cause significant difference between male and female student. Government and private schools students and rural and urban school student do not cause difference between adjustment and academic achievement. It is also found that there is a low positive relationship between adjustment and academic achievement. Sanandraj & Thomas (1984) investigated sex differences in masculinity, femininity and its relationship to self-esteem, personal adjustment and social adjustment. They found that there was a significant sex difference in masculine-feminine orientation of the sample. Agarwal (2003) conducted a comparative study of adolescents’ level of adjustment in relation to the academic success and failure. It was found that successful adolescents were significantly superior in their social emotions and educational adjustment in comparison to unsuccessful ad descents. Singh (2006) examined the effects of socio, emotional and socio emotional climate of the school and sex on the adjustment of students along with their interactions effects. Boys were significantly better than girls in their health adjustment at different levels of socio-emotional climate of the school. Parmar Gira B. (2012) the study has been conducted to know the adjustment of secondary school students of Gandhinagar district. In the study effect of gender and category on the adjustment of secondary school students’ Vandana Chauhan (2013) studied that there is significant difference in adjustment of higher secondary school’s students and Female students have good adjustment level when compared to the male students.

II. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM
In the present research main aim is to study and compare certain areas of adjustment of the students in relation to habitat. The exact problem of the present research is as under: “A study of certain areas of adjustment of higher secondary school’s students in relation to habitat”

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
The main objective of the present research is to study and compare certain areas of adjustment like Home adjustment, Health adjustment, Emotional adjustment, Social adjustment and Overall adjustment between urban and rural students of higher secondary school.
IV. HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY
The main hypothesis of the present research is as under:
There will be no significant difference between urban and rural students of higher secondary schools in relation to certain areas of adjustment like Home adjustment, Health adjustment, Emotional adjustment, Social adjustment and Overall adjustment.

V. SAMPLE OF THE STUDY
In the present research 100 urban and 100 rural higher secondary schools students were randomly selected from the urban and rural areas of Ahmedabad District.

VI. VARIABLE OF THE STUDY
In the present research work habitat is considered as independent variable and scores of certain areas of adjustment like Home adjustment, Health adjustment, Emotional adjustment, Social adjustment and Overall adjustment of higher secondary school students is considered as dependent variable.

VII. TOOLS
In the present research Adjustment Inventory of R.K. Ojha was used for data collection.

A. Reliability and validity
Reliability:
The adjustment inventory possesses high reliability. The reliability coefficients were determined by split-half and test-retest method. For split-half, the correlation between odd and even items was calculated and corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula. Similarly, in case of test-retest method, the inventory was again administered on a sample of 200 students after a period of two months. The reliability coefficients are shown in Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Split-Half</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test-Retest</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity:
The adjustment inventory was validated against K. Kumar’s Adjustment inventory. The two inventory scores yielded positive correlations. This study was conducted on a sample of 400 cases of four educational groups. Pearson’s r is given in Table 2.

Scoring:
Scoring of the inventory is most easy. You have to count the number of responses where the individual has encircled “Yes” only. For each encircles “Yes” response 1 score is to be given. The total number of “Yes” scores thus makes total score of the individual in the part. You are not concerned to the “No” and “?” response. The inventory is totally negative inventory. When an individual answers in “Yes”, it indicates his difficulties. If he answers in “No”, if indicates that the individual has not such difficulty. If one answers in question mark “?” his answer is neither affirmative nor negative towards difficulties. Therefore, only “Yes” responses are scored to measure adjustment difficulty.

VIII. PROCEDURE
The main aim of the present research work is to study certain areas of adjustment of higher secondary schools students in relation to habitat. 100 urban and 100 rural students from were selected randomly from the various higher secondary schools of Ahmedabad District. Principals of the selected school were personally contacted. The permission for data collection was taken. In small manageable group of student rapport was established with them. They were instructed about the adjustment inventory which was being used for data collection. They were given Adjustment Inventory and answer sheet. After the completion of data collection the responses of each test were assigned scores according to the manual of adjustment inventory.

IX. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
To find out the significance mean difference between urban and rural student of higher secondary schools with regards to the scores of certain areas of adjustment’t’ test was used.

X. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Mean SD and t value of urban and rural higher secondary school student on certain areas of adjustment.
In above Table an attempt is made to find out the significant difference between urban and rural higher secondary school students on certain areas of adjustment such Home adjustment, Health adjustment, Emotional adjustment, Social adjustment and Overall adjustment. Mean scores of urban higher secondary school students on home adjustment is 12.81 and SD is 3.64 and mean scores of rural higher secondary school students on home adjustment is 15.08 and SD is 2.80. The ‘t’ value is 4.55 which is significant at .01 level. It means urban higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to rural higher secondary school students on home adjustment. On home adjustment, urban and rural students differ significantly. It is true that rural students adjust better in home environment than urban students. Rural students get an opportunity to be with their parents. As compared to them urban students get less opportunities to mix an adjust with their parents. Mean scores of urban higher secondary school students on health adjustment is 6.52 and SD is 3.71 and mean scores of rural higher secondary school students on health adjustment is 6.38 and SD is 3.21. The ‘t’ value is 0.27 which is not significant. It means urban higher secondary school students do not differ significantly as compare to rural higher secondary school students on health adjustment. On health adjustment, there is no significant difference between rural and urban students. It is quite likely that the health care advantages are equal in rural and urban area. Today Government has made provisions for maintaining both urban and rural area. Mean scores of urban higher secondary school students on emotional adjustment is 17.70 and SD is 4.54 and mean scores of rural higher secondary school students on emotional adjustment is 17.34 and SD is 3.23. The ‘t’ value is 0.65 which is not significant. It means urban higher secondary school students do not differ significantly as compare to rural higher secondary school students on emotional adjustment. On emotional adjustment, there is no significant difference between rural and urban students. Both types of students get equal opportunity to acquire emotional maturity. They emotionally adjust with home environment because the environment is suitable to them. Mean scores of urban higher secondary school students on social adjustment is 8.47 and SD is 6.69 and mean scores of rural higher secondary school students on emotional adjustment is 8.74 and SD is 4.77. The ‘t’ value is 0.33 which is not significant. It means urban higher secondary school students do not differ significantly as compare to rural higher secondary school students on social adjustment. On social adjustment dimension, urban and rural students do not differ significantly. In urban and rural homes, socialization of children is almost similar. Both types of environment more helpful in learning social adjustment. Mean scores of urban higher secondary school students on overall adjustment is 44.98 and SD is 13.01 and mean scores of rural higher secondary school students on overall adjustment is 47.54 and SD is 10.44. The ‘t’ value is 1.54 which is not significant. It means urban higher secondary school students do not differ significantly as compare to rural higher secondary school students on overall adjustment. On overall adjustment, there is no significant difference between rural and urban students. In urban and rural areas parents take equal care to teach adjustment in different areas of life. Therefore, the overall adjustment is equal in rural and urban students.

XI. CONCLUSIONS

- Urban higher secondary school students differ significantly as compare to rural higher secondary school students on home adjustment.
- Urban higher secondary school students do not differ significantly as compare to rural higher secondary school students on health adjustment.
- Urban higher secondary school students do not differ significantly as compare to rural higher secondary school students on emotional adjustment.
- Urban higher secondary school students do not differ significantly as compare to rural higher secondary school students on social adjustment.
- Urban higher secondary school students do not differ significantly as compare to rural higher secondary school students on overall adjustment.
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