

## Family environment of primary school teachers

<sup>1</sup> Dr. AC Lal Kumar, <sup>2</sup> Dr. M Muthamizhselvan

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor for M.Ed., G.E.T. College of Education, Vidyasankara Puram Village, Paradarami, Gudiyattam, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Pedagogical Sciences, Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University, Gangaianman Kovil Street, Karapakkam, Chennai, India

### Abstract

The present study was taken up to find out the family environment towards the primary school teachers. The study also aimed to find out whether significant difference towards gender, locality of institution, mode of management, locality of residence, teaching stream, teaching experience, marital status and type of family. Survey method was adopted for the study, 250 primary school teachers of government, aided and private of teachers of vellore district of tamilnadu state were selected by random sampling. FES by Harpreet Bhatia and Chadah NK (1993) was the tool used for data collection. Result revealed that there is no significant difference towards gender, locality of institution, mode of management, locality of residence, teaching stream, teaching experience, marital status and type of family of primary school teachers towards family environment.

**Keywords:** environment, school teachers, management, teaching stream

### Introduction

The family is the first to influence every individual. It is the family which gives the experience of living. The influence of the family on the individual is immense. The influence of other agencies, although indispensable, must build upon the ground work furnished by the family. The family environment possesses certain consistency so that the impact of the same basic values, individuals, materials and objects is felt over and over. Parental influence may not be felt in a specific situation but the attitudes and ideas expressed day after day inevitably leave their mark. Family environment denotes the extent of existences of the tree following dimensions in family.

#### a. Relationship Dimension

1. Cohesion: Degree of commitment, help and support of family members towards one another.
2. Expressiveness: Extent to which family members are encouraged to act openly and express their feelings and thoughts directly.
3. Conflict: Amount of openly expressed aggression and conflict among the family members.
4. Acceptance and Caring: Extent to which the members are in conditionally accepted and the degree of which caring is expressed in the family.

#### b. Personal growth dimension

1. Independence: Extent to which family members are assertive and independent to make their own decisions.
2. Active – Recreational Orientation: Extent of participation in social and recreational activities.

#### c. System maintenance dimension

1. Organization: Degree of importance of clear organization structure in planning family activities and responsibilities.

2. Control: Degree of setting with in a family.

### Need and importance

Family Environmental is one of the significant factors which decides the future of the higher secondary students. Earlier, studies were done on this area by various researchers and some are described here, Kopperunde, N (2006) <sup>[4]</sup> has conducted a study of the influence of pupils family environment on their academic achievement in IX standard in Tamilnadu, India and found that the parental education and family size do not show any significant differences in respect to their family environment. Padma Prabha (2006) <sup>[6]</sup> conducted a study of the self- disclosure of junior college students in Bangalore district in relation to their family environment in India and showed that better the family environment higher the level of self-disclosure. Philomina (2006) <sup>[7]</sup> conducted a study on the relationship between study habit and family environment of X standard students of Krishnagiri district of Tamilnadu state in India and found that the sex of the students belong to type of school he students are studying the locality of the school the students are studying and the locality of the students are residing in shows no significant differences in respect of their family environment. Hence, it is a dominant element, so the measurement of the family environment of the family environment becomes essentials.

### Statement of the Problem

The problem chosen for the study may be stated as “A Study of family environment of primary school teachers.

### Sample

Simple random sampling technique was used in the selection

of the sample of as many as 250 primary school teachers in vellore district.

**Method**

Normative survey method has been used in the present investigation to collect the data from the primary school teachers working in the vellore district of Tamilnadu state.

**Statistical Techniques Used**

The investigator used the statistical techniques, Mean, SD, 't' test and 'F' test to accept or reject hypotheses.

**Operational Definitions of Key Term Used**

Family is a biological unit whose members have common dwelling place, and the parents are bound together by institutionalized social relationships.

**Tool Used In the Present Study**

Family Environment Scale (FES) Developed by Harpreet Bhatia and Chadah NK (1993) The scale consists of 69 statements; each statement has five options, Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree. The statements had the scoring as 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1. The scores ranges from 69 to 345.

**Variables used for the study**

- Gender : Male / Female
- Locality of Institution : Rural / Urban
- Mode of Management : Government / Private / Aided
- Locality of Residence : Rural / Urban
- Teaching Stream : Language / Science / Maths
- Teaching Experience : Less than 10 years / Above 11 years
- Marital Status : Married / Unmarried
- Type of family : Nuclear / Joint

**Objectives of the Study**

1. To find out the significant difference if any between the male and female of primary school teachers in respect of their Family environment.
2. To find out the significant difference if any between the rural and urban locality of institution of primary school teachers of in respect of their Family environment.
3. To find out the significant difference if any between the sub samples of mode of management towards primary school teachers in respect of their Family environment.
4. To find out the significant difference if any between the rural and urban locality of residence of primary school teachers in respect of their Family environment.
5. To find out the significant difference if any between the sub samples of teaching stream towards primary school teachers in respect of their Family environment.
6. To find out the significant difference if any between the sub samples of teaching experience towards primary school teachers in respect of their Family environment.
7. To find out the significant difference if any between the married and unmarried of primary school teachers in respect of their Family environment.

8. To find out the significant difference if any between the nuclear and joint of primary school teachers in respect of their Family environment.

**Hypotheses of the Study**

1. There is no significant difference if any between the male and female of primary school teachers in respect of their Family environment.
2. There is no significant difference if any between the rural and urban locality of institution of primary school teachers of in respect of their Family environment.
3. There is no significant difference if any between the sub samples of mode of management towards primary school teachers in respect of their Family environment.
4. There is no significant difference if any between the rural and urban locality of residence of primary school teachers in respect of their Family environment.
5. There is no significant difference if any between the sub samples of teaching stream towards primary school teachers in respect of their Family environment.
6. There is no significant difference if any between the sub samples of teaching experience towards primary school teachers in respect of their Family environment.
7. There is no significant difference if any between the married and unmarried of primary school teachers in respect of their Family environment.
8. There is no significant difference if any between the nuclear and joint of primary school teachers in respect of their Family environment.

**Differential Analysis towards Family Environment Gender and Family environment**

**Table 1:** 't' test among gender with respect to family environment

Gender	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	L.S
Male	132	197.19	18.93	0.199	NS
Female	118	197.72	23.29		

From the table 1 we may infer that the calculated' value is 0.199 which is less than the table (1.97) at 0.05 level. Hence there exists no significant difference between male and female primary school teachers with regard to their family environment.

**Locality of Institution and Family environment**

**Table 2:** 't' test among locality of institution with respect to family environment

Locality of institution	N	Mean	S. d	T-value	L.s
Rural	94	198.06	22.39	0.358	NS
Urban	156	197.07	20.28		

From the table 2 we may infer that the calculated' value is 0.358 which is less than the table (1.97) at 0.05 level. Hence there exists no significant difference between rural and urban locality of institution of primary school teachers with regard to their family environment.

### Mode of management and family environment

**Table 3:** ‘F’ test among the sub sample of mode of management with respect to family environment

Mode of management	Sum of squares	Mean square	DF	F Value	L.S
Between the groups	4812.404	2406.202	2	5.625	N.S
Within groups	105659.420	427.771	247		
Total	110471.824		249		

It is evident from the table 3 the calculated ‘F’ value is 5.625 which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the framed null hypothesis was accepted. It is inferred that there is no significant difference among the sub-sample of mode of management with respect to family environment of primary school teachers.

### Locality of Residence and Family environment

**Table 4:** ‘T’ test among locality of residence with respect to family environment

Locality of residence	N	Mean	S.D	T-value	L.S
Rural	105	197.14	18.50	0.195	NS
Urban	145	197.66	22.79		

From the table 4 we may infer that the calculated’ value is 0.195 which is less than the table (1.97) at 0.05 level. Hence there is no significant difference between rural and urban locality of residence of primary school teachers with regard to their family environment.

### Teaching stream and family environment

**Table 5:** ‘F’ test among the sub sample of teaching stream with respect to family environment

Teaching stream	Sum of squares	Mean square	DF	F Value	Ls
Between the groups	500.015	250.007	2	0.562	N.S
Within groups	109971.809	445.230	247		
Total	110471.824		249		

It is evident from the table 5 the calculated ‘F’ value is 0.562 which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the framed null hypothesis was accepted. It is inferred that there is no significant difference among the sub-sample of teaching steam with respect to family environment of primary school teachers.

### Teaching Experience and Family environment

**Table 6:** ‘t’ test among teaching experience with respect to family environment

Teaching Experience	N	Mean	S. d	T-value	L.S
Less than 10 years	121	198.50	22.36	0.767	NS
Above 11 years	129	196.45	19.80		

From the table 6 we may infer that the calculated’ value is 0.767 which is less than the table (1.97) at 0.05 level. Hence there is no significant difference between teaching experience of primary school teachers with regard to their family environment.

### Marital status and Family environment

**Table 7:** ‘T’ test among marital status with respect to family environment

Marital status	N	Mean	S.D	T-value	L.S
Married	128	196.44	21.36	0.770	NS
Unmarried	122	198.50	20.77		

From the table 7 we may infer that the calculated’ value is 0.770 which is less than the table (1.97) at 0.05 level. Hence there is no significant difference between marital status of primary school teachers with regard to their family environment.

### Type of family and Family environment

**Table 8:** ‘t’ test among type of family with respect to family environment

Type of family	N	Mean	S.D	T-value	L.S
Joint	96	199.93	22.36	1.479	NS
Nuclear	154	195.89	20.12		

From the table 8 we may infer that the calculated’ value is 1.479 which is less than the table (1.97) at 0.05 level. Hence there is no significant difference between type of family of primary school teachers with regard to their family environment.

### Major findings of the study

- There exists no significant difference between male and female primary school teachers with regard to their family environment.
- There exists no significant difference between rural and urban locality of institution of primary school teachers with regard to their family environment.
- There is no significant difference among the sub-sample of mode of management with respect to family environment of primary school teachers.
- There is no significant difference between rural and urban locality of residence of primary school teachers with regard to their family environment.
- There is no significant difference among the sub-sample of teaching steam with respect to family environment of primary school teachers.
- There is no significant difference between teaching experience of primary school teachers with regard to their family environment.
- There is no significant difference between marital status of primary school teachers with regard to their family environment.
- There is no significant difference between type of family

of primary school teachers with regard to their family environment.

### References

1. Best John W, Khan James V. Research in Education, Tenth Edition, New Delhi. Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd, 2008.
2. Garrett Henry, Wood worth RS. Statistics in Psychology and Education, Surjeet Publications Ltd, New Delhi, 2008.
3. Guilford JP. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education New York, Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, Inc, 1956.
4. Koppurundevi N. A study of the influence of pupils family environment on their academic achievement in IX standard, Unpublished MPhil Dissertation, Annamalai University, Tamilnadu, India, 2006.
5. Lokesh Kovi Methodology of Educational Research 2<sup>nd</sup> ed New Delhi, Vikas Publishing house Pvt. Ltd, 1990.
6. Padma Prabha. A study of the self-disclosure of junior college students in Bangalore district in relation to their family environment. Unpublished MPhil dissertation, Annamalai University, Tamilnadu, India, 2006.
7. Philomina. Relationship between study habits and family environment of X standard students of krishnagiri district, MPhil dissertation, Tamilnadu, India, 2006.