



ISSN Print: 2394-7500
ISSN Online: 2394-5869
Impact Factor: 5.2
IJAR 2015; 1(13): 804-809
www.allresearchjournal.com
Received: 23-10-2015
Accepted: 26-11-2015

Antony Joseph J
Assistant Professor
Krishnasamy College of
Education for Women,
Manapattu, Bahour commune,
Puducherry – 607402, India.

The problems of higher secondary students in Pondicherry region

Antony Joseph J

Abstract

The objective of the present study is to study “The Problems of Higher Secondary Students in Pondicherry Region” for which 300 Higher Secondary Students (150 boys and 150 Girls) in the age of 17 and above. The study was conducted through Normative survey method. The ‘Youth problem inventory by K.M Sandhya sharma’ was used to collect data. To analyze and interpret the data mean, S.D, t- test were used. The findings of the present study revealed that (i) There is significant difference in the mean of the problem scores of the Boys and Girls of Higher Secondary Students. (ii) There is no significant difference in the mean of the problem scores of the Urban and Rural Higher Secondary Students. (iii) There is no significant difference in the mean of the problem scores of the Private and Government schools students. (iv) There is no significant relationship between castes and problem of higher secondary students. (v) There is no significant relationship between economic background of the students and their problems. (vi) There is no significant relationship between Parents educational background and their children problems.

Keywords: Higher Secondary Student, Problems

1. Introduction

“Education means enabling the mind to find out ultimate truth which emancipates us from the bondage of the dust” - Rabindranath Tagore

“Education is the development of all those capacities in the individual which will enable him to control his environment and fulfill his possibilities” - John Dewey

Thus the definitions makes it clear, any society can progress by the help of education alone, it is a process through which the customs, tradition, experiences, thought etc., are transmitted. The members of the society also get training in the like ways of adult life. All this is possible to achieve through education, it is for each society to maintain and develop sound education for the transmission of cultural heritage to the rising generation

Education should also take into account all the Physical, Emotional and Social needs of the youth as well as their intellectual needs arising out of broadening and deepening of intellectual interests.

Adolescent learning in schools will be facilitated when there is balance between responsibility, autonomy and freedom. It is argued, the teachers with lack of adolescence psychology makes the adolescents adjustment problems in school education.

Hence this study is the outcome of the felt need of the teachers serving in higher secondary school.

Statement of the Problem

The present study is entitled as “The Problems of Higher Secondary Students in Pondicherry Region”.

Objectives

1. To find out the significance of the mean difference of the problems of Boys and Girls Higher Secondary students.
2. To find out the significance of the mean difference of the problems of the Urban and Rural Higher Secondary students.

Correspondence
Antony Joseph J
Assistant Professor
Krishnasamy College of
Education for Women,
Manapattu, Bahour commune,
Puducherry – 607402, India.

3. To find out the significance of the mean difference of the problems of the Private and Government Higher Secondary School Students.
4. To find out the significance of the mean difference of the problems of Higher Secondary students belong to different caste.
5. To find out the significance of the mean difference of the problems of the Higher Secondary students from different economic background.
6. To find out the significance of the mean difference of the problems of the Higher Secondary students of different parents Educational background.

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in the mean of the problem scores of the Boys and Girls of Higher Secondary Students.
2. There is no significant difference in the mean of the problem scores of the Urban and Rural Higher Secondary Students.
3. There is no significant difference in the mean of the problem scores of the Private and Government schools students.
4. There is no significant relationship between castes and problem of higher secondary students.
5. There is no significant relationship between economic background of the students and their problems
6. There is no significant relationship between Parents educational background and their children problems.

Limitation of the Study

- 1) This study was conducted in a limited area. The same study could be extended to other areas also.
- 2) The tool was designed to age 17 and above years of students. The researcher conducted the test for +2 students only, with notion of that they are in the age of 17.
- 3) Since the study was confined to twelfth standard students, there is no Possibility to comparison with other age groups.

Review of Literature

Goswami. N (1980) examined the problems as experienced by school going adolescent girls. The inventory consists of 232 items to the sample of 370 girls. The result shows that the research found problems are increased with age (i.e) the adolescent girls encountered maximum number of problems in the emotional area, and he identified the most problematic areas among the girls in 9th and 10th standard are emotional, mental, school and studies.

Mankad R.B (1995) studied an analytical study of problems of adolescence in Rajkot. The sample of the study consisted of 550 high school students and 450 college students. The tool used was problem inventory of Badami. The results of the study show except in emotional and moral/religious problems boys always had more problems than girls in the areas of physical health and appearance, as well as family and interpersonal relationship. High school pupils had more problems than college students but in economic area reverse was the case.

Madhusudhan. A and Soundararaja Rao. T.R (1975) conducted a study in school students. For that he prepared a check list which contained 151 problems consisting of four

categories – Home, School, Emotional and Health. The sample size was 300 – (129 boys and 171 girls). The results show that boys have significantly more problems than the girls, lower the economic status of a family more the problems, they look for separate study room at home. It further reveals that they get discouraged if they get low marks in the examination.

Methodology

Method of the Study

Normative survey method was used in the study.

Selection of the Sample

The sample for the study was drawn from 12 schools in the urban and rural areas of Pondicherry. Out of 300 students comprising the sample of the study, 150 students in government schools and 150 students in private schools were selected as sample for this study. The purposive sampling was used to select the above mentioned 12 schools.

In each school the class XII students were taken for the study. In each school among the class XII a section is selected randomly in which 25 students were selected through lottery method.

Tool used for the Study

Youth problem inventory by K.M Sandhya Sharma was used as a tool to collect data

Statistical Techniques

Mean and standard deviation for the scores of personal, family, socio-emotional and educational problems of students were calculated. The mean difference was found out and was used for testing the significant difference in personal, family, socio-emotional and educational problems of the students with reference to type of School, Locality, Sex, Community, Economic status and Educational qualification of the parents.

Operational Definition of the Terms Used

1. **Higher Secondary Students:** In a higher secondary school, the educator comes into contact with the adolescents who are individuals who have got certain unique characteristics peculiar to their age. During this period, marked changes in an individual's personality occur. These changes are physical, mental, physiological, emotional, sociological and psychological and as a result the individual usually faces a number of problems.
2. **Problems:** The word "Problems" in this study relates to adolescent problems. It is very wide and broad in meaning. The 'problems' has been taken to mean any difficulty that the students studying in higher secondary classes encounter either at school or at home or in the society.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

The data collected for the present study have been analyzed and interpreted according to the objective in the following way

Hypothesis - 1

There is no significant difference in the mean of the problems of Boys and Girls of Higher Secondary Students.

Table 1: Mean, S.D, ‘t’ value for problems Score of Boys and Girls of Higher Secondary Students

Problems	Boys			Girls			‘t’ Value	Significant level 0.05
	Number	Mean	S.D	Number	Mean	S.D		
A Personal Problems	150	31.30	2.69	150	28.85	3.22	7.04	S
B Family Problems	150	29.4	4.94	150	26.40	4.44	7.57	S
C Socio- Emotional Problems	150	35.98	2.55	150	34.55	3.00	1.31	N.S
D Educational Problems	150	17.68	1.82	150	17.14	1.71	0.007	N.S
Total Problems	150	114.37	8.00	150	106.95	8.72	2.34	S

The mean scores of the elements of the overall problems of two groups, Boys students (114.37) and Girls students (106.95) differ. (i.e.,)The mean score of Boys students is more than the overall problems mean score of Girls students. And the calculated ‘t’ value is higher than the table value for df=298 at 5% level of significance for overall problems.

Hence, the null hypothesis is Rejected.

Hypothesis - 2

There is no significant difference in the mean of the problems of Urban and Rural of Higher Secondary Students.

Table 2: Mean, S.D, ‘t’ value for problems Score of Urban and Rural of Higher Secondary Students

Problems	Urban			Rural			‘t’ Value	Significant level 0.05
	Number	Mean	S.D	Number	Mean	S.D		
A Personal Problems	200	29.84	3.42	100	30.55	2.69	0.073	N.S
B Family Problems	200	27.62	4.88	100	28.44	4.98	0.177	N.S
C Socio- Emotional Problems	200	35.44	2.92	100	34.92	2.74	0.139	N.S
D Educational Problems	200	17.49	1.77	100	17.25	1.81	0.264	N.S
Total Problems	200	110.40	9.28	100	111.16	8.86	0.501	N.S

The mean scores of the elements of the overall problems of two groups, Urban students (110.40) and Rural students (111.16) differ. And the calculated ‘t’ value is lower than the table value for df=298 at 5% level of significance for overall problems.

Hypothesis – 3

There is no significant difference in the mean of the problems of Government and Private School Higher Secondary Students.

Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 3: Mean, S.D, ‘t’ value for problems Score of Government and Private School Higher Secondary Students.

Problems	Government			Private			‘t’ Value	Significant level 0.05
	Number	Mean	S.D	Number	Mean	S.D		
A Personal Problems	150	30.36	2.97	150	29.79	3.41	0.122	N.S
B Family Problems	150	27.44	4.80	150	28.34	5.01	0.113	N.S
C Socio- Emotional Problems	150	35.10	3.00	150	35.42	2.74	0.335	N.S,
D Educational Problems	150	17.42	1.79	150	17.41	1.78	0.897	N.S
Total Problems	150	110.34	9.13	150	110.96	9.17	0.557	N.S

The mean scores of the elements of the overall problems of two groups, Government School students (110.34) and Private School students (110.96) differ. And the calculated ‘t’ value is lower than the table value for df=298 at 5% level of significance for overall problems.

Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis – 4

There is no significant relationship between castes and problems of higher secondary students.

Table 4: Mean, S.D, ‘t’ value for problems Score of Other Backward Caste and Schedule Caste Higher Secondary School Students

Problems	Other Backward Caste			Schedule Caste			‘t’ Value	Significant level 0.05
	Number	Mean	S.D	Number	Mean	S.D		
A Personal Problems	236	30.00	3.17	45	31.04	2.92	0.043	N.S
B Family Problems	236	27.81	4.87	45	28.45	5.09	0.465	N.S
C Socio-Emotional Problems	236	35.24	2.84	45	35.46	3.16	0.636	N.S
D Educational Problems	236	17.36	1.80	45	17.50	1.91	0.567	N.S
Total Problems	236	110.52	9.27	45	113.02	9.53	0.101	N.S

The mean scores of the elements of the overall problems of two groups, Other Backward Caste students (110.52) and Schedule Caste students (113.02) differ. And the calculated

't' value is lower than the table value for df=279 at 5% level of significance for overall problems. Hence, there is no significant difference between Other Backward Caste and Schedule caste in overall problems.

Table 5: Mean, S.D, 't' value for problems Score of Forward caste and Schedule caste Higher Secondary School Students

Problems	Forward Caste			Schedule Caste			't' Value	Significant level 0.05
	Number	Mean	S.D	Number	Mean	S.D		
A Personal Problems	19	29.63	3.21	45	31.04	2.92	0.091	N.S
B Family Problems	19	26.63	4.62	45	28.45	5.09	0.197	N.S
C Socio- Emotional Problems	19	34.84	3.32	45	35.46	3.16	0.479	N.S
D Educational Problems	19	18	1.45	45	17.50	1.91	0.344	N.S
Total Problems	19	109.10	9.17	45	113.02	9.53	0.134	N.S

The mean scores of the elements of the overall problems of two groups, Forward caste students (109.10) and Schedule caste students (113.02) differ. And the calculated 't' value is

lower than the table value for df=62 at 5% level of significance for overall problems. Hence, there is no significant difference between Forward Caste and Schedule caste in overall problems.

Table 6: Mean, S.D, 't' value for problems Score of Other Backward Caste and Forward Caste Higher Secondary School Students

Problems	Other Backward Caste			Forward Caste			't' Value	Significant level 0.05
	Number	Mean	S.D	Number	Mean	S.D		
A Personal Problems	236	30.00	3.17	19	29.63	3.21	0.619	N.S
B Family Problems	236	27.81	4.87	19	26.63	4.62	0.307	N.S
C Socio- Emotional Problems	236	35.24	2.84	19	34.84	3.32	0.559	N.S
D Educational Problems	236	17.36	1.80	19	18.00	1.45	0.136	N.S
Total Problems	236	110.52	9.27	19	109.10	9.17	0.519	N.S

The mean scores of the elements of the overall problems of two groups, Other Backward Caste students (110.52) and Forward Caste students (109.10) differ. And the calculated 't' value is lower than the table value for df=253 at 5% level of significance for overall problems. Hence, there is no significant difference between Other Backward Caste and Forward caste in overall problems.

Based on the 't' value of the table - 4, table-5, and table-6. It is clearly understood, that the overall problems concern there is no significant different between the students from three different caste. Thus the null hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis -5

There is no significant relationship between economic background of the students and their problems

Table 7: Mean, S.D, 't' value for problems Score of Below Poverty and Lower Middle Class Higher Secondary Students

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

The mean scores of the elements of the overall problems of two groups, Below Poverty students (110.44) and Lower Middle Class students (111.20) differ. And the calculated 't' value is lower than the table value for df=247 at 5% level of significance for overall problems.

Hence, there is no significant difference between Below Poverty Students and Lower Middle class students in overall problems.

Table 8: Mean, S.D, 't' value for problems Score of Below Poverty and Upper Middle Class Higher Secondary Students

Problems	Below Poverty			Upper Middle Class			't' Value	Significant level 0.05
	Number	Mean	S.D	Number	Mean	S.D		
A Personal Problems	58	31.11	2.61	51	29.42	3.71	0.013	N.S
B Family Problems	58	26.83	4.29	51	26.54	4.68	0.752	N.S
C Socio- Emotional Problems	58	35.02	3.60	51	35.16	3.48	0.853	N.S
D Educational Problems	58	17.16	1.92	51	17.58	1.55	0.250	N.S
Total Problems	58	110.44	9.26	51	108.92	10.54	0.465	N.S

The mean scores of the elements of the overall problems of two groups, Below Poverty students (110.44) and Upper Middle Class students (108.92) differ. And the calculated 't' value is lower than the table value for df=107 at 5% level of significance for overall problems.

Hence, there is no significant difference between Below Poverty Students and Upper Middle class students in overall problems.

Table 9: Mean, S.D, 't' value for problems Score of Upper Middle Class and Lower Middle Class Higher Secondary Students

Problems	Upper Middle Class			Lower Middle Class			't' Value	Significant level 0.05
	Number	Mean	S.D	Number	Mean	S.D		
A Personal Problems	51	29.42	3.71	191	29.92	3.17	0.334	N.S
B Family Problems	51	26.54	4.68	191	28.60	5.04	0.009	N.S
C Socio- Emotional Problems	51	35.16	3.48	191	35.16	2.51	0.995	N.S
D Educational Problems	51	17.58	1.55	191	17.31	1.83	0.357	N.S
Total Problems	51	108.92	10.54	191	111.20	9.23	0.131	N.S

The mean scores of the elements of the overall problems of two groups, Upper Middle Class students (108.92) and Lower Middle Class students (111.20) differ. And the calculated 't' value is lower than the table value for df=240 at 5% level of significance for overall problems.

Based on the 't' value of the table -7, table-8, and table-9. It is clearly understood, that the overall problems concern there is no significant different between the students from three different Economic classes. Thus the null hypothesis is accepted.

Hence, there is no significant difference between Upper Middle Class Students and Lower Middle class students in overall problems.

Hypothesis -6

There is no significant relationship between Parents educational background and their children problems.

Table 10: Mean, S.D, 't' value for problems Score of Higher Secondary Students Belonging to Graduate and Illiterate Parents

Problems	Graduate			Illiterate			't' Value	Significant level 0.05
	Number	Mean	S.D	Number	Mean	S.D		
A Personal Problems	110	29.29	3.20	68	30.52	2.62	0.008	N.S
B Family Problems	110	27.58	5.04	68	27.86	4.94	0.718	N.S
C Socio- Emotional Problems	110	35.07	2.71	68	34.85	3.24	0.627	N.S
D Educational Problems	110	17.57	1.55	68	17.29	1.97	0.297	N.S
Total Problems	110	109.55	9.08	68	111.07	9.54	0.620	N.S

The mean scores of the elements of the overall problems of two groups, Children belong to Graduate (109.55) and Illiterate parents (111.07) differ. And the calculated 't' value is lower than the table value for df=176 at 5% level of significance for overall problems.

Hence, there is no significant difference between Children belong to Graduate and Illiterate parents in overall problems.

Table 11: Mean, S.D, 't' value for problems Score of Higher Secondary Students Belonging to Illiterate and Higher Secondary Qualified Parents

Problems	Illiterate			Higher Secondary			't' Value	Significant level 0.05
	Number	Mean	S.D	Number	Mean	S.D		
A Personal Problems	68	30.52	2.62	112	30.58	3.36	0.900	N.S
B Family Problems	68	27.86	4.94	112	28.29	4.83	0.566	N.S
C Socio- Emotional Problems	68	34.85	3.24	112	35.49	2.73	0.149	N.S
D Educational Problems	68	17.29	1.97	112	17.30	1.85	0.965	N.S
Total Problems	68	111.07	9.54	112	111.77	9.26	0.620	N.S

The mean scores of the elements of the overall problems of two groups, Illiterate parents (111.07) and Children belong to Higher Secondary Qualified Parents (111.77) differ. And the calculated 't' value is lower than the table value for df=178 at 5% level of significance for overall problems.

Hence, there is no significant difference between Children of Illiterate and Higher Secondary Qualified parents in overall problems.

Table 12: Mean, S.D, 't' value for problems Score of Higher Secondary Students Belonging to Graduate and Higher Secondary Qualified Parents

Problems	Graduate			Higher Secondary			't' Value	Significant level 0.05
	Number	Mean	S.D	Number	Mean	S.D		
A Personal Problems	110	29.29	3.20	112	30.58	3.36	0.002	N.S
B Family Problems	110	27.58	5.04	112	28.29	4.83	0.277	N.S
C Socio- Emotional Problems	110	35.07	2.71	112	35.49	2.73	0.238	N.S
D Educational Problems	110	17.57	1.55	112	17.30	1.85	0.239	N.S
Total Problems	110	109.55	9.08	112	111.77	9.26	0.286	N.S

The mean scores of the elements of the overall problems of two groups, Children belong to Graduate (109.55) and Children belong to Higher Secondary Qualified Parents (111.77) differ. And the calculated 't' value is lower than the table value for df=220 at 5% level of significance for overall problems.

Hence, there is no significant difference between Children of Graduate and Higher Secondary Qualified parents in overall problems.

Based on the 't' value of the table -10, table-11, and table-12. It is clearly understood, that the overall problems concern there is no significant different between the students from three different Educational Background of parents. Thus the null hypothesis is Accepted.

Summary of the Findings

- 1) Boys and Girls differ significantly in their problems
- 2) Rural and Urban school pupils did not differ significantly in their problems
- 3) Government and Private school Students did not differ significantly in their problems
- 4) Students of community differences with regard to problems
 - (i) Students of Other Backward Community and Students of Schedule Community did not differ significantly in their problems.
 - (ii) Students of Forward Community and Students of Schedule Community did not differ significantly in their problems.
 - (iii) Students of Other Backward Community and Students of Forward Community did not differ significantly in their problems.
- 5) Students of Economic background difference with regard to problems
 - (i) Students of Below Poverty and Students of Lower Middle Class did not differ significantly in their problems.
 - (ii) Students of Below Poverty and Students of Upper Middle Class did not differ significantly in their problems.
 - (iii) Students of Upper Middle Class and Students of Lower Middle Class did not differ significantly in their problems.
- 6) Difference of Students with regard to their problem with respect of Parents' different educational level
 - (i) Children of illiterate parents and Children of Higher secondary parents did not differ significantly in their problems.
 - (ii) Children of Higher secondary parents and Children of Degree holder parents did not differ significantly in their problems.
 - (iii) Children of illiterate parents and Children of Degree holder parents did not differ significantly in their problems.

Educational Implications

- 1) The present study established the problems of youth. In the present competitive world, the youth experience more problems. So, there is a great concern to the subject of psychology should be implemented as one of the subjects, to maintain the mental health of the adolescents.

- 2) Government should compel parents-teachers relationships by adopting a few systems or rules.
- 3) There should be a great concern for the implementation of Guidance and Counseling cell in all Government and Private Higher Secondary School to counsel the youth.

Suggestion for Further Research

- 1) Youth problem is an important problem and more number of researches which are being conducted in this area requires careful and proper attention of the investigator.
- 2) Study of youth problems requires more number of items to get clear distinct between sub-variables in the study.
- 3) The study should be replaced with more items in educational areas.
- 4) The investigators may either increase the sample size or concentrate in proportionate distribution of community size.

Reference

1. Buch MB. Fifth survey of educational research. National Council of Educational Research and Training, 1988-92, II.
2. Hurlock Elizabeth B. Development Psychology. Tata Mc Graw – Hill Publishing co-ltd, New Delhi 1989, 221-259.
3. Mangal SK. Educational Psychology. Prentice. Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi 1982, 64-126.
4. Best Jhon W. Research in Education. Prentice. Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi, 1978.
5. Kochhar SK. Pivotal issues in Indian Education. Sterling Publishing Private Limited, New Delhi, 1987.
6. Murty SK. Essential of Higher Secondary Education. Prakash Brothers Educational Publishers, Ludhiana, 1986.
7. Crow LD, Crow A. Mental Hygiene in School and Home Life. Mc Graw Hill, New York, 1942.
8. Ebel RL. Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Edn 4, Macmillan Company, London, 1969.
9. Good Carter V. Dictionary of Education. Edn 3, Mc Graw Hill, New York, 1973.