



ISSN Print: 2394-7500
ISSN Online: 2394-5869
Impact Factor: 5.2
IJAR 2016; 2(11): 300-303
www.allresearchjournal.com
Received: 13-09-2016
Accepted: 14-10-2016

Vidhya K
Assistant Professor, PG &
Research Department of
Zoology, Auxilium College,
Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India

A study on environmental ethics among the higher secondary students in Vellore district

Vidhya K

Abstract

Environmental ethics refers to the responsibility to understand the environmental consequences of our consumption and need to recognize our individual and social responsibility to conserve natural environment and protect the earth for future generation". The study was intended to evaluate the environmental ethics of higher secondary students belonging to Vellore district in Tamilnadu. The investigators employed the gender, locality of institution, type of institution, medium of instruction, parental qualification, residence of students, parental occupation and type of family of higher secondary students. The random sampling technique was employed. Descriptive and Differential analysis was used to analyze the data. The tool used for measure the environmental ethics by Dr. Haseen Taj, this scale consists of 45 items with 3 categories. The maximum score is 135 and the minimum possible score is 45. The findings of the study revealed that there exists significant difference in the environmental ethics of higher secondary students belonging to locality of institution, parental qualification and residence of students and show do not significant difference belonging to gender, type of institution, medium of instruction, parental occupation and type of family towards environmental ethics of higher secondary students.

Keywords: Environmental ethics, demographic variables

Introduction

Environmental quality is necessary for quality of human life. Humans dramatically rebuild their environments; still, their lives, filled with artifacts', are lived in a natural resources like soil, air, water, photosynthesis and climate are matters of life and death. Culture and nature have entwined destinies, similar to (and related to) the way minds are inseparable from bodies. So ethics needs to be applied to the environment. Ethics deals with the realm of human conduct. It means that the ethical realm of human being is within the area of human capacity and choice. The field of environmental ethics offers an extension of this human capacity and choice towards nature. It is an important perspective subscribing to some of the values and duties that man must have towards nature. The plan here is to outline six levels of concern: humans, animals, organisms, species, ecosystems, Earth. These will be differing approaches to environmental ethics: humanistic ethics, animal welfare ethics, biocentrism, deep ecology, land ethics, theological environmental ethics, ethics Environmental Ethics of eco justice, communitarian ethics with circles of concern, environmental virtue ethics, axiological environmental ethics, political ecology, sustainable development ethics, bioregionalism, eco feminism, postmodern environmental ethics, and an ethics of place. Environmental ethics has given a new dimension to the conservation of natural resources concerns of mankind. To take part in an environmental organization or voluntarily involve in various environmental activities is known as participation in environmental activities.

Statement of the Problem

The problem chosen for the study may be stated as "A Study on Environmental Ethics among the Higher Secondary Students in Vellore District".

Sample

Survey method was employed to collect the data from 300 higher secondary students studying in different schools in Vellore district, using random sampling technique.

Correspondence
Vidhya K
Assistant Professor, PG &
Research Department of
Zoology, Auxilium College,
Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India

The basic purpose of the present investigation was to investigate the environment ethics among the higher secondary students in relation to certain demographic variables such as gender, locality of institution, type of institution, medium of instruction, parental qualification, and residence of students, parental occupation and type of family.

Statistical Techniques

The data was analyzed with the help of SPSS. The analysis was conducted at three levels. At the first level, basic descriptive measures were calculated. At second level, the significance of difference between means was calculated using t-test or ANOVA.

Tool Used In the Present Study

Scale was developed and standardized by Dr. Haseen Taj, this scale consists of 45 items with 3 categories. The three categories are I agree absolutely, I slightly agree and don't agree. The maximum score is 135 and the minimum possible score is 45.

Objectives of the Study

1. To analysis the significant difference in environmental ethics of higher secondary students in terms of
 - a) Gender
 - b) Locality of the Institution
 - c) Type of Institution
 - d) Medium of Instruction
 - e) Parental Qualification
 - f) Residence of students
 - g) Parental Occupation
 - h) Type of Family

Hypotheses of the Study

1. There will be no significant difference between male and female higher secondary students on environmental ethics.
2. There will be no significant difference between rural and urban higher secondary students on environmental ethics.
3. There will be no significant difference between sub samples of type of institution with respect to their environmental ethics.
4. There will be no significant difference between English and Tamil medium of higher secondary students on environmental ethics.

Table 3: 'F' test among the Sub- samples of Type of Institution with Respect To Environmental Ethics

Type of Institution	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	df	'F' Value	Level of Significance
Between Groups	482.257	241.128	2	0.291	NS
Within Groups	245882.660	827.888	297		
Total	246364.917		299		

It is evident from the Table 3, the calculated 'F' value is 0.291, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference among sub samples of type of institution of higher secondary students with respect to their Environmental Ethics.

5. There will be no significant difference between illiterate and literate with respect to their environmental ethics.
6. There will be no significant difference between rural and urban residence with respect to their environmental ethics.
7. There will be no significant difference between self-employ and government employ with respect to their environmental ethics.
8. There will be no significant difference between nuclear and joint family with respect to their environmental ethics.

Differential Analysis – in Environmental Ethics Gender and Environmental Ethics

Table 1: 't' test between gender with respect to Environmental Ethics

Gender	N	Mean	SD	't' Value	Level of Significance
Male	172	93.16	29.38	0.619	NS
Female	128	95.15	27.84		

It is evident from the Table 1, the calculated't' value is 0.619, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between male and female higher secondary students with respect to their environmental ethics.

Locality of Institution and Environmental Ethics

Table 2: 't' test between locality of institution with respect to Environmental Ethics

Locality of Institution	N	Mean	SD	't' Value	Level of Significance
Rural	199	98.17	28.97	3.59	S
Urban	101	85.82	26.45		

It is evident from the Table 2, the calculated't' value is 3.59, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is rejected and research hypothesis is accepted. It is inferred that there is a significant difference found out between rural and urban higher secondary students with respect to their Environmental Ethics.

Type of Institution and Environmental Ethics

Medium of Instruction and Environmental Ethics

Table 4:'t' test between medium of instruction of with respect to Environmental Ethics

Medium of instruction	N	Mean	SD	't' Value	Level of Significance
English	186	93.57	28.24	0.340	NS
Tamil	114	94.73	29.55		

It is evident from the Table 4, the calculated 't' value is 0.340, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between English and tamil medium of higher secondary students with respect to their Environmental Ethics.

Parental Qualification and Environmental Ethics

Table 5: 't' test between parental qualification with respect to Environmental Ethics

Parental Qualification	N	Mean	SD	't' Value	Level of Significance
Illiterate	81	103.61	32.58	3.593	S
Literate	219	90.46	26.33		

It is evident from the Table 5, the calculated 't' value is 3.593, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is rejected and research hypothesis is accepted. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out Illiterate and literate of higher secondary students with respect to their Environmental Ethics

Residence of students and Environmental Ethics

Table 6: 't' test between residences of students with respect to Environmental Ethics

Residence of students	N	Mean	SD	't' Value	Level of Significance
Rural	175	96.90	30.29	2.072	S
Urban	125	89.97	25.90		

It is evident from the Table 6, the calculated 't' value is 2.072, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is rejected and research hypothesis is accepted. It is inferred that there is a significant difference found out between rural and urban higher secondary students with respect to their Environmental Ethics.

Parental Occupation and Environmental Ethics

Table 7: 't' test between parental occupations with respect to Environmental Ethics

Parental Occupation	N	Mean	SD	't' Value	Level of Significance
Self employed	238	95.13	29.39	1.328	NS
Government employed	62	89.70	25.06		

It is evident from the Table 7, the calculated 't' value is 1.328, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between self-employed and government employed of higher secondary students with respect to their environmental ethics.

Type of Family and Environmental Ethics

Table 8: 't' test between type of family with respect to Environmental Ethics

Type of Family	N	Mean	SD	't' Value	Level of Significance
Nuclear	131	94.35	27.73	0.181	NS
Joint	169	93.75	29.51		

It is evident from the Table 8, the calculated 't' value is 0.181, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between nuclear and joint family of higher secondary students with respect to their Environmental Ethics.

Major Findings of the Study

1. There is no significant difference in the environmental ethics of higher secondary students belonging to male and female.
2. There is significant difference in the environmental ethics of higher secondary students belonging to rural and urban.
3. There is no significant difference in the environmental ethics of higher secondary students in relation to their type of institution.
4. There is no significant difference in the environmental ethics of higher secondary students in relation to their medium of instruction.
5. There is no significant difference in the environmental ethics of higher secondary students in relation to their parental qualification.
6. There is significant difference in the environmental ethics of higher secondary students in relation to their residence of students.
7. There is no significant difference in the environmental ethics of higher secondary students in relation to their parental occupation.
8. There is no significant difference in the environmental ethics of higher secondary students in relation to their type of family.

Educational Implications

- The curriculum is not focusing on environment related issues in the present curriculum, all education subjects should highlight the contemporary issues of environment and role of man in protecting, preserving the natural resources and its sustainable development.
- To develop environment responsible behaviour and attitude among elder men of the society, administrator, policy makers, business people, industry, working personnel etc. on par with sensitized people.
- Teachers and community have an important role to play in nurturing and sensitizing adding value based issues so that students start respecting the environment in each and every step of their life.

Conclusion

The man-nature relationship has arrived at the verge of collapse and if serious steps are not taken immediately, the future remains indecisive and uncertain. Consequently, the educational institutions have to take a lead role in developing right type of society member is socially as and are competent for Environment Oriented Action. This further demands incorporation of the values and ethics in the overall framework of environmental education at all level well as responsible. The teachers need to develop appropriate 'pedagogical content knowledge' with respect to teaching of environmental ethics and enhancing the individuals for Environment Oriented Action. The result can be achieved through further deliberations and substantiation of the various dimensions of Environment Oriented Action".

However, it provides an initial step towards a more progressive and promising the action to make environmental ethics education more effective and outcome oriented.

References

1. Alli J, Ganapathy s, Muthumanickam R. An Analysis of the Environmental Participation of Municipal Employees, International Journal od Current Research. 2011; 3(9):144-146.
2. Best John W, Khan James V. Research in Education, Tenth Edition, New Delhi. Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd, 2008.
3. Bryan Norton. Environmental Ethics and Weak Anthropocentrism. Environmental Ethics 1984; 6:131-148.
4. Garrett Henry, Wood Worth RS. Statistics in Psychology and Education, Surjeet Publications Ltd, New Delhi. 2008.
5. Guilford JP. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education New York, Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, Inc, 1956.
6. Lokesh Kowl. Methodology of Educational Research (2nd ed) New Delhi, Vikas Publishing house Pvt. Ltd. 1990.
7. Obusegen Akinbote. The Study on Student Knowledge Towards Pollution. The Social Science Medwell Journals, 2007; 2(3):283-286.
8. Prayoon Wongchantra, Prasart Nuangchalerm. Effects of Environmental Ethics Infusion Instruction on Knowledge and Ethics of Undergraduate Students. Research Journal of Environmental Sciences. 2011; 5:77-81.
9. Quinn Courtney, Burbach Mark E, Matkin Gina S, Flores Kevin. Critical Thinking for Natural Resource, Agricultural, and Environmental Ethics Education. A Journal of Natural Resources and Life Sciences Education. 2009; 38:221-227.
10. Robert E Goodin. International Ethics and the Environmental Crisis, Ethics & International Affairs, 1990; 4(1):91-105.
11. Said Aini Mat, Yahaya Nurizan, Ahmadun Fakhru Razi. Environmental Comprehension and Participation of Malaysian Secondary School Students, Environmental Education Research, 2007; 13(1):17-31.
12. Shari L Britner. Environmental Ethics in Middle School Students: Analysis of the Moral Orientation of Student Responses to Environment Dilemmas, Online Research in Middle Level Education, Research Journal of Environmental Sciences. 2002; 5:77-81.