Sunder Lal
Research Scholar, Higher
Education and Research
Institute, Dakshin Bharat
Hindi Prachar Sabha Madras,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

School environment of different generation learners studying in primary schools of Delhi

Sunder Lal

Abstract
Present study titled "School Environment of Different generation learners studying in Primary schools of Delhi" conducted on primary schools of Delhi. Descriptive survey method was implied to collect the data of the study. Hundred fifty seven primary school first and non first generation learners have been selected by using multi stage stratified random sampling technique as a sample of the study. These learners are selected on the basis of gender and type of school from the primary school. School Environment Inventory by Karuna Shankar Mishra have been used to collect the data. Descriptive and inferential statistics (mean, standards derivation, t-value and correlation) have been used for analyzing and interpreting the data and its finding are conducted as: -
There is no significant difference in the creative simulation dimension of school environment of rural and urban FGL and NFGL of Delhi. It can be concluded that Creative Stimulation, Cognitive Encouragement, Recommendation and Permissiveness component school environment of government schools of first and non first generation learner have no significant difference was found, Whereas Permissiveness component of school environment of government schools, Rejection and control of first and non first generation learner of Primary schools of Delhi have significant difference in favour of non first generation learners.
It can be also be concluded that Creative Stimulation, Cognitive Encouragement, Rejection and control of FGL and NFGL of government Primary schools FGL and NFGL of Delhi was found significant whereas Recommendation and Permissiveness component school environment of government schools of first and non first generation learner have significant difference. Simulation component of component school environment of government schools of first and non first generation learner have no significant difference. The direction of significant difference in favour of non first generation learners. Thus second null hypothesis is partially accepted.

Keywords: School Environment, First generation learner

Introduction
Modern Elementary Education gives a fillip to sound Secondary Education. Elementary Education deserves the highest priority not only on ground of social justice and democracy, but also for raising the competence of the normal for increasing national productivity. Universalization of Education referred to any system of Education that extend opportunities to population concerned regardless of any extraneous consideration like race, colour, caste, religion, sex and ability. It implied that every state is responsible for free, compulsory and Universal Elementary Education to all children until the age of 14 years. The constitution referred to it as compulsory education. Article-45 of the constitution directed this to be providing by 1960. Education for all has remained mirage, distant and illusive. Article-29 and 30 provided certain exclusive educational and cultural right to all especially the minorities. Directive principles of state policy emphasis the intellectual development of all cities all taken together. Now in India 2020, a vision Document has further extended probable date by which universalization of Primary Education might be possible a long distance away from 1960 as originally contemplated and every Govt. would like to see that this dream comes true. Borland, 2003 studied that effect of Elementary school size on students Academic Achievement did not imply cause ability. While school size might relate strongly to Academic achievement, the former might not be the cause for the outcome of the later, and vice versa. For instance it could be argued that a group of caring and well qualified teachers at a school attracted more students in the schools, while at the same time teaching methods employed by the teachers contributed to high degree of students' achievement.

Correspondence
Sunder Lal
Research Scholar, Higher
Education and Research
Institute, Dakshin Bharat
Hindi Prachar Sabha Madras,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

If so, excellent/experienced teachers in a school environment influenced the better result and Academic achievement, however, it was neither the cause nor the effect of school size. Thus, there is a need for conducting a study that looked at the children and their Educational problems and Academic achievement in a comprehensive way in relation to their School environment and Socio-economic status. The present study is in fact one such attempt to delineate the influence of School environment and Socio-economic status of First Generation Learners of Elementary schools of Delhi. More specifically the problem of present study was stated as follow:

Statement of the Problem
The problem of present study was taken up by the researcher as follow:

School Environment of Different generation learners studying in Primary schools of Delhi
Objectives of the Study
The major objective of the study was taken as follow:
- To study School Environment of Different generation (First Generation and non First Generation) learners studying in urban area Primary schools of Delhi.
- To study School Environment of Different generation (First Generation and non First Generation) learners studying in rural area Primary schools of Delhi.

Hypotheses of the Study
In the light of the objective of the study the investigator has framed the following null hypothesis.
- There is no significant difference in School Environment of Different generation (First Generation and non First Generation) learners studying in urban area Primary schools of Delhi.
- There is no significant difference in School Environment of Different generation (First Generation

and non First Generation) learners studying in rural area Primary schools of Delhi.

Method
The present study belongs to the category of descriptive field survey type of research and includes characteristic of casual comparative survey research

Population
The children of First and non first Generation Learners of Elementary schools located at Delhi were considered as the population of the study.

Sample
157 students of different generations from the Delhi have been selected by random sampling technique.

Tools used
School Environment Inventory developed and standardized by Karuna Shankar Mishra

Data analysis and interpretation of the study
Objective 1
To study the School Environment of Different generation (First Generation and non First Generation) learners studying in urban area Primary schools.

Hypothesis $H_0 1$
There is no significant difference in School Environment of Different generation (First Generation and non First Generation) learners studying in urban area Primary schools. The first objective of the study was to School Environment of Different generation (First Generation and non First Generation) learners studying in urban area Primary schools of Delhi. Following table describe mean, SD and t-value of School Environment of Different generation (First Generation and non First Generation) learners studying in rural area Primary schools of Delhi.

Table 1: Showing mean, SD and t-value of School Environment of Different generation (First Generation and non First Generation) learners studying in rural area Primary schools of Delhi (Urban Area)

Sr. No	Dimensions	Types of schools	Types of learner	MEAN	SD	t-value
1	Creative Stimulation	Govt.	FGL	56.54	10.18	.33
			NFGL	57.12	9.97	
		Pvt.	FGL	58.23	9.76	.64
			NFGL	57.12	9.97	
2	Cognitive Encouragement	Govt.	FGL	32.39	5.99	.11
			NFGL	32.54	8.98	
		Pvt.	FGL	31.34	6.21	1.48
			NFGL	33.11	7.43	
3	Recommendation	Govt.	FGL	28.00	6.77	.63
			NFGL	27.26	6.82	
		Pvt.	FGL	27.75	5.67	1.55
			NFGL	26.17	5.97	
4	Permissiveness	Govt.	FGL	22.95	6.92	.88
			NFGL	23.84	4.70	
		Pvt.	FGL	24.58	5.00	3.36**
			NFGL	21.29	6.11	
5	Rejection	Govt.	FGL	14.85	6.14	3.81**
			NFGL	19.16	6.96	
		Pvt.	FGL	16.34	7.42	3.74**
			NFGL	21.60	8.61	
6	Control	Govt.	FGL	27.75	6.34	1.26
			NFGL	26.46	5.56	
		Pvt.	FGL	23.67	6.78	2.95**
			NFGL	27.34	7.44	

FGL: first generation learner; NFGL: non first generation learner

Observation of the above table indicates that schools environment questionnaires has six dimensions viz; Creative Stimulation, Cognitive Encouragement, Recommendation, Permissiveness, Permissiveness, Rejection and control. Mean, standard deviation and t-values of government and private FGL and NFGL studying in Primary schools of Delhi was calculated and results are summarised as: The calculated t-values for creative simulation dimension of school environment for government FGL and NFGL was found .33 which is less than the table value for 133 DF in rural area of Delhi. This indicates that *there is no significant difference in the creative simulation dimension of school environment of FGL and NFGL of Delhi*. Similarly for private schools FGL and NFGL calculated t- value is .64. Thus creative simulation dimension of school environment for government and private FGL and NFGL of urban area of Delhi was similar. Similarly for other component of school environment calculated t-value for Cognitive Encouragement (for govt. 11andforPvt.1.48) for Recommendation (for govt. 63 and for Pvt. 1.55), Permissiveness (for govt. .88 and for Pvt. 3.63**), Permissiveness (for govt. 3.81** and for Pvt. 3.74**), Rejection (for govt.1.26 and for Pvt. 2.59**). *It can be concluded that Creative Stimulation, Cognitive Encouragement, Recommendation and Permissiveness*

component school environment of government schools of first and non first generation learner have no significant difference was found, Whereas Permissiveness component of school environment of government schools, Rejection and control of first and non first generation learner of Primary schools of Delhi have significant difference in favour of non first generation learners. Thus second null hypothesis is partially accepted.

Objective 2
To study the School Environment of Different generation (First Generation and non First Generation) learners studying in rural area Primary schools.

Hypothesis H₀2
There is no significant difference in School Environment of Different generation (First Generation and non First Generation) learners studying in rural area Primary schools. The second objective was to study School Environment of Different generation (First Generation and non First Generation) learners studying in rural area Primary schools of Delhi. Following table describe mean, SD and t-value of School Environment of Different generation (First Generation and non First Generation) learners studying in rural area Primary schools of Delhi.

Table 2: Showing mean, SD and t-value of School Environment of Different generation (First Generation and non First Generation) learners studying in Primary schools (Rural Area)

Sr. No	Dimensions	Types of schools	Types of learner	MEAN	SD	t-value
1	Creative Stimulation	Govt.	FGL	54.31	8.27	2.62*
			NFGL	58.32	8.67	
		Pvt.	FGL	59.41	10.21	1.03
			NFGL	61.22	9.68	
2	Cognitive Encouragement	Govt.	FGL	30.89	5.25	2.38*
			NFGL	33.49	6.73	
		Pvt.	FGL	32.39	6.31	1.98*
			NFGL	34.76	7.23	
3	Recommendation	Govt.	FGL	28.38	6.91	.71
			NFGL	29.22	6.18	
		Pvt.	FGL	26.45	5.32	2.52*
			NFGL	28.87	5.56	
4	Permissiveness	Govt.	FGL	21.95	5.61	1.41
			NFGL	23.27	4.78	
		pvt.	FGL	23.18	4.26	2.05*
			NFGL	21.38	5.61	
5	Rejection	Govt.	FGL	16.79	5.82	3.52**
			NFGL	20.36	5.43	
		Pvt.	FGL	17.89	6.92	3.80**
			NFGL	22.63	7.21	
6	Control	Govt.	FGL	29.28	7.14	2.43*
			NFGL	32.49	7.51	
		Pvt.	FGL	25.28	6.99	3.36**
			NFGL	29.34	6.68	

FGL: first generation learner; NFGL: non first generation learner

Observation of the above table indicates that schools environment questionnaires has six dimensions viz; Creative Stimulation, Cognitive Encouragement, Recommendation, Permissiveness, Permissiveness, Rejection and control. Mean, standard deviation and t-values of government and private FGL and NFGL studying in Primary schools of Delhi was calculated and results are summarised as: The calculated t-values for creative simulation dimension of school environment for government FGL and NFGL was found 2.62* which is greater than the table value for 121 DF in Urban area of Delhi. This indicates that there is significant difference in the creative simulation dimension of school environment of FGL and NFGL of Delhi. Similarly for private schools FGL and NFGL calculated t- value is 1.03. Thus creative simulation dimension of school environment for government and private FGL and NFGL of urban area of Delhi was similar.
Similarly calculated t-value for Cognitive Encouragement (for govt. 2.38* and for Pvt. 1.98*), for Recommendation (for govt. .71 and for Pvt. 2.52*), Permissiveness (for govt.

1.41 and for Pvt. 2.05*), Rejection (for govt. 3.52** and for Pvt. 3.80**). It can be concluded that Creative Stimulation, Cognitive Encouragement, Rejection and control of FGL and NFGL of government Primary schools FGL and NFGL of Delhi was found significant whereas Recommendation and Permissiveness component school environment of government schools of first and non first generation learner have significant difference. Simulation component of component school environment of government schools of first and non first generation learner have no significant difference. The direction of significant difference in favour of non first generation learners. *Thus second null hypothesis is partially accepted.*

Results and conclusions

Analysis of data indicates that there is no significant difference in the creative simulation dimension of school environment of rural and urban FGL and NFGL of Delhi. It can be concluded that Creative Stimulation, Cognitive Encouragement, Recommendation and Permissiveness component school environment of government schools of first and non first generation learner have no significant difference was found, Whereas Permissiveness component of school environment of government schools, Rejection and control of first and non first generation learner of Primary schools of Delhi have significant difference in favour of non first generation learners. It can be also be concluded that Creative Stimulation, Cognitive Encouragement, Rejection and control of FGL and NFGL of government Primary schools FGL and NFGL of Delhi was found significant whereas Recommendation and Permissiveness component school environment of government schools of first and non first generation learner have significant difference. Simulation component of component school environment of government schools of first and non first generation learner have no significant difference. The direction of significant difference in favour of non first generation learners. Thus second null hypothesis is partially accepted.

References

1. Arora Reeta. Role of parents child relationship and teachers student relationship in the Academic achievement of higher secondary school students in both sense. Ph.D Psychology, Agara University, 1988.
2. Aruna NS. A study of the factors influencing the achievement of standard VII students belonging to SC and ST, whose medium of instructions was Kannada. In Bouch M.B., Third survey of Educational Research. 1981, 658.
3. Asthana M. A study of socio psychological correlates of dropouts of senior basic level. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation in Education, Rohilkhand University, Bareilly, 1993.
4. Bouch MB. A study of family background variables, some motivational variables, cognitive characteristics and school performance of primary school children. Independent study. Baroda. Society for educational research and development, 1988, 308.
5. Capell Lee, Frank Lewis. Caring for Indoor Environment in Southern Schools. Enviros 7.5, 1997.
6. Chand SK. A study of personal values of adolescent boys and girls in relation to Socio-Economic Status and Academic Achievement. M.Phil (Edu.) Raven-show College, Cuttack, 1992.
7. Chauhan SC. Study of Geographical locale and its influence on the Educational Achievement of Tribal Children in Bastar Distt. Of Madhya Pradesh. Sixth Survey of Educational Research, 1993, 392.
8. Ganguly Malabike. Socio-economic status and scholastic achievement. Indian Educational Review, 1989; 24(1):84-94.
9. Ganihar Noorjahan N, Shaik Noorjahan D. Relationship between school effectiveness and selected personal and institutional variables. Perspectives in Education. 2004; 20(2):110-119.
10. Garrison Karl C. Psychology of Adolescents, Engle Wood Cliffs. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1965.
11. Jennifer De Planty, Russell Coulter-kern, Kim Duchane A. Perceptions of parent involvement in academic achievement. Journal of Educational Reasearch, 2007; 100(6):361-368.
12. Johnson KA. The peer effect on academic achievement among public elementary school students. The heritage foundation, America, Centre for data analysis report, 2000, 1-6.