# FAMILY ENVIRONMENT STATUS OF UNDER-GRADUATE STUDENTS OF KASHMIR WITH RESPECT TO GENDER, LOCALE AND STREAM

**Mr. Jan Jahanger and Mr. Mudasir Sadiq**
Research Scholar, School of Education, Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya,
Indore, Madhya Pradesh, India.

## Abstract
Family is the vast and essential unit of society having a solid impact upon the social and emotional development of a person. Family environment involves the circumstances and social climatic conditions within the families. It is the child's primary agent of socialization. The focus of the present research is to study the family environment status of under-graduate students of Kashmir division of the state of Jammu and Kashmir. For the purpose a sample of 400 students with 102 as HFEG, 198 as AFEG and 100 as LFEG. The sample of 400 students is further divided into 200 males & 200 females, 200 rural & 200 urban students and 200 as arts & 200 science stream students. The data was collected from the University of Kashmir and its affiliated colleges by using probability sampling techniques. The tool used for data collection was Family Environment Scale developed and tested by Dr. Harpreet Bhatia & Dr. N.K. Chaddha (2002). For this study the statistical tools used were Mean, Standard Deviation and ANOVA. The findings of the study revealed that there is significant difference between male & female, rural & urban and arts & science UG students in their family environment status. The results further revealed that there is no significant interaction effect of gender, locale and stream of study on family environment status of UG students.
**Keywords:** Arts, Science, Family Environment Status, Rural and Urban.

## Introduction
Family is the oldest and the most important of all the institutions that man has devised to control and incorporate his behaviour to satisfy his basic needs (Bhatia and Chadha, 1993). As per Oxford dictionary reference family is characterized as: a) the assemblage of people who live in one house it incorporates guardians, kids, workers, and so on., b) the ground comprising of guardians and their kids, in the case of living together or not; c) a man's kids raised all in all; and d) those plunged, or guaranteeing plummet from a typical parentage. It is as of late demonstrated by the research conducted by analysts, sociologists, educationalists and different behaviorists that the family outfits the fundamental condition for building solid identity of a kid by fulfilling their emotional needs. Family is the most huge and essential unit of society having a solid impact upon the social and emotional improvement of a person. It is seen as the essential setting in which children' emotional capabilities are produced. Family is fundamentally a unit in which guardians and children live respectively. Guardians specifically or in a roundabout way impact kids' response to or method for adapting to sincerely reminiscent circumstances. As indicated by Larson and Richard (1991) with regards to family reinforces grown-up values; empower accomplishment in scholastic level and it underpins emotional security. In this way, positive cooperation particularly with teenagers is formatively valuable for all.

Family environment also plays an important role in the development of the individual particularly in the area of intelligence and motivation. Family provides the basic environment for building healthy personality of the child by satisfying their emotional needs. Family also has the significant effect on the social and emotional development of the child. Research has revealed that the children from the poor family environment satisfy their emotional needs slower than the children having rich family environment. Poor family environment and its related terms, such as, low socio-economic condition, poverty, parenting style, motivation, adjustment, empathy, support etc. have a great effect on our society. In the present era the attitude and parenting style in our families is growing towards the positive side. The family environment involves the circumstances and social climate conditions within the families. It is the child's

primary agent of socialization. For this study the family environment refers to the scores of under graduate students on family environment scale.

Sonthalia and Dasgupta (2012) studied the impact of family attachment style on self-esteem, emotional intelligence and risk behavior among adolescent's (boys and girls). The sample consist of 120 adolescent boys and girls. Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA-1979) was used to measure the attachment style of parents. Self-esteem of students was measured by Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES-1965) and emotional intelligence was measured by Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS) prepared by Salovey and Mayer (1990). Results revealed that, positive attachment style of parents is very important to increase self-esteem and emotional intelligence of adolescent's. Ozabaci (2006) conducted a study to examine the relationship between EQ and family environment. In this study 274 participants were selected as a sample in Istanbul (Turkey). Data were collected by emotional intelligence scale and family environment scale to assess the EQ and family characteristics. The results of the study indicate that there was a significant relationship between EQ and dimensions of family environment. With changes in the level of emotional Intelligence the characteristics of family environment also change. Authors additionally commented that the family environment is mostly important, it enhance the emotional and social development of the child. Rana and et al. (2005) examined the relationship between family environment and the development of aggressive tendencies. A total of 200 students used as a sample, ranging in age from 15 to 18 years. The results demonstrated that family environment affected aggressive behavior. Results also show that boys were superior to girls on the verbal, physical dimension and indirect aggression. Mohanty and Devi (2010) have examined the relationship of adolescents Emotional Intelligence with secure attachment style of family and selected socio-personal variables. The sample comprised of 60 adolescents studying intermediate course from Hyderabad and Secunderabad city of Andhra Pradesh. The study shows that, those adolescents who were securely attached with their parents had better interpersonal relation, good problem-solving skills and were happier. It was further concluded that the conductive home environment with secure feelings, give raise to emotional intelligent individuals in future.

## Methodology

The sample for study was selected from under-graduate departments of Kashmir University and its affiliated colleges by using stratified random sampling. The study consists of 400 students with 102 as High Family Environment Group (HFEG), 198 as Average Family Environment Group (AFEG) and 100 as Low Family Environment Group (LFEG). The sample of 400 students were further divided into 200 males & 200 females, 200 rural & 200 urban students and 200 as arts & 200 science stream students. The tool used for data collection was Family Environment Scale developed and tested by Dr. Harpreet Bhatia & Dr. N.K. Chaddha (2002) of department of Psychology, University of Delhi, in the year 1993. This scale consists of three dimensions which are taken from Moos scale although the concept of dimensions are taken from Moos scale all the subscales in each dimensions are operationally defined with certain modifications of original three of the original subscales were dropped and one subscales was added. This scale consists of 69 items divided into 9 dimensions    and each statement has its score. There are two types of statements: positive & negative and there are five response options: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree. Positive items were scored as 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 while as negative items were given as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Test reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.95.  Descriptive survey method was used in this study in order to find out the Mean, Standard Deviation, Correlation and ANOVA test of the analyzed data.

## Analysis and Results

The current study tries to investigate the difference and interaction effect among family environment status of UG students of Kashmir. The feasibility, dependability and generalizability of the findings of the research study, are largely determined by the techniques used for analysis and interpretation of data. Thus relevant techniques were used to analyze data for the current investigation.

**Jan Jahanger and Mudasir Sadiq**

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF LEVELS OF FAMILY ENVIRONMENT OF UG STUDENTS OF KASHMIR

| Levels | N | %age |
|---|---|---|
| LFEG | 102 | 25.5% |
| AFEG | 198 | 49.5 % |
| HFEG | 100 | 25% |
| **TOTAL** | **400** | **100%** |

TABLE 2
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF FAMILY ENVIRONMENT WITH RESPECT TO LOCALE, GENDER AND STREAM

| Area | Gender | Stream | Mean | SD | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rural | Female | Arts | 226.36 | 19.602 | 50 |
| | | Science | 212.80 | 12.571 | 50 |
| | | Total | 219.58 | 17.744 | 100 |
| | Male | Arts | 224.84 | 9.855 | 50 |
| | | Science | 220.52 | 6.109 | 50 |
| | | Total | 222.68 | 8.441 | 100 |
| | Total | Arts | 225.60 | 15.454 | 100 |
| | | Science | 216.66 | 10.571 | 100 |
| | | Total | 221.13 | 13.946 | 200 |
| Urban | Female | Arts | 233.76 | 19.760 | 50 |
| | | Science | 223.32 | 22.398 | 50 |
| | | Total | 228.54 | 21.659 | 100 |
| | Male | Arts | 235.72 | 27.622 | 50 |
| | | Science | 217.48 | 18.749 | 50 |
| | | Total | 226.60 | 25.212 | 100 |
| | Total | Arts | 234.74 | 23.914 | 100 |
| | | Science | 220.40 | 20.758 | 100 |
| | | Total | 227.57 | 23.464 | 200 |
| Total | Female | Arts | 230.06 | 19.932 | 100 |
| | | Science | 218.06 | 18.828 | 100 |
| | | Total | 224.06 | 20.253 | 200 |
| | Male | Arts | 230.28 | 21.345 | 100 |
| | | Science | 219.00 | 13.957 | 100 |
| | | Total | 224.64 | 18.855 | 200 |
| | Total | Arts | 230.17 | 20.599 | 200 |
| | | Science | 218.53 | 16.537 | 200 |
| | | Total | 224.35 | 19.544 | 400 |

**Jan Jahanger and Mudasir Sadiq**

International Journal of Physical Education, Health and Social Science (IJPEHSS)
www.ijpehss.org
Peer Reviewed, Indexed and UGC Approved Journal (48531)

ISSN: 2278 – 716X
Vol. 7, Issue 1, (2018)
Impact Factor 5.02

TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF THREE-WAY ANOVA (2X2X2) FACTORIAL DESIGN OF FAMILY ENVIRONMENT IN
RELATION TO LOCALE, GENDER AND STREAM OF UG STUDENTS OF KASHMIR

| Source | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | 2.015E7 | 8 | 2519261.340 | 7510.730 | .000 |
| Locale | 4147.360 | 1 | 4147.360 | 12.365 | .000 |
| Gender | 33.640 | 1 | 33.640 | .100 | .752 |
| Stream | 13548.960 | 1 | 13548.960 | 40.394 | .000 |
| Locale * Gender | 635.040 | 1 | 635.040 | 1.893 | .170 |
| Locale * Stream | 729.000 | 1 | 729.000 | 2.173 | .141 |
| Gender * Stream | 12.960 | 1 | 12.960 | .039 | .844 |
| Locale * Gender * Stream | 1814.760 | 1 | 1814.760 | 5.410 | .021 |
| Error | 131485.280 | 392 | 335.422 | | |
| Total | 2.029 | 400 | | | |
| a. R Squared = .994 (Adjusted R Squared = .993) | | | | | |

Locale
Viewing the results in Table 4, the F value (12.365**) was found to be significant at 0.01 level of significance. It indicated that urban and rural UG students differ significantly in family environment status. Therefore, the first hypothesis of the study which was stated that "There will be no significant difference in Family environment status of rural and urban under-graduate students" stands rejected. Meaning thereby urban and rural UG students of Kashmir differ in their family environment. Further, reviewing the means Table 3 indicated that the mean score of urban UG students is 227.57 and standard deviation is 24.464 whereas the mean score of rural UG students is 221.13 and standard deviation is 13.946. This indicates that Urban UG students are better in family environment as compared to their rural UG counterparts.

Gender
Viewing the results in Table 4, the F value (.100**) was found to be significant at 0.01 level of significance. It indicated that male and female UG students differ significantly in family environment status. Therefore, the second hypothesis of the study which was stated that "There will be no significant difference in Family environment status of male and female under-graduate students." stands rejected. Meaning thereby male and female UG students of Kashmir differ in their family environment status. Further, reviewing the means Table 3 indicated that the mean score of Male UG students is 224.64 and standard deviation is 18.855 whereas the mean score of Female UG students is 224.06 and standard deviation is 20.253. This indicates that male UG students are better in family environment status as compared to their female UG counterparts.

Stream
Viewing the results in Table 4, the F value (40.391) was found to be significant at 0.01 level of significance. It indicated that arts and science UG students differ significantly in family environment status. Therefore, the third hypothesis of the study which was stated that "There will be no significant difference in Family environment status of arts and science under-graduate students." stands rejected. Meaning thereby arts and science UG students of Kashmir differ in their family environment status.
Further, reviewing the means Table 3 indicated that the mean score of arts UG students is 230.17 and standard deviation is 20.599 whereas the mean score of science UG students is 218.53 and standard deviation is 16.537. This indicates that arts UG students are better in family environment status as compared to their science UG counterparts.

Locale x Gender

In order to explore group differences on family environment status of UG students as indicated in table, the F-value was found to be 1.893 which was found insignificant at 0.01 level of significance. It indicates that there is no significant influence of locale and gender on family environment status of UG students. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis which was stated as, "There will be no interaction effect on Family environment status of under-graduate students based on locale and gender" stands accepted. Meaning thereby there is no significant effect of locale and gender on family environment status of UG students.

Locale x Stream

In order to explore group differences on family environment status of UG students as indicated in table 4, the F-value was found to be 2.173 which was found insignificant at 0.01 level of significance. It indicates that there is no significant influence of locale and stream on family environment status of UG students. Therefore, the fifth hypothesis which was stated as, "There will be no interaction effect on Family environment status of under-graduate students based on locale and stream" stands accepted. Meaning thereby there is no significant effect of locale and stream on family environment status of UG students.

Stream x Gender

In order to explore group differences on family environment of UG students as indicated in table 4, the F-value was found to be 0.039 which was found insignificant at 0.01 level of significance. It indicates that there is no significant influence of stream and gender on family environment of UG students. Therefore, the sixth hypothesis which was stated as, "There will be no interaction effect on Family environment status of under-graduate students based on stream and gender" stands accepted. Meaning thereby there is no significant effect of stream and gender on family environment status of UG students.

Locale x Gender x Stream

As indicated in table 4, the F-value was found to be 5.410 which was found insignificant at 0.01 level of significance. It indicates that there is no significant influence of stream, locale and gender on family environment of UG students. Therefore, the seventh hypothesis which was stated as, "There will be no interaction effect on Family environment status of under-graduate students based on locale, gender and stream" stands accepted. Meaning thereby there is no significant effect of, locale, gender and stream on family environment of UG students.

**Conclusion**

25.5% UG students have low level of family environment status, 49.5 % UG students have average level of family environment status while as 25% UG students have high level of Family environment status. Locale wise two groups of UG students i.e. rural and urban students differ in their family environment status. Urban UG students tend to be significantly higher in family environment status as compared to the rural UG students. Gender wise two groups of UG students i.e. male and female students differ in family environment status. Male UG students tend to be significantly higher in family environment status as compared to the female UG students. Stream wise two groups of UG students i.e. arts and science students differ in their family environment status. Arts UG students tend to be significantly higher in family environment status as compared to the science UG students. There is no significant interaction effect of locale, gender and Stream of study on family environment status of UG students.

**References:**

Bhatia, H., & Chadha, N. K. (1993). Technical manual of family environment scale. Lucknow, Ankur Psychological Agency.

Chakra, A., & Prabha, R. (2004). Influence of family environment of emotional competence of adolescents. Journal of Community guidance and Research, 21(2), 213-222.

**Jan Jahanger and Mudasir Sadiq**

Devi, U. & Royal (2004). Adolescent's perception about family environment and emotional intelligence. Indian Psychological review, 62(3), 157-167.

Larson, R., & Richard, M. S. (1991). Daily companionship in childhood and adolescence, charging developmental context. Child Development, 62, 284-30

Mohanty, I. & Devi, U. L. (2010). Socio-personal variable and emotional intelligence of adolescents in secure attachment style, Indian Psychological Review, 74(1), 29-37.

Moos, R. H., Cronkite, R. C., & Moos, B. S. (1998). Family and extra family resources and the 10 year course of treated depression. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 107, 450-460.

Ozabaci, N. (2006). Emotional Intelligence and family environment. Sosyal Billimler Dergisi, 16, 169-175.

Rana, Minakshi, Malhotra, & Dalip. (2005). Family environment as a predictor of aggressive behavior. Studica Psychologica, 47(1), 61-74.

Salovey, P. & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional Intelligence. Imagination, cognition and personality (9), 185-211.

Sonthali, S., & Dasgupta, S. (2012). Attachment Style and their Implication for Adolescents. Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 38(1), 54-62.

https://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/release23/en/, retrieved on 22 September, 2018.