

Correlates of School and Family Environment on Well - Being

*** S. Suganya,**

Ph.D Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Annamalai University, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu Email: Suganyas@hccetrichy.ac.in

**** Dr. Suresh Kumar Murugesan,**

Head, P.G Department of Psychology, The American College, Madurai, Tamil Nadu

***** Dr. K. Govind,**

Head (i/c) Associate Professor Department of Psychology, Annamalai University, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu

Abstract

The current study aims to explore the relationship between school environment family environment and well - being. Sample size of the study is 600 school students from Tiruchirappalli. All the samples were selected using random sampling technique. To collect the data relevant to the aim of the study well being index developed by Dr. Vijayalakshmi chaudan and Dr. Varsha Sharma in 2005 school environment and family environment scale was developed by Ms.S.Suganya, Dr Sureshkumar Murugaesan and Dr K.Govind in 2022 was used. Collected data was scored by using respected questionnaires and it was analysed with the SPSS. The results will be discussed in detail.

Background

Children and young people spend a large amount of time in school and home. The school represents an easy access environment with direct day to day contact with children and young people. During childhood students problems met and solved to a significant extent by parents and teachers. Now at this stage, if parents and teachers provide less help and demand more than they did earlier. Excess pressure from parents, teachers and school environment creates negative impact on their psychological wellbeing. So during this period, it is a great responsibility of parents as well as teachers to understand this phenomenon of development because at school, the teacher's role also involves parenting functions. They should help students develop specific skills, make them aware of their different abilities and talents and motivate them toward development. It is a fact that in present scenario of society

psychiatric problem and diseases are increasing day by day and are a serious concern and problem for a developing society. For a healthy citizenship it is most essential that roots of the person should be healthy and strong in physical as well as psychological term. In this ground not only family but school also play important role. Psychological traits which can help in success cannot be acquired by only reading text books, or listening to a lecture. The house is one of the main settings where kids and teenagers grow up. The factors at play in this scenario might have an impact on their experiences and personal growth. (King, Balistren, Morriea, Scoot) A good family environment has elements of closeness, care, and support, which are reflected in improved well-being, a higher standard of living, and better outcomes (Harrison). In contrast to relationships based on rejection, which can result in the onset of developmental difficulties,

supportive parental connections also yield more favourable outcomes (Miranda). As a result, the wellbeing of teenagers is linked to the presence of connections between parents and children that are built on trust, communication, and lack of alienation (Mónaco,). In this study researcher will investigate those environmental factors, which help in developing the integrity and strength of character that prepare for success ' Hence the current study aims to explore the relationship between school environment ,family environment and well – being.

Aim of the Study:

The aim of the study is to find the relationship between school environment family environment and well-being among school students

Primary Objective:

To find the relationship of relationship between school environment family environment and well-being among school students

Hypothesis:

H1:There will be significant relationship between school environment family environment and well-being among school students

Research Design:

The current study used a survey method to collect information on the qualities being studied. The relationship between school environment, family environment and well-being was examined in the current study using a quantitative study methodology. 500 school students from three Trichy-area educational institutions were recruited as participants in the current study. A further 100 school kids were

enlisted to take part in a web-based poll for tool construction from online communities. Through a procedure known as simple random sampling, the individuals were chosen. There were a total of 600 participants in the sample, including 282 girls and 308 boys. Participants ranged in age from 14 to 18 years old. The well-being was evaluated using the well-being index created by Drs. Vijayalakshmi Chaudan and Varsha Sharma in 2005. To evaluate the school environments and family environment the researcher established a school environment scale and family environment scale. Correlation, was used to analyse the data. Statistical Package For Social Sciences Version 27.0 was used to conduct statistical analysis on the collected data (SPSS)

Tools Used:

Various research tools can be used for data collection. Every form of research requires a specific set of instruments to collect data or explore new territory; these instruments are known as research tools. Any research project's success is heavily reliant on the instruments that are employed to gather the data. The researcher chose and employed the following tools for the investigation.

1. School environment Scale
2. Family environment scale
3. Well-Being Index

Description of the tool:

1. School environment scale

The tool has been prepared on a five-point rating scale based on Likert's type. Initially, 32 statements were prepared in English. The scoring procedure for the tool with the option Always is given 5, Often is given 4, Sometimes is given 3, Rarely is given 2 and Never is given 1. The

minimum score for the tool is '32' and maximum score of the tool is 160.

Scoring:

Interpretation:

- Score range from 32-75 – Poor school environment

- Score range from 76 -118 -Average school environment
- Score range from Above 118 - High school environment

Reliability

Shows reliability co-efficient of School Environment

S.No.	Method of Reliability	Values
1.	Test-retest (Repetition)	0.89
2	Split – Half	0.925

Validity:

The appropriateness, meaningfulness and usefulness of the specific inferences made from test scores. In research, if findings are to be appropriate, meaningful and useful, they need to be valid. The first essential quality of valid test is that it should be highly reliable. Besides, the content or face validity, the investigator intended to arrive intrinsic validity. Guilford (1950) defined the intrinsic validity as “the degree to which a test measures what it measures.” The square root of reliability gives the intrinsic

validity. Therefore, the intrinsic validity of School Environment scale is 0.89.

2. Family environment scale

Family Environment scale for school students has been constructed by the investigator. The scale consist of 23 statement with two response: yes= “1” No= “2” is given. The minimum score for the tool is '0' and maximum score of the tool is 23.

Reliability

Shows reliability co-efficient of Family Environment

S.No.	Method of Reliability	Values
1.	Test-retest (Repetition)	0.83
2	Split – Half	0.75

Validity:

The first essential quality of valid test is that it should be highly reliable. Besides, the content or face validity, the investigator intended to arrive intrinsic validity. Guilford (1950) defined the intrinsic validity as “the degree to which a test measures what it measures.” The square root of reliability gives the intrinsic

validity. Therefore, the intrinsic validity of Family Environment scale is 0.83

Interpretation:

- Below 12 good family environment
- Above 12 poor family environment

3. Well being index

Dr. Vijayalakshmi chaudan and Dr. Varsha Sharma developed well being index in

2005. There are 50 statements with 5 response (always ,often ,sometimes ,rarely & never). There are 6 dimensions:

- ✓ Emotional well being
- ✓ Psychological well being
- ✓ Social well being
- ✓ Spiritual well being
- ✓ Self awareness
- ✓ Physical well being

Scoring & interpretation

well - being index consists of positive and negative statements. For positive items following scores is given: always =5, often=4 , sometimes = 3, rarely= 2 and never= 1 and for negative statements following scores is given: always =1 ,often=2 , sometimes = 3, rarely= 4 and never= 5. Obtained total raw score is converted into z score.

Interpretation

- +2.01 and above – extremely high well being
- +1.26 to 2.00 - high
- +0.51 to +1.25 – above average
- -0.50 to+0.50 – average
- -1.25 to – 0.51 – below average
- -2.00 to -1.26 – low
- -2.01 and below – extremely low

Reliability

The test of the scale is determined by calculating test retest reliability for full strength on the sample of 100 subjects of age of 13 and above. The scale was again administered within the gap of 15 days. The coefficient correlation found is 0.71 which is significant at 0.01 level.

Validity

Beside the face validity as all items of the scale are concerned with the variable under focus, the scale has high content validity. It

is evident from the assessment and rating of the experts that the item of the scale are directly related to the concept of well-being. The reliability index of the scale was calculated between the score of the present scale and general well- being scale of Chouhan and Didwania (2014). The later has indicated high validity on account of well -being is 0.85.

Inclusion Criteria:

1. Only school students were considered as sample.
2. Both gender were considered as sample.
3. Both rural and urban were included.

Exclusion Criteria:

1. Illiterate were excluded as a sample in this study.
2. College and university students were excluded
3. Samples outside Tiruchirapalli were excluded

Analysis:

1. Correlation

Results & Discussion

Table 1: Relationship between school environment family environment and well- being among school students

H1: There will be significant relationship between Family environment School environment and well-being dimensions

Inter Correlation Analysis

The following table gives the Inter correlation among school environment (Physical, Curriculum, Co curricular, Discipline and Total School Environment), Family Environment (Relationship, Personal, System and Total Family Environment) and Well being (Emotional, Psychological, Social, Spiritual, Self awareness, Physical and Total Well being).

	Physical	Curriculum	Co curricular	Discipline	School Environment	relationship	personal	system	Family Environment	Emotional well being	Psychological	Social	Spiritual	Self awareness	Physical	Well Being
Physical	1															
Curriculum	.780 [*]	1														
Co curricular	.619 [*]	.726 [*]	1													
Discipline	.704 [*]	.800 [*]	.709 ^{**}	1												
School Environment	.908 [*]	.933 [*]	.819 ^{**}	.886 ^{**}	1											
Relationship	-.211 [*]	-.262 [*]	-.180 ^{**}	-.220 ^{**}	-.247 ^{**}	1										
Personal	-.169 [*]	-.198 [*]	-.138 ^{**}	-.194 ^{**}	-.197 ^{**}	.666 ^{**}	1									
System	-.179 [*]	-.229 [*]	-.190 ^{**}	-.231 ^{**}	-.229 ^{**}	.676 ^{**}	.669 ^{**}	1								
Family Environment	-.209 [*]	-.256 [*]	-.186 ^{**}	-.239 ^{**}	-.251 ^{**}	.881 ^{**}	.910 ^{**}	.851 ^{**}	1							
Emotional	.089 [*]	.043	-.010	-.020	.041	.011	-.018	.039	.006	1						
Psychological	-.040	-.014	-.051	-.069	-.046	.022	.034	.045	.037	.076	1					
Social	.010	.049	.077	.042	.043	.012	-.029	.015	-.005	.000	.019	1				
Spiritual	-.043	-.022	-.052	-.053	-.046	-.012	.077	.020	.037	.023	.092 [*]	.030	1			
Self awareness	.110 [*]	.177 [*]	.155 ^{**}	.103 [*]	.150 ^{**}	-.027	.064	.000	.020	-.066	-.037	.013	.078	1		

Physical	-.108*	-.109*	-.059	-.045	-.097*	.053	-.030	-.041	-.006	-.075	.115**	-.092*	-.128**	-.058	1	
Well being	.017	.070	.059	.009	.041	.023	.021	.033	.028	.286**	.461**	.690**	.300**	.346**	.194**	1

The relationship between Well - being and Family Environment scores were analyzed by using the method of Pearson's Product Moment Coefficient of correlation. The results are presented in the Table above

It is observed from the table that the correlation coefficient between School Environment scores and Well - being scores is .041 which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the stated hypothesis that there is significant relationship between School Environment and Well - being is not accepted. The result implies that Well-being is associated with School Environment of students in emotional Well-being physical Well-being and self awareness dimensions. It is also seen that self awareness dimension of Well-being is correlated all the dimension of (physical, curriculum, co- curricular and discipline) school environment.

It is observed from the table that the correlation coefficient between Family Environment scores and Well - being scores is .028 which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the stated hypothesis that there is significant relationship between Family Environment and Well - being is not accepted. The result implies that Well-being is not associated with Family Environment of students.

Major Findings

The result implies that Well- being is not associated with Family Environment and school environment of school students.

Limitations Of The Study:

- Self-report measures were used to assess the sensitivity of family environment school environment and well being .The measures relied on the subjective evaluations of the participants. Subjective evaluations are mostly influenced by the individuals perception of themselves which may not be always consistent with the individuals actual potentiality and tendency. Thus, the findings derived from self-report measures cannot be considered as sole empirical indicators of the measured traits.
- There are several limitations associated with the sample characteristics. The sample size was small and comprised mostly of 9th,10th,11 &12th . The proportion of days scholar was relatively higher than hostlers. It can be observed that the present study sample was not an adequate representation of the general population and thus consequently limits the generalizability of the findings.
- The sample of the present study did not include clinical populations and thus the clinical significance and the implications of the findings could not be conclusively stated.

Suggestion For Further Research:

- Longitudinal studies should be conducted
- Experimental studies should be designed
- The prospective studies should include the variables related with the current study variables

- The prospective studies should include a larger sample size which is adequately representative of the general population. The sensitivities of school and family environment on well being should be studied in a clinical population to derive clinically significant findings and implications for affective disorders and other psychopathologies.

being in adolescents: How does emotional development affect this relationship? *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2019, 16, 2554. [CrossRef]

References

King, V.; Boyd, L.M.; Pragg, B. Parent–adolescent closeness, family belonging, and adolescent well-being across family structures. *J. Fam. Issues* 2018, 39, 2007–2036.

Balistreri, K.S.; Alvira-Hammond, M. Adverse childhood experiences, family functioning and adolescent health and emotional well-being. *Public Health* 2016, 132, 72–78.

Moreira, J.F.G.; Telzer, E.H. Changes in family cohesion and links to depression during the college transition. *J. Adolesc.* 2015, 43, 72–82.

Scott, S.M.; Wallander, J.L.; Elliott, M.N.; Grunbaum, J.A.; Chien, A.T.; Tortolero, S.; Cuccaro, P.; Schuster, M.A. Do social resources protect against lower quality of life among diverse young adolescents? *J. Early Adolesc.* 2016, 36, 754–782.

Harrison, M.E.; Norris, M.L.; Obeid, N.; Fu, M.; Weinstangel, H.; Sampson, M. Systematic review of the effects of family meal frequency on psychosocial outcomes in youth. *Can. Fam. Physician* 2015, 61, e96–e106.

Miranda, M.C.; Affuso, G.; Esposito, C.; Bacchini, D. Parental acceptance–rejection and adolescent maladjustment: Mothers’ and fathers’ combined roles. *J. Child Fam. Stud.* 2016, 25, 1352–1362.

Mónaco, E.; Schoeps, K.; Montoya-Castilla, I. Attachment styles and well-