

## Correlates of School Environment on Well - Being

<sup>1</sup>S. Suganya

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Annamalai University, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu Email: Suganyas@hccetrichy.ac.in

<sup>2</sup>Dr. K. Govind

<sup>2</sup>Head (i/c) and Associate Professor Department of Psychology, Annamalai University, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu

<sup>3</sup>Dr. Suresh

<sup>3</sup>Kumar Murugesan, Head, P.G Department of Psychology, The American College, Madurai

### Abstract

The current study aims to explore the relationship between school environment and well - being. The study also finds the significant difference of school environment and well being on the basis of demographic variables. 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 and school 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

Infants learn to enjoy the company of others and to accomplish their goals with the support and collaboration of important ones. These objectives might be to fulfil biological necessities like the urge for survival. need to satisfy physical requirements like comfort and protection as well as needs like hunger and thirst. In actuality, man's evident yet powerful desire to identify with and live among others is what drives him to coexist in society. Because childhood is the period when most early learning takes place, living together at home is thus a crucial socio-physical environment in a person's existence. During this stage of childhood, several streams from the spectrum of knowledge, including self-knowledge, knowledge from others, and knowledge of the environment, are all launched and crystallised.

Environmental psychology

concentrates on the impact of the physical environment, whereas psychology concentrates on the influence of the social environment. The study of social processes in actual physical environments as well as the psychology of social settings including the home, workplace, and school are included in the overlap between community psychology and environmental psychology. A deeper knowledge of how qualities of one type of environment, like a family, are altered in other elements in participants' life, including vocational and educational contexts, has been added by Bronfenbrenner's (1989) ecological approach to human development. One of the primary environments in which children and adolescents develop is the home and school. Their experiences and personal development may be impacted by the variables that exist in this situation.

The "quality and character of

school life," which includes both social and physical features of the school, has sometimes been referred to as school climate. Existing research, however, does not provide much insight into how kids' origins connect to these processes or how the school environment influences or restricts their health behaviours. The perception that people have of various areas of their lives, such as their families, schools, and connections with peers, is related to the idea of quality of life [Nunes]. According to Wallander, the combination of subjective and objective well-being in regard to various aspects of children's and adolescents' lives, set within a particular context and culture and taking into account basic human rights, determines the quality of such peoples' Hence the current study aims to explore the relationship between school environment and well being.

#### **AIM OF THE STUDY:**

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

#### **OBJECTIVE:**

##### **PRIMARY OBJECTIVE:**

To find the relationship of relationship between school environment and well-being.

##### **SECONDARY OBJECTIVE:**

- To examine the difference in school environment on the basis of demographic variables Class, type of school and Gender.
- To examine the difference in well-being on the basis of demographic variables Class, type of school and Gender

#### **HYPOTHESIS:**

H1: There will be significant relationship of school on well- being among school students

H2: There will be significant differences in school environment & well- being with regards to class

H3: There will be significant differences in school environment & well- being with regards to type of school

H4: There will be significant differences in school environment & well- being with regards to gender

#### **RESEARCH DESIGN:**

The current study used a survey method to collect information on the qualities being studied. The relationship between school 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, the researcher established a school environment scale. Correlation, One Way Analysis of Variance, and t-tests were used to analyse the data at the group level. 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. 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 form 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.

**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 students were excluded
3. Samples outside Tiruchirapalli were excluded

### ANALYSIS:

1. F- test
2. "t"- test
3. Correlation

### RESULTS & DISCUSSION

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

	Well – being
School environment	-0.367**

The correlation coefficient -0.367 is found between School Environment and Well-being of young adolescent students, which is found to be significant at 0.01 level. It indicates that better the School Environment, the well -being will be increase. So it is concluded that there is a significant negative relationship between School Environment and Wellbeing of young adolescent students. The formulated hypothesis i.e there is a significant relationship between School Environment and Well- being of young adolescent students is true and it is accepted.

**Table 2 :** Significant differences in school environment & well- being with regards to class

Variables	Class	N	Mean	SD	F- Value	P- Value
School Environment	9 <sup>th</sup>	178	156.16	5.839	367.170	.001 (S)
	10 <sup>th</sup>	201	128.39	15.452		

	11 <sup>th</sup>	100	156.57	3.385		
	12 <sup>th</sup>	121	156.48	3.704		
	Total	600	146.99	16.400		
	9 <sup>th</sup>	178	3.65	1.798		
	10 <sup>th</sup>	201	5.76	1.147		
	11 <sup>th</sup>	100	2.51	1.508	163.929	.001 (S)
<b>Well Being</b>	12 <sup>th</sup>	121	5.66	1.130		
	Total	600	4.57	1.923		

On the basis of the demographic variable class, Table 2 one-way ANOVA (f-test) reveals that there are significant variations in the home environment, school environment, and well-being. So, assumption 2 is confirmed. Additionally,

research demonstrates that kids in the 10th standard have high levels of well-being and family environment. Students in the eleventh standard experience high school environment more than others.

**Table 3:** : Significant differences in school environment & well- being with regards to type of school

Variable	Type of school	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t – value	P- value
<b>School Environment</b>	<b>Government</b>	342	140.01	18.390	189.456	.001 (S)
	<b>Private</b>	258	156.24	5.231		
<b>Well Being</b>	<b>Government</b>	342	5.65	1.164	423.540	.001 (S)
	<b>Private</b>	258	3.15	1.802		

The "t" test, which is displayed in Table 3, reveals that there are substantial disparities in the school environment and well-being. Additionally, the table demonstrates that, depending on type of school, there are notable differences in school environments and well - being. As a result, hypothesis

number three is accepted. This further demonstrates that government school kids had higher levels of well-being and than children in private schools. Students in private schools attend high school environment, as opposed to those in government ones.

**Table 4:** : Significant differences in school environment & well- being with regards to gender

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F- Value	P- Value
School Environment	Male	308	148.46	16.206	4.535	.011 (S)
	Female	282	145.09	16.667		
	TG	10	155.50	1.650		
	Total	600	146.99	16.400		
Well Being	Male	308	4.36	1.941	8.682	.001 (S)
	Female	282	4.86	1.861		
	TG	10	3.00	1.563		
	Total	600	4.57	1.923		

Table 4 shows the one way ANOVA (f-test) indicates that there are significant gender differences in family environment, school environment and well-being. Hence hypothesis 4 is verified. Moreover, this also shows that female have high well – being and family environment than males. Here boys have obtained higher mean value in well - being when compared to females. This may be because in Indian culture males are given full freedom when compared to females. Ghadially (1985)

#### MAJOR FINDINGS:

- The well-being of students was significantly impacted by their school environments.
- On the basis of the demographic variable class (9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th), there were substantial disparities in the means of school and well-being.
- There were also significant differences based on the demographic variable type of school.

- Based on the demographic variable gender, there were substantial disparities in Mean between the school and well-being.

#### LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

- Self-report measures were used to assess the sensitivity of 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 9<sup>th</sup>,10<sup>th</sup>,11 &12<sup>th</sup> . 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 environment on well being should be studied in a clinical population to derive clinically significant findings and implications for affective disorders and other psychopathologies.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Archambault, I., Janosz, M., Morizot, J., and Pagani, L. (2009). Adolescent behavioral, affective, and cognitive engagement in school: relationship to dropout. *J. School Health* 79, 408–415. doi: 10.1111/j.1746-1561.2009.00428.x
2. Jennings, G. (2003). An exploration of meaningful participation and caring relationships as contexts for school engagement. *Calif. School Psychol.* 8, 43–52. doi: 10.1007/BF03340895
3. Ainley, M., and Ainley, J. (2011). Student engagement with science in early adolescence: the contribution of enjoyment to students' continuing interest in learning about science. *Contemp. Educ. Psychol.* 36, 4–12. doi: 10.1016/j.cedpsych.2010.08.001
4. Christenson, S. L., and Thurlow, M. L. (2004). School dropouts: prevention considerations, interventions, and challenges. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* 13, 36–39. doi: 10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.01301010.x
5. Hamilton, S., and Hamilton, M. (2009). "The transition to adulthood: challenges of poverty and structural lag," in *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*, 3rd Edn, eds R. Lerner and L. Steinberg, (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons), 492–526.
6. Norrish, J. M., Williams, P., O'Connor, M., and Robinson, J. (2013). An applied framework for positive education. *Int. J. Wellbeing* 3, 147–161. doi: 10.5502/ijw.v3i2.2
7. Froh, J. J., Huebner, E. S., Youssef, A. J., and Conte, V. (2011). Acknowledging and appreciating the full spectrum of the human condition: school Psychology's (limited) focus on positive psychological functioning. *Psychol. Schools* 48, 110–123. doi: 10.1002/pits.20530
8. Seligman, M. E., and Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). *Positive Psychology: An Introduction*. Washington, DC:

- American Psychological Association.
9. Ford, D. Y. (1995). A study of achievement and underachievement among gifted, potentially gifted, and average African-American students (Research Monograph 95128). University of Connecticut, The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented. <https://nrcgt.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/953/2015/03/rm95128.pdf>
  10. 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. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
  11. Balistreri, K.S.; Alvira-Hammond, M. Adverse childhood experiences, family functioning and adolescent health and emotional well-being. *Public Health* 2016, 132, 72–78. [CrossRef] [PubMed].
  12. 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. [CrossRef]
  13. 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. [CrossRef]
  14. 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.
  15. 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. [CrossRef]
  16. Mónaco, E.; Schoeps, K.; Montoya-Castilla, I. Attachment styles and well-being in adolescents: How does emotional development affect this relationship? *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2019, 16, 2554. [CrossRef]
  17. Nunes, C.; Hernando, Á.; Lemos, I.; Ayala-Nunes, L.; Oliva, C.R.; Coronado, C.M. Quality of life of Portuguese and Spanish adolescents. A comparative study between natives and immigrants. *Ciência. Saúde. Coletiva*. 2016, 21, 1137–1144. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
  18. Wallander, J.L.; Schmitt, M.; Koot, H.M. Quality of life measurement in children and adolescents: Issues, instruments, and applications. *J. Clin. Psychol.* 2001, 57, 571–585. [CrossRef]