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ABSTRACT

This article briefly analysis the Academic Achievement and Home-Environment in Economics of Higher Secondary Students in Namakkal District in TamilNadu. In Order to analyse the problem, the survey method was used. The population for the present study was economics students studying in higher secondary school in Namakkal District in Tamil Nadu. The random sampling technique was used to select a sample of 409 students. The data were analysed by using Mean, Standard Deviation and ‘t’ test. The finding reveals that there will be significant difference between the Home-Environment scores of the Boys and Girls students and the urban and rural school students.

INTRODUCTION

There have been a lot of controversial statements about the meaning of “Education”. It is rather very difficult to assess the real value of the term “Education”. Education has such a broad sense that it’s canvas cannot be limited within a definition of two or three lines. Education is the process of bringing out the innate potentialities inherent in a child. A child possesses some internal capacities which are made external through the weapon of “Education”. It is a continuous process from cradle to the grave. The term “Study” is used loosely by both teachers and students memurray defines it as “The work that is necessary in assimilation of ideas”........the vigorous application of the mind to a subject for the satisfaction of a felt need”. “Study” is the controlled mental activity working towards the realization of a goal.
ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Research on academic achievement of young students (Komarraju, Karau & Schmeck, 2008), provides no reliable and consistent indication concerning the extent of creativity, age and gender on academic achievement. A search on academic achievement studies revealed that various variables had been identified as correlates of academic achievement (Kutnick, & Layne, 2008). Research has also suggests that academic achievement can be predicted through creativity testing (Hirsh Peterson, 2008).

STUDIES CONDUCTED ON HOME ENVIRONMENT

Today’s modern society expects everyone to be a high achiever. The key criteria to judge one’s true potentialities and capabilities is perhaps scholastic /academic achievement. Academic achievement has become an index of a child’s future. Therefore, it is putting a great pressure on the minds of children and their parents. This scholastic achievement is a function of cognitive and non-cognitive aspects of personality, and is the resultant of various factors like personal, social, economic and other environmental factors. Research studies have proved that a good, supportive environment in home, school and neighborhood could enhance a child’s scholastic achievement.

‘Family being the first and major agency of socialization has great influence and bearing on the development of the child. It has been shown by various studies that most of the children who are successful /great achievers and well adjusted come from the families where sustaining wholesome relationships exist. So, it is the home which sets the pattern for the Child’s attitude towards people and society, aids intellectual growth in the child and supports his aspirations and achievements. A highly significant positive relationship between the variables of academic achievement and family scores has been assessed (Shaha and Sharma, 1984). Studies have revealed that high home environment groups achieved greater success than middle and low home environment groups (Jagannathan, 1986). It has also been reported that punishment aspect of home environment has negative impact on achievement among girls. Other aspects of home - environment viz. Permissiveness, control, protectiveness, conformity, deprivation of privileges, nurturance and reward were not significantly related. She concluded that if proper system of reward and punishment is followed, children shall certainly perform well in school (Pandey, 1985). It has also been reported that a positive affective
relationship between parents and children increases the likelihood that the child will initiate and persist in challenging and intellectual tasks. Positive and affective relationship is likely to get hampered when control and punishment exist beyond optimum limits.

**Jagpreet Kaur (2009)** has taken “Home Environment and Academic Achievement as Correlates of Self-concept among Adolescents”. The present study is an attempt to explore academic achievement and home environment as correlates of self-concept in a sample of 300 adolescents. The results of the study revealed self-concept to be positively correlated with academic achievement, though not significantly so. A significantly positive relationship of home environment components of protectiveness, conformity, reward, and nurturance with self-concept is revealed, thereby meaning that use of rewards and nurturance from parents should be done for positive self-concept development among adolescents. However, the correlation of social isolation, deprivation of privileges and rejection components of home environment is significantly negative with self-concept among adolescents indicating that for positive self-concept development among adolescents, there should be less or no use of social isolation, deprivation of privileges and rejection. The study has implications for educationists and parents as well.

**Juan J. Dolado and Eduardo Morales (2009)** have studied “Which factors determine academic performance of Economics Freshers? Some Spanish Evidence”. This paper analyses the impact of several factors potentially affecting academic performance of first-year undergraduates (fresher) in Economics at Universidad Carlos III de Madrid during 2002-2005. Outcomes are the grades obtained in three core subjects which differ substantially in their requirements of math skills. Our main finding is that those students who completed a technical track at high school tend to perform much better in math-intensive subjects than those who followed a social sciences track and that the latter do not perform better in subjects where prior training in economics is bound to be helpful.

**HYPOTHESES**

The investigator formulated the following hypotheses for the present study.

1. Economics students significantly differ among themselves in respect of their of academic achievement.
2. Boys and girls significantly differ in their means home environment scores,
3. Students of the government and private schools significantly differ in their means home – environment scores.
4. Students of the urban and rural schools significantly differ in their means home – environment scores.
5. There is a significant relationship between academic achievement and home – environment.
6. There is a direct association between academic achievement and home – environment.
7. The academic achievement is the effect of home – environment.
8. The independent variables selected are the discriminate variables to differentiate the achievement levels of students.

SAMPLE DESIGN

Tamil Nadu is one of the 28 states in the Indian Union. The present study was conducted in the Namakkal educational district in state of Tamil Nadu. In the Namakkal Educational District there are 29 private schools and 30 government schools. Out of these 59 schools, only in 39 schools economics is offered as a subject under academic stream. Therefore, the Global number of economics students studying in these 39 schools constitutes the Global population for the present study which is 918 for the academic year 2010-2011. Table 1 shows the distribution of population and subjects of the samples for the final study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>44.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>44.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>44.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAMPLE OF THE STUDY

In consideration of the objectives given above, the investigator has adopted the following procedures.

(i) Random sampling technique has been used in the selection of the schools.
(ii) Cluster sampling techniques has been used in the selection of subjects form a particular school.
(iii) 44.55% of the population was selected for the sample.

Out of the 39 schools offering economics only under academic stream, 14 schools were selected for the present study. All the students studying economics in these 14 schools were selected as the subjects of the sample for the final study.

TOOLS USED IN THE STUDY

The following tools have been used to collect the data regarding the above variables.

1. An achievement test in economics was constructed and validated by the investigator himself to collect data regarding the academic achievement. The test was constructed for XI standard students on basis of the new syllabus prescribed during 2010 – 2011 by the Tamil Nadu Government based on the New Education Policy (1986).

2. The economics interest questionnaire constructed and validated by Muthumanickam (1992), “Study on academic achievement of students of higher secondary economics group in relation to their reasoning ability, socio-economic status and interest in Commerce” has been used as a tool in the present study. Hence the investigator has decided in favour of this tool for use in the present study.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION:

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS - HOME-ENVIRONMENT SCORES

Table 2 furnishes the scores in the mean and standard deviation scores of the home-environment scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Levels of Achievement</td>
<td>High-achievers</td>
<td>23.78</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average-achievers</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low-achievers</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>21.78</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>23.19</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Types of Management</td>
<td>Students studying in</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>government schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students studying in</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>government schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 reveals that the home-environment score of girls is higher (23.19) than that of boys (21.78). Moreover, the mean home-environment score of rural students is higher (23.63) than that of urban students (22.14).

DIFFERENTIAL ANALYSIS – HOME-ENVIRONMENT

Sex and Home-Environment

Table 3 furnishes the scores in the home environment of boys and girls students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>21.78</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.18^s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>23.19</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S - Significant

Table 3, it is inferred that the mean home-environment scores of boys and girls and results of the ‘t’ test. The obtained ‘t’ value is 2.18 which is lower that the scale value of 2.57 to be significant at 0.01 level of significance therefore, the null hypothesis is retained and the research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that home-environment of boys and girls are not statistically different and in the present study sex is not found exert any influence on home-environment.

HYPOTHESIS TESTED

There will be significant difference between the Home-Environment scores of the Boys and Girls students.

Based on the analysis of data (With reference to table 3) the null hypothesis is retained and the research hypothesis is rejected.

Type of Management and Home-Environment

Table 4 furnishes the home-environment scores of the government and the private school students.
Table 4
Home-environment mean scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Type of Management</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S – Not Significant

Table 4 reveals the t value of 0.07, which is not significant at 0.01 level of significance. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained and the research hypothesis is rejected. It is therefore, interred that the home-environment of the students of the government and private schools is not statistically different and in the present study the type of management of schools is not found to exert any influence on home-environment.

HYPOTHESIS TESTED

There will be significant difference between the Home-Environment scores of the Government and Private school students.

Based on the analysis of data (With reference to table 4) the null hypothesis is retained and the research hypothesis is rejected.

Location of the School and Home – Environment

Table 5 furnishes the home-environment scores of urban and rural school students.

Table 5
Home – environment mean scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>σ</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>49.73</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.52&lt;sup&gt;S&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>48.29</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S - Significant

The home-environment means scores of the urban and rural students were compared and obtained t value of 2.52 is less than the table value of 2.57 to be significantly at 0.01 level significance (Table 5). Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, in the present study it is found that home-environment of urban and rural students are not statistically different.

HYPOTHESIS TESTED

There will be significant difference between the Home-Environment scores of the urban and rural school students.
Based on the analysis of data (With reference to table 5) the null hypothesis is retained and the research hypothesis is rejected.

SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER STUDY

(i) A similar study involving the students of other districts of Tamil Nadu may be undertaken.

(ii) A similar study involving the students belonging to the science group may be made.

(iii) A similar study involving other psychological variables such as motivation reasoning ability etc., may be made.

(iv) A similar study involving other self-related factors such as academic self-image, self-esteem etc., may be made.

(v) A study on the academic achievement of students at the higher secondary stage may be made with due emphasis on those factors which affect academic achievement.

(vi) A study of academic achievement in relation to the four needs related factors and the role of teachers in developing these factors may be undertaken.

(vii) A study of academic achievement in relation to innovative methods of teaching like CAI or programmed instruction can be made.

(viii) A study of academic achievement and its relationship to the development of social responsibility on the part of the students, may be made.

(ix) Development of a tool to measure social responsibility of school, college and university economics students, can be attempted.

(x) It can be extended to other schools such as Welfare Schools, Corporation Schools, Municipality Schools, Matriculation Schools and Central Board Schools.
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