Research Paper   **Education**

"Perception of School Environment Among Different Academic Achievers".A Study

Smt. A. V. S. PRASANNA	Faculty Member, Department of Education, Vikrama Simhapuri University, Nellore
P.SIVA	Lecturer, Seshachala teacher training college, Chittor.

KEYWORDS :

Introduction:

Perception: At any moment you are getting a mass of sensory impulses produced by the object and persons that surround you. They are stimulating several of your sense organs out of the mass of sensory impulses, a limited set of impulses are organized as 'one whole' this one whole or organized set of sensory impulses constitutes the object that you perceive. They do so in order to emphasize the organizational process in perception.

School Environment: Education is based on the psychological factors and sociological factors. Student academic success is greatly influenced by the type of schools they attend. School factors include school structure, school composition and school climate.

Academic Achievement: Study implies investigation for the mastery of facts, ideas, or procedures that as yet unknown or only partially known to the individual says.   - **Crow and Crow**

Academic Ahiever: The Children's who are performing in academic programmes are called academic achievers. They are mainly divided into two groups.

High Academic Achievers: High Achievers are those who achieve a goal. In school, a high achiever would be student who gets high marks, good grades. They do the work that is required and do it well. They tend to be well-organized, with good time management skills, which is why turn in neat and tidy work on time. They also tend to be well-behaved, adjusting well to the classroom environment and participating.

Low Academic Achievers: The term "low achievers" sometimes refers to those children IQ levels lower than average but not low enough to categorize them as learning disabled or mentally disabled. Potentially, this category can include up to half of the children in a given school or classroom. However, this does not cover all low-achieving students. Some children who fall into the low-achievement category actually have above-average, even high, intelligence levels as determined by standardized tests; however, they become bored with the regularized presentation of learning materials because they have exceeded those milestones.

2. Related study:

prakash chandra jena (2013), Effect of smart class room learning environment on academic achievement of high achievers and low achievers of science in rural. The present study is an experimental one and conducted in jalandhar district of Punjab. The investigators has taken "60" secondary schools students from royal convert school by using simple random sampling technique. For conducting experiment the investigator has used two group randomized pre-test and post-test design for collecting of data the investigator has used an achievement constructed and standardized by the investigator and t-test has also used for analysis and interpretation data. The result of the study reveals that smart class learning environment is better to teach both low achievers and high achievers than traditional class.

3 Variables of the study: Variables are attributes or qualities which exhibits differences in magnitude and which very along some dimension. The dependent variable for the study is environment awareness contain six areas i.e., creative simulation, cognitive encouragement,

acceptance, permissiveness, rejection and control in the present study gender, parental education and student residence are used as demographic variables.

Objectives of the present study:

To study the level of perception of school environment among IX class students under different dimensions i.e. Creative simulation, Cognitive encouragement, Acceptance, Permissiveness, Rejection & Control raring.

To analyze the significant differences among Gender, locality, management, of the student of IX class students in their perception of school environment.

Hypotheses:

There is no significance difference between under different dimensions of perception of school environment among IXth class students i.e. Creative simulation, Cognitive encouragement, Acceptance, Permissiveness, Rejection & Control

There is no significant difference among Gender, locality, management, of IX class students in their Perception of School Environment

Tool selected for present study scoring procedure: For the present study, the investigator adopted the school environment inventory (SEI) developed and standardized by K.s.Mishra (2010) and use in the study the School Environment Inventory consists of 70 statements with 6 dimensions viz., creative simulation, cognitive encouragement, acceptance, permissiveness, rejection and control ranging.

Sample for the study: The investigator will be made a survey on sample of 200 high school students studying IX class student selected 5 schools. The investigator adopted the simple random sampling technique in the selection of the sample. The sample is distributes across the gender, 100 boys of IX class students

Method adopted for the present study: The investigator selected the NARMETIVE SURVEY research, because it is more suitable for the present study.

Statistical techniques used for this study: Mean, standard deviation, critical ratio (t-test) are the statistical techniques used for this study.

Analysis and interpretation of the data : This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the data according to the observers and hypotheses formulated, appropriate statistical techniques are used for the analysis of the data.

Table No-1
Showing the details of Means, S.D.'s and t-values of Perception of School Environment High and Low achievers.

DIMENSIONS (AREAS)	ACADEMIC ACHIEVERS					T-VALUE
	CATEGORY	N	MEAN	S.D		
Creative simulation	High achievers	28	52.89	7.48	4.87	0.64@
	Low achievers	41	49.78	12.35		

Cognitive Encouragement	High achievers	28	32.96	5.72	1.45	**2.26***
	Low achievers	41	29.68	6.18		
Acceptance	High achievers	28	27.36	6.03	1.43	1.64@
	Low achievers	41	25.02	5.55		
Permissiveness	High achievers	28	23.5	4.60	1.20	0.36@
	Low achievers	41	23.07	5.32		
Rejection	High achievers	28	16.64	5.78	1.37	1.49@
	Low achievers	41	18.68	5.30		
Control raring	High achievers	28	30.5	4.87	1.19	**2.06***
	Low achievers	41	28.05	4.84		

 *-significant at 0.05 level for the dimensions of cognitive encouragement and control rearing

@-not significant at 0.05 level for the dimensions of creative simulation, acceptance, permissiveness   and rejection

**-significant at 0.01 level
From the above table the mean values obtained for the dimensions in the perception of school environment among high and low academic achievers. The mean of high achievers are ''32.96'' ''30.5'', and for the low achievers are''29.68'', ''28.05'' for the dimensions of cognitive encouragement and control raring. This clearly indicates that the high achievers have more cognitive encouragement and control raring than low achievers regarding their perception of school environment.

The t- value obtained for the cognitive encouragement is ''2.26'' and for control raring ''2.06''.. And the t- values for creative simulation are ''0.64'', and acceptance is ''1.64'' and ''0.34''for permissiveness, and ''1.49''for rejection. Hence the predicted null hypothesis for the four dimensions i.e., creative simulation, acceptance, permissiveness and rejection were not significant and for "two" dimensions cognitive encouragement and control raring were significant. So hypothesis No-1 is accepted for the four dimensions i.e., creative simulation, acceptance, permissiveness and rejection ,and for the "two" dimensions cognitive encouragement and control raring were rejected.

Table No -2
 Showing the details of Means, S.D's and t –values of Perception of School Environmnt of Boys and Girls.

DIMEN-SIONS (AREAS)	Gender					T-VALUE
	CATE-GORY	N	MEAN	S.D		
Creative simulation	Boys	100	54.5	9.21	1.40	2.29*
	Girls	100	51.3	10.55		
Cognitive Encouragement	Boys	100	30.2	5.62	0.8	2.47*
	Girls	100	32.17	5.67		
Acceptance	Boys	100	26.5	5.93	0.84	0.17@
	Girls	100	26.64	5.96		
Permissiveness	Boys	100	22.9	4.74	0.69	1.81@
	Girls	100	24.15	4.95		
Rejection	Boys	100	20.5	6.97	0.88	1.58@
	Girls	100	19.11	5.39		
Control raring	Boys	100	27.3	6.72	0.83	1.78@
	Girls	100	28.78	4.86		

*-significant at 0.05 level to the dimensions of creative simulation and cognitive encouragement.

@-not significant at 0.05 level to the dimensions of Acceptance, permissiveness, Rejection and Control rearing

**-significant at 0.01 level
From the above table revealed the mean values obtained for the dimensions in the perception of school environment among the Boys and Girls. The mean value of the Boys is ''54.5'', and for Girls is ''51.5'' for creative simulation. This clearly indicates that the boys have more

creative simulation than girls. The mean value obtained for the Boys is ''30.17'' and for Girls is'' 32.17''for the cognitive encouragement. This clearly indicates the boys have less cognitive encouragement than girls. . Regarding their perception of school environment.

The t- values obtained for the creative simulation is ''2.29'' and for Cognitive encouragement is ''2.47''. And the t- values for Acceptance is'' 0.17'', and for Permissiveness is''1.8'', '' 1.58'' for Rejection, and'' 1.78''for Control raring. Hence the predicted null hypothesis for '' four'' dimensions i.e., Acceptance, Permissiveness, Rejection and Control rearing were not significant and for "two" dimensions i.e., Creative simulation and Cognitive Encouragement are significant. So hypothesis No-2 that there is no significant difference among boys and girls is accepted for the two dimensions i.e., Creative simulation and Cognitive Encouragement, and rejected for the four dimensions i.e., Acceptance, Permissiveness, Rejection and Control rearing.

Table No-3
Showing the details of Means, S.D's and t –values of Perception of School Environment of Urban and Rural.

DIMENSIONS (AREAS)	Locality of the school					T-VALUE
	CATE-GORY	N	MEAN	S.D		
Creative simulation	Urban	91	55.78	11.60	1.42	3.72**
	Rural	109	50.50	7.71		
Cognitive Encouragement	Urban	91	31.26	5.39	0.78	0.18@
	Rural	109	31.12	5.65		
Acceptance	Urban	91	28.46	6.03	0.74	4.74**
	Rural	109	24.95	6.09		
Permissiveness	Urban	91	24.33	5.14	0.48	3.04**
	Rural	109	22.87	4.56		
Rejection	Urban	91	22.10	5.47	0.83	5.05**
	Rural	109	17.91	6.26		
Control raring	Urban	91	27.36	6.55	0.85	1.41@
	Rural	109	28.60	5.26		

*-significant at 0.05 level to the dimensions of Creative Simulation, Acceptance, Permissiveness, and Rejection.

@significant at 0.05 level to the dimensions of Cognitive Encouragement and Control Rearing.

**-significant at 0.01 level
From the above table the mean values obtained for the dimensions in the perception of school environment among the urban students and rural students. The mean value obtained for the Urban students is "55.78", and for Rural students is'' 50.50 for creative simulation. This clearly indicates that the urban students have more creative simulation than Rural students. And the mean value obtained for the urban students is ''28.46'', and for rural students is'' 24.95'' for the Acceptance. This clearly indicates that the Urban students have more Acceptance than Rural students. And for permissiveness the mean value for Urban students is'' 24.33 ''and for Rural students is ''22.87''.This clearly indicates that the Urban students have more permissiveness than Rural students, And for Rejection the mean value of Urban students is ''22.09'' and for Rural students is ''17.91''. This clearly indicates that the urban students have more rejection than Rural students regarding their perception of school environment.

The t- values obtained for the creative simulation towards perception is''3.72''and for Acceptance is ''4.74''. Permissiveness is ''3.04'' and ''5.05'' is Rejection, this clearly indicates that there is significant at 0.05 level. And the t- values for cognitive encouragement are 0.18, and for control raring is'' 1.41'', it is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence

the predicted null hypothesis is significant for Creative simulation, Acceptance, Permissiveness, and Rejection   and for "two" dimensions i.e., Cognitive Encouragement and Control Rearing were not significant. So the hypothesis No-4 is accepted for Cognitive Encouragement and Control Rearing, and rejected for the Creative simulation, Acceptance, permissiveness and Rejection.

Table No-4
Showing the details of Means, S.D's and t –values of Perception of School Environment of Govt. and Private.

DIMENSIONS (AREAS)	ACDAMIC ACHIEVERS					T-VALUE
	CATEGORY	N	MEAN	S.D		
Creative stimulation	Govt.	110	52.71	10.34	1.41	0.30@
	Private	90	53.14	9.64		
Cognitive Encouragement	Govt.	110	31.21	5.47	0.79	0.06@
	Private	90	31.16	5.62		
Acceptance	Govt.	110	27.32	4.79	0.87	1.97*
	Private	90	25.61	6.99		
Permissiveness	Govt.	110	24.76	4.76	0.67	4.07*
	Private	90	22.03	4.60		
Rejection	Govt.	110	20.36	5.19	0.92	1.30@
	Private	90	19.16	7.32		
Control raring	Govt.	110	28.22	5.47	0.85	0.44@
	Private	90	27.84	6.40		

*-significant at 0.05 level to the Dimensions of Acceptance and permissiveness.

@significant at 0.05 level to the Dimensions of Creative Simulation, Cognitive Encouragement, Rejection and Control Rearing.

-significant at 0.01 level.
From the above table shows the mean values obtained for the dimensions in the perception of school environment among the Govt. schools and private schools. The mean value obtained for Govt Schools is "27.32", and for Private schools is "25.61" for Acceptance. This clearly indicates that the Govt. schools have more Acceptance than private schools. The mean value obtained for the Govt. schools is "24.76" and for private schools is "22.03"for the Permissiveness. This clearly indicates the govt. schools have more Permissiveness than private schools. Regarding their perception of School Environment.

The t- values obtained for the Acceptance are "1.97"and for Permissiveness is "4.07". And the t- value for creative simulation is 0.30, and cognitive encouragement is 0.06 and 1.30 for Rejection, and 0.484 is Control raring. Hence the predicted null hypothesis for four" dimensions i.e., Creative Simulation, Cognitive Encouragement, Rejection and Control Rearing are not significant and for "two" dimensions i.e., Acceptance and permissiveness are significant. So the hypothesis No-5 is accepted Creative Simulation, Cognitive Encouragement, Rejection and Control Rearing and rejected for Acceptance and permissiveness.

4. Major findings of the present study
There is significant difference between high and low achievers for the dimensions of cognitive encouragement and control raring. And no significant difference in creative simulation, acceptance, permissiveness, and rejection. Regarding their perception of school environment.

There is no significant difference between boys and girls for the dimensions of creative simulation, and cognitive encouragement. And no significant difference in acceptance, permissiveness, rejection, and control raring. Regarding their perception of school environment.

There is significant difference between High school students studying in Urban and Rural schools dimensions for the creative simulation, acceptance, permissiveness, and rejection. No significant difference in cognitive encouragement, and control raring. Regarding their perception of school environment.

There is significant difference between High school students studying in Govt. and private management schools dimensions of acceptance, and permissiveness. And No significant difference in creative simulation, cognitive encouragement, rejection, and control raring. Regard-

ing their perception of school environment.

CONCLUSION: Education is necessary for a country for its progress. The main problem in the field of Education is wastage and stagnation. An analysis of the results of the different board's examination showed that 55 percent of the candidates appearing for the high school examinations, and fail regularly every year. The parents, teachers and students are responsible for it. Environment of the school also plays a key role for the student's achievement. Association between teachers and students, teachers with teachers, is very important. New teaching methods and techniques have to implement in the class room for better achievement. So if the school environment is good ,students output also good. We can motivate the slow learners with good environment of the school. We can make the children's all round development keeping the school Environment cool.

REFERENCES;

1.   **ASIKHIA, O.A. (2010).**Students and teachers perception of the causes of poor academic performance in Ogun state secondary schools; *(European journal of social sciences, vol-no-13.)*

2.   **AGGARWAL, J.C.** Educational research – *(An introduction Arya Book Dept., New Delhi.)*

3.   **BHATIA K.K. AND NARANG, C.L.** principal of Education *(1968).(NCERT, New Delhi (1991.)*

4.   **BOGGIANO, A.K., MAIN, D.S. & KATZ, P. (1991).**Mastery motivation in boys and girls. The role of intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation.(*Sex roles, vol-25(9/10),pp-511-520.)*