

## **RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HOME ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR: A CASE OF SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL**

**Kamran Nawaz Chuhan<sup>1</sup>, Liaqat Hussain<sup>2</sup> & Asia Gul<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>M. Phil Scholar, Qurtuba University, Dera Ismail Khan, Pakistan

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Education & Research, Gomal University, D. I. Khan

<sup>3</sup>Teacher, University Public School, Gomal University, D. I. Khan

### **ABSTRACT**

*This study was conducted to investigate the relationship of home environment with social behavior of the secondary school students in District Dera Ismail Khan (D.I.K). Home environment plays a vital role in the process of Social Development. All the male secondary level students of Government schools in District D.I.K were the population of the study. 600 male science students of the 10<sup>th</sup> class from 12 selected schools was the sample of the study. Questionnaire related with home environment was constructed after going through literature review. Similarly, in order to know about the social behavior, social distance scale was developed. Questionnaire and social distance scale were made valid and reliable. Five null hypotheses were tested to investigate the relationship between home environment and social behavior of the students. Pearson product moment correlation was used for the analysis of collected data. Findings showed that no significant relationship existed between home environment and social behavior. Therefore, it was concluded that all the variables of the study have no significant relationship with social behavior.*

**Keywords:** *Home environment, social behavior, Factors (sociological, psychological & economic).*

### **INTRODUCTION**

A baby born to the parents is gifted with instinct. The prominent instinct is imitation. The baby imitates mother, father, and those who get closer. As the baby grows the faculty of memory helps further imitation. The home has immediate influence on the growth and development. The psychologists have explained the relationship of family condition on mind of the students particularly at their formative phases of life. If there is continuous clash of conflict between husband and wife and any other member of family and this clash is constant such homes are called broken homes. The situation adversely affects the mind of students. If such uproar is continuous, it creates mental disease and disorder among the

youngsters. It affects receptivity and retention of students because of instability of the mind (Kundu, 1989).

Students adopt manner, behavior and relationship from the parents. This serves as the foundation for the growth of their personality. This pattern of life persists throughout life. At Secondary level they have the trailing of this reservoir in their psyche. We can understand that the students have this adaptation. At secondary level the students have direct interaction with their fellows. There is a process of transformation. This study is an attempt to project this natural phenomenon so that it can be helpful for the teachers in understanding the personality traits.

### **Objectives of the study**

The main objectives of the study were to:

- Identify the relationship between home environment and social behavior of the students at secondary level in District D. I. Khan.
- Find out the relationship between educational factor of home environment and social behavior of the students at secondary level in District D. I. Khan.
- Investigate the relationship between sociological factor of home environment and social behavior of the students at secondary level in District D. I. Khan
- Discover the relationship between psychological factor of home environment and social behavior of the students at secondary level in District D. I. Khan
- Explore the relationship between economic factor of home environment and social behavior of the students at secondary level in District D. I. Khan

### **Null hypotheses**

1. There is no significant relationship between Home Environment and social behavior of the students.
2. There is no significant relationship between Educational factor of Home Environment and social behavior of the students.
3. There is no significant relationship between Sociological factor of Home Environment and social behavior of the students.
4. There is no significant relationship between Psychological factor of Home Environment and social behavior of the students.
5. There is no significant relationship between Economic factor of Home Environment and social behavior of the students.

**Significance of the study**

The study is significant in many aspects. It will throw light on relationship of home environment with social behavior which is source of inspiration for the teachers, researchers and educationists. The stake holders may take step for the improvement in social behavior of the students at secondary level. The study uncovers the social problems of students and will be helpful to improve the quality of secondary education.

**Limitations**

There are many instruments like interviews, observation, surveys etc to investigate the relationship of home environment with social behavior of the students but the researcher used only the questionnaire and social distance scale for this purpose as it was suitable in terms of economy and availability.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

We have to understand the nature, structure and function of Home Environment to find relationship between home environments and social behavior. The parents nourish their children out of love and affection. The level of economic development is also important. This aspect of life-biological and psychological has ever lasting effect on human personality. The children, male and female, imitate the behavior of their parents, speech, language, jargons, terminology, emotions and sentiments. In fact, behavior traits are so ingrained that these are perennial in human personality. In interaction with their fellows in the school, there is a process of transformation through interaction and adaptation. Students at secondary school level depict their behavior.

The research scholars have explained the importance of Home Environment and have proved that it can influence their personality. Family relationships have great effect on the young person's attitude formulations (Parish, Dostol & Parish, 1981). It is also observed that some families provide unpleasant atmosphere which influences their children very badly (Ballatine, 1993). The parent's relationship directly influences the children to such an extent that they reflect it through their attitude and behavior. The children who belong to such families in which parents share love with each other without any conflict are best adjusted children (McMillan & Hilton Smith, 1982).

The level of intelligence is directly proportional to the atmosphere of the home. The home environment plays a fundamental role in the development of child

personality. The child repeatedly interacts with the family and is constantly affected by the entire environment that surrounds it. It was established that a close emotional affiliation between parents and the child affects the inculcation of well-organized emotional relationship. Negation and broken homes in the shape of parting, divorce and death of a parent or denial of advantages of civil liberties, punishment, threats, disgrace and meager socioeconomic situation also influence the social modification and conduct of the child (Kundu, 1989).

The emotional climate of home is an influencing agent. The aspect which is related with sociological condition is another important area. The parents as motivators are also changing agent in bringing positive change in their children. Facilities provided by the parents is another important factor also. Those elements which are essential regarding the physical aspect of the individuals have their own place. The atmosphere where love and affection, peace of mind, serenity, care, and self-respect prevails has soothing relationship with the individual's performance (Krashen, 2005). The term social behavior comprises on two words social and behavior: Social means interaction of one species with other species. The features of an individual among the group and the features of group consciously with individual, whether both know it or not.

Behavior means manifestation of one or all activates of one with other along with environment is known as behavior. It can be in the form of reaction or response to something else. It can be latent or visible. The mutual understanding between parents and children bring fruitful results. The parents help their children in many ways. Some of them provide assistance and back up. They also observe the activities of their children (Bloom, 1984). Parent's help is famous for the assistance provided at appropriate occasion. Similarly the children are encouraged when they become sad or gloomy at certain matters. They are taught the lesson of endurance and patience which help them a lot in becoming a compromising soul. Similarly the lessons of morality are infused by the parents by giving them awareness to differentiate between evil doing and right conduct. In the process of motivation, the ambition of the family also plays a significant role (Saini, 1977).

The students who are provided such kind of atmosphere which is good for doing daily activities perform well. Their parents also try to provide those opportunities which are suitable. The schools in which the students get quality education play vital role in the performance of the students (Ginsburg, G. S. & Bronstein, P. 1993). The rate of social interaction depends highly upon the relationship which is

framed during the early age. The affiliation grew stronger during the passage of time. The interaction in formative phase has strength too. The common pattern of knowing the opinion of the individuals in the particular group is to ask to give opinion about the members of the group. It will throw light on the rate of social interaction (Brown, 2004).

The techniques that are used to find out the rate of interaction are different at elementary level because the nature of relationship varies from time to time. The affiliation of the members of the group affects the rate of interaction in group in such a way that selected is chosen. Similarly, the process shows the rejected one's too (Coie & Dodge, 1983; Newcomb Bukowski, 1983). The responses are given numbers. The numbers are added then the total numbers clearly show the one who is not liked by majority and the one who has complicated nature. Similarly normal and reserve are identified. The process of selection or rejection based on numbers is suitable and they show their interest (Eder & Sanford, 1986).

As the child grows up, his place in the group affects his attitude plus his performance in the examination to such an extent that for instance, his popularity among the group becomes inversely proportional with his disruptive attitude (Coie & Dodge, 1998). However, it does not happen in Adolescence. Moreover, this popularity has pleasant relationship with performance in middle school (Ryan, 2001). Another important method of giving numbers to responses is also used. The process in which there is no restrictions or is limitless, better than the procedure in which options are specific or in a limit. The evaluation by using the technique is considered to be more suitable and reliable (Terry, 2000). Moreover, an individual can be chosen frequently by members of the group as his name has been written on the top (Cillessen & Bukowski, 2000).

It was established that to some extent aloofness is linked with low score in the rate of interaction in childhood and worried / unhappy signs are found in the youth (Moreno, 1951). The word peer group means small and close set of individuals working together with one another daily and is known as colleagues. There is an element of resemblance in the members of the same group. The attitude, habits, liking, disliking and points of views are almost same. They become ready to help each other in every thick and thin and become homogenous. They meet with each other frequently regarding their educational issues (Bandura, 1986).

Figure 1 Theoretical Framework



## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Population

All the students enrolled in different public secondary schools in District D.I.K were the target population of the study.

### Sample

A Cluster sample of 600 male students from 12 public schools of Dera Ismail Khan with 50 male students from each school was selected as the sample of the study.

### Instrument development

First of all related literature was reviewed. In the light of related literature a first instrument questionnaire which was divided in 4 sections related with home environment was constructed. Similarly the second instrument of research was a social distance scale which was developed through consensus with experts and literature review.

### Validation and Reliability of Instruments

Both the instruments were made valid and reliable through the experts of the field. The reliability of the questionnaire through Cronbach alpha method was 0.78 while in the case of social distance scale it was 0.79.

Reliability of Questionnaire	No. of items	Co-efficient of correlation	Cronbach alpha co-efficient
	28	0.76	0.78

Reliability of Social Distance Scale	No. of items	Co-efficient of correlation	Cronbach alpha co-efficient
	12	0.77	0.79

### Procedure

A survey was used for this study in 12 selected male public schools of Dera Ismail Khan. To know the home environment a questionnaire was distributed among the 50 male science students of 10<sup>th</sup> in each school. Similarly, to assess the social behavior it was required to constitute groups. The 50 students of each school were divided into 5 groups. In every group there were 10 students. Then they were asked to fill the social distance scale accordingly. After getting the responses of the students, data was collected carefully from each school. The information about social behavior was collected from the scores of social distance scale.

### DATA ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATIONS

The collected data was analyzed by using Pearson product moment correlation through SPSS

Table 1 Showing relationship of Home Environment and Social behavior of the secondary school students

Selected variables	No. of students	r
Home Environment	600	.087
Social Behavior	60	

The table 1 shows that no significant relationship ( $r = .087$ ) exists between Home Environment and Social Behavior of the secondary school students. Hence, null hypothesis that is there is no significant relationship between home environment and social behavior of the students at secondary level was accepted. It is

therefore, concluded that Home Environment and Social Behavior are not related with one another.

Table 2 Showing relationship of Educational factor of Home Environment and Social behavior of the secondary school students

<b>Selected variables</b>	<b>No. of students</b>	<b>r</b>
Educational factor of Home Environment	600	.044
Social Behavior	60	

The table 2 shows that no significant relationship ( $r = .044$ ) exists between Educational factor of Home Environment and Social behavior of the secondary school students. Hence, null hypothesis that is there is no significant relationship between educational factor of home environment and social behavior of the students at secondary level was accepted. It is therefore, concluded that educational factor of home environment and social behavior are not related with one another.

Table 3 Showing relationship of Sociological factor of Home Environment and Social behavior of the secondary school students

<b>Selected variables</b>	<b>No. of students</b>	<b>r</b>
Sociological factor of Home Environment	600	.084
Social Behavior	60	

The table 3 shows that no significant relationship ( $r = .084$ ) exists between Sociological factor of Home Environment and Social Behavior of the secondary school students. Hence, null hypothesis that is there is no significant relationship between sociological factor of home environment and social behavior of the students at secondary level was accepted. It is therefore, concluded that sociological factor of home environment and Social Behavior are not related with one another.

Table 4 Showing relationship of Psychological factor of Home Environment and Social behavior of the secondary school students



<b>Selected variables</b>	<b>No. of students</b>	<b>r</b>
Psychological factor of Home Environment	600	.048
Social Behavior	60	

The table 4 shows that no significant relationship ( $r = .048$ ) exists between Psychological factor of Home Environment and Social Behavior of the secondary school students. Hence, null hypothesis that is there is no significant relationship between psychological factor of home environment and social behavior of the students at secondary level was accepted. It is therefore, concluded that psychological factor of home environment and Social Behavior are not related with one another.

Table 5 Showing relationship between Economic factor of Home Environment and Social behavior of the secondary school students

<b>Selected variables</b>	<b>No. of students</b>	<b>r</b>
Economic factor of Home Environment	600	.076
Social Behavior	60	

The table 5 shows that no significant relationship ( $r = .076$ ) exists between Economic factor of Home Environment and Social Behavior of the secondary school students. Hence, null hypothesis that is there is no significant relationship between economic factor of home environment and social behavior of the students at secondary level was accepted. It is therefore, concluded that economic factor of home environment and social behavior are not related with one another.

## **DISCUSSION**

The aim of the study was to examine the relationship of Home environment with social behavior of the students. The results of this study show that no significant relationship exists between home environment and social behavior of the students. These findings do not match with the findings of (Cillesen & Rose, 2005). It indicates that social development of the individuals is not polished in our schools. The students must be given opportunities to exchange their point of views with one another (Boivin, 1995). Probably parents are also not conscious about this

important factor. It is also possible that psychological needs of the students are not fulfilled. Regional and racial prejudices may be the reason also. Similarly, in our schools focus of attention is only on intellectual development. So the social aspect of the students may be given due consideration.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

There are many factors which affect the social behavior. This study only focused on some of the factors outside school that influence the student's social behavior. To achieve this objective it is necessary for the educators to understand better about the factors that may contribute in the social development of students. The results show that home environment has no relationship with social behavior of the secondary school students which means that Home Environment and Social Behavior are not related with one another.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Findings show that no significant relationship exists between Home Environment and Social Behavior of the secondary school students. Therefore, stress may be given on social activities of the students. In order to bring improvement in social development, student centered teaching can play an important role in the social development of the individuals. Sports, excursion, debate, role-playing and other socio metric techniques may be used in bringing improvement. Family like spirits of cooperation may be infused during teaching learning experiences. Home environment is an important factor therefore researchers should explore other factors, which may influence social development.

### **REFERENCES**

- Ballatine, J. H. (1993). *The sociology of education. A systematic analysis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.*
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action. A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs: NJ. Prentice Hall.*
- Bishop, J. A. (1995). Peer acceptance and friendship. An Investigation Of Their Relation To Self-Esteem. *Journal of Early Adolescence*. 15(2): 476–489.
- Bloom, B. S. (1984). The search for methods of group introduction as effective a one to one tutoring. *Educational Leadership*, 41(1): 4-17.
- Boivin, M. (1995). Individual–group behavioral similarity and peer status in experimental play groups of boys. The Social Misfit Revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69 (2): 269–279.

- Brown, B. B. (2004). Adolescents' relationships with peers. *The handbook of adolescent psychology*. New York: Wiley 363–396.
- Cillessen, A. H., & Rose, A. J. (2005). Understanding popularity in the peer system. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14, 102–105.
- Cillessen, A. H., & Bukowski, W. M. (2000). Recent advances in the measurement of acceptance and rejection in the peer system. *Psychological science*
- Coie, J. D., Dodge, K. A., & Coppotelli, H. (1982). Dimensions of types of social status: A cross-age perspective. *Developmental Psychology*, 18(2): 557–560.
- Eder, D., & Sanford, S. (1986). The development and maintenance of interactional norms among early adolescents. *In Sociological studies of child development*. 12(2): 283–300.
- Ginsburg, G. S., & Bronstein, P. (1993). Family factors related to children's intrinsic/extrinsic motivational orientation and academic performance. *Child development* 64, 1461-1474.
- Krashen, S. (2005). The hard work hypothesis: Is doing your homework enough to overcome the effects of poverty? *Multicultural Education*, 12(4):16-19.
- Kundu, C. I. (1989). *Personality Development*, Sterling Publishers Private Limited.
- McMillan, D. W., & Hiltonsmith, R. W. (1982). Adolescents at home: An exploratory study of the relationship between perception of family social climate, general well-being and actual behavior in the home setting. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 11(1):301-315.
- Moreno, J. L. (1951). *Sociometry, Experimental Method and the Science of Society. An Approach to a New Political Orientation*. Beacon House: Beacon, New York.
- Newcomb, A. F., & Bukowski, W. M. (1983). Social impact and social preference as determinants of children's peer group status. *Developmental Psychology*, 19(2): 856–867.
- Parish, T. S., Dostal, J. W., & Parish, J. G. (1981). Evaluations of self and parents as a function of intactness of family and family happiness. *Adolescence*, 16(3): 203-210.
- Ryan, A. M. (2001). The peer group as a context for the development of young adolescents' motivation and achievement. *Child Development*, 72(2): 1135–1150.
- Saini, B. K. (1977). Academic achievement as a function of economic status and educational standard of parents. *Psychological Studies*, 22(3): 23-28.

Terry, R. (2000). Recent advances in measurement theory and the use of sociometric techniques, *Recent advances in the measurement of acceptance and rejection in the peer system*, 3(2): 220-225.