

## A study of self-concept of rural and urban high school students

Dr. A.C. Lal Kumar

Assistant Professor for M.Ed., G.E.T. College of Education, Vidyasankara Puram Village, Paradarami Post, Gudiyattam Taluk,  
Vellore District, Tamil Nadu, India

### Abstract

The study aimed to assess the self-concept of high school students of rural and urban students. For the present investigation a sample of 200 high school students from the Vellore District are selected by the method of Random sampling technique. The data so collected was analyzed using mean, SD and t-test. The results reveal that respect to the gender, nature of institution, parental qualification, parental occupation and type of family shows that there no significant difference between the self-concept of rural and urban high school students.

**Keywords:** students of rural, urban, investigation, Vellore District, Random sampling technique

### 1. Introduction

Education is the key to all processes of development especially human development. Catalytic action of education in this complex and dynamic growth process needs to be planned meticulously and executed with great sensitivity. Education is fundamental to all-round development of human potential-material and spiritual. It refines sensitivities and perceptions that contribute to national cohesion, a scientific temper and independence of mind and spirit thus furthering to goal of socialism, secularism and democracy enshrined in our contribution.

Education is the main tool in the hands of man through which he enables himself to meet the various challenges of the life. It is a unique feature of human society which enables the human beings, not only to distinguish between the civilized and uncivilized, but also help them to achieve what otherwise remains unachieved. India has witnessed phenomenal development in education since independence. The overall literacy rate has gone up significantly during this period. It is the teacher with sufficient degree of mental health who can maintain the twin requisites of teaching-learning situations, healthy interactions in the classroom and healthy participation by students in lessons.

#### 1.1 Self Concept

Self-concept is often defined not so much in terms of what we think of ourselves as in terms of what we think, others think of us. Self-concept works like a mirror; we look at other people to see ourselves. If we think they think we are valuable, we think we are valuable; if we think they think we are deficient, we think we are deficient. Obviously, this definition has direct implications for teachers. Teachers who send clear, positive messages to their students are likely to enhance student's self-concepts, while teachers who berate their students may diminish their sense of self-worth. Teachers' criticism can damage students' self-concepts.

Self-concept theorists promote self-concept as the most important and focal object within the experience of each individual because of its primacy, centrality, continuity and

ubiquity in all aspects of behavior. Bakadorova *et al.* (2009) [1] was prompted to acknowledge that only man has the ability to objectify himself, to stand apart from himself and consider what he is and what he would like to do and become. Nguyen, Hong T.; Scott, Amy N. (2008) [8]. Sees man as transcending all other forms of living beings since only he is the being actually aware of it. Huang, Chiungjung, (2011) [5]. Also claims self-awareness as the fundamental characteristics and evolutionary novelty of Homo sapiens. This self-awareness places considerable implications on human experiences since it involves a search for the meaning of life itself. Man's conception of himself influences his choice of behaviours and his expectations from life. According to Hattie (1992), Self-concept has typically been defined in terms of the cognitive appraisal one makes of the expectations, descriptions, and prescriptions that one holds about one's self. Huitt (1998) also added that, self-concept is a person's perceptions of his or her own strengths and weaknesses. There are three aspects of self-concept which are; self-image (of what the person is), ideal self (what the person wants to be), and self-esteem (what the person feels about the discrepancy between what she/he is and what she/he would like to be) (Lawrence 1996) [6].

#### 1.2 Statement of the Problem

The problem chosen for the study may be stated as "A Study of self-concept of rural and urban high school students.

#### 1.3 Sample of the Study

Normative survey method is adopted for the present study. For the present investigation a sample of 200, out of 200 sample rural are 108 and 102 urban high school students were selected from the Vellore District are selected by the method of random sampling.

#### 1.4 Statistical Techniques Used

The investigator used the statistical techniques, Mean, SD and 't' test to accept or reject hypotheses

### 1.5 Operational Definitions of Key Term Used

Self-concept Self- Concept, in the present study, means the individual's view of himself. Self-concept can be defined as the mental image one has of oneself. It is the individual's evaluation of various aspects of the self and his ideas about himself. In simple terms, self-concept is the concept of one's own self.

### 1.6 Tool Used In the Present Study

Self-Concept by Dr. (Miss) Mukta Rani Restogi, National Psychological. New Delhi.

### 1.7 Description of the Tool

Self-concept can be described as the mental image one has of oneself. This image of course may be composed of a host of attributes. There are many attributes that define our images of ourselves, physical appearance, wit, charm, religiousness, ethnicity, sociability, success, etc. The scoring is based on 5,4,3,2 and 1.

## 2. Objectives of the Study

1 To find out whether there is significant difference between the following sub samples with respect to self-concept of rural and urban high school students

- Gender : Male/Female
- Nature of Institution : Government/ Private/Aided
- Parental Qualification : School Education/College Education
- Parental Occupation : Self Employ/Government employ
- Type of family : Nuclear family/Joint family

### 2.1 Hypotheses of the study

1. There is no significant difference between the following sub-samples with respect to the self-concept of rural and urban high school students

- Gender : Male/ Female
- Nature of Institution : Government/ Private / Aided
- Parental Qualification : School Education/College Education
- Parental Occupation : Self Employ/Government employ
- Type of family : Nuclear family/ Joint family

### 2.2 Descriptive Analysis

**Table 1:** 't' value of Rural and Urban high school Students of Self Concept towards Gender

|       | Sub sample | N  | M     | SD    | 't' Value |
|-------|------------|----|-------|-------|-----------|
| Rural | Male       | 57 | 34.68 | 11.43 | 1.45 NS   |
|       | Female     | 51 | 31.92 | 7.75  |           |
| Urban | Male       | 51 | 31.92 | 9.17  | 0.14 NS   |
|       | Female     | 61 | 32.13 | 9.11  |           |

From the table 1 it is inferred that 't' value of male and female of rural and urban high school students is found to be 1.45 and 0.14, which is not significant at 0.05 level as it is lower than the table value of 1.97. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected, it is inferred that

both male and female rural and urban high school students do not differ significantly towards self-concept.

**Table 2:** 't' value of Rural high school Students of Self Concept towards Nature of Institution

|       | Sub sample | N  | M     | SD    | 't' Value |
|-------|------------|----|-------|-------|-----------|
| Rural | Government | 40 | 34.87 | 12.61 | 1.35      |
|       | Private    | 32 | 31.40 | 8.04  | NS        |
|       | Government | 40 | 34.87 | 12.61 | 0.56      |
|       | Aided      | 36 | 33.47 | 7.76  | NS        |
|       | Private    | 32 | 31.40 | 8.04  | 1.07      |
|       | Aided      | 36 | 33.47 | 7.76  | NS        |

From the table 2 it is inferred that 't' value of government vs private, government vs aided and private vs aided of rural high school students which is not significant at 0.05 level as it is lower than the table value of 1.97. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected, it is inferred that government vs private, government vs aided and private vs aided of rural high school students do not differ significantly towards self-concept.

**Table 3:** 't' value of Urban high school Students of Self Concept towards Nature of Institution

|       | Sub sample | N  | M      | SD    | 't' Value |
|-------|------------|----|--------|-------|-----------|
| Urban | Government | 30 | 103.50 | 38.98 | 0.14      |
|       | Private    | 46 | 101.89 | 40.94 | NS        |
|       | Government | 30 | 103.50 | 38.98 | 0.81      |
|       | Aided      | 36 | 101.02 | 41.60 | NS        |
|       | Private    | 46 | 101.89 | 40.94 | 0.43      |
|       | Aided      | 36 | 101.02 | 41.60 | NS        |

From the table 3 it is inferred that 't' value of government vs private, government vs aided and private vs aided of urban high school students which is not significant at 0.05 level as it is lower than the table value of 1.97. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected, it is inferred that government vs private, government vs aided and private vs aided of rural high school students do not differ significantly towards self-concept.

**Table 4:** 't' value of Rural and Urban high school Students of Self Concept towards Parental Qualification

|       | Parental Qualification | N  | M     | SD    | 't' Value |
|-------|------------------------|----|-------|-------|-----------|
| Rural | School education       | 56 | 32.50 | 8.62  | 0.95      |
|       | College education      | 52 | 34.32 | 11.16 | NS        |
| Urban | School education       | 58 | 32.13 | 9.31  | 0.34      |
|       | College education      | 54 | 31.92 | 8.95  | NS        |

From the table 4 it is inferred that 't' value of school education and college education of rural and urban high school students is found to be 0.95 and 0.34, which is not significant at 0.05 level as it is lower than the table value of 1.97. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected, it is inferred that both the school education and college education of rural and urban high school students do not differ significantly towards self-concept.

**Table 5:** 't' value of Rural and Urban high school Students of Self Concept towards Parental Occupation

|       | Parental Occupation | N  | M     | SD    | 't' Value |
|-------|---------------------|----|-------|-------|-----------|
| Rural | Self-employ         | 51 | 33.11 | 11.19 | 0.25      |
|       | Government employ   | 57 | 33.61 | 8.72  | NS        |
| Urban | Self-employ         | 54 | 32.46 | 8.67  | 0.37      |
|       | Government employ   | 58 | 31.68 | 9.54  | NS        |

From the table 5 it is inferred that 't' value of self employ and government employ of rural and urban high school students is found to be 0.25 and 0.37, which is not significant at 0.05 level as it is lower than the table value of 1.97. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected, it is inferred that both the self employ and government employ of rural and urban high school students do not differ significantly towards self concept.

**Table 6:** 't' value of Rural and Urban high school Students of Self Concept towards Type of family

|       | Type of family | N  | M     | SD    | 't' Value |
|-------|----------------|----|-------|-------|-----------|
| Rural | Nuclear        | 53 | 34.06 | 11.93 | 0.69      |
|       | Joint          | 55 | 32.72 | 7.58  | NS        |
| Urban | Nuclear        | 55 | 32.87 | 9.02  | 0.91      |
|       | Joint          | 57 | 31.22 | 9.17  | NS        |

From the table 6 it is inferred that 't' value of nuclear and joint of rural and urban high school students is found to be 0.69 and 0.91, which is not significant at 0.05 level as it is lower than the table value of 1.97. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected, it is inferred that both the nuclear and joint type of family of rural and urban high school students do not differ significantly towards self concept.

### 2.3 Major Findings of the Study

- It is inferred that both male and female of rural and urban high school students do not differ significantly towards self concept.
- It is inferred that government vs private, government vs aided and private vs aided of rural high school students do not differ significantly towards self concept.
- It is inferred that government vs private, government vs aided and private vs aided of urban high school students do not differ significantly towards self concept.
- It is inferred that both the school education and college education of rural and urban high school students do not differ significantly towards self concept.
- It is inferred that both the self employ and government employ of rural and urban high school students do not differ significantly towards self concept.
- It is inferred that both the nuclear and joint type of family of rural and urban high school students do not differ significantly towards self concept.

### 3. References

1. Bakadorova, Olga Raufelder, Diana. The Mediating Role of Socio-Motivational Support in the Association between Individual School Self-Concept and Achievement Motivation amongst Adolescent Students. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*. 2009; 29(3):347-366.
2. Best John W, Khan James V. *Research in Education*, Tenth Edition, New Delhi. Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd. 2008.
3. Garrett, Henry, Wood Worth RS. *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, Surjeet Publications Ltd, New Delhi, 2008.
4. Guilford JP. *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education* New York, Mc Graw Hill Book Company Inc, 1956.
5. Huang, Chiungjung. Discriminate and Incremental Validity of Self-Concept and Academic Self-Efficacy: A Meta-Analysis. *Educational Psychology*. 2011; 32(6):777-805.
6. Lawrence AS. Self-Concept and Achievement Motivation of High School Students. Online Submission, *Conflux: Journal of Education*. 1996; 1(1):141-146.
7. Lokesh Koul. *Methodology of Educational Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed) New Delhi, Vikas Publishing house Pvt. Ltd. 1990.
8. Nguyen Hong T, Scott Amy N. Self-Concept and Depression among Children Who Experienced the Death of a Family Member. *Death Studies*. 2008; 37(3):197-211.