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**INTRODUCTION**

According to thinkers of ancient India, education is the ‘third eye’ of a person. It gives him insight into all affairs. It teaches him how to act justly and rightly. It leads him to the true significance of life. It removes darkness and shatters illusion. A person without education is really blind.

 The following is a traditional common saying in India.

 “Swedesh Pujyate Raja

 Divan Sarvatra Pujyata”

 A King is respected only in his kingdom while a learned man is worshipped everywhere.

 Gandhiji (1969-1948) gives the meaning of education as “By education I mean all round drawing out the best in child and man – body, mind and spirit”.

 How to draw out the best? Now the key question arises as to how the innate powers are to be brought out, developed, nourished and trained. Here comes the environmental factor which includes the family, the community neighborhood, the school, and the society. Thus, education means to provide the proper environment for the all round development of the individual.

 In the words of Rousseau, “Plants are developed by cultivation and men by education “. Education increases our fame. It makes us cultured and pure. Education nourishes us like a mother. It directs us to the proper path like a father. It guides us to reach out destination like a teacher. The “Upanishads” considers education as a means to salvation

Education is basically a process which is concerned with how the students develop as an individual and in group relations. Its objective is to prepare the individual for participation in society and it serves as a vehicle by which the culture of the group can be transmitted and perpetuated. Education is preparation for life. Education is experience. Education aims at developing the potential of the individual to maximum. It is an institutionalized and formal setup for the specific period. The quality of education we provide to our children depends to a large extent on the quality of teacher education we inject to our education system.

 Education in its wider sense is the total development of the personality of the learners rather than mere transmission of information by the teacher or the acquisition of knowledge by child. In this sense education consists of all those experience which affect the individual from birth till death. Thus education is a process by which an individual freely develop his self according to his nature in a free and uncontrolled environment. It is also the development of the individual according to his needs and demands of the society, of which he is an integral part.

 Reymont (1984) has remarked that “Education is the process of human being from infancy to maturity, the process whereby he adopts himself gradually in various ways to his physical, social and spiritual environment

Schools, the chief agency of formal education play the most signifaticant role in education. According to Dewey “The school is primarily a social institution-an affective agency in bringing the child to share in the inherited resources of the race and to use his own power for social ends”. The Education Commission1964-66 remarked, “The destiny of India is being shaped in her classroom”

 Coming to Kerala, schools are categorized generally into three viz., government, aided, and unaided schools. Government schools are managed and controlled directly by the government. Aided schools means a private schools which is recognized by and is receiving aid from the government. Unaided schools are managed by trust or individual under the government recognition. Appointment of teachers and other staff, salary, development of infrastructure facilities, etc come under the responsibility of the management only.

 One of the major informal agency of education is family. An infant begins his life under the fostering affection and care of his parents and other near and dear ones who are associated with his family. He tries to imbibe the habits, ideas and patterns of behavior from the family members especially parents. The term parental support has been widely used in the educational context. Parents can support their children’s schooling by attending school functions and responding to school obligations. They can become more involved in help their children improve their school work providing encouragement, arranging for appropriate study time and space, modeling desired behaviours, monitoring home work and actively tutoring their children at home.

 Outside the home, the parents serve as an advocate for the school. They can volunteer to help out with school actively or work in the class room or they can take an active role in the governance and decision making necessary for planning, developing, and providing an education for the communities children. The concept of parental involvement with the students and the school is vital one and can produce general reward for all concerned.

 The smooth functioning of the parental involvement is possible only in a healthy family atmosphere. In broken families children often denied opportunities to express their ideas, they often feel fear to ask doubts to parents. Hence children don’t get proper guidance from the parents.

 Educational development of children begins from home itself. Education does not begin with the learning of alphabet, but from the experience the child had in the home. A student spent more time with his parents than with his teachers. So the parents have an important role in moulding his behavior and academic achievement. The home environment, the education facilitates at home and parents attitude towards education and socio-economic status of parents, have profound influence on academic achievement. Socio-economic status is the level of indication of both social and economic achievement of an individual or group. Socio-economic status is major factor in educational achievement. This is determined by a few accepted factors like the educational, occupational economic, home, and social status of the parent. It is the position one occupies in the society by virtue of his home.

 Education has been grouped in to primary, secondary, and university education. Secondary education is that a kind of education which is given after primary education and before university education. Secondary education deals with the adolescence period of child’s development. Secondary education is the gateway to the opportunity and benefits of economic and social development. Secondary Education makes the first turning point in the academic life of the individual. At this stage children are equipped with necessary skills and information to manipulate in the higher education.

Education is important for the preservation and transmission of culture, and it is vital instrument for accelerating development in all spheres-political, economic and social of life.

**1.1**. **NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE**

Education builds the man so it builds the nation. Education prepares the future generation to take their due place in the society.

 Parenting is the most essential and enduring profession acknowledged by society. A parent develops and use the knowledge and skill required to plan for children, give birth to them and rear and care for them(Morrison 1978)

 A school is one of the most important formal agencies of education. The school is functioned as the conserver, transmitter, and promoter of cultural heritage of the society. School functioned as the promoter of secular, ethical, moral and spiritual values of the child.

 Recently, in Kerala, there has been a tremendous increase in the number of private school as the direct outcome of privatization. As a direct impact of globalization English Language has been gaining an upper hand throughout the world. Close on the heel of that, the upcoming private schools are more or less English median schools.

 While there is mushroom growth of private schools, we also witness a cut throat competition among these schools to maintain high success rate to provide adequate facilities and there by attract both parents and students to their fold. This fierce competition among private school has forced the government and aided schools also joining the race. But these schools which face severe financial and infrastructural problems along with a host of other problems always find it difficult to keep up the race. This is very much evident in the increasing number of students joining in the unaided schools and decreasing number of students getting admitted into the government and aided schools.

 There are also disparities in the curriculum provided by different type of schools. The net outcome of this is the production of students who differ in their quality. This is also threat to social cohesion and unity among the pupil. That means producing different type of education is against the principal of equality.

 There are number of factors effecting parental preference to schools viz, physical facilities, teacher related factors, instructional factors, administrative factors, disciplinary factors, transportation facilities, economic factors, following syllabus, etc. The parental pressure on choosing type of schooling is a topic of serious debate of these days. Schools can be classified into different types as per the syllabus they follow. It may be CBSE, ICSE, NCERT, SCERT syllabus etc. Plenty of arguments are raised for and against each of these syllabi. Parents are in dilemma, where his child is to be get admitted for schooling? This question makes the present study relevant and significant.

 By conducting this study, investigator aims to find out how much percentage of Professional College students comes out from different type schools, as per the syllabus they follow. Investigator also tries to give answer to layman, where his child is to be getting admitted for schooling?

 In the present education scenario the educators are engaging in hot discussion for the reformation and equalization of school curriculum. The investigator hopes that the study will be helpful for the educators for the formation of new curriculum.

 The investigator also study the influence of social economics status of family and perception of child about parental support, which gained during their secondary stage of education, to find out socio-economic status of family and parental support have any significant role in the education of the child.

 By conducting this study, the investigator hopes that the line of this research in this area can make a lot of significant contribution to guard the present education process, which is very competitive.

**1.2. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM**

**A RETROSPECTIVE STUDY OF PERCIEVED PARENTAL SUPPORT SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND SCHOOLING TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL COLLEGE STUDENTS DURING THEIR SECONDARY STAGE**

**DEFENITION OF KEY TERMS**

**1. Retrospective**: It means, thinking about or connected with something that happened in the past, i.e. a flashback. This study is concerned with the life of professional college students during their secondary stage.

**2. Perceived parental support:** It refers to perception of child about the availability of support from parents. Perceived parental support is the perceived, actual, instructional or emotional provision supplied different individuals about the provision of concern, understanding and assistance, demandingness, loving nature of their parenting

**3. Socio-economic status:** Socio-economic status(SES) is an economic and sociological combined total measure of a person’s work experience and of an individual’s or families economic and social position relative to other, based on income, education, and occupation

**4. Schooling type:** Schools are categorized in to three; government, aided, and unaided schools on the basis of management. Government schools are managed and controlled directly by state government. Aided school means, a private school which is recognized by and is received aid from the government. Unaided schools are managed by Trusts or individuals under the government recognition. Schools are also different as per the syllabus they follow. It may be SCERT, NCERT, CBSE, or ICSE.

**5. Professional college students:** It refers to the students studying for professional course in any professional college recognized by government. For the present study students of Government Medical College, Government Engineering College, National Institute of Technology (NIT), Indian Institute of Management (IIM) were selected.

**6**. **Secondary stage**: Secondary stage refers secondary stage of education, a kind of education which is given after primary education and before university education.ie the period of 8th standard to 10th standard. In the present study, the investigator concerned with the schooling type, socio-economic status of family, perception of parental support which gained, during the secondary stage of professional college students.

**1.3.** **VARIABLES OF THE STUDY**

 The important variables measured and analyzed by the investigator in this research work are**,**

1.Perceived Parental Support

2. Socio-Economic Status

3. Schooling Type

**1.4. OBJECTIVES**

* Toanalyze the influence of parental support on getting entry to professional course.
* To find out the effect of socio-economic status on the academic achievement of professional college students.
* To find out how many percentage of professional college students came from government schools, aided schools or unaided schools.
* To find out how many percentage of professional college students followed SCERT, CBSE or other syllabus.

**1.5. METHODOLOGY**

The methodology adopted for the present study is outlined in the following sections

**1.5 (a). Sample**

 The samples of the study comprised of the professional college students representing 40 students from Government Medical College-Calicut, Government Engineering College-Kannur, National Institute of Technology (NIT)-Calicut, Indian Institute of Management (IIM)-Calicut. Stratified random sampling technique was used to select the representative group of final year professional college students.

**1.5 (b**). **Tools Used for the Study**

The investigator used the following tools for the present study.

1. Questionnaire of perceived parental support.
2. Socio-economic status scale.

**1.5 (C). Statistical Techniques Used for Analysis of Data**

* Percentage analysis

**1.6 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS**

 The present study is mainly intended to explore the perceived parental support, schooling type and socio-economic status of professional college students while they were study at secondary stage. For the purpose of the study the investigator prepared a questionnaire of perceived parental support and socio-economic status scale with the help of supervising teacher. The study conducted on sample 160 professional college students drawn by stratified random sampling technique from various professional colleges. Appropriate statistical techniques are used to analyze data. Therefore the investigator hopes that the findings of the study will be valid and generalizable to considerable extent.

Even though every attempt was made to make the study as precise and objective as possible certain limitation has crept in to the study.

Due to the limited time allotted the population of the study is limited to 160 professional college students gathered from four professional colleges of Kerala. Inspite of this limitation the investigator hope that the will yield valid findings leading to scientific and objective conclusion

**1.7 ORGANISATION OF REPORT**

 The report of the present study is organized in the following way,

Chapter 1 contains brief introduction, need and significant of the study, statement of the problem, definition of the key term, variable of the study, objectives, and scope and limitations of the study.

Chapter 2 includes theoretical overview of the variables, studies related to the variable and summary of review of related literature.

Chapter 3 presents methodology of the study in detail with description of tools used for data collection, sample for the study, data collection procedure, scoring and consolidation of data and the statistical technique used for analysis.

Chapter 4 describes the details of major statistical analysis of data, interpretation and discussion of data.

Chapter 5 presents major findings, educational implication of the study and suggestion for further research.

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

The role of review of related literature in a new research is very essential.”A summary of the writings of recognized authorities and of previous research provides evidence that the researcher is familiar with what is already known and what is still unknown and untested”(Best&Kahn,1993). It is a valuable guide to defining the problem, recognizing its significance suggesting promising data gathering devices, appropriate study design and source of data.

 “The keys to the vast store house of published literature may open door to source of significant problems and explanatory hypothesis and provide helpful orientation for definition of problem background for selection procedure and comparative data for interpretation of results. In order to be creative and original, one must be read extensively and critically as a stimulus to thinking” (Good, 1961).

The intention of the present study to assess the parental support, schooling type, socio economic status to find out if there exist any influence of parental support, schooling type and socio economic status on professional College students.

In this section investigator discussed the theoretical aspect of the variable, perceived parental support, socio economic status and schooling type and make more review of the previous studies. The review related literature has been presented under the following heads.

**2 .1**. **THEORETICAL OVERVIEW OF THE VARIABLE**

**2.1.1. .**PERCEIVED PARENTAL SUPPORT

**2.1.2.** SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS

**2.1.3.** SCHOOLING TYPE

**2.2. REVIEW RELATED LITERATURE**

**2.2.1** STUDIES RELATED TO PERCEIVED PARENTAL SUPPORT

**2.2.2** STUDIES RELATED TO SOCIO ECONOMICS STATUS

**2.2.3** STUDIES RELATED TO SCHOOLING TYPE

**2.1. THEORETICAL OVERVEW OF THE VARIABLE**

**2.1.1. Perceived parental support:**

Parenting is a complex dynamic process that affects both parent and child. A parent develops and uses the knowledge and skills required to plan for children, give birth to them and rear and care for them (Morrison,1978).Parenting is the most essential and enduring profession acknowledged by society. Thus parents must essentially learn to manipulate the environment for their children’s benefits, protecting them from social forces that conflict with their parenting philosophy and objectives. Parenting is the privileged responsibility of helping the child to reach the potentialities there by and contributing effectively to the society. Parents share the responsibility of bringing up their children in a manner. So that they become effective members of respective society. Whatever parents do with children to achieve this goal is broadly known as parenting.

 Parenting behavior is a specific, goal directed action, which has certain direct consequences for the child. In earlier research, parenting process in which children were the recipients of the parental action (Holden, 1983).A contemporary and holistic view is that parenting is a serious of reciprocal interaction between the parents and their children with the behavior of each participant affecting the behavior of the other (Chamberlain & Patterson,1995)

 Thus depending up on the socio-cultural milieu, parental belief system and child’s temperament, different context of interaction are created in which parents adopt suitable strategies to socialize children. Since these strategies remain fairly consistent across situations, they are generally referred to as parenting style.

 In Psychology, Baumrind’s conceptual model of parenting prototype is relatively more popular. Diana Baurmind conducted extensive observations and interviews with parents that resulted in the most well known and influential typological approach (Baumrind, 1971, 1978, 1989). Through multiple studies, Baumrind identified three primary parental topologies: Authoritative, Authoritarian, and permissive. Baumrind (1978) suggested that authoritative parents are warm and responsive, providing their children with affection and support in their explorations and pursuit of interest. These parents have high maturity demands (e.g. expectation for achievement) for their children but foster their maturity demands through bidirectional communication, induction (i.e. explanations of their behavior) and encouragements of independence. These parents might provide their children with a rationale for their actions and priorities. These parents secure high on measures of warmth and responsiveness and high on measures of control and maturity demands (Jacobi& Martin, 1983). They respect the Childs individuality, while at the same time stressing social values. They are loving, consistent, demanding and respectful and children’s independent decisions but they are firm in maintaining standards and willing to impose limited punishment. They explain the reasoning behind their stands and encourage verbal give and take. They combine control with encouragement. Their children feel secure in knowing that they are loved and in knowing what is expected of them.

 Baumrind (1978) suggested that authoritarian parents are neither warm or nor responsive to their children. They have high maturity demands for their children primarily because they are in tolerant of selfishness or in appropriate behavior. These parents are strict, expect obedience and assert power when their children misbehave. When socializing their children, authoritarian parents express their maturity demands and expectations through rules and orders, and do not communicate to their children the rationale behind these rules. These parents score high on measures of responsiveness, warmth and bidirectional communications (Maccoby&Martin, 1983). They try to make their children conform to a set of standard conduct, and they punish them forcefully for acting contrary to standard. They are more detached and less warm than other parents; their children tend to be more discontented, with drawn and distrustful.

 Baumrind (1978) suggested that permissive parents are moderate in their responsiveness towards their children’s need. These parents are excessively lax in their expectations for their children’s level of maturity and their tolerance of misbehavior. When socializing their children, permissive parents are usually dismissive and unconcerned. These parents score moderately high or measures of responsiveness and low on measures of maturity demands and control (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). They make few demands, allowing children to monitor their own activities as much as possible. They are noncontrolling, nondemanding and relatively warm, their children tend to be immature- the least self controlled and the least exploratory

 In review and reflection on the literature, (Maccoby and Martin, 1983) added a fourth dimension to the Baumrind typology; indulgent. They described indulgent parents as similar to permissive parents in their levels of control and maturity demands but different from permissive parents in their level of responsiveness, warmth and control.

 After constant documentation as this style, Baumrind (1991) factor analyzed data on these typologies and reduced parenting style in to two dimensions. Demandingness and responsiveness. Demandingness refers to the demands parents make on their children to become integrated in to the family and society. Aspects of parental demandingnesss include the extent to where parents hold maturity demands for their children, provides supervision and enact disciplinary efforts when needed (Baumrind,1991). Responsiveness refers to parental behaviours that intentionally foster individuality, self regulation and self assertion in their children. Aspect of parental responsiveness include the extent to which parents are sensitive towards and supportive of their children (Baumrind, 1991)

 The kind of parenting that seems to provide the right balance is still authoritative parenting.Childrens of authoritative parents, who balance firmness with love and respect, are often the most self reliant, self controlled and content.

Maccoby and Martin (1983) indicate that the parenting styles capture two important dimensions of parenting- (a) parental acceptance and parental supportiveness.(b)parental control and demandingness. Parental acceptance refers to the extent to which parents intentionally foster individually, self regulation, and self assertion by being attuned, supportive and acquiescent to children’s special needs& demands. Parental control refers to the claims parents makes on children to become integral in to the family by their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront child who disobeys.

A significant amount of work has been focus on the concepts of parental supportive behavior advocated by Rollins& Thomas (1979) using a wide variety of measures and research designs.E.C.Rhoner, R.P.Rohner,&Rolls (1980) view acceptance and rejection as two poles of a continnum. Acceptance is defined as the warmth, affection, care, comfort, concern, nurturance support or simply love that children experience from their parents. Rejection refers to the absence or significant withdrawal of these feelings and behaviours and by presence of a variety of physically or psychologically hurtful behaviours and affects parental rejection can be experienced by any combination of the four principal expressions namely, cold and unaffectionate, indifferent and neglecting, hostile and aggressive, and undifferentiated and rejection. On the other hand, parental acceptance can be shown physically, verbally, or symbolically supported by the use of culturally specific gesture.

Perceived parental support is the perception of instrumental or emotional provisions supported by the individuals about their parents. Emotional provisions are an opportunity to share and communicate with the individuals. Instrumental support refers to the available sources, guidance, and assistance or advice from the parents. Perceived parental support is defined in terms of the interpretations children make of their caregiver’s behaviours. Research suggest effectiveness of parental warmth and supportiveness in developing secure attachment and intimate parent-child relationship (Bowby,1980; Karavasilis, Doyole&Margolese,1999;Larson, Richards, Moneta & Holmback,1996) in making children autonomous, well adjusted, and socially competent(Baumrind,1991), Lamborn 1997, Parish& Mc Cluskey,1992; STEINBERG,darling&Fletcher,19950. A host of research studies have found a positive relationship between authoritative parenting style and student achievement (Baum rind, 1967; Lamborn, et al, 1991; Steinberg et.al, 1991). Buri et al (1998) demonstrated that parental authoritarian style was negatively correlated with self esteem where as the relationship was positive (late adolescent) self perception and authoritarian style with negative self perception. Recent research has shown a clear positive relationship between parental nurturance and self worth (Connelt, et al, 1997; Kitamura& suziki, 1993, Rodriguez, et al 1996.

Durkins (1995) cited three reasons why authoritative parenting might be related to positive child out comes. First, he suggests that authoritative parents provide a high level of emotional security that provides their children with a secure of comfort and independence and help them succeed in school. Second, he suggests that authoritative parents provide their children with a sense of awareness and understanding of their parents’ values, morals and goals. The transmission of these goals and values equips the students with tools needed to perform well in school. Third, he suggests that authoritative parents engage in bidirectional communication with their children. This communication styles nurtures skills in interpersonal relations and produces better adjusted children. These interpersonal skills help children succeed in school, both socially and academically.

A number of related studies have developed and tested multidimensional conceptualization and measures of parenting behaviours. Metzler, Biylan, Ary & Li (1998) employed a measure of six dimensions of family process-conflict, positive family relations, parental monitoring, parental rule making and consistent enforcement of rules and use of positive reinforcement. Similarly, Vazsonyi, Hibbert & Snidder (2003) confirmed a measure of six separate dimensions of parenting process; closeness, support, monitoring, communication, conflict and approval. The importance of multidimensional conceptualization and measurement of parenting is that it will enable the researchers to more fully examine the parenting processes

From a developmental perspective, parent-child congruence is considered as one of the important factor for effective parenting. Parental behaviours are most likely to produce designed outcomes. When they are perceived similarly by children and parents. Disagreement with parent-child perception increases with low parental warmth and coercive parental control (Aquilino, 1999; Rossi&Rossi, 1990) Congruence in parent child perception and interactions are considered as important factor for effective parenting and healthy child development (Tein, et.al, 1999). Children’s perceptions of incongruent parental behavior have been found related to low school adaptation, school achievement and self esteem.(John, Shukan &Collins,1991).

**2.1.2. Socio-economic status**

The word ‘status’ is Latin and it indicate the rank with in a social system or a sub system. And it is determined partially by the status of the social class to which an individual belongs and partially by his characteristics in terms of economic and cultural possession and including his contribution to society (Unni, 1987). The decision to which social class an individual belongs to depends up on a series of factor including income, occupation, accent, spending habits, residence, culture, leisure pursuit, education, moral attitude, and relationship with other individuals.

 Socioeconomic status is typically broken into three categories, high socioeconomic status middle socioeconomic status, low socioeconomic status to describe the three are of family or an individual may fall into. When placing a family or individual into one of this categories any or all of these variables (income, education and occupation).

 A family’s socioeconomic status is based on family income, parental education level, parental occupation and social status in the community (such as contact with in community, group associations, and community’s perception of the family).Note, Demarest, Reinsner, Anderson, Humphry, Farquhar, and Stein (1993). Families with high socioeconomic status often have more success in preparing their young children for school because they typically have access to a wide range of resources to promote and support young children’s development. They are able to provide their young children with high quality child care, books and toys to encourage children in various learning activities at home. Also they have easy access to information regarding their children’s held as well as social, emotional and cognitive development. In addition, families with high socioeconomic status often seek out information to help them better prepare their young children for school. Families with law socioeconomic status often lack the financial, social and educational supports that characterize families with high socioeconomic status. Poor families also may have in adequate or limited access to community resources that promote and support children’s development and school readiness. Parents may have inadequate skill for such activities as reading to and with their children, and they may lack information about childhood immunization and nutrition. Zill, Collins, Westand Hansen (1995) state that “low maternal educational and minority language status are most consistently associated with fewer signs of emerging literacy and greater number of difficulties in pre-schoolers”. Having inadequate resources and limited access to available resources can negatively affect family’s decisions regarding their young children development and learning. As a results, children from families with low socioeconomic status are at greater risk of entering Kindergarten unprepared than their peers from families with median or high socioeconomic status.

 Socioeconomic status is major factor in educational achievement. This is determent by a few accepted factors like the educational, occupational and economic status of the parent. It is the position one occupies in the society by virtue of his home. The assumption is that higher position of family in the hierarchy of socioeconomic status the more chances for the social and psychological environment of the home being conducive to positive self concept and higher self esteem.

 The level of socioeconomic status is positively but not very strongly related to a variety of measures of scholastic ability and achievement. Children who come from home in which parents have been educated to high level perform better such measures. High educational attainment of parents were found to be associated with better school performance of their children.(Patric,1993).

 It is also true that more highly educated mother have greater success in providing their children with the cognitive language skills that contributes to early success in school than less well educated mothers (Benjamin 1993).

**2.1.3. Schooling type**

 Schools are categorized generally in to three viz; government, aided, and unaided schools. Government schools are managed and controlled directly by the government. Aided schools means a private schools which is recognized by and is receiving aid from the government. Unaided schools are managed by trust or individual under the government recognition. Appointment of teachers and other staff, salary, development of infrastructure facilities’, etc come under the responsibility of the management only.

**2.2. REVIEW RELATED LITERATURE**

**2.2.1. Perceived parental support**

Gayathridevi (1985) investigated parents’ interest and its influence on children’s academic achievement at middle school. The result reveals that there is significant relationship between parental influence and academic achievement.

Agarwaal (1986) studied the effect of parental encouragement upon educational development of secondary school students. The sample consists of 1000 secondary school students. The findings revealed that the high achieving group had been getting higher parental encouragement. The high achieving girls got greater parental encouragement in the urban areas compared to rural areas. There were differences in the amount of parental encouragement received by the students in the different regions.

Pareschandra (1992) explore how adolescents’ perception of parental behaviour (support, punishment, control and protective behaviour) is related to their own frustration (Exagression, Intragression, Imagression and Group Conformity Ratings. A sample of 334 eighth grade rural secondary school children were administered the Sarkar Parent Behaviour Description Inventory and the Reaction to Frustration Test. Findings indicated significant relationship between the different dimensions of parental behaviour and adolescents’ behaviour.

Uma & Radhi (1994) examines the influence of parental acceptance on the self confidence and achievement motivation of adolescent girls and investigated whether self confidence affects the achievement of adolescents. A sample of 44 adolescent girls students was administered the Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire, the Self Confidence Inventory and the Achievement Motivation Questionnaire. Results indicate that there were significant differences in the self confidence scores of respondents who perceived themselves as rejected. No significant differences were found in the achievement motivation scores of those who perceived themselves as rejected by the parents.

Chowdhary, *et al*., (1995) explores the role of parental support in satisfying children’s needs and academic achievements in a sample of 50 children. Results revealed that girls required more support from their parents and their needs were more as compare to boys. Also parental support has a positive effect on children’s academic achievement.

Kaur, *et al*., (1995) investigated the sex differences between parent child relationships of low and high achieving boys and girls. The sample consists of 200 students. It was found that among the high as well as low achieving groups girls shared a better relationship with their parents than boys. It was found that significant sex differences existed in parent- child relationship.

O’Connor (1995) identified the relationship of adolescent egocentrism and identity development with perceptions of parental behaviour. 418 subjects from twelve to twenty-one years of age served as the samples. The findings revealed that perceived parental behaviour is accounted for little variance with adolescents egocentrism.

Andrew & Sandra (1995) investigated the independent and combined effects of perceived parental support and social problem solving skills on children’s adjustment. Thirty children served as the samples. The results revealed that perceived parental support was significantly related to measures of competence and self-worth, but social problem solving skills were not significantly related to perceived parental support.

Bloir (1997) examined the parenting behaviour of the academically successful urban students and found that the overall parent- child relationship was characterized by high levels of emotional closeness, parents actively communication, actively monitoring behaviour and participating in discussions on issues of concern. Parents were highly involved, warm and supportive but not encouraging psychological autonomy.

Singh & Feinted (1998) examined perceived rearing styles of mizo adolescents. 247 mizo adolescents served as subjects for study. Girls perceived both their parents to be more rejecting as compared to boys. Boys perceived both their parents to be more emotionally warm as compared to girls.

Alpana (1999) conducted a study to determine is there any relationship existed between parental acceptance and rejection of adolescents. The sample consists of 300 adolescents. The findings revealed that there was a direct significant correlation between parental acceptance and rejection

 Stroud (1999) explored the importance of familial support perceived by adult victims of childhood sexual abuse. The inter familial victims reported more significant more dissatisfaction and specifically, perceived significantly less parent support. The gender of the victim played a significant role. Male victims reported less parent support when compared to female victims.

 Rai (2000) attempted to examine perceived parental rearing style among adolescents. 50 boys and 50 girls served as subject for the study and perceived parental rearing style questionnaire was employed. The result indicated significant sex differences on factor of rejection emotion and warmth. The boys and girls did not manifest significant difference on over protection and favoring subject on the scale of perceived parental rearing questionnaire.

 Agarwal (2003) intended to find out if there is any significant difference between boys and girls perception of parental behavior. Sample consists of 170 boys and girls. The results indicate that parental behavior, changes with respect to the sex of the child. However significant difference we observed on disciplining and punishing variable for boys and girls.

Suman and Umapathi (2003) examine the relationship between achievement motivation and parent child relationship in adolescent. The sample consists of 219 ninth standard students. The results revealed that achievement motivation was higher, when adolescents perceived their parents as loving and demanding.

 Andersons, et.al (2003) examined children’s perception of their parents’ involvement in all types of extracurricular activities. The findings suggested that perceived parental support positively predicted participant’s amount of extracurricular involvement and children’s affective experience of participation.

 Jayaswal et.al, (2003) examined the role of parental support on academic achievement of tribal school students using 300 children and parents of 30 high achievers and 30 low achievers. The parents of high achievers exerted significantly more support in their studies than the parents of low achievers. The parents of high achiever have higher aspiration for their children’s educational success.

 Cheng&Furnham (2003) studied about the perceived parental rearing style, self esteem and self criticism. Maternal care was the only directed correlate of happiness when parental and maternal rearing style were examined together suggesting that the warmth showed by mothers towards their children was particularly beneficial in increasing the off springs scores on self reported happiness.

 Snider, et.al,(2004) examined the relations between adolescents reports of parents religiosity and parenting process, use both dimensional and typological conceptualization of parenting. The data were collected from 357 later adolescents. The partial correlations indicated that parent’s religiosity was associated with both parenting dimensions and parenting styles.

 Davols, et.al,(2005) examined the roles of perceived parental schools support and family communication in the context of delinquent behaviours in Mexican, American and White Non Latino adolescents. Results demonstrated that adolescent’s perception of family communication and parental school support were related to the likelyhood committing delinquent acts. There were no significant differences in gender or ethnicity in perceived levels of family communication and perceived parental school support.

 Mohanraj & Latha (2005) investigated the relation between family environment, the home adjustment and academic achievement in adolescents. Family environment appeared to influence home adjustment as well as academic performance. Academic performance was significantly related to independence and conflict domains of family environment. Boys and girls differed in perception of the home environment.

 Pande (2005) studied the perceived parental behavior dimension and the difference in the boys & girls. The samples were 170 boys & girls below 15 years. The findings suggested that parental behaivour changes with respect to the gender of child. Boys perceived their parents as more dominating in comparison to girls while perception on loving various is nearly the same boys and girls perceived their father as more disciplining than the mother; on the other hand girls perceived mothers as more loving and less dominating

 Ratelle, et.al (2005) examined how perceived parental support predict college students persistence in science. Results suggest that perceived parental autonomy support predicted scientific persistence partly through students autonomy and that perceived parental support have specific role in predicting students self process and achievement.

 Raudsepp (2006) examined the relationship of parental support and adolescent physical activity using 326 urban adolescents and their parents. The result revealed that the parental support were significantly higher towards their daughters. The findings also suggest that the parental support is posivitively related to physical activity in adolescents.

 Arora, et.al (2006) made an attempt to investigate the perceived parental behavior and its relationship with academic school success and academic competence. Results of the study revealed that parental acceptance and encouragement scores were positively related with academic success and academic competence scores. Parental control showed negative relationship with academic success and competence. Parents who were perceived as being more acceptant and using less strict and hostile psychological control tended to have adolescents with higher academic success and competence.

Boyd and Higgins (2006) under took a study of 425 college students to examine whether parental support can mediate the link that low self control has with deviance. The result revealed that parental support does not completely mediate the link between low self control and deviance. The parental support can reduce the link that low self control has with deviance.

 Andrew and Stephen (2006) compared adolescent perception of parental support, knowledge and authoritative decision make on samples of Hmong and European American’s. Additions analysis considered variations in parental influence on adolescents out comes across these groups. The results suggested that Hmong American youth perceived less parental support and knowledge and were less likely to report authoritative decision making with parents. Parental support and knowledge were associated with High self esteem.

 Donnelly, et.al (2007) explores the effect of late adolescent’s positive and negative perceptions of their parents in the association between perceived parenting and late adolescent emotional adjustment. The sample consists of 150 males and 324 females rearranging in age from 18-22 years. Result of the study suggested that perceived parenting, positive & negative perception of parent, and emotional adjustment as report by late adolescents all are correlated significantly.

 Ojha (2007) studied the relationship between perceived parental behaviour and children’s Machiavellian orientation and also between parent’s Machiavellian orientation and children’s Machiavellian orientation. He selected a sample of 300 plus two male students aged 15 to 18 years. The findings revealed that loving and permissive behavour of parents were negatively and significantly related with their son’s Machiavellian orientation. It was also found that Machiavellian orientation of parents and their sons were positively and significantly associated.

Klink et.al (2008) investigated the relationship between family support and coping efficacy in 238 pre-medical students. Correlation analysis revealed significant positive relationship between family support and students perceived abilities to cope with anticipated academic barriers. Findings from this study indicate that perceived family support place a key role in establishing pre-medical students’ confidence in their ability to cope with the challenges of academic life.

 Susan (2008) studied about the role of parental support as a predictor of identity status in an ethnically diverse 635 adolescent samples. The regression analyses suggested that parental support predicted higher fire closure and lower moratorium in white students, higher achievement is Latin and higher diffusion in African Americans.

**2.2.2. Socio-economic status**

Zacharia (1977) in his study *Impact of attitude and interest on achievement of secondary school students*indicated that parental educational level can exert considerable influence upon their children achievement in social studies.

Venktaish (1980) in his study *Factors effecting the academic achievement of students of different socio-economic status*. pointed out that socio-economic status is positively related to the academic performance of both arts and science students.

 The important findings of the study carried out by Sivappa (1980) is that habit, educational aspiration, socio-economic status. Need, achievement and intelligence are positive correlates of achievements.

 Nair (1981) in his study *Certain personality and familial variables discriminating between over and under achievers in secondary school Science and Mathematics* showed that significantly greater number of under achievers were evidenced among subjects whose father have low education having any significant influence on education, parental occupation and income were found to have significant influence on educational aspiration.

 The study carried out by Chopra (1982) revealed that the socio-economic back ground is very important determinant of continuation of education and significantly a large number of students from low socio-economic class failed in the High School examination and significantly a large number of first class students belong to the higher socio-economic classes.

 Khanna (1980) studied the relationship between socio-economic back ground and academic achievement of junior school students and established that socio-economic status was positively and significantly related with academic achievement; the academic achievement of rural and urban students was closely related with their guardian income.

 A study of Pappachan (1983) on the 10th standard pupils of Kerala found that high socio-economic status Students are significantly differentiated in intelligence than low socio-economic status.

According to the study of Subhash Gokhan (1983) highly socio-economic status accounts for higher achievement in mathematical concept and low socio-economic status accounts for low achievement.

 Sulatha (1984) found significant relationship between education level of father and their children academic performance in biology.

 Oforibika (1985) found difference in socio-economic status

Being manifested in academic achievement of children in high and low socio-economic group.

 Jaganathan (1985) in a study found that academic achievements, type of family and fathers education are interrcorelated

 Roy 1985) in his study found that there was significant relationship between socio-economic status and achievement in English.

 Das (1986) in his study revealed that students of high socio-economic status had higher education aspiration than students of low socio-economic status

 Beena Rani (1986) found that there was significant relationship between achievement in English and socio-economic status.

 Sankaran Kutty (1987) concludes that socio-economic variables are significantly related to academic achievement of secondary school pupils.

 In the study of Davis (1988) in three countries about low income parents and the school found out that the parents with low income have low involvement with learning and schooling. It is due to the fact that the teachers and administrators have a substantial view of low v socio-economic status family.

 Kelu (1989) found that socio-familial variable such as learning at home, family acceptance, cultural level of family; home environment and income level are significantly related with language skill in mothertounge of secondary school pupils.

 In a study by Reddy(1989) was reported that children’s whose parents have high educational background had better language development as evident by large number of sentence written by them compared to children whose parents had low educational background.

 Good (1990) found that the coefficient of correlation between academic achievement and socio-economic status is significant.

 Lohani,et.al(1990) studied the link between selected family demographic factors, home environment, and academic performance, and found out that positive relationship exist between variables such as education of mother and education of father with academic performance.

 Kadeeja.k (1991) reported that there is significant relation between socio-economic status and achievement in chemistry.

 In their study Slave and Trivedi (1991) found that neither intelligence nor socio-economic status has a significant influence on achievement in English.

 Prameela (1991) found that significant positive relationship exists between socio-economic status and learning facilities at home.

 Anilkumar (1992) found that three levels of socio-economic status namely; high, average, and low are significantly dissimilar with respect to the achievement in science.

 Das (1993) in his study revealed that there was a weak relation between socio-economic status and achievement in social studies.

 In an Australian perspective Young et.al (1993) investigated socio-economic effect on science achievement. The study revealed that home background; context of school, socio-economic status has significant relation with science achievement.

 Girija (1994) found positive relationship between occupation of father and academic achievement in mathematics.

 In her study Sheeja (1994) conducted in Malappuram district found that there is significant positive relation of biology achievement with socio-economic status and family size.

 Sindhu (1995) found socio-economic status of parent and cognitive style is significantly related to achievement in biology of secondary school pupils.

 Padilla (1996) in a study about influence of family background on educational attainment of Latinos found that family background and later childhood factor influence the educational attainment of Latinos.

 In her study Deepa (1996) found that there is positive relationship between achievement in biology and socio-economic status and there exists significant difference of achievement in biology between urban and rural pupils.

 Naik (1997) reported that income securing is must for academic achievement of their children.

 Investigation of Marco (1998) about gender vs socio-economic status and school location. Difference in grade and reading literacy in five African countries revealed that there were no significant gender difference in reading achievement but there were significant difference for socio-economic level and school locations.

 Pradhan&Prabha (1998) found that there is significant relationship between scholastic achievement and intelligence. Whereas no such relationship was observed between socio-economic status and scholastic achievement.

Nair (1999) in his study as a sample of 1758 secondary school pupils found that familial variables such as mothers occupation, mothers income, family acceptance of education, home learning facility,etc significantly discriminate between over and under achievers in science.

 Mishra and Gopal (1999) examined the educational aspiration of SC&ST boys and girls in relation to their attitude towards the education, parent’s education, and economic status. Results reveal a significant correlation between educational aspiration and parents’ economic status. Boys aspired for higher education than girls. SC students had higher educational aspiration than ST students.

 Hadder and Margret (2000) studied various factors contributing to students’ achievement like parental education level, parental material status, family size, race ethnicity, etc. findings are inconclusive and inconsistent regarding pupil’s achievement and parental involvement.

Carbrera and Steven (2000) made investigations on the factors affecting the lowest socio-economic status students chance to get college qualifications, graduates from high school and apply to four year institution. They come to the conclusion that parental involvement, early planning for college and experimenting at risk factors most affected students chance of becoming college qualified.

 Yang (2003) conducted a study about dimensions of socio-economic status and their relationship to mathematics and science achievement of individual and collective level. The study revealed that socio-economic status dimensions have different achievement in individual and school level.

 Pandey and Maikhori (2003) conducted a study to find out the relationship between socio-economic status and academic achievement of adolescents. The sample comprised of 200 boys and girls in the age group of 16 to 18 years. Shah’s socio-economic status scale (1986) was used to measure socio-economic status of students. Academic achievement was taken in terms of aggregate marks obtained by the subject in their previous examination. The results of the study revealed significant relationship between academic achievements of adolescent belong to high and low socio-economic status.

Shabana (2003) from her study ” process outcome in science in relation to creativity and socio-economic status of secondary school pupils” concluded that there is a positive relationship between socio-economic status and process outcomes in science.

 Memol (2003) from her study” socio-economic status and learning obstacles of secondary school pupil in relation to achievement in social science” found that there is a positive relationship between socio-economic status and achievement in social science.

 Sheila, et al (2005) conducted a study entitled, a genetically sensitive investigation of the effects of the school environment and socio-economic status or academic achievement in seven year old s in which it is found that socio-economic status has positive effect on academic achievement.

**2.2.3. Schooling type**

“Mothers institutions, choosing secondary schools” a study conducted by David ,et al;(1998) found that although choice of school was often made by mothers and fathers, there seems to be border cultural assumptions that anything to do with schooling was a maternal internal factions. The authors reported that mothers were solely responsible for choice of school in 46 percent of cases, fathers solely in 7 percent and both in 31 percent.

 Study conducted by Gilding and Hausman(1999), the result of the analysis indicate that parent background charecteristics,parent reason for choosing particular school, satisfaction with public school and the distance between the home and school. Differentiate between parents who choose magnet parents who choose non magnet and non choosers.

 The proponents of private schools believed that it would introduce competition and choice in the educational system. Competition among the public and private schools would improve the overall efficiency of the schools. A report by Duraiswami and Subramanyan (2000). It was also held that encouragement of private schooling would partially relieve the government of the Fiscal stringency was that the emergence of private school would lead to educational elitism in society and wider inequality in economic and social opportunities.

Study in the United states by Coleman etal (1987) concluded that catholic schools were more effective than state high schools, especially with at risk students and attributed this primarily to the coherence of the former, based up on shared assumptions and values.

**METHODOLOGY**

 “Research is considered to be more formal, systematic, extensive process of carrying on the scientific method of analysis. It involves a more systematic structure of investigation usually results in some sort of formal record of procedure and a report of result or conclusion” (Best&Kahn, 1977)

 The success of any research depends largely on the suitability of methods and tools and techniques used for the collection of data. Research method differs on the basis of their approach to the solution of the problem. The method depends up on the nature of the research problem and the kind of data necessary for its solution. Methodology discusses the procedure or the technique adopted for the conduct of the study. The findings of research to a great extent depend up on the method adopted and hence methodology has an important portion in any type of research.

 This chapter provides a detailed description of the variables of the study, tools employed for the collection of data, selection of the sample, data collection procedure, scoring and consolidation of data, the statistical techniques used for analysis. Therefore the methodology of the present study ”A RETROSPECTIVE STUDY OF PERCEIVED PARENTAL SUPPORT SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND SCHOOLING TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL COLLEGE STUDENTS DURING THEIR SECONDARY STAGE” is presented under the following sections.

**3.1**. VARAIBLES SELECTED FOR THE STUDY

**3.2**. OBJJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

**3.3**. TOOLS EMPLOYED FOR THE DATA COLLECTION

**3.4**. SAMPLES SELECTED FOR THE STUDY

**3.5**. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

**3.6**. SCORING AND CONSOLIDATION OF DATA

**3.7**. STATISTICAL TECHNIQUE USED FOR THE STUDY

**3.1. VARIABLES SELECTED FOR THE STUDY**

Variables selected for the for the present study is perceived parental support, socio-economic status and schooling type

**3.2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

* Toanalyze the influence of parental support on getting entry to professional course
* To find out the effect of socio-economic status on the academic achievement of professional college students
* To find out how many percentage of professional college students came from Government schools, aided schools or unaided schools
* To find out how many percentage of professional college students followed SCERT,CBSE or other syllabus

**3.3**. **TOOLS EMPLOYED FOR THE DATA COLLECTION**

For collecting the required data for the study of any problem, one may use various devises. For each and every type of research we need certain instruments to gather new facts or to explore new fields. These instruments are called tools. These tools are of many kinds and employ distinctive and quantifying the data. Accurate and reliable tool can supply the correct data which is inevitable for a valid study. Thus the selection of suitable instruments or tools for collecting data is of vital importance for a successful research.

For the present study, the investigator employed the following tool for collection of data with regards to the variables selected.

**3.3.1. Questionnaire of Perceived Parental Support**

**3.3.2. Socio-Economic Status Scale**

**DESCRIPTION OF TOOLS USED**

**3.3.1. Questionnaire of Perceived Parental Support**

For the purpose of measuring perceived parental support of professional college students, the investigator used the tool constructed by himself with the help of supervising teacher

***Components of perceived parental support***

1. Demandingness

Demandingness refers to the intensity of authority with which requirements are made by parents to their children. This include

* Maturity demands: it is the expectations of parents for their children’s achievement and establishing high standards stressing social values and behavioural control.
* Reasoning or induction: it is the explanations of consequences of their children’s behavior
1. Loving

Loving refers to the feeling or sharing of love or affection extended by parents to their wards. This includes,

* Emotional warmth: it is the liveliness of feeling or emotions
* Affection: it is the found attachment of parents to their children.
* Acceptance: the positive attitude or favourable reception of parents to their teacher.
1. Protecting

Protecting refers to the shelternesss, protection, or concerns the parents extended for their children. This includes:

* Attention: it is the care or provision of concern parents give for their children.
* Understanding: it is the familiarity of parents with the actions of their child.
* Monitoring: the close observance of the child by their parents in all actions and assistance with several life situations.
* Nurturing: promoting the development of the child by their parents by providing nourishment.
1. Rewarding

Rewarding refers to the positive incentive or encouragement extended by parents to their children which are capable of arousing pleasure. This measures the extent to which the parents provide

* Inspiration: Exalting the divine influence directly to the children by their parents.
* Encouragement: The acts of being encourage to do well in school activities.
* Foster individuality: The encouragement of particular character or aggregate qualities.
* Approval: The formal permission or sanction of parents to their children for their activities.

All the items in the prepared tools measure global parental support so as to capture a general nature of parental support, ie the items did not differentiate between the maternal and paternal support

**PILOT STUDY**

The first draft of the questionnaire of perceived parental support consist of 55 items, the tryout of which was done in order to select valid items for the final form by empirically testing the t-value of each item at 0.01 level of significant.

For this, the questionnaire was administrated on a sample of 100 professional college students, selected using stratified random sampling technique. The response sheets were scored according to scoring scheme.

**ITEM ANALYSIS**

The purpose of item analysis is to select items that have item characteristics. Items were analyzed in order to compute the’t’ value of each item at 0.01 level of significant. The procedure of analysis was discussed below.

At first, the 100 response sheets were scored and the total scores of each sheet were calculated. Then these sheets were arranged in the descending order of the total score. From this 27 percentage of the total sheet with the highest score and 27 percentage of the total sheets with the lowest score were separated.

The mean and standard deviation of the scores obtained for each items for the upper group and the lower group were calculated using the formulae.



Where

X1 = Mean of the first group

X2 = Mean of the second group

σ1 = S.D of the first group

σ2 = S.D of the second group

N1 = Total number of the first group

N2 = Total number of the second group

Items with critical ratio greatherthan 2.58, the table value of‘t’ at 0.01 level of significant were selected for the final draft. The critical ratio (t value) obtained for each item together with mean and standard deviations of the score for the two groups are given in table 1.

The first draft is given as appendix 1.

**TABLE I**

**Critical Ratio‘t’ Value with Mean and**

 **Standard Deviations of the Scores for the Two**

**Groups for Questionnaire of Perceived Parental Support**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl.No | X1 | X2 | σ1 | σ2 | ‘t’ value |
| 1 |  .33 | .85 | .48 | .36 | 4.48 |
| 2 | 0.7 | 1 | 0.47 | 0 | 3.3 |
| 3 | 0.26 | .96 | .45 | .19 | 7.52 |
| 4 | .26 | .89 | .45 | .32 | 5.95 |
| 5 | .41 | .89 | .5 | .32 | 4.29 |
| 6 | .33 | 1 | .48 | 0 | 7.21 |
| 7 | .24 | .85 | .34 | .18 | 3.18 |
| 8 | 0 | .30 | 0 | .47 | 3.31 |
| 9 | .33 | .85 | .48 | .36 | 4.48 |
| 10 | .40 | .85 | .50 | .36 | 3.74 |
| 11 | .22 | .81 | .42 | .40 | 5.31 |
| 12 | .30 | .67 | .47 | .48 | 2.88 |
| 13 | .78 | 1 | .42 | 0 | 2.73 |
| 14 | .41 | .89 | .5 | .32 | 4.29 |
| 15 | .67 | .96 | .48 | .19 | 2.98 |
| 16 | .67 | .96 | .48 | .19 | 2.98 |
| 17 | .63 | .96 | .49 | .19 | 3.28 |
| 18 | .48 | .93 | .5 | .27 | 4.02 |
| 19 | .37 | 1 | .49 | 0 | 6.65 |
| 20 | .56 | .89 | .50 | .32 | 2.89 |
| 21 | .30 | .74 | .47 | .45 | 3.58 |
| 22 | .30 | .67 | .47 | .48 | 2.88 |
| 23 | .33 | 1 | .48 | 0 | 7.21 |
| 24 | .04 | .52 | .19 | .50 | 4.60 |
| 25 | .67 | .96 | .48 | .19 | 2.98 |
| 26 | .37 | .78 | .49 | .42 | 3.26 |
| 27 | 0.26 | .96 | .45 | .19 | 7.52 |
| 28 | .11 | .78 | .32 | .42 | 6.52 |
| 29 | .63 | 1 | .49 | 0 | 3.91 |
| 30 | .40 | .85 | .50 | .36 | 3.74 |
| 31 | .30 | .67 | .47 | .48 | 2.88 |
| 32 | .15 | .59 | .36 | .50 | 3.74 |
| 33 | .4 | .96 | .5 | .19 | 5.38 |
| 34 | .26 | .78 | .45 | .42 | 4.38 |
| 35 | .04 | .37 | .19 | .49 | 3.28 |
| 36 | .26 | 1 | .45 | 0 | 8.62 |
| 37 | .11 | .78 | .32 | .42 | 6.52 |
| 38 | .04 | .52 | .19 | .50 | 4.60 |
| 39 | .19 | .89 | .40 | .32 | 7.18 |
| 40 | .63 | .96 | .49 | .19 | 3.28 |
| 41 | .63 | .96 | .49 | .19 | 3.28 |
| 42 | .22 | .81 | .42 | .40 | 5.31 |
| 43 | .33 | .89 | .48 | .32 | 5 |
| 44 | .37 | .93 | .49 | .27 | 5.16 |
| 45 | .48 | .93 | .5 | .27 | 4.02 |
| 46 | .67 | .96 | .48 | .19 | 2.98 |
| 47 | .48 | .93 | .5 | .27 | 4.02 |
| 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\* |
| 49 | .63 | .96 | .49 | .19 | 3.28 |
| 50 | .33 | .67 | .48 | .48 | 2.61 |
| 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\* |
| 52 | .56 | .93 | .51 | .27 | 3.36 |
| 53 | .67 | .96 | .48 | .19 | 2.98 |
| 54 | .15 | .59 | .36 | .50 | 3.74 |
| 55 | .40 | .85 | .50 | .36 | 3.74 |

\*Indicate rejected items

**PREPARATION OF THE FINAL DRAFT**

Out of 55 items the critical ratio of 53 items are greater than 2.58, and that of two items is less than 2.58, the table value of ‘t’ at 0.01 level of significant. Hence the investigator selected 53 items for the final draft and rejected 2 items.

Final draft is given as appendix 2

**RELIABILITY**

Reliability of a test refers to the consistency. Whatever it is, measuring, it does so consistently. The investigator established reliability of the present questionnaire by using test-retest method. The time interval between first and second administration was three weeks. Both the administration was made for same set of students. The correlation between the first test score and second test score were calculated using Pearson’s product moment of correlation.



 Where

 **∑**X= sum of X scores

 ∑Y = sum of Y scores

 ∑X2 = sum of the squared X scores.

 ∑Y2 = sum of the squared Y scores

 ∑XY = sum of the products of paired X and Y scores.

 N = Number of paired scores.

Using the formula a cross examination of the responses in the two administration of the questionnaire is done. Thus, the obtained reliability coefficient is 0.88. There is no wide variation in the responses between first and second test. It suggests that there is high degree of consistency in the responses. Which means the questionnaire prepared for student is reliable

**VALIDITY**

Validity is the quality of data gathering instrument or procedure that enables it to measure what is supposed to measure. The validity of the present questionnaire is done through face validity. A test is said to have face validity when it appears to measure whatever the author had in mind, viz, what he thought he was measuring (Garrett, 1973). The items in the present questionnaire were phrased in least ambiguous way and the meanings of the terms are clearly defined. It is found that expert comprehended the questionnaire clearly and responded to the items without misunderstanding. Thus questionnaire possesses face validity.

**3.3. 2 SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS SCALE**

For the purpose of measuring socio-economic status of professional college students, the investigator used the tool constructed by himself with the help of supervising teacher.

*COMPONENTS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS SCALE*

1. Educational profile: The alternatives in this profile were defined according to the educational status achieved by those members of the family, who have crossed the school going age.
2. Occupational profile: The alternates in the profile were categorized according to occupation of the family members. Different occupations of parents have been classified into six categories. They are,
3. Unemployed: those who having no work at all.
4. Unskilled: coolies, ordinary labours, watch man, peon, etc.
5. Semiskilled: farmers, small merchants, laboratory attenders, police constable, etc.
6. Skilled: mechanics, fitter, electricians, driver, photographer, carpenter, lab assistant, mason, document writer, head constable, village officer, etc.
7. Semi-professional: chemists, druggists, qualified nurses, teachers, managers, minor business men, contractor, small land lords, sub registrar, AEO,BDO, Public health workers, etc.
8. High professional: the minister, judge, bank executives, officials, doctors, engineers, lawyers, university level teachers, head of research organization, head of government department, secretaries of government, business executives.
9. Income profile: in this profile the alternatives were classified according to the annual income of the family. For calculating annual income, add total family income of all sources.
10. House profile: house profile was divided in to two sub parts land area and houstype. The total land area included constructed and unconstructed area. And the house type covers different types of walls, floors, and roof of the house.
11. Social profile: social profile also divided in to two parts, understand and participation. The alternatives in the understanding sub profile were defined according to the knowledge of social issues. While in the participation sub profiles, the alternatives were well defined according to their involvement in social activities. The social issues and activities were classified in to five types, viz, religious, cultural, developmental, educational, health, promotional, and political

**RELIABILITY**

Reliability of a test refers to the consistency. Whatever it is, measuring, it does so consistently. The investigator established reliability of the present scale by using test-retest method. The time interval between first and second administration was three weeks. Both the administration was made for same set of students. The correlation between the first test score and second test score were calculated using Pearson’s product moment of correlation.



Where

 **∑**X= sum of X scores

 ∑Y = sum of Y scores

 ∑X2 = sum of the squared X scores.

 ∑Y2 = sum of the squared Y scores

 ∑XY = sum of the products of paired X and Y scores.

 N = Number of paired scores.

Using the formula a cross examination of the responses in the two administration of the scale is done. Thus, the obtained reliability coefficient is 0.78. There is no wide variation in the responses between first and second test. It suggests that there is high degree of consistency in the responses. Which means the scale prepared for student is reliable.

**VALIDITY**

Content validity of the socio-economic status scale was established consulting with experts in the field.

**3.4 SAMPLE SELECTED FOR THE STUDY**

A sample is a small portion of a population selected for observation and analysis. By observing the characteristic of the sample, one can make certain inference about the characteristics of the population from which it is drawn. According to Dand.S.Fox “In the social science, it is not possible to collect data from every respondent relevant to our study, but only from some fractional part is called sampling”

Selection of the sample is important in any type of research work. For the present study the population considered is the final year students of professional college. The sample of the study comprised of the professional college representing 40 students each from Govt: Medical College-Calicut, Govt:Engineering college- kannur, National Institute of Technology (NIT)-Calicut, Indian Institute of Management (IIM)-Calicut. Stratified random sampling technique was used to select the representative group of final year professional college students. The details of the sample selected are presented in the table 2.

 **TABLE 2**

 Details of sample selected for the study

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SI. No. |  Name of Institution |  Number |
|  1 | Govt. Medical College- Calicut |  40 |
|  2 | Government Engineering College-Calicut |  40 |
|  3 | Indian Institute of Management(IIM) |  40  |
|  4 | National Institute of Technology(NIT) |  40 |

**3.5**. **DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE**

Data collection was conducted during the months of July and August 2010. After selecting the sample, the investigator sought permission from heads of institutions, selected for administering the tools. Before administering the tool the purpose and importance of the study were carefully explained to the students and directions for answering the tool were along given. It is emphasized on the outset that all the students must attempt all the questions. Students were also assured that the data given by them would be used only for research purpose.

During the progress of the sessions, doubts aroused by the students were also cleared.

**3.6**. **SCORING AND CONSOLIDATION OF DATA**

Scoring of response sheet was done separately using separate scoring keys.

Each items of the questionnaire of perceived parental support has two possible responses. The subject has to respond to each of the item by choosing any one of the alternatives, yes or No. A score of 1 & 0 was given to the response of positive items and for negative items the scoring was done in the reverse order. The maximum score possible is 55 and minimum scoring being zero.

Socio- economic status scale have five sub variables; educational profile, occupational profile, income profile, house and land profile, and social profile. Weightage scores had given for each section is given below.

Educational profile

*Uneducated—0*

*Primary education—5*

*Upper primary education—10*

*Secondary education—15*

*Plus two/pre-degree—20*

*BA/BSc/BCOM/Diploma—25*

*MA/MSc/MCOM/MBA/MCA—30*

*MBBS/Engineering/Ph.D—35*

Occupational profile,

Unemployed—0

Unskilled--5

Semiskilled--10

Skilled--15

Semi-professional--20

High professional—25

Income profile

Annual income below 5000 got a score 5 and 5001-10000, 10001-20000, 20001-40000, above 40000 got 10,15,20,25 respectively.

House and land profile

House type: Roof—palm(5), tail(10), concrete(15)

 Floor—cow dung (5), cement (10), tile (15), others (20)

 Electricity—yes (10), no (5)

Total land area: 1-5cent,6-10cent,11-30cent,31-50cent,above 50cent are got 5,10,15,20,25 score respectively.

Social profile

Understanding: Participation:

Minimum--5 Never—5

Average—10 Sometimes—10

Maximum—15 Always—15

**3.7**. **STATISTICAL TECHNIQUE USED FOR ANALYSISE OF DATA**

* Percentage analysis: A method of converting raw data in to percentage form.

**ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETAION**

The data after collection was analyzed in accordance with the outline laid down for the purpose at the time of developing the research plan. The main purpose of the study was to investigate the parental support, socio-economic status, and schooling type have any role to get admission in professional colleges. The analysis of data has been done to throw light on the major objectives formulated as follows.

**4.1. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

* Toanalyze the influence of parental support on getting entry to professional course
* To find out the effect of socio-economic status on the academic achievement of professional college students
* To find out how many percentage of professional college students came from Government schools, aided schools or unaided schools
* To find out how many percentage of professional college students followed State/SCERT, CBSE or other syllabus
	1. **CLASSIFICATION BASED ON PARENTAL SUPPORT**

Using mean and standard deviation of the scores of, questionnaire of perceived parental support, the total sample was categorized in to three groups having high perceived parental support groups, moderate perceived parental support group and low perceived parental support group. The high perceived parental support group have scores one standard deviation above the mean; low perceived parental support group scores are one standard deviation below the mean and those subject whose score come in between high perceived parental support and low perceived parental support fall in to average perceived parental support

The mean and standard deviation of scores of questionnaire of perceived parental support is 31.87 and 0.81 respectively. Those subject having scores above 32.68 (M + σ) were consider as having high perceived parental support and the score below 31.06 (M - σ) as considered as having low perceived parental support. Subjects whose score comes between 31.06 and 32.68 were considered as having moderate perceived parental support

**4.3 CLASSIFICATION BASED ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS**

Using mean and standard deviation of the scores of socio-economic status scale, the total sample was categorized in to three groups having high socio-economic status, average socio-economic status and low socio-economic status. The high socio-economic status group have scores one standard deviation above the mean; low socio-economic status group scores are one standard deviation below the mean and those subject whose score come in between high socio-economic status and low socio-economic status fall in to average socio-economic status group.

The mean and standard deviation of scores of socio-economic status scale is 218.29 and 57.69 respectively. Those subject having scores above 275.98(M + σ) were consider as having high socio-economic status and the score below i60.6 (M - σ) as considered as having low socio-economic status. Subjects whose score comes between 160.6 and 275.28 were considered as having average socio-economic status.

**4.4 PERCEIVED PARENTAL SUPPORT OF PROFESSIONAL COLLEGE**

**STUDENTS DURING THEIR SECONDARY STAGE**

The table 3 gives the details of percentage of perceived parental support on the basis of above said three classes.

**TABLE 3**

Percentage Analysis

on Perceived Parental Support Professional College Students

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PerceivedParental support | Govt. Medical College, Calicut | Govt. Engineering College, Calicut | National Institute of Technology Calicut | Indian Institute of Management Calicut | Total |
| Students | Students | Students | Students | Students |
| No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Low | 5 | 12.5 | 5 | 12.5 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 12.5 | 19 | 1.87 |
| Moderate | 27 | 67.5 | 30 | 75 | 32 | 80 | 24 | 60 | 113 | 70.63 |
| High | 8 | 20 | 5 | 12.5 | 4 | 10 | 11 | 27.5 | 28 | 17.5 |

**DISCUSSION**

From the above table, we can see that 11.87 percentage of professional college students had got low parental support,70.63 percentage of professional college students had got moderate parental support and 17.5 percentage of professional college students had got high parental support. So we can assume that, number of professional college students, who got moderate parental support are very larger than those who got low or high parental support.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure 1 shows the percentage of professional college students who got low, moderate and high parental support on the basis of the table 3

****

**FIGURE 1 Graphical Representation of Perceived Parental Support of Professional College Students**

4.4.1. INSTITUTION WISE ANALYSIS

The investigator selected four high esteemed professional colleges for his study. Which are Government Medical College, Government Engineering College, National Institute of Technology, Indian Institute of Management.

a) Government Medical College

The table 4 gives the details of percentage of medical college students’ perceived parental support.

**TABLE.4**

Percentage Analysis of Perceived

Parental Support of Medical College Students

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PerceivedParental support | Govt. Medical college, Calicut |
| Number of students | Percentage |
| low | 5 | 12.5 |
| moderate | 27 | 67.5 |
| High | 8 | 20 |

**DISCUSSION**

From the above table we can see that 12.5 percentage of Medical college students got low parental support, 67.5 percentage of Medical college students got moderate parental support and 20 percentage of Medical college students got high parental support. Then we can assume that, number of medical college students, who got moderate parental support, are larger than those who got low or high parental support.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure 2 shows the percentage of Medical college students who got low, moderate and high parental support on the basis of the table.4



**FIGURE 2** Graphical representation of Perceived Parental Support of Medical College Students

**b) Government Engineering College**

The table 5 gives the details of percentage of engineering college students’ perceived parental support during their secondary stage

**TABLE 5**

Percentage Analysis of

Perceived Parental Support of Engineering College Students

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PerceivedParental support | Govt.Engineering college, Calicut |
| Number of students | percentage |
| Low | 5 | 12.5 |
| Moderate | 30 | 75 |
| High | 5 | 12.5 |

**DISCUSSION**

From the above table we can conclude that 12.5 percentage of engineering college students got low parental support, 75 percentage of engineering college students got moderate parental support and 12.5 percentage of Engineering college students got high parental support. So we can assume that, number of engineering college students, who got moderate parental support, are larger than those who got low or high parental support.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

 The figure.3 shows the percentage of engineering college students who got low, moderate and high parental support on the basis of the table 5



**FIGURE 3:** Graphical Representation of Perceived Parental Support of Engineering College Students

**c) National Institute of technology (NIT)**

The table 6 gives the details of percentage of National Institute of Technology students’ perceived parental support during their secondary stage.

**TABLE 6**

Percentage Analysis of Perceived Parental

Support of National Institute of Technology Students

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Perceived Parental support | National Institute of Technology(NIT),Calicut |
| Number of students | Percentage |
| Low | 4 | 10 |
| Moderate | 32 | 80 |
| High | 4 | 10 |

**DISCUSSION**

The data given above shows that 10 percentage of NIT students got low parental support, 80 percentage of NIT students got moderate parental support and 10 percentage of NIT students got high parental support. So we can assume that, number of NIT students, who got moderate parental support, are larger than those who got low or high parental support.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure 4 shows the percentage of National Institute of Technology students who got low, moderate and high parental support on the basis of the table.6.

**FIGURE 4:** Graphical Representation of Perceived Parental Support of Students in National Institute of Technology

**d) Indian Institute of Management (IIM)**

The table.7 gives the details of percentage of Indian Institute of Management students’ perceived parental support.

**TABLE.7**

Percentage Analysis of Perceived Parental

Support of Students in Indian Institute of Management (IIM)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PerceivedParental support | Indian Institute of Management(IIM),Calicut |
| Number of students | Percentage |
| Low | 5 | 12.5 |
| Moderate | 24 | 60 |
| High | 11 | 27.5 |

**DISCUSSION**

From the above table we can see that 12.5 percentage of IIM students got low parental support,60 percentage of IIM students got moderate parental support and 27.5 percentage of IIM students got high parental support. Then we can assume that, number of IIM students, who got moderate parental support , are larger than those who got low or high parental support.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure 5 shows the percentage of Indian Institute of Management students who got low, moderate and high parental support on the basis of the table.7



**FIGURE 5:** Graphical Representation of Perceived Parental Support of Students in Indian Institute of Management (IIM)

**4.5. PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE FAMILY OF PROFESSIONAL COLLEGE STUDENTS’ DURING THEIR SECONDARY STAGE**

The table 8 gives the details of the socio-economic status of family of students in professional college during their secondary stage.

**TABLE 8**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Socio-economic status | Medical College Calicut | Engineering College Calicut | National Institute of Technology Calicut | Indian Institute of Management Calicut |   Total  |
| Students | Student | Student | Student | Student |
| No. | **%** | No. | **%** | No. | **%** | No. | **%** | No. | **%** |
| Low | 2 | 1.2 | 9 | 5.6 | 7 | 4.4 | 6 | 3.8 | 24 | 15 |
| Average | 31 | 19.3 | 30 | 18.8 | 27 | 16.9 | 27 | 16.9 | 115 | 71.9 |
| High | 7 | 4.4 | 1 | 0.6 | 6 | 3.7 | 7 | 4.4 | 21 | 13.1 |

Percentage Analysis on Socio-Economic

Status of Professional college students ’ Family during Their Secondary Stage

**DISCUSSION**

From the above table we can see that 15 percentage of professional college students had low socio-economic status, 71.9 percentage professional college students had average socio-economic status and 13.1percentage of professional college students had high socio-economic status during their secondary stage. Then we can assume that, number of professional college students who had average socio-economic status, are larger than those who had low or high socio-economic status.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure 6 shows the socio-economic status of professional college students during their secondary stage.

**FIGURE 6:** Graphical Representation of Socio-Economic Statusof Professional College Students’ Family during their Secondary Stage.

4.5.1. INSTITUTION WISE ANALYSIS

The investigator selected four high esteemed professional colleges for his study. Which are Government Medical College, Government Engineering College, National Institute of Technology, Indian Institute of Management.

a) Government Medical College

Table.9 gives the details of socio-economic status of family ofmedical college students during their secondary stage.

 **TABLE 9**

Percentage Analysis on Socio-Economic

Status of Medical College Students’ Family During Their Secondary Stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Socio-economic status | Govt.Medical college, Calicut |
| Number of Students | Percentage |
| Low | 2 | 5 |
| Average | 31 | 77.5 |
| High | 7 | 17.5 |
|  |

**DISCUSSION**

From the above table, we can see that 5 percentage of medical college students had low socio-economic status,77.5 percentage of medical college students had average socio-economic status and 17.5 percentage of medical college students had high socio-economic status during their secondary stage. Then we can assume that, number of medical college students who had average socio-economic status, are larger than those who had low or high socio-economic status.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

Figure.7 shows the socio-economic status of the family ofmedical college students during their secondary stage.



**FIGURE 7** Graphical Representation of Socio-Economic Status of Medical College Students’ Family During Their Secondary Stage.

**b) Government Engineering College**

Table 10 gives the details of socio-economic status of engineering college students during their secondary stage.

**TABLE 10**

Percentage Analysis of Socio-Economic Status of

Engineering College Students’ Family during Their Secondary Stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Socio-economic status | Govt.Engineering College, Calicut |
| Number of students | Percentage |
| Low | 9 | 22.5 |
| Average | 30 | 75 |
| High | 1 | 2.5 |

**DISCUSSION**

From the above table, we can see that 9 percentage of engineering college students had low socio-economic status,75 percentage of engineering college students had average socio-economic status and 2.5 percentage of engineering college students had high socio-economic status during their secondary stage. Then we can assume that, number of engineering college students who had average socio-economic status, are larger than those who had low or high socio-economic status.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure.8 shows the socio-economic status of engineering college students during their secondary stage.

****

 FIGURE 8: Graphical Representation of Socio-Economic Status of Engineering College Students’ Family During Their Secondary Stage

**c) National Institute of Technology (NIT)**

The table 11 gives the details of socio-economic status of National Institute of Technology students during their secondary stage.

**TABLE 11**

Percentage Analysis of Socio-Economic Status of National

Institute of Technology Students’ Family during Their Secondary Stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Socioeconomic status | National Institute of Technology, Calicut |
| Number of students | Percentage |
| Low | 7 | 17.5 |
| Average | 27 | 67.5 |
| High | 6 | 15 |

**DISCUSSION**

From the above table, we can see that 17.5 percentage of National Institute of Technologystudents had low socio-economic status, 67.5 percentage of National Institute of Technologystudents had average socio-economic status and 15 percentage of National Institute of Technology students had high socio-economic status during their secondary stage. Then we can assume that, number National Institute of Technology students who had average socio-economic status, are larger than those who had low or high socio-economic status.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure.9 shows the socio-economic status of National Institute of Technology students during their secondary stage.

****

FIGURE 9 Graphical Representation of Socio-Economic Status of National Institute of Technology Students’ Family During Their Secondary Stage

**d). Indian Institute of Management(IIM)**

The table 12 gives the details of socio-economic status of the family of Indian Institute of Management students during their secondary stage

**TABLE 12**

Percentage Analysis of Socio-Economic Status of Indian

Institute of Management Students’ Family During Their Secondary Stage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Socio-economic status | Indian Institute of Management,Calicut |
| Number of students | percentage |
| low | 6 | 15 |
| Average | 27 | 67.5 |
| High | 7 | 17.5 |

**DISCUSSION**

From the above table we can see that 15 percentage of Indian Institute of Management students had low socio-economic status,67.5 percentage of Indian Institute of Management students had average socio-economic status and 17.5 percentage of Indian Institute of Management students had high socio-economic status during their secondary stage. Then we can assume that, number Indian Institute of Management students who had average socio-economic status, are larger than those who had low or high socio-economic status.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure.10 shows the socio-economic status of the family ofIndian Institute of Management students during their secondary stage.

****

FIGURE 10 Graphical Representation of Socio-Economic Status of Indian Institute of Management Students’ Family During Their Secondary Stage

**4.5.2 STATUS WISE ANALYSIS**

Socio-economic status of a family mainly consider the educational status, occupational status, income status, home and land status, and social status of the family.

**a) EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF THE PROFESSIONAL COLLEGE STUDENT’S FAMILY DURING THEIR SECONDARY STAGE**

The table 13 gives the details of educational status of the family of professional college students during their secondary stage.

**TABLE 13**

Percentage Analysis of Educational

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Educationalstatus | Govt.Medical college, Calicut | Govt. Engineering college, Kannur | National Institute of Technology, Calicut | Indian Institute of Management Calicut |  Total |
| Students | Students | Students | Students | Students |
| No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Low | 4 | 2.5 | 5 | 3.1 | 4 | 2.5 | 4 | 2.5 | 17 | 10.6 |
| Average | 30 | 18.7 | 32 | 20 | 34 | 21.3 | 29 | 18.1 | 125 | 78.1 |
| High | 6 | 3.7 | 3 | 1.9 | 2 | 1.3 | 7 | 4.4 | 18 | 11.3 |

 Status of Professional College Students’ Family

**DISCUSSION**

From the above table we can see that 10.6 percentage of professional college students had low educational status, 78.1 percentage professional college students had average educational status and 11.3 percentage of professional college students had high educational status during their secondary stage. Then we can assume that, number of professional college students who had average educational status, are larger than those who had low or high educational status.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure.11 shows the educational status of professional college student’s family during their secondary stage.



FIGURE 11 Graphical Representation of Educational Status of Professional College Students’ Family

**4.5.3. OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF THE PROFESSIONAL COLLEGE STUDENT’S FAMILY, DURING THEIR SECONDARY STAGE**

The table 14 gives the details of occupational status of the family of professional college students during their secondary stage.

**TABLE 14**

Percentage Analysis of Occupational Status of

Professional College Students’ Family During Their Secondary Stage

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Occupationalstatus | Medical College Calicut | Engineering College Calicut | National Institute of Technology Calicut | Indian Institute of Management Calicut | Total |
| Students | **%** | Students | **%** | Students | **%** | Students | **%** | Students | **%** |
| Low | 2 | 1.25 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 7.5 | 2 | 1.25 | 16 | 10 |
| Average | 27 | 16.9 | 39 | 24.4 | 19 | 11.9 | 31 | 19.3 | 116 | 72.5 |
| High | 11 | 6.9 | 1 | 0.6 | 9 | 5.6 | 7 | 4.4 | 28 | 17.5 |

**DISCUSSION**

From the above table we can see that 10. Percentage of professional college students had low occupational status, 72.5 percentage professional college students had average occupational status and 17.5 percentage of professional college students had high occupational status during their secondary stage. Then we can assume that, number of professional college students who had average occupational status, are larger than those who had low or high occupational status.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure.12 shows the occupational status of professional college student’s family during their secondary stage.



FIGURE 12 Graphical Representation of Occupational Status of Professional College Students’ Family During Their Secondary Stage.

**4.5.4. INCOME STATUS OF THE PROFESSIONAL COLLEGE STUDENT’S DURING THEIR SECONDARY STAGE**

The table 15 gives the details of income status of the family of professional college students during their secondary stage

**TABLE 15**

Percentage Analysis of Income Status of

Professional College Students’ Family During Their Secondary Stage

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Incomestatus | Medical College Calicut | Engineering College Calicut | National Institute of Technology Calicut | Indian Institute of Management Calicut |  Total |
| Students | Students | Students | Students | Students |
| No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Low | 1 | 0.6 | 11 | 6.9 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 3.8 | 26 | 16.3 |
| Average | 31 | 19.3 | 27 | 16.9 | 23 | 14.3 | 26 | 16.3 | 107 | 66.8 |
| High | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1.3 | 9 | 5.6 | 8 | 5 | 27 | 16.9 |

 **DISCUSSION**

From the above table we can see that 16.3 Percentage of professional college students had low income status, 66.8 percentage professional college students had average income status and 16.9 percentage of professional college students had high income status during their secondary stage. Then we can assume that, number of professional college students who had average income status, are larger than those who had low or high income status.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure.13 shows the income status of professional college student’s family during their secondary stage

****

FIGURE 13 Graphical Representation of Income Status of Professional College Students’ Family

**4.5.5. HOME STATUS OF THE PROFESSIONAL COLLEGE STUDENT’S FAMILY, DURING THEIR SECONDARY STAGE**

The table 16 gives the details of home status of the family of professional college students during their secondary stage.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Home status | Medical College Calicut | Engineering College Calicut | National Institute of Technology Calicut | Indian Institute of Management Calicut | Total |
| Students | Students | Students | Students | Students |
| No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Low | 1 | 0.6 | 4 | 2.5 | 6 | 3.8 | 6 | 3.8 | 17 | 10.7 |
| Average | 34 | 21.2 | 31 | 19.4 | 24 | 15 | 29 | 18.1 | 118 | 73.7 |
| High | 5 | 3.1 | 5 | 3.1 | 10 | 6.3 | 5 | 3.1 | 25 | 15.6 |

**TABLE 16**

Percentage Analysis of

Home Status of Professional College Students’ Family.

**DISCUSSION**

From the above table we can see that 10.7 Percentage of professional college students had low home status, 73.7 percentage professional college students had average home status and 15.6 percentage of professional college students had high home status during their secondary stage. Then we can assume that, number of professional college students who had average home status, are larger than those who had low or high home status.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure.14 shows the home status of professional college student’s family during their secondary stage

****

FIGURE 14 Graphical Representation of Home Status of Professional College Students’ Family

**4.5.6. SOCIAL STATUS OF THE PROFESSIONAL COLLEGE STUDENT’S FAMILY, DURING THEIR SECONDARY STAGE**

The table 17 gives the details of social status of the family of professional college students during their secondary stage.

**TABLE 17**

Percentage Analysis of

Social Status of Professional College Students’ Family

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Social status | Medical College Calicut | Engineering College Calicut | National Institute of Technology Calicut | Indian Institute of Management Calicut | Total |
| Students  | Students  | Students  | Students  | Students  |
| No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Low | 12 | 7.5 | 3 | 1.8 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 3.8 | 29 | 18.1 |
| Average | 26 | 16.2 | 32 | 20 | 25 | 15.6 | 27 | 16.9 | 110 | 68.7 |
| High | 2 | 1.3 | 5 | 3.1 | 7 | 4.4 | 7 | 4.4 | 21 | 13.2 |

**DISCUSSION**

From the above table we can see that 18.1 Percentage of professional college students had low social status, 68.7 percentage professional college students had average social status and 13.2 percentage of professional college students had high social status during their secondary stage. Then we can assume that, number of professional college students who had average social status, are larger than those who had low or high social status.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure.15 shows the social status of professional college student’s family during their secondary stage.

****

FIGURE 15 Graphical Representation of Social Status of Professional College Students’ Family.

**4.6 SCHOOLING TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL COLLEGE STUDENTS**

The table 18 gives the details about the type of schools where the professional college students studied and the details of syllabus which they followed during their secondary stage.

**TABLE 18**

Percentage Analysis of schooling

 type of Professional College Students During Their Secondary Stage

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Syllabus School  | State/SCERT  | Central/CBSE  | Other  | Total | Percentage |
| Government | 46 | 20 | 0 | 66 | 41.25 |
| Aided | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 15 |
| Unaided | 17 | 49 | 4 | 70 | 43.75 |
| Total | 87 | 69 | 4 | 160 | 100 |
| Percentage | 54.38 | 43.12 | 2.5 | 100 |  |

**DISCUSSION**

From the table 18 we can see that among the professional college students 41.25 percentage of students were studied in government schools, 15 percentage of students were studied in aided schools, and 43.75 percentage students were studied in unaided schools. We can also see that 54.38 percentage, 43.12 percentage, 2.5 percentage of the professional college students followed State /SCERT, Central/ CBSE and other syllabus respectively. So we can assume that professional college students came from unaided schools are slightly larger than that of government schools and very larger than that of aided schools. Professional college students came from government schools are very larger than aided schools.

In the case of syllabus which they followed we can assume that State/SCERT syllabus is dominated than CBSE and other syllabus.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The Figure 16 shows the schooling type of professional college students during their secondary stage.

****

FIGURE 16: Graphical Representation of Schooling Type of Professional College Students Based on management type and syllabus.

**4.6.1 INSTITUTION WISE ANALYSIS BASED ON GOVERNMENT,**

 **AIDED AND UNAIDED SCHOOLS**

The table 19 gives the details of the professional colleges and corresponding percentages of students were studied in government, aided and unaided schools.

**TABLE 19**

Percentage Analysis Based on

Students Studied in Different Type of Schools

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  SchoolsInstitutions | Government | Aided | Unaided |
| Government Medical college | 47.5% | 12.5% | 40% |
| Government Engineering college | 52.5% | 25% | 22.5% |
| National Institute of Technology | 40% | 7.5% | 52.5% |
| Indian Institute of Management | 25% | 15% | 60% |

**DISCUSSION**

From table 19 we can see that among Medical College students 47.5 percentage of students studied in government schools, 12.5 percentages of students studied in aided schools, and 40 percentage of student studied in unaided schools during their secondary stage. With reference to this table we can assume that the percentage of students coming from government school is larger than that of aided and unaided schools, Percentage of students coming from aided school is too smaller than that of government and unaided schools, and percentage of students coming from unaided school is smaller than that of government schools and larger than that of aided schools.

Among the Engineering College students 52.5 percentages of students studied in government schools, 25 percentages of students studied in aided schools, and 22.5 percentage of student studied in unaided schools during their secondary stage. With reference to this table we can assume that the percentage of students coming from government school is very larger than that of aided and unaided schools, Percentage of students coming from aided school is smaller than that of government and larger than unaided schools, and percentage of students coming from unaided school is smaller than that of government and aided schools.

Among students in National Institute of technology 40 percentage of students studied in government schools, 7.5 percentages of students studied in aided schools, and 52.5 percentage of student studied in unaided schools during their secondary stage. With reference to this table we can assume that the percentage of students coming from government school is larger than that of aided schools and smaller than unaided schools, Percentage of students coming from aided school is too smaller than that of government and unaided schools, and percentage of students coming from unaided school is larger than that of government and aided schools.

Among students in Indian Institute of Management 25 percentage of students studied in government schools, 15 percentages of students studied in aided schools, and 60 percentage of student studied in unaided schools during their secondary stage. With reference to this table we can assume that the percentage of students coming from government school is larger than that of aided and smaller than unaided schools, Percentage of students coming from aided school is too smaller than that of government and unaided schools, and percentage of students coming from unaided school is larger than that of government and aided schools.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure 17 shows the percentage of students studied in different schools during their secondary.



FIGURE 17 Graphical representation of Institution wise analysis based on school Management type

**4.6.2 INSTITUTION WISE ANALYSIS BASED ON SYLLABUS**

The table 20 gives the details of syllabus followed by professional college students during their secondary stage.

**TABLE 20**

Percentage Analysis on Syllabus

Followed by Professional College Students During their Secondary Stage

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  syllabusInstitutions | State/ SCERTsyllabus | Central/ CBSE syllabus | Other syllabus |
| Government Medical college | 50% | 50% | 0 |
| Government Engineering college | 70% | 30% | 0 |
| National Institute of Technology | 47.5% | 50% | 2.5% |
| Indian Institute of Management | 50% | 42.5% | 7.5% |

**DISCUSSION**

With reference to the table 20 we can assume that 50 percentage of medical college students followed SCERT/state syllabus, 50 percentage of students followed CBSE syllabus during their secondary stage. Among engineering college students 70 percentage of students followed state/SCERT syllabus and 30 percentage of students followed CBSE syllabus during their secondary stage. 47.5 percentage of students in National Institute of Technology followed State/SCERT syllabus, 50 percentage students followed CBSE syllabus and 2.5 percentage of them followed other syllabus during their secondary stage. Among the students in Indian Institute of Management 50 percentage followed state/SCERT syllabus, 42.5 percentage of students followed CBSE syllabus and 7.5 percentage of students followed other syllabus during their secondary stage.

**GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION**

The figure 18 shows the percentage of students followed by different syllabus.



FIGURE 18 Graphical Representation of Percentage Analysis Based on the Syllabus.

**SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS**

This chapter provides a retrospective view of the study, major findings, educational implication and suggestion for further research in the area.

**5.1** **STUDY IN RETROSPECT**

**5.1.1 RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

 The present study is entitled with “A RETROSPECTIVE STUDY OF PERCIEVED PARENTAL SUPPORT SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND SCHOOLING TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL COLLEGE STUDENTS DURING THEIR SECONDARY STAGE”

**5.1.2 VARIABLES OF THE STUDY**

 The important variables measured and analyzed by the investigator in this research work are**,**

**1.** Perceived parental support

**2.** socio-economic status

**3**. Schooling type

**5.1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

* Toanalyze the influence of parental support on getting entry to professional course
* To find out the effect of socio-economic status on the academic achievement of professional college students
* To find out how many percentage of professional college students came from Government schools, aided schools or unaided schools
* To find out how many percentage of professional college students followed SCERT,CBSE or other syllabus

**5.1.4 METHODOLOGY**

The methodology adopted for the present study is outlined in the following sections

**5.1.4.1Samples**

The samples of the study comprised of the professional college students, representing 40 students from Government Medical College-Calicut, Government Engineering College-Kannur, National Institute of Technology (NIT)-Calicut, Indian Institute of Management (IIM)-Calicut. Stratified random sampling technique was used to select the representative group of final year professional college students.

**5.1.4.2** **Tools used for the study**

The investigator used the following tools for the present study.

1. Questionnaire of Perceived Parental Support.
2. Socio-Economic Status Scale.

**5.1.4.3 Statistical techniques**

Statistical techniques used for the analysis of data in this study is Percentage analysis.

**5.1.4.4 Procedure**

The investigator personally administered the instrument to selected professional college students after giving necessary instruction to them. After administering the test, response sheets were collected from the students. The data collected were subjected to percentage analysis.

**5.2 MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY**

1. Students who got moderate parental support during their secondary stage have largely got admission in professional colleges
2. Students who got moderate parental support during their secondary stage have largely got admission in Medical Colleges.
3. Students who got moderate parental support during their secondary stage have largely got admission in Engineering Colleges.
4. Students who got moderate parental support during their secondary stage have largely got admission in National Institute of Technology.
5. Students who got moderate parental support during their secondary stage have largely got admission in Indian Institute of Management.
6. Students who had average socio-economic status during their secondary stage have largely got admission in professional colleges
7. Students who had average socio-economic status during their secondary stage have largely got admission in Medical Colleges
8. Students who had average socio-economic status during their secondary stage have largely got admission in Engineering colleges
9. Students who had average socio-economic status during their secondary stage have largely got admission in National Institute of Technology.
10. Students who had average socio-economic status during their secondary stage have largely got admission in Indian Institute of Management.
11. Among professional college students 41.2 percentage of students studied in government schools.
12. Among professional college students 15 percentage of students studied in aided schools.
13. Among professional college students 43.75 percentage of students studied in unaided schools.
14. Among Medical College students 47.5 percentage of students studied in government schools.
15. Among Medical College students 12.5 percentage of students studied in aided schools.
16. Among Medical College students 40 percentage of students studied in unaided schools.
17. Among Engineering College students 52.5 percentage of students studied in government schools.
18. Among Engineering College students 25 percentage of students studied in aided schools.
19. Among Engineering College students 22.5 percentage of students studied in unaided schools.
20. Among the students in National Institute of Technology 40 percentage of students studied in government schools.
21. Among the students in National Institute of Technology 7.5 percentage of students studied in aided schools.
22. Among the students in National Institute of Technology 52.5 percentage of students studied in unaided schools.
23. Among the students in Indian Institute of Management 25 percentage of students studied in government schools
24. Among the students in Indian Institute of Management 15 percentage of students studied in aided schools
25. Among the students in Indian Institute of Management 60 percentage of students studied in unaided schools
26. Among professional college students 54.38 percentage of students followed state/ SCERT syllabus.
27. Among professional college students 43.12 percentage of students followed CBSE syllabus.
28. Among professional college students 2.5 percentage of students followed other syllabus than state/SCERT and CBSE syllabus.
29. Among Medical college students 50 percentage of students followed state/ SCERT syllabus
30. Among Medical college students 50 percentage of students followed CBSE syllabus.
31. Among Engineering college students 70 percentage of students followed state/ SCERT syllabus.
32. Among Engineering college students 30 percentage of students followed CBSE syllabus.
33. Among the students in National Institute of Technology 47.5 percentage of students followed state/ SCERT syllabus.
34. Among the students in National Institute of Technology 50 percentage of students followed CBSE syllabus.
35. Among the students in National Institute of Technology 2.5 percentage of students followed other syllabus than state/SCERT and CBSE syllabus.
36. Among the students in Indian Institute of Management 50 percentage of students followed state/ SCERT syllabus.
37. Among the students in Indian Institute of Management 42.5 percentage of students followed CBSE syllabus.
38. Among the students in Indian Institute of Management 7.5 percentage of students followed other syllabus than state/SCERT and CBSE syllabus

**5.3 CONCLUSSION**

Based on the analysis the investigator reached the following conclusions.

 The level of perceived parental support is moderate for most of the professional college students during their secondary stage. The number of students had low or high parental support is very small.

 A large number of professional college student’s family had average socio-economic status during their secondary stage. From the result it can be concluded that family’s of professional college students had average educational, occupational, income, home and social status.

 Only a slight difference is seen between the percentage of students coming from government and unaided schools to professional college and the percentage of students coming from aided school are lower than that of government ant unaided schools. It shows that the participation of unaided school in producing high professional is almost similar to that of government and aided schools.So society should take measures to empower Government schools for providing better quality education. The study also reveals that the state syllabus or SCERT dominate over central or CBSE and other syllabi in leading the students towards high profession. It also proved through this study that is there is no significant difference in academic achievement of students according to the types of school or syllabi. There is no need of for parents to stick on Unaided CBSE school for getting admission to their children. So it can be stated that the fear and anxiety of parents in selecting the most suitable school for their schooling are unnecessary.

**5.4 EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

* Lack of parental support should affect the educational achievements of students. It may be a cause of wastage and stagnation of students in school. So parents should provide support for students in selecting their course, which results in getting admission to high esteemed institutions
* High parental support and involvement cause high anxiety & stress in children. It may results in educational failure.
* Students should get a chance to think freely and select course according to their aptitude.
* Parents should provide adequate mental support and facilities for study.
* The students following state syllabus are found to be studied in high esteemed institutions. It indicate that the existing SCERT syllabus meet the needs of students. Yet it is to be improved a lot. So government and other concerned authority should take appropriate measure for improving the status of SCERT syllabus.
* There is no significant difference in academic achievement of students according to the types of school or syllabi. So it can be stated that the fear and anxiety of parents in selecting the most suitable school for their students are unnecessary.

**5.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

1) The study can be extended to first, second, third, or fourth year students of the same institutions where the study held.

2) Replications of the present study using samples from Government arts and Science college students.

3) A study can be conducted on male or female students in professional colleges.

4) The same study can be conducted on students in unaided professional Colleges

5) The same study can be conducted on students in aided professional colleges.
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**APPENDIX 2**

**FAROOK TRAINING COLLEGE**

**FAROOK COLLEGE**

**QUESTIONNAIR OF PERCEIVED PARENTAL SUPPORT**

(FINAL)

**Mr. Afeef Tharavattath Mr. Prajeesh.OK**

Lecturer, M.Ed Student,

Farook Training College. Farook Training College

**Directions:** This is intended to collect your personal details while you were studying at secondary stage (VIII-X), for the purpose of a research work. Please try to give correct information to the best of your knowledge. No matter if you skip the uninterested items. I assure you that the details collected by this scale will be kept confidential.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Had your parents…….*** |
| 1 | Tried to arrange the basic facilities for your study?  | Yes | No |
| 2 | Discussed with others about the then available educational opportunities for you? | Yes | No |
| 3 | Insisted you to score good marks in every subject? | Yes | No |
| 4 | Sought your study prospects from your teachers? | Yes | No |
| 5 | Properly recognized your talents?  | Yes | No |
| 6 | Compelled you to study without considering your problems?  | Yes | No |
| 7 | Entrusted you certain household duties you were interested in? | Yes | No |
| 8 | Blamed you, when you came across any problem?  | Yes | No |
| 9 | Directed you to spend your leisure time?  | Yes | No |
| 10 | Entrusted you with other responsibilities while you were preparing for exams? | Yes | No |
| 11 | Inspired you to attend the functions in the neighborhood and relatives’ house?  | Yes | No |
| 12 | Insisted you to respect teachers? | Yes | No |
| 13 | Encouraged you to buy books required for your study? | Yes | No |
| 14 | Awaken you early in the morning? | Yes | No |
| 15 | Treated your friends with enthusiasm while they were visiting your house? | Yes | No |
| 16 | Encouraged you to play with your friends during leisure time? | Yes | No |
| 17 | Identified your needs and worked to satisfy them unconditionally? | Yes | No |
| 18 | Attended PTA meetings at school? | Yes | No |
| 19 | Insisted to study school lessons up to date? | Yes | No |
| 20 | Intimated you on the consequences of social evils prevailed in the society? | Yes | No |
| 21 | Asked about the behaviour of your friends? | Yes | No |
| 22 | Helped you to prepare assignments?  | Yes | No |
| 23 | Inspired you to do home works up to date?  | Yes | No |
| ***Had your parents…….*** |
| 24 | Scolded you in front of guests or friends?  | Yes | No |
| 25 | Consoled you when you felt restless? | Yes | No |
| 26 | Asked the reason when you came late from the school? | Yes | No |
| 27 | Compelled you to participate in competitions which you were not interested in? | Yes | No |
| 28 | Decided that you have to undergo such and such professional courses?  | Yes | No |
| 29 | Inspired you to be ambitious for professional courses?  | Yes | No |
| 30 | Used to advice you to attain the standard of those who had good jobs, pointing out them as examples? | Yes | No |
| 31 | Taught you that professional jobs are the noblest of all jobs? | Yes | No |
| 32 | Prepared a preferential list of jobs for you?  | Yes | No |
| 33 | Encouraged you to select professional courses?  | Yes | No |
| 34 | Allotted you to go for tuition?  | Yes | No |
| 35 | Compelled you to go for tuition? | Yes | No |
| 36 | Taken special efforts during your examination time? | Yes | No |
| 37 | Blamed you if you didn’t get high marks in exams?  | Yes | No |
| 38 | Insisted you to join the course of their selection?  | Yes | No |
|  |
| 39 | Directed you to professional colleges? | Yes | No |
| 40 | Were your parents interested in knowing your results?  | Yes | No |
| 41 | Had you disclosed your secret matters with your parents?  | Yes | No |
| 42 | Were your parents anxious during your exams?  | Yes | No |
| 43 | Were your parents anxious during the publication of your results?  | Yes | No |
| 44 | Had you joined the school as per the direction of your parents? | Yes | No |
| 45 | Was your school governmental? | Yes | No |
| 46 | Was your school government aided? | Yes | No |
| 47 | Was your school unaided and recognized?  | Yes | No |
| 48 | Had your school followed state (SCERT) syllabus?  | Yes | No |
| 49 | Had your school followed central (CBSE) syllabus? | Yes | No |
| 50 | Had you ever felt that you could have studied in any other school?  | Yes | No |
| 51 | Had you got enough leisure time to spend with parents?  | Yes | No |
| 52 | Had you got enough time and permission to enjoy your school days? | Yes | No |
| 53 | Will you follow the same procedure that your parents adopted to bring up and educate your future generation also?  | Yes | No |
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**SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS SCALE**

**Mr. Afeef Tharavattath Mr. Prajeesh.OK**

Lecturer, M.Ed Student,

Farook Training College. Farook Training College

**Directions:** This is intended to collect your personal details while you were studying at secondary stage (VIII-X), for the purpose of a research work. Please try to give correct information to the best of your knowledge. No matter if you skip the uninterested items. I assure you that the details collected by this scale will be kept confidential.

**General Data Sheet**

 1. Name :

 2. Age :

 3. Male / Female :

 4. Name of the institution :

5. Course :

 6. Class :

 7. No. of family members :

 8. No. of elder brothers :

 9. No. of elder sisters :

 10. No. of younger brothers :

 11. No. of younger sisters :