

Social maturity of higher secondary students

Dr. AC Lal Kumar

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

Abstract

Social Maturity is the ability to function in an appropriate responsible manner. As adolescence is the age for an individual to express mature behavior. Social Maturity is an essential aspect for the individual as well as society. The present study was designed to investigate the social maturity of higher secondary students. For this purpose a total sample of 300 higher secondary students studying in 12th standard was taken on purposive basis from the schools of vellore district in Tamilnadu. Out of which 162 were male and 138 were female. In order to collect the data Social Maturity scale by Nalini Rao's were administered on the participants. Thus obtained data was analyzed using means, S.D's, 't'-test and F test. The results of analysis showed no significant contribution of social maturity towards gender, locality of institution, type of institution, medium of instruction, parental qualification, residence of students, mode of school and type of family.

Keywords: adolescence, higher secondary students

1. Introduction

The social maturity has various aspects of social abilities as self-sufficiency, occupational activities, communication, self-direction and social participation. Raj, M. defines social maturity as the level of social skills and awareness that an individual has achieved relative to particular norms related to an age group. It is a measure of the development competence of an individual with regard to interpersonal relations, behavior appropriateness, social problem solving and judgment. Every child is unique in itself and has its own pace of growth and development. As the child grows up, his emotions and social functioning changes and continuous till adolescence. Adolescence is that critical period of human development during which rapid biological, psychological and social changes takes place. This period marks the end of childhood and sets the foundation of maturity.

1.1 Social Maturity

Social Maturity is a personal commitment each individual must make as the attitude that will influence his/her daily lives. Individuals can opt for the socially immature attitude of self-centeredness or they can opt for the socially mature attitude of genuine concern for the total well-being of each other. The very informal atmosphere of self-help groups where the individuals discuss and share their problems and their achievements with each other within the framework of caring and sharing without the fear of being exploited (Dilts, 1982) [2]. Ryff (1998) [8] proposes that some factors of well-being in particular self-acceptance, environmental mastery, and purpose in life are highly correlated with self-esteem. According to Major, Cooper, Richards and Zubek (1998) [9] self-esteem may be thought of as a core resource that contributes to resilient personality, and a person with a resilient personality has a positive view of him or her, a sense of control and an optimistic outlook on the future. Levi (1987) defined well-being as a dynamic state of mind characterized by a reasonable amount of harmony between an

individual's abilities, needs, expectations and environmental demands.

Social maturity is a term commonly used in two ways, with reference to the behavior that conforms to the standards and expectations of the adults and secondly, with reference to the behavior that is appropriate to the age of the individual under observation. Thus, the social maturation permits more detailed perception of the social environment which helps adolescents to influence the social circumstances and develop stable patterns of social behaviour (Bretsch, 1952) [11].

2. Methodology

Normative survey method was followed. The present study is based on correlation method where the dependent variable is factors affecting social maturity where the independent variable is social maturity.

2.1 Sample

The sample consists of 300 students of XIIth class selected from the coeducational schools of Vellore district. Out of which 162 were male and 138 were female. The sample was collected by using multistage random sampling technique

2.2 Tools

Self-designed socio-demographic questionnaire was used to study the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents. Social maturity of the respondents was assessed by using Rao's Social Maturity scale developed by Nalini Rao's.

2.3 Statement of the Problem

The problem chosen for the study may be stated as "Social Maturity of higher secondary students.

2.4 Statistical Techniques Used

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

2.5 Operational Definitions of Key Term Used

Social maturity means acceptance of a person or how a person is accepted in the society. It is characterized by the individual’s ability to establish social relations independently with different social groups of the society. Social maturity in this study has been taken as an aggregated countenance involving self-confidence, self-direction, social-feeling, productivity and social and human values. A composite score on human adequacy-personal, interpersonal and social-constitute a construct called social maturity.

2.6 Description of the Tool

The items were scored by a five point scale. Namely strongly agree, a score of 5 is given, for agree a score of 4 is given, for neutral a score of 3 is given, for disagree a score of 2 is given and for strongly disagree a score of 1 is awarded. Higher score represent the high social maturity. The maximum social maturity score is $90 \times 5 = 450$ marks, and minimum social maturity score is $90 \times 1 = 90$ marks.

3. Objectives

The present study was designed to attain the following objectives:

1. To study the significant difference in social maturity of higher secondary students with respect to
 - a) Gender (Male, Female)
 - b) Locality of the Institution (Rural, Urban)
 - c) Type of Institution (Government, Aided, Private)
 - d) Medium of Instruction (English, Tamil)
 - e) Parental Qualification (Illiterate, School Education, College education)
 - f) Residence of students (Rural, Urban)
 - g) Mode of School (Boys, Co-Education, Girls)
 - h) Type of Family (Nuclear, Joint)

3.1 Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested in the present study:

1. There is no significant difference between Social Maturity of Male and Female higher secondary Students.
2. There is no significant difference between social maturity of Urban and rural higher secondary students.
3. There is no significant difference between social maturity of type of institution higher secondary students.
4. There is no significant difference between social maturity of English and Tamil medium of higher secondary students.
5. There is no significant difference between social maturity of parental qualification of higher secondary students.
6. There is no significant difference between social maturity of Urban and rural residence of higher secondary students.
7. There is no significant difference between social maturity of mode of school of higher secondary students.
8. There is no significant difference between social maturity of nuclear and joint family of higher secondary students.

3.2 Data Analysis

Null hypothesis

There is no significant difference between Social Maturity of Male and Female higher secondary Students.

Table 1: ‘T’ value between Mean and S.D scores of Male and Female in their Social Maturity

Gender	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ value	L.O.S
Male	162	238.01	95.62	1.059	N.S
Female	138	250.00	100.27		

It is evident from the table 1, the calculated ‘t’ value is 1.059 which is not significant at 0.05 level hence, the framed null hypothesis was accepted. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between Male and Female higher secondary students with respect to Social Maturity.

3.3 Null hypothesis

There is no significant difference between social maturity of Urban and rural higher secondary students.

Table 2: ‘T’ value between Mean and S.D scores of Rural and Urban in their Social Maturity

Locality of Institution	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ value	L.O.S
Rural	140	241.79	95.63	0.287	N.S
Urban	160	245.05	99.94		

It is evident from the table 2 the calculated ‘t’ value is 0.287 which is not significant at 0.05 level hence, the framed null hypothesis was accepted. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between Rural and Urban higher secondary students with respect to Social Maturity.

3.4 Null Hypothesis

There is no significant difference between social maturity of type of institution higher secondary students.

Table 3: ‘F’ test among the sub sample of Type of institution with respect to Social Maturity

Type of institution	Sum of squares	Mean square	Df	F Value	L.O.S
Between the groups	12445.05	6222.52	2	0.649	N.S
Within groups	2847945.67	9589.04	297		
Total	2860390.73		299		

It is evident from the table 3, the calculated ‘F’ value is 0.649 which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the framed null hypothesis was accepted. It is inferred that there is no significant difference among the sub-sample of type of institution with respect to Social Maturity.

3.5 Null Hypothesis

There is no significant difference between social maturity of English and Tamil medium of higher secondary students.

Table 4: ‘T’ value between mean scores of English and Tamil in their Social Maturity

Medium of Instruction	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ value	L.O.S
English	136	236.24	97.29	1.191	N.S
Tamil	164	249.65	98.10		

It is evident from the table 4, the calculated ‘t’ value is 1.191 which is not significant at 0.05 level hence, the framed null hypothesis was accepted. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between English and Tamil medium of higher secondary students with respect to Social Maturity.

3.6 Null Hypothesis

There is no significant difference between social maturity of parental qualification of higher secondary students.

Table 5: ‘F’ test among the sub sample of Parental qualification with respect to Social Maturity

Parental Qualification	Sum of squares	Mean square	Df	F Value	L.O.S
Between the groups	2847.60	1423.80	2	0.148	N.S
Within groups	2857543.13	9621.35	297		
Total	2860390.73		299		

Table 7: ‘F’ test among the sub sample of mode of school with respect to Social Maturity.

Mode of School	Sum of squares	Mean square	Df	F Value	L.O.S
Between the groups	10314.18	5157.09	2	0.537	N.S
Within groups	2850076.54	9596.21	297		
Total	2860390.73		299		

It is evident from the table 7 the calculated ‘F’ value is 0.537 which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the framed null hypothesis was accepted. It is inferred that there is no significant difference among the sub-sample of mode of schools with respect to Social Maturity.

3.9 Null Hypothesis

There is no significant difference between social maturity of nuclear and joint family of higher secondary students.

Table 8: ‘T’ value between mean scores of Nuclear and Joint in their Social Maturity

Type of Family	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ value	L.O.S
Nuclear	161	235.48	93.76	0.392	N.S
Joint	139	252.84	101.83		

It is evident from the table 8 the calculated ‘t’ value is 0.392 which is not significant at 0.05 level hence, the framed null hypothesis was accepted. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between nuclear and joint family higher secondary students with respect to Social Maturity.

3.10 Major Findings of the Study

- It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between Male and Female higher secondary students with respect to Social Maturity.

It is evident from the table 5 the calculated ‘F’ value is 0.148 which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the framed null hypothesis was accepted. It is inferred that there is no significant difference among the sub-sample of Parental qualification with respect to Social Maturity.

3.7 Null Hypothesis

There is no significant difference between social maturity of Urban and rural residence of higher secondary students.

Table 6: ‘T’ value between mean scores of Rural and Urban in their Social Maturity

Residence of students	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ value	L.O.S
Rural	142	245.86	95.68	0.392	N.S
Urban	158	241.43	99.93		

It is evident from the table.6, the calculated ‘t’ value is 0.392 which is not significant at 0.05 level hence, the framed null hypothesis was accepted. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between Rural and Urban residence of students with respect to Social Maturity.

3.8 Null Hypothesis

There is no significant difference between social maturity of mode of school of higher secondary students.

- It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between Rural and Urban higher secondary students with respect to Social Maturity.
- It is inferred that there is no significant difference among the sub-sample of type of institution with respect to Social Maturity.
- It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between English and Tamil medium of higher secondary students with respect to Social Maturity.
- It is inferred that there is no significant difference among the sub-sample of Parental qualification with respect to Social Maturity.
- It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between Rural and Urban residence of students with respect to Social Maturity.
- It is inferred that there is no significant difference among the sub-sample of mode of schools with respect to Social Maturity.
- It is inferred that there is no significant difference found out between nuclear and joint family higher secondary students with respect to Social Maturity.

4. References

- Best John W, Khan James V. Research in Education, Tenth Edition, New Delhi. Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd, 2008.

2. Garrett Henry, Wood Worth RS. Statistics in Psychology and Education, Surjeet Publications Ltd, New Delhi, 2008.
3. Guilford JP. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education New York, Mc Graw Hill Book Company Inc. 1956.
4. Lokesh Koul. Methodology of Educational Research (2nd Ed) New Delhi, Vikas publishing house Pvt. Ltd., 1990.
5. Mangal SK. Advanced Educational Psychology (2nd Ed.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd, 2008.
6. Mangal SK. Essentials of Educational Psychology. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd, 2008.
7. Dilts R. 1982. www.magamc.ca/Social_Maturity.htm. Retrieved on 12th May 2011.
8. Ryff D. The contours of positive human health. Psychological Inquiry, 1998, 1-28.
9. Major B, Cooper M, Richards, Zubek T. Personal appraisals and coping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1998; 74:735-757.
10. Levi I. Fitting work to human capacities and needs: Improvements in the contents and organisation of work. 1987.
11. Bretsch HS. Social skills and activities of socially accepted and unaccepted adolescents. Journal of Education Psychology, 1952, 443- 449.