



Social integration of professional college students in relation to gender, medium of instruction and type of management

¹ S Dhamodharan, ² Dr. M Muthamizhlselvan

¹ Research Scholar, Department of Pedagogical Science, Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

² Assistant professor, Department of Pedagogical Science, Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract

The social integration is one of the most important key-problems that the students need to overcome when they enter the higher education system; that is why, for the first months of their college attendance, students are more focused on the establishment of interpersonal relations, then later shifting their focus to the responsibilities of higher education. The present study was conducted to find the social integration of the professional college students in Tamilnadu. Using random sampling technique 1000 professional college students from five different districts are chosen. Social Integration Scale constructed and validated by the investigator and guide (2016). The tool was used to collect the data. The data collected is subjected to statistical analysis, namely, mean, standard deviation, 't'- test. Results show that there is no significant difference found out between the samples of gender, medium of instruction and type of management towards social integration of professional college students.

Keywords: social integration, professional college students

Introduction

Social integration is one of a constellation of "social" terms that is being used widely in contemporary policy development to describe concepts whose aim (as stated by the Copenhagen Declaration and Programme of Action) is to foster societies that are stable, safe, just and tolerant, and respect diversity, equality of opportunity and participation of all people. Other terms that often invoked in support of this goal are "social inclusion", "social cohesion" and "social capital". All of these are contested terms, which often results in fruitless debate about what is meant when the terms are used. More seriously for policy makers, they are also notoriously difficult concepts to measure and operationalize, which is a distinct disadvantage in the current context of "evidence-based policy making".

Social integration is a complex idea, which means different things to different people. To some, it is a positive goal, implying equal opportunities and rights for all human beings. In this case, becoming more integrated implies improving life chances. To others, however, increasing integration may conjure up the image of an unwanted imposition of conformity. And, to still others, the term in itself does not necessarily imply a desirable or undesirable state at all. It is simply a way of describing the established patterns of human relations in any given society. Thus, in the latter view, one pattern of social integration may provide a more prosperous, just or humane context for human beings than another; but it is also possible for one pattern of social integration to be markedly different from another without being either better or worse.

Although no one doubts the importance of denouncing the unacceptable trend toward greater polarization, and launching an urgent call for greater solidarity, it is important to point out

some of the hidden assumptions which often underlie an exclusive emphasis on social integration as a goal or end in itself.

In fact, social integration is one of the most important key-problems that the students need to overcome when they enter the higher education system; that is why, for the first months of their college attendance, students are more focused on the establishment of interpersonal relations, then later shifting their focus to the responsibilities of higher education attendance (Diniz & Almeida, 2006; Ferreira, Almeida & Soares, 2001) [3,5].

Review of literature

Mertes, Scott (2015) [12] has found that the social integration, using Tinto's construct, significantly difference between male and female. Jones, Willis (2010) [9] examined whether social integration has a different impact on female students as compared to male students.

Statement of the problem

The problem taken up for the present study by the investigator may be stated as Social Integration of professional college students in relation to their gender, medium of instruction and type of management.

Population and sample of the study

The Social Integration Scale constructed and validated by the investigators, have been administered to a purposive sample of 1000 professional college students studying in different colleges in Chennai, Vellore, Kanchipuram and Villupuram, Cuddalore Districts in Tamilnadu. The sample and college was selected by using simple random sampling technique.

Instrument scoring procedures

Social integration scale constructed and validated by Guide and Investigator (2016). The Likert-type scale calls for a graded response to each statement on a five-point scale ranging from “Strongly Agree (SA)”, “Agree (A)”, “Undecided (UD)”, “Disagree (DA)” and “Strongly Disagree (SDA)”. The different points on the scale are assigned arbitrary weights, for example 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 in the order of response for the 42 items.

Methodology

Normative survey method was adopted in the present study. A random sample of 1000 college students from 33 professional college students located in 5 districts of Tamilnadu was selected for the study.

Operational definitions of term

The term “social integration” first came into use in the work of French sociologist Emile Durkheim (1897/1997) [4]. He wanted to understand why rates of suicide were higher in some social classes than others. Durkheim believed that society exerted a powerful force on individuals. He concluded that a people’s beliefs, values, and norms make up a collective consciousness, a shared way of understanding each other and the world.

It actually is a phase covering all other integration steps and the longest one. Social integration to take place is one generation. If there are socio-cultural obstacles preventing integration, it could take several generations. In other words, social integration can occur in from 30 to 300 years. For instance, slavery regulations in the USA hindered social integration of African-Americans for more than three centuries (Massey, Durand, and Malone, 2002) [11]. Hence, social and cultural values of local people and immigrants should be evaluated carefully before coming up with integration policies (Favell, 1998; Jiménez, 2011) [8].

Objectives of the study

1. To find out whether there is any significant difference between the male and female professional college students in their social integration.
2. To find out whether there is any significant difference

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation and ‘t’ test on Social Integration Scores of Professional College Students with regard to Medium of instruction

Variable	Medium of Instruction	N	Mean	S.D	‘t’ Value	Level of Significance
Social Integration	Tamil	412	165.42	18.35	1.53	Not Significant
	English	588	163.64	17.86		

It could be observed from table 2 the ‘t’ value is found to be 1.53. It is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the null hypothesis 2 is accepted. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between the Tamil medium and English medium professional college students in their social integration.

Hypothesis 3

There is no significant difference between the Government and Private professional college students in their social integration.

between the Tamil medium and English medium professional college students in their social integration.

3. To find out whether there is any significant difference between the Government and Private professional college students in their social integration.

Hypotheses of the study

1. There is no significant difference between the male and female professional college students in their social integration.
2. There is no significant difference between the Tamil medium and English medium medium professional college students in their social integration.
3. There is no significant difference between the Government and Private professional college students in their social integration.

Analysis of data

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference between the male and female professional college students in their social integration.

Table 1: Mean and standard deviation and ‘t’ test on Social Integration Scores of Professional College Students with regard to Gender

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	‘t’ Value	Level of Significance
Social Integration	Male	481	165.37	18.48	1.68	Not Significant
	Female	519	163.45	17.66		

It could be observed from table 1 the ‘t’ value is found to be 1.68. It is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the null hypothesis 1 is accepted. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between the male and female professional college students in their social integration.

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference between the Tamil and English professional college students in their social integration.

Table 3: Mean and standard deviation and ‘t’ test on social integration scores of professional college students with regard to type of management

Variable	Type of Management	N	Mean	S.D	‘t’ value	Level of Significance
Social Integration	Government	510	166.14	17.31	1.25	Not Significant
	Private	490	164.62	17.60		

It could be observed from table 3 the ‘t’ value is found to be 1.25. It is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the null hypothesis

3 is accepted. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between the government and private professional college students in their social integration.

Findings of the study

1. There is no significant difference between the male and female professional college students in their social integration.
2. There is no significant difference between the Tamil medium and English medium professional college students in their social integration.
3. There is no significant difference between the government and private professional college students in their social integration.

References

1. Aggarwal JC. Basic Ideas in Educational Psychology, Shipra Publication, New Delhi, 2001.
2. Best John W, Khan James V. Research in Education, Tenth Edition, New Delhi. Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd, 2008.
3. Diniz A, Almeida L. Adaptação à Universidade em Estudantes do Primeiro Ano: Estudo Diacrónico da Interacção entre o Relacionamento com Pares, o Bem-Estar Pessoal e o Equilíbrio Emocional [Adjustment to Higher Education on 1st Year Students: Diachronic Study of the Interaction between the Peer's Relationship, Personal Well-Being and Emotional Balance]. *Análise Psicológica*. 2006; 1(24):29-38.
4. Durkheim E. Suicide. Mankato, MN, The Free Press, 1897/1997.
5. Ferreira J, Almeida L, Soares A. Adaptação Académica em Estudantes do 1º Ano: Diferenças de Género, Situação de Estudantes e Curso Academic Adjustment of 1st Year's Students: Differences in Gender, Student's State and Course]. *Psico USF*. 2001; 6(1):1-10.
6. Garrett Henry, Wood Worth RS. Statistics in Psychology and Education, Surjeet Publications Ltd, New Delhi, 2008.
7. Guilford JP. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education New York, McGraw Hill Book Company Inc, 1956.
8. Jiménez TR. Immigrants in the United States: How Well Are They Integrating into Society? Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute, 2011.
9. Jones Willis A. The Impact of Social Integration on Subsequent Institutional Commitment Conditional on Gender Research in Higher Education. 2010; 51(7):687-700.
10. Lokesh Koul. Methodology of Educational Research (2nd Ed) New Delhi, Vikas Publishing house Pvt. Ltd.
11. Massey DS, Durand J, Malone NJ. Beyond Smoke and Mirrors: Mexican Immigration in an Era of Economic Integration, 2002.
12. Mertes, Scott J. Social integration in a Community college Environment, *Community college journal of research and practice*. 2015; 39(11):1052-1064.