

A STUDY ON PARENTAL SUPPORT OF HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS

A. Ramya

Ph.D.Scholar, Department of Educational Psychology, Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University, Chennai-97, India.

Dr. T. Sivasakthi Rajammal

Research Guide, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University, Chennai-97, India

Abstract

Parental support positively impacts students' academic performance, confirms the previous majority of studies. The present study goes beyond and in-depth to study the impact of curricular support, co-curricular support, social support, financial support, and emotional support that make up parental support on higher secondary students studying class XI (N=592) and class XII (N=758) from Mayiladuthurai district (N=450), Nagapattinam district (N=450), and Cuddalore district (N=450) of Tamil Nadu State, India. The study results showed that the male higher secondary students were in an advantageous position and received more parental support than the female regarding curricular support, co-curricular support, social support, financial support, emotional support, and parental support in total; the higher secondary students studying in rural schools, received more parental support than the urban regarding co-curricular support, social support, financial support and emotional support; the higher secondary students studying in girls' schools received more parental support regarding curricular support, co-curricular support, social support, financial support, emotional support, and parental support in total than the boys' and co-education schools; the higher secondary students studying in government schools received more parental support regarding co-curricular support, social support, financial support, and parental support in total than the aided and self-financed school higher secondary students.

Keywords: Parental support, curricular support, co-curricular support, social support, financial support, emotional support, higher secondary students

1. Introduction

"Teachers are seen as the heart of the learning process" (NCERT, 2022), for they are the human resources who provide quality education to students at the school level. The Indian educational system starts from pre-primary and proceeds to primary, secondary, senior secondary and finally to higher education. Among these different levels of educational systems, "secondary and higher secondary education builds a firm foundation for both higher education and employment options to the students" (Government of Tamil Nadu, 2022, p.17). Thus, the Government of India established the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT); the State governments established the State Council of Educational Research and Training (SCERT) to provide quality education and meet the academic needs of teachers and students. Providing quality education and scoring high achievement scores is contingent upon multiple factors; among them,

parental support plays a significant role. No doubt, the entire academic success of school children revolves around the support received from their parents.

1.1 Parental Support

Parental support refers to the involvement and assistance provided by parents in their children's education and overall development. It includes activities such as supporting school performance, communicating with children, and participating in their education (Scispace, n.d.). Making wiser and smart decisions by the higher secondary students, in tune with their nature, interest and aspirations towards progress demands abundant parental support. Without parent support, a student of this stage cannot move forward in his/her life and professional aspirations. The parental support extended to the adolescents at emotional, informational and financial levels differed from culture to culture, country to country (Dutton, 2022). Nevertheless, how far and how much these students' received parental support contributes to the growth of the secondary students is a matter of concern and academic curiosity, as it impacts their career development. Hence, it requires this investigative research.

2. Review of Literature

Naparan and Olivar (2023) studied parental involvement and academic performance of students in online class learning among the Grade 12 students and found out a positive correlation between parental involvement and the academic performance of students. Oranga et al. (2023) study revealed that parental participation and involvement in education has a positive influence on a child's academic outcomes. The study of Varshney and Joshi (2022) on parental involvement towards school education of children affirmed that majority of the students were found having the average parental involvement. Rath and Sarangi (2020) investigated parental involvement and academic achievement of secondary school students in Odisha and found out that about one third of the total sample student had a privilege to have good and excellent parental involvement and it influenced their academic achievement. Tiwari and Tiwari (2020) examined the relationship between parental involvement and academic achievement in higher secondary school students among the XI class and the study proved that there was a significant relationship between parental involvement and academic achievement of students.

3. Objectives:

To find out whether there is any significant difference between the following sub-groups of higher secondary students:

- a) Gender – Male and female
- b) Locality of school – Rural and urban
- c) Medium of instruction – Tamil and English
- d) Type of school – Boys', Girls' & Co-education
- e) Type of management – Self-financed, Aided and Government

4. Hypotheses:

There is no significant difference between the following sub-groups of higher secondary students:

- a) Gender – Male and female
- b) Locality of school – Rural and urban
- c) Medium of instruction – Tamil and English
- d) Type of school – Boys’, Girls’ & Co-education
- e) Type of management – Self-financed, Aided and Government

5. Methodology

The investigator used survey method to study ‘*Career Maturity of Higher Secondary Students in Relation to Their School Climate, Level of Aspiration and Parental Support*’. The population for the study comprises all the higher secondary students studying XI and XII Standard in Mayiladuthurai, Nagapattinam, and Cuddalore districts of Tamil Nadu. The sample consists of 1,350 XI and XII standard students studying in higher secondary schools of Mayiladuthurai, Nagapattinam, and Cuddalore districts using stratified random sampling for selecting 450 higher secondary students each from and altogether for the study.

6. Tools Used for the Study

The investigator used the *Parental Support Questionnaire* constructed and validated by A. Ramya and Dr T. Sivasakthi Rajammal (2022). The tool contains 24 items under five dimensions with 7, 3, 3,3, and 8 items respectively in a 5-point Liker Scale with the options never, seldom, sometimes, often and always, after removing 16 items based on the pilot study.

7. Analysis and Interpretation of Data:

The collected data were analysed by applying Percentage Analysis, ‘t’ test, ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) & Post-hoc ANOVA.

8. Testing of Hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1:

There is no significant difference between male and female higher secondary students in their parental support.

Table 1 Difference between Male and Female Higher Secondary Students in their Parental Support

Parental Support	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	Calculated ‘t’ value	Remarks
Curricular support	Male	635	24.22	7.403	2.18	S
	Female	715	23.31	7.761		
Co-curricular support	Male	635	9.26	3.002	2.11	S
	Female	715	9.08	2.843		
Social support	Male	635	9.57	3.035	2.61	S

Financial support	Female	715	9.14	3.043	4.12	S
	Male	635	9.58	2.860		
Emotional support	Female	715	8.91	3.063	2.50	S
	Male	635	22.73	7.931		
Parental support in total	Male	635	75.18	15.212	3.55	S
	Female	715	72.25	15.064		

(The table value of 't' is 1.96, S - Significant, NS - Not Significant)

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated 't' value (2.18, 2.11, 2.61, 4.12, 2.50, 3.55) is greater than the table value (1.96) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the respective null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, the result shows that there is significant difference between male and female higher secondary students in the dimensions curricular support, co-curricular support, social support, financial support, emotional support and parental support in total.

While comparing the mean scores of male (Mean=24.22, 9.26, 9.57, 9.58, 22.73, 75.18) and female higher secondary students (Mean=23.31, 9.08, 9.14, 8.91, 21.63, 72.25), the male higher secondary students are better than the female higher secondary students in the dimension curricular support, co-curricular support, social support, financial support, emotional support, and parental support in total.

Hypothesis 2:

There is no significant difference between rural and urban school higher secondary students in their parental support.

Table 2 Difference between Rural and Urban School Higher Secondary Students in their Parental support

Parental support	School Locality	N	Mean	S.D	Calculated value	't'	Remarks
Curricular support	Rural	700	23.51	7.698	1.15		NS
	Urban	650	23.98	7.502			
Co-curricular support	Rural	700	9.47	2.952	3.81		S
	Urban	650	8.86	2.851			
Social support	Rural	700	10.05	2.877	9.10		S
	Urban	650	8.58	3.042			
Financial support	Rural	700	9.84	2.922	7.94		S
	Urban	650	8.57	2.918			
Emotional support	Rural	700	23.21	8.072	4.69		S
	Urban	650	21.16	7.960			
Parental support in total	Rural	700	74.02	15.799	0.96		NS
	Urban	650	73.21	14.527			

(The table value of 't' is 1.96, S - Significant, NS - Not Significant)

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated 't' value (1.15, 0.96) is less than the table value (1.96) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the respective null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, the result shows that there is no significant difference between rural and urban school higher secondary students in the dimensions of curricular support and parental support in total. But there is significant difference between rural and urban school higher secondary students in the dimensions co-curricular support, social support, financial support and emotional support. Hence the respective null hypothesis is rejected.

While comparing the mean scores of rural (Mean= 9.47, 10.05, 9.84, 23.21) and urban school higher secondary students (Mean= 8.86, 8.58, 8.57, 21.16), the rural school higher secondary students are better than the urban school higher secondary students in the dimension co-curricular support, social support, financial support and emotional support).

Hypothesis 3:

There is no significant difference between Tamil and English medium higher secondary students in their parental support.

Table 3 Difference between Tamil and English Medium Higher Secondary Students in their Parental Support

Parental Support	Medium of Study	N	Mean	S.D	Calculated 't' value	Remarks
Curricular support	Tamil	712	23.60	7.688	0.68	NS
	English	638	23.89	7.516		
Co-curricular support	Tamil	712	9.12	2.895	0.78	NS
	English	638	9.24	2.946		
Social support	Tamil	712	9.49	3.070	1.88	NS
	English	638	9.17	3.013		
Financial support	Tamil	712	9.51	2.919	1.65	NS
	English	638	8.92	3.032		
Emotional support	Tamil	712	22.52	8.137	1.76	NS
	English	638	21.74	8.004		
Parental support in total	Tamil	712	74.23	15.990	1.53	NS
	English	638	72.96	14.248		

(The table value of 't' is 1.96, NS - Not Significant)

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated 't' value (0.68, 0.78, 1.88, 1.65, 1.76, 1.53) is less than the table value (1.96) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the respective null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, the result shows that there is no significant difference between Tamil and

English medium higher secondary students in the dimensions of curricular support, co-curricular support, social support, financial support, emotional support and parental support in total.

Hypothesis 4:

There is no significant difference among boys’, girls’ and co-education schools higher secondary students in their parental support.

Table 4 Difference among Boys’, Girls’ and Co-education Schools Higher Secondary Students in their Parental support

Parental Support	Source of variation	Sum of squares	of df	Mean square	Calculated ‘F’ value	Remarks
Curricular support	Between	311.010	2	155.505	12.69	S
	Within	77717.111	1347	57.696		
Co-curricular support	Between	527.551	2	263.776	32.40	S
	Within	10963.842	1347	8.139		
Social support	Between	900.579	2	450.290	52.21	S
	Within	11616.040	1347	8.624		
Financial support	Between	675.218	2	337.609	40.04	S
	Within	11357.056	1347	8.431		
Emotional support	Between	1114.424	2	557.212	8.63	S
	Within	86969.351	1347	64.565		
Parental support in total	Between	6991.384	2	3495.692	15.45	S
	Within	304651.431	1347	226.170		

(For (2, 1347) df the table value of ‘F’ is 3.00, S - Significant)

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated ‘F’ value (12.69, 32.40, 52.21, 40.04, 8.63, 15.45) is greater than the table value (3.00) for the df(2, 1347) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the respective null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, the result shows that there is significant difference among boys’, girls’ and co-education schools higher secondary students in the dimensions parental support and its dimensions. Scheffe test is used as post hoc test to find which of the paired mean scores differ significantly.

The Scheffe post hoc test result indicates that the girls’ school higher secondary students are better in the curricular support, co-curricular support, social support, financial support, emotional support, and parental support in total than the boys’ and co-education schools higher secondary students.

Hypothesis 5:

There is no significant difference among government, aided and self-financed school higher secondary students in their parental support.

Table 5 Difference among Government, Aided and Self-Financed School Higher Secondary Students in their Parental support

Parental Support	Source of variation	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	Calculated 'F' value	Remarks
Curricular support	Between	34.611	2	17.305	0.29	NS
	Within	77993.511	1347	57.902		
Co-curricular support	Between	300.600	2	150.300	18.09	S
	Within	11190.793	1347	8.308		
Social support	Between	1114.030	2	557.015	65.80	S
	Within	11402.589	1347	8.465		
Financial support	Between	1213.154	2	606.577	75.52	S
	Within	10819.119	1347	8.032		
Emotional support	Between	305.303	2	152.651	2.34	NS
	Within	87778.472	1347	65.166		
Parental support in total	Between	6699.103	2	3349.552	14.79	S
	Within	304943.712	1347	226.387		

(For (2, 1347) df the table value of 'F' is 3.00, S - Significant, NS - Not Significant)

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated 'F' value (0.29, 2.34) is less than the table value (3.00) for the df (2, 1347) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the respective null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, the result shows that there is no significant difference among government, aided and self-financed school higher secondary students in the dimensions curricular support and emotional support.

But calculated 'F' value (18.09, 65.80, 75.52, 14.79) is greater than the table value (3.00) for the df (2, 1347) at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the respective null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, the result shows that there is significant difference among government, aided and self-financed school higher secondary students in the dimensions co-curricular support, social support, financial support and parental support in total. Scheffe test is used as post hoc test to find which of the paired mean scores differ significantly.

The Scheffe post hoc test result indicates that the government school higher secondary students are better in the co-curricular support, social support, financial support, and parental support in total than the aided and self-financed school higher secondary students.

9. Implication

The investigator suggests the following few recommendations based on the study.

- The school management can organize workshops for the parents to provide adequate and timely support for the higher secondary students.
- Brainstorm sessions could be arranged for the female students to find out the reasons behind why they get less support from their parents and appropriate efforts could be taken to improve the situation.

- The higher secondary students should be encouraged to share with parents what is happening in the school and ask for support openly.

10. Conclusion

Family is the root from which the fruits of children bloom and prosper. It would be difficult for the children to solve their problems at the schooling stage to solve their problems, whether it is academic or, social or emotional. Hence, it is obligatory for the parents to extend all possible assistance and support towards their children. Higher secondary students are at a crucial stage as it decides their future, and coming out with flying colours at the end of this schooling stage is challenging. It takes a lot of effort, guidance, exposure, maturity and support. Prioritizing at first to fulfill their children's needs when required, whatever it may be, will benefit the higher secondary students and the parents, as the study confirms.

References

1. Dutton, Y. E. C., Choi, I-J., & Choi, E. (2022). Perceived parental support and adolescents' positive self-beliefs and levels of distress across four countries. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, :353. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00353>
2. Government of Tamil Nadu, Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (2022). Performance audit on functioning of government secondary and higher secondary educational institutions [Report No. 10 of the year 2022]. https://cag.gov.in/uploads/download_audit_report/2022/Report-No-10-of-2022-School-Education-2020-21-English-064427c54a43990.22472310.pdf
3. Naparan, G., & Olivar, M. J. A. (2023). Parental involvement and academic performance of students in online class learning modality. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Educational Studies 10*(2):16-31. <https://doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v10i2p16>
4. NCERT, (2022). *Guidelines for 50 hours of continuous professional development for teachers, head teachers and teacher educators: Based on NEP 2020*. <https://ncert.nic.in/pdf/Guidelines50HoursCpd.pdf>
5. Oranga, J., Matere, A. & Nyakundi, E. (2023). Importance and Types of Parental Involvement in Education. *Open Access Library Journal, 10*, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1110512>
6. Rath, V., Sarangi, D. (2020). Parental involvement and academic achievement of secondary school students in Odisha. [Doctoral dissertation, Berhampur University]. Shodhganga. <http://hdl.handle.net/10603/346054>
7. Scispace. (n.d.) What is parental support? And how can affect on children's academic performance? Retrieved 2024 February 16 from <https://typeset.io/questions/what-is-parental-support-and-how-can-affect-on-children-s-3lz3xm9olo>
8. Tiwari, N. s., & Tiwari, S. K. (2020). Relationship between parental involvement and academic achievement in higher secondary school students. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education, 6*(5), 90-96.

9. Varshney, R., & Joshi, U. (2022). A study on assessment of parental involvement towards school education and academic achievement of children. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 10(2), 1513-1516. <https://ijip.in/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/18.01.150.20221002.pdf>