

Social Relations of Prospective Teachers in Chennai District

Mr. S. Dharmaraju¹ & Dr. K. Saikumari²

¹Guest Lecturer of Education, Institute of Advanced Study in Education, Saidapet, Chennai – 600015.

²Assistant Professor of Biological Science, Institute of Advanced Study in Education, Saidapet, Chennai – 600015.

Abstract

The present study was undertaken to measure the Social Relations of Prospective Teachers in Chennai District, Tamilnadu with regard to their gender, locality, and medium of instruction. For this purpose, 600 Prospective Teachers (200 male and 400 female) from Chennai District were selected from 18 colleges. A questionnaire on Social Relations was used for data collection and t-test was used for data analysis. Results revealed that there was a significant difference in the Social Relations of prospective teachers in relation to their gender, locality, and type of family.

Key terms: Social Relations, Prospective teachers, Parents, Teachers, Peers.

Introduction

Social relations are a fundamental aspect of human life. This has been advocated early in the history of social science by luminaries such as Cooley (1902), Durkheim (1915), and Mead (1913), and continues to be of significance today, both theoretically and empirically, Antonucci, Ajrouch, & Birditt (2014), believes that context also matters the way in which social relations evolve and influence well-being which seems to vary across time and place (Ajrouch, Fuller, Akiyama & Antonucci, 2017; Fiori, Smith & Antonucci, 2007). Social relations have a central role, both in human life and in sociology. There are several ways in which relationships are important. For instance, close relations are a basis for attachment and social support (Belle 1989; Berkman et al. 2000; Gifford-Smith and Brownell 2003). Relationships are a source of social influence and are central to identity formation, role modeling, sense of belonging, and social comparisons (Berkman et al. 2000). Furthermore, a relationship can be a means to access different types of resources that other people possess (Coleman 1988; Lin 2001).

Relations in Different Microsystems

Parents: Relation with parents has a central role in the child's development. An early relationship with a caregiver is important for the child's development of attachment and is considered to be crucial in forming future relations with other persons (Berkman et al. 2000; Cohn et al. 1991; Dunn 1993; Garbarino 1992).

Teachers: Intergenerational bonding with adults other than parents (e.g. Recreation leaders or teachers) is an often neglected but potentially important factor for children's well-being. Teachers are adults whom children meet on a regular basis in their daily lives. Besides being

a source of support, teachers might serve as role models and mentors, and their set of standards and expectations of the child might influence educational outcomes. Also, the transmission of resources between teachers and the child is facilitated when these relations are strong (Birch and Ladd 1997; Crosnoe and Elder 2004; Crosnoe et al. 2004).

Peers: Another important type of social relation is with peers. There are several methods of studying children's relations with peers. For example, sociometric methods are often used to measure peer acceptance, status, and popularity; social networks are used to map the structure of connections between peers, and the quality of a dyadic relation is used to measure friendship and social support (Almquist 2011; Gifford-Smith and Brownell 2003).

The main quality of a teacher is maintaining a positive relationship with students. A teacher will not be going to interact with machines; he is going to interact with living human beings. So, student teachers who are prospective in nature should maintain a good relationship with parents, teachers, and society. If he /she don't possess a good social relationship, then he/she will be considered to be socially ill-adjusted. A socially ill-adjusted teacher will not be able to groom and make a better society as they deal with future citizens of the nation that is students.

The ultimate need of this research is to find the Social Relations of the prospective Teachers.

Objective

2.01. To find out the significant difference in Social Relations of male and female prospective teachers with respect to Gender.

2.02. To study the Social Relations of rural and urban prospective teachers with respect to locality.

2.03. To study the Social Relations of Joint Family and Nuclear Family prospective teachers with respect to Type of family.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses of the study were:

H0 1. There is no significant difference between the Social Relations of male and female prospective teachers with respect to Gender.

H0 2. There is no significant difference between the Social Relations of rural and urban prospective teachers with respect to locality.

H0 3. There is no significant difference between the Social Relations of Joint Family and Nuclear Family prospective teachers with respect to Type of family.

Methodology

The total sample of the study comprised 600 Prospective teachers (200 Male and 400 Female) of the age group of < 25 and above 25 years studying in Chennai District, Tamilnadu. The simple random sampling technique was used for the selection of 18 colleges (2 Government, 4 Government Aided, and 14 Self-financing colleges) and a simple random sampling technique was used to select the students' sample. The tool used for data collection was the Social Relations Questionnaire Modified and standardized by the investigator with the help of the research supervisor.

Analysis and Interpretation**Table.1: SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE IN SOCIAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE MALE AND FEMALE PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS.**

Variable		N	M	S.D	Calculated Value	Tabulated Value	Significance / result
Social Relations	Male	200	89.10	9.13	0.101	1.96	NS
	Female	400	89.19	9.48			

The mean, S.D, and t-value were calculated from the statistical analysis of data. The Mean score of male and female prospective teachers on social relations scores was calculated as 89.10 and 89.19 with S.D. 9.13 and 9.48 respectively. As shown in Table 1. The obtained t-value was 0.101 which is less than the table value even at a 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis is (H0-1) that there is no significant difference in the social relations of male and female prospective teachers is accepted and concluded that there was no significant difference in the social relations of male and female prospective teachers

Table.2: SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE IN SOCIAL RELATIONS OF PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS FROM RURAL AND URBAN AREAS.

Variable		N	M	S.D	Calculated Value	Tabulated Value	Significance / result
Social Relations	Rural	376	88.54	9.7	2.104	1.96	S
	Urban	224	90.20	8.7			

Table 2 indicates that the Mean scores of Social relations for prospective teachers from rural and urban were 88.54 and 90.20 with S.D. 9.7 and 8.7 respectively. The calculated t-value is greater than (2.104) the tabulated value at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis (N0-2) that there is no significant difference in social relations of prospective teachers with respect to the locality is rejected and concluded that there is a significant difference in social relations of prospective teachers with respect to the locality. From the mean scores, the prospective teachers from urban areas have more social relations (90.20) than the prospective teachers from rural areas (88.54)

Table.3: SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE JOINT FAMILY AND NUCLEAR FAMILY PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS SOCIAL RELATIONS.

Variable		N	M	S.D	Calculated Value	Tabulated Value	Significance / result
Social Relations	Joint Family	210	90.54	8.42	2.67	1.96	S
	Nuclear	390	88.41	9.75			

	r					
	Family					

The Mean score of Joint and Nuclear family prospective teachers on social relations scores was calculated as 90.54 and 88.41 with S.D. 8.42 and 9.75 respectively. As shown in Table 3. The obtained t-value was 2.67 which are greater than the table value at 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis is (H0-3) that there is no significant difference between the social relations of joint and nuclear family prospective teachers with respect to the type of family **is rejected** and concluded that there is a significant difference in the social relations of prospective teachers from a joint and nuclear family. From the mean scores, the prospective teachers from joint families have more social relations (90.54) than the prospective teachers from the nuclear family (88.41)

Conclusion

The findings and discussion in this study revealed that the locality of residence, type of family is a decisive factor in the process of social relations of prospective teachers. The study concluded that gender does not influence the social relations of prospective teachers. Since we are living in an era that is well aware of gender sensitivity and gives due respect to social relations might be the reason for gender has no influence on the social relations of a person. The locality of the residence and the type of family has influenced the social relations of prospective teachers. Since social relations are essential for the prospective teachers B.E d colleges of Education should take due steps to increase the social relations of prospective teachers by engaging them in group activities such as cooperative learning, group discussion in a classroom situation and encouraging their active participation in activities like Youth Red Cross, National Social Service, National Cadet Corps, and Community Social Service prevailing in the institution.

Reference

- [1]. Best, W. James & Khan, V. (1989). *Research in Education* (6th ed). New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
- [2]. Deepu Abraham K (). A Study on the Self-Esteem and Social Relations of Adolescents with Learning Disability. Christ University, Centre of Research Christ University, Bangalore.
- [3]. Judy and Arin. (2004). The Relationship of Coping, Self-Worth, and Subjective WellBeing. *Rehabil Couns Bull*, 53(3), 131-142.
- [4]. Wayt, Lindsay K., "The Impact of Students' Academic and Social Relationships on College Student Persistence" (2012). *Educational Administration: Theses, Dissertations, and Student Research*. 106. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedaddiss/10>