Abstract

Today, the environmental problems are matter of great concerns. The very survival of man depends on the solution of these problems. Education can play a vital role in this direction. Awareness and practices are essentials for action. It is education, which makes man aware, conscious of and knowledge about environment and environmental problems. The present study was intended to investigate the environmental awareness and practices among Secondary school students.

I. INTRODUCTION

The students, on whom the present study is conducted, might have been exposed to a variety of environmental related concepts, besides their exposure to mass media. Therefore, they might have acquired some level of environmental knowledge during their student hood. The present study therefore makes an attempt to estimate the level of awareness and practices. Environmental awareness is defined as factual information (for knowledge) possessed by a student about environmental issues, facts and events in the content areas of ecological concepts, pollution, wildlife, natural resources population and persons organization involved in the environmental movement. The environmental awareness test (EAT) which assesses the student’s awareness (Knowledge) in area of ecology concepts, pollution, wild life, natural resources, population and person’s organizations involved in the environmental movement. Environmental practice is defined as the day today practices of an individual as related to the conservation and preservation of his/her immediate environment in a
particular situations or give social group and individuals as an opportunity. So as to be actively involved at all levels in working towards the solution of environment problems.

II. RESEARCH DESIGN

2.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:
The problem for the present study is entitled, “A study on environmental awareness and practices among Secondary school students of Honnalli taluka”.

2.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:
1. To study the level of environmental awareness of Secondary school students of Honnalli taluka.
2. To study the level of environmental practices of Secondary school students of Honnalli taluka.
3. To study the significance of the difference in respect of Secondary school students’ environmental awareness if any between the subsamples with regard to
   a. Gender
   b. Location of the school
   c. Subject group
   d. Type of management
4. To study the significance of the difference in respect of Secondary school students’ environmental practices if any between the subsamples with regard to
   a. Gender
   b. Location of the school
   c. Subject group
   d. Type of management
5. To study the significant relationship if any between environmental awareness and environmental practices of Secondary school students.

2.3 HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY:
1. The level of environmental awareness of Secondary school students of Honnalli taluka is low.
2. The level of environmental practices of Secondary school students of Honnalli taluka is low.
3. There is no significant difference in the environmental awareness of Secondary school students of Honnalli taluka between the following subsamples
   a. Gender
   b. Location of the school
   c. Subject group
   d. Type of management
4. There is no significant difference in the involvement environmental movements of secondary students of Honnalli taluka between the following subsamples
   a. Gender
b. Location of the school

c. Type of School

d. Type of management

5. There is no significant relationship between environmental awareness and environmental practices of Secondary school students of Honnalli taluka.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Normative Survey Method has been used in the study.

3.1 Tools used

1. Environmental practice test for Secondary school students was constructed and validated by the investigator.

2. Environmental Awareness Scale constructed and validated by Dr. S. Kulasekara Perumal Pillai.

3.2 Sample

Using random selection, 1000 Secondary school students from Honnalli taluka of Karnataka were selected for the present study.

3.3 Statistical Technique Used

Descriptive analysis, Differential analysis and Correlation analysis were used in the present study to test the hypotheses and interpret the data.

IV. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

4.1 Descriptive Analysis

4.1.1 Comparison of Environmental Awareness and Environmental practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental awareness</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>63.51</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental practices</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>65.61</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It could be observed from Table-1 that Mean and standard deviation values of Secondary school students environmental awareness of the entire sample is found to be 63.51 and 6.31 respectively. The Mean value of the entire sample is higher than the mid value 48. Therefore, it is found that the Secondary school students have high environmental awareness. The hypothesis no.1 is rejected. The calculated Mean and standard deviation values of Secondary school students’ environmental practices of the entire sample are found to be 65.61 and 5.91 respectively. The Mean value of the entire sample is higher than the mid value 50.11. Therefore, it is found that the Secondary school students of Honnalli taluka have higher level of environmental practices. The hypothesis no. 2 is rejected.

4.2 Differential Analysis:

4.2.1 Significance Difference in the Sub-samples (Gender and Location) of Secondary
school Students' Environmental Awareness and Environmental practices:

**Table-2: Significance Difference in the Sub-samples of Secondary School Students' Environmental Awareness and Involvement in Environmental practices -Gender and Location of the school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Environmental Awareness</th>
<th></th>
<th>Environmental practices</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>Sig*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>65.91</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>14.2*</td>
<td>NS (0.05 level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>62.36</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of the school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>65.51</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>5.70*</td>
<td>S (0.05 level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>62.14</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant, NS - Not significant, S - Significant

A. Environmental Awareness:

In order to check the null hypothesis with respect to gender (Table 2), the t- test was employed. The Mean of male Secondary school students (N= 500) is found to be 65.91 with an SD of 6.21. The Mean of female Secondary school students (N=500) is found to be 62.37 with an SD of 6.10. The computed t value is 14.2 which is significant at 0.05 level. Since the calculated t- value is greater than the tabulated t- value, the hypothesis no.3 (a) is rejected and alternate hypothesis accepted. In order to check the null hypothesis with respect to location of the school, the t- test was employed. The Mean of urban school Secondary school students (N=500) is found to be 65.51 with an SD of 6.31. The Mean of rural school Secondary school students (N=500) is found to be 62.14 with an SD of 6.21. The computed t value is 5.70 which is significant at 0.05 level. Since the calculated t- value is greater than the tabulated t- value, the hypothesis 3(b) is rejected.

B. Environmental practices:

In order to check the null hypothesis with respect to gender, the t- test was employed. The Mean of male Secondary school students (N=500) is found to be 67.15 with an SD of 6.91. The Mean of female Secondary school students (N=500) is found to be 65.16 with an SD of 6.34. The computed t value is 8.29 which is significant at 0.01 level. Since the calculated t- value is higher than the tabulated t- value, the hypothesis 4(a) is rejected. In order to check the null hypothesis with respect to location of the school, the t- test was employed. The Mean of urban school Secondary school students (N=500) is found to be 65.61 with an SD of 5.91. The Mean of rural school Secondary school students (N=500) is found to be 64.91 with an SD of 5.60. The computed t value is 4.00 which is significant at 0.05 level. Since the calculated t- value is greater than the tabulated t- value, the hypothesis 4(b) is accepted

4.2.2 Significance Difference in the Sub-samples (type of school group and Type of management) of Secondary school Students' Environmental Awareness:
As seen from Table 3, to check the null hypothesis with respect to subject group, the F test was made. The F value is found to be 9.15 which is significant at 0.01 level for 997 degree of freedom. It denotes that there is significant difference among the Secondary school students who belong to different type of school groups with respect to their environmental awareness. The null hypothesis 3(c) is rejected.

In order to check the null hypothesis with respect to the type of management, the F test was made. The F value is found to be 3.07 which is significant at 0.05 level for 997 degree of freedom. It denotes that there is no significant difference among the Secondary school students who belong to different types of management with respect to their environmental awareness. The null hypothesis 3(d) is rejected.

### 4.2.3 Significance Difference in the Sub-samples (type of school group and Type of management) of Secondary school Students’ Environmental practices:

As seen from Table 3, to check the null hypothesis with respect to subject group, the F test was made. The F value is found to be 9.15 which is significant at 0.01 level for 997 degree of freedom. It denotes that there is significant difference among the Secondary school students who belong to different type of school groups with respect to their environmental awareness. The null hypothesis 3(c) is rejected.

In order to check the null hypothesis with respect to the type of management, the F test was made. The F value is found to be 3.07 which is significant at 0.05 level for 997 degree of freedom. It denotes that there is no significant difference among the Secondary school students who belong to different types of management with respect to their environmental awareness. The null hypothesis 3(d) is rejected.

### Table- 4: Significance Difference in the Sub-samples of Secondary School Students’ Environmental practices - type of school group and Type of management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F - Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject group</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>219.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>109.59</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>Significant at 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>21717.58</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>21.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21936.76</td>
<td>999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Management</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>353.51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>176.75</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>21583.25</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21936.76</td>
<td>999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen from Table 4, to check the null hypothesis with respect to subject group, the F test was made. The F value is found to be 5.03 which is significant at 0.01 level for 997 degree of freedom. It denotes that there is significant difference among the Secondary school students who belong to different subject groups with respect to their environmental practices. The null hypothesis 4(c) is rejected.

In order to check the null hypothesis with respect to the types of management, the F test was made. The F value is found to be 8.17 which is significant at 0.01 level for 997 degree of freedom. It denotes that there is significant difference among the Secondary school students who belong to different types of management with respect to their environmental practices. The null hypothesis 4(d) is rejected.

### 4.3 Correlation Analysis

Table-5: Correlation of Co – efficient between Environmental Awareness and Environmental practices of Secondary school Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>'r' Value</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental awareness</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>Significant 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen from Table 5 the correlation co-efficient (r) between environmental awareness and environmental practices is found to be 0.378 for the sample of 1000 of Secondary school students. It is higher than the table value of 0.081 at 0.01 level. It is concluded that there is significant relationship between environmental awareness and environmental practices of Secondary school students of Honnalli taluka. Hence the null hypothesis 5 is rejected.

### V. MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

1. The Secondary school students of Honnalli taluka have high environmental awareness.
2. The Secondary school students of Honnalli taluka have higher level of environmental practices.
3. The male and female Secondary school students of Honnalli taluka do differ significantly with respect to their environmental awareness.
4. The urban and rural school Secondary school students of Honnalli taluka differ significantly in their environmental awareness.
5. There is significant difference among the Secondary school students who belong to different subject groups with respect to their environmental awareness.
6. There is no significant difference among the Secondary school students who belong to different types of school management with respect to their environmental awareness.
7. The male and female Secondary school students differ significantly in their environmental practices.
8. The urban and rural school Secondary school students do not differ significantly in their environmental practices.
9. There is significant difference among the Secondary school students who belong to different subject groups with respect to their environmental practices.
10. There is significant difference among the Secondary school students who belong to...
different types of school management with respect to their environmental practices.

11. There is significant relationship between environmental awareness and environmental practices of Secondary school students of Honnalli taluka.
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