

A STUDY OF FRIENDSHIP AT X STANDARD STUDENTS

Dr. C. Manoharan

Assistant Professor, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore

Introduction

Friendship is a relationship of mutual affection between two or more people. Friendship is a stronger form of interpersonal bond than an association. Friendship has been studied in academic fields such as sociology, social psychology, anthropology, and philosophy. Various academic theories of friendship have been proposed, including social exchange theory, equity theory, relational dialectics, and attachment styles. A World Happiness Database study found that people with close friendships are happier.

Although there are many forms of friendship, some of which may vary from place to place, certain characteristics are present in many types of friendship. Such characteristics include affection, sympathy, empathy, honesty, altruism, mutual understanding and compassion, enjoyment of each other's company, trust, and the ability to be oneself, express one's feelings, and make mistakes without fear of judgment from the friend.

While there is no practical limit on what types of people can form a friendship, friends tend to share common backgrounds, occupations, or interests, and have similar demographics.

Adolescence

A study examined over 9,000 American adolescents to determine how their engagement in problem behavior (such as stealing, fighting, truancy) was related to their friendships. Findings indicated that adolescents who were less likely to engage in problem behavior when their friends did well in school, participated in school activities, avoided drinking, and had good mental health. The opposite was found regarding adolescents who did engage in more problem behavior. Whether adolescents were influenced by their friends to engage in problem behavior depended on how much they were exposed to those friends, and whether they and their friendship groups "fit in" at school (Crosnoe, R., & Needham, B., 2004).

A study by researchers from Purdue University found that friendships formed during post-secondary education last longer than friendships formed earlier.

Friendships in Adulthood

Life events such as marriage, parenthood, and accelerated career development can complicate friendships in the transition from young adulthood to middle adulthood. After marriage, both women and men report having fewer friends of the opposite sex (Friendships, 2012).

Adults may find it particularly difficult to maintain meaningful friendships in the workplace. "The workplace can crackle with competition, so people learn to hide

vulnerabilities and quirks from colleagues. Work friendships often take on a transactional feel; it is difficult to say where networking ends and real friendship begins." Most adults value the financial security of their jobs more than friendship with coworkers. The majority of adults have an average of two close friends.

Old Age of Friendship

As family responsibilities and vocational pressures become less, friendships become more important. Among the elderly, friendships can provide links to the larger community; especially for people who cannot go out as often, interactions with friends allow for continued societal interaction. Additionally, older adults in declining health who remain in contact with friends show improved psychological well-being.

Although older adults prefer familiar and established relationships over new ones, friendship formation can continue in old age. With age, elders report that the friends to whom they feel closest are fewer in number and live in the same community. They tend to choose friends whose age, sex, race, ethnicity, and values are like their own. Compared with younger people, fewer older people report other-sex friendships. Older women, in particular, have more secondary friends—people who are not intimates, but with whom they spend time occasionally, such as in groups that meet for lunch or bridge.

In Diderot's Encyclopedia his definition offers an early modern conception of good friendship in the 18th century. He writes:

"Friendship is nothing other than the practice of maintaining a decent and pleasant commerce with someone. Is friendship no more than that? Friendship, it will be said, is not limited to those terms; it goes beyond those narrow boundaries. But those who make this observation do not consider that two people do not, without being friends, maintain a connection that has nothing incorrect about it and that gives them reciprocal pleasure. The commerce that we may have with men involves either the mind or the heart. The pure commerce of the mind is called acquaintance; the commerce in which the heart takes an interest because of the pleasure it derives from it is friendship. I see no idea more accurate and more suitable for explaining all that friendship is in itself and likewise all its properties." [28]

Correlates of Friendships

Friendships have been described most often with respect to their qualities and functions (Newcomb & Bagwell, 1996; Parker & Asher, 1993). They provide a source of companionship and entertainment; help in solving problems, personal validation, and emotional support; and especially during adolescence, offer a foundation for identity development. Research on friendship formation based on interviews and observations of children at school suggests that positive friendships are most likely to be developed and maintained over time when children display personal attributes such as the ability to communicate responsively, exchange information, and establish common ground, and when

they can self-disclose, extend and elaborate the activities of others, resolve conflict, and provide emotional support (Gottman, 1983). These characteristics tend to differ as a function of age. Young children describe their friendships in terms of specific overt characteristics such as spending time together or having common interests; older children are more likely to include psychological characteristics such as intimacy, self-disclosure, loyalty, and commitment in describing their friends. Friendships also become more stable as children develop (Rubin et al., 2006).

Relationships of friends also are characterized as more balanced with respect to mutuality and reciprocity, as having stronger affective bonds, and stronger levels of mutual trust and commitment than those of non-friends. Compared to non-friends, friends also have in common more interests, values, activities, levels of prosocial as well as aggressive behavior, and personality characteristics (Wentzel, 2005). Research on school-based motivation indicates that friends are similar in the degree to which they value academic achievement, set goals for educational accomplishments, and pursue goals to behave in prosocial ways (e.g., Wentzel, Barry, & Caldwell, 2004).

The supportive function of friendships is demonstrated in research showing that students who make school transitions with friends show overall better adjustment during and after transition periods (e.g., when they enter formal schooling, middle school, and high school) than those who do so without friends (e.g., Ladd & Price, 1987; Wentzel et al., 2004). Students who have established friendships with classmates also are more likely to enjoy a relatively safe school environment and are less likely to be the targets of peer-directed violence and harassment than their counterparts without friends (e.g., Schwartz et al., 2000). This safety net that friends appear to provide each other is critical in that peer-directed violence and harassment is a fairly pervasive problem in U.S. schools and can have an enormous negative impact on students' social and emotional functioning.

Although the importance of friendships in early development should not be understated, it is well documented that friendships play their most pivotal role in development during the adolescent years (Youniss & Smollar, 1989). During this time friendships are believed to provide a unique avenue for identity development; furthermore, during this time the strongest relationship between the experience of positive friendships and the numerous associated positive outcomes are found. In this stage of development, children exhibit increased psychological investment in their peers and dependence on friends for support.

Objectives of the Study

The following objectives are framed for the study:

- To assess the degree of Friendship prevalent at standard X.
- Tools

Appropriate tools were employed to collect relevant data based upon method. In the present study, the following tools were used.

Research Questions

The investigation was done in order to find out the answers to the following questions:

1. What is meant by Friendship?
2. Can Friendship contribute to Guidance?

Hypothesis

1. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of Friendship of the students in terms of Gender.
2. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of Friendship of the students in terms of Type of Institution.
3. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of Friendship of the students in terms of Locality.
4. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of Friendship of the students in terms of qualification.
5. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of Guidance of the students in terms of Experience.
6. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of Guidance of the students in terms of groups.
7. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of Guidance of the students in terms of Socio Economic Status.

Population and Sample for the Study

The sample for the study consists of 40 teachers serving in Higher Secondary Schools run by Government and Management. Belonging to both gender with varied experience.

The sample is random sampling. The teachers were selected randomly for the sample. The following table furnishes the details

S. No	Type of institutions	No. of Students		Total
		Boys	Girls	
1	Government	30	30	60
2	Management	30	30	60
	Total	60	60	120

Tools Employed

Appropriate tools were employed to collect relevant data based upon method. In the present study, the following tools were used.

Class Room Climate Scale

This implies the construction and validation of the tool used in this Study. The present study needed class room climate scale. The tools were constructed and validated

by Dr. Peston Jee. It is a standard scale. The scale consists of 90 items. This scale deals with several dimensions of the Friendship scale.

Dimensions	Dimensions Favourable Items	Unfavourable Items
Classroom Activities	2, 50, 68, 70	12, 27, 31, 47, 58,
Teacher Stimulus	3,28, 46, 87	30, 51, 59, 67, 81,
Classroom control	9, 21, 65, 84	18, 33, 38, 48, 79,
Teacher Activity	11, 13, 32, 39, 60, 86,	4, 25, 53, 80,
Participation	14, 24, 34, 52,61, 63,	5, 19, 41, 69
Rules and Regulations	8, 22, 44, 56, 74	17, 37, 40, 64,
Interest	1, 23, 29 43, 45, 49, 57, 62, 66, 72, 76, 83,	6,10, 15, 26, 36, 55, 89, 90, 75
Order	20, 35, 54, 63,	7, 42, 71, 85

The above table furnishes 45 favourable and 45 unfavourable items in the classroom climate rating scale administered to the students.

The scale was administered to 120 students of different schools. The investigator explained the purpose of the study to the learners. A brief outline and instructions about filling the coding sheet were given to the V standard students before administering the tool and the learners were requested to go through each words and tick the appropriate number in the rating scale which indicates the opinion of the learners. After answering all the questions the investigator collected the response sheets.

Procedure

To analyze the data statistically to find out the significant of difference between the teachers in the respective variables namely Teaching Attitude, Teaching Aptitude, teaching Professional Perception and Role perception. To find out if there is any correlation between the dependent and independent variables.

Scheme of Analysis of Data

Mean, Standard Deviation, correlation co-efficient were to be found out for conducting the investigation. For the purpose of finding out the significance of difference between the teachers in relation to attitude to teaching, aptitude, teacher professional perception and role perception 't' tests were done.

Table 1: Difference in Students due to type of Institution

Type of institution	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Government	30	269.83	14.94	2.94	S
Management	30	280.83	13.96		

There exists significant difference in the mean scores in Friendship of the boys belonging to Government schools and management schools.

Table 2: Difference in Students due to Gender

Gender	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Boys	60	275.00	17.84	4.13	S
Girls	60	288.33	17.56		

There exists significant difference in the mean scores in Friendship of the students in terms of gender.

Table 3: Difference in Students due to Locality

Locality	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Urban	60	268.10	21.21	4.94	S
Rural	60	286.17	18.79		

There exists significant difference in the mean scores in Friendship of the students in terms of locality.

Table 4: Difference in Students due to Qualification

Type of institution	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Government	30	31.50	11.83	2.03	S
Management	30	37.16	9.66		

There exists significant difference in the mean scores in Friendship of the students in terms of qualification.

Table 5: Difference in Students due to Experience

Institution	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Government	30	34.16	12.67	1.49	NS
Management	30	38.50	9.83		

There exists no significant difference in the mean scores in Friendship of the students in terms of qualification.

Table 6: Difference in Students due to SES

Gender	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Boys	60	34.33	11.03	1.52	NS
Girls	60	36.33	10.50		

There exists no significant difference in the mean scores in Friendship of the students in terms of socio-economic status.

Table 7: Difference in Students due to Groups

Groups	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Arts	60	32.83	11.55	2.54	S
Science	60	37.83	10.00		

There exists no significant difference in the mean scores in Guidance of the students in terms of type of Institution.

Correlation

Correlation is the relationship between two or more paired variables, between two or more sets of data. The degree of relationship may be measured and represented by the coefficient of correlation. This coefficient may be identified by the symbol. r (of Pearson)¹³

Correlation co-efficient

“The degree of relationship may be measured and represented by the co-efficient of correlation.

Table 8: Relationship between Friendship and Values

Sl. No.	CORRELATES	r values	Relationship
1.	Class room climate	0.63	High Positive
2	Guidance	0.45	Positive Substantial

There will be no substantial positive relationship between the criterion variable and correlate variables.

Findings

1. There exists significant difference in the mean scores in Friendship of the boys belonging to Government schools and management schools.
2. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores in Friendship of the girls belonging to Government schools and management schools.
3. There exists significant difference in the mean scores in Friendship of the students in terms of gender.
4. There exists significant difference in the mean scores in Friendship of the students in terms of type of Institution.
5. There exists significant difference in the mean scores in Guidance of the boys belonging to Government schools and management schools.
6. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores in Guidance of the girls belonging to Government schools and management schools.
7. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores in Guidance of the students in terms of gender.
8. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores in Guidance of the students in terms of type of Institution.
9. There exists a low positive correlation between Guidance and

Limitation of the Study

The limitation of the study is as follows:

1. The study is limited to the learners studying in V std in certain schools of Madurai District.
2. The sample is accessible sampling.
3. The period of study is short owing to paucity of time on the part of the investigators.
4. As Class room Climate covers a wide range of social and psychological phenomena a few factors have been taken into consideration for the study.

Implications of the Study

Friendship plays a significant role in imparting quality education to the learners. Friendship perception is a term which covers various traits such as personality, motivation, attitude, aptitude, leadership quality, classroom control, classroom management and enforcing discipline. A teacher who is imbued with a higher sense of fostering creativity may contribute his might to the betterment of the student's personality and growth of the nation. Classroom interaction of the teachers occupies a prominent place in his role. The teaching style of the teachers is related to learning aspects of the students. Hence, it is imperative on the part of the teachers to be replete with a higher order of conscience for effective teaching. Friendship perception has a high positive correlation with the academic achievement of the students. This drives home the point that Friendship perception is an important factor that is to be cultivated among the teachers.

Suggestions for Further Study

The following titles are suggested for further study .

- Impact of Friendship Perception upon academic achievement in physics, Chemistry, humanities and vocational subjects.
- A study of Friendship Perception of the teachers and academic achievement of he learners at different levels.
- A similar study may be undertaken with students of Matriculation Schools.
- A study of Friendship Perception and Role performance of the teachers at different school levels with special reference to fostering creativity.

Conclusion

The investigator could decipher that the good Friendship may go a long way in nurturing creativity and enhancing achievement of students in Mathematics, A good Friendship plays a vital role in imparting education to students at an optimum level.

References

1. Conger, John Janeway; Galambos, Nancy (1997). *Adolescence and youth: psychological development in a changing world* (5th ed.). New York: Longman.
2. Muraco, Anna (2005). "Heterosexual Evaluations of Hypothetical Friendship Behavior Based on Sex and Sexual Orientation". *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 22 (5): 587-605.
3. Kennedy-Moore, E. (2011). Can boys and girls be friends?
<http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/growing-friendships/201108/can-boys-and-girls-be-friends>
4. Selman, R. L. (1980). *The Growth of Interpersonal Understanding: Developmental and Clinical Analyses*. Academic Press: New York.
5. Vandegrift, Darcie (2015). "We don't have any limits': Russian young adult life narratives through a social generations lens". *Journal of Youth Studies*.