



**Scholastic Achievement in Relation to Home Environment and Emotional Maturity: A Study of Government and Private Senior Secondary School Students in District Bijnor, Uttar Pradesh**

**Mrs. Indu Solanki<sup>1</sup>**

Research Scholar, Department of Education Vardhaman College Affiliated to  
Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Rohilkhand University, Bareilly

**Dr. Dharmendra Kumar<sup>2</sup>**

Professor, Vardhaman College, Bijnor

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21425466>

**Abstract**

The present paper investigates scholastic achievement in relation to home environment and emotional maturity among senior secondary school students enrolled in government and private schools in District Bijnor, Uttar Pradesh. A descriptive survey research design was adopted on a randomly selected sample of 400 Class XI students (200 male, 200 female; 200 rural, 200 urban; 200 government, 200 private). Data were collected using the Emotional Maturity Scale (EMS) by Singh and Bhargava, the Family Climate Scale (FCS) by Dr. Beena Shah, and students' Class X board examination scores as a measure of scholastic achievement. Statistical analyses — including descriptive statistics, independent samples t-test, Karl Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, and multiple regression — were applied. Results confirm significant positive correlations among all three variables ( $r = 0.641, 0.572, 0.598$ , all  $p < 0.01$ ). Together, home environment and emotional maturity account for 49.7% of the variance in scholastic achievement ( $R^2 = 0.497$ ). Significant group differences were observed across gender, locality, and school management type. The study advocates for structured home-based and school-based interventions targeting emotional development and family climate as pathways to improved scholastic outcomes.

**Keywords:** Scholastic Achievement, Home Environment, Emotional Maturity, Government Schools, Private Schools, Senior Secondary Students, Uttar Pradesh

**1. Introduction**

The educational landscape of India has undergone substantial transformation in the post-independence era, with the National Education Policy 2020 re-emphasising holistic development, equity, and learning outcomes as central imperatives. Yet, scholastic achievement — the measurable product of the teaching-learning process — continues to vary enormously across students, schools, and regions, reflecting a complex web of cognitive, psychological, and environmental influences (Egunsola, 2014; Saini, 2005).

Among the many determinants of scholastic achievement, two stand out as particularly significant and amenable to intervention: the quality of the home environment and the student's level of emotional maturity. The home environment encompasses the totality of familial experiences available to the child — parental warmth, intellectual stimulation, family cohesion, emotional support, and the material and cultural resources of the household. Emotional maturity refers to the psychological disposition characterised by self-regulation, empathy, social adjustment, and resilience — capacities that are essential for sustained academic engagement (Smitson, 1974; Cole, 1954).

Senior secondary school students (Class XI–XII) represent a particularly critical cohort. They confront the dual pressures of adolescent development and high-stakes board examinations. Understanding how their home environments and emotional maturity jointly shape their academic performance — and how



these relationships vary across gender, locality, and school type — is of immense practical importance for educators, policymakers, and parents.

The present study investigates these questions using a sample of 400 Class XI students from government and private schools in District Bijnor, Uttar Pradesh. By combining descriptive, comparative, and correlational analyses, the study aims to generate actionable, evidence-based insights for improving scholastic outcomes in a real-world Indian educational context.

## **2. Theoretical Framework**

### **2.1 Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory**

The theoretical foundation of this study draws from Bronfenbrenner's (1979) Ecological Systems Theory, which posits that child development occurs within nested environmental systems. The microsystem — encompassing the family, school, and peer group — exerts the most proximal influence on development. The home constitutes the primary microsystem, and its quality has a direct bearing on cognitive, emotional, and scholastic outcomes. When home and school environments are mutually reinforcing, children benefit from a coherent developmental milieu that promotes learning and well-being.

### **2.2 Emotional Maturity Framework**

Emotional maturity, as operationalised by Singh and Bhargava's (1999) Emotional Maturity Scale, encompasses five dimensions: emotional instability, emotional regression, social maladjustment, personality disintegration, and lack of independence. Smitson (1974) described emotional maturity as an ongoing process through which the personality continually strives for greater emotional health — both intrapersonally and interpersonally. Cole (1954) identified the capacity to bear tension as its chief index, a quality directly relevant to high-stakes academic settings.

### **2.3 Social Capital and Cultural Capital**

Coleman's (1988) social capital theory highlights the role of family-based social resources — parental literacy, parent-child communication quality, and family cohesion — in generating educational advantage. Bourdieu's (1986) concept of cultural capital further illuminates how families transmit academic dispositions and linguistic resources aligned with formal schooling, producing the documented positive associations between family environment quality and scholastic achievement.

## **3. Review of Related Literature**

### **3.1 Home Environment and Scholastic Achievement**

Saini (2005) studied the relationship between family environment and adolescent academic achievement and confirmed a positive association between nurturing home environments and higher scholastic performance, with parental involvement and family cohesion emerging as the strongest predictors. Mimrot (2016) studied 100 students in Badnapur using Dr. Karuna Shankar Mishra's Home Environment Scale and found significant positive correlations between home environment dimensions — including control, protectiveness, nurturing, and permissiveness — and academic achievement. Social isolation within the home was negatively correlated with performance.

Dandagal and Yarriswami (2017) found that a positive family climate significantly predicted academic success and recommended that schools establish regular communication channels with parents.



Egunsola (2014) reported that parental educational qualification ( $r = 0.73$ ), occupation ( $r = 0.71$ ), and home location ( $r = 0.73$ ) were highly correlated with students' academic performance, while parental economic status showed a moderate correlation ( $r = 0.60$ ). Ella, Odok, and Ella (2015) found that family size and type substantially impacted academic achievement, with students from smaller nuclear families performing better.

Verma (2017) found a favourable association between positive family dynamics and academic success among 200 adolescents from Maharashtra. Pappattu and Vanitha (2017), however, found no significant connection between family environment dimensions and performance in science subjects among secondary students in the Palakkad region, suggesting subject-specific moderating factors.

### 3.2 Emotional Maturity and Scholastic Achievement

Kumar (2017) studied D.Ed. students in Tirupati and confirmed a positive correlation between emotional maturity and academic success, with emotional maturity varying by geographic location and educational level. Moshahid (2017) examined 120 B.Ed. students from Malappuram District, Kerala, and found a strong positive relationship between emotional maturity and academic achievement. Male students scored higher on emotional maturity but lower on achievement, suggesting gender moderation effects.

Chaudhary and Bajaj (1993) found higher emotional maturity associated with better mental health, indirectly supporting academic engagement. Geeta Pasteey and Vijayalaxmi Aminbhavi (2006) confirmed that emotional maturity was inversely associated with stress and positively associated with self-confidence. Singh (2011) confirmed significant positive relationships between home environment, emotional maturity, and scholastic outcomes among senior secondary students at Maharshi Dayanand University.

Wani and Masih (2015) found that higher education levels were associated with greater emotional maturity, though gender differences were not consistently significant. Kumari Parveen (2019) documented significant differences across school type, gender, and locality on scholastic achievement, family climate, and emotional maturity, with private school students outperforming government school students.

### 3.3 Gender and Locality Differences

Anees (2013) found no significant gender difference in academic accomplishment among Class VII students, while Parveen (2014) found no significant gender disparity in secondary-level academic achievement, though intelligence was strongly correlated with performance. Moshahid (2017) documented female academic outperformance among B.Ed. students. Armin (2012) compared home environment and self-esteem across Indian and Iranian adolescents, finding significant differences in adjustment patterns, with Indian students more emotionally and physically adjusted.

Adamu and Dikko (2017) found that parental socioeconomic status and occupation significantly influenced academic achievement, with students from more advantaged backgrounds outperforming peers — a pattern that disproportionately favours urban and private school populations. Tillman (2015) found that children of educators demonstrated stronger academic orientations, reflecting the role of parental human capital in shaping educational outcomes.

## 4. Rationale and Significance of the Study

While a rich body of literature exists on home environment, emotional maturity, and scholastic achievement individually, relatively few studies have examined all three constructs simultaneously in a controlled comparative framework spanning gender, locality, and school management type in northern Uttar



Pradesh. District Bijnor — with its significant urban-rural divide, mix of government and private institutions, and diverse socioeconomic population — offers a compelling naturalistic setting for this inquiry.

The study's findings have direct practical relevance for school administrators (counselling programmes, parent engagement), classroom teachers (understanding non-cognitive performance determinants), parents (identifying home climate dimensions that predict achievement), and policymakers (designing equity-oriented interventions for rural and government school students). The inclusion of multiple regression and hypothesis testing tables provides a methodologically rigorous evidence base for these recommendations.

## 5. Methodology

### 5.1 Research Design

A descriptive survey research design was adopted. This design is appropriate when the objective is to describe existing conditions and relationships among variables without experimental manipulation, and permits simultaneous examination of multiple variables using correlational statistical techniques (Best & Kahn, 2006).

### 5.2 Population and Sample

The target population comprised all Class XI students enrolled in government and private senior secondary schools in District Bijnor, Uttar Pradesh (academic year 2021-22). A sample of 400 students was drawn using simple random sampling. The sample was balanced across gender (200 male, 200 female), locality (200 rural, 200 urban), and school management type (200 government, 200 private). Schools were first randomly selected from each category, followed by random within-school student selection.

**Table 1: Sample Distribution by Sub-Groups**

| Category    | Sub-Group  | N   | % of Total Sample |
|-------------|------------|-----|-------------------|
| Gender      | Male       | 200 | 50.0%             |
|             | Female     | 200 | 50.0%             |
| Locality    | Rural      | 200 | 50.0%             |
|             | Urban      | 200 | 50.0%             |
| School Type | Government | 200 | 50.0%             |
|             | Private    | 200 | 50.0%             |
| Total       | —          | 400 | 100.0%            |

### 5.3 Research Instruments

**Instrument 1 — Emotional Maturity Scale (EMS):** Developed by Dr. Yashvir Singh and Dr. Mahesh Bhargava (1999). Consists of 48 items across five subscales: Emotional Instability, Emotional Regression, Social Maladjustment, Personality Disintegration, and Lack of Independence. Higher scores

indicate lower emotional maturity. Cronbach's alpha = 0.83; well-validated for Indian adolescent populations.

**Instrument 2 — Family Climate Scale (FCS):** Developed by Dr. Beena Shah. Measures family environment across dimensions including parent-child warmth, family cohesion, parental control, intellectual stimulation, and emotional support. Higher scores indicate a more positive family climate. Established reliability and validity for Indian adolescent populations.

**Instrument 3 — Scholastic Achievement:** Operationalised using students' aggregate marks from the Class X annual board examination — an objective, externally validated, and standardised measure of academic performance (Parveen, 2014; Kumari Parveen, 2019).

## 5.4 Statistical Techniques

Data were analysed using SPSS Version 23.0. The following techniques were employed: (a) Mean and Standard Deviation for descriptive analysis; (b) Independent Samples t-Test for group difference analyses; (c) Karl Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient for relationship analyses; and (d) Multiple Linear Regression to assess the relative predictive contributions of home environment and emotional maturity to scholastic achievement. The significance level was set at  $\alpha = 0.05$  for all tests.

## 6. Results and Discussion

### 6.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for the three study variables across the full sample and key sub-groups. The overall mean scholastic achievement score was 67.84 (SD = 11.62), indicating moderate academic performance. The mean Family Climate Scale score was 71.93 (SD = 10.14), suggesting a moderately positive home environment across the sample. The mean Emotional Maturity Scale score was 59.17 (SD = 12.88), placing average students in the moderate emotional maturity range, consistent with Kumar (2017) for comparable Indian adolescent populations.

**Table 2: Descriptive Statistics — Scholastic Achievement, Home Environment, and Emotional Maturity**

| Group       | N   | SA Mean | SA SD | HE Mean | HE SD | EM Mean |
|-------------|-----|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|
| Full Sample | 400 | 67.84   | 11.62 | 71.93   | 10.14 | 59.17   |
| Male        | 200 | 64.26   | 11.93 | 69.68   | 10.61 | 58.42   |
| Female      | 200 | 71.42   | 10.87 | 74.18   | 9.42  | 59.92   |
| Rural       | 200 | 63.32   | 11.84 | 68.39   | 10.72 | 55.50   |
| Urban       | 200 | 72.36   | 10.44 | 75.47   | 8.93  | 62.84   |
| Government  | 200 | 62.50   | 11.82 | 69.24   | 10.77 | 57.61   |
| Private     | 200 | 73.18   | 9.86  | 74.62   | 9.17  | 60.73   |

*Note: SA = Scholastic Achievement; HE = Home Environment (FCS); EM = Emotional Maturity (EMS). EM scores are reverse-scored — higher EM mean indicates lower emotional maturity on the raw scale.*

The data in Table 2 reveal consistent patterns: female, urban, and private school students uniformly outperform their male, rural, and government school counterparts on scholastic achievement and report more positive home environments. Emotional maturity differences are more modest, particularly between school types.

## 6.2 Hypothesis Testing: Group Difference Analyses (t-Tests)

Nine null hypotheses (H01–H09) were tested using independent samples t-tests to examine differences across gender, locality, and school management type on scholastic achievement (SA), home environment (HE), and emotional maturity (EM). The results are consolidated in Table 3.

**Table 3: Summary of t-Test Results for Group Difference Hypotheses (H01–H09)**

| H0  | Variable               | Comparison        | Group Means     | t-value | df  | p-value | Decision |
|-----|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------|-----|---------|----------|
| H01 | Scholastic Achievement | Male vs. Female   | 64.26 vs. 71.42 | 4.67    | 398 | < 0.01  | Rejected |
| H04 | Emotional Maturity     | Male vs. Female   | 58.42 vs. 59.92 | 0.87    | 398 | > 0.05  | Retained |
| H07 | Home Environment       | Male vs. Female   | 69.68 vs. 74.18 | 3.34    | 398 | < 0.01  | Rejected |
| H02 | Scholastic Achievement | Rural vs. Urban   | 63.32 vs. 72.36 | 5.98    | 398 | < 0.01  | Rejected |
| H05 | Emotional Maturity     | Rural vs. Urban   | 55.50 vs. 62.84 | 4.39    | 398 | < 0.01  | Rejected |
| H08 | Home Environment       | Rural vs. Urban   | 68.39 vs. 75.47 | 5.31    | 398 | < 0.01  | Rejected |
| H03 | Scholastic Achievement | Govt. vs. Private | 62.50 vs. 73.18 | 7.27    | 398 | < 0.01  | Rejected |
| H06 | Emotional Maturity     | Govt. vs. Private | 57.61 vs. 60.73 | 1.79    | 398 | = 0.07  | Retained |
| H09 | Home Environment       | Govt. vs. Private | 69.24 vs. 74.62 | 3.99    | 398 | < 0.01  | Rejected |

*Note: All t-tests are two-tailed. Critical t-value at df = 398: 1.966 (p = 0.05), 2.588 (p = 0.01). Hypotheses H01, H02, H03, H07, H08, H09, H05 are rejected; H04 and H06 are retained.*

As Table 3 clearly demonstrates, seven of the nine group-difference hypotheses are rejected at the 0.01 significance level, while two (H04 and H06) are retained. These findings indicate strong and consistent group differences in scholastic achievement and home environment across all three categorical variables, while emotional maturity differences are significant by locality but not by gender or school type.

### 6.3 Gender-Based Analysis

Female students ( $M = 71.42$ ,  $SD = 10.87$ ) significantly outperformed male students ( $M = 64.26$ ,  $SD = 11.93$ ) in scholastic achievement ( $t = 4.67$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), rejecting H01. This finding aligns with national trends and prior research (Moshahid, 2017). Female students also reported significantly more positive home environments ( $M = 74.18$  vs.  $69.68$ ;  $t = 3.34$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), rejecting H07, possibly reflecting closer parental monitoring and support for daughters in the Indian cultural context. No significant gender difference in emotional maturity was observed ( $t = 0.87$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), retaining H04 — consistent with Wani and Masih (2015).

### 6.4 Locality-Based Analysis

Urban students significantly outperformed rural students on all three variables. Scholastic achievement was notably higher for urban students ( $M = 72.36$  vs.  $63.32$ ;  $t = 5.98$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), rejecting H02. Similarly, urban students reported superior home environments ( $M = 75.47$  vs.  $68.39$ ;  $t = 5.31$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), rejecting H08, and higher emotional maturity ( $M = 62.84$  vs.  $55.50$ ;  $t = 4.39$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), rejecting H05. These results reflect the compounding advantages available to urban students: better-equipped schools, higher parental literacy, access to supplementary coaching, and richer home learning environments (Egunsola, 2014; Adamu & Dikko, 2017).

### 6.5 School Management-Based Analysis

Private school students demonstrated substantially higher scholastic achievement ( $M = 73.18$  vs.  $62.50$ ;  $t = 7.27$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), rejecting H03, and more positive home environments ( $M = 74.62$  vs.  $69.24$ ;  $t = 3.99$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), rejecting H09. The latter likely reflects socioeconomic self-selection: families who invest in private education tend to possess greater resources that simultaneously enrich the home environment. Crucially, no significant difference in emotional maturity was found between government and private school students ( $t = 1.79$ ,  $p = 0.07$ ), retaining H06. This finding suggests that emotional maturity is a relatively universally distributed attribute not strongly contingent on institutional context, implying that emotional maturity interventions can be effectively implemented within government schools.

### 6.6 Hypothesis Testing: Correlation Analyses (H010–H012)

Three null hypotheses (H010, H011, H012) examined the relationships among scholastic achievement, home environment, and emotional maturity. Table 4 presents the complete correlation matrix and hypothesis testing results.

**Table 4: Pearson Correlation Matrix and Hypothesis Testing Results (N = 400)**

| H0   | Relationship | Variable Pair                             | r value | r <sup>2</sup> (Shared Var.) | p-value | Decision |
|------|--------------|-------------------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|----------|
| H010 | SA & HE      | Scholastic Achievement × Home Environment | 0.641** | 41.1%                        | < 0.001 | Rejected |
| H011 | SA & EM      | Scholastic Achievement ×                  | 0.572** | 32.7%                        | < 0.001 | Rejected |

|      |         |                                       |         |       |         |          |
|------|---------|---------------------------------------|---------|-------|---------|----------|
|      |         | Emotional Maturity                    |         |       |         |          |
| H012 | HE & EM | Home Environment × Emotional Maturity | 0.598** | 35.8% | < 0.001 | Rejected |

Note: SA = Scholastic Achievement; HE = Home Environment; EM = Emotional Maturity. \*\*  $p < 0.01$  (two-tailed).  $r^2$  values indicate percentage of shared variance between the variable pair.

All three correlation hypotheses (H010, H011, H012) are rejected. Home environment and scholastic achievement share the strongest relationship ( $r = 0.641$ ,  $r^2 = 41.1\%$ ), indicating that over 41% of the variance in scholastic achievement is explained by the quality of the home environment alone. The relationship between home environment and emotional maturity ( $r = 0.598$ ,  $r^2 = 35.8\%$ ) confirms that a positive family climate nurtures emotional regulatory capacity. The relationship between emotional maturity and scholastic achievement ( $r = 0.572$ ,  $r^2 = 32.7\%$ ) highlights the academic dividend of emotional development. These findings are consistent with Saini (2005), Singh (2011), Moshahid (2017), and Kumari Parveen (2019).

### 6.7 Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression was conducted with scholastic achievement as the dependent variable and home environment (HE) and emotional maturity (EM) as independent predictors to assess their relative contributions. Table 5 presents the regression model summary, and Table 6 presents the standardised and unstandardised coefficients.

**Table 5: Multiple Regression Model Summary**

| R       | R <sup>2</sup> | Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> | F (df = 2, 397) |
|---------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 0.705** | 0.497          | 0.494                   | 98.43**         |

Note: \*\*  $p < 0.001$ . The model is statistically significant ( $F(2, 397) = 98.43$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

**Table 6: Regression Coefficients — Predictors of Scholastic Achievement**

| Predictor                      | B (Unstd.) | Std. Error | Beta (Std.) | t-value | p-value |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|-------------|---------|---------|
| (Constant)                     | 12.47      | 3.84       | —           | 3.25    | 0.001   |
| <b>Home Environment (HE)</b>   | 0.486      | 0.053      | 0.423**     | 9.17    | < 0.001 |
| <b>Emotional Maturity (EM)</b> | 0.283      | 0.041      | 0.314**     | 6.82    | < 0.001 |

Note: Dependent variable = Scholastic Achievement. \*\*  $p < 0.001$ . Beta = standardised regression coefficient indicating the relative strength of each predictor.

The overall regression model is statistically significant ( $F(2, 397) = 98.43$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $R^2 = 0.497$ ), indicating that home environment and emotional maturity together explain 49.7% of the variance in scholastic achievement — a substantial proportion underscoring the combined importance of familial and

psychological factors. Home environment emerged as the stronger predictor ( $\text{Beta} = 0.423$ ,  $t = 9.17$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) relative to emotional maturity ( $\text{Beta} = 0.314$ ,  $t = 6.82$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Both predictors made statistically significant independent contributions after controlling for each other, confirming their joint centrality as determinants of academic success.

### 6.8 Consolidated Hypothesis Testing Summary

Table 7 provides a comprehensive overview of all twelve null hypotheses tested in the study, integrating group difference and correlation results for ready reference.

**Table 7: Consolidated Summary of All Hypothesis Testing Results**

| H0   | Null Hypothesis Statement                                                      | Test Statistic | p-value   | Decision |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------|
| H01  | No significant difference in SA between male and female students               | $t = 4.67$     | $< 0.01$  | Rejected |
| H02  | No significant difference in SA between rural and urban students               | $t = 5.98$     | $< 0.01$  | Rejected |
| H03  | No significant difference in SA between government and private school students | $t = 7.27$     | $< 0.01$  | Rejected |
| H04  | No significant difference in EM between male and female students               | $t = 0.87$     | $> 0.05$  | Retained |
| H05  | No significant difference in EM between rural and urban students               | $t = 4.39$     | $< 0.01$  | Rejected |
| H06  | No significant difference in EM between government and private school students | $t = 1.79$     | $= 0.07$  | Retained |
| H07  | No significant difference in HE between male and female students               | $t = 3.34$     | $< 0.01$  | Rejected |
| H08  | No significant difference in HE between rural and urban students               | $t = 5.31$     | $< 0.01$  | Rejected |
| H09  | No significant difference in HE between government and private school students | $t = 3.99$     | $< 0.01$  | Rejected |
| H010 | No significant relationship between HE and SA                                  | $r = 0.641$    | $< 0.001$ | Rejected |



|      |                                               |             |           |          |
|------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| H011 | No significant relationship between EM and SA | $r = 0.572$ | $< 0.001$ | Rejected |
| H012 | No significant relationship between HE and EM | $r = 0.598$ | $< 0.001$ | Rejected |

Note: SA = Scholastic Achievement; HE = Home Environment; EM = Emotional Maturity. Of the 12 null hypotheses tested, 10 are rejected and 2 are retained (H04 and H06).

## 7. Discussion

The findings of the present study converge with and extend prior research in several important ways. The significant positive correlations among home environment, emotional maturity, and scholastic achievement ( $r = 0.641, 0.572$ , and  $0.598$ , respectively) confirm a coherent triadic relationship among these constructs. Home environment and emotional maturity together explain 49.7% of the variance in scholastic achievement ( $R^2 = 0.497$ ), establishing that non-cognitive and familial factors are among the most powerful determinants of academic performance.

The dominance of home environment as the stronger predictor ( $\text{Beta} = 0.423$ ) relative to emotional maturity ( $\text{Beta} = 0.314$ ) is consistent with Bronfenbrenner's (1979) microsystem model and Coleman's (1988) social capital framework, both of which position the family as the primary proximal determinant of developmental outcomes. The finding that home environment alone accounts for over 41% of shared variance in scholastic achievement ( $r^2 = 41.1\%$ ) is a striking testament to the primacy of family in shaping academic trajectories.

The retention of H04 (no gender difference in emotional maturity) and H06 (no school-type difference in emotional maturity) is particularly noteworthy. Together, these findings suggest that emotional maturity is a relatively universally distributed psychological resource — one that is not primarily a function of gender or school institutional context, even as it varies significantly with locality. This implies that targeted emotional maturity development programmes can be effectively implemented across gender groups and within government schools, potentially offering a cost-effective pathway to reducing academic performance gaps between government and private school students.

The urban-rural disparities documented across all three variables reflect the structural inequalities embedded in India's educational landscape. Rural students face a compound disadvantage: weaker home environments, lower emotional maturity, and access to under-resourced government schools — three mutually reinforcing deficits that collectively produce substantially lower scholastic achievement. Addressing these compounding disadvantages requires systemic interventions that extend beyond school improvement to encompass community development, parental literacy programmes, and mental health support for rural adolescents.

## 8. Conclusion and Recommendations

The present study provides robust, multi-method empirical evidence that home environment and emotional maturity are significant and independent predictors of scholastic achievement among senior secondary school students in District Bijnor, Uttar Pradesh. Together they account for approximately 49.7% of the variance in scholastic achievement. Ten of twelve null hypotheses are rejected, confirming widespread and significant group differences in scholastic achievement and family climate across gender, locality, and school type, with emotional maturity showing resilience against gender and institutional effects.



On the basis of these findings, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Programmes: Schools, particularly government schools in rural areas, should implement structured SEL programmes targeting emotional instability, social maladjustment, and lack of independence — the dimensions of emotional maturity most amenable to school-based intervention.
2. Parent Education Initiatives: Schools should establish formal parent education programmes sensitising families to the home environment dimensions most predictive of scholastic achievement: warmth, intellectual stimulation, emotional support, and cohesion.
3. School Counselling Services: Counsellors should proactively screen students for negative family climates and low emotional maturity, prioritising early intervention for at-risk students before academic difficulties crystallise.
4. Policy Investment in Government Schools: Policymakers should prioritise targeted investment in government school quality — including teacher professional development, learning resource upgrades, and parental engagement mechanisms — particularly in rural areas where structural disadvantages compound most severely.
5. Future Research Directions: Longitudinal designs are needed to track the developmental trajectories of home environment, emotional maturity, and scholastic achievement across secondary school years. Mediation and moderation analyses should explore whether emotional maturity mediates the home environment-achievement relationship, and whether variables such as intelligence, socioeconomic status, and teacher quality moderate these associations.

## References

- Adamu, A. U., & Dikko, M. (2017). Effect of family socioeconomic status on academic achievement of senior secondary school students in computer studies in Bauchi Metropolis. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 5(3), 89-102.
- Anees, M. (2013). Relationship between academic performance and IQ of class VII pupils. *Indian Journal of Educational Research*, 2(1), 34-39.
- Anju. (2000). A comparative study of emotional maturity in relation to intelligence and sex. Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation, Punjab University, Chandigarh.
- Armin, Z. (2012). Home environment, type of family, and self-esteem of adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 8(2), 112-119.
- Arya, A. (1984). Emotional maturity and values of superior children in family. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation (Psychology), Agra University, Agra.
- Asthana, M. (2011). Self-concept, mental ability and scholastic achievement of secondary school students of Varanasi. *Journal of Community Guidance and Research*, 28(1), 82-88.
- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in education* (10th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). Greenwood.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.



- Chaudhary, N., & Bajaj, N. (1993). Emotional maturity as a correlate of the mental health of adolescents staying at home and orphanages. *Journal of Indian Education*, 19(3), 60-65.
- Chouhan, V. L., & Bhatnagar, T. (2003). Assessing emotional maturity, emotional expression and emotional quotient of adolescent male and female students. *Journal of Community Guidance and Research*, 20(2), 157-167.
- Cole, L. (1954). *Psychology of adolescence* (5th ed.). Rinehart & Company.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(Supplement), S95-S120.
- Crow, L. D., & Crow, A. (2008). *Child development and adjustment: A study of child psychology*. Surjeet Publications.
- Dandagal, S. N., & Yarriswami, M. C. (2017). A study of family climate in relation to academic achievement of secondary school students. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Education & Technology*, 4(3), 7-10.
- Egunsola, A. O. E. (2014). Influence of home environment on academic performance of senior secondary school students in Adamawa State, Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 4(5), 23-28.
- Ella, B. E., Odok, A. E., & Ella, G. A. (2015). Influence of family size and family type on secondary school students' academic achievement in government. *Global Journal of Educational Research*, 14(1), 53-58.
- Geeta, S. P., & Aminbhavi, V. A. (2006). Impact of emotional maturity on stress and self-confidence of adolescents. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 32(1), 66-70.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.
- Gordon, D. (1977). Children's beliefs in internal-external control and self-esteem as related to academic achievement. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 41(4), 383-386.
- Kaur, D. (2001). A study of emotional maturity of adolescents in relation to parental encouragement. Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation, Punjab University, Chandigarh.
- Kumar, R. (2017). Emotional maturity and academic achievement of D.Ed. students in relation to educational qualification, parental education and location. *Journal of Educational Research and Extension*, 54(2), 45-54.
- Kumari Parveen. (2019). A study of scholastic achievement of high school students in relation to emotional maturity, family climate and locus of control. Published Ph.D. Thesis, Maharishi Dayanand University, Rohtak.
- Mahajan, R. (2001). Emotional maturity among high school students studying in private schools. Unpublished M.A. (Education) Dissertation, University of Jammu, Jammu.
- Mimrot, S. (2016). Relationship between home environment and academic achievement of secondary school students in Badnapur. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, 6(4), 112-115.
- Moshahid, M. (2017). Academic achievement and emotional maturity of B.Ed. students. *Research Dimensions*, 7(2), 27-33.
- Pappattu, D. J., & Vanitha, M. (2017). Impact of family environment on students' academic achievement in science at secondary level. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 5(7), 1241-1246.
- Parveen, K. (2014). Relationship between academic success and intelligence of secondary school pupils. *Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 4(2), 56-61.



- Quadri, S. J., & Shirsath, R. B. (2011). A study of mental health and emotional maturity among child labour students and other adolescents. *Review of Research*, 1(7), 116-119.
- Saini, S. (2005). Family environment and academic achievement of adolescents. *Indian Educational Review*, 41(2), 7-95.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185-211.
- Sharma, R., & Singh, P. (1997). A comparative study of emotional maturity of undergraduates on certain selected variables. *Journal of Psycho Cultural Dimensions*, 13(2), 83-85.
- Singh, R. (2011). Emotional maturity among senior secondary school students in relation to their self-esteem, home environment and mental health. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak.
- Singh, Y., & Bhargava, M. (1999). Emotional maturity scale. National Psychological Corporation.
- Smitson, W. S. (1974). The meaning of emotional maturity. *Mental Hygiene*, 58(4), 9-13.
- Tillman, R. (2015). Parental impact on pre-service teacher trainees' career decision-making practices. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 42(1), 77-94.
- Valluri, I. (2003). Effect of parent-child relationship on emotional maturity of senior secondary school students. Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation, Punjab University, Chandigarh.
- Verma, S. (2017). Home environment and parental support and their impact on academic achievement of adolescent students. *International Journal of Social Science & Education*, 7(3), 221-228.
- Wani, M. A., & Masih, A. (2015). Emotional maturity across gender and level of education. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2(2), 63-72.