

TV PROGRAMS' EFFECT ON INCREASING STUDENTS' HEALTH AWARENESS AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL

M. Leonard Ashok

RVS College of Education, Coimbatore, India

Abstract

A country's socioeconomic development is directly impacted by the population's health. Through sub-centers, primary health centres, and community centres, the Indian government and state governments offer rural residents a variety of health services, such as immunisation, health education, nutrition promotion, basic sanitation, mother and child health care, control of local diseases, personal hygiene, health care infrastructure, blood bank service, ambulance service, and malaria prevention programmes. In India, rural areas are home to 70% of the people. Even the ignorant citizens of remote, sparsely populated regions want to have access to healthcare that may be used for both therapeutic and preventive purposes. The federal and state governments are making efforts to improve their health system's equity, efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness in an effort to accomplish this goal.

Keywords: *television programs, personal hygiene, health awareness, secondary level students.*

Introduction

A robust human resource base is a country's most important resource for fostering socioeconomic growth. To implement this idea, modern society has built formal institutions including hospitals, patient care centres, sub-centers, primary health centres, and community centres. Primary healthcare delivery continues to be the cornerstone of healthcare services. India was the first country to recognise the advantages of primary healthcare. India is a welfare state as well. The government aims to provide medical treatments that are both curative and preventative, even to the ignorant citizens of remote, sparsely populated communities. The concept of primary healthcare was founded in 1946. The federal and state governments are working to improve the effectiveness, responsiveness, efficiency, and quality of their healthcare system through primary health centres.

Methodology

Hypotheses

1. There is no appreciable variation in the mean scores for health, hygiene, and nutritional status between students in the VIII Standard according to the type of institution.
2. The mean assessments for the health, hygiene, and nutrition status of pupils in the VIII Standard show no statistically significant gender difference.

3. There are no discernible geographical disparities in the mean scores of students for health, hygiene, and nutrition status in the VIII Standard.
4. There is no appreciable variation in the mean ratings for health, hygiene, and nutrition status amongst students in the VIII Standard based on their socioeconomic class.
5. In terms of parental literacy, the mean ratings for the health, cleanliness, and nutritional status of students in the VIII Standard do not significantly differ.
6. Regarding their mean assessments for nutrition, cleanliness, and health state, students in the VIII Standard do not significantly differ from one another.
7. The mean ratings for nutrition, cleanliness, and health status among eighth-graders did not significantly differ depending on the type of instruction.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Hypothesis-1

Research Hypothesis

The mean scores of eighth-grade students' environmental awareness vary significantly depending on the type of institution.

Null Hypothesis

There is no discernible difference between students in the VIII standard in terms of the type of institution in their mean environmental awareness scores.

Table 1 Difference due to Type of Institution

Type of institution	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Government	30	19.83	6.58	0.58	NS
Govt. Aided	30	20.83	6.83		

$$df=98 \quad t_{(0.05)} = 1.96 \quad t_{(0.01)} = 2.58$$

The table shows the following information.

The estimated "t" value is lower than the table value; hence, it has no bearing at any level. As a result, the null hypothesis is accepted and the research hypothesis is rejected. There is no discernible difference between students in the VIII standard in terms of the type of institution in their mean environmental awareness scores.

Hypothesis 2

Research Hypothesis

The mean scores of eighth-grade students' environmental awareness vary significantly depending on the type of institution.

Null Hypothesis

There is no discernible difference between students in the VIII standard in terms of Type of Institution in terms of their mean environmental awareness scores.

Table 2 Difference due to Type of Institution

Type of Institution	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Government	30	19.83	6.58	0.21	NS
Matriculation	30	19.50	5.85		

$$df=98 \quad t_{(0.05)} = 1.96 \quad t_{(0.01)} = 2.58$$

The table shows the following information.

The estimated "t" value is lower than the table value; hence, it has no bearing at any level. As a result, the null hypothesis is accepted and the research hypothesis is rejected. There is no discernible difference between students in the VIII standard in terms of Type of Institution in terms of their mean environmental awareness scores.

Hypothesis 3***Research Hypothesis***

The mean scores of eighth-grade students' environmental awareness vary significantly depending on the type of institution.

Null Hypothesis

There is no discernible difference between students in the VIII standard in terms of Type of Institution in terms of their mean environmental awareness scores.

Table 3 Difference due to Type of Institution

Type of Institution	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Govt. Aided	30	20.83	6.83	0.75	NS
Matriculation	30	19.50	5.85		

$$df=98 \quad t_{(0.05)} = 1.96 \quad t_{(0.01)} = 2.58$$

The table shows the following information.

The estimated "t" value is lower than the table value; hence, it has no bearing at any level. As a result, the null hypothesis is accepted and the research hypothesis is rejected.

There is no discernible difference between the mean Environmental Awareness scores of eighth-grade pupils in terms of Community.

Hypothesis-4**Research Hypothesis**

The mean Environmental Awareness scores of eighth-grade students varies significantly depending on the gender.

Null Hypothesis

There is no discernible gender difference in the mean Environmental Awareness scores of eighth-grade students.

Table 4 Difference due to Gender

Gender	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Boys	45	20.27	7.24	0.07	NS
Girls	45	20.39	7.15		

$$df=98 \quad t_{(0.05)} = 1.96 \quad t_{(0.01)} = 2.58$$

The table shows the following information.

The estimated "t" value is lower than the table value; hence, it has no bearing at any level. As a result, the null hypothesis is accepted and the research hypothesis is rejected. There is no discernible gender difference in the mean Environmental Awareness scores of eighth-grade students.

Hypothesis-5**Research Hypothesis**

The mean scores of eighth-grade students' environmental awareness in terms of locality differ significantly.

Null Hypothesis

The average Environmental Awareness scores of pupils in the VIII standard do not significantly differ in terms of Locality.

Table 5 Difference due to Locality

Locality	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Urban	63	20.27	7.24	1.03	NS
Rural	27	21.80	6.08		

$$df=98 \quad t_{(0.05)} = 1.96 \quad t_{(0.01)} = 2.58$$

The table shows the following information.

The estimated "t" value is lower than the table value; hence, it has no bearing at any level. As a result, the null hypothesis is supported and the research hypothesis is rejected.

The mean scores of eighth-grade students' environmental awareness in terms of locality differ significantly.

Hypothesis - 6

Research Hypothesis

In terms of socioeconomic class, there is a sizable disparity between the mean environmental awareness scores of eighth-grade children.

Null Hypothesis

In terms of socioeconomic status, there is no discernible difference between the mean Environmental Awareness scores of pupils in the VIII grade.

Table 6 Difference due to Socio-economic Status

SES	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Low	32	22.68	5.30	2.49	NS
High	58	19.64	6.02		

$$df=98 \quad t_{(0.05)} = 1.96 \quad t_{(0.01)} = 2.58$$

The table shows the following information.

The calculated "t" value is equal to or greater than the table value, and it is significant at the level of 0.05. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected and the research hypothesis is accepted. In terms of socioeconomic class, there is a sizable disparity between the mean environmental awareness scores of eighth-grade children.

Hypothesis 7

Research Hypothesis

The mean scores of eighth-grade pupils' environmental awareness fluctuate significantly depending on their parents' education levels.

Null Hypothesis

The mean scores don't differ much from one another. Students in the eighth grade's awareness of the environment in relation to their parents' education.

Table 7 Difference due to Parental Education

Parental Education	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Low	32	20.50	7.07	0.19	NS
High	58	20.84	6.82		

$$df=98 \quad t_{(0.05)} = 1.96 \quad t_{(0.01)} = 2.58$$

The table shows the following information.

The estimated "t" value is lower than the table value; hence, it has no bearing at any level. As a result, the null hypothesis is accepted and the research hypothesis is rejected. The mean scores don't differ much from one another. Students in the eighth grade's awareness of the environment in relation to their parents' education.

Hypothesis 8

Research Hypothesis

The mean scores of eighth-grade pupils' environmental awareness varied significantly in terms of community.

Null Hypothesis

There is no discernible difference between the mean scores of eighth-grade pupils' environmental awareness in terms of community.

Table 8 Difference due to Community

Community	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
SC	27	22.17	6.38	0.74	NS
NSC	63	20.09	7.35		

$$df=98 \quad t_{(0.05)} = 1.96 \quad t_{(0.01)} = 2.58$$

The table shows the following information.

The estimated "t" value is lower than the table value; hence, it has no bearing at any level. As a result, the null hypothesis is accepted and the research hypothesis is rejected.

There is no discernible difference between the mean scores of eighth-grade pupils' environmental awareness in terms of community.

Hypothesis 9

Research Hypothesis

The mean scores of eighth-grade pupils' environmental awareness varied significantly in terms of Medium.

Null Hypothesis

There is no discernible difference in the VIII standard students' mean scores for Environmental Awareness in terms of Medium.

Table 9 Difference due to Medium

Medium	N	Mean	SD	"t" value	Significance
Tamil	60	20.83	6.83	0.18	NS
English	30	20.50	7.07		

$$df=98 \quad t_{(0.05)} = 1.96 \quad t_{(0.01)} = 2.58$$

The table shows the following information.

The estimated "t" value is lower than the table value; hence, it has no bearing at any level. As a result, the null hypothesis is accepted and the research hypothesis is rejected. The mean scores of eighth-grade pupils in Environmental Awareness in terms of Community do not significantly differ from one another.

Conclusion

The media profoundly shapes public opinion. Television, radio, and newspapers are all powerful media that significantly influence how people think. Mass media companies create messages in an effort to influence public opinion. Disseminating knowledge or important information to a significant percentage of the people is another crucial function of the media. It is possible to communicate with millions of people at once using mass communication techniques. The entertainment industry relies heavily on the mass media. In the age of Internet and TV technology, mass media is crucial for providing entertainment. The way that goods are advertised and marketed in the jet age is significantly influenced by the media.

References

1. Best, J. W. (2016). *Research in education*. Pearson.
2. Gronlund, N. E., & Linn, R. L. (1989). *Measurement and evaluation in teaching*. Macmillan.
3. Peters, D. H. (2002). The role of oversight in the health sector: The example of sexual and reproductive health matters in India. *Reproductive health matters*, 10(20), 82-94.
4. Selvaraj, S., & Karan, A. (2009). Deepening health insecurity in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 44(40), pp. 55-60.
5. Dash, U., Vaishnavi, S. D., & Muraleedharan, V. R. (2008). Technical efficiency in the use of healthcare. *Indian Economic Review*, 43(1), 69-82.
6. Akhtar, R. (2004). *India health care patterns and planning*. New Delhi: A.P.H. Publishing Corporation.