



A SCIENTIFIC APPROACH OF AMBIENT ATMOSPHERE TO DEVELOP ALLROUND PERSONALAITES FOR SUSTAINABLE WELFARE OF THE STUDENTS: A MODEL STUDY

Md. Vaseem Chavhan, M. Siva Jagadish Kumar

Assistant Professor, Department of Textile Technology,
Vignan's University, Vadlamudi – 522213, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India

M.V. Raju

Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, Vignan's University,
Vadlamudi – 522213, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India

E. Naveen Kumar

U.G Student, Department of Textile Technology, Vignan's University,
Vadlamudi – 522213, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

This study is to understand the psychology on acceptance of uniform at undergraduate student level. It was carried by segregating the students into active, unassertive and passive categories based on the personnel information obtained through questionnaire. Questionnaire consists of positive and negative points relating to uniform dress code and it has three positive and two negative responses. The responses taken on the point scale and quantified finally to the acceptance coefficient, to see the overall acceptance of different psychological groups. It has been found that there is a significant difference towards the acceptance of uniform between all the groups of students, further more active groups of students is having negative response while unassertive and passive having positive response towards the uniform acceptance.

Key words: Good Environment, Psychology, Dress Code, Under Graduates, RP and EQ

Cite this Article: Md. Vaseem Chavhan, M. Siva Jagadish Kumar, M.V. Raju and E. Naveen Kumar, A Scientific Approach of Ambient Atmosphere To Develop Allround Personalaites For Sustainable Welfare Of The Students: A Model Study. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 8(5), 2017, pp. 743–749.

<http://www.iaeme.com/IJCET/issues.asp?JType=IJCET&VType=8&IType=5>

1. INTRODUCTION

Uniform is a dress of the same style, materials and colour worn by a group of individuals. It is generally used in educational institutions, industries, multinational corporate companies and found in everywhere right from small grocery stores to flight crew. Uniform have many advantages and improves morale of the employees. The type of uniform dress code also effects on the perceptions about own ability or work, morale and trustworthiness (Karl, Hall, and Peluchette, 2013). It is evident that the use of uniform is more dominant in manufacturing sector than the artistic jobs. In this view, the institutes offer technical education, need to prepare the students with this kind of attitude. Also, in educational institutions people from different backgrounds appear in the same class and the uniform improves the equality feeling.

It is important to know that how the uniform is influencing the behavior and performance of students. The uniforms are having advantages as well as disadvantages (Flowpsychology, 2015). Some studies (Brunsma and Kerry, 1998) (Gentile and Imberman, 2009) have been carried on the outcomes of student's uniforms. In one of the study it is found that the uniforms had little or no impact on outcomes of students but helpful in improving the attendance and language. On contrary, study by (Seunghee, 2010) it was proved that, by having mandatory school uniform policy there are lower incidents relating to drugs, alcohol, hate crimes, use of firearms and gang activities. For undergraduate students, there is always discussion on implementation of uniform dressing. One of the studies by (Mohan et al. 2011) revealed that there is a negative attitude of undergraduate students towards professional dress code and difference in preferences. Before implementing uniform, the clothing preferences and psychology of students have to consider. Regarding clothing preferences (Jasmine and Esenc 2015) it is found that, the factor mood is one of the influencing factors for clothing preferences and other significant factors are personal style, comfort. The color of the uniform clothing is also having significant effect on the perception (Radeloff, 1991). Similarly the study has to be carried out on psychology of undergraduate students towards the uniform acceptance.

The psychology of students towards the uniform is positive for some point of view and negative for other. So overall response of different psychological groups of students has to be studied. Based on to the various literatures on uniform selection and psychology (Johnson, Lennon, and Rudd, 2014), the positive responses and negative responses have been considered in this paper. Also instead of subjective outcomes there is a need of quantitative approach. Therefore the responses are quantified to see the effect of psychology and to compare the different psychological groups of students.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. Maintenance of good ambience in and around the study zones
2. Guidelines to be followed with proper instructions and
3. improving self motivational attitude of learning practices among the students

3. METHODOLOGY

1. Addressing students with a proper scientific approach to identify their interests.
2. Developing strategies by adopting recent trends in technological aspects for their all-round development.
3. Encouraging students to follow the guidelines for ambient atmosphere with proper appreciation

The survey was conducted at private university where uniform is recently implemented. The number of participants (N=126) were undergraduate students.

Questionnaire was designed to take personal information and view points of undergraduate student on uniform. Starting with student's personnel details names, sex, age, followed by the factors from which student psychology can be predicted such as academic performance, hobby, frequency of shopping and brand knowledge is considered in questionnaire. Afterward responses are taken in the form of rating.

For knowing the psychology of students they were segregated as per participation in academic and non academic activities, four factors qualifying exam marks, hobby, shopping frequency and brand knowledge have been considered for this purpose. The criteria are set with its justification as shown in **Table 1** for classifying the different psychological groups of students.

Table 1 Criteria for classifying students in to the different psychological groups

Sl.No.	Factor	Criteria	Justification
1	Qualifying exam marks	> 90% marks	It is expected that student with more marks having good understanding.
2	Hobby	Hobby which related with active participation like sports, drawing.	It is assumed that student with creativity hobby are more active.
3	Shopping frequency	Frequently	Student doing frequently shopping having more knowledge about fashion
4	Brand knowledge	If the student given feedback about any good brand.	Student with textile brands knowledge, obviously will able to understand uniform.

Based on these factors all the students were graded as the active, unassertive or passive students. There are total 77(61%) students which are passing all four criteria are classified in to psychologically active group and 21 (17%) are passing three criteria are classified in to unassertive group. Another category is there for psychologically passive group where 28 (22%) students are fulfilling less than three criteria as shown in **Table 2**

Table 2 Frequency of different number of students in different psychological groups

Psychological Groups of Student	Frequency	Percentage Frequency
Active	77	61
Unassertive	21	17
Passive	28	22
Total	126	100

Response Variables

The following positive and negative response related to effect of uniform are considered from the literature survey to know the view on uniform of undergraduate students.

Positive responses are Good Environment, (GE) – Wearing the uniform is giving good environment in the campus; Reminds Professional (RP) - Wearing uniform is reminding the profession every time; Gives Equality (EQ) - Wearing the same uniform gives equality

Negative responses are Identity dilution (ID) – Student having a specific image because of own style of wearing dresses is get diluted; Gives feeling upward (FU) – Wearing is giving upward feeling because of same dress all the time, easy identification etc.

The responses are taken in the form of rating, scaling from 1 to 5 where rating 1 means totally disagree and rating 5 means fully agree.

Quantification of responses

The responses of each category have been quantified to compare psychological group of students. For quantifying the results of independent response, firstly the weighted average is calculated by considering the frequencies as in equations 1 to 5. Total average positive and negative points can be obtained using equation 6 and 7 and finally the difference between these two will give the acceptance point for a give group of students as in equation 8. Afterward to compare the all groups, the coefficient of acceptance can be calculated using equation 9.

$$\text{GE average point} = \text{GE} [(5 \times f_5 + 4 \times f_4 + 3 \times f_3 + 2 \times f_2 + 1 \times f_1) / \sum f] \dots \quad (1)$$

$$\text{RP average point} = \text{RP} [(5 \times f_5 + 4 \times f_4 + 3 \times f_3 + 2 \times f_2 + 1 \times f_1) / \sum f] \dots \quad (2)$$

$$\text{EQ average point} = \text{EQ} [(5 \times f_5 + 4 \times f_4 + 3 \times f_3 + 2 \times f_2 + 1 \times f_1) / \sum f] \dots \quad (3)$$

$$\text{ID average point} = \text{ID} [(5 \times f_5 + 4 \times f_4 + 3 \times f_3 + 2 \times f_2 + 1 \times f_1) / \sum f] \dots \quad (4)$$

$$\text{FU average point} = \text{FU} [(5 \times f_5 + 4 \times f_4 + 3 \times f_3 + 2 \times f_2 + 1 \times f_1) / \sum f] \dots \quad (5)$$

Where f_1 is the frequency for rating 1 or number of students given a rating 1, similarly for f_2, f_3, f_4 and f_5

$$\text{Total average positive point (APS)} = [\text{GE average point} + \text{RP score average point} + \text{EQ average point}] / 3 \dots \quad (6)$$

$$\text{Total average negative point (ANS)} = [\text{ID average point} + \text{FU average point}] / 2 \dots \quad (7)$$

$$\text{Overall acceptance point (OS)} = \text{APS} - \text{ANS} \dots \quad (8)$$

As the range varying from -4 to 4, the acceptance coefficient can be calculated as follows

$$\text{Acceptance coefficient (AC)} = (\text{OS} + 4) / 8 \dots \quad (9)$$

The range of acceptance coefficient (AC) is 0 to 1.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the above equations the results for different psychological groups of students that are for active, unassertive and passive groups of students have been calculates as shown in **Table 3**.

Table 3 Response Results for Different Groups of Students

Response results	Active	Unassertive	Passive
GE average point	3.17	4.14	4.07
RP average point	3.10	4.19	4.29
EQ average point	3.78	4.38	4.68
<i>Total average positive point (APP)</i>	<i>3.35</i>	<i>4.24</i>	<i>4.35</i>
ID average point	3.78	3.52	3.36
FU average point	3.64	3.76	3.25
<i>Total average negative point (ANP)</i>	<i>3.71</i>	<i>3.64</i>	<i>3.30</i>
<i>Overall acceptance point (OP)</i>	<i>-0.36</i>	<i>0.60</i>	<i>1.04</i>
<i>Acceptance coefficient (AC)</i>	<i>0.46</i>	<i>0.57</i>	<i>0.63</i>

It is assumed that more the average positive point more will be the acceptance for uniform. For the positive responses, uniform is giving Good Environment (GE) and Reminding The Profession every time (RP), as per ANOVA result there is significant difference between active and other groups of students as shown in table 4. Furthermore, based on average point value for these responses (GE and RP) as shown in table 3, it can be concluded that active students are less agreed with uniform as compare to other groups of students, For unassertive and passive groups, the response for GE and RP is more positive and there is no significant difference between the results of these groups.

While for the third positive response uniform gives equality (EQ) there is no significant difference between the all groups. EQ response is mostly acceptable out of all responses irrespective of psychological groups of students as its point score is maximum out of all positive responses for all the groups of students as shown in **Table 3**

Table 4 Main effects in ANOVA of individual response on three psychological student groups.

Between groups	GE		RP		EQ		ID		FU	
	df	F	df	F	df	F	df	F	df	F
A*U*P	2,124	3.57*	2,124	3.73*	2,124	2.99	2,124	2.19	2,124	2.7

A - Active Group,

U - Unassertive Group

P - Passive Group and

* indicates significant difference between the groups responses.

Table 5 Main effects in ANOVA of response results on three psychological student groups.

Between Groups	Average Positive Score		Average Negative Score		Acceptance Coefficient	
	df	F	df	F	df	F
A*U*P	2,123	24.37*	2,123	1.48	2,123	19.72*
U*P	1, 47	0.24	1, 47	0.89	1, 47	1.82
A*U	1, 96	23.09*	1, 96	0.06	1, 96	14.36*
A*P	1, 103	37.45*	1, 103	3.17	1, 103	32.98*

A - Active Group,

U - Unassertive Group

P - Passive Group and

* Indicates Significant Difference between the Groups

Overall positive responses are more acceptable by the passive and unassertive group of students as compare to active group of students as shown in Table 3, total average positive point (APP) is less for active students as compare with unassertive and passive groups of students. Also there is a significant difference between the all groups of students for overall positive response, while the difference is not significant between the unassertive and passive groups of students as shown in Table 5. This may be because of active group of students are generally having creative thinking and own preferences for clothing, while passive group of students are the follower and unassertive type of students are in between.

For negative responses identity get diluted by uniform (ID) and feeling upward by uniform (FU) there is no significant difference between the all groups of students. All the students irrespective of groups almost having same point of view for the negative responses. The total average negative point (ANP) value for all the groups is greater than three out of five as shown table 3, means less acceptance of uniform.

Assessment of overall acceptance of uniform by students is possible by including all positive and negative response, which can be done by considering overall acceptance point (OP) and acceptance coefficient (AC). The acceptance coefficient for a the active categories of students is 0.47 near to 0.5 that is wearing uniform is just acceptable with negative view (OP =

-0.36). The students of unassertive categories are little more positive in response (OP = +0.6 and AC=0.57) towards the uniform acceptance. For passive group of students the acceptance of uniform is more positively (AC=0.63 and OP = +1.04) as compare to other groups of students. There is a significant difference in the acceptance of uniform between the active and other groups of students while the difference is not significant between unassertive and passive groups of students.

The active groups of students accepting the uniform with little resistance and unassertive types of students are accepting uniform while without out resistance while passive type of students are more readily accepting the uniform.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Active students are less agreed as compare to other group of students for positive responses uniform is giving good environment (GE) and reminding the profession every time (RP). While for third positive response uniform gives equality (EQ) is mostly acceptable out of all responses irrespective of psychological groups of students. Overall positive responses are more for the passive and unassertive group of students as compare to active group of students that is uniform is more readily acceptable these groups as compare to active groups of student. All students irrespective of groups almost having same point of view for the negative responses and there is no significant difference between the groups for negative responses. For overall acceptance of uniform for psychological groups of undergraduate students there is a significant difference between active and other groups of students, while there is no significant difference between unassertive and passive groups of students. The active groups of students having less acceptance towards the uniform while passive students are having more acceptances. Further the acceptance is little negative for active groups of students and positive for unassertive and active groups of students. Finally it can be concludes that, the active groups of students can accept the uniform with little resistance and unassertive types of students without out resistance while passive type of students can readily accept the uniform.

REFERENCES

- [1] Brunσμα, D. L., and Kerry, A. R. (1998). effects of student uniformson Attendance,behaviour problems, Substance Use, and Academic Achievement. The Journal of Educational research, 53-62
- [2] Flowpsychology. (2015, MAY 29). Retrieved from Flow Psychology: <https://flowpsychology.com/12-advantages-and-disadvantages-of-school-uniforms/>
- [3] Gentile, E., and Imberman, S. A. (2009). Dressed for Success: Do School Uniforms Improve Student Behavior, Attendance, and Achievement? Houston: University of Houston.
- [4] Jasmine Barquet and Esenc M. Balam. (2015). Clothing Preferences of College Students:. Journal of Undergraduate Ethnic Minority Psychology, 4-6
- [5] Johnson, K., Lennon, S. J., and Rudd, N. (2014). Dress, body and self: research in the social psychology of dress. Fashion and Textiles, 1-20
- [6] Karl, K. A., Hall, L. M., and Peluchette, J. V. (2013). City Employee Perceptions of the Impact of Dress and Appearance: You Are What You Wear. Public Personnel Management , Vol 42, Issue 3, pp. 452 - 470
- [7] KM, S., Mohan, G. C., Nusrath, F., and Shanthi, M. (2011). Dental students' perception towards dress code in a private dental institution in Andhra Pradesh: A cross-sectional study. Journal of Education and Ethics in Dentistry, 68-72
- [8] Radeloff, D. J. (1991). Psychological Types, Color Attributes, and Color Preferences of Clothing, Textiles, and Design Students. Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 59-67.

A Scientific Approach of Ambient Atmosphere To Develop Allround Personalities For Sustainable Welfare Of The Students: A Model Study

- [9] Seunghee, H. (2010). A Mandatory Uniform Policy in Urban Schools: Findings from the School Survey on Crime and Safety: 2003-04. *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership*, v. 5, n. 8. Retrieved from <http://journals.sfu.ca/ijepl/index.php/ijepl/article/view/253>
- [10] Hepsibah Palivela (2012). Insight of anaemia with socio demographic acquaintances among pregnant women in South India, *Journal of Asian Journal of Microbiology, Biotechnology and Environmental Sciences*, Vol. 14, No.1:63-68
- [11] Keith Vernon, (2008). The Health and Welfare of University Students in Britain, 1920–1939 , *Journal of History of Education Society*, Vol. 37, Issue 2, 227-252.
- [12] Ioakimidis Marilou, *Organisational Psychology: Scientific Discipline, Managerial Tool Or Neither? Discussion and Evaluation of Different Classical Theories*. *International Journal of Management*, 8(2), 2017, pp. 224–230.
- [13] Andre Berger (2016). Characterizing implementable allocation rules in multi-dimensional environments, *Journal of Social Choice and Welfare* , Volume 48, Issue 2,367-383.