

Comparison of Self-Esteem Level Between Female Students of Private and Public Institution of Pakistan

Nuzhat Firdous^a

Abstract

The purpose of present study is to compare the level of self-esteem in female students between private and public educational institutions of Lahore. All research variables and indicators were extracted from rigorous theoretical framework and extensive review of relevant literature on related issues. Quantitative survey design was used to get information through self-administrated questionnaire. It was a structured questionnaire that consisted on four parts including structured questions with probable key options given below. The participants of present study were female students of age ranged between 13 to 16 years from different public and private educational institutions of Lahore city, who were attending 7th, 8th and 9th classes respectively. The sample was consisting of 864 female students, in which 511 students were from public and 353 from private educational institutions. Convenient sampling technique was used due to unequal distribution of population in the public and private sectors. Data was analyzed statistically, Chi-square test was applied to analyze and compare the data between private and public educational institutions. Results showed significant difference between female students of private and public educational institutions. High socio-economic status contributes to higher levels of self-confidence, and thus private sector students exhibit substantial self-worthiness about themselves.

Introduction

Self is essentially a social structure that develops through interaction with others in social experiences. Self is a social construction which builds through process of socialization involving the experiences of family relations (Harter, 2012). Self-esteem is how one evaluates one's self, which affects conformity, moral behavior and educational orientations in children (La Rossa & Reitzes, 1993).

The global evaluation of self has been typically referred as self-esteem. Self-esteem is person's feeling of self-worth (Rosenberg, 1965) and how "good" or "bad" one feels about oneself (Sherina et al., 2008). Harter (1990) explained two dimensions of self-esteem; firstly how a person perceives success and secondly how a person perceives himself. It is stable and dynamic as well because it is open to change.

Many factors are related to self-esteem development, such as on academic ability, social acceptance, appearance, school, and relationship with family, gender, age and ethnicity (Connor, et al., 2004). Self-esteem and school performance are correlated (Mann, et al. 2004; Yahaya and Ramli, 2009). Therefore, Self-esteem has been seen as the key to financial success, health and personal fulfillment. According to Brook (2010), children who exhibited high self-esteem, enjoy beneficial relationship with their parents, those are supposed to be more independent and successful.

Sociological perspective of Self-Esteem is based on Cooley's (1902) model of the "looking-glass self" and Mead's (1934) ideas about "generalized other". Sociologically self-

^a Associate Professor, Govt. College of Home Economics, Gulberg, Lahore

esteem is seen through the lens of sociological variables, such as occupation, income, education, race, religion, and gender.

Private and Public Educational Institution Systems

There are two major important stream lines of educational system in Pakistan, one is public sector and other is private sector. During 1990s and 2000s private sector was emerged as a key provider of education services in Pakistan both in absolute terms and relative to the public sector. The private educational institutions were believed to be the symbol of better education, strict discipline, hardworking, cooperation, mutual understanding, and charming future. These two sectors are similar in structures but different in finance. In public sector school / colleges and universities are being owned and funded by the state. There is no tuition fee for students enrolled in public sector. Education is almost free of cost for enrolled students in public Educational institutions. In the private sector, on the other hand all educational institutions are being owned and funded by people or private organizations. Such educational institutions are labeled as “private” which are being financially established by private sector and formal organizations. Reasonable tuition fee is being charged from students to meet the expenses of the Educational institutions (Awan& Zia, 2015).

Awan and Saeed (2014) plead that private school are playing key role not only in eradicating illiteracy but also enhancing the level of students as well as teachers by providing better academic environment.

Review of Literature

DeSisto, Farreras and Woody (2010) found that quality of parent-adolescent relationship and parental involvement significantly impacted upon the self-esteem of adolescents of both sex. Positive correlation was found between level of self-esteem and perceived parental support in 132 students (aged 12- 18 years). However, girls reported higher self-esteem than boys.

Sherina et al (2008) found significant relationship of self-esteem of adolescents with their social demographic characteristics, religious practices and smoking habits through cross-sectional study in Malaysia. Results showed significance of age, sex, religion, number of sibling, and smoking practices in the development of self-esteem of adolescents.

Yahaya and Ramli (2009) found significant relationship among interpersonal communication skills, self-concept and academic performance of students (370) in JoharBahru. Empirical evidences supported the ideas that availability of interpersonal communication significantly affected the self-concept of students. Whereas, self-concept of students were insignificantly related to their academic achievement, birth order, and family income.

Ashley et al (2014) after extensive review of literature on effects of private school on education of children in third world developing countries, proposed that private Educational institution did better for students' outcomes, as compared to public Educational institution held by state. Logical evidences proposed that private Educational institutions showed positive contribution for better learning outcomes in students because of better teaching practices and amiable environment as compared to public Educational institutions.

Methodology

In this research, quantitative survey method is used to get information from female students studying in private and public Educational institutions of Lahore. The survey was conducted on female / girls from urban area of Lahore; a metropolitan city of Pakistan.

Participants

The targeted population or participants of present study were *Female students* of aged ranging from 13 to 16 years studying in public and private Educational institutions located in urban and sub-urban areas of Metropolitan City of Lahore. The sample of 864 girls was drawn from different private and public Educational institutions in Lahore. Among 864 participants (were girl-students among all participants, there were 511 girls from public Schools and 353 students were from private Schools. This unequal distribution of participants was due to the constraints and sensitivity of security issues and enlarged enrollment policies of private schools

Procedure

The sample was drawn from Schools in the towns of Lahore. There were nine (9) towns in Metropolitan City Lahore. Among nine towns of Lahore three (3) towns were selected through simple random sampling. From selected three towns, eight (8) girls' Schools were included in the study by using convenience sampling. There were 4 public Schools and 4 private girls' overall there were eight female secondary Schools (4 public and 4 privates) were included in this study. Private school list- Crescent Girls School, DPS, Lahore Grammar and National Grammar. In Public schools – Government Girls' High School, Data GunjBuksih, Millat Public School, Government Dar-ul-Niswan High School, Shadman Lahore. The survey was being conducted at various Schools both private and public in weekdays from 9pm to 2pm, during School timings. In every School, successful interactive discussion sessions with participants about the contents of questionnaire were being ensured.

Before the distribution of questionnaires, detailed instructions were given to all respondents while sitting in their respective classrooms in the supervision of their class teachers to make them more attentive and focused. The students were directed to read question attentively, comprehend the meaning of content, and then click the key option given below to each question item. On average students took 25 to 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire, additional adequate time was provided to slow learners for completion. After completion, the questionnaires were collected back and researcher conveyed thank you humbly. Entire survey procedure was being monitored carefully and vigilantly.

Measures

The sample of 864 female students was drawn through Convenience sampling technique. It was structured questionnaire. There are two main parts of Questionnaire; Part one for demographic information, in which all questions were related to characteristics of responded family. All questions were close ended questions and options were given below. Some demographic questions were open ended like age, family income, School name etc. Part-two was consisting of Rosenberg Scale (1965) to measure Self-esteem. Rosenberg Scale (1965) was developed to measure self-esteem in adolescents. It was administrated originally on high school students to measure feeling of an individual about one's self (Rosenberg, 1965, Crandal, 1973 and Wylie, 1974). There are ten questions on four-point Likert scale with options given bellow. All responses were ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Rational

This scale is widely used in researches to measure self-esteem especially for teen–youngster. Its ten-items are short and easy to manage to apply showing its relevance for the intended population. (Blascovich and Tomaka, 1991).

Results

Characteristic of Respondents and Family Demographic Profile

In this chapter, the demographic characteristics as well as personal profile of respondents is presented in order to provide the necessary background information on the survey sample.

Table 1: Family Characteristics

	School	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error Mean
Age of students	Private	353	14.08	.834	.044
	Public	511	14.54	.991	.044
What is your birth order in siblings?	Private	353	2.29	1.268	.067
	Public	511	2.81	1.754	.078
What is monthly income of your father?	Private	353	61713.88	59254.94	3153.82
	Public	511	14475.54	7510.97	332.27

Table no. 1 of preliminary demographics is representing that average age of students participating in this research was 14-15 years. Monthly income of fathers of private School students' was found to be 62,000 on average and that of public School students' fathers was 14,000 on average.

Table 2: Rosenberg self-esteem scale

Variables	Private F (%)	Public F (%)	P-value
On the whole, I am satisfied with myself			<0.001
Strongly disagree	4 (1.1)	2 (0.4)	
Disagree	25 (7.1)	4 (0.8)	
Agree	173 (49)	155 (30.3)	
Strongly agree	151 (42.8)	350 (68.5)	
I feel that I have a number of good qualities			0.001
Strongly disagree	8 (2.3)	11 (2.2)	
Disagree	45 (12.7)	27 (5.3)	
Agree	177 (50.1)	262 (51.3)	
Strongly agree	123 (34.8)	211 (41.3)	
I am able to do things as well as most other people			<0.001
Strongly disagree	2 (0.6)	5 (1)	
Disagree	23 (6.5)	10 (2)	

Agree	165 (46.7)	199 (38.9)	
Strongly agree	163 (46.2)	297 (58.1)	
I feel that I am a person of worth, atleast on an equal plan with others			<0.001
Strongly disagree	7 (2)	4 (0.8)	
Disagree	28 (7.9)	20 (3.9)	
Agree	188 (53.3)	230 (45)	
Strongly agree	130 (36.8)	257 (50.3)	
I take a positive attitude toward myself			<0.001
Strongly disagree	7 (2)	2 (0.4)	
Disagree	24 (6.8)	17 (3.3)	
Agree	146 (41.4)	144 (28.2)	
Strongly agree	176 (49.9)	348 (68.1)	
I wish I could have more respect for myself			<0.001
Strongly disagree	7 (2)	1 (0.2)	
Disagree	30 (8.5)	5 (1)	
Agree	104 (29.5)	79 (15.5)	
Strongly agree	212 (60.1)	426 (83.4)	
I feel I do not have much to be proud of			0.002
Strongly disagree	77 (21.8)	90 (17.6)	
Disagree	129 (36.5)	142 (27.8)	
Agree	98 (27.8)	174 (34.1)	
Strongly agree	49 (13.9)	105 (20.5)	
I certainly feel useless at times			0.060
Strongly disagree	77 (21.8)	87 (17)	
Disagree	110 (31.2)	145 (28.4)	
Agree	117 (33.1)	178 (34.8)	
Strongly agree	49 (13.9)	101 (19.8)	
All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure			<0.001
Strongly disagree	156 (44.2)	140 (27.4)	
Disagree	146 (41.4)	207 (40.5)	
Agree	32 (9.1)	106 (20.7)	
Strongly agree	19 (5.4)	58 (11.4)	
At times, I think I am now good at all.			<0.001
Strongly disagree	48 (13.6)	50 (9.8)	
Disagree	74 (21)	66 (12.9)	
Agree	173 (49)	260 (50.9)	
Strongly agree	58 (16.4)	135 (26.4)	

Table no. 2 represents the questions to measure self-esteem of participant girls. Majority (49%) of the private School girls agreed and surprisingly public School students (68.5%) strongly agreed that they feel satisfaction with themselves with significant differences ($p < 0.001$). On the other hand majority of both private 50.1% and public 51.3% School students significantly agreed with feeling of having number of good qualities ($p < 0.001$).

Interestingly majority of 58.1% of public School students were strongly agreed and private students 46.7% were just agreed with the statement that they were able to do things as well as most other people, showing significant difference ($p < 0.001$). Similarly majority of the private 53.3% agreed and surprisingly 50.3% of public School students

strongly agreed that they feel themselves as person of worth, at least on an equal plan with others ($p < 0.001$).

On the other hand majority of both private 60.1% and public 83.4% School students strongly agreed that they wish they could have more respect for themselves. Similarly majority of both private 49.9% and public School students with higher percentage of 68.1% strongly agreed that they take a positive attitude towards themselves ($p < 0.001$). It shows their optimism and positivity toward their personalities.

Majority of both private 49 % and public 50.9% School students agreed that at times, they think they are not good at all ($p < 0.001$). Both group of students agreed on the statement that sometimes they feel bad as well about themselves, showing a normal behavior. Similarly when it comes to certainly feeling useless at times, majority of both private 33.1% and public 34.8% School students agree to it but showing no significant difference ($p = 0.060$). Again this question indicates that occasionally an individual feel depressed and feel uselessness of his/her existence.

36.5% of private School students disagree to the statement "I feel I do not have much to be proud of" while 34.1 % of public students agree with it, showing significant difference ($p = 0.02$). There is a difference of opinion in both groups of students indicated that they had not possessed equal resources to feel to be proud of. The reason can be traced through difference in income level or financial resources between private and public School children. Similarly 44.2% of private School students strongly disagree and 40.5% of public students disagree when asked "All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure", showing significant difference ($p < 0.001$). Again female students of both private and public Schools show disagreement to statement that claim about failure in their lives. This a healthy sign of their personalities that indicate their positive and optimistic approach toward success or failure in the course of life span.

Table 4: Rosenberg self-esteem score

	School	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	P-Value
Total Score	Private	353	28.8924	3.94418	0.170
	Public	511	28.5479	3.38062	
Positive Score	Private	353	16.5354	2.37279	0.000
	Public	511	17.6164	1.90604	
Negative Score	Private	353	12.3569	2.83396	0.000
	Public	511	10.9315	2.79937	

Table no. 4 is representing score for Rosenberg self-esteem scale. The scale ranges from 0-30. Negative and positive questions scores are computed to get total score. Total score between 15-25 is considered within normal range, below 15 suggests low self-esteem. Whereas the total score above 15 is considered as 'high self-esteem'. The total score of private and public educational institution students was 28.8924 ± 3.94418 and 28.5479 ± 3.38062 respectively. Both private and public educational institution students are showing significant statistical difference ($p = 0.170$).

Discussion

Self-esteem is the panacea of modern life. It is a developmental phenomenon that forms and shows itself over time. The present study aims to compare whether there is some significance difference in the level of self-esteem among female students of private and public educational institution. The participants of present study were *female students* of age ranging from 13 to 16 years. who were attending class 7th 8th and 9th from different public and private Schools. The age range of students was between 13 to 16 years. The level of Self-esteem was measured through Rosenberg scale (1965).

In present study public educational institution adolescents showed healthier amount of self-assurance and optimistic self-attitude, which are the base characteristics generally considered necessary to make the best use of one's ability. This contributes further toward satisfaction with one's self. Such positivity can encourage more of public School students to take part in extracurricular activities aside from academics. This includes participating in scholastic events which can provide awareness, enriched learning experience and an even greater sense of achievement, along with improving their School record. Jalali and Nazari (2009) surveyed 304 students including boys and girls of high School through cluster sampling. He observed significant relationship of 'self esteem' and academic scores of both genders. A longitudinal study conducted by Muijs (1997) showed the relationships among socioeconomic status, academic achievement, and self-esteem. By studying fourth and fifth graders, he found that parental socioeconomic status affected academic achievement; moreover, academic achievement was a predictor of academic self-concept.

As mentioned above, private educational institution students' satisfaction levels do not match closely with those of public School students. This difference of self-satisfaction is likely to have impact on both short-term and long-term academic prospects of adolescents. This may vary from individual to individual but it has significant effect on motivating them to try even harder for educational success. Most of the students both from public and private Schools agreed that they felt they were not good enough at times. However, there is a slight difference in statistics this time. It is observed that parental care and *supervision* has significant effect on children's self-esteem (Ho, 2003). Özkan (1994) reported a positive association between self-esteem and maternal education level. Raymore, Godbey, and Crawford (1994) found that the self-esteem of adolescents, whose parent's education is above high School level, is of a significantly higher self-esteem than those of students whose parent's education is at or below high School level.

Rosenberg and Pearlin (1978), Wiltfang and Scarbecz (1990) pointed out that parents education has a small but significant effect on adolescents' self-esteem. In a recent study, Bachman, O'Malley, Freedman-Doan, Trzesniewski, and Donnellan (2011) also suggest that having a well-educated parents for adolescents are positively linked with self-esteem.

Socioeconomic position has a clear impact on developing self-esteem, especially during the important stage of adolescence (Veselska et al., 2010). In present study, a noticeably higher percentage of public School students, compared to private School students, responded in feeling proud of them. This can be related to socio-economic differences among private and public School students which lead to inferiority / superiority complex accordingly. Previous studies also showed socioeconomic status to be significantly related to self-esteem. In general, those with higher socioeconomic status report higher self-esteem than those with lower socioeconomic status (Rhodes, Roffman, Reddy & Fredriksen, 2004; Francis &

Jones, 1996). The study conducted by Veselska et al (2010) also revealed that an association exists between low socioeconomic status and lower self-esteem.

Towards a similar subtopic, when asked about the inclination of feeling like a failure, more private School students responded with an affirmation, compared to public School students with substantial statistical difference ($p < 0.001$). However, the percentage of public School students agreeing to this is also considerable. The study conducted by Singh and Bhaitia (2012) on self esteem of secondary School students in relation to their family environment concluded the same review as mentioned above.

According to general perception of public educational institution being attended or chosen by families of low socio-economic status, there may be coincidence of difficulty of studies and poor living arrangements which can lead to negativity in a common student. In private Schools believed to be attended by students from families of higher socio-economic status, while there may not be problem of living arrangements or finances, as discussed before, curriculum may be more difficult to cope with and students could be required to work harder than they are prepared or believe they are capable of and decide to declare themselves as 'failures'. According to Birndorf et al., (2005) among socioeconomic factors, family income seems to be most related to self-esteem among adolescents. Rosenberg and Pearlin (1978) also find a similar relationship between self esteem and socio-economic status.

Finally, several students also admitted to the notion of 'feeling useless'. There is no noteworthy deviance in their respective percentages. This too could stem from poor academic achievements but as the notion itself points to nothing specific and is rather general, it could refer to current affairs, homely troubles, financial mishaps, or other situations which are out of a student's range of control. Kordi and Bharudin (2002) came up with a similar review that academic achievements and social interaction of a child can be reflected by their parental attitude and family environment.

On the basis of socio-economic status, private educational institution participants ranked higher than public sector. Private School adolescents belong to financially strong families and tend to enjoy improved quality of life style. As measured by Uddin (2008) family structure is positively, and family income is *negatively* associated with family communication pattern. The socio-economic background has significant impact on children's developmental and academic outcomes (Vellymalay, 2012). Moreover parental occupation also flashes bright importance in the development of self-concepts in children. The prevalence of parental occupation as doctor/engineer or teachers is higher in private educational institution as compared to public sector; thus can be placing direct effects on academic outcomes and self-esteem of these adolescents.

Conclusion

The main objective of this study was to compare the levels of self-esteem of private and public educational institution students using Rosenberg self-esteem scale. After measuring the key dimensions it can be concluded that there is appreciable difference in the level of self-esteem. Level of self-esteem is higher in both groups of students, with private School students exceeding in levels than public School students. Socio-economic status being a strong determinant of self-concept in children can reflect as a measure of high self-worthiness in private School students. High socio-economic status contributes to higher levels of self-confidence, and thus private School students exhibit substantial self-worthiness about themselves.

Recommendations

- It is suggested that sample should include boys as well. The girls and boys should have similar family characteristics, means from same social class.
- It is recommended that sample should be large and population should be normally distributed. So that probability sampling can be applied.
- Mothers of child should also be included in the research. So that mother's perception about her child can be measured.
- The study should extend to rural areas of the country. So that perception of poor and marginalized adolescents can be measured.

References

1. Ashley, D. L., Mcloughlin, C., Aslam, M., Engel, J., Wales, J., Rawal, S., & Rose, P. (2014). The role and impact of private Schools in developing countries: a rigorous review of the evidence. *Unpublished Final Report. USA [United States of America]: Education Rigorous Literature Review, Department for International Development.*
2. Awan, A. G., & Saeed, K. (2014). Intellectual capital and research performance of universities in southern Punjab-Pakistan. *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research, 2*(6)
3. Awan, A. G., & Zia, A. (2015). Comparative Analysis of Public and Private Schools: A case study of District Vehari-Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(16), 122-130.
4. Bachman, J. G., O'Malley, P. M., Freedman-Doan, P., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Donnellan, M. B. (2011). Adolescent self-esteem: Differences by race/ethnicity, gender, and age. *Self and Identity, 10*(4), 445-473.
5. Birndorf, S., Ryan, S., Auinger, P., Aten, M. (2005). High self-esteem among adolescents: Longitudinal trends, sex differences, and protective factors. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 37*
6. Blascovich, J., & Tomaka, J. (1991). Measures of self-esteem. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes. New York: Academic, 115-160.*
7. Brooks, Y., (2012). Building Your Child's Self-Esteem: 9 Secrets Every Parent Needs to Know. iUniverse, Incorporated, 1-188.
8. Brown, J. D. (1998). McGraw-Hill series in social psychology. The self.
9. Connor, J. M., Poyrazli, S., Ferrer-Wreder, L., & Grahame, K. M. (2004). The relation of age, gender, ethnicity, and risk behaviors to self-esteem among students in nonmainstream Schools. *Adolescence, 39*(155), 457.
10. Crandall, R. (1973). The measurement of self-esteem and related constructs. *Measures of social psychological attitudes, 45-167.*
11. DeSisto, C. A., Farreras, I. G., & Woody, C. M. (2010). Perceived Parental Involvement Positively Correlated With Middle and High School Students' Self-Esteem. *Undergraduate Research Journal for the Human Sciences, 9*(1).
12. Francis, L. J., Jones S. H. (1996). Social class and self-esteem. *Journal of Social Psychology, 136, 405-406.*
13. Harter, S. (1990). Self and identity development. In SS Feldman & GR Elliot, red: At the Threshold. *The Developing Adolescent, s 352-387.*
14. Harter, S. (2012). Self-perception profile for adolescents: Manual and questionnaires. *University of Denver.*
15. Ho, E. S. C. (2003). Students' self-esteem in an asian educational system: contribution of parental involvement and parental investment. *School Community Journal, 13*(1), 65.

16. Jalali, D, Nazari, & A. (2009). Effects of social learning model training on self-esteem, self-confidence, self assertiveness and academic achievement in third grade students of intermediary Schools. *Journal of Research in Behavioural Sciences*, 7(1).
17. Kordi, A., & Baharudin, R. (2010). Parenting attitude and style and its effect on children's School achievements. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 2(2), 217.
18. LaRossa, R., & Reitzes, D. C. (2009). Symbolic interactionism and family studies. In *Sourcebook of family theories and methods* (pp. 135-166).
19. Lee, D. H. (1990). Symbolic interactionism: some implications for consumer self-concept and product symbolism research. *NA-Advances in Consumer Research Volume 17*.
20. LUO, L. (2010). Investigation and Analysis Of Parent-Child Relationship In Adolescents. *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, 5(2-3), 88-97.
21. Mann, M. M., Hosman, C. M., Schaalma, H. P., & De Vries, N. K. (2004). Self-esteem in a broad-spectrum approach for mental health promotion. *Health education research*, 19(4)
22. Muijs, R. D. (1997). Predictors of academic achievement and academic self-concept: a longitudinal perspective. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 67(3), 263-277.
23. Özkan, İ. (1994). Factors affecting self-esteem. *Düşünen Adam*, 7(3), 4-9.
24. Raymore, L. A., Godbey, G. C., & Crawford, D. W. (1994). Self-esteem, gender, and socioeconomic status: their relation to perceptions of constraint on leisure among adolescents. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26 (2), 99-118.
25. Rhodes, J., Roffman, J., Reddy, R., Fredriksen, K. (2004). Changes in self-esteem during the middle School years: a latent growth curve study of individual and contextual influences. *Journal of School Psychology*, 42, 243–261.
26. Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image* (Vol. 11, p. 326). Princeton, NJ: Princeton university press.
27. Rosenberg, M., & Pearlin, L. I. (1978). Social class and self-esteem among children and adults. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84(1), 53-77.
28. Shek, D. T. (2005). Perceived parental control and parent–child relational qualities in Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong. *Sex Roles*, 53(9-10), 635-646.
29. Sherina, M. S., Rampal, L., Loh, J. W., Chan, C. L., Teh, P. C., & Tan, P. O. (2008). Self-esteem and its associated factors among secondary School students in Klang District, Selangor. *Med J Malaysia*, 63(1), 26-30.
30. Singh, S., and Bhatia, G., (2012). Study of Self Esteem of Secondary School Students in Relation to Their Family Environment. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 2(10), 1-4.
31. Uddin, M. E. (2008). Family communication patterns between Muslim and Santal communities in rural Bangladesh: A cross-cultural perspective. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology* 44.pp. 675, 687.
32. Vellymalay, S. K. N. (2012). Parental involvement at home: Analyzing the influence of parents' socioeconomic status. *Studies in Sociology of Science*, 3(1), 1.
33. Veselska, Z., Geckova, A. M., Gajdosova, B., Orosova, O., Van Dijk, J. P., and Reijneveld, S. A. (2010). Socio-economic differences in self-esteem of adolescents influenced by personality, mental health and social support. *The European Journal of Public Health*, 20(6), 647-652.
34. Wiltfang, G. L., & Scarbecz, M. (1990). Social class and adolescents' self-esteem: Another look. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 53 (2), 174-183.