

# A Nursing Study on the Assessment of Needs Gratification among School Children

Uma Shendey

Professor, Department of Nursing and Child Welfare, Government Nursing College, Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh, India

## Abstract

**Introduction:** All of us have needs but certain needs are more important in childhood. Children are very much dependent on others for the gratification of their needs. If their needs are met adequately, they will develop as balanced individuals.

**Objectives:** The objectives of this study were (1) to assess the need gratification of school children, living at home and staying in hostels. (2) To compare levels of need gratification among school children, living at home and stay in hostels. (3) To find out the association between need gratification and selected demographic variables of school children living at home and stay in hostels.

**Materials and Methods:** A systemic literature search was performed to identify all relevant articles to the research questions. The bibliographic databases, CIMS, WHO, FAO, Pub, CINHALL, and around 194 national and international book references with 40 national and international journals were searched from 2008 to 2012. The search comprised all the articles on literature related to needs and problems of children, child development, the family and child care at home and in hostel. Nonexperimental, descriptive design was adopted in this study. Selected population was higher secondary schools children studying in 8-12<sup>th</sup> class standard of Bhilai Town, District Durg, and Chhattisgarh. Stratified simple random technique was considered for data collection. The sample size was 500 among them 250 children were living at home, and 250 children were staying in the hostel.

**Results and Conclusion:** Based on findings study was concluded, the hostel students had fully gratified with hostel conditions. Because of trained warden/care takers and better facilities provided by the warden/care takers regarding physiological, safety, and belonging needs.

**Key words:** Gratification, children, nursing

## INTRODUCTION

The investigator appearances that physical and emotional condition of a child often is not clean is tired and has no energy, comes to schools without breakfast, often does not have lunch. Seems to be alone often, needs glasses, and dental care or the medical attention. Some of the children were unwilling to participate in physical activities, study timing and recreational activities, etc., in views of all these the investigators have decided to do a comparative study on “*A nursing study on the assessment of needs gratification among school children.*”

## Objectives

1. To assess the needs gratification among school children, living at home and in the hostel.
2. To compare the level of needs gratification among school children, living at home and in the hostel.
3. To determine the association between needs gratification and selected demographic variables among school children living at home and in the hostel.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research approach adopted for this study was nonexperimental survey approach, ex post facto research design used to examine the association between the demographic variables and relationship of needs and gratification among subjects living with parents and staying in the hostel. Ethnographic survey research was used to fixed answer for the self-administered questionnaire to elicit the gratification on needs

### Access this article online



www.ijss-sn.com

**Month of Submission :** 12-2016  
**Month of Peer Review :** 01-2017  
**Month of Acceptance :** 01-2017  
**Month of Publishing :** 02-2017

**Corresponding Author:** Uma Shendey, Government Nursing College, Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh, India. E-mail: aditijain300789@gmail.com

gratification among school children living with parents and staying in the hostel.

**Sample Size**

Among 500 samples, 250 Children were living at home, and 250 children were living in the hostel.

**Sampling Technique**

The stratified simple random technique was considered.

Section A: It consists of questionnaire about participants housing condition and hostel condition.

Section B: It consists of rating scale to assess the levels of needs gratification among school children regarding five basic needs.

In the Table 1, all gratification tools' stability were  $\geq 0.7$  ( $r \geq 0.7$ ), and the stability of the tools were more than 50%.

**Internal Consistency**

The internal consistency of the gratification tools were tested by Croneback's alpha ( $\alpha$ ). They were physiological needs.

**Stability**

The stability of the tool was tested by test, retest method. The Pear sonic correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) between the test and retest of physiological needs gratification, safety needs gratification, and belonging needs gratification is shown in Table 2.

**Data Collection Procedure**

There were 47 schools having without hostel facility for such children, among these 5 schools has been selected at random to make 50% of the available school for inclusion in the sample. From each school 10 students were selected from each class of 8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> standards, coming from the home. Similarly, there were 10 schools

having hostel facility for such children, among these 5 schools has been selected at random to make 50% of the available school for inclusion in the sample. From each school were having hostel facility 10 students were selected from each class of 8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> standards, staying in hostels. Permission was obtained from concerned selected schools. List of subjects was collected from each selected school. The data were collected from September 2011 to March 2012.

**RESULTS**

The study subjects of home and hosteller were described according to the demographic characteristics in terms of percentages. They were matched for comparison by the prime variables of age and the class of studying. Pearson correlation coefficient was applied to analyze and interpret the relationship between the condition of home or hostel with the respective needs gratification. The needs gratification of home and hosteller were compared and interpreted by Student's independent *t*-test. The gratification needs of physiological, safety and belonging needs were analyzed in terms of percentages. The associations between gratifications of needs and demographic characteristics were studied by Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$ ). The above statistical procedures were performed by the statistical package predictive and analysis software statistics version-18, the so-called SPSS. The  $P < 0.05$  was considered as statistically significant under two-tailed test.

As per the objectives of a study finding were:

Section A: Distribution of students according to their demographic profiles.

Table 3 describes the demographic characteristics of the students in terms of percentages of home as well as hostel

**Table 1: Stability of gratification tools of home and hostel**

Gratification tool	Home (n=30)				Hostel (n=30)			
	"r"	Significance	r <sup>2</sup>	%	"r"	Significance	r <sup>2</sup>	%
Physiological	0.973	P<0.000	0.947	94.7	0.945	P<0.000	0.893	89.3
Safety	0.881	P<0.000	0.776	77.6	0.757	P<0.000	0.573	57.3
Belonging	0.908	P<0.000	0.824	82.4	0.786	P<0.000	0.618	61.8

**Table 2: Internal consistency of gratification tools of house and hostel**

Gratification tool	Home (n=30)				Hostel (n=30)			
	"α"	Significant	α <sup>2</sup>	%	"α"	Significant	α <sup>2</sup>	%
Physiological	0.807	P<0.000	0.651	65.1	0.867	P<0.000	0.752	75.2
Safety	0.792	P<0.000	0.623	62.3	0.704	P<0.000	0.501	50.1
Belonging	0.712	P<0.000	0.507	50.7	0.709	P<0.000	0.503	50.3

**Table 3: Distribution of students according to their demographic profiles**

Demographic profiles	Category	Number (%)	
		Home (n=250)	Hostel (n=250)
Age group (years)	14-15	100 (40.0)	100 (40.0)
	16-17	121 (48.4)	119 (47.6)
	18+	29 (11.6)	31 (12.4)
Gender	Male	106 (42.4)	97 (38.8)
	Female	144 (57.6)	153 (61.2)
Class of studying	VIII	49 (19.6)	50 (20.0)
	IX	51 (20.4)	51 (20.4)
	X	50 (20.0)	50 (20.0)
	XI	50 (20.0)	49 (19.6)
	XII	50 (20.0)	50 (20.0)
	Type of family	Nuclear	122 (48.8)
	Joint	128 (51.2)	80 (32.0)
Religion	Hindu	108 (43.2)	174 (69.6)
	Muslim	62 (24.8)	41 (16.4)
	Sikhs	48 (19.2)	15 (6.0)
	Christians	32 (12.8)	20 (8.0)
Family monthly income (INR)	2000-12000/m	29 (11.6)	91 (36.4)
	13000-23000/m	93 (37.2)	65 (26.0)
	24000-34000/m	59 (23.6)	22 (8.8)
	≥350000/m	69 (27.6)	72 (28.8)
Father's education	Illiterate	2 (0.8)	39 (15.6)
	Primary	6 (2.4)	32 (12.8)
	Middle	6 (2.4)	16 (6.4)
	High school	15 (6.0)	30 (12.0)
	Higher secondary+	221 (88.4)	133 (53.2)
Mother's education	Illiterate	20 (8.0)	45 (18.0)
	Primary	36 (14.4)	43 (17.2)
	Middle	4 (1.6)	25 (10.0)
	High school	25 (10.0)	38 (15.2)
Father's occupation	Higher secondary+	165 (66.0)	99 (39.6)
	Service	116 (46.4)	95 (38.0)
	Business	120 (48.0)	73 (29.2)
Mother's occupation	Others	14 (5.6)	82 (32.8)
	Service	79 (31.6)	55 (22.0)
Relation to head of family	Business	123 (49.2)	68 (27.2)
	Others	48 (19.2)	127 (50.8)
	Son	85 (34.0)	68 (27.2)
No. of siblings	Daughter	124 (49.6)	121 (48.4)
	Others	41 (16.4)	61 (24.4)
	1	89 (35.6)	65 (26.0)
	2	124 (49.6)	72 (28.8)
Primary source of help	3	23 (9.2)	55 (22.0)
	4+	14 (5.6)	58 (23.2)
	Father/Warden	99 (39.6)	165 (66.0)
	Mother/Care taker	97 (38.8)	43 (17.2)
Closeness at home/hostel	Both	54 (21.6)	42 (16.8)
	Father/Warden	60 (24.0)	151 (60.4)
	Mother/Care taker	56 (22.4)	56 (22.4)
Reasons of closeness	Both/Any other	134 (53.6)	43 (17.2)
	Caring nature/Cooperation	53 (21.2)	73 (29.2)
	Caring nature	50 (20.0)	52 (20.8)
	Cooperation	157 (62.8)	125 (50.0)

students. The selection of the subjects was made based on the prime characteristics of the students such as age and class studying. They were matched by their age and class since they have to be compared between the home dwelling and hostel staying students.

Section B: Comparison of home and hostel students according to their age group (year).

The comparison in Table 4 reveals that the home students and hostel students were not significantly differed in respect of their age groups (year) ( $P > 0.05$ ).

Section C: Comparison of home and hosteller students according to their class.

Table 5 compares the class of studying the home and hosteller students. 50 students were selected from each class for both study groups.

Section D: Assessment of needs gratification of home and hostel students (Table 6a-c).

Section E: Comparison of needs gratification of home and hostel students.

The comparison of home and hosteller students' gratifications are shown in Table 7. The mean gratification of physiological needs of home students was 18.4, (standard deviation [SD] 7.8) and it was 20.1, (SD 7.7) for hostellers, observed difference was statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ ). The mean safety needs gratification of home was 19.6, (SD 7.7) and the same for the hostellers was 23.2, (SD 9.5) the difference observed was highly statistically significant ( $P < 0.001$ ). The mean gratification of belonging needs of home and hosteller students were 19.3, (SD 8.3) and 23.3, (SD 8.2), respectively.

Section F: Comparison of home and hostel conditions of students. The conditions of home and hostel of students were compared to identify the difference of conditions between them.

The results of the comparison between are presented compared in Table 8. The mean condition of the home was 24.3 (SD 3.0) and it was 20.9 (SD 5.1) for hosteller students. The mean difference was highly statistically significant ( $P < 0.001$ ).

Section G: Relationship between home/hostel conditions with gratification of needs. The conditions of home and hostel were correlated with their respective gratification of needs such as physiological needs, safety needs, and belonging needs (Table 9).

**Table 4: Comparison of home and hostel students according to their age group (year)**

Age (years)	Number (%)	
	Home students	Hostel students
14-15	100 (40.0)	100 (40.0)
16-17	121 (48.4)	119 (47.6)
18+	29 (11.6)	31 (12.4)
Total	250 (100)	250 (100)

Chi-square test statistic=0.08; P=0.96; not statistically significant

**Table 5: Comparison of home and hosteller students according to their class of studying**

Class studying	Number (%)	
	Home students	Hostel students
VIII	50 (20)	50 (20)
IX	50 (20)	50 (20)
X	50 (20)	50 (20)
XI	50 (20)	50 (20)
XII	50 (20)	50 (20)
Total	250 (100)	250 (100)

**Table 6a: Assessment of gratification of physiological needs of home and hostel students**

Score	% of score	Category	Number (%)	
			Home students	Hostel students
32-40	81-100	Fully gratified	15 (6.0)	14 (5.6)
24-31	61-80	Gratified	56 (22.4)	73 (29.2)
16-23	41-60	Moderately gratified	84 (33.6)	99 (39.6)
8-15	21-40	Minimally gratified	76 (30.4)	46 (18.4)
0-7	0-20	Not gratified	19 (7.6)	18 (7.2)
Total			250 (100)	250 (100)

Chi-square test statistic=10.91; P=0.03; not statistically significant

**Table 6b: Assessment of gratification of safety needs of home and hostel students**

Score	% of score	Category	Number (%)	
			Home students	Hostel students
32-40	81-100	Fully gratified	15 (6.0)	57 (22.8)
24-31	61-80	Gratified	65 (26.0)	77 (30.8)
16-23	41-60	Moderately gratified	87 (34.8)	83 (33.2)
8-15	21-40	Minimally gratified	66 (26.4)	17 (6.8)
0-7	0-20	Not gratified	17 (6.8)	16 (6.4)
Total			250 (100)	250 (100)

Chi-square test statistic=54.57; P<0.001; highly statistically significant

## DISCUSSION

In 1<sup>st</sup> objective, our study revealed that home students will be more gratified than hostel students with their physiological, safety, love, and belonging needs.<sup>1</sup> However, our study revealed opposite of need and gratification of

**Table 6c: Assessment of gratification of belonging needs of home and hostel students**

Score	% of score	Category	Number (%)	
			Home students	Hostel students
32-40	81-100	Fully gratified	23 (9.2)	38 (15.2)
24-31	61-80	Gratified	54 (21.6)	103 (41.2)
16-23	41-60	Moderately gratified	80 (32)	62 (24.8)
8-15	21-40	Minimally gratified	77 (30.8)	34 (13.6)
0-7	0-20	Not gratified	16 (6.4)	13 (5.2)
Total			250 (100)	250 (100)

Chi-square test statistic=38.23; P<0.001; highly statistically significant

**Table 7: The home students and hostellers were compared in respect of their gratification such as physiological needs, safety needs, and belonging needs**

Gratification	Mean±SD		t statistic	d.f	Sig.
	Home students (n=250)	Hostel students (n=250)			
Physiological needs	18.4±7.8	20.1±7.7	2.397	498	P<0.05
Safety needs	19.6±7.7	23.2±9.5	4.731	498	P<0.001
Belonging needs	19.3±8.3	23.3±8.2	5.441	498	P<0.001

SD: Standard deviation

**Table 8: Comparison of home and hostel conditions of students**

Variable	Mean±SD		t statistic	d.f	Sig.
	Home students (n=250)	Hostel students (n=250)			
Home/Hostel condition	24.3±3.0	20.9±5.1	8.982	498	P<0.001

SD: Standard deviation

**Table 9: Correlation of home and hostel condition with gratification of needs**

Home condition with gratification of	"r"	Sig.	Hostel condition with gratification of	"r"	Sig.
Physiological needs	-0.096	P>0.05	Physiological needs	0.329	P<0.001
Safety needs	-0.016	P>0.05	Safety needs	0.27	P<0.001
Belonging needs	0.015	P>0.05	Belonging needs	0.295	P<0.001

hostel students were more gratified with all three basic needs compare to home students and home children were not gratified of their needs because of nuclear family, less educated parents, working parents, lack in care of children at home, under care of untrained care takers/mates, broken family, and parents may be under stress because of over burden of work at working place and at home, no love and affection to children, more number of sibling, lower income of the family, etc.



Objective 2: To compare levels of need gratification among school children, living at home, and stay in hostels.<sup>2</sup> In 2<sup>nd</sup> objective our study revealed that the comparisons of house and hostel students' gratifications were shown in the above Table 7. The mean gratification of Physiological needs of house students was  $18.4 \pm 7.8$  and the same of the hostellers was  $20.1 \pm 7.7$ . The difference between them was statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ ). The mean safety needs gratification of the house was  $19.6 \pm 7.7$ , and the same of the hostellers was  $23.2 \pm 9.5$ . The difference between them was statistically very highly significant ( $P < 0.001$ ). The means gratification of belonging needs of house and hostel students were  $19.3 \pm 8.3$  and  $23.3 \pm 8.2$ , respectively. The relationship between house condition with the gratification needs of house students were not significantly correlated ( $P > 0.05$ ). The house students were not gratified with their house conditions, but the hostel conditions were significantly positively correlated with physiological need, safety need, and belonging needs ( $P < 0.001$ ). The hostel students had fully gratified with hostel conditions. Because of trained care takers/warden in hostels, who gratified the need of the hostellers.<sup>3</sup>

Objective 3: To find out the association between need gratification and selected demographic variables of school children living at home and stay in hostels.

Study revealed that;

1. The physiological need gratification of hostel students was statistically significantly associated with their demographic characteristics such as religion, class, closure to hostel warden/care takers, and reasons for closeness ( $P < 0.05$ ).

Because all religion parents agreed to admit their children in school with hostels facility and they were not concern with religion of the other students, care takers, and warden.<sup>4-6</sup> Parents were agreed with the rules and regulations of the hostels as well as hosteller students accepted positively, environment of hostels. Beside these hosteller students were receiving, proper balanced and nutritious diet at a time, clean water facilities, proper ventilation, rest and steep, physical exercise, adequate time for study, and recreation along with sports facilities.<sup>7-9</sup>

Whereas, the physiological need gratification of house students were not significantly associated with their all demographic characteristics ( $P > 0.05$ ) because parents were not paying attention to words their children because of less education, less income, more number of sibling, joint family, only father may be earning member in the family, and inadequate facility at home.

The safety need gratification of hostel students were statistically associated with their demographic characteristics

such as age, class, education of mother, occupation of father and mother, closer to hostel, and reasons for closeness ( $P < 0.05$ ). Because from 8<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> standard of students, between the age group of 14-18 years met safety needs such as immunization facility, properly maintenance of health records, feeling of safety under the care of warden/care takers, provision for training of personal hygiene, followed rules and regulation of hostels, paying attention toward need of children, feeling of fearlessness and facing problem with full strength in the presence of care takers/warden, and because of highly education of mother, occupation of father and mother, parents think that they cannot spent time and give care in a proper way for their children. Hence, as a result, hostel is the best residential place where their children can met with their needs.<sup>10,11</sup>

Whereas, the safety need gratification of house students were statistically significantly associated with their demographic characteristics ( $P < 0.05$ ) such as class only.

3. The hosteller belonging need gratification was statistically significantly associated with their demographic characteristics such as class and education of mother ( $P < 0.05$ ).

From 8<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> standard of school children hostel are the residential area as a safety point of view and proper growth and development of child where children will get love and affection, play therapy with peer group relaxation therapy as well as care from care takers/warden when he/she falls sick. Because highly educated mother will do service/business and would not be able to meet need at home.

Whereas, the belonging needs gratification of house students were statistically associated with their demographic characteristics ( $P < 0.05$ ) age, class, and occupation of father. Because house students from 14 to 18 years of age studying in 8<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> standard received love and affection from mothers who is housewives and well educated. Because of occupation of father and good position (service/business) paid attention to met need of children.

From the above results and discussions, the research hypothesis ( $H_1$ ), "there will be significant difference between needs gratification of school children living at home and in the hostel," is accepted and concluded that the hostellers' needs gratification is significantly more than the children living in home.

The research hypothesis ( $H_2$ ), "there will be association between needs gratification and the selected demographic variables of School children living at home and in the hostel," is rejected in respect of all demographic profiles of School children living at home regarding physiological

needs gratifications. Moreover, the following demographic variables related to respective needs gratification are also rejected.

1. Safety needs gratification = Age, sex, religion, type of family, family monthly income, education of father, education of mother, occupation of father, occupation of mother, siblings, primary source of help, closer to family/hostel head, and reasons of closeness.
2. Belonging needs gratification = Sex, religion, type of family, family monthly income, education of father, education of mother, occupation of mother, relation to head of family, siblings, primary source of help, closer to family/hostel head, and reasons for closeness.

## CONCLUSION

Based on findings, the study was concluded that the hostel students had fully gratified with hostel conditions. Because of trained warden/care takers and better facilities provided by the warden/care takers regarding physiological, safety, and belonging needs.

## REFERENCES

1. Maslow A. A preface to motivation theory. *Psychosomatic Med* 1943;5:85-92.
2. Aguilera DC, Messick JM. *Crisis Intervention*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. St. Louis: CV Mosby; 1965.
3. Anthony EJ, editor. The syndrome of the psychological invulnerable child. In: *The Child in His Family. Children at Psychiatric Risk*. Vol. 3. New York: John Wiley and Sons; 1974. p. 529-44.
4. Arnold JF. Family violence. Short-circuiting abusive behavior *Sultan* 1983;23:204, July 1983
5. Alterman AI. *Substance Abuse and Psychopathology*. New York: Plenum Press; 1985.
6. Abdussalam M, Foster C, Käferstein F. Food-related behaviour. In: *Health and Behaviour: Selected Perspectives*. Ch. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1989.
7. Geln A. Environmental influence on the developmental outcome of children at risk. *Infants Young Child* 1990;2:1-9.
8. Austin G. School Failure and AOD Use: A Literal Review. Draft Submitted to Wisconsin Clearinghouse, Madison, Wisconsin; 1991.
9. Barocas R, Seifer R, Sameroff AJ. Defining environmental risk: Multiple dimensions of psychological vulnerability. *Am J Community Psychol* 1985;13:433-47.
10. Bangert-Drowns RL. The effects of school-based substance abuse education – Meta-analysis. *J Drug Educ* 1988;18:243-64.
11. Bennett LA, Wolin SJ, Reiss D. Cognitive, behavioral, and emotional problems among school-age children of alcoholic parents. *Am J Psychiatry* 1988;145:185-90.

**How to cite this article:** Shendey U. A Nursing Study on the Assessment of Needs Gratification among School Children. *Int J Sci Stud* 2017;4(11):22-27.

**Source of Support:** Nil, **Conflict of Interest:** None declared.