

**A STUDY ON LEGAL AWARENESS AMONG HIGHER SECONDARY  
STUDENTS OF KANYAKUMARI DISTRICT.**

*Synopsis submitted to Tamilnadu Teacher's Education university in partial  
fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of*

MASTER OF EDUCATION

By

Mary Sakila. S

Reg. No : M1311100

Under the guidance of

Mr. Prasad P.S



N.V.K.S.D. COLLEGE OF EDUCATION,  
CENTRE FOR RESEARCH  
(Reaccredited by NAAC with A grade)  
ATTOOR, KANYAKUMARI DISTRICT,  
TAMILNADU.  
JUNE – 2014.

Mary Sakila, S.  
M.ED., scholar,  
N.V.K.S.D. College of Education,  
Attoor, Kanyakumari District.

### DECLARATION

I declare that the dissertation entitled “A STUDY ON LEGAL AWARENESS AMONG HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS OF KANYAKUMARI DISTRICT” submitted to the Tamil Nadu Teacher’s Education University, Chennai for the fulfilment of the degree of master of education is the record of original research work carried out by me under the guidance of Mr. Prasad, P.S Assistant professor in Education, N.V.K.S.D College of Education, Attoor and it has not been submitted by me for the award of any degree, diploma, title or recognition before.

Place : Attoor

Mary Sakila, S.

Date :

(M.Ed student)

Mr. Prasad P.S. M.Sc., M.Ed., M.Phil.

Assistant Professor in Education

N.V.K.S.D. College of Education,

Attoor, Kanyakumari District.

### CERTIFICATE

Certified that Mary Sakila, S. student of Master of Education has done research on the topic “A STUDY ON LEGAL AWARENESS AMONG HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS OF KANYAKUMARI DISTRICT” for the award of degree of Master of Education, submitted to N.V.K.S.D. College of Education Attoor affiliated to Tamil Nadu Teacher’s Education University. It is record of bonafide research work done by her under my guidance and supervision. It is further certified that the work is an original one, free from any duplication.

Place : Attoor

Date :

Prasad, P.S.

(Guide)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost I thank the Almighty God who inspired and guided me all the way.

I have immense pleasure in expressing my deep sense of gratitude and my heartiest thanks to my beloved guide Mr. Prasad, P.S. M.Sc., M.Ed., M.Phil. assistant professor in Education, N.V.K.S.D. college of Education, Attoor for his immense patience, effective guidance, cordial support and constant advocacy bestowed throughout the work.

My profound gratitude to Dr. B.C. Shoba, Principal, N.V.K.S.D. college of Education, Attoor, for given me the opportunity to undertake this dissertation work and for the encouragement given to accomplish the same.

I express my sincere thanks to Mrs. P. Sheela, Librarian and Mr. Jeya Mohan, Library Assistant, N.V.K.S.D. college of Education Attoor, for their valuable assistance.

I also express my gratitude to all the teaching and non teaching staff of the N.V.K.S.D college of Education, Attoor for the encouragement given to me completing this research work.

I express my sincere thanks to the administrators, staffs and higher secondary students of various schools for their kind of co-operation.

My whole hearted thanks and gratitude to my family members for their advice, encouragement and moral support.

Finally thanks are extended to one and all for those who extended their co-operation to finish the dissertation work.

Mary Sakila, S.

**CONTENTS**

| <b>Sl. No</b> | <b>CHAPTERS</b>                                   | <b>PAGE NO.</b> |
|---------------|---|-----------------|
| I             | INTRODUCTION                                      | 1 – 9           |
| II            | REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE                      | 10 – 36         |
| III           | METHODOLOGY                                       | 37 – 58         |
| IV            | ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION                       | 59 – 110        |
| V             | FINDINGS, EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS,<br>CONCLUSION | 111 – 120       |
|               | REFERENCES  |                 |
|               | APPENDICES  |                 |

## LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE<br>NO | NAME OF TABLES   | PAGE<br>NO |
|-------------|--|------------|
| 3.1         | Details of selected items for the legal awareness test   | 46         |
| 3.2         | Reliability analysis of legal awareness test   | 50         |
| 3.3         | Details of schools selected for the study  | 53         |
| 3.4         | Details about the sample selected for the study (percentage wise distribution)                         | 54         |
| 4.1         | Mean and standard deviation of legal awareness of higher secondary students.                           | 61         |
| 4.2         | Legal awareness of higher secondary students based on levels   | 62         |
| 4.3         | Gender – wise mean, standard deviation, number and t – value of legal awareness                        | 64         |
| 4.4         | Religion wise mean, standard deviation, number and F – value of legal awareness and its dimensions     | 67         |
| 4.4.1       | Result of scheffe’s procedure for the higher secondary students legal awareness of various religions   | 68         |
| 4.4.2       | Result of scheffe’s procedure for dimension drunken driven   | 69         |
| 4.4.3       | Result of scheffe’s procedure for dimension drug abuse   | 70         |
| 4.4.4       | Result of scheffe’s procedure for dimension child labour   | 71         |
| 4.4.5       | Result of scheffe’s procedure for dimension right to education   | 72         |
| 4.4.6       | Result of scheffe’s procedure for dimension other crimes   | 73         |
| 4.5         | Community wise mean, standard deviation, number and F – value of legal awareness and its dimensions    | 74         |
| 4.5.1       | Result of scheffe’s procedure for the higher secondary students legal awareness of various communities | 76         |
| 4.5.2.      | Result of scheffe’s procedure for dimension drunken driven   | 77         |
| 4.5.3       | Result of scheffe’s procedure for dimension child labour   | 79         |
| 4.6         | Locale wise mean, standard deviation, number and t – value of legal awareness and its dimensions       | 81         |

|       |  |     |
|-------|--|-----|
| 4.7   | Type of management wise mean, standard deviation, number and F- value of legal awareness and its dimensions                  | 83  |
| 4.7.1 | Results of scheffe's procedure for higher secondary students legal awareness based on type of management                     | 84  |
| 4.7.2 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension drunken driven   | 85  |
| 4.7.3 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension drug abuse   | 86  |
| 4.7.4 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension child labour   | 87  |
| 4.7.5 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension right to education   | 88  |
| 4.7.6 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension other crimes   | 89  |
| 4.8   | Father's educational qualification wise mean, standard deviation, number and F – value of legal awareness and its dimensions | 91  |
| 4.8.1 | Result of scheffe's procedure for higher secondary students legal awareness based on father's educational qualifications     | 93  |
| 4.8.2 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension drunken driven   | 94  |
| 4.8.3 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension drug abuse   | 95  |
| 4.8.4 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension child labour   | 97  |
| 4.8.5 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension right to education   | 98  |
| 4.8.6 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension other crimes   | 99  |
| 4.9   | Mother's educational qualification wise mean, standard deviation, number and F – value of legal awareness and its dimensions | 100 |
| 4.9.1 | Result of scheffe's procedure for higher secondary students legal awareness based on mother's educational qualifications     | 102 |
| 4.9.2 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension drunken driven   | 103 |
| 4.9.3 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension drug abuse   | 104 |
| 4.9.4 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension child labour   | 106 |
| 4.9.5 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension right to education   | 107 |
| 4.9.6 | Result of scheffe's procedure for dimension other crimes   | 108 |

## **CHAPTER - I**

### **INTRODUCTION**

- **Need and significance of the study**
- **Statement of the problem**
- **Operational definitions of terms**
- **Objectives of the study**
- **Hypotheses framed**
- **Methodology in brief**
- **Tools used**
- **Statistical techniques used**
- **Organization of the report.**



**“The world is not a problem, the problem is your unawareness”**

- Sonam Priya Singh

Our country is a democratic country as well as a welfare state. “Rule of Law” is the edifice on which the democratic structure has been built on. “Rule of Law” means everybody is equal in the eyes of law. In spite of this solemn principle, everyday we hear news about instances of atrocities committed against women and children, excuses by law enforcing agencies, harassment of citizens by officials, cheating by seller of goods, exploitation of the weak, stories of discriminations and deprivation in the society besides heinous crimes like murder, looting etc. In most of the cases the victims of these suffering silently by ascribing them to fate or are afraid to protest on the grounds of further reprisals. The fact is many time people are not aware of the law and the right of laws confer their

protection. The directive principles of the constitution lays down the guidelines for the welfare of the socially and economically neglected section of the society. A number of laws have been enacted to contribute to the welfare of the socially and economically downtrodden population of the society. However, the benefits of these provisions are not reaped by them due to lack of awareness about the same.

Law and society are two sides of same coin. The aim of all research is to gain more knowledge and render better services to mankind. Law is considered to be one of the hallmarks of societal stability and it is a legislative venture through which society earns maturity. In education, all learning is self learning. It remains stable and permanent and can be applied to solve the problems of future life.

Every country has prescribed rights and Duties for its citizen. The citizens need to be aware about their rights, the legal provisions and processes. Coupled with this knowledge, they are also required to know how to realize their rights and entitlement. On the reverse side, there are certain duties and prohibitions which are cast upon people and that need to be observed so that they do not transcend the barriers and into trouble for the same.

#### **NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY:**

Legal awareness is a dynamic concept that will find expanded expression and constantly covers new areas as human society continues to evolve to higher levels of development. Law is the powerful force that fosters the modern interactive society of global dimension. Constitutional interpretation and application were made necessary by the very nature of the constitution. The

constitution limits the court to dealing with cases and controversies. Social and economic injustice increase the inequalities in most spheres of the human activity and the endless discrimination against the weaker sections of society when we are inactive, stay immobile at a single point and live on the benevolence of others, perhaps we can ignore law. But, if we are active in life we can earn income, accumulate wealth etc. Legal system became sophisticated, technical and assumed much significance.

The legal age would also mean knowing all your legal rights and responsibilities. Not everyone has the resources to know everything about the law that's why lawyers exist. Every society or even community should be living under a common law. This is to maintain the quo, to protect property, vested right and established relationships. It is even considered to be the backbone of the society. Of the several age groups that we have, the minors (or) the children and the elders are those who need legal assistance.

The lawyers and judges cannot solve the problem of the society, unless the citizens are well aware of the rights and duties. It is necessary for achieving the goal of social, national and international co-operation and integrations. It is important to develop integrated personality for developing sense of justice, equality which will help him/her to adjust with the changing environment.

From child's early years itself the legal awareness is necessary. The school children should be aware of social and political issues and they have a right to learn about values which have been universally proclaimed. The failure of

execution of many laws has been attributed to the beneficiaries. Education can play a vital role in promoting legal awareness among students.

Common rights of human beings are right to education, right to equality, right to freedom of speech, right against exploitation, right to freedom of religion and right to constitutional remedies. The social evils prevalent in our society are violence against women, gender bias, child labour, black money, corruption etc. School students should be aware of social evils and legal issues related to Eve teasing and ragging, drug abuse, drunken driving, child labour, Right to Education and other crimes etc. The students should have good knowledge of legal awareness, otherwise they have to face problems and in some instance punishment like fine, under the custody of police and imprisonment. Considering all those the investigator like to study the legal awareness of higher secondary students.

#### **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM :**

The purpose of the study was to examine the legal awareness of higher secondary students and entitled as “A STUDY ON LEGAL AWARENESS AMONG HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS OF KANYAKUMARI DISTRICT”.

#### **OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS :**

##### **LEGAL AWARENESS :**

According to American Bar Association, commission on public understanding, legal awareness is “The ability to make critical judgements about the substance of the law, the legal process and available legal resources and to

effectively utilize the legal system and articulate strategies to improve it is legal literacy”.

In this study the investigator means the awareness about (Ragging and Eve teasing, Drunken Driven, Drug Abuse, Child Labour and Right to Education and other crimes) legal in higher secondary students.

### **HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS:**

Refers to the students studying in XI standard in Kanyakumari District.

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:**

1. To construct and validate legal awareness test.
2. To study the level of legal awareness among higher secondary students.
3. To compare the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimension of higher secondary students with respect to the background variables namely.
  - a) Gender
  - b) Religion
  - c) Community
  - d) Locale of the school
  - e) Type of management
  - f) Educational Qualification of father
  - g) Educational Qualification of mother

### **HYPOTHESES:**

1. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of male and female higher secondary students.

2. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions among hindu, christian and muslim higher secondary students.
3. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of OC, BC, MBC, and SC/ST higher secondary students.
4. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of Rural and Urban higher secondary students.
5. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of government, private and aided higher secondary students.
6. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students having father's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC.
7. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students having mother's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC.

#### **METHODOLOGY IN BRIEF :**

#### **METHOD :**

For the present study normative survey method was used.

**SAMPLE :**

The total sample for the present study consisted of 400 higher secondary students in Kanyakumari District.

**TOOLS USED :**

The tools used for study are as follows:

- i. Legal awareness test developed and validated by the investigator.
- ii. General data sheet.

**STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES :**

For the present study the following statistical techniques are used

- i. Percentage
- ii. Arithmetic Mean
- iii. Standard Deviation
- iv. t- test
- v. ANOVA

**DELIMITATIONS :**

The main de-limitations of the study are the following.

1. The sample comprises 400 students only.
2. The sample comprises of eleventh standard students only.

**ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT :**

The investigator conducted the study and collected data from various sources. It has been analyzed, conclusions are drawn and proposals are

recommended for further research in the field of legal awareness, and this has been systematically presented in the following chapters.

The chapter I deals with the details of the introduction which includes need and significance of study, important terms and objectives of study major hypotheses and delimitations.

The chapter II contains the review related to the present investigations and theoretical overview.

The chapter III contains methodology, Normative survey method, preparation of tool, the sample used for the study, the tool used for the study, data collection procedure and statistical procedure.

The chapter IV contains details of analysis of data, their results and also the interpretation for the same.

The chapter V contains the summary, findings, conclusion, recommendation and suggestions.



## **CHAPTER - II**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

- **Theoretical overview**
- **Studies in India**
- **Studies in abroad**
- **Critical Review**

According to James S. Ross “ The whole of education, intellectual, moral and physical, consisted in leading out the innate knowledge, virtues and power of child, making the potential actual”. Unless we put something into the pupils mind, we cannot draw out anything. Thus education is a process of learning and teaching.

**PURPOSE OF LEGAL EDUCATION :**

Legal rules and doctrines are very critical. They need some technical skill to understand and make them applicable. In the complex modern society it is very difficult to deal with public affairs, where government’s action operates and legal norms dominates over such areas. The area covers all democratic institutions, socio-cultural centers, religious and financial societies and various other agencies those are channeled towards the goal of democratic process.

India followed the English pattern of legal education during the post independent era. Justice J.M. Shelat stated that the matter related legal education has hardly even been considered reasonably.

### **SCOPE OF LEGAL EDUCATION :**

Legal education starts from mother's womb and subsists till death. Prof. Ottaway states that " Education can be studied from many different views, what is here called the sociology of education. It is fairly a new name for an aspect of education which has always been the concern of educator in some form or another". Thus legal education is all social activities that is concerned in the society. Legal education primarily helps the citizens to understand basic democratic values and broadens the idea about the scope and purpose of law. Legal education is highly necessary in any society for socialization of individual and democratic society. It helps to identify the values of life and achieving the goals of the society.

The scope of legal education should not be confined to the thought of developing professional lawyers in the society. The basic purpose of legal education is to impart a deliberate and conscious training concerning the values of our constitution. The prime purpose is to rear up our people to understand the basic assumptions of our organic law and provide adequate training facilities.

The function of legal education is not only to impart legal skills among professional lawyers but also to provide opportunity to the people to achieve the end of democratic value. It will create an opportunity to understand the purpose of

law and help to maintain democratic society on the principle of legal order. Professors Lass Well and Mc Dougal have defined the purpose of legal education in the following words. “A student may even be allowed, if he so ultimately but consciously reject the democratic way of life and embraces the opposites. But his education must be such that if he does make such a choice he does it deliberately, with full awareness of consequences for himself and community which he lives not by sluggish self deception”. F. Willcox submits that “In a democracy the law defends and promotes the individual, being the unit of society, social welfare is a merely a short hand description of the welfare of the individuals, who are that society”.

Prof. Q.S. Sharma defined the purpose of legal education in India and opined “The purpose of legal education in any society is socialization of the individuals and groups”. Each society must therefore identify as clearly as possible its goals, values and direct educational process towards achieving the goals.

#### **AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF LEGAL EDUCATION :**

The aim may be to acquire legal knowledge acquiring degree or making an entry or legal practice. The aim of legal education also conceived in reference to general legal education and clinical education.

#### **IMPORTANCE OF LEGAL EDUCATION :**

In a vibrant democracy, people’s participation in the governance of the affair state forms an integral part. All citizens are equal in the eyes of law, It does not nourish the idea of class, classification, irrespective of caste, creed, sex and place

of birth, law is made equal. It never distinguishes rich and poor, privileged and under privileged. It extends equal opportunities in all spheres of life. Hence, legal education has much importance. The following points signifies the importance of legal education.

Legal education develop democratic spirit; Abraham Lincoln defines “Democracy is the government of the people, by the people, for the people” Democracy stands on the rule of law. Legal education creates good citizens, validates human values, develops leadership, develops professional skill, develops the ideas of social justice, provides opportunity for research.

### **CLASSIFICATION OF RIGHTS :**

Broadly speaking rights are divided into two categories, civil rights and political rights. But in modern time this classification is not the “Bill of Rights” or list of fundamental rights in the constitutions of many states. There are certain rights which fell under both the categories. Civil rights were achieved by the people earlier and they have existed and can exist even in those countries where political rights are defined to the people. A distinction is also generally made between two other kinds of rights ie, moral and legal rights.

### **LEGAL RIGHTS :**

Legal rights are those privileges of man, which are recognized, sanctioned and enforced by the state. Leacock says, “A legal right is a privilege enjoyed by a citizen as against his fellow citizens granted and upheld by the sovereign power of the state”. The test of legal rights is that it can be enforced in a court of law. The

Indian constitution includes for this reason rights of constitutional remedies among fundamentals rights guaranteed to Indian citizens.

The legal rights may be further classified in civil rights and political rights. Those rights which relate to the protection and enjoyment of life and property by the individual are regarded as essential to civilized existence are known as civil rights. They are called civil because they are essential conditions of civilized society. Civil rights vary from state to state and from time to time.

### **RAGGING :**

Ragging in India is a damaging the of interaction of the seniors in college or school with the juniors, newcomers or first years. It involves insults, running errands for seniors, and many other complex activities. Highly reputed Indian colleges have a wistful history of ragging especially medical colleges. It has become increasingly unpopular due to several complaints of serious injury to the victims and strict laws regarding ragging. Ragging is now defined as an act that violates or perceived to violate an individual student's dignity.

### **BEFORE AND DURING ADMISSION AND REGISTRATION :**

- Every public declaration brochure of admission / instruction booklet or the prospectus to print these regulations in full.
- Telephone number of the anti – ragging helpline and the important functionaries in the institution, members of the anti – ragging committees and anti – ragging squad etc. to be published in brochure of admission / instruction booklet or the prospectus.

- Every student and his / her parents to file an affidavit among not to indulge in ragging.
- The institution to prominently display posters detailing laws and punishment against ragging.
- Anti – ragging squad to ensure vigil at odd hours during first few months at hostels, inside institution premises as well as privately commercially managed hostels.

### **EVE TEASING :**

Eve teasing as we know it is an action of perversion like touching, rubbing, grouping, staring, pinching, slapping, display of private parts and even pornographic material. Many other arts can be added to this compendium. Eve teasing is a crime committed against women everyday but the criminals are not punished and they continue violating a women's privacy assuming they have a right to do so. Eve teasing is a social complex problem. It is a type of public sexual harassment, street harassment of women by men. Out going women are not secure in anywhere. They can be teased not only on road, but also on road, bus stop, school, colleges, train ... anywhere.

### **DRUNKEN DRIVING :**

Alcohol has been successful in making a distinct niche in daily lives of humans since the centuries of the recorded history. Alcohol has been found to play a major role in social ills in almost all countries across the world, but foremost amongst the ills produced by alcohol is its role in traffic crashes.

Alcohol and driving don't mix, but still, many people love to drink and drive resulting in numerous road mishaps. Drunken driving has been recognized as a world menace, based on the states which reveal that road accidents cause 1.2 million death and 50 million injuries around the world each year. Some 480,000 of these deaths and 20 million of people get injured by drunken driving.

### **DRUG ABUSE :**

A drug can be said to be any substance use in medicine. It can also be said to be any substance taken by some people to get certain effect, such as happiness and excitement. Driving from these definitions above drugs can be classified into two categories.

- i. The soft drug e.g antibiotics and analgesics
- ii. The hard drugs e.g cocaine, marijuana heroin etc.

Consequently, a drug addict is said to be someone whose life has become dependent on drugs hence drug abuse.

### **CAUSES :**

There are two primary causes of drug abuse among the youths. These are

1. Peer Pressure and
2. Depression

### **PEER PRESSURE :**

Youth associate with different types of people otherwise known as friends. Through the pressure from these friends a child they tend, to have a taste of these



drugs and once this is done they continue to take it and becomes addicted to it at the longrun.

### **DEPRESSION :**

Another primary cause of drug abuse is depression when certain things happen to someone that is considered very sad and disheartening the person started thinking of the best way to become happy once more hence the use of hard drugs will come in. This later on times to an habit hence drug abuse.

### **SOLUTION TO DRUG ABUSE :**

- ❖ Aggressive extinction of all the sources of these' hard drugs including the farms where they planned by a joint force of the UNO.
- ❖ Parents should monitor the kind of friends their children with and guide against bad company.
- ❖ Rehabilitation of the affected persons. Teaching the effects of drug abuse in schools.
- ❖ Continuous campaign against the use of hard drugs at the federal state and local levels.
- ❖ Consult of a doctor should be sought before a prolong take of a particular soft drug.
- ❖ Stiff penalty should be metted against anybody found dealing on hard drugs.

**CHILD LABOUR :**

“Child is the father of Man” the famous lines by William Wordsworth. It symbolizes the need of children in building a healthy nation and society. Childhood is the first stage after infancy. It is the formative period in men’s life. For their minds are very soft, receptive and plastic at this tender age.

Children’s mind is like potter’s clay. It has to be shaped in a right manner. A child normally has to enjoy its childhood days with its parents, teachers, friends etc. it is the age where fine and long lasting impressions gather in child’s mind childhood is the best time to develop spiritual, intellectual, emotional support. But this rule of nature has been crippled by the perilous child labour.

Every child has his right to enjoy his childhood. But inspite of this a few children are forcefully put to work throughout the world about 250 million children are child labourer. Due to poverty, poor parents put their children to work in order to supplement the family’s economic status.

**CHILD LABOUR LAWS IN INDIA :**

After its independence from colonial rule. India has passed a number of constitutional protections and laws on child labour. The constitution of India in the fundamental rights and directive of state policy prohibits child labour below the age of 14 years in any factory or mine or castle or engaged in any other hazardous employment (Article 24).

**THE FACTORIES ACT OF 1948 :**

The Act prohibits the employment of children below the age of 14 years in any factory. The law also placed rules on who, when and how long can pre-adults aged 15/18 years be employed in any factory.

**THE MINES ACT OF 1952 :**

The Act prohibits the employment of children below 18 years of age in a mine.

**THE CHILD LABOUR (PROHIBITION & REGULATION) ACT OF 1986:**

The Act prohibits the employment of children below the age of 14 years in hazardous occupation identified in a list by the law. The list was expanded in 2006, and again in 2008.

**THE JUVENILE JUSTICE (CARE AND PROTECTION) OF CHILDREN ACT OF 2000 :**

This law made it a crime, punishable with a prison term, for anyone to procure or employ in a child in any hazardous employment or in bondage.

**RIGHT TO EDUCATION :**

The constitution (Eighty – sixth Amendment) Act, 2002 inserted Article 21-A in the constitution of India to provide free and compulsory education of all children in the age group of six to fourteen years as a fundamental Right in such a manner as the state may, by law, determine.

The right of children to free and compulsory education (RTE) Act, 2009 which represents the consequential legislation envisaged under Article 21-A

means that every child has a right to full time elementary education of satisfactory and equitable quality in a formal school which satisfies certain essential norms and standards.

The Act provide free and compulsory education of all children in the age group of six to fourteen years.

‘Compulsory education’ casts an obligation on the appropriate government and local authorities to provide and ensure admission, attendance and completion of elementary education by all children in the 6 – 14 age groups. With this India has moved forward to a rights based framework that casts a legal obligation on the central and state government to implement this fundamental child rights enshrined in the article 21A of the constitution, in accordance with the provisions of the RTE Act.

#### **PROVISIONS OF THE RTE ACT :**

- i. Right of children to free and compulsory education till completion of elementary education in a neighborhood school.
- ii. It clarifies that ‘compulsory education’ means obligation of the appropriate government to provide free elementary education and ensure compulsory admission, attendance and completion of elementary education to every child in the six to fourteen age group. ‘Free’ means that no child shall be liable to pay any kind of fee of charges or expenses which may prevent him or her from pursuing and completing elementary education.

- iii. It makes provisions for a non admitted child to be admitted to an age appropriate class.
- iv. It specifies the duties and responsibilities of appropriate governments local authority and parents in providing free and compulsory education and sharing of financial and other responsibilities between the central and state governments.
- v. It lays down the norms and standards relating inter alia to Pupil Teacher Rations(PTRs), buildings and infrastructure, school – working days, teacher – working hours.
- vi. It provides for rational deployment of teachers by ensuring that the specified pupil teacher ratio is maintained for each school, rather than just as an average for the state or district or block, thus ensuring that there is no urban – rural imbalance in teacher posting. It also provides for prohibition of deployment of teachers for non – educational work, other than decennial census, elections to local authority state legislatures and parliament, and disaster relief.
- vii. It provides for appointment of appropriately trained teachers. That is teachers with the requisite entry and academic qualifications.
- viii. It prohibits (a) physical punishment and mental harassment (b) screening procedures for admission of children (c) capitation fee (d) private tuition by teachers and (e) running of schools without recognition.

- ix. It provides for development of curriculum in consonance with the values enshrined in the constitution, and which would ensure the all – round development of the child, building on the child’s knowledge, potentiality and talent and making the child free of fear, trauma and anxiety through a system of child friendly and child centered learning.

## **Section B**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE :**

#### **INTRODUCTION :**

The essential aspect of a research is the review of the related research literature before taking up the research. It helps the researcher in many ways in conducting study with full insight. Any investigation / research what ever the scale will involve reading about what other people have done about their area of interest, gathering evidence to support or refute their arguments and finally drawing their conclusions on the basis of available evidences.

#### **DEFINITIONS :**

The term 'review of literature' has been defined in the following ways. According to Good, Barn and Scates "The competent physician much keep abreast of the latest discoveries in the field of medicine. Obviously the careful students of education, the research worker and investigator should become familiar with location and use of sources educational information".

According to John W. Best "Practically all human knowledge can be found in books and libraries unlike other animals that must start a new with each generation, man builds upon the accumulated and recorded knowledge of the past. His constant adding to the vast store of knowledge makes possible progress in all areas of human endeavour".

## **FUNCTIONS :**

- To justify ones choice of research question, theoretical or conceptual framework and method.
- To establish the importance of the topic.
- To provide background information needed to understand the study.
- To familiarize reader with significant and / or up-to-date research to the relevant.
- To establish ones study as one link in a chain of research that is developing knowledge in ones field.

## **NEED AND IMPORTANCE OF RELATED LITERATURE :**

- **To have a strong theoretical base on which research is stand.**

It is the very basis of research platform on which one will build argument. It places research in context with in discipline and demonstrates how research improves discipline.

- **To justify research :**

- ✓ To prove that there are gaps in field that merits a closer investigation.
- ✓ To demonstrate that work will improve field in some way, filling in gaps and adding to knowledge and understanding of field.
- ✓ To prove that work hasn't been previously done thus ensuring the intellectual contribution is indeed original.



- **As an exercise in thesis development :**
  - ✓ To educate yourself on the primary theoretical approaches to your discipline, as well as the primary actors.
  - ✓ To provide yourself with an intellectual historical and theoretical context within which one can frame ones research and writing.
- **A good literature review will help to do the following :**
  - ✓ Narrow your research focus.
  - ✓ Pose questions that might not have previously occurred to you, and
  - ✓ Build a knowledge base for future research.

### **STUDIES IN INDIA :**

1. Paul (2008) examined the “ Awareness of Legal Rights Among Women Teachers”. The data were collected by normative survey method. The sample consisted of 162 women teachers working in Hyderabad and Rangareddy districts of Andrapradesh. The major finding showed that nearly one fourth of the sample have knowledge about the special provisions under the constitution and the special provision provided to the women in the constitution. Half of the women teacher has shown high awareness of legal rights with respect to the dimensions like divorce, suicide and discrimination.
2. Babu, Sharma (2005) examined the “Elementary Teachers Awareness and Opinion on Constitutional Values”. The data were collected by descriptive survey method. The sample consisted of 100 elementary school teachers

from various schools of Bhopal city. The major findings showed that there was no significant difference of awareness regarding constitutional values among the elementary teachers with varied back grounds such as gender, medium of instruction and even the subject background of teachers. There was no significance difference between social studies and other subject teachers awareness levels with regard to constitution values indicates social studies assuming the character of general studies.

3. Dorai, Muthuchamy (2006) examined the “General Legal Awareness Among Teacher Trainees”. The data were collected by explorative research method. The sample consisted of 200 students studying diploma in Teacher Training of both sexes was taken from private & government Teacher Trainee Institutes of Salem and Nammakkal Districts of Tamilnadu state. The major finding showed that the male and female students do not differ in their legal awareness. There was no significant difference in legal awareness in relation to their +2 qualified and other qualified students. There was significant difference in general legal awareness between first year and second year trainee students.
4. Ismail (2011) examined the “Legal Literacy Among Secondary School Students”. The data were collected by normative survey method. The sample consisted of 75 students of class 10 from various schools in Kerala. The major finding showed that there was a slight difference between boys and girls regarding legal literacy. Boys are comparatively better than the

girls in legal literacy. There was significant difference between rural and urban schools regarding legal literacy. Rural schools are comparatively better than urban schools in legal literacy.

5. Pradeep, Anil (2005) examined the “Human Rights Awareness among Tribal and Non Tribal Higher Secondary Students”. The data were collected by normative survey method. The sample consisted of 612 students from 15 higher secondary schools in wayanad district in Kerala. The major findings showed that the human rights awareness among non-tribal students found to be more as compared to tribal higher secondary students. It was found that boys are more aware of human rights compared to girls among the Non-tribal higher secondary students. There was no difference in human rights awareness between tribal boys and Tribal girls at higher secondary students.
6. Arpana, Chauhan (2012) examined the “Preventing Cyber Crime – A study Regarding Awareness of Cyber Crime in Trichy”. The data were collected by descriptive survey method. The sample consisted of 100 respondents including senior managers, IT administrators and IT security consultants. The major findings showed that there was no association between the respondents' occupation and level of awareness.
7. Suvitha, Kumari, Gowri (2013) examined the “Awareness of Rural Women of their Legal Rights”. The data were collected by normative survey method. The sample consisted of 159 rural women from villages in and

around maduranthakam, kancheepuram district in Tamilnadu. The major findings showed the rural women are becoming aware of their rights and are making effort to achieve them. But still the rural women get in poor awareness. Because only 20% of rural women have high level of awareness. The same 20% of women have low level awareness and the remaining 60% of rural women have average level of awareness.

8. Patel (2008) examined the “Constitutional Awareness among M.Ed Teacher Trainees”. The data were collected by normative survey method. The sample consisted of 75 M.Ed student teachers of the Hemachandracharya North Gujarat University. The major findings showed that there was no significant difference in the constitutional awareness of student teachers belonging to science. Commerce, arts groups 60% of student teachers scored less than 48.66% in constitutional awareness. Approximately half of the students teachers have less than 42.66% constitutional awareness.
9. Metha, Singh (2013) examined “A study on Awareness about Cyberlaws in the Indian society”. The data were collected by a three point structured questionnaire. The sample consisted of 500 working and non working people are selected from Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa. The major findings showed that there was a significance difference between the awareness level of male and female users of internet services and it was established

that the male citizens are more aware for India cyber laws in comparison to their female counter parts.

10. Santhan (2012) examined the “Legal Awareness of Students at Secondary level”. The data were collected by normative survey method. The sample consisted of 300 secondary school students drawn from 8 institution in Trivandrum District. The major findings showed that the majority of the secondary school students under study possess medium or average level of legal awareness. From the legal awareness score of male and female students, it was identified that male students possess better legal awareness the female students. From the legal awareness score of rural and urban students, it was identified there was no significant difference exist between rural and urban students with respect to their legal awareness.
11. Kurup (2009) examined “Constitutional Awareness of Student Teachers and Teacher Educators of the Colleges of the Teacher Education in Kerala”. The data were collected by normative survey method. The sample consisted of a representative group of 450 student teachers and 70 teacher educators selected from 10 institution of Trivandrum, Kollem and Pathanamthitta. The major findings showed that the group under (student teachers) a hetrogeneous one with respect to their constitutional awareness scores (highest score as 28 out of a maximum 40 and lowest 6) only a small proportion (9.33%) student teachers possess high awareness others was either in the average category (54.4) on it the low awareness group (36.22)

only a small proportion of teacher educators (28.5%) possess high awareness. Others was either in the average category (62.35%) in the low awareness group.

12. Abdul Wahid, Muhamedunni, Musthafa (2013) examined the “Human Rights Awareness of Secondary School Students”. The data were collected by normative survey method. The sample consisted of 300 students IX standard pupils of malappuram distict of Kerala state. The major findings showed that there was a slight difference between boys and girls higher secondary students human awareness. Comparatively boys are better than girls in human awareness.
13. Vijayalekshmi (2012) examined the “Human Rights Awareness among Teacher Educators”. The data were collected by descriptive survey method. The sample consisted of 150 teacher educators from various colleges of education under university of Kerala the major findings showed that majority of the teacher educators (52%) lack awareness of basic human right concept. There was no significant difference in human rights awareness of teacher educators for sub samples based on gender and locale. A significant difference was noted in the case of teacher educators belonging to different subject stream.
14. Kumar, Sharma (2009) conducted “A Study of Parents and Teacher Awareness towards Right to Education Act 2009”. The data were collected by normative survey method. The sample consisted of 320 all the primary

to upper primary level of sardar shachar teachers and parents from Gujarat state. The major findings showed that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of awareness levels of RTE of teachers and parents. Teachers are significantly more aware than that of parents.

15. Jaseena (2011) examined the “Study of Right to Education – Awareness of M.Ed Trainees”. The data were collected by normative survey method. The sample consisted of 60 M.Ed students from aided and unaided training colleges of Calicut district. The major findings showed that the male M.Ed students possess significantly higher awareness RTE than their counterparts. Management of the M.Ed college does not effect on the awareness RTE.

16. Reddy, Azad Chandra Shekar (2012) examined the “Awareness of Ragging Among The Professional College Students”. The data were collected by normative survey method. The sample consisted of 200 students from the various professional colleges of Warangal city in Andhra Pradesh. The major findings showed that there was significant difference between the means of awareness levels of medical engineering college students and under graduate college students. Medical engineering college students are significantly more aware than in under graduate college students.

17. Kala (2005) examined “A Study on the Problems of Child Labourers in Kerala”. The data were collected by analytical cum survey method. The sample consisted of 30 child labourers from Kerala state. The major

findings showed age wise analysis of data revealed that majority of child labourers belongs to adolescents. Locality wise analysis of data revealed more or less or equal distribution of child labourer in rural and urban area.

18. Jasmine (2013) examined “A Study on Legal Awareness Among College Students of Kanyakumari District”. The data were collected by normative survey method. The sample consisted of 400 college students from 12 various arts and science colleges of Kanyakumari district. The major findings showed that there was no significant difference between boys and girls college students regarding legal awareness. There was no significant difference between rural and urban college students regarding legal awareness.

#### **STUDIES IN ABROAD :**

1. Curnan (2004) examined the “Legal needs of the public in America”. The data were collected by multistage probability sampling strategy. The sample consisted of 1<sup>st</sup> large scale national study of the use of lawyers by the American public. The achieved sample size was 2064, giving a response rate of 77%. The major findings showed that the most significantly it produced some important and robust findings regarding the use of lawyer services. The general findings on patterns of lawyer use and non-use have been replicated in subsequent surveys.
2. Abel Smith (2004) examined the “Legal problems and the citizen – A study in three London Boroughs”. The data were collected by normative survey



method. The sample consisted of 1651 persons, response rate 73%. The major findings showed that the use of lawyers varied considerably by problem type. For some problems, very few said that they saw a solicitor. In other circumstances almost all of the respondents deemed to need advice said that they saw a lawyer.

3. Rafi, Holme (2007) examined the “Awareness on rights and legal aid facilities, the first steps ensuring human security in Bangladesh”. The data were collected by normative survey method. The sample consisted of 1309 respondents participated in the survey. The major findings revealed the respondents in all three areas may be classified as above the national average in terms of educational and professional background. However even this privileged category of the population was lacking in awareness on core aspects of human security laws and rights. Awareness of even the most basic rights such as the right not to be subjected to torture was very limited.
4. Kim, Lee (2007) examined the “perception of legal liability by Registered Nurses in Korea. The data were collected by questionnaire technique was used. The sample consisted of 288 registered nurses in Korea. The major findings showed that there were significant correlation between attitude towards doctor’s duty and nurses liability. But not between legal awareness and liability.
5. Innocent tuhumwire (2010) examined the :Assessment of legal information needs and access problem of lawyer in Uganda”. The data were collected

by structured questionnaire technique was used sample consisted of 75 practicing lawyers are participant kampala the capital of Uganda. The major findings showed that the update of court rules and judge cases constitute the most needed legal cases information of lawyers attorneys in Uganda. Lawyers indicated that the latest decisions of superior courts constitute their greatest professional information need.

6. Mary Ann, Mauro Allan (2012) examined the “women’s awareness on the law of Anti – violence against women and their children”. The data were collected by descriptive – correlational method. The sample consisted of 96 womens who are selected in mandaue city of Philippines. The major findings showed that the majority of the respondents were aware of the intimate partner violence from watching television. There was a significant relationship between the modes of information, education and communication.
7. Hooria Mashhour (2012) examined the “Human rights Public awareness survey in Yamen”. The data were collected by questionnaire method used. The sample consisted of 2498 respondents as such it was more sufficient to accomplish national representativeness. The major findings showed that the through out all topics of the survey significant differences were commonly found between men and women as well as between those living in cities, in Peri – urban areas and in rural communities.

## **CRITICAL REVIEW :**

Review of related literature helps to link the previous researches with present research. A review of the related literature in the area of legal awareness in this chapter has helped to give adequate insight into the nature of the problem under study. These studies have helped the investigator to locate comparative data useful in the interpretation of results. It also provides ideas explanations, hypothesis or method of research, valuable in formulating and studying the problem.

The investigator has gone through twenty five related literatures are having in this study. Eighteen reviews are Indian studies and other 7 reviews are from abroad studies. Eighteen Indian studies totally related to the awareness of legal right, awareness of constitutional values, general legal awareness, legal literacy, human rights, preventing cybercrime, legal rights, constitutional awareness, awareness of cyber laws, awareness right to ragging, child labour in students or teachers. In abroad studies most of the studies shows that awareness of women rights, legal problems, legal needs, awareness of rights, perception of legal liability, assessment of legal information needs, human rights awareness. These studies were useful for the investigator to know nature of the problem under study.

## **CHAPTER - III**

### **METHODOLOGY**

- **Method used in present study**
- **The sample**
- **The tools**
- **Development of the tool**
- **Reliability and validity of the tool**
- **Administration of the tool**
- **Scoring**
- **Statistical techniques.**

Research may be defined as the application of scientific method in the study of problems. Research is a systematic attempt to obtain answers to meaningful questions about phenomena or events through the applications of scientific procedures. It is an objective, impartial, empirical and logical analysis and recording of controlled observations that may lead to the development of generalizations, principles or theories, resulting to some extent in prediction and control of events that may be consequences or causes of specific phenomena. It is concerned with the objective verification of generalizations. Such verification requires logical analysis of problems and devising the appropriate methodologies for obtaining evidence. According to Clifford Woody “Research comprises defining and refining problems, formulating hypothesis or suggested solutions, collecting organizing and evaluating data, making deduction and reaching conclusion to determine whether they fit the formulated hypothesis”.

Educational research involves application of the main principles of scientific research to the solution of educational problems. According to J.W. Best “Educational research is that activity which is directed towards development of a science to provide knowledge that will permit the educator to achieve this methods”. Research method refers to the methods, the researchers use in performing research operations. In other words, all those methods which are used by the researcher during the course of studying his research problem are termed as research method.

Different methods are used for research, George .J. Mouley (1963) has classified research methods into three basic types, they are

1. Historical Method
2. Experimental Method
3. Normative survey Method

#### **METHOD ADOPTED FOR THE COLLECTION OF DATA :**

The present study attempts to find out the legal awareness among higher secondary students. Since the problem concerned with ‘survey’, the investigator has selected the normative survey method for conducting the study.

#### **NORMATIVE SURVEY METHOD :**

The word ‘survey’ indicates the gathering of the data regarding current conditions. The word ‘normative’ is used because surveys are frequently made for the purpose of ascertaining, which is the normal or typical condition or practice.

‘Normative Survey’ is applied in order to suggest the two closely related aspects of study. The descriptive or normative survey method of educational research is very common. It is that method of investigation which attempts to describe the interpretation of what exist at present in the form of conditions, practices, processes, attitudes, beliefs etc. It is concerned with the phenomena that are typical of the normal conditions. It is an organised attempt to analyze, interpret and report the present status of social institution, group or area.

### **CHARACTERISTICS OF NORMATIVE SURVEY METHOD.**

- It is essentially cross – sectional, mostly accounts for the existing data.
- It gathers data from relatively large number of cases at a particular time.
- It is not concerned with the characteristics of the individuals.
- It involves a clearly defined problem. It requires experts imaginative planning.
- It involves definite objectives.
- It requires careful analysis and interpretation of the data gathered.
- It requires logical and skillful reporting of the findings.
- Surveys vary greatly in complexity.
- It does not seek to develop an organised body of scientific principles.
- It provides information useful to the solution of local problems.
- It contributes to the achievement of knowledge.
- It helps to fashion many tools with which we do the research.
- It suggests the course of future development.

- It determines the present trends and solves current problems.

### **SURVEY STUDIES COLLECTS THREE TYPES OF INFORMATION :**

- ❖ Of what exists by studying and analyzing important aspects of present situation.
- ❖ Of what we want by clarifying goals and objectives possibly through a study of the conditions existing elsewhere or what experts otherwise consider to be desirable.
- ❖ Of what how to get through discovering the possible means of achieving the goals on the basis of the experiences of others or the opinion of experts.

### **TOOLS USED FOR THE COLLECTION OF DATA :**

For collecting the data one may use various devices. For each and every type of research, we need certain investments called tools. There are a large number of tools and techniques available for data collection in research.

**The tools used for the present study are the following.**

1. Legal awareness test prepared and validated by the investigator.
2. Personal data sheet.

### **TOOLS :**

#### **DESCRIPTION OF TOOLS :**

##### **1. GENERAL DATA SHEET :**

General data sheet is prepared to collect data regarding variables such as name, class, gender, religion, community, locality of school, type of management,



educational qualification of father, educational qualification of mother. A copy of personal data sheet is given in appendix A.

## **2. LEGAL AWARENESS TEST :**

In the present study in order to find out the legal awareness of higher secondary school students, legal awareness test was constructed by Mary Sakila, S and Mr. Prasad. P.S., This was the major tool that used for the present study. A copy of legal awareness test tool is given in appendix B.

### **TEST DEVELOPMENT :**

In preparing the plan of statistical investigation, the most important task is the collection of data. Data collection is the formulation stone of statistical investigation, on which the entire structure of investigation is constructed. Therefore data should be collected with maximum efficiency, ability and accuracy. Because if there is any deficiency in this process, the conclusion drawn will be fallacious and unreliable.

For any and every type research, instruments are needed and these instruments are called tools. In certain research ready made tools are available which may help the investigator to carry out their study. But sometimes such tools may not work suitably with the variable under study. Therefore keeping all these facts in mind the investigator developed an instrument for the study.

The tool for the present study prepared by Mary Sakila, S and Mr. Prasad, P.S. is legal awareness test for higher secondary students. The major steps followed in the construction of the test are,

- i. Planning of test
- ii. Item writing
- iii. Item editing
- iv. Arrangement of items
- v. Preliminary tryout (Tryout – 1)
- vi. Draft scale
- vii. Final tryout ( Tryout – 2)
- viii. Item analysis
- ix. Scoring
- x. Validity
- xi. Reliability

#### **PLANNING OF THE TEST :**

Legal Awareness test prepared by Mary Sakila, S. and Mr. Prasad, P.S. (2013 – 2014) aims at measuring the legal awareness of higher secondary school students. Due considerations were given to the dimensions of legal awareness.

#### **ITEM WRITING :**

Writing the suitable items is one of the important steps in the construction of any research tool. After a thorough study of the literature available on the legal awareness, the investigator collected materials on different aspects of legal awareness.

The test covers the decisive features of the needed data. The method used in item writing is the fixed response method. The respondent must select ideas from books, journals, magazines, internet and experts.

The Prepared items are given for item editing. The key domains to the present study related legal awareness test are,

- a) Ragging and Eve – teasing
- b) Drug Abuse
- c) Drunken Driven
- d) child labour
- e) Right to Education
- f) Other crimes

### **ITEM EDITING**

Editing the items need much care and it is the process of checking and scrutinizing items. The items were referred to the experts for modification as per the suggestions, the ambiguous items were written in simple and meaningful languages.

### **PRELIMINARY TRYOUT :**

Preliminary tryout was made with 400 higher secondary school students. The intention behind is to find out the workability of items. The difficulties in responding the items and a rough estimate of the time limit for responding the items were noted. This step helped the investigator to modify certain items which are vague and ambiguous that included in the draft scale.

**DRAFT TEST :**

The first draft test was prepared by printing the items with the provision to mark response for the respondent were also printed. A sample copy of the draft test is given as appendix – B.

**FINAL TRYOUT :**

The investigator visited various higher secondary schools which were selected randomly from the population. The tool was administered to a sample of 400 higher secondary school students of various schools in Kanyakumari district.

**SCORING :**

The collected response sheets were scored with the help of a scoring key prepared by the investigator. For each right response one mark was given and each wrong response was given zero mark.

**ITEM ANALYSIS :**

The selected 91 questions were printed and subjected to a pilot study. The test was administered to 400 higher secondary students. The total score for each subject for all the items was then found out. One point credit was given for each correct answer. For item analysis the answer sheets were arranged in descending order according to the scores obtained in the test. The top 27 percent of the answer sheets were classified as lower group. The number of correct responses for each item was identified for both upper and lower group. The difficulty index and discriminating power of each item was calculated using the formulas.

$$\text{Difficulty index} = \frac{R_H + R_L}{N_1 + N_2}$$

$$\text{Discriminating power} = \frac{R_H - R_L}{N}$$

$R_H$  - Number of correct response in the upper group

$R_L$  - Number of correct response in the lower group

$N$  - Number of students in the upper and lower group.

Items having difficulty index between 0.41 and 0.66 were selected for the final test. Thus from the first administered 91 questions 41 items were selected for the final test. A copy of final tryout is given as appendix C. The details of items selected is given Table 3.3.

**Table 3.1**

**Details of selected item for the legal awareness test (Item analysis)**

| Q. NO | DIFFICULTY INDEX | DISCRIMINATING POWER | SELECTED ITEMS |
|-------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 1     | 0.47             | 0.28                 |                |
| 2     | 0.59             | 0.29                 |                |
| 3     | 0.53             | 0.42                 | *              |
| 4     | 0.54             | 0.20                 |                |
| 5     | 0.3              | 0.08                 |                |
| 6     | 0.48             | 0.33                 |                |
| 7     | 0.58             | 0.26                 |                |
| 8     | 0.37             | 0.17                 |                |
| 9     | 0.18             | 0.11                 |                |
| 10    | 0.26             | 0.08                 |                |
| 11    | 0.6              | 0.30                 |                |

|    |      |      |   |
|----|------|------|---|
| 12 | 0.5  | 0.42 | * |
| 13 | 0.54 | 0.38 |   |
| 14 | 0.40 | 0.21 |   |
| 15 | 0.35 | 0.28 |   |
| 16 | 0.24 | 0.06 |   |
| 17 | 0.29 | 0.17 |   |
| 18 | 0.51 | 0.40 |   |
| 19 | 0.49 | 0.25 |   |
| 20 | 0.45 | 0.29 |   |
| 21 | 0.29 | 0.19 |   |
| 22 | 0.44 | 0.33 |   |
| 23 | 0.51 | 0.56 | * |
| 24 | 0.60 | 0.49 | * |
| 25 | 0.63 | 0.42 | * |
| 26 | 0.41 | 0.19 |   |
| 27 | 0.55 | 0.46 | * |
| 28 | 0.55 | 0.46 | * |
| 29 | 0.56 | 0.62 | * |
| 30 | 0.61 | 0.64 | * |
| 31 | 0.34 | 0.50 |   |
| 32 | 0.48 | 0.40 |   |
| 33 | 0.46 | 0.25 |   |
| 34 | 0.32 | 0.26 |   |
| 35 | 0.45 | 0.35 |   |
| 36 | 0.54 | 0.29 |   |
| 37 | 0.55 | 0.57 | * |
| 38 | 0.5  | 0.52 | * |
| 39 | 0.49 | 0.45 | * |
| 40 | 0.45 | 0.55 | * |
| 41 | 0.45 | 0.21 |   |
| 42 | 0.56 | 0.52 | * |
| 43 | 0.47 | 0.55 | * |
| 44 | 0.55 | 0.61 | * |
| 45 | 0.52 | 0.50 | * |
| 46 | 0.31 | 0.20 |   |
| 47 | 0.45 | 0.60 | * |

|    |      |      |   |
|----|------|------|---|
| 48 | 0.43 | 0.19 |   |
| 49 | 0.40 | 0.25 |   |
| 50 | 0.44 | 0.47 | * |
| 51 | 0.38 | 0.23 |   |
| 52 | 0.48 | 0.58 | * |
| 53 | 0.52 | 0.55 | * |
| 54 | 0.49 | 0.45 | * |
| 55 | 0.43 | 0.32 |   |
| 56 | 0.42 | 0.61 | * |
| 57 | 0.38 | 0.49 |   |
| 58 | 0.37 | 0.35 |   |
| 59 | 0.43 | 0.42 | * |
| 60 | 0.57 | 0.51 | * |
| 61 | 0.70 | 0.40 |   |
| 62 | 0.44 | 0.58 | * |
| 63 | 0.48 | 0.59 | * |
| 64 | 0.48 | 0.56 | * |
| 65 | 0.49 | 0.59 | * |
| 66 | 0.41 | 0.52 | * |
| 67 | 0.49 | 0.51 | * |
| 68 | 0.46 | 0.42 | * |
| 69 | 0.41 | 0.36 |   |
| 70 | 0.50 | 0.62 | * |
| 71 | 0.38 | 0.46 |   |
| 72 | 0.47 | 0.54 | * |
| 73 | 0.35 | 0.14 |   |
| 74 | 0.50 | 0.55 | * |
| 75 | 0.61 | 0.43 | * |
| 76 | 0.37 | 0.23 |   |
| 77 | 0.44 | 0.25 |   |
| 78 | 0.39 | 0.53 |   |
| 79 | 0.5  | 0.38 |   |
| 80 | 0.45 | 0.48 | * |
| 81 | 0.61 | 0.33 |   |
| 82 | 0.3  | 0.12 |   |
| 83 | 0.42 | 0.38 |   |

|                     |      |      |    |
|---------------------|------|------|----|
| 84                  | 0.38 | 0.25 |    |
| 85                  | 0.41 | 0.45 | *  |
| 86                  | 0.43 | 0.46 | *  |
| 87                  | 0.51 | 0.30 |    |
| 88                  | 0.46 | 0.41 | *  |
| 89                  | 0.36 | 0.27 |    |
| 90                  | 0.41 | 0.28 |    |
| 91                  | 0.63 | 0.43 | *  |
| Total selected Item |      |      | 41 |

\*. Means Selected item

### **RELIABILITY OF THE TEST**

According to Best (1976), “A test is reliable to the extent that it measures accurately and consists from one another”. Reliability is the consistency of scores obtained by the same individual on different occasions or with different set of equivalent items. The reliability of a test can be accessed in different ways such as test, split half method, rational equivalence method.

In the present investigation the reliability was found by split half method. It measures the degree of homogeneity of the items in a test for calculating the split half reliability of the test. The scores obtained by a sample of 100 higher secondary students are used. The scores an odd items and even items are obtained separately and the correlation co-efficient was calculated using Spearman Brown prophency formula

$$r = \frac{N \cdot \sum XY - \sum X \cdot \sum Y}{\sqrt{(N \cdot \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2)(N \cdot \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2)}}$$

r = Reliability Co-efficient of half test



X = Total score for a section in odd items test

Y = Total score for a section in even items test

XY = Estimated reliability of the whole test

N = Total number of students in the group

Reliability Co-efficient formula

$$R = \frac{2r}{1+r}$$

**Table 3.2**

**Reliability analysis of legal awareness test**

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| Number of sample                           | 100   |
| Number of item                             | 41    |
| Correlation between odd half and even half | 0.747 |
| Reliability Co-efficient                   | 0.855 |

The split half reliability co-efficient calculated which is in the table 3.4 shows high reliability. This reveals that the present legal awareness test possess 0.855 reliability co-efficient.

**i. VALIDITY :**

A test is valid when it meets the purpose for which it was designed. The two main types of validity established for this tool were face validity and content validity.

**a) FACE VALIDITY :**

Face validity means that the given test appears or seen to measure what it is to measure. The tool was submitted to a panel of experts and in their opinion it appeared to measure the relevant objectives of the test. A close link on the items of the test reveals that each and every item is capable of reflecting legal awareness. This provided face validity for the test.

**b) CONTENT VALIDITY :**

Content validity of a test was established by verifying the comprehensiveness coverage of the content of the test using authentic literature and opinion of the experts. Thus it is ascertained that the test was moderate content validity.

**POPULATION :**

Sampling involves the selection of a few items from a particular group to be studied with a view to obtain relevant data which helps in drawing conclusion regarding the entire group. The total from which the sample was selected is called a 'population'.

**SAMPLE FOR THE STUDY :**

A sample as the name implies is a smaller representation of a large whole. In other words a section of the population selected from the latter in such a way that they are the representation of universe is called sample. By observing the characteristics of the sample one can make certain inferences about the characteristics of the population from which it is drawn.

The sample for the present study consists of 400 students studying in different schools of higher secondary in Kanyakumari district during the academic year 2013 – 2014. The investigator selected 400 higher secondary students from 15 schools of higher secondary through random sampling technique. The name of the schools and the number of students selected from each school are furnished in the following tables 3.3 and table 3.4.

**Table 3.3****Details of schools selected for the study**

| SL. NO | NAME OF THE SCHOOLS  | NO. OF STUDENTS |
|--------|--|-----------------|
| 1      | Govt. (A.D.W) Hr. Secondary School, Kalingarajapuram.            | 25              |
| 2      | Govt. Hr. Secondary School, Munchirai                            | 25              |
| 3      | Govt. Boys Hr. Secondary School, Marthandam                      | 28              |
| 4      | Govt. Girls Hr. Secondary School, Marthandam                     | 29              |
| 5      | Govt. Hr. Secondary School, Thuckalay                            | 30              |
| 6      | Good Shephared Matriculation Hr. Secondary School,<br>Nagercoil. | 28              |
| 7      | Vivekananda Matric Hr. Secondary School, Mulagumoodu.            | 25              |
| 8      | M.P.A Matric Hr. Secondary School, Puthukkadai                   | 25              |
| 9      | Mar Gregories Matric Hr. Secondary School, Kirathoor.            | 29              |
| 10     | Child Jesus Matric Hr. Secondary Scchool,<br>Unnamalaikkadai     | 25              |
| 11     | D.V.D Hr. Secondary School, Nagercoil                            | 28              |
| 12     | ST. Joseph's Hr. Secondary School, Thiruthuvapuram               | 30              |
| 13     | ST. Alaysious Hr. Secondary School, Marthandamthurai             | 23              |
| 14     | L.I.M.L.M.S. Hr. Secondary School, Kollemcode                    | 24              |
| 15     | Scott Christian Hr. Secondary School, Nagercoil                  | 26              |
|        | <b>Total</b>   | <b>400</b>      |

**Table 3.4**  
**Details about sample selected for the study**  
*(Percentage wise distribution)*

| <b>VARIABLE</b>                     | <b>CATEGORY</b> | <b>NUMBER</b> | <b>PERCENTAGE</b> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Gender                              | Male            | 201           | 50.25             |
|                                     | Female          | 199           | 49.75             |
| Religion                            | Hindu           | 161           | 40.25             |
|                                     | Christian       | 166           | 41.50             |
|                                     | Muslim          | 73            | 18.25             |
| Community                           | OC              | 32            | 8.00              |
|                                     | BC              | 248           | 62.00             |
|                                     | MBC             | 75            | 18.75             |
|                                     | SC/ST           | 45            | 11.25             |
| Locality                            | Rural           | 201           | 50.25             |
|                                     | Urban           | 199           | 49.75             |
| Type of Management                  | Govt            | 134           | 33.50             |
|                                     | Private         | 132           | 33.00             |
|                                     | Aided           | 134           | 33.50             |
| Educational Qualification of father | Below SSLC      | 186           | 46.50             |
|                                     | Above SSLC      | 134           | 33.50             |
|                                     | Above HSC       | 80            | 20.00             |
| Educational qualification of mother | Below SSLC      | 167           | 41.75             |
|                                     | Above SSLC      | 115           | 28.75             |
|                                     | Above HSC       | 118           | 29.50             |

### **ADMINISTRATION OF THE TOOL :**

The investigator personally visited the 15 higher secondary schools in Kanyakumari district and administered the test. The permission for administering the tool was obtained from the principals of the selected higher secondary schools. Prior instructions were given to the respondents at the time of administration of the tools were cleared. After administration of the tools all the tools were collected from the respondents.

### **SCORING :**

The collected response sheets were scored with the help of scoring key prepared by the investigator. To score the test items each correct response was given a weightage of one point and each wrong responses or omitted item received zero point. A copy of the scoring key is given as appendix F.

### **STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES ADOPTED :**

For the analysis of the data collected following statistical techniques were adopted.

#### **1. PERCENTAGE :**

Percentage help in the comparative study of fraction. It means per hundred and hence it is calculated on 100.

#### **2. ARITHMETIC MEAN :**

The mean is nothing else but the well known arithmetic mean. The mean of a series of values is the quotient of the sum of the values by their number

$$\text{Arithmetic Mean} = A + \frac{\sum fd}{N} X C$$

Where

A = Assumed mean of the scores obtained

F = Frequency of each class.

D = Deviation of the scores from the assumed mean

N = Total frequency

C = Class Interval

### 3. STANDARD DEVIATION :

Standard deviation is an ideal, scientific and most population measure of dispersion. It was first used by Karl Pearson in 1883. This measure is a much more accurate and mathematical measure of deviation. Because of complexity and difficulty in computation, it is the tool of researchers and specialists in statistics.

Guilford defines, “Standard deviation is also known as root mean square deviation. It is the square root of the mean value of all the deviations squared taken from their mean values”.

$$\text{Standard deviation} = C \times \sqrt{\frac{\sum fd^2}{N} - \left(\frac{\sum fd}{N}\right)^2}$$

Where

C = Class interval

d = Deviation of the scores from the assumed mean

pf = Frequency

N = Total Frequency

#### 4. t – TEST :

The significance of the difference between means of two groups of population. From the mean and standard deviation, t – values can be calculated. If the obtained t –value is 2.58 and above then the level of significance is at 0.01. If the t-value is between 1.96 and 2.58 significant below 1.96, the difference is not significant.

It is used for finding

$$t\text{-ratio} = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{\sigma_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

Where ,

$\bar{X}_1$  – Arithmetic Mean of the first group.

$\bar{X}_2$  – Arithmetic Mean of the second group

$\sigma_1$  – Standard deviation of the first group

$\sigma_2$  – Standard deviation of the second group

$N_1$  – Total number in the first group

$N_2$  – Total number in the second group

#### 5. ANOVA :

Analysis of variance is an important method for dividing the variation observed in experimental situation into different part, each part assignable to a known source cause or factor. The method is derived by R.A. Fisher in 1923.

F – test or analysis of variance method is an improvement over t – test. The t – test is used for ascertaining the significance of difference between two means.



Where F- test is used for testing the significance of difference more than two means simultaneously.

The composite procedure for testing simultaneously the difference between several sample mean is known as analysis of variance or ANOVA

$$F = \frac{Vb}{Vw}$$

Here

$$Vb = Vt - Vw$$

$Vb$  = means square variance between groups

$Vw$  = means square variance within groups

$Vt$  = means square variance of total groups.

## **CHAPTER - IV**

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

- **Interpretation of data**
- **Tenability of hypotheses**

Analysis and interpretation are central steps in the research process. The goal of analysis is to summarize the collected data in such a way that they provide answer to the question that triggered the research. Interpretation is the research for the broader meaning of research findings. Through interpretation the meaning and implication become clear.

Analysis means the categorizing, ordering, manipulating and summarizing of data. Interpretation takes the results of analysis, makes inferences, pertinent to the research relations studied and draws conclusions about these relations. Interpretation of the data is necessary to explain and to find meaning of the data.

The first step in analyzing qualitative research involves organizing the data. Qualitative research often results in voluminous notes from observations, interviews and documents. The method of organizing these data will differ, depending on the research strategy and data organized, the researcher can move to the second stage in data analysis description. Only after the organization of the

data, the researcher begin the final and most critical phase of the analysis process, interpretation.

Interpretation involves, explaining the findings, answering ‘why’ questions, attaching significance to particular results, and putting pattern into an analytic framework. The interpretation of qualitative research data is more dependent on the researcher’s background, skills, biases and knowledge than conclusions drawn from quantitative research, that are derived more directly from the numerical analysis of the data.

## **LEGAL AWARENESS OF HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS**

**TABLE 4. 1**

**Mean and standard deviation of legal awareness of Higher Secondary Students.**

| Legal Awareness | Number | Mean  | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|--------|-------|--------------------|
|                 | 400    | 20.48 | 7.54               |

From the above table (4.1) it is evident that the mean score is 20.48 out of 41. This indicates that the higher secondary students have average legal awareness. The obtained standard deviation was 7.54.

**TABLE 4. 2**

**Percentage wise distribution of different levels of legal awareness and its dimensions among Higher Secondary Students.**

| <b>Dimensions</b>  | <b>Levels</b> | <b>Count</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
|--------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Legal Awareness    | Low           | 69           | 17.25          |
|                    | Medium        | 263          | 65.75          |
|                    | High          | 68           | 17.00          |
|                    | Total         | 400          | 100.00         |
| Drunken Driven     | Low           | 71           | 17.75          |
|                    | Medium        | 243          | 60.75          |
|                    | High          | 86           | 21.50          |
|                    | Total         | 400          | 100.00         |
| Drug Abuse         | Low           | 48           | 12.00          |
|                    | Medium        | 267          | 66.75          |
|                    | High          | 85           | 21.25          |
|                    | Total         | 400          | 100.00         |
| Child Labour       | Low           | 50           | 12.50          |
|                    | Medium        | 251          | 62.75          |
|                    | High          | 99           | 24.75          |
|                    | Total         | 400          | 100.00         |
| Right to Education | Low           | 49           | 12.25          |
|                    | Medium        | 251          | 62.75          |
|                    | High          | 100          | 25.00          |
|                    | Total         | 400          | 100.00         |
| Other crimes       | Low           | 76           | 19.00          |
|                    | Medium        | 246          | 61.50          |
|                    | High          | 78           | 19.50          |
|                    | Total         | 400          | 100.00         |

From the above table 4.2 it is evident that, about 17.25 percent of the total sample have low legal awareness and its dimensions and about 17.00 percent have high legal awareness and its dimensions. But 65.75 percent of the sample have average legal awareness and its dimensions.

For the dimension drunken driven it is evident that, about 17.15 percent of the total sample have low legal awareness and about 21.50 percent have high legal awareness. But 60.75 percent of the sample have average legal awareness.

For the dimension drug abuse it is evident that, about 12.00 percent of the total sample have low legal awareness and about 21.25 percent have high legal awareness. But 66.75 percent of the sample have average legal awareness

For the dimension child labour it is evident that, about 12.50 percent of the total sample have low legal awareness and about 24.75 percent have high legal awareness. But 62.75 percent of the sample have average legal awareness.

For the dimension right to education it is evident that, about 12.25 percent of the total sample have low legal awareness and about 25.00 percent have high legal awareness. But 62.75 percent of the sample have average legal awareness.

For the dimension other crimes it is evident that, about 19.00 percent of the total sample have low legal awareness and about 19.50 percent have high legal awareness. But 61.50 percent of the sample have average legal awareness.

## 1. GENDER WISE COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF LEGAL AWARENESS AND ITS DIMENSIONS AMONG HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENT.

The first hypothesis was “ There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of male and female higher secondary students”. The data were analysed with the help of ‘t’ test and results are given in table 4.3.

**TABLE 4.3**

**Gender wise number, standard deviation, mean and t – values of legal awareness and its dimensions.**

| <b>Dimensions</b>  | <b>Gender</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>SD</b> | <b>t</b> | <b>P</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|--------------------|---------------|----------|-------------|-----------|----------|----------|---------------------|
| Legal Awareness    | Male          | 201      | 18.66       | 7.62      | 5.00     | 0.000    | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
|                    | Female        | 199      | 22.32       | 7.01      |          |          |                     |
| Drunken Driven     | Male          | 201      | 2.72        | 1.53      | 3.80     | 0.000    | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
|                    | Female        | 199      | 3.30        | 1.52      |          |          |                     |
| Drug Abuse         | Male          | 201      | 3.39        | 1.97      | 3.87     | 0.000    | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
|                    | Female        | 199      | 4.12        | 1.80      |          |          |                     |
| Child Labour       | Male          | 201      | 3.01        | 1.47      | 3.24     | 0.001    | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
|                    | Female        | 199      | 3.51        | 1.67      |          |          |                     |
| Right to Education | Male          | 201      | 3.08        | 1.51      | 3.75     | 0.000    | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
|                    | Female        | 199      | 3.65        | 1.53      |          |          |                     |
| Other Crimes       | Male          | 201      | 6.46        | 2.68      | 4.95     | 0.000    | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
|                    | Female        | 199      | 7.74        | 2.49      |          |          |                     |

From the table 4.3 ( $t = 5.00, P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions male and female higher secondary students. Therefore the null hypothesis that “there is no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of male and female higher secondary students” is rejected. All the mean values showed that female higher secondary students obtained better scores of legal awareness comparing their counter parts.

**i. DRUNKEN DRIVEN :**

The table 4.3 ( $t = 3.80, P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of male and female higher secondary students in the dimension drunken driven. Mean values showed that female higher secondary students obtained better scores in drunken driven awareness comparing their counter parts.

**ii. DRUG ABUSE :**

The table 4.3 ( $t = 3.87, P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of male and female higher secondary students in the dimension drug abuse. Mean values showed that female higher secondary students obtained better scores in drug abuse awareness comparing their counter parts.

**iii. CHILD LABOUR :**

The table 4.3 ( $t = 3.24, P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of male and female higher secondary students in the dimension child labour. Mean values showed that female higher secondary



students obtained better scores in child labour awareness comparing their counter parts.

**iv. RIGHT TO EDUCATION :**

The table 4.3 ( $t = 3.75$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of male and female higher secondary students in the dimension Right to Education. Mean values showed that female higher secondary students obtained better scores in Right to Education awareness comparing their counter parts.

**v. OTHER CRIMES :**

The table 4.3 ( $t = 4.95$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of male and female higher secondary students in the dimension other crimes. Mean values showed that female higher secondary students obtained better scores in other crimes awareness comparing their counter parts.

**2. RELIGION WISE COMPARISION OF MEAN SCORES OF LEGAL AWARENESS AND ITS DIMENSIONS OF HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS.**

The second hypothesis was “There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of Hindu, Christian and Muslim higher secondary students”. The data were analysed with the help of ‘F’ test and results are given in table 4.4

**TABLE 4. 4**

**Religion – wise mean, standard deviation, number and ‘F’ value of legal awareness and its dimensions.**

| Dimension          | Religion  | Number | Mean  | S.D  | Source        | Sum of Square | df  | Mean Square | F     | P     | Significance       |
|--------------------|-----------|--------|-------|------|---------------|---------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|--------------------|
| Legal Awareness    | Hindu     | 161    | 18.76 | 7.24 | Between Group | 1263.8        | 2   | 631.91      | 11.72 | 0.000 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Christian | 166    | 22.57 | 7.55 | Within Group  | 21399.8       | 397 | 53.90       |       |       |                    |
|                    | Muslim    | 73     | 19.52 | 7.07 | Total         | 22663.6       | 399 |             |       |       |                    |
| Drunken Driven     | Hindu     | 161    | 2.71  | 1.51 | Between Group | 48.6          | 2   | 24.34       | 10.59 | 0.000 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Christian | 166    | 3.42  | 1.58 | Within Group  | 912.2         | 397 | 2.30        |       |       |                    |
|                    | Muslim    | 73     | 2.71  | 1.37 | Total         | 960.9         | 399 |             |       |       |                    |
| Drug Abuse         | Hindu     | 161    | 3.34  | 1.89 | Between Group | 57.7          | 2   | 28.86       | 8.09  | 0.000 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Christian | 166    | 4.17  | 1.91 | Within Group  | 1416.7        | 397 | 3.57        |       |       |                    |
|                    | Muslim    | 73     | 3.71  | 1.84 | Total         | 1474.4        | 399 |             |       |       |                    |
| Child Labour       | Hindu     | 161    | 2.99  | 1.46 | Between Group | 31.4          | 2   | 15.75       | 6.65  | 0.001 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Christian | 166    | 3.59  | 1.66 | Within Group  | 939.4         | 397 | 2.37        |       |       |                    |
|                    | Muslim    | 73     | 3.1   | 1.42 | Total         | 970.9         | 399 |             |       |       |                    |
| Right to Education | Hindu     | 161    | 3.18  | 1.49 | Between Group | 16.4          | 2   | 8.20        | 3.47  | 0.032 | Sig. at 0.05 level |
|                    | Christian | 166    | 3.60  | 1.61 | Within Group  | 938.02        | 397 | 2.36        |       |       |                    |
|                    | Muslim    | 73     | 3.22  | 1.46 | Total         | 954.4         | 399 |             |       |       |                    |
| Other Crimes       | Hindu     | 161    | 6.54  | 2.46 | Between Group | 133.9         | 2   | 66.98       | 9.87  | 0.000 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Christian | 166    | 7.78  | 2.63 | Within Group  | 2695.2        | 397 | 6.79        |       |       |                    |
|                    | Muslim    | 73     | 6.78  | 2.85 | Total         | 2829.2        | 399 |             |       |       |                    |

From the table 4.4 ( $F = 11.72$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of Hindu, Christian and Muslim higher secondary students legal awareness its dimension

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.4.1**

**Result of scheffe procedure for the Higher Secondary Students of various Religions**

| <b>Religion</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P (Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|-----------------|----------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Hindu (A)       | 161      | 18.76       | A Vs B      | 0.000              | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Christian (B)   | 166      | 22.57       | B Vs C      | 0.013              | Sig. at 0.05 level  |
| Muslim (C)      | 73       | 19.52       | A Vs C      | 0.764              | NS                  |

The results shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the two pairs of Hindu and Christian and Christian and Muslim higher secondary students in their legal awareness and its dimensions. Therefore null hypothesis that “there is no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of Hindu, Christian and Muslim higher secondary students” is rejected. The other pair Hindu and Muslim higher secondary students do not differ in their legal awareness and its dimensions.

From the mean values, it is clear that the christian higher secondary students have high level legal awareness than the hindu and muslim higher secondary students.

**i. DRUNKEN DRIVEN :**

The table 4.4 ( $F = 10.59$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of hindu, christian and muslim higher secondary students in the dimension drunken driven of legal awareness.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.4.2**

**Result of scheffe procedure for dimension drunken driven**

| <b>Religion</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P (Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|-----------------|----------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Hindu (A)       | 161      | 2.71        | A Vs B      | 0.000              | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Christian (B)   | 166      | 3.42        | B Vs C      | 0.004              | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Muslim (C)      | 73       | 2.71        | A Vs C      | 1.000              | NS                  |

The results shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of hindu and christian and christian and muslim higher secondary students in their drunken driven legal awareness. The other pair of hindu and muslim higher secondary students do not differ in their drunken driven legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the christian higher secondary students have high level legal awareness (drunken driven) than the hindu and muslim higher secondary students.

**ii. DRUG ABUSE :**

The table 4.4 ( $F = 8.09$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of hindu, christian and muslim higher secondary students in the dimension drug abuse legal awareness.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence, Scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.4.3**

**Result of scheffe procedure for dimension drug abuse**

| Religion      | N   | Mean | Pair   | P (Scheffe) | Significance       |
|---------------|-----|------|--------|-------------|--------------------|
| Hindu (A)     | 161 | 3.34 | A Vs B | 0.000       | Sig. at 0.01 level |
| Christian (B) | 166 | 4.17 | B Vs C | 0.024       | NS                 |
| Muslim (C)    | 73  | 3.71 | A Vs C | 1.382       | NS                 |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of hindu and christian higher secondary students in their drug abuse legal awareness. The other two pairs Christian & Muslim and Hindu & Muslim higher secondary students do not differ in their drug abuse legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the christian higher secondary students have high level legal awareness (drug abuse) than the hindu and muslim higher secondary students.

### iii. CHILD LABOUR :

The table 4.4 ( $F = 6.65$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of Hindu, Christian and Muslim higher secondary students in the dimension child labour legal awareness.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.4.4**

#### **Result of scheffe procedure for dimension child labour**

| <b>Religion</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P (Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|-----------------|----------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Hindu (A)       | 161      | 2.99        | A Vs B      | 0.002              | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Christian (B)   | 166      | 3.59        | B Vs C      | 0.078              | NS                  |
| Muslim (C)      | 73       | 3.1         | A Vs C      | 0.880              | NS                  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the Hindu and Christian higher secondary students in their child labour legal awareness. The other two pairs Christian and Muslim and Hindu and Muslim higher secondary students do not differ in their child labour legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the christian higher secondary students have high level legal awareness (child labour) than the hindu and muslim higher secondary students.

**iv. RIGHT TO EDUCATION :**

The table 4.4 ( $F = 3.47$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) indicates that there exists significant difference in the mean scores of Hindu, Christian and Muslim higher secondary students in the dimension right to education legal awareness.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.4.5**

**Result of scheffe procedure for dimension Right to Education**

| <b>Religion</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P (Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|-----------------|----------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Hindu (A)       | 161      | 3.18        | A Vs B      | 0.048              | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Christian (B)   | 166      | 3.60        | B Vs C      | 0.214              | NS                  |
| Muslim (C)      | 73       | 3.22        | A Vs C      | 0.983              | NS                  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the Hindu and Christian higher secondary students in their Right to Education legal awareness. The other two pairs Christian and Muslim and Hindu and Muslim higher secondary students do not differ in their Right to Education legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the christian higher secondary students have high level legal awareness (Right to Education) than the hindu and muslim higher secondary students.

**v. OTHER CRIMES :**

The table 4.4 ( $F = 9.87$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of Hindu, Christian and Muslim higher secondary students in the dimension other crimes of legal awareness.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.4.6**

**Result of scheffe procedure for dimension other crimes**

| <b>Religion</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P (Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|-----------------|----------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Hindu (A)       | 161      | 6.54        | A Vs B      | 0.000              | Sig. at 001 level   |
| Christian (B)   | 166      | 7.78        | B Vs C      | 0.025              | Sig. at 0.05 level  |
| Muslim (C)      | 73       | 6.78        | A Vs C      | 0.808              | NS                  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the two pairs of Hindu and Christian and Christian and Muslim higher secondary students in their other crimes legal awareness. The other pair Hindu and Muslim higher secondary students do not differ in their other crimes legal awareness.



From the mean values, it is clear that the christian higher secondary students have high level legal awareness (other crimes) than the hindu and muslim higher secondary students.

### 3. COMMUNITY WISE COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF LEGAL AWARENESS AND ITS DIMENSIONS OF HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS.

The third hypothesis was “There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of OC, BC, MBC and SC / ST higher secondary students”. The data were analyzed with the help of ‘F’ test and results are given in table 4.5.

**TABLE 4.5**

**Community wise mean, standard deviation, number and ‘F’ value of legal awareness and its dimensions.**

| Dimension       | Community | Number | Mean  | S.D  | Source        | Sum of Square | df  | Mean Square | F    | P     | Significance       |
|-----------------|-----------|--------|-------|------|---------------|---------------|-----|-------------|------|-------|--------------------|
| Legal Awareness | OC        | 32     | 17.57 | 7.27 | Between Group | 584.2         | 3   | 194.76      | 3.49 | 0.016 | Sig. at 0.05 level |
|                 | BC        | 248    | 20.33 | 7.57 | Within Group  | 22079.3       | 396 | 55.76       |      |       |                    |
|                 | MBC       | 75     | 22.49 | 7.26 | Total         | 22663.6       | 399 |             |      |       |                    |
|                 | SC/ST     | 45     | 19.67 | 7.33 |               |               |     |             |      |       |                    |
| Drunken Driven  | OC        | 32     | 2.11  | 1.45 | Between Group | 29.3          | 3   | 9.78        | 4.16 | 0.006 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                 | BC        | 248    | 3.04  | 1.5  | Within Group  | 931.6         | 396 | 2.35        |      |       |                    |
|                 | MBC       | 75     | 3.29  | 1.61 | Total         | 960.9         | 399 |             |      |       |                    |
|                 | SC/ST     | 45     | 2.91  | 1.65 |               |               |     |             |      |       |                    |

|                    |       |     |      |      |               |        |     |       |      |       |                    |
|--------------------|-------|-----|------|------|---------------|--------|-----|-------|------|-------|--------------------|
| Drug Abuse         | OC    | 32  | 3.11 | 1.95 | Between Group | 23.8   | 3   | 7.96  | 2.17 | 0.091 | NS                 |
|                    | BC    | 248 | 3.79 | 1.95 | Within Group  | 1450.6 | 396 | 3.66  |      |       |                    |
|                    | MBC   | 75  | 4.05 | 1.83 | Total         | 1474.4 | 399 |       |      |       |                    |
|                    | SC/ST | 45  | 3.42 | 1.79 |               |        |     |       |      |       |                    |
| Child Labour       | OC    | 32  | 2.68 | 1.42 | Between Group | 26.9   | 3   | 8.98  | 3.77 | 0.011 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | BC    | 248 | 3.21 | 1.5  | Within Group  | 944.0  | 396 | 2.38  |      |       |                    |
|                    | MBC   | 75  | 3.71 | 1.73 | Total         | 970.9  | 399 |       |      |       |                    |
|                    | SC/ST | 45  | 3.11 | 1.51 |               |        |     |       |      |       |                    |
| Right to Education | OC    | 32  | 2.96 | 1.71 | Between Group | 15.7   | 3   | 5.24  | 2.21 | 0.086 | NS                 |
|                    | BC    | 248 | 3.34 | 1.48 | Within Group  | 938.7  | 396 | 2.37  |      |       |                    |
|                    | MBC   | 75  | 3.7  | 1.63 | Total         | 954.4  | 399 |       |      |       |                    |
|                    | SC/ST | 45  | 3.13 | 1.58 |               |        |     |       |      |       |                    |
| Other Crimes       | OC    | 32  | 6.71 | 2.52 | Between Group | 41.8   | 3   | 13.94 | 1.98 | 0.116 | NS                 |
|                    | BC    | 248 | 6.94 | 2.76 | Within Group  | 2787.3 | 396 | 7.04  |      |       |                    |
|                    | MBC   | 75  | 7.74 | 2.42 | Total         | 2829.2 | 399 |       |      |       |                    |
|                    | SC/ST | 45  | 7.09 | 2.48 |               |        |     |       |      |       |                    |

From the above table 4.5 ( $F = 3.49$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of OC, BC, MBC and SC/ST higher secondary students legal awareness and its dimensions.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.5.1**

**Result of scheffe procedure for higher secondary students of various communities**

| <b>Community</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P (Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| OC (A)           | 32       | 17.57       | A Vs B      | 0.330              | NS                  |
| BC (B)           | 248      | 22.49       | B Vs C      | 0.179              | NS                  |
| MBC (C)          | 75       | 20.33       | A Vs C      | 0.032              | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| SC/ST            | 45       | 19.67       | A Vs D      | 0.714              | NS                  |
|                  |          |             | B Vs D      | 0.960              | NS                  |
|                  |          |             | C Vs D      | 0.258              | NS                  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the OC and MBC higher secondary students in their legal awareness. Therefore the null hypothesis that “there is no significant difference in the mean scores of Legal awareness and its dimensions of OC, BC, MBC and SC/ST higher secondary students” is rejected. The other five fair pairs OC and BC, BC and MBC, OC and SC/ST, BC and SC/ST, MBC and SC/ST higher secondary students do not differ in their legal awareness and its dimensions.

From the mean values, it is clear that the BC higher secondary students have high level legal awareness than the OC, MBC, SC/ST higher secondary students.

**i. DRUNKEN DRIVEN :**

The table 4.5 ( $F = 4.16$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of OC, BC, MBC and SC /ST higher secondary students in the dimension drunken driven.

The result also does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.5.2**

**Result of scheffe procedure for dimension drunken driven**

| Community | N   | Mean | Pair   | P (Scheffe) | Significance       |
|-----------|-----|------|--------|-------------|--------------------|
| OC (A)    | 32  | 2.11 | A Vs B | 0.027       | Sig. at 0.05 level |
| BC (B)    | 248 | 3.34 | B Vs C | 0.668       | NS                 |
| MBC (C)   | 75  | 3.29 | A Vs C | 0.007       | Sig. at 0.01 level |
| SC/ST     | 45  | 2.91 | A Vs D | 0.197       | NS                 |
|           |     |      | B Vs D | 0.965       | NS                 |
|           |     |      | C Vs D | 0.628       | NS                 |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the two pairs of OC and BC and OC and MBC higher secondary students in their drunken driven legal awareness. The other four pairs BC and MBC, OC and

SC/ST, BC and SC/ST, MBC and SC/ST higher secondary students do not differ in their drunken driven legal awareness.

From the table mean values, it is clear that the BC higher secondary students have high level legal awareness (Drunken driven) than the OC, MBC, SC/ST higher secondary students.

**ii. DRUG ABUSE :**

The table 4.5 ( $F = 2.17, P > 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed no significant difference in the mean scores of OC, BC, MBC, and SC/ST higher secondary students in the dimension drug abuse.

**iii. CHILD LABOUR :**

The table 4.5 ( $F = 3.77, P < 0.05$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of OC, BC, MBC and SC /ST higher secondary students in the dimension child labour of legal awareness.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.5.3****Result of scheffe procedure for dimension child labour**

| <b>Community</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P (Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b>   |
|------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| OC (A)           | 32       | 2.11        | A Vs B      | 0.027              | Sig. at 0.05<br>level |
| BC (B)           | 248      | 3.34        | B Vs C      | 0.668              | NS                    |
| MBC (C)          | 75       | 3.29        | A Vs C      | 0.007              | Sig. at 0.01<br>level |
| SC/ST            | 45       | 2.91        | A Vs D      | 0.197              | NS                    |
|                  |          |             | B Vs D      | 0.965              | NS                    |
|                  |          |             | C Vs D      | 0.628              | NS                    |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the two pairs of OC and BC and OC and MBC higher secondary students in their child labour legal awareness. The other four pairs BC and MBC, OC and SC/ST, BC and SC/ST, MBC and SC/ST higher secondary students do not differ in their child labour legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the BC higher secondary students have high level legal awareness (child labour) than the OC, MBC, SC/ST higher secondary students.

**iv. RIGHT TO EDUCATION :**

The table 4.5 ( $F = 2.21, P > 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed no significant difference in the mean scores of OC, BC, MBC and SC/ST higher secondary students in the dimension Right to Education.

**v. OTHER CRIMES :**

The results presented in table 4.5 ( $F = 1.98, P > 0.01$ ) indicate that there existed no significant difference in the mean scores of OC, BC, MBC and SC/ST higher secondary students in the dimension other crimes.

**4. LOCALITY WISE COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF LEGAL AWARENESS AND ITS DIMENSIONS AMONG HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS.**

The fourth hypothesis was “There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of rural and urban higher secondary students”. The data were analysed with the help of ‘t’ test and results are given in table 4.6.

**Table 4.6**

**Locale wise mean, standard deviation, number and 't' value of legal awareness and its dimensions.**

| <b>Dimension</b>   | <b>Locality</b> | <b>Number</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>SD</b> | <b>t</b> | <b>P</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|--------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|----------|----------|---------------------|
| Legal awareness    | Rural           | 201           | 20.37       | 7.48      | 0.29     | 0.77     | NS                  |
|                    | Urban           | 199           | 20.59       | 7.62      |          |          |                     |
| Drunken Drugs      | Rural           | 201           | 3.09        | 1.60      | 1.10     | 0.27     | NS                  |
|                    | Urban           | 199           | 2.92        | 1.50      |          |          |                     |
| Drug Abuse         | Rural           | 201           | 3.68        | 1.96      | 0.73     | 0.47     | NS                  |
|                    | Urban           | 199           | 3.82        | 1.89      |          |          |                     |
| Child Labour       | Rural           | 201           | 3.26        | 1.59      | 0.00     | 1.00     | NS                  |
|                    | Urban           | 199           | 3.26        | 1.53      |          |          |                     |
| Right to Education | Rural           | 201           | 3.37        | 1.51      | 0.06     | 0.95     | NS                  |
|                    | Urban           | 199           | 3.36        | 1.59      |          |          |                     |
| Other Crimes       | Rural           | 201           | 6.97        | 2.53      | 0.98     | 0.33     | NS                  |
|                    | Urban           | 199           | 7.23        | 2.79      |          |          |                     |

From the table 4.6 ( $t = 0.29$ ,  $P > 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed no significant difference in the mean scores of rural and urban higher secondary students in their legal awareness and its dimension. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

**i. DRUNKEN DRIVEN :**

The table 4.6 ( $t = 0.27$ ,  $P > 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed no significant difference in the mean scores of rural and urban higher secondary students in the dimension Drunken Driven.



ii. **DRUG ABUSE :**

The table 4.6 ( $t = 0.73$ ,  $P > 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed no significant difference in the mean scores of rural and urban higher secondary students in the dimension Drug Abuse.

iii. **CHILD LABOUR :**

The table 4.6 ( $t = 0.00$ ,  $P > 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed no significant difference in the mean scores of rural and urban higher secondary students in the dimension Child Labour.

iv. **RIGHT TO EDUCATION :**

The table 4.6 ( $t = 0.06$ ,  $P > 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed no significant difference in the mean scores of rural and urban higher secondary students in the dimension Right to Education.

v. **OTHER CRIMES :**

The table 4.6 ( $t = 0.98$ ,  $P > 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed no significant difference in the mean scores of rural and urban higher secondary students in the dimension other crimes.

**4. TYPE OF MANAGEMENT WISE COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF LEGAL AWARENESS AND ITS DIMENSIONS OF HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS.**

The fifth hypothesis was “There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of Government, Private and Aided

higher secondary students”. The data were analysed with the help of ‘F’ – test and results are given in table 4.7

**Table 4.7**

**Type of management wise mean, standard deviation, number and ‘F’ values of legal awareness and its dimensions.**

| Dimensions         | Type of Mgt. | No. | Mean  | SD   | Source        | Sum of Square | df  | Mean Square | F     | P     | Significacne       |
|--------------------|--------------|-----|-------|------|---------------|---------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|--------------------|
| Legal Awareness    | Govt         | 134 | 17.16 | 6.13 | Between group | 2625.6        | 2   | 1312.82     | 26.01 | 0.000 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Private      | 132 | 23.4  | 7.27 | Within group  | 20038.0       | 397 | 50.47       |       |       |                    |
|                    | Aided        | 134 | 20.92 | 7.81 | Total         | 22663.7       | 399 |             |       |       |                    |
| Drunken Driven     | Govt         | 134 | 2.58  | 1.31 | Between group | 57.87         | 2   | 28.93       | 12.72 | 0.000 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Private      | 132 | 3.51  | 1.58 | Within group  | 903.09        | 397 | 2.27        |       |       |                    |
|                    | Aided        | 134 | 2.94  | 1.62 | Total         | 960.96        | 399 |             |       |       |                    |
| Drug Abuse         | Govt         | 134 | 3.02  | 1.65 | Between group | 123.9         | 2   | 61.96       | 18.21 | 0.000 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Private      | 132 | 4.37  | 1.85 | Within group  | 1350.6        | 397 | 3.40        |       |       |                    |
|                    | Aided        | 134 | 3.87  | 2.01 | Total         | 1474.5        | 399 |             |       |       |                    |
| Child Labour       | Govt         | 134 | 2.73  | 1.36 | Between group | 86.13         | 2   | 43.07       | 19.32 | 0.000 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Private      | 132 | 3.86  | 1.55 | Within group  | 884.82        | 397 | 2.23        |       |       |                    |
|                    | Aided        | 134 | 3.19  | 1.56 | Total         | 970.95        | 399 |             |       |       |                    |
| Right to Education | Govt         | 134 | 2.57  | 1.27 | Between group | 63.4          | 2   | 31.69       | 14.12 | 0.000 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Private      | 132 | 3.84  | 1.68 | Within group  | 891.4         | 397 | 2.24        |       |       |                    |
|                    | Aided        | 134 | 3.39  | 1.52 | Total         | 954.4         | 399 |             |       |       |                    |
| Other crimes       | Govt         | 134 | 5.96  | 2.32 | Between group | 265.31        | 2   | 132.66      | 20.54 | 0.000 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Private      | 132 | 7.82  | 2.43 | Within group  | 2563.88       | 397 | 6.46        |       |       |                    |
|                    | Aided        | 134 | 7.52  | 2.84 | Total         | 2829.20       | 399 |             |       |       |                    |

From the table 4.7 ( $F = 26.01$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of Government, private and Aided higher secondary students of legal awareness.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of group which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.7.1**

**Result of scheffe procedure for higher secondary students based on type of management**

| <b>Type of Management</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|---------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Govt (A)                  | 134      | 17.16       | A Vs B      | 0.000             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Private (B)               | 132      | 23.4        | B Vs C      | 0.018             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Aided (C)                 | 134      | 20.92       | A Vs C      | 0.000             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |

The results shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the three pairs of Government and Private, Private and Aided, Government and Aided higher secondary students in their legal awareness and its dimensions. Therefore the null hypothesis that “there is no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of Government, Private and Aided higher secondary students” is rejected.

From the mean values, it is clear that the private higher secondary students have high level legal awareness than the Government and Aided higher secondary students.

**i. DRUNKEN DRIVEN :**

The table 4.7 ( $F = 12.72$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of Government, private and Aided higher secondary students in the dimension Drunken Driven of legal awareness.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of group which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.7.2**

**Result of scheffe procedure for dimension drunken driven**

| <b>Type of Management</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|---------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Govt (A)                  | 134      | 2.58        | A Vs B      | 0.000             | Sig at 0.01 level   |
| Private (B)               | 132      | 3.51        | B Vs C      | 0.009             | Sig at 0.01 level   |
| Aided (C)                 | 134      | 2.94        | A Vs C      | 0.150             | NS                  |

The results shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the two pairs of Government and Private, and Private and Aided higher secondary students in their drunken driven legal awareness. The other pair of

Government and Aided higher secondary students do not differ in their drunken driven legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the private higher secondary students have high level legal awareness (Drunken driven) than the Government and Aided higher secondary students.

**ii. DRUG ABUSE :**

The table 4.7 ( $F = 18.21, P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of Government, private and Aided higher secondary students in the dimension drug abuse of legal awareness.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of group which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.7.3**

**Result of scheffe procedure for dimension Drug Abuse**

| <b>Type of Management</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|---------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Govt (A)                  | 134      | 3.02        | A Vs B      | 0.000             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Private (B)               | 132      | 4.37        | B Vs C      | 0.088             | NS                  |
| Aided (C)                 | 134      | 3.87        | A Vs C      | 0.001             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |

The results shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the two pairs of Government and Private, and Government and Aided

higher secondary students in their Drug Abuse legal awareness. The other pair Private and Aided higher secondary students do not differ in their Drug Abuse legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the private higher secondary students have high level legal awareness (Drug abuse) than the Government and Aided higher secondary students.

### iii. CHILD LABOUR :

The table 4.7 ( $F = 19.32$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of Government, private and Aided higher secondary students in the dimension Child Labour of legal awareness.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of group which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.7.4**

**Result of scheffe procedure for dimension child labour**

| Type of Management | N   | Mean | Pair   | P(Scheffe) | Significance       |
|--------------------|-----|------|--------|------------|--------------------|
| Govt (A)           | 134 | 2.73 | A Vs B | 0.000      | Sig. at 0.01 level |
| Private (B)        | 132 | 3.86 | B Vs C | 0.001      | Sig. at 0.01 level |
| Aided (C)          | 134 | 3.19 | A Vs C | 0.043      | Sig. at 0.01 level |

The results shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the three pairs of Government and Private, Private and Aided, Government and Aided higher secondary students in their Child Labour legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the private higher secondary students have high level legal awareness (child labour) than the Government and Aided higher secondary students.

**iv. RIGHT TO EDUCATION:**

The table 4.7 (F – 14.12, P < 0.01) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of Government, private and Aided higher secondary students in the dimension Right to Education legal awareness.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of group which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.7.5**

**Result of scheffe procedure for dimension Right to Education**

| <b>Type of Management</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Remark</b>      |
|---------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Govt (A)                  | 134      | 1.27        | A Vs B      | 0.000             | Sig. at 0.01 level |
| Private (B)               | 132      | 1.68        | B Vs C      | 0.051             | NS                 |
| Aided (C)                 | 134      | 1.52        | A Vs C      | 0.018             | Sig. at 0.01 level |

The results shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the two pairs of Government and Private, Government and Aided higher secondary students in their Right to Education legal awareness. The other pair Private and Aided higher secondary students do not differ in their Right to Education legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the private higher secondary students have high level legal awareness (Right to Education) than the Government and Aided higher secondary students.

**v. OTHER CRIMES :**

The table 4.7 ( $F = 20.54$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of Government, private and Aided higher secondary students in the dimension Other crimes of legal awareness.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of group which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.7.6**

**Result of scheffe procedure for dimension other crimes**

| <b>Type of Management</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|---------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Govt (A)                  | 134      | 5.96        | A Vs B      | 0.000             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Private (B)               | 132      | 7.82        | B Vs C      | 0.630             | NS                  |
| Aided (C)                 | 134      | 7.52        | A Vs C      | 0.000             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |



The results shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the two pairs of Government and Private, Government and Aided higher secondary students in their Other crimes legal awareness. The other pair private and Aided higher secondary students do not differ in their other crimes legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the private higher secondary students have high level legal awareness (other crimes) than the Government and Aided higher secondary students.

#### **6. FATHER'S EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS WISE COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF LEGAL AWARENESS AND ITS DIMENSION OF HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS.**

The sixth hypothesis was “There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students having based on their father’s educational qualification”. The data were analysed with the help of ‘F’ test and results are given in table 4.8.



|                    |            |     |      |      |               |         |     |       |      |       |       |              |
|--------------------|------------|-----|------|------|---------------|---------|-----|-------|------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Child Labour       | Below SSLC | 186 | 3.23 | 1.59 | Between Group | 24.6    | 2   | 2.38  | 5.16 | 0.006 | level | Sig. at 0.01 |
|                    | Above SSLC | 134 | 3.03 | 1.49 | Within Group  | 946.3   | 397 |       |      |       |       |              |
|                    | Above HSC  | 80  | 3.73 | 1.52 | Total         | 970.9   | 399 |       |      |       |       |              |
| Right to Education | Below SSLC | 186 | 3.24 | 1.6  | Between Group | 18.2    | 2   | 9.076 | 3.85 | 0.22  | level | Sig. at 0.05 |
|                    | Above SSLC | 134 | 3.28 | 1.46 | Within Group  | 936.2   | 397 | 2.36  |      |       |       |              |
|                    | Above HSC  | 80  | 3.79 | 1.51 | Total         | 954.4   | 399 |       |      |       |       |              |
| Other Crimes       | Below SSLC | 186 | 6.82 | 2.67 | Between Group | 48.1    | 2   | 24.06 | 3.49 | 0.033 | level | Sig. at 0.05 |
|                    | Above SSLC | 134 | 7.09 | 2.59 | Within Group  | 2781.07 | 397 | 7.01  |      |       |       |              |
|                    | Above HSC  | 80  | 7.75 | 2.68 | Total         | 2829.2  | 399 |       |      |       |       |              |

From the table 4.8 ( $F = 6.58$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness of higher secondary students father's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.8.1**

**Result of scheffe procedure for higher secondary students legal awareness based on father's educational qualifications**

| <b>Qualification of father</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Below SSLC<br>(A)              | 186      | 19.84       | A Vs B      | 0.995             | NS                  |
| Above SSLC<br>(B)              | 134      | 19.76       | B Vs C      | 0.005             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Above HSC<br>(C)               | 80       | 23.18       | A Vs C      | 0.004             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the two pairs of above SSLC and above HSC, below SSLC and above HSC of higher secondary students father's educational qualification in legal awareness. Therefore the null hypothesis that "there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students having based on their father's educational qualification" is rejected. The other pair of below SSLC and above SSLC of higher secondary students father's educational qualification do not differ in their legal awareness and its dimensions.

From the mean values, it is clear that the higher secondary students whose father's educational qualification is above HSC have high level legal awareness than the below SSLC and Above SSLC.

**i. DRUNKEN DRIVEN :**

The table 4.8 ( $F = 5.82$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness of higher secondary students father's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC in the dimension drunken driven.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison used for further analysis.

**Table 4.8.2**

**Result of scheffe procedure for dimension drunken driven**

| <b>Qualification of father</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Below SSLC<br>(A)              | 186      | 2.91        | A Vs B      | 0.899             | NS                  |
| Above SSLC<br>(B)              | 134      | 2.83        | B Vs C      | 0.006             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Above HSC<br>(C)               | 80       | 3.53        | A Vs C      | 0.011             | Sig. at 0.05 level  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the two pair of above SSLC and above HSC and below SSLC and above HSC of higher secondary students father's education qualification in the dimension

drunken driven legal awareness. The other pair below SSLC and above SSLC of higher secondary students father's educational qualification do not differ in their drunken driven legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the higher secondary students whose father's educational qualification is above HSC have high level legal awareness (Drunken driven) than the below SSLC and Above SSLC.

**ii. DRUG ABUSE :**

The table 4.8 ( $F = 5.69$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significance in the means scores of legal awareness of higher secondary students father's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC in the dimension Drug Abuse.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.8.3**

**Result of scheffe procedure for dimension drug abuse**

| <b>Qualification of father</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Below SSLC<br>(A)              | 186      | 3.63        | A Vs B      | 0.916             | NS                  |
| Above SSLC<br>(B)              | 134      | 3.54        | B Vs C      | 0.007             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Above HSC<br>(C)               | 80       | 4.39        | A Vs C      | 0.012             | Sig. at 0.05 level  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the two pair of above SSLC and above HSC and below SSLC and above HSC of higher secondary students father's educational qualification in the dimension drug abuse legal awareness. The other pair below SSLC and above SSLC of higher secondary students father's educational qualification do not differ in their drug abuse legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the higher secondary students whose father's educational qualification is above HSC have high level legal awareness (drug abuse) than the below SSLC and Above SSLC.

### **iii. CHILD LABOUR :**

The table 4.8 ( $F = 5.16$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness of higher secondary students father's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC in the dimension Child Labour.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.8.4****Result of scheffe procedure for dimension child labour.**

| <b>Qualification of father</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Below SSLC<br>(A)              | 186      | 3.23        | A Vs B      | 0.521             | NS                  |
| Above SSLC<br>(B)              | 134      | 3.03        | B Vs C      | 0.006             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Above HSC<br>(C)               | 80       | 3.73        | A Vs C      | 0.054             | NS                  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the pair of above SSLC and above HSC of higher secondary students father's educational qualification in the dimension Child labour legal awareness. The other two pairs below SSLC and above SSLC , below SSLC and above HSC of higher secondary students father's educational qualification do not differ in their child labour legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the higher secondary students whose father's educational qualification is above HSC have high level legal awareness (child labour) than the below SSLC and Above SSLC.

**iv. RIGHT TO EDUCATION :**

The table 4.8 ( $F = 3.85$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness of higher secondary students



father's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC in the dimension Right to Education.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.8.5**

**Result of scheffe procedure for dimension Right to Education**

| <b>Qualification of father</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Below SSLC (A)                 | 186      | 3.24        | A Vs B      | 0.974             | NS                  |
| Above SSLC (B)                 | 134      | 3.28        | B Vs C      | 0.064             | NS                  |
| Above HSC (C)                  | 80       | 3.79        | A Vs C      | 0.029             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the pair of above SSLC and above HSC of higher secondary students father's educational qualification in the dimension Right to Education legal awareness. The other two pairs below SSLC and above SSLC , above SSLC and above HSC of higher secondary students father's educational qualification do not differ in their right to education legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the higher secondary students whose father's educational qualification is above HSC have high level legal awareness (Right to education) than the below SSLC and Above SSLC.

**v. OTHER CRIMES :**

The table 4.8 ( $F = 3.49$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness of higher secondary students father's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC in the dimension other crimes.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.8.6**

**Result of scheffe procedure for dimension other crimes**

| <b>Qualification of father</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Below SSLC<br>(A)              | 186      | 6.82        | A Vs B      | 0.667             | NS                  |
| Above SSLC<br>(B)              | 134      | 7.09        | B Vs C      | 0.212             | NS                  |
| Above HSC<br>(C)               | 80       | 7.75        | A Vs C      | 0.033             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the pair of above SSLC and above HSC of higher secondary students father's educational qualification in the dimension other crimes. The other two pairs of below SSLC and above SSLC , above SSLC and above HSC of higher secondary students father's educational qualification do not differ in their other crimes legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the higher secondary students whose father's educational qualification is above HSC have high level legal awareness (Other crimes) than the below SSLC and Above SSLC.

#### **7. MOTHER'S EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION WISE COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF LEGAL AWARENESS AND ITS DIMENSIONS OF HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS.**

The seventh hypothesis was "There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students having based on their mother's educational qualification". The data were analysed with the help of 'F' test and results are given in table 4.9.

**Table 4.9**

**Mother's educational qualification wise mean, standard deviation, number and 'F' value of legal awareness and its dimensions.**

| Dimension       | Qualification of father | N   | Mean  | SD   | Source        | Sum of Square | df  | Mean Square | F     | P    | Significance       |
|-----------------|-------------------------|-----|-------|------|---------------|---------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|--------------------|
| Legal Awareness | Below SSLC              | 167 | 18.49 | 7.22 | Between Group | 1679.05       | 2   | 839.53      | 15.88 | 0.00 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                 | Above SSLC              | 115 | 20.36 | 7.48 | Within Group  | 20984.6       | 397 | 52.86       |       |      |                    |
|                 | Above HSC               | 118 | 23.42 | 7.13 | Total         | 22663.6       | 399 |             |       |      |                    |
| Drunken Driven  | Below SSLC              | 167 | 2.75  | 1.57 | Between Group | 31.94         | 2   | 15.97       | 6.83  | 0.00 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                 | Above SSLC              | 115 | 2.96  | 1.51 | Within Group  | 929.01        | 397 | 2.34        |       |      |                    |
|                 | Above HSC               | 118 | 3.42  | 1.48 | Total         | 960.9         | 399 |             |       |      |                    |

|                    |            |     |      |      |               |         |     |       |       |      |                    |
|--------------------|------------|-----|------|------|---------------|---------|-----|-------|-------|------|--------------------|
| Drug Abuse         | Below SSLC | 167 | 3.34 | 1.79 | Between Group | 69.6    | 2   | 34.83 | 9.84  | 0.00 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Above SSLC | 115 | 3.76 | 1.99 | Within Group  | 1404.8  | 397 | 3.54  |       |      |                    |
|                    | Above HSC  | 118 | 4.34 | 1.9  | Total         | 1474.4  | 399 |       |       |      |                    |
| Child Labour       | Below SSLC | 167 | 2.97 | 1.54 | Between Group | 30.83   | 2   | 15.42 | 6.51  | 0.00 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Above SSLC | 115 | 3.3  | 1.52 | Within Group  | 940.1   | 397 | 2.37  |       |      |                    |
|                    | Above HSC  | 118 | 3.64 | 1.56 | Total         | 970.955 | 399 |       |       |      |                    |
| Right to Education | Below SSLC | 167 | 2.99 | 1.51 | Between Group | 57.6    | 2   | 28.85 | 12.77 | 0.00 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Above SSLC | 115 | 3.34 | 1.58 | Within Group  | 896.7   | 397 | 2.26  |       |      |                    |
|                    | Above HSC  | 118 | 3.91 | 1.41 | Total         | 954.4   | 399 |       |       |      |                    |
| Other Crimes       | Below SSLC | 167 | 6.44 | 2.46 | Between Group | 193.43  | 2   | 96.71 | 14.57 | 0.00 | Sig. at 0.01 level |
|                    | Above SSLC | 115 | 7.01 | 2.73 | Within Group  | 2635.77 | 397 | 6.64  |       |      |                    |
|                    | Above HSC  | 118 | 8.11 | 2.59 | Total         | 2859.2  | 399 |       |       |      |                    |

From the table 4.9 ( $F = 15.88$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness of higher secondary students mother's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.9.1**

**Result of scheffe procedure for higher secondary students legal awareness based on mother's educational qualification**

| <b>Qualification of mother</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Below SSLC<br>(A)              | 167      | 18.49       | A Vs B      | 0.106             | NS                  |
| Above SSLC<br>(B)              | 115      | 20.36       | B Vs C      | 0.006             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Above HSC<br>(C)               | 118      | 23.42       | A Vs C      | 0.000             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the two pairs of above SSLC and above HSC, below SSLC and above HSC of higher secondary students mother's educational qualification of legal awareness and its dimension. Therefore the null hypothesis that "there exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students having based on their mother's educational qualification" is rejected. The other pair below SSLC and above SSLC of higher secondary students mother's educational qualification do not differ in their legal awareness and its dimensions.

From the mean values, it is clear that the higher secondary students whose mother's educational qualification is above HSC have high level legal awareness than the below SSLC and Above SSLC.

**i. DRUNKEN DRIVEN :**

The table 4.9 ( $F = 6.83$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness of higher secondary students mother's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC in the dimension drunken driven.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.9.2**

**Result of scheffe procedure for various mother's educational qualification of higher secondary students for the dimension drunken driven.**

| <b>Qualification of Mother</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Below SSLC (A)                 | 167      | 2.75        | A Vs B      | 0.527             | NS                  |
| Above SSLC (B)                 | 115      | 2.96        | B Vs C      | 0.073             | NS                  |
| Above HSC (C)                  | 118      | 3.42        | A Vs C      | 0.001             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the pair of below SSLC and above HSC of mother's educational qualification of higher secondary students. The other two pairs of below SSLC and above SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC of higher secondary students mother's educational qualification do not differ in their drunken driven legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the higher secondary students whose mother's educational qualification is above HSC have high level legal awareness (Drunken Driven) than the below SSLC and Above SSLC.

**ii. DRUG ABUSE :**

The table 4.9 ( $F = 9.84, P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness of higher secondary students mother's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC in the dimension drunken driven.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.9.3**

**Result of scheffe procedure for various mother's educational qualification of higher secondary students for the dimension Drug Abuse**

| <b>Qualification of mother</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Below SSLC<br>(A)              | 167      | 3.34        | A Vs B      | 0.184             | NS                  |
| Above SSLC<br>(B)              | 115      | 3.76        | B Vs C      | 0.064             | NS                  |
| Above HSC<br>(C)               | 118      | 4.34        | A Vs C      | 0.000             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the pair of below SSLC and above HSC of mother's educational qualification of higher secondary students. The other two pairs of below SSLC and above SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC of higher secondary students mother's educational qualification do not differ in their drug abuse legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the higher secondary students whose mother's educational qualification is above HSC have high level legal awareness (Drug Abuse) than the below SSLC and Above SSLC.

### **iii. CHILD LABOUR :**

The table 4.9 ( $F = 6.51, P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness of higher secondary students mother's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC in the dimension drunken driven.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.



**Table 4.9.4**

**Result of scheffe procedure for various mother's educational qualification of higher secondary students for the dimension child labour.**

| <b>Qualification of mother</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Below SSLC<br>(A)              | 167      | 2.97        | A Vs B      | 0.210             | NS                  |
| Above SSLC<br>(B)              | 115      | 3.3         | B Vs C      | 0.243             | NS                  |
| Above HSC<br>(C)               | 118      | 3.64        | A Vs C      | 0.002             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the pair of below SSLC and above HSC of mother's educational qualification of higher secondary students. The other two pairs of below SSLC and above SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC of higher secondary students mother's educational qualification do not differ in their child labour legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the higher secondary students whose mother's educational qualification is above HSC have high level legal awareness (Child labour) than the below SSLC and Above SSLC.

**iv. RIGHT TO EDUCATION :**

The table 4.9 (F – 12.77, P < 0.01) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness of higher secondary students

mother's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC in the dimension right to education.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.9.5**

**Result of scheffe procedure for various mother's educational qualification of higher secondary students for the dimension right to education.**

| <b>Qualification of mother</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Below SSLC<br>(A)              | 167      | 2.99        | A Vs B      | 0.159             | NS                  |
| Above SSLC<br>(B)              | 115      | 3.34        | B Vs C      | 0.016             | NS                  |
| Above HSC<br>(C)               | 118      | 3.91        | A Vs C      | 0.000             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the two pairs of above SSLC and above HSC, below SSLC and above HSC of higher secondary students mother's educational qualification in right to education legal awareness. The other pair below SSLC and above SSLC, of higher secondary students mother's educational qualification do not differ in their right to education legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the higher secondary students whose mother's educational qualification is above HSC have high level legal awareness (Right to Education) than the below SSLC and Above SSLC.

**v. OTHER CRIMES :**

The table 4.9 ( $F = 14.57$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) indicates that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness of higher secondary students mother's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC in the dimension other crimes.

The result does not help to identify exactly the pairs of groups which differ significantly. Hence scheffe multiple comparison is used for further analysis.

**Table 4.9.6**

**Result of scheffe procedure for various mother's educational qualification of higher secondary students for the dimension other crimes.**

| <b>Qualification of mother</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Pair</b> | <b>P(Scheffe)</b> | <b>Significance</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Below SSLC<br>(A)              | 167      | 6.44        | A Vs B      | 0.190             | NS                  |
| Above SSLC<br>(B)              | 115      | 7.01        | B Vs C      | 0.005             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |
| Above HSC<br>(C)               | 118      | 8.11        | A Vs C      | 0.000             | Sig. at 0.01 level  |

The result shows that there existed significant difference in the mean scores of the two pairs of above SSLC and above HSC, below SSLC and above HSC of

higher secondary students mother's educational qualification in other crimes legal awareness. The other pair of below SSLC and above SSLC of higher secondary students mother's educational qualification do not differ in their other crimes legal awareness.

From the mean values, it is clear that the higher secondary students whose mother's educational qualification is above HSC have high level legal awareness (other crimes) than the below SSLC and Above SSLC.

**TENABILITY OF HYPOTHESES :**

1. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of male and female higher secondary students. The null hypothesis is rejected.
2. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions among hindu, christian and muslim higher secondary students. The null hypothesis is rejected.
3. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of OC, BC, MBC, and SC/ST higher secondary students. The null hypothesis is rejected.
4. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of Rural and Urban higher secondary students. The null hypothesis is accepted.

5. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of government, private and aided higher secondary students. The null hypothesis is rejected.
6. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students having father's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC. The null hypothesis is rejected.
7. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students having mother's educational qualification such as below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC. The null hypothesis is rejected.

**CHAPTER - V****FINDINGS, SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

- **Major findings**
- **Conclusions**
- **Educational Implication**
- **Suggestions for Improving awareness  
on legal**
- **Suggestions for further research.**

**The study in Retrospect :**

The study under investigation is entitled as "A study on legal Awareness among higher secondary students in Kanyakumari District". In this chapter the investigator summarizes all findings and conclusions drawn from the study. In addition, the investigator also added recommendations and suggestions for further research.

For the present study the investigator adopted a normative survey method. The study was conducted on a sample of 400 higher secondary students from various schools in Kanyakumari District. The students selected for the investigation differ in terms of gender, religion, community, locality, type of management, father's educational qualification, mother's educational qualification. The tools used for the study such as,

1. Legal Awareness Test
2. General Data Sheet

## **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The major objectives framed for the study test.

1. To construct and validate legal awareness test.
2. To study the level of legal awareness among higher secondary students.
3. To compare the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students with respect to the background variables, namely gender, religion, community, locality, type of management, father's educational qualification, mother's educational qualification.

## **HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY :**

The major hypotheses formulated for the study were following

1. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of male and female higher secondary students.
2. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions among Hindu, Christian and Muslim higher secondary students.
3. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of OC, BC, MBC and SC/ST higher secondary students.
4. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of Rural and Urban higher secondary students.



5. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of Government, Private and Aided higher secondary students.
6. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students father's educational qualification based on below SSLC, above SSLC and above HSC.
7. There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students mother's educational qualifications based on below SSLC, above SSLC and HSC.

#### **METHODOLOGY IN BRIEF :**

##### **METHOD :**

For the present study normative survey method was used.

##### **SAMPLE :**

The total sample for the present study consisted 400 higher secondary students in Kanyakumari District.

##### **TOOLS USED :**

The tools to be used for study are as follows.

- i. Legal awareness test developed and validated by the investigator.
- ii. General data sheet.

##### **STATISTICAL TECHNIQUE :**

For the present study the following statistical techniques are used.

- i. Percentage
- ii. Arithmetic Mean
- iii. Standard Deviation
- iv. t- test
- v. ANOVA

### **MAJOR FINDINGS :**

Following are the major findings emerge from the study.

1. From this study it had been found that, the total sample of higher secondary students had average legal awareness. The result is supported by the following finding (arithmetic mean for the total score of 41 is 20.48 and standard deviation is 7.54).
2. Gender had influence on legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students. For all the dimensions, mean values showed that female higher secondary students obtained high scores of legal awareness comparing their counter parts ( $t = 5.00$ ).
3. Religion had influence on legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students. For all the dimensions, mean values showed that Christian higher secondary students obtained better scores of legal awareness comparing their counter parts ( $F = 11.72$ ).
4. Community had influence on legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students. For all the dimensions, mean values showed that BC

higher secondary students obtained better scores of legal awareness comparing their counter parts ( $F = 3.49$ ).

5. Locality had no influence on legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students. For all the dimensions, mean values showed that no significant difference in the mean scores of rural and urban higher secondary students ( $t = 0.29$ ).
6. Type of management had influence on legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students. For all the dimensions, mean values showed that private higher secondary students obtained better scores of legal awareness comparing their counter parts ( $F = 26.01$ ).
7. Father's educational qualification had influence on legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students. For all the dimensions, mean values showed that above HSC of father's educational qualifications having higher secondary students obtained better scores of legal awareness comparing their counter parts ( $F = 6.58$ ).
8. Mother's educational qualification had influence on legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students. For all the dimensions, mean values showed that above HSC of mother's educational qualifications having higher secondary students obtained better scores of legal awareness comparing their counter parts ( $F = 15.88$ ).

**CONCLUSION :**

The above findings have helped the investigator to arrive at certain conclusion regarding the study. It is made clear that legal awareness play a vital role to bring higher secondary students into the mainstream.

The study gives an evident that average legal awareness of higher secondary students. Locality has no influence in legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students. The other variables such as gender, religion, community, type of management, father's educational qualification, mother's educational qualification had influence in legal awareness and its dimensions of higher secondary students.

Keeping the findings in the mind, investigator, suggested that legal awareness plays an important part in life to solve and overcome any kind of complicated circumstance.

**EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS :**

1. For improving the legal awareness certain improvement programmes such as seminars, workshops, conference should be arranged.
2. Opportunities for guidance and counseling can be given so that they may be aware of laws and punishment.
3. Higher secondary students can be encouraged for group learning and thus help them to understand various punishments.
4. Providing education and training in skills to make them free from subordination.

5. Development of values and ideas about higher secondary students can be given through redesigned curriculum.
6. Higher secondary students may be given special coaching on legal awareness.
7. Higher secondary students can be encouraged for group learning for understand various laws and punishment.

### **RECOMMENDATION :**

The findings and result of the study have revealed a number of facts. These provide researchers with a number of relevant issues that could be subjected to further investigation. Some of the recommendations are as follows.

- Promoting social welfare activities and implementing various awareness programmes for higher secondary students.
- Appointment of protection officers and NGO will provide assistance to the higher secondary students for legal aid and safe shelter.
- Legal education must become part of social curriculum. Students should be educated to understand relevant laws like traffic rules, drug abuse, Eve teasing, ragging, child labour and right to education and also know their fundamental duties.
- A helpline centre has to be installed by the school authorities to enable the students to approach for immediate help / action.
- Legal literacy campaigns should be organized in the schools.
- Students legal literacy clubs should be organized in the schools.

- Legal literacy classes should be organized for the member of the clubs.
- Special legal awareness classes related to problems faced by women abusement should be organized for girl students.
- Clubs should prepare and distribution of books, booklets and reading materials to create legal awareness.
- Club should organise essay, poem and slogan competition related to legal literacy.
- Better awareness can be given to students for the positive effect on the future generation. Organization of seminars can arranged in schools to equip the students to develop healthy legal awareness. Apart from several other means such as media, which are used for creating awareness, the teaching community and schools which is at the root level is the best means of creating legal awareness.

#### **SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FURTHER STUDIES :**

The study will become more fruitful and meaningful if similar studies in this field could be carried out. The desire areas for further research are as follows.

- ❖ The present study is confined to only higher secondary students much more effective if it is conducted on curriculum planners, teacher educators, educational administrators, teachers etc. It may help the authorities to improve the quality of legal awareness program.
- ❖ Further study can conduct legal awareness and criminal behaviour of higher secondary students.

- ❖ A study on legal awareness and attitude towards crime of higher secondary students.
- ❖ A study on aggressive behaviour and legal awareness of higher secondary students.
- ❖ A comparative study on legal awareness of school and college students.
- ❖ A study “An enquiry into the need for legal awareness in coastal area”.
- ❖ A study can be conducted on legal awareness and attitude towards legal education of professional college students.
- ❖ A study can be conducted on the influence of mass media in imparting legal awareness.
- ❖ An analysis study can be conducted in socio – economic disparities and violation of legal rights.
- ❖ Legal awareness for educational personnel with focus on married and unmarried women.
- ❖ A study can be conducted in legal awareness of women college students.
- ❖ A study can be conducted in legal awareness of adolescents.

## **REFERENCES**



## REFERENCES

### BOOKS

- Ahuja Ram, (2003). *Social problems in India*, Jaipur: Rawat publications.
- Ahuja, R. (2002). *Research Methods*, New Delhi: Rawat publications.
- Arul selvam, M. (2004). *Trial of motor vehicle Accident claim cases Chennai*, Malathi publication.
- Best, J. & Khan, J.V. (2007). *Research in Education*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.
- Das, B.K. (2012). *Legal Education and Research Methodology*. Delhi : Mangalam Publishers and Distributors.
- George, J. Mouly. (1964). *The science to Educational Research*. New Delhi : Eurasia Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- Kothari, C.R. (2010). *Research Methodology*. Mumbai : New Age International Limited Publishers.
- Kowl Lokesh. (2007). *Methodology of Educational Research*. Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- Ratha Mohan. (2012). *Research Methods in Education*, New Delhi : Neal Kamal Publications Pvt. Ltd.
- Sambandham, S. (2005). *A hand book of The Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 1998*. Chennai : C. Sitharaman & Co. Pvt. Ltd.
- Samidurai, K. and Kandhi, R. (2004) *ATC Criminal Reference Madurai* : Account test centre.

Sharma, R.A. (2002). *Research Methodology* New Delhi : National Publishing House.

Sidhu, K.S. (2007). *Methodology of Research in Education*. New Delhi : Steling Publishers Pvt. Ltd.

### **UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS:**

Legal Awareness of students at secondary Level (2012) Santhini Santham, E.S. University of Kerala.

Constitutional Awareness of student Teachers and Teachers Educators of the colleges of the Teacher Education in Kerala (2009) Savitha K Kurup. University of Kerala.

A study on the problems of child Labourers in Kerala (2005) Sree kala. University of Kerala.

A study on Legal Awareness Among College students Kanyakumari District (2013) Jasmine, S. N.V.K.S.D. College of Education Attoor.

### **JOURNALS :**

Adam Paul, (2008). "Awareness of Legal Rights Among Women Teachers". *Edutracks*. (7(9)38 – 40.

Thampi Dorai, M.I. (2006). "General Legal Awareness Among Teacher Trainees". *Edutracks*. 5(11) 38 – 39.

Jayanthibai V Patel, (2008). "Constitution Awareness Among M.Ed Teacher Trainees". *Edutracks* 7(10) 34 – 35.

Pradeep Kumar, K.A. and Anil Kumar, K. (2009). “Human Rights Awareness among non – tribal students”. *Edutracks*. 9(1) 32 – 33.

Mahinder Reddy Azad Chandra, (2012). “ Awareness of Ragging Among professional College Students”. *Edutracks* 11(11) 43 – 43.

Ismail Thamarasseri, Sabu, S. (2011). “Legal Literacy Among Secondary School students”. *Edutracks*. 11(2) 17 – 19.

Asead Abdul Wahid and Dr. Muhamedueen Alias Musthafa, M.N. (2013). “Human Rights Awareness of Secondary School Students”. *Research and pedagogic Interventions* 2(1) 121 – 125.

Vijaya Lekshmi, N.S. (2012). “Human Rights Awareness Among Teacher Educators”. *Endeavours in Education* 3(2) 24 – 28.

Suvitha, D. A.J.A. Rajakumar, Amirtha gowri (2013). “Awareness of Rural women of their Legal Rights”. *Journal of community Guidance and Research* (1) 138 – 145.

Ramesh Babu, B. Renu Sharma. (2005). “ Elementary Teachers Awareness and opinion on Constitutional values”. *Edutrack*. 4 (123) 37 – 38.

Fathima Jaseena, M.P.M.(2011). “Right to Education - A study on the Awareness of M.Ed Trainees”. *Edutrack* 2(2) 47 – 48.

## WEBSITE

[www.scribd.com](http://www.scribd.com) 27/1/.2014

[www.info@spicerdrivingschool.com](http://www.info@spicerdrivingschool.com) 22/12/2013.

<http://www.ilo.org/childlabour> 22/12/2013

[www.Risidave23.hubpages.com](http://www.Risidave23.hubpages.com) 3/1/2014.

[www.Labour.nic.in](http://www.Labour.nic.in) 3/1/2014

[www.savethechildren.in/child-protection](http://www.savethechildren.in/child-protection) 27/1/2014

[www.legalLiteracy.com](http://www.legalLiteracy.com) 28/2/2013

[www.Researchmanuscripts.com](http://www.Researchmanuscripts.com) 3/1/2013

[www.Webpages.Uidaho.edul](http://www.Webpages.Uidaho.edul) 19/12/2013

[www.Undp.Org.Yelreports](http://www.Undp.Org.Yelreports) 3/1/2014

[www.Higherred.megraw.hill.com](http://www.Higherred.megraw.hill.com) 9/1/2014

[zakat.hubpages.com](http://zakat.hubpages.com) 1/4/2014

[www.nicbi.nlm.nih.gov](http://www.nicbi.nlm.nih.gov) 1/4/2014

[www.solutionsreteam.org](http://www.solutionsreteam.org) 1/4/2014

[www.Madd-ca/Media](http://www.Madd-ca/Media) 3/1/2014

[www.Linkadin.com](http://www.Linkadin.com) 2/4/2014

[www.wikipedia.org](http://www.wikipedia.org) 2/4/2014

[www.studymode.com](http://www.studymode.com) 2/4/2014

## **APPENDICES**

## Appendix – A

**vd;. tp. Nf. v];. b. fy;tpapay; fy;Y}up> Mw;W}u;**

**nghJthd jfty; gbtk; (2013 - 2014)**

**Fwpg;G :**

jq;fis Fwpj;j nghJthd rpy jfty; tpguq;fs; Njitg;gLfpwJ. ,e;j jfty;fis  
vdJ Ma;T Nehf;fj;jpw;fhf kl;Lk; gad;gLj;jpf; nfhs;Ntd; vd cWjpf;  
\$WfpNwd;.

Nkup \fpyh. S

Name of the student :

khztu; ngau;

Class / tFg;G :

Gender / ghypdk; : Male / Mz; Female / ngz;

Religion / kjk; : Hindu / Christian / Muslim

,e;J / fpwp];jtk; / K];yPk;

Community / tFg;G : OC/ BC / MBC / SC / ST

Location of the School : Rural / Urban

gs;spapd; miktplk; : fpuhkk; / efuk;

Type of Management : Government / Private / Aided

gs;spapd; epu;thfk; : muR / jdpahu; / muR cjtp ngWk; gs;sp

Educational qualification of father : Below SSLC / Above SSLC / Above HSC

je;ijapd; fy;tpj;jFjp : 10- f;F fPo; /10- f;F Nky; /12-f;F Nky;

Educational qualification of Mother : Below SSLC / Above SSLC / Above HSC

jhapd; fy;tpj;jFjp : 10- f;F fPo;/10- f;F Nky;/12-f;F Nky;

## Appendix – B

**vd;. tp. Nf. v];. b fy;tpapay; fy;Y}up>**

**Mw;W}H.**

***rl;l tpopg;GzHT NjHT***

jahupg;G : Nkup ~fpyh S & Mr. gpurhj; P.S

(Draft)

Fwpg;G :

,e;j tpdhj;jhs; njhFg;gpy; rl;l tpopg;GzHT njhIHghd 91 tpdhf;fs;>  
rupahd tpilia NjHe;njLj;J vOJk; tifapy; nfhLf;fg;gl;Ls;sd. xt;nthU tpdhTf;Fk; 4  
tpilfs; nfhLf;fg;gl;Ls;sd. mtw;iw ftdkhf thrpj;J cq;fSf;F jdpahf nfhLf;fg;gLk;  
tpilj;jhspy; cq;fs; tpilia tl;lk; nra;J fh;lITk;. ve;jf; Nfs;tpiaAk; jtpHf;f Ntz;lhk;.  
jaTnra;J ,e;j tpdhj;jhspy; tl;lk; nra;a Ntz;lhk; vdf; Nfl;Lf; nfhs;fpNwd;.

**Nfyptijr; nra;jy; (RAGGING)**

1. Nfyptijr; (Ragging) rl;l;lg;gpupT 4-d; gb fy;tpepiyaj;jpy; mf;Fw;wk; Gupe;J jz;lid  
ngWk; khztd;
 

|                                  |                                |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| a) fz;bf;fg;gLjy;                | b) ngw;NwhUf;F njupag;gLj;Jjy; |
| c) fy;tpepiyaj;ij tpl;L ePf;Fjy; | d) vJTkpy;iy                   |
  
2. Nfyptijapy; (Ragging) xU fy;tpepiyaj;jpy; jz;lid ngw;W ntspNaw;wg;gl;l khztd;  
NtW fy;tpepiyaj;jpy; \_\_\_\_\_
 

|                         |                       |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| a) NrHe;J gbf;fyhk;     | b) NrHe;J gbf;f KbahJ |
| c) gupe;Jiug;gb Nruyhk; | d) vJTkpy;iy          |

3. fy;tp epiyaj;jiytuhy; Nfyptijapy; (Ragging) Fw;wk; ep&gpf;fg;gl;lhy;  
 a) khztiujw;fhypfkhf ePf;f Ntz;Lk;      b) epue;jukhf ePf;f Ntz;Lk;  
 c) ngw;NwhUf;F njuptpj;jy;                      d) vJTkpy;iy
4. gpupT (2)(1) d; gb fy;tpepiyaj;jpy; fz;lwpag;gLk; Nfyptij (Ragging) Fw;wj;jpw;F  
 a) fy;tp epiya jiytupd; KbT ,WjpahdJ  
 b) rl;l;jpd; KbT ,WjpahdJ  
 c) murpd; KbT ,WjpahdJ  
 d) vJTkpy;iy
5. gpupT 4-d; gb fy;tpepiyaj;jpy; Nfyptij;F (Ragging) JizNghFk; egUf;fhd jz;lid  
 a) jw;fhypf ePf;fk;  
 b) epue;ju ePf;fk;  
 c) epue;juePf;fk;> NtW fy;tpepiyaj;jpy; NrHf;ff;\$lhJ  
 d) vJTkpy;iy
6. fy;tp epiyaj;jiytH Nfyptijia (Ragging) fz;lwpe;J eltbf;if vLf;f jtWk; gl;rj;jpy;  
 rl;l;g;gpupT 6(1) d; gb  
 a) Fw;wj;jpy; mtUk; cle;ij                      b) Fw;wthsp  
 c) rl;l;g;gb jz;lid                                      d) jz;lid ,y;iy
7. fy;tp epiyaj;jiytH eltbf;if vLf;f jtWk; gl;rj;jpy; gpupT 4-d; gb mtUf;fhd jz;lid  
 a) gzpePf;fk;    b) mguhjk;  
 c) rpiwj;jz;lid    d) vJTkpy;iy
8. rl;l eltbf;if vLf;f Nfyptij (Ragging) KiwaPl;il vOj;JUtpy; vj;jid ehl;fSf;Fs; mspf;f  
 Ntz;Lk;



- a) 4 ehl;fs;                      b) 3 ehl;fs;  
c) ,uz;L ehl;fs;                d) 5 ehl;fs;

9. Nfyptij (Ragging) KiwaPL fpil;j vj;jid kzp Neu;j;pw;Fs; tprhuiz Nkw;nfhs;s Ntz;Lk;  
a) 24 kzpNeuk;                      b) 36 kzpNeuk;  
c) 48 kzpNeuk;                      d) 72 kzpNeuk;

10. KiwaPl;il ve;j fhty;epiyaj;jpy; gjpT nra;a Ntz;Lk;?  
a) Fw;wk; ele;j ,lk;                b) tiuaiwf;Fl;gl;l fhty; epiyak;  
c) mUfpYs;s fhty;epiyak;        d) vJTkpy;iy

11. Fw;wk; ep&gpf;fg;gl;l vj;jid kzp Neu;j;jpy; fhty;Jiw tof;F gjpT nra;a Ntz;Lk;?  
a) 72 kzpNeuk;                      b) 48 kzpNeuk;  
c) 36 kzpNeuk;                      d) 24 kzpNeuk;

**ngz;fis njhy;iy nra;jy; (EVE - TEASING)**

12. ngz;fis njhy;iy nra;jy; (Eve-Teasing) vd;gJ ngz; xUtiu  
a) kpul;Ljy;> gak; Vw;gLj;Jjy;  
b) mjpHr;rp mila itj;jy;> jpl;Ljy;  
c) fhak; Vw;gLj;Jjy;> jhf;Fjy;  
d) Nkw;fz;l ahTk;

13. njhy;iy nra;J ngz; (Eve-Teasing) kuzkile;jhy; mJ  
a) jw;nfhiy                          b) nfhiy  
c) rpj;utij kuzk;                    d) vJTkpy;iy  
14. kuzk; Vw;gLj;Jk; Nehf;Fld; njhy;iy nra;jhy; rpiwj;jz;lid  
a) 10 tUlK;                          b) 15 tUlK;  
c) ,ul;il MAs;jz;lid                d) MAs;jz;lid





c) mDkjpAld; nry;yyhk;                      d) vJTkpy;iy

28. gpd; tUdtw;wpy; vJ Fw;wk;?

- (i) Fwpg;gpl;l Ntfj;jpw;F mjpgkhf thfdk; Xl;Ljy;
- (ii) myl;rpakhf thfdk; Xl;Ljy;
- (iii) mLj;jtUf;F fhak; Vw;gLj;Jjy;
- (iv) mLj;jtuJ thfdj;ij Nrg;gLj;Jjy;

a) i, ii, iii, iv                                      b) ii, iii, iv  
c) i, ii    d) iii, iv

29. gpd; tUdtw;wpy; vJ Fw;wk;?

- a) kJ mUe;jptpl;L thfdk; Xl;Ljy;
- b) jiyf;ftrk; mzpahky; ,Urf;fu thfdk; Xl;Ljy;
- c) nry;Nghd; Ngrpf; nfhz;L thfdk; Xl;Ljy;
- d) ,itaidj;Jk;

30. xU thfd Xl;LeH thfdk; Xl;Lk;NghJ vd;d Mtzq;fis itj;jpUf;f Ntz;Lk;?

- a) Xl;LeH cupkk;
- b) tz;bapd; gjpT rhd;wpjo;
- c) thfdj;jpw;fhd fhg;gPL rhd;wpjo;
- d) ,itaidj;Jk;

31. kJ mUe;jptpl;L thfdk; Xl;bdhy;

- a) mguhjk;    b) rpiwj;jz;lid
- c) cupkk; uj;J    d) ,it midj;Jk;

**Nghijg;ngHUs; gad;gLj;Jjy; (DRUG ABUSE)**

32. Nghijg; nghUs; gad;gLj;JtJ ve;jr; rl;lg;gb Fw;wkhFk;  
 a) NDPS rl;lk; b) IT rl;lk;  
 c) rhiy tpjpf; rl;lk; d) fhg;Gupikr;rl;lk;
33. Nghijg; nghUs; gad;gLj;Jtjd; jz;lid vjdr; rhHe;jJ?  
 a) msT b) juk;  
 c) tpahghu msT d) vJTkpy;iy
34. Nghijg; nghUs; flj;jiyg; gw;wp mwpe;jhy; Kjypy; ahuplk; njuptpf;f Ntz;Lk;?  
 a) fhty;epiyak; b) mUfpy; cs;s fhty;epiyak;  
 c) caH mjpfhupfs; d) Nkw;fz;l ahTk;
35. Nkw;Fwpg;gpl;l egHfis jtpu NtW ahuplk; Nghijg; nghUs; njhIHghd Fw;wj;ij  
 njuptpf;fyhk;  
 a) khepy jPHit b) kj;jpa jPHit  
 c) Rq;f mjpfhup d) Nkw;fz;l ahTk;
36. Nghijg; nghUs; gad;gLj;Jtjw;F cdf;F njupe;J Ntz;Lnkd;Nw ,lkspj;jhy;  
 a) rl;lg;gbf;Fw;wk; b) fhuzk; \$wpdhy; NghJk;  
 c) a kw;Wk; b d) vJTkpy;iy
37. kUj;JtHfspd; gupe;Jiu ,y;yhky; vtNuDk; Nghijg; nghUs; tpw;why;?  
 a) jz;lid mDgtpf;f Ntz;Lk; b) fhuzk; \$wpdhy; NghJk;  
 c) Fw;wk; ,y;iy d) murhq;fj;jpw;F tupfl;INtz;Lk;
38. Nghijg; nghUs; rl;ltpNuhjkhf ,stH (Minor) gad;gLj;jpdhy; mtHfs; Nky; vLf;fg;gLk;  
 rl;l eltbf;if  
 a) rpWtH rPHjpUj;jg; gs;spf;F mDg;gg;gLtH

- b) rpiwf;F mDg;gg;gLtH
  - c) rl;l eltbf;if ,y;iy
  - d) mwpTiu toq;fg;gLk;
  
- 39. cq;fs; tPl;IUfpy; Nghijg;ngHUs; tpw;gidia fz;lwpe;jhy;
  - a) ngw;Nwhuplk; njuptpg;Ngd;
  - b) ez;gHfsplk; njuptpg;Ngd;
  - c) fhty;epiyaj;jpy; njuptpg;Ngd;
  - d) ahuplKk;; njuptpf;f khI;NIId;
  
- 40. rpWtH rPHjpUj;jr;rl;lK; vjw;fhf nfhz;L tug;gl;IJ?
  - a) Foe;ijfis ftdpf;fTk;> ghJfhf;fTk;
  - b) ,stHfis ftdpf;fTk;> ghJfhf;fTk;
  - c) khztHfis ftdpf;fTk;> ghJfhf;fTk;
  - d) Nkw;fz;l ahTk;.
  
- 41. rl;l;j;pw;F tpNuhjkhf ,isQH xUtH Nghijg;ngHUs; tpw;gid nra;jhy; vd;d  
 jz;lidf;fpilf;Fk;?
  - a) 10 tUl rpiwj; jz;lId
  - b) 20 tUl rpiwj; jz;lId
  - c) 25 tUl rpiwj; jz;lId
  - d) MAs; jz;lId
  
- 42. rpfnul; thq;Ftjw;fhD taJ tuk;G
 

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) 18-f;F fPo;</li> <li>c) 18-tajpw;F Nky;</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) 10-tajpw;Fs;</li> <li>d) vy;yh tajpYk;</li> </ul> |
|--|---|
  
- 43. ve;j rl;l;j;jpd; kPjhd Fw;wq;fspy; Kd; [hkPd; fpilf;fhJ?
  - a) Nghijg; ngHUs; flj;jy; jLg;Gr;rl;lK;

- b) Fz;lH jLg;Gr; rl;lk;  
 c) jho;j;jg;gl;l kw;Wk; goq;Fbapdiu nfhLikg; gLj;Jjy; jLg;Gr;rl;lk;  
 d) ,itaidj;Jk;
44. fPo;Fwpg;gplg;gl;l ,lq;fspy;> ve;j ,lj;jpy; Gifgpbg;gJ jilr; nra;ag;gl;Ls;sJ?  
 a) mYtyfq;fs; b) ,uapy; epiyaq;fs;  
 c) kUj;Jtkidfs; d) ,itaidj;Jk;
45. gs;sp tshfj;jpy; xUtH Gifg;gpbj;jhy; ahH eltb;f;if vLf;f Ntz;Lk;?  
 a) jiyikahrpupaH b) jhshsH  
 c) mYtyf cjtpahsH d) fhty; Ma;thsH
46. fPo; Fwpg;gplg;gl;l;litapy; vitr;rl;l;jpd; %yk; jil nra;ag;gl;Ls;sJ?  
 (i) nghJ ,lq;fspy; Gifgpbg;gJ  
 (ii) 18 tajpw;Fs; Gifapiy nghUl;fis cgNahfpg;gJ  
 (iii) ngz;fs; Gifgpbg;gJ  
 a) (i),(ii),(iii) b) (i)  
 c) (ii) d) (i),(ii)

**Foe;ijj; njhopyhsu;fs; (CHILD LABOURS)**

47. Fiwe;j \$ypf;fhf Foe;ijfis Ntiyf;F gad;gLj;JtJ Foe;ijfspy; vd;d ghjpg;ig  
 Vw;gLj;JfpwJ?  
 a) cly;eyk; b) kdeyk; c) vjpHfhyk; d) midj;Jk;

48. ,e;jpa njhopw;rhiyr;rl;lk; 1948 gpupT – 67 \$WtJ vd;d?
- Foe;ijf;F fy;tp mspf;f
  - 14-taJ epiwtilahj Foe;ijia njhopw;rhiyapy; Ntiy nra;a mDkjpgf;ff; \$lhJ
  - Foe;ijfs; cupikfs; Ngzg;gl Ntz;Lk;
  - vJTkpy;iy
49. Foe;ij njhopyhsH rl;lk; 1986 ,e;jpahpty; vq;F mkypy; ,Uf;fpwJ?
- ,e;jpah KOtJk;
  - fh~;kPH jtpu gpwkhepyq;fspy;
  - Fwpg;gpl;l khtl;lq;fspy; kl;Lk;
  - vJTkpy;iy
50. 3 kzp Neu Ntiyf;F gpd; vj;jid kzp Neuk; Xa;T ju Ntz;Lk;?
- 2 kzp Neuk;
  - 1 kzp Neuk;
  - $\frac{1}{2}$  kzp Neuk;
  - $\frac{1}{4}$  kzp Neuk;
51. 14 tajpw;F Nkw;gl;l Foe;ijfis khiy vj;jid kzpf;F Nky; Ntiy nra;a mDkjpgf;ff;\$lhJ?
- 6 kzpf;F Nky;
  - 7 kzpf;F Nky;
  - 8 kzpf;F Nky;
  - 9 kzpf;F Nky;
52. Foe;ijfSf;fhd ghJfhg;G ngWtjw;fhd cupik vd;gJ
- Ruz;ly;fspy; ,Ue;J ghJfhg;G
  - nfhLikfspy; ,Ue;J ghJfhg;G
  - kdpj jd;ikaw;w Kiwapy; fPo;j;jukhf ele;JtjppUe;J ghJfhg;G
  - Nkw;\$wpa midj;Jk;



53. ,e;jpa Fw;wtpay; rl;lq;gb vJ jz;lidf;Fupa Fw;wk;  
 i. Foe;ijfis Nkhrb nra;tJ  
 ii. jtwhf milj;J itj;jy;  
 iii. 18 tajpw;Fl;gl;l Foe;ijfis jpULtJ  
 iv. 18 tajpw;Fl;gl;ltHfis tpw;gJ  
 a) i, ii, iii, iv                      b) i, ii, iii                      c) i, iii, iv                      d) iii, iv
54. ,e;jpar; rl;lq;gb vj;jid tajpw;Fl;gl;ltHfis; Foe;ijfshf fUjg;gLthHfis;?  
 a) 18 taJf;F fPo; cs;stHfis;  
 b) 16 taJf;F fPo; cs;stHfis;  
 c) 12 taJf;F fPo; cs;stHfis;  
 d) 10 taJf;F fPo; cs;stHfis;
55. ,e;jpar; rl;lq;gb 24-d; gb vj;jid taJ G+Hj;jpahFk; tiu jPq;F tpistpf;Fk; #o;epiyapy;  
 Ntiy nra;a jil vd;fpw ghJfhg;G cupik cs;sJ?  
 a) 14 taJ G+Hj;jpahFk; tiu  
 b) 18 taJ G+Hj;jpahFk; tiu  
 c) 12 taJ G+Hj;jpahFk; tiu  
 d) 6 taJ G+Hj;jpahFk; tiu
56. Foe;ijfspd; cupik ahJ?  
 a) rkkhd cupik  
 b) ghugl;rkhf elj;jg;gLtjw;F vjpuhd cupik  
 c) jdpq;gl;l Rje;jpuj;jpw;Fk; rl;lG+Htkhd nray;ghLfSf;fhhd cupik  
 d) ,it midj;Jk;

57. Foe;ijfSf;fhd cjtp njhiyNgrp vz; ahJ  
 a) 1098                      b) 1097                      c) 1001                      d) 1091
58. Foe;ijfSf;F cly; uPjpahd jz;lid toq;Ftij ve;j rl;lk; Fw;wk; vd;fpwJ?  
 a) fy;tp cupikr;rl;lk;                      b) Fw;wtpay; rl;lk;  
 c) kdpj cupikr;rl;lk;                      d) ,it midj;Jk;
59. Foe;ijfis Ntiyf;F mkHj;jpdhy; ahUf;F jz;lid fpilf;Fk;  
 a) Ntiyf;F itj;Jf;nfhs;gtH                      b) ngw;NwhH my;yJ ghJfhtyH  
 c) nghWg;ghsHfs;                      d) Nkw;\$wpa midj;Jk;

**fy;tp fw;Fk; cupik (RIGHT TO EDUCATION)**

60. fy;tp fw;gJ ekJ  
 a) mbg;gil cupik                      b) mbg;gil flik  
 c) mbg;gilj;Njit                      d) vJTkpy;iy
61. ,e;jpa murpayikg;gpd; gb ,ytrf; fl;lhaf; fy;tp vd;gJ  
 a) 5 tajpy; Kjy; tFg;gpy; NrHj;jy;  
 b) ,J fl;lhaf;fy;tp  
 c) vl;lhk; tFg;G tiu ,ilepWj;jhky; gbj;jy;  
 d) Nkw;fz;l ahTk;
62. ,e;jpa murpayikg;Gr; rl;lg;gpupT -46 fy;tpapy; vg;gpuptpdUf;F Kf;fpaj;Jtk;  
 nfhLf;fpwJ?  
 a) goq;FbapdH                      b) jho;j;jg;gl;NIhH  
 c) a kw;Wk; b                      d) vJTkpy;iy

63. ,e;jpa rl;l;jjpd; gb vj;jid tajpw;Fl;gl;ltHfSf;F ,ytrf;fy;tp ngWtjw;fhd cupik cs;sJ?  
 a) 6-14                      b) 6-18                      c) 6-10                      d) 6-12
64. fy;tp cupikr; rl;l;jjpd;gb> vy;yhg; gs;spfSk; vj;jid tpOf;fhL ,lq;fis mjd; mUfhikapy;  
 ,Uf;Fk; eype;j gpuptpdH tha;g;Gfs; kWf;fg;gl;l Foe;ijfSf;F xJf;f Ntz;Lk;  
 a) 25%                      b) 30%                      c) 10%                      d) 5%
65. fy;tp cupikr;rl;l;jjpd; gb khztHfspd; gs;sp NrHf;ifapd; NghJ  
 i. NjHTfs; elj;jf; \$lhJ  
 ii. tha;nkhop tpdhf;fs; Nfl;ff;\$lhJ  
 iii. ed;nfhil thq;ff; \$lhJ  
 iv. ngw;Nwhuplk; tha;nkhop tpdhf;fs; Nfl;ff; \$lhJ  
 a) i, ii                      b) i, ii, iii, iv                      c) i, ii, iv                      d) i, iv
66. fy;tp fw;Fk; cupikr;rl;l;g;gb MrpupaHfs; jdpq; gapw;rp tFg;G vLj;jhy;?  
 a) jdpq;gapw;rp tFg;G vLf;fyhk;  
 b) MrpupaUf;F gjtp caHT toq;fg;gLk;  
 c) jz;lid vJk; fpilahJ  
 d) gzptpjpfspd;gb xOq;F eltb;f;if vLf;fg;gLk;
67. fy;tpfw;Fk; cupikr; rl;l;g;gb khztHfis cly; kw;Wk; kd uPjpahf Jd;GWj;jpdhy;  
 a) mJ jtwpy;iy  
 b) khztHfs; jpUe;Jtjw;fhd tha;g;G  
 c) gzptpjpfspd;gb xOq;F eltb;f;if  
 d) vJTkpy;iy

68. fy;tpf; fw;Fk; cupikr; rl;lg;gb ed;nfhil t#ypj;jhy; vd;d jz;lid toq;fg;gLk;?  
a) t#ypj;j ed;nfhilj; njhifiag; Nghy 10 klq;F mjpgf mguhjk; fl;INtz;Lk;  
b) t#ypj;j ed;nfhilia jpUg;gpf; nfhLj;jhy; NghJk;  
c) ed;nfhil t#ypj;j khztdplk; fy;tpf; fl;lzk; thq;fhky; ,Uj;jy;  
d) ,itaidj;Jk;
69. fy;tpf;fw;Fk; cupikr; rl;lg;gb gs;spfspd; mq;fPfhuk; jpUk;g ngw;w gpwFk; gs;sp  
nray;gl;lhy; vd;d mguhjk; tpjpgf;fg;gLk;.  
a) & 1 yl;rk; mguhjk;  
b) njhlHe;J kPwpdhy; xt;nthU ehSf;Fk; & 10000 mguhjk;  
c) a kw;Wk; b  
d) vJTkpy;iy

**gpw (OTHER CRIMES)**

70. 16-tajpw;Fl;gl;l Foe;ijfspd; Fw;wk; ep&gpf;fg;gl;lhy; vd;d jz;lid toq;fg;gLk;?  
a) rpiwj;jz;lid  
b) MAs; jz;lid  
c) rpWtH rPHjpUj;jg; gs;spf;F mDg;Gjy;  
d) mguhjk; kl;Lk;
71. FIR vd;gJ  
i. Kjy; jfty; mwpf;if  
ii. Fw;wk; rhl;lg;gl;ltH kPJ fhtyuhy; gjpag;gLk; tof;F Mtzk;  
iii. Kjypy; Fw;wk; nra;jtH \$wpa tpguk; kl;Lk;  
a) i                                  b) ii                                  c) i, iii                                  d) i, ii, iii
72. FIR gjpT nra;j gpd;  
a) mjd; efiy GfhH jUeUf;F mspf;fyhk;

- b) efiy ePjpkd;wj;jpw;F mspf;f Ntz;Lk;  
c) a kw;Wk; b  
d) efiy GfhH jUeUf;F nfhLj;jy; \$lhJ
73. xU Fw;wj;jpw;F fhty;epiyaj;jpy; FIR gjpT nra;a Ntz;Lkhdhy;  
i. Fw;wk; ele;j ,lj;ij epHtffp;Fk; fhty; epiyaj;jpy; GfhH mspf;f Ntz;Lk;  
ii. ghjpf;fg; gl;ltupd; ifnaOj;Njh> ifNuifNah Gfhupy; ,lk;ngw Ntz;Lk;  
iii. fhtyH Fw;wk; ele;J ,Ug;gij cWjp nra;a Ntz;Lk;  
a) i                          b) ii                          c) i, iii                          d) i, ii, iii
74. ahUila cj;jutpd; Ngupy; fhty; epiya mjpfhupfs; Vw;f kWj;j Gfhupd; Nky; tprhuiz  
elj;JthHfs;?  
a) ePjpgjp                          b) fhty;epiya Ma;thsH  
c) cjtp Ma;thsH                          d) rl;lkd;w cWg;gpdH
75. Fw;wj;ij tprhupf;Fk; fhty;epiya mjpfhup tprhuizf;fhf Fw;w gpd;dzp kw;Wk;  
Fw;wj;ij gw;wp njupe;jpUf;f tha;g;Gs;s egHfis Nehl;B]; mDg;gp mioj;J  
nry;yhkypUe;jhy;  
a) ePjpkd;wj;jpd; %yk; eltbf;if vLf;fg;gLk;  
b) jiykiwthfyhk;  
c) rpiwapy; milf;fg;gLthHfs;  
d) ,itaidj;Jk;
76. Fw;wtpay; eilKiwg;gb ahiu Nehl;B]; mDg;gp fhty; mjpfhupfs; tprhuizf;F mioj;jy;  
\$lhJ?  
i. ngz;fs;

- ii. 15 taJf;Fl;gl;l rpWtHfs;  
 iii. tajhdtHfs;  
 iv. tzpfHfs;
- a) i, ii                      b) ii, iii, iv                      c) ii, iv                      d) i, ii, iii, iv
77. ,e;jpa Fw;wtpay; eilKiwg;gb Fw;wj;jpw;fhd rhl;rpahf NrHf;fg;gl;ltH  
 fhty;epiyaj;jpy; mspj;j rhl;rpf;F vjpuhf ePjpkd;w tprhuizapd; NghJ khw;wpf;  
 \$wpdhy;?
- a) jz;lidf;Fupa Fw;wk;  
 b) rl;lg;gb eltbf;if vLf;fg;gLk;  
 c) Fw;wkpy;iy  
 d) ,itaidj;Jk;
78. tprhuiz ele;J nfhz;bUf;Fk; tof;fpy; Fw;wk; rhl;lg;gl;ltH Fw;wj;ij xg;Gf; nfhs;tjdhy;  
 ahUila Kd;dpiyapy; rhl;rpahf NrHf;f Ntz;Lk;?
- a) Fw;wtpay; ePjpkd;w ePjggjaplk;  
 b) fhty;epiya cjtp Ma;thsH  
 c) fhty;epiya Ma;thsH  
 d) Nkw;\$wpa midtUk;
79. Fw;wk; rhl;lg;gl;l xU egIU ifJ nra;Ak; NghJ fhtyH vd;d nra;a Ntz;Lk;?
- a) mtIU iftpyq;fpl Ntz;Lk;  
 b) mtIU mbj;J gpd;Gwkhf ifia fl;b iftpyq;fpl Ntz;Lk;  
 c) mtIUj; njhl;L ePq;fs; ifJ nra;ag;gl;bUf;fpwPHfs; vd;W \$wpdhy; NghJk;  
 d) ,itaidj;Jk;
80. ePjpkd;wj;jpy; jhf;fy; nra;ag;gLfpd;w Fw;wg;gj;jpupf;ifapy; fPo; Fwpg;gpl;Ls;s  
 vitnay;yhk; ,lk; ngw Ntz;Lk;?
- a) Fw;wk; rhl;lg;gl;ltupd; Nky; tpyhrk;

- b) Fw;wj;jpd; jd;ik  
 c) rhl;rpfSila Nky; tpyhrk;  
 d) ,itaidj;Jk;
81. tprhuizf;fhf Fw;wk; rhl;lg;gl;ltH ifJ nra;ag;gl;lhy; mtIU vg;NghOJ ePjpkd;wj;jpy;  
 M[H gLj;j Ntz;Lk;?  
 a) 24 kzp Neuj;jpy; b) 2 ehisf;Fs;  
 c) 12 kzp Neuj;jpw;Fs; d) 5 ehisf;Fs;
82. xU jw;nfhiy ele;jhy; fhty;Jiw mjpfhup vd;dr; nra;a Ntz;Lk;?  
 i. tprhuiz elj;j Ntz;Lk;  
 ii. gpNuj gupNrhjid nra;a eltb;f;if vLf;f Ntz;Lk;  
 iii. gpNuj gupNrhjid nra;ahky; mJ jw;nfhiy vd KbT nra;ayhk;  
 iv. ,itaidj;Jk;  
 a) i, ii b) i, ii, iii c) i, iii d) iv
82. [hkpd; fpilf;ff; \$ba Fw;wq;fspy; xU egH ifJ nra;ag;gl;lhy; mtIU [hkPdpy;  
 tpLtjw;fhd mjpfhuk; ahUf;F cs;sJ?  
 a) fhty;epiyaj;jpy; fhty; mjpfhup b) rl;lkd;w cWg;gpdH  
 c) ghuhSkd;w cWg;gpdH d) khtl;l MI;rpaH
84. jfty; mwpAk; cupikr; rl;l;jpd; gb fPo;Fwpg;gpl;Ls;s ve;j jftiy ngw KbahJ?  
 a) ,uhZt ,ufrpak;  
 b) ,e;jpahtpd; ghJfhg;G  
 c) ePjpkd;w cj;jTg;gb jilnra;ag;gl;l jfty;  
 d) ,itaidj;Jk;

85. ePjpkd;w [hkpd; fpilf;fhj Fw;wj;jpw;F epge;jidfNshL [hkpd; toq;f fhuzk; ahJ?  
i. Fw;wk; rhl;lg;gl;ltH ePjpkd;wj;jpy; Fwpg;gpl;l ehspy; M[uhfhky; ,Ug;gij jLf;f  
ii. Fw;wk; rhl;lg;gl;ltH jiykiwthfhky; ,Uf;f  
iii. rhl;rpfis mopf;f  
a) i                              b) ii                              c) iii                              d) i, ii
86. fPo; Fwpg;gplg;gl;litapy; vJ irgH Fw;wk;?  
a) Mghr glq;fs; mDg;GtJ  
b) mDkjp ,y;yhky; nry;Nghid cgNahfpj;J glk; gpbg;gJ  
c) njhiy njhIHG rhjdq;fs; %yk; kpul;LtJ  
d) ,itaidj;Jk;
87. ,e;jpa Foe;ij jpUkz rl;lg;gb vj;jid tajpw;F Fiwthd Mz;fSf;F elf;Fk; jpUkzk; Foe;ij jpUkzk; MFk;?  
a) 21                              b) 18                              c) 16                              d) 19
88. rl;lg;gbahd jpUkzj;jpw;F ngz;fSf;F vj;jid taJ epiwtila Ntz;Lk;  
a) 18                              b) 20                              c) 16                              d) 21
89. Foe;ij jpUkz jLg;G rl;lg;gb Fw;wthsp ahH?  
a) jpUkzk; nra;J nfhz;l thypgH  
b) jpUkzj;ij elj;jpatH  
c) J}z;bath kw;Wk; njspTg;gLj;jpatH  
d) Nkw;\$wpa midtUk;
90. Foe;ij jpUkzj; jLg;G rl;l; 2006-d; gb Fw;wk; Gupe;jtHfSf;F toq;fg;gLk; jz;lid



- a) xU yl;rk; &gha; mguhjk;                      b) 2 Mz;L fLq;fhty; jz;lid  
 c) a kw;Wk; b    d) 10 Mz;L fLq;fhty;

91. cq;fs; Cupy; ahUf;fhtJ Foe;ij jpUkzk; eilngw ,Ue;jhy;> mij jLg;gjw;F ahuplk;  
 GfhH njuptpg;gPH?

- a) mUfpy; cs;s fhty; epiyak;                      b) cq;fs; ngw;Nwhuplk;  
 c) gs;sp jiyikahrpupauplk;                      d) gs;sp Mrpupauplk;

**vd;. tp. Nf. v];. b fy;tpapay; fy;Y}up>**

**Mw;W}H.**

***rl;l tpopg;GzHT NjHT***

jahupg;G : Nkup ~fpyh S & Mr. gpurhj; P.S

(Final Dryout)

Fwpg;G :

,e;j tpdhj;jhs; njhFg;gpy; rl;l tpopg;GzHT njhIHghd 41 tpdhf;fs;>  
 rupahd tpilia NjHe;njLj;J vOJk; tifapy; nfhLf;fg;gl;Ls;sd. xt;nthU tpdhTf;Fk; 4  
 tpilfs; nfhLf;fg;gl;Ls;sd. mtw;iw ftdkhf thrpj;J cq;fSf;F jdpahf nfhLf;fg;gLk;  
 tpilj;jhspy; cq;fs; tpilia tl;lk; nra;J fh;lITk;. ve;jf; Nfs;tpiaAk; jtpHf;f Ntz;lhk;. jaTnra;J ,e;j tpdhj;jhspy; tl;lk; nra;a Ntz;lhk; vdf; Nfl;Lf; nfhs;fpNwd;.

**Nghijapy; thfdk; XI;Ljy; (DRUNKEN DRIVEN)**

- 1 rhiyapy; Mgj;ij tpistpf;Fk; tifapy; tpjpfis kPwp thfdk; XI;bdhy;
  - a) rl;lg;gb Fw;wk;
  - b) Fw;wkpy;iy
  - c) mwpTiu toq;fg;gLk;
  - d) vJTkpy;iy
- 2 thfdk; tpgj;jpy; kh;l;bdhy; njuptpf;f Ntz;baJ ahuplk;?
  - a) fhty;epiyak;
  - b) khtl;l MI;rpaH
  - c) ePjpkd;wk;
  - d) rl;l mjpfhup
- 3 gpd; tUdtw;wpy; vJ Fw;wk;?
  - a) kJ mUe;jptpl;L thfdk; XI;Ljy;
  - b) jiyf;ftrk; mzpahky; ,Urf;fu thfdk; XI;Ljy;
  - c) nry;Nghd; Ngrpf; nfhz;L thfdk; XI;Ljy;
  - d) ,itaidj;Jk;

- 4 ,Urf;fu thfdj;jpy; ,uz;L egUf;F Nky; mkHe;J nrd;why;  
 a) Fw;wk; b) Fw;wkpy;iy  
 c) mDkjpAld; nry;yyhk; d) vJTkpy;iy
- 5 gpd; tUtdtw;wpy; vJ Fw;wk;?  
 (v) Fwpg;gpl;l Ntfj;jpw;F mjpgkhf thfdk; Xl;Ljy;  
 (vi) myl;rpakhf thfdk; Xl;Ljy;  
 (vii)mLj;jtUf;F fhak; Vw;gLj;Jjy;  
 (viii) mLj;jtuJ thfdj;ij Nrg;gLj;Jjy;  
 a) i, ii, iii, iv b) ii, iii, iv  
 c) i, ii d) iii, iv
- 6 xU thfd Xl;LeH thfdk; Xl;Lk;NghJ vd;d Mtzq;fis itj;jpUf;f Ntz;Lk;?  
 a) Xl;LeH cupkk;  
 b) tz;bapd; gjpT rhd;wpjo;  
 c) thfdj;jpw;fhd fhg;gPL rhd;wpjo;  
 d) ,itaidj;Jk;

**Nghijg;ngHUs; gad;gLj;Jjy; (DRUG ABUSE)**

- 7 kUj;JtHfspd; gupe;Jiu ,y;yhky; vtNuDk; Nghijg; ngHUs; tpw;why;?  
 a) jz;lid mDgtpf;f Ntz;Lk; b) fhuzk; \$wpdhy; NghJk;  
 c) Fw;wk; ,y;iy d) murhq;fj;jpw;F tupfl;INtz;Lk;

- 8 Nghijg; nghUs; rl;ltPNUhjkhf ,stH (Minor) gad;gLj;jpdhy; mtHfs; Nky; vLf;fg;gLk;  
rl;l eltbf;if
- rpWtH rPHjpUj;jg; gs;spf;F mDg;gg;gLtH
  - rpiwf;F mDg;gg;gLtH
  - rl;l eltbf;if ,y;iy
  - mwpTiu toq;fg;gLk;
- 9 cq;fs; tPl;lUfpy; Nghijg;nghUs; tpw;gidia fz;lwpe;jhy;
- ngw;Nwhuplk; njuptpg;Ngd;
  - ez;gHfsplk; njuptpg;Ngd;
  - fhty;epiyaj;jpy; njuptpg;Ngd;
  - ahuplKk;; njuptpf;f khl;Nld;
- 10 rpWtH rPHjpUj;jr;rl;lk; vjw;fhf nfhz;L tug;gl;lj?
- Foe;ijfis ftdpf;fTk;> ghJfhf;fTk;
  - ,stHfis ftdpf;fTk;> ghJfhf;fTk;
  - khztHfis ftdpf;fTk;> ghJfhf;fTk;
  - Nkw;fz;l ahTk;.
- 11 rpfnul; thq;Ftjw;fhd taJ tuk;G
- |                    |                  |
|--------------------|------------------|
| a) 18-f;F fPo;     | b) 10-tajpw;Fs;  |
| c) 18-tajpw;F Nky; | d) vy;yh tajpYk; |
- 12 ve;j rl;l;jpd; kPjhd Fw;wq;fspy; Kd; [hkPd; fpilf;fhJ?
- Nghijg; nghUs; flj;jy; jLg;Gr;rl;lk;
  - Fz;lH jLg;Gr; rl;lk;
  - jho;j;jg;gl;l kw;Wk; goq;Fbapdiu nfhLikg; gLj;Jjy; jLg;Gr;rl;lk;

- d) ,itaidj;Jk;
- 13 fPo;Fwpg;gplg;gl;l ,lq;fspy;> ve;j ,lj;jpy; Gifgpbg;gJ jilr; nra;ag;gl;Ls;sJ?  
 a) mYtyfq;fs; b) ,uapy; epiyaq;fs;  
 c) kUj;Jtkidfs; d) ,itaidj;Jk;
- 14 gs;sp tshfj;jpy; xUtH Gifg;gpbj;jhy; ahH eltb;f;if vLf;f Ntz;Lk;?  
 a) jiyikahrpupaH b) jhshsH  
 c) mYtyf cjtpahsH d) fhty; Ma;thsH

### Foe;ijj; njhopyhsu;fs; (CHILD LABOURS)

- 15 Fiwe;j \$ypf;fhf Foe;ijfis Ntiyf;F gad;gLj;JtJ Foe;ijfspy; vd;d ghjpg;ig  
 Vw;gLj;JfpwJ?  
 a) cly;eyk; b) kdeyk; c) vjpHfhyk; d) midj;Jk;
- 16 3 kzp Neu Ntiyf;F gpd; vj;jid kzp Neuk; Xa;T ju Ntz;Lk;?  
 a) 2 kzp Neuk; b) 1 kzp Neuk;  
 c)  $\frac{1}{2}$  kzp Neuk; d)  $\frac{1}{4}$  kzp Neuk;
- 17 Foe;ijfSf;fhd ghJfhg;G ngWtjw;fhd cupik vd;gJ  
 a) Ruz;ly;fspy; ,Ue;J ghJfhg;G  
 b) nfhLikfspy; ,Ue;J ghJfhg;G  
 c) kdpj jd;ikaw;w Kiwapy; fPo;j;jukhf ele;JtjppUe;J ghJfhg;G  
 d) Nkw;\$wpa midj;Jk;
- 18 ,e;jpa Fw;wtpay; rl;lg;gb vJ jz;lidf;Fupa Fw;wk;  
 v. Foe;ijfis Nkhrb nra;tJ  
 vi. jtwhf milj;J itj;jy;  
 vii. 18 tajpw;Fl;gl;l Foe;ijfis jpULtJ  
 viii. 18 tajpw;Fl;gl;ltHfis tpw;gJ

- a) i, ii, iii, iv      b) i, ii, iii      c) i, iii, iv      d) iii, iv

19 ,e;jpar; rl;lq;gb vj;jid tajpw;Fl;gl;ltHfs; Foe;ijfshf fUjg;gLthHfs;?

- a) 18 taJf;F fPo; cs;stHfs;  
 b) 16 taJf;F fPo; cs;stHfs;  
 c) 12 taJf;F fPo; cs;stHfs;  
 d) 10 taJf;F fPo; cs;stHfs;

20 Foe;ijfspd; cupik ahJ?

- a) rkkhd cupik  
 b) ghugl;rkhf elj;jg;gLtjw;F vjpuhd cupik  
 c) jdpq;gl;l Rje;jpuj;jpw;Fk; rl;lG+Htkhd nray;ghLfSf;fhd cupik  
 d) ,it midj;Jk;

21 Foe;ijfis Ntiyf;F mkHj;jpdhy; ahUf;F jz;lid fpilf;Fk;

- a) Ntiyf;F itj;Jf;nfhs;gtH      b) ngw;NwhH my;yJ ghJfhtyH  
 c) nghWg;ghsHfs;      d) Nkw;\$wpa midj;Jk;

**fy;tp fw;Fk; cupik (RIGHT TO EDUCATION)**

22 fy;tp fw;gJ ekJ

- a) mbg;gil cupik      b) mbg;gil flik  
 c) mbg;gilj;Njit      d) vJTkpy;iy

23 ,e;jpa murpayikg;gpd; gb ,ytrf; fl;lhaf; fy;tp vd;gJ

- a) 5 tajpy; Kjy; tFg;gpy; NrHj;jy;  
 b) ,J fl;lhaf;fy;tp

- c) vl;lhk; tFg;G tiu ,ilepWj;jhky; gbj;jy;  
d) Nkw;fz;l ahTk;
- 24 ,e;jpa murpayikg;Gr; rl;lg;gpupT -46 fy;tpapy; vg;gpuptpdUf;F Kf;fpaj;Jtk;  
nfhLf;fpwJ?  
a) goq;FbapdH  
b) jho;j;jg;gl;NIhH  
c) a kw;Wk; b  
d) vJTkpy;iy
- 25 ,e;jpa rl;l;j;jpd; gb vj;jid tajpw;Fl;gl;ltHfSf;F ,ytrf;fy;tp ngWtjw;fhd cupik cs;sJ?  
a) 6-14  
b) 6-18  
c) 6-10  
d) 6-12
- 26 fy;tp cupikr;rl;l;j;jpd; gb khztHfspd; gs;sp NrHf;ifapd; NghJ  
v. NjHTfs; elj;jf; \$lhJ  
vi. tha;nkhop tpdhf;fs; Nfl;ff;\$lhJ  
vii. ed;nfhil thq;ff; \$lhJ  
viii. ngw;Nwhuplk; tha;nkhop tpdhf;fs; Nfl;ff; \$lhJ  
a) i, ii  
b) i, ii, iii, iv  
c) i, ii, iv  
d) i, iv
- 27 fy;tpfw;Fk; cupikr; rl;lg;gb khztHfis cly; kw;Wk; kd uPjpahf Jd;GWj;jpdhy;  
a) mJ jtwpy;iy  
b) khztHfs; jpUe;Jtjw;fhd tha;g;G  
c) gzptpjpfspd;gb xOq;F eltb;f;if  
d) vJTkpy;iy
- 28 fy;tpf;fw;Fk; cupikr; rl;lg;gb gs;spfspd; mq;fPfhuk; jpUk;g ngw;w gpwFk; gs;sp  
nray;gl;lhy; vd;d mguhjk; tpjpf;fg;gLk;.  
a) & 1 yl;rk; mguhjk;  
b) njhlHe;J kPwpdhy; xt;nthU ehSf;Fk; & 10000 mguhjk;

- c) a kw;Wk; b
- d) vJTkpy;iy

**gpw (OTHER CRIMES)**

- 29 16-tajpw;Fl;gl;l Foe;ijfspd; Fw;wk; ep&gpf;fg;gl;lhy; vd;d jz;lid toq;fg;gLk;?
- a) rpiwj;jz;lid
  - b) MAs; jz;lid
  - c) rpWtH rPHjpUj;jg; gs;spf;F mDg;Gjy;
  - d) mguhjk; kl;Lk;
- 30 Fw;wj;ij tprhupf;Fk; fhty;epiya mjpgfhup tprhuizf;fhf Fw;w gpd;dzp kw;Wk;  
Fw;wj;ij gw;wp njupe;jpUf;f tha;g;Gs;s egHfis Nehl;B]; mDg;gp mioj;J  
nry;yhkypUe;jhy;
- a) ePjpkd;wj;jpd; %yk; eltbf;if vLf;fg;gLk;
  - b) jiykiwthfyhk;
  - c) rpiwapy; milf;fg;gLthHfs;
  - d) ,itaidj;Jk;
- 31 ePjpkd;wj;jpy; jhf;fy; nra;ag;gLfpd;w Fw;wg;gj;jpupf;ifapy; fPo; Fwpg;gpl;Ls;s  
vitnay;yhk; ,lk; ngw Ntz;Lk;?
- a) Fw;wk; rhl;lg;gl;ltupd; Nky; tpyhrk;
  - b) Fw;wj;jpd; jd;ik
  - c) rhl;rpfSila Nky; tpyhrk;
  - d) ,itaidj;Jk;
- 32 tprhuizf;fhf Fw;wk; rhl;lg;gl;ltH ifJ nra;ag;gl;lhy; mtIU vg;NghOJ ePjpkd;wj;jpy;  
M[H gLj;j Ntz;Lk;?





- 38 ,e;jpa Foe;ij jpUkz rl;lg;gb vj;jid tajpw;F Fiwthd Mz;fSf;F elf;Fk; jpUkzk; Foe;ij  
jpUkzk; MFk;?
- a) 21                      b) 18                      c) 16                      d) 19
- 39 rl;lg;gbahd jpUkzj;jpw;F ngz;fSf;F vj;jid taJ epiwtila Ntz;Lk;
- a) 18                      b) 20                      c) 16                      d) 21
- 40 Foe;ij jpUkz jLg;G rl;lg;gb Fw;wthsp ahH?
- a) jpUkzk; nra;J nfhz;l thypgH
- b) jpUkzj;ij elj;jpath
- c) J}z;bath kw;Wk; njspTg;gLj;jpath
- d) Nkw;\$wpa midtUk;
- 41 Foe;ij jpUkzj; jLg;G rl;lk; 2006-d; gb Fw;wk; Gupe;jtHfSf;F toq;fg;gLk; jz;lid
- a) xU yl;rk; &gha; mguhjk;                      b) 2 Mz;L fLq;fhty; jz;lid
- c) a kw;Wk; b                      d) 10 Mz;L fLq;fhty;

## Appendix - D

## RESPONSE SHEET FOR LEGAL AWARENESS TEST

ri;l tpopg;Gzu;T Nju;tpd; tpilfs; gjpT gbtk;

| tpdh vz;<br>Question<br>No | Answers / tpilfs; |   |   |   | tpdh vz;<br>Question<br>No | Answers / tpilfs; |   |   |   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|----------------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|
| 1                          | a                 | b | c | d | 31                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 2                          | a                 | b | c | d | 32                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 3                          | a                 | b | c | d | 33                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 4                          | a                 | b | c | d | 34                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 5                          | a                 | b | c | d | 35                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 6                          | a                 | b | c | d | 36                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 7                          | a                 | b | c | d | 37                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 8                          | a                 | b | c | d | 38                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 9                          | a                 | b | c | d | 39                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 10                         | a                 | b | c | d | 40                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 11                         | a                 | b | c | d | 41                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 12                         | a                 | b | c | d | 42                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 13                         | a                 | b | c | d | 43                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 14                         | a                 | b | c | d | 44                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 15                         | a                 | b | c | d | 45                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 16                         | a                 | b | c | d | 46                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 17                         | a                 | b | c | d | 47                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 18                         | a                 | b | c | d | 48                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 19                         | a                 | b | c | d | 49                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 20                         | a                 | b | c | d | 50                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 21                         | a                 | b | c | d | 51                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 22                         | a                 | b | c | d | 52                         | a                 | b | c | d |

|    |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|
| 23 | a | b | c | d | 53 | a | b | c | d |
| 24 | a | b | c | d | 54 | a | b | c | d |
| 25 | a | b | c | d | 55 | a | b | c | d |
| 26 | a | b | c | d | 56 | a | b | c | d |
| 27 | a | b | c | d | 57 | a | b | c | d |
| 28 | a | b | c | d | 58 | a | b | c | d |
| 29 | a | b | c | d | 59 | a | b | c | d |
| 30 | a | b | c | d | 60 | a | b | c | d |
| 61 | a | b | c | d | 81 | a | b | c | d |
| 62 | a | b | c | d | 82 | a | b | c | d |
| 63 | a | b | c | d | 83 | a | b | c | d |
| 64 | a | b | c | d | 84 | a | b | c | d |
| 65 | a | b | c | d | 85 | a | b | c | d |
| 66 | a | b | c | d | 86 | a | b | c | d |
| 67 | a | b | c | d | 87 | a | b | c | d |
| 68 | a | b | c | d | 88 | a | b | c | d |
| 69 | a | b | c | d | 89 | a | b | c | d |
| 70 | a | b | c | d | 90 | a | b | c | d |
| 71 | a | b | c | d | 91 | a | b | c | d |
| 72 | a | b | c | d |    |   |   |   |   |
| 73 | a | b | c | d |    |   |   |   |   |
| 74 | a | b | c | d |    |   |   |   |   |
| 75 | a | b | c | d |    |   |   |   |   |
| 76 | a | b | c | d |    |   |   |   |   |
| 77 | a | b | c | d |    |   |   |   |   |
| 78 | a | b | c | d |    |   |   |   |   |
| 79 | a | b | c | d |    |   |   |   |   |
| 80 | a | b | c | d |    |   |   |   |   |

## Appendix - E

## RESPONSE SHEET FOR LEGAL AWARENESS TEST

ri;l tpopg;Gzu;T Nju;tpd; tpilfs; gjpT gbtk;

| tpdh vz;<br>Question<br>No | Answers / tpilfs; |   |   |   | tpdh vz;<br>Question<br>No | Answers / tpilfs; |   |   |   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|----------------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|
| 1                          | a                 | b | c | d | 31                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 2                          | a                 | b | c | d | 32                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 3                          | a                 | b | c | d | 33                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 4                          | a                 | b | c | d | 34                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 5                          | a                 | b | c | d | 35                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 6                          | a                 | b | c | d | 36                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 7                          | a                 | b | c | d | 37                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 8                          | a                 | b | c | d | 38                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 9                          | a                 | b | c | d | 39                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 10                         | a                 | b | c | d | 40                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 11                         | a                 | b | c | d | 41                         | a                 | b | c | d |
| 12                         | a                 | b | c | d |                            |                   |   |   |   |
| 13                         | a                 | b | c | d |                            |                   |   |   |   |
| 14                         | a                 | b | c | d |                            |                   |   |   |   |
| 15                         | a                 | b | c | d |                            |                   |   |   |   |
| 16                         | a                 | b | c | d |                            |                   |   |   |   |
| 17                         | a                 | b | c | d |                            |                   |   |   |   |
| 18                         | a                 | b | c | d |                            |                   |   |   |   |
| 19                         | a                 | b | c | d |                            |                   |   |   |   |
| 20                         | a                 | b | c | d |                            |                   |   |   |   |

|    |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 21 | a | b | c | d |
| 22 | a | b | c | d |
| 23 | a | b | c | d |
| 24 | a | b | c | d |
| 25 | a | b | c | d |
| 26 | a | b | c | d |
| 27 | a | b | c | d |

### Appendix – F

#### N.V.K.S.D. COLLEGE OF EDUCATION ATTOOR (2013 – 2014)

#### LEGAL AWARENESS TEST (KEY ANSWERS)

| Answer Key | Selected question | Answer Key | Selected question |
|------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|
| a          | 1                 | a          | 22                |
| a          | 2                 | d          | 23                |
| d          | 3                 | c          | 24                |
| a          | 4                 | a          | 25                |
| a          | 5                 | b          | 26                |
| d          | 6                 | c          | 27                |
| a          | 7                 | c          | 28                |
| a          | 8                 | c          | 29                |
| c          | 9                 | a          | 30                |
| d          | 10                | d          | 31                |
| c          | 11                | a          | 32                |
| d          | 12                | a          | 33                |
| d          | 13                | d          | 34                |
| a          | 14                | b          | 35                |
| d          | 15                | d          | 36                |

|   |    |   |    |
|---|----|---|----|
| b | 16 | d | 37 |
| d | 17 | a | 38 |
| a | 18 | a | 39 |
| a | 19 | d | 40 |
| d | 20 | c | 41 |
| d | 21 |   |    |