ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

# Life Skills Of Youth In Chennai Slums

**RICHARD M.P.,** Research Scholar, Research & Development Centre, Bharathiar University, Coimbtore-46

**Dr S. ARUL PRASAD.,** Research Supervisor, Research & Development Centre, Bharathiar University , Coimbtore-46 , Associate Professor- Department of Rural Development Science, Arul Anandar College, Karumathur, Madurai-14

**ABSTRACT**

Slums are universal in character and no country is able to get rid of them. Large-scale migration to the cities due to employment opportunities and other community facilities, an income level which is inadequate to maintain decent standards of living are some of the major contributory factors responsible for the growth of slums especially in Chennai as per Tamilnadu slum clearance board. Life Skills have been defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) **as** psychosocial abilities for adaptive and positive behavior that enable individuals to deal effectively with the demands and challenges of everyday life. The youth from slums due to lack of effective utilization of their skills are still in a lower level jobs and have not climbed to great ladders. The youth pursuing their graduation or pursuing their post graduation belonging to the age group between eighteen to twenty four years of age from Zone 8 slum recognized by the slum clearance board alone are the respondents. Strength of thirty samples by using simple random sampling method was used for the research. A majority 73.3% of the respondents were in poor condition level in self awareness dimension, while 26.7% of them were in average level. It is inferred that the respondents various life skills from different dimensions namely interpersonal relationship, critical thinking, decision making, problem solving and coping with emotions do differ with regard to their gender. It is observed that there is strong and significant association between various dimensions of life skills namely Interpersonal relationship ($\mathbf{X^{2-}}$4.562,**df**-1), Effective communication ($\mathbf{X^{2-}}$1.425,**df**-1) and Critical thinking ($\mathbf{X^{2-}}$4.124,**df**-1). The research suggests the need for bettering the life skill education among the youth from slums at the time of their academics itself.

Key words: Life Skills, Self awareness dimension, interpersonal relationship, Critical thinking

**AIM OF THE STUDY**

To study the life skills of youth in Chennai slums.

**OBJECTIVES**

1. To study the Socio Economic profile of the youth of slums in Chennai
2. To measure the level of Life Skills of youth of slums in Chennai

 Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

3. To understand the relation between Socio Economic status of the respondents on the various Dimensions of Life Skills of youth

**INTRODUCTION**

Slums are universal in character and no country is able to get rid of them. The census of India defines slum as "a compact area of at least 300 in population or about 60 - 70 households of poorly built, congested tenements in an unhygienic environment usually with inadequate infrastructure and lacking proper sanitary and drinking water facilities." Some of the major contributory factors responsible for the growth of slums especially in Chennai as per Tamilnadu slum clearance board include: (1)Large-scale migration to the cities due to employment opportunities and other community facilities and advantages offered by the city, which are absent in majority of the rural areas (2)The poverty which means an income level which is inadequate to maintain a decent standards of living as judged by the standards of the society and low paying capacity of the migrants, force them to find refuge either in low rental areas or to squat on the unused land located near their work places.(3)There is a housing shortage in urban areas due to low level of income, Proximity of their houses, close to the source of employment for economic reasons especially due to the low level of transportation cost. As per censusindia.gov.in together, adolescents and youth are referred to as 'Young people', encompassing the ages 10-24 years. Youth in the age group of 15-29 years comprise 27.5% of our countries population. Life Skills have been defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) **as** psychosocial abilities for adaptive and positive behavior that enable individuals to deal effectively with the demands and challenges of everyday life. The Ten core Life Skills as laid down by WHO are: (1) Self-awareness, (2) Empathy, (3) Critical thinking, (4) Creative thinking, (5) Decision making, (6) Problem Solving, (7) Effective communication, (8) Interpersonal relationship, (9) Coping with stress, (10) Coping with emotion. The youth from slums due to lack of effective utilization of their skills are still in a lower level jobs and have not climbed to great ladders. The awareness on importance to education is lacking at the family level in the slums that leads to lack of values and ethics and ethics among the young minds.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

**Vydyanathan Lakshmanan., (2007)**[1] in his study entitled "A Statistical Insight into Health and Education in Chennai Slums", found that the slums continue to reel under acute poverty with no

[1] Vydyanathan Lakshmanan., "A Statistical Insight into Health and Education in Chennai Slums", CCS Working Paper No. 177, Research Internship Program, Centre for Civil Society,2007,pp.1-14.

 Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

substantial improvements in real income of dwellers. **Schenk., (2010)**[2] in his study entitled "Slum Diversity in Kolkata", found that religion and language have greater influence on the social, economic and physical characteristic of slums than caste. **Vasantha Kumaran., (2012)**[3] in her study entitled "Community Engagement in Chennai Slums a Reflection from the Field", found that relationship between local communities, NGOs and local leaders is not always smooth. There are often overlaps in tasks. **Abir Bandyopadhyay., (2013)**[4] in his study entitled "Slums In India: From Past to Present", found that slums are considered to be the major issue within many urban areas; particularly problems related to transportation, population, health and safety. **Chanisara Tangkijmongkol., (2013)**[5] in her study entitled "An analysis of english language learning needs and problems of underprivileged children in a slum area in bangkok metropolis", found that children from the slum area realize the significance of English and that they are interested in learning English through games, songs, videos, and TV programs. **Kala Seetharam Sridhar., (2014)**[6] in her study entitled "Contribution of the urban poor: evidence from Chennai, India", found that gender, education level and the salary status of the urban poor have a significant impact on their income. **Mahesh Chougule., (2015)**[7] in her study entitled **"Poverty, youth and politics; A three dimensional view of youth in slum areas of solapur city**" reveals that youth from slums are misled by politicians in slum areas and that youth are largely unaware of the results of their deeds and get knowingly or unknowingly involved in socially harmful activities.

**RESEARCH DESIGN & SAMPLING**

The researcher adopted Descriptive research design. The youth pursuing their graduation or pursuing their post graduation belonging to the age group between eighteen to twenty four years of age from Zone 8 slum recognized by the slum clearance board alone are the respondents. A total of 30 samples were identified and collected by using simple random sampling method. In zone 8 one housing board Osankulam and one tenemant slum New boopathy nagar were identified for the research. In order to assess the Life Skills of the respondents a tested standardized questionnaire from RGNIYD with a five

[2] Schenk, C., "Slum Diversity in Kolkata", Journal of South Asian Studies, Vol:1, Issue No:,2010,pp.1-2.
[3] Vasantha Kumaran., "Community Engagement in Chennai Slums a Reflection from the Field", Internationales Asienforum, Vol: 43, Issue No:1, 2012,pp.99-113.
[4] Abir Bandyopadhyay., " Slums In India: From Past to Present", International Refereed Journal of Engineering and Science, Vol:2, Issue No:4, 2013,pp.55-59.
[5] Chanisara Tangkijmongkol., "An analysis of english language learning needs and problems of underprivileged children in a slum area in bangkok metropolis", Journal of PASAA, Vol: 46, Issue No:1,2013,pp.11-46.
[6] Kala Seetharam Sridhar., "Contribution of the urban poor: evidence from Chennai, India", Asia-Pacific Development Journal, Vol:21, Issue No:2,2014,pp.54-76.
[7] Mahesh Chougule., "**Poverty, youth and politics; A three dimensional view of youth in slum areas of solapur city**", Journal of Social Affairs, Vol:1, Issue No:3, 2015,pp.1-12.

 Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

point scale was preferred having a structured interview schedule as the primary data source. Socio demographic details of the respondent and their economic background were included in it.

**LIFE SKILLS ASSESSMENT SCALE**

Recognizing the conceptual framework of WHO, the Life Skills Assesment Scale was constructed to assess the levels of life skills among Indian adolescents. The multi dimensional Life Skills Assesment Scale consists of 100 items in the form of statements in-built with a 5 point scale for the respondent to check the appropriate response which is most descriptive of him/her viz, Always true of me, Very true of me, Sometimes true of me, Occasionally true of me and Not at all true of me. It has both positive and negative items. The 100 test items have been arranged in such a fashion that the one test item pertaining to each dimension being measured are arranged one after the other i.e the test items under the first dimension are arranged in the order of $1^{st}$, $11^{th}$, $21^{st}$, $31^{st}$, … item sequence. This approach was adopted with a view to reduce the halo effect and the logical errors and also to relieve the respondent from monotony. The Life Skills Assesment Scale (LSAS) measures ten (10) dimensions of Life Skills as indicated below:

*DIMENSIONS OF LIFE SKILLS AND NUMBER OF ITEMS*

| S.No | Dimensions of Life Skills | No of items |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Self Awareness | 11 |
| 2 | Empathy | 11 |
| 3 | Effective Communication | 09 |
| 4 | Interpersonal Relationships | 11 |
| 5 | Creative Thinking | 08 |
| 6 | Critical Thinking | 11 |
| 7 | Decision Making | 11 |
| 8 | Problem Solving | 09 |
| 9 | Coping with Emotions | 11 |
| 10 | Coping with Stress | 08 |


Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

The scores obtained under each dimension represents the level of Life Skills in the respective domain and summation of all the score obtained under each of the 10 dimensions would evolve as a global score for life skills.

**FINDINGS**

**Life skills Frequency Table**

*Gender*

| | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| FEMALE | 17 | 56.7 |
| MALE | 13 | 43.3 |
| Total | 30 | 100.0 |

The above table shows that more than 58.7 % of the respondents are female,
Whereas 43.3 percent of the are male respondents

*Age*

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | 18-20 | 19 | 63.3 |
| | 21-24 | 11 | 36.7 |
| | Total | 30 | 100.0 |

The above table reveals that majority 63.3% of the respondents belong to the age group of 18-20 years, whereas 36.7% of them are in the age group of 21.24 years

*Education*

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | PG | 11 | 36.7 |
| | UG | 19 | 63.3 |
| | Total | 30 | 100.0 |

The above table makes it clear that majority 63.3% of the respondents are studying undergraduate level, whereas 36.7% of them are pursuing their postgraduate level


Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

**DIMENSIONS WISE**

*Self awareness*

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | POOR | 22 | 73.3 |
| | AVERAGE | 8 | 26.7 |
| | Total | 30 | 100.0 |

A majority 73.3% of the respondents are in poor condition level in self awareness dimension, while 26.7% of them were in average level

*Empathy*

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | POOR | 7 | 23.3 |
| | AVERAGE | 23 | 76.7 |
| | Total | 30 | 100.0 |

A majority 76.7% of the respondents are in average condition level in empathy dimension, while 23.3 % of them were in poor level

*Effective communication*

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | POOR | 18 | 60.0 |
| | AVERAGE | 12 | 40.0 |
| | Total | 30 | 100.0 |

A majority 60% of the respondents are in average condition level in Effective communication dimension, while 40% of them were in poor level


Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

*Interpersonal relationship*

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | POOR | 13 | 43.3 |
| | AVERAGE | 17 | 56.7 |
| | Total | 30 | 100.0 |

More than half of the respondents 56.7 % are in average condition level in Interpersonal relationship dimension, while 43.3 % of them were in poor level

*Creative thinking*

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | POOR | 4 | 13.3 |
| | AVERAGE | 26 | 86.7 |
| | Total | 30 | 100.0 |

A majority 86.7 % of the respondents are in average condition level in Creative thinking dimension, while 13.3 % of them were in poor level

*Critical thinking*

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | POOR | 7 | 23.3 |
| | AVERAGE | 23 | 76.7 |
| | Total | 30 | 100.0 |

A majority 76.7 % of the respondents are in average condition level in Critical thinking dimension, while 23.3 % of them were in poor level

*Decision making*

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | POOR | 5 | 16.7 |
| | AVERAGE | 25 | 83.3 |
| | Total | 30 | 100.0 |


Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

A vast majority 83.3 % of the respondents are in average condition level in Decision making dimension, while 23.3 % of them were in poor level

*Problem solving*

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | POOR | 13 | 43.3 |
| | AVERAGE | 17 | 56.7 |
| | Total | 30 | 100.0 |

More than half 56.7 % of the respondents are in average condition level in Problem solving dimension, while 43.3 % of them were in poor level

*Coping with emotions*

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | POOR | 3 | 10.0 |
| | AVERAGE | 27 | 90.0 |
| | Total | 30 | 100.0 |

A vast majority 90 % of the respondents are in average condition level in Coping with emotions dimension, while 10 % of them are in poor level

*Coping with stress*

| | | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | POOR | 10 | 33.3 |
| | AVERAGE | 20 | 66.7 |
| | Total | 30 | 100.0 |

A majority 66.7 % of the respondents are in average condition level in Coping with stress dimension, while 33.3 % of them were in poor level


Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

**GENDER VS DIMENSIONS**

*T-Test*

| Life skills Dimensions | Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | df | T value | Statistical Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self awareness | Male | 13 | 27.08 | 7.708 | 28 | 0.451 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | Female | 17 | 25.94 | 5.483 | | | |
| Empathy | Male | 13 | 29.69 | 6.434 | 28 | 0.343 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | Female | 17 | 28.94 | 5.238 | | | |
| Effective communication | Male | 13 | 24.38 | 4.840 | 28 | 0.833 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | Female | 17 | 22.59 | 6.956 | | | |
| Interpersonal relationship | Male | 13 | 27.77 | 4.186 | 28 | 1.186 | **P<0.05 sig.** |
| | Female | 17 | 25.47 | 6.395 | | | |
| Creative thinking | Male | 13 | 18.92 | 3.328 | 28 | 0.750 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | Female | 17 | 18.06 | 2.839 | | | |
| Critical thinking | Male | 13 | 26.77 | 4.585 | 28 | 1.111 | **P<0.05 sig.** |
| | Female | 17 | 24.53 | 6.453 | | | |
| Decision making | Male | 13 | 26.77 | 4.711 | 28 | 1.004 | **P<0.05 sig.** |
| | Female | 17 | 24.82 | 5.897 | | | |
| Problem solving | Male | 13 | 21.69 | 3.966 | 28 | 1.041 | **P<0.05 sig.** |
| | Female | 17 | 20.12 | 4.285 | | | |
| Coping with emotions | Male | 13 | 29.38 | 5.781 | 28 | 1.474 | **P<0.05 sig.** |
| | Female | 17 | 26.12 | 6.314 | | | |
| Coping with stress | Male | 13 | 22.46 | 3.307 | 28 | 0.349 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | Female | 17 | 21.53 | 10.333 | | | |

From the above table independent t test was used to know the mean difference between the gender and various life skills dimensions.

It is identified from the table that respondents from different gender with regards to their interpersonal relationship, critical thinking, decision making, problem solving and coping with emotions do differ with gender of the respondents. Therefore, the "t" value is significant, thus the observed difference is statistically significant at 0.05 level. Hence it is inferred that the respondents various life skills from different dimensions namely interpersonal relationship, critical thinking, decision making, problem solving and coping with emotions do differ with regard to their gender.


Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

**Age VS Dimensions**
*T-Test*

| Life skills Dimensions | Age | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | df | T value | Statistical result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self awareness | 1 | 19 | 26.84 | 7.267 | 28 | 0.499 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 25.73 | 4.941 | | | |
| Empathy | 1 | 19 | 29.47 | 6.195 | 28 | 0.273 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 28.91 | 4.969 | | | |
| Effective communication | 1 | 19 | 22.37 | 5.890 | 28 | -1.162 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 25.09 | 6.348 | | | |
| Interpersonal relationship | 1 | 19 | 25.37 | 6.175 | 28 | -1.622 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 28.36 | 3.931 | | | |
| Creative thinking | 1 | 19 | 17.89 | 3.332 | 28 | -1.425 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 19.36 | 2.292 | | | |
| Critical thinking | 1 | 19 | 24.95 | 5.720 | 28 | -0.680 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 26.45 | 5.922 | | | |
| Decision making | 1 | 19 | 24.84 | 5.919 | 28 | -1.198 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 27.09 | 4.300 | | | |
| Problem solving | 1 | 19 | 20.53 | 4.526 | 28 | -0.498 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 21.27 | 3.580 | | | |
| Coping with emotions | 1 | 19 | 27.89 | 6.674 | 28 | 0.434 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 26.91 | 5.558 | | | |
| Coping with stress | 1 | 19 | 20.89 | 5.695 | 28 | -0.796 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 23.73 | 10.983 | | | |

From the above table independent t test was used to know the mean difference between the age and various life skills dimensions.


Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

It is portrait that the respondents from different age group with regard to their various life skills dimensions do not differ with regard to various life skills dimensions of the respondents. Therefore, the "t" value is not significant, thus the observed difference is not statistically significant at 0.05 level. Thus it is inferred that respondents various life skills do not differ with regard to their age.

**EDUCATION VS DIMENSIONS**

*T-Test*

| Life skills Dimensions | Edu | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | df | T value | Statistical |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self awareness | 1 | 19 | 26.84 | 7.267 | 28 | 0.499 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 25.73 | 4.941 | | | |
| Empathy | 1 | 19 | 29.47 | 6.195 | 28 | 0.273 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 28.91 | 4.969 | | | |
| Effective communication | 1 | 19 | 22.37 | 5.890 | 28 | -1.162 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 25.09 | 6.348 | | | |
| Interpersonal relationship | 1 | 19 | 25.37 | 6.175 | 28 | -1.622 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 28.36 | 3.931 | | | |
| Creative thinking | 1 | 19 | 17.89 | 3.332 | 28 | -1.425 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 19.36 | 2.292 | | | |
| Critical thinking | 1 | 19 | 24.95 | 5.720 | 28 | -0.680 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 26.45 | 5.922 | | | |
| Decision making | 1 | 19 | 24.84 | 5.919 | 28 | -1.198 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 27.09 | 4.300 | | | |
| Problem solving | 1 | 19 | 20.53 | 4.526 | 28 | -0.498 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 21.27 | 3.580 | | | |
| Coping with emotions | 1 | 19 | 27.89 | 6.674 | 28 | 0.434 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 26.91 | 5.558 | | | |
| Coping with stress | 1 | 19 | 20.89 | 5.695 | 28 | -0.796 | P>0.05 not sig. |
| | 2 | 11 | 23.73 | 10.983 | 28 | | |


Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

From the above table independent t test was used to know the mean difference between the level of education and various life skills dimensions.

It is seen from the table that the respondents from different level of education with regard to their various life skills dimensions do not differ with regard to various life skills dimensions of the respondents. Therefore, the "t" value is not significant, thus the observed difference is not statistically significant at 0.05 level. Hence it is inferred that respondents various life skills do not differ with regard to their level of education.

*Chi square result for gender and various dimensions of life skills*

| S.No | Dimensions | Df | X2 Value | Statistical result |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Self awareness | 1 | 0.196 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 2 | Empathy | 1 | 0.001 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 3 | Effective communication | 1 | 0.623 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 4 | Interpersonal relationship | 1 | 1.497 | **P<0.05sig.** |
| 5 | Creative thinking | 1 | 0.666 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 6 | Critical thinking | 1 | 3.471 | **P<0.05sig.** |
| 7 | Decision making | 1 | 1.433 | **P<0.05sig.** |
| 8 | Problem solving | 1 | 0.223 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 9 | Coping with emotions | 1 | 0.139 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 10 | Coping with stress | 1 | 3.520 | **P<0.05sig.** |

The table above represents the results of Chi-Square analysis carried out to see whether there is a statistically significant association between various **gender** and **various dimensions of life skills** of Caregivers.

It is observed that there is strong and significant association between various dimensions of life skills namely Interpersonal relationship ($\mathbf{X^{2-}}$1.497,**df**-1), Critical thinking ($\mathbf{X^{2-}}$ 3.471,**df**-1) and Decision making ($\mathbf{X^{2-}}$1.433,**df**-1). Thus the observed association is satisfactorily significant, since the Chi-Square value is significant at 0.05 levels.


Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

*Chi square result for age and various dimensions of life skills*

| S.No | Dimensions | Df | X2 Value | Statistical result |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Self awareness | 1 | 0.665 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 2 | Empathy | 1 | 0.265 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 3 | Effective communication | 1 | 1.524 | **P<0.05sig.** |
| 4 | Interpersonal relationship | 1 | 4.756 | **P<0.05sig.** |
| 5 | Creative thinking | 1 | 4.004 | **P<0.05sig.** |
| 6 | Critical thinking | 1 | 0.265 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 7 | Decision making | 1 | 0.775 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 8 | Problem solving | 1 | 0.032 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 9 | Coping with emotions | 1 | 0.016 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 10 | Coping with stress | 1 | 0.071 | P>0.05 Not sig. |

df – degree of freedom, X2- chi square value

The table above represents the results of Chi-Square analysis carried out to see whether there is a statistically significant association between various **age** and **various dimensions of life skills** of Caregivers.

It is observed that there is strong and significant association between various dimensions of life skills namely Interpersonal relationship ($\mathbf{X^{2-}}$4.756,**df**-1), Effective communication ($\mathbf{X^{2-}}$1.524,**df**-1) and Critical thinking ($\mathbf{X^{2-}}$0.265,**df**-1). Thus the observed association is satisfactorily significant, since the Chi-Square value is significant at 0.05 levels.

*Chi square result for level of education and various dimensions of life skills*

| S.No | Dimensions | Df | X2 Value | Statistical result |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Self awareness | 1 | 0.624 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 2 | Empathy | 1 | 0.321 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 3 | Effective communication | 1 | 1.425 | **P<0.05sig.** |
| 4 | Interpersonal relationship | 1 | 4.562 | **P<0.05sig.** |
| 5 | Creative thinking | 1 | 4.124 | **P<0.05sig.** |
| 6 | Critical thinking | 1 | 0.223 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 7 | Decision making | 1 | 0.631 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 8 | Problem solving | 1 | 0.651 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 9 | Coping with emotions | 1 | 0.234 | P>0.05 Not sig. |
| 10 | Coping with stress | 1 | 0.126 | P>0.05 Not sig. |


Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors

ISSN: 0971-1260
Vol-22-Issue-3-July-September-2019

The table above represents the results of Chi-Square analysis carried out to see whether there is a statistically significant association between various **level of education** and **various dimensions of life skills** of Caregivers. It is observed that there is strong and significant association between various dimensions of life skills namely Interpersonal relationship ($\mathbf{X^{2}}$-4.562,**df**-1), Effective communication ($\mathbf{X^{2}}$-1.425,**df**-1) and Critical thinking ($\mathbf{X^{2}}$-4.124,**df**-1). Thus the observed association is satisfactorily significant, since the Chi-Square value is significant at 0.05 levels.

## CONCLUSION

The research suggests the need for bettering the life skill education among the youth from slums at the time of their academics itself so that they can be prepared to succeed in the competitive world. Despite the reservations, the percentage of youth from slums studying higher studies still has not reached in top and those who have completed their graduation and above have not reached in any of the higher posts in their career. If the skills of these youth are trimmed then they can compete well with their non slum youth groups and also can fulfill the requirements of their employers which will have an impact in the improvement of their career. Life skills programme should be an integral part of the education system in order to transmit the accumulated resources of our cultural heritage to each new generation. Youth has all the potential. Let us all provide rational education support to them so that they keep on growing in their knowledge and understanding and keep making a difference to the nation and to the world.

## REFERENCES

Report of the Working Group of Youth Affairs and Adolescents Development for 11th Five Year Plan.

UNICEF (2010) what skills are life skills? Retrieved July 14, 2010, from http: www.unicef.org/lifeskills/index_which skills.html

Gajendra Verma, (2010). Empowerment of Youth as a Strategy for National Development, Second National Colloquium on Empowerment of Youth, RGNIYD, India.

Hennna T Abussun . 'Slums in India'- , NYP-2014-of GOI

Prof. P.B. Sharma, (2010). Meeting the Challenges of Globalization of Higher Education in India.

www.tamilnaduslumclearanceboard.in, www.chennaicorporation.in,

www.censusindia.gov.in

 Copyright ⓒ 2019 Authors