

International Multidisciplinary
Research Journal

*Indian Streams
Research Journal*

Executive Editor
Ashok Yakkaldevi

Editor-in-Chief
H.N.Jagtap

Welcome to ISRJ

RNI MAHMUL/2011/38595

ISSN No.2230-7850

Indian Streams Research Journal is a multidisciplinary research journal, published monthly in English, Hindi & Marathi Language. All research papers submitted to the journal will be double - blind peer reviewed referred by members of the editorial board. Readers will include investigator in universities, research institutes government and industry with research interest in the general subjects.

International Advisory Board

Flávio de São Pedro Filho Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil	Mohammad Hailat Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, University of South Carolina Aiken	Hasan Baktir English Language and Literature Department, Kayseri
Kamani Perera Regional Center For Strategic Studies, Sri Lanka	Abdullah Sabbagh Engineering Studies, Sydney	Ghayoor Abbas Chotana Dept of Chemistry, Lahore University of Management Sciences[PK]
Janaki Sinnasamy Librarian, University of Malaya	Ecaterina Patrascu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest	Anna Maria Constantinovici AL. I. Cuza University, Romania
Romona Mihaila Spiru Haret University, Romania	Loredana Bosca Spiru Haret University, Romania	Ilie Pinteau, Spiru Haret University, Romania
Delia Serbescu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest, Romania	Fabricio Moraes de Almeida Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil	Xiaohua Yang PhD, USA
Anurag Misra DBS College, Kanpur	George - Calin SERITAN Faculty of Philosophy and Socio-Political Sciences Al. I. Cuza University, IasiMore
Titus PopPhD, Partium Christian University, Oradea,Romania		

Editorial Board

Pratap Vyamktrao Naikwade ASP College Devrukh,Ratnagiri,MS India	Iresh Swami Ex - VC. Solapur University, Solapur	Rajendra Shendge Director, B.C.U.D. Solapur University, Solapur
R. R. Patil Head Geology Department Solapur University,Solapur	N.S. Dhaygude Ex. Prin. Dayanand College, Solapur	R. R. Yalikalr Director Managment Institute, Solapur
Rama Bhosale Prin. and Jt. Director Higher Education, Panvel	Narendra Kadu Jt. Director Higher Education, Pune	Umesh Rajderkar Head Humanities & Social Science YCMOU,Nashik
Salve R. N. Department of Sociology, Shivaji University,Kolhapur	K. M. Bhandarkar Praful Patel College of Education, Gondia	S. R. Pandya Head Education Dept. Mumbai University, Mumbai
Govind P. Shinde Bharati Vidyapeeth School of Distance Education Center, Navi Mumbai	G. P. Patankar S. D. M. Degree College, Honavar, Karnataka	Alka Darshan Shrivastava Shaskiya Snatkottar Mahavidyalaya, Dhar
Chakane Sanjay Dnyaneshwar Arts, Science & Commerce College, Indapur, Pune	Maj. S. Bakhtiar Choudhary Director,Hyderabad AP India.	Rahul Shriram Sudke Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya, Indore
Awadhesh Kumar Shirotriya Secretary,Play India Play,Meerut(U.P.)	S.Parvathi Devi Ph.D.-University of Allahabad	S.KANNAN Annamalai University,TN
	Sonal Singh, Vikram University, Ujjain	Satish Kumar Kalhotra Maulana Azad National Urdu University



COMPARISON OF SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS AND SOCIAL, EMOTIONAL AND BEHAVIOUR PROBLEM OF STUDENTS STUDYING IN ADI-DRAVIDAR WELFARE SCHOOLS



R.Gnanadevan¹ and G. Sivakumar²

¹Professor, Department of Education, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar.

²Research Fellow, Department of Education, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar.

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study is to compare the socio economic status and social, emotional and behaviour problem of students studying in Adi-Dravidar welfare schools, for which the survey method has been adapted. Random sampling technique has been used for the present study for the selection of sample. The sample of the study includes the adolescent students studying in Adi- Dravidar Welfare School in Cuddalore District. The social, emotional and behaviour problem scale standardised by the R.Gnanadevan et al.(2015) have been used for collecting data from the sample. The present study indicates that the students belonging to various socio economic status differ significantly in the internalizing problem, externalizing problem and total social, emotional and behaviour problem. It further indicates that for all the above mentioned problems is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status than the students belonging to upper lower, lower middle and upper middle socio economic status. Proper efforts can be made for the desired care, treatment and progress of the children with social, emotional and behaviour problems through collaborated approach involving effective behavioural and educational intervention.

KEYWORDS :socio economic status and social, emotional and behaviour problem, adi-dravidar welfare schools.



INTRODUCTION:-

The scheduled caste students have been handicapped in matters of education because of socio-economic and cultural reasons. They are mostly first generation learners, that is, they do not have the tradition of learning, reading, writing and arithmetic. The parents are mostly illiterate. The literacy and education are not synonymous, though to a great extent they are inter-related intrinsically. They do not find any family support in terms of learning atmosphere or home support to augment

or supplement the learning in schools. The students studying in Adi-Dravidar welfare schools experiences numerous problems, ranging from mild to severe, that interfere with their mastering many of the subjects of the secondary and higher secondary curriculum. In addition to academic problems, these students have difficulties with cognitive skills, social behaviour and emotional

stability. Social skills and emotional stability are necessary to meet the basic social demands of everyday life.

NEED AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The challenges faced by the students studying in Adi-Dravidar welfare schools are multifarious in connection with life, values, family, friends etc. They face psychological problems, social problems, and financial problems. The characteristics of social problems includes poor social perception, lack of judgment, difficulty in perceiving the feelings of others, problems in socializing and making friends, and problems in family relationship and in schools. Sometimes they exhibit emotional and behavioural problem. It includes low self confidence, a poor self concept, anxiety, depression and low self esteem. Scanlon (1996) states that the social problems affects friendship, employment, and family relationship. Silver (1998) states that the family is the core of a child's life. Children desperately need the satisfaction and assurance of members in the primary family. Even with the intimate family, however, the numerous problems in social skills, behaviour, language and temperament make it hard for a child with social disabilities to establish a healthy family relationship. The family may not receive satisfaction from the family sphere and may even be rejected by parents, as well as by peers and teachers. Buck, Polloway, Kirpatick et al., (2000) and Scott (2003), insists that the behavioural problems must be considered in the planning of instruction. Sameroff et al., (1998) states that simultaneous exposure to multiple risk factors was particularly harmful to youth's long-term psychological well-being.

Based on the above discussion, the investigator felt it necessary to study about the social, emotional and behaviour problem of students studying in Adi-dravidar welfare schools with respect to their socio economic status.

METHOD OF STUDY

The survey method has been used for the present study to compare the socio economic status of students with respect to social, emotional and behaviour problems. Random sampling technique has been adapted for the present study for the selection of sample from the schools. The sample of the study includes the adolescent students studying in Adi- Dravidar Welfare School in Cuddalore District. There are eleven Adi-Dravidar Welfare Schools in Cuddalore District. All the schools have been selected for this study. The social, emotional and behaviour problem scale standardised by R.Gnanadevan et al. (2015) have been used for the present study to collect the data from the sample. The social, behaviour and emotional problems scale can be broadly classified into three dimensions such as internalizing, externalizing and mixed Category. The internalizing problem further subdivided into three dimensions such as, withdrawn, somatic complains and anxious/depressed. The externalizing problem also further subdivided in to two dimensions which include delinquent and aggression. The mixed category includes the dimensions such as, thought problem, attention problem and social problem. For the total problem includes all the categories.

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND INTERPRETATIONS

The mean scores of various dimensions of social, emotional and behaviour problem of students with respect to their socio economic status has been subjected to analysis of variance. The result of the analysis is given in Table-1.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean withdrawn problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 30.40, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic

status differ significantly in their withdrawn problem. The mean value indicates that the withdrawn problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=11.06) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=9.42), lower middle (M=8.53), and upper middle (M=9.12) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean somatic complaints problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 55.27, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their somatic complaints problem. The mean value indicates that the somatic complaints problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=8.13) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=4.91), lower middle (M=4.76), and upper middle (M=5.40) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean anxious or depression problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 42.52, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their anxious or depression problem. The mean value indicates that the anxious or depression problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=15.52) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=12.20), lower middle (M=11.69), and upper middle (M=13.24) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean delinquent behaviour scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 119.96, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their delinquent behaviour. The mean value indicates that the delinquent behaviour is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=13.61) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=9.25), lower middle (M=7.57), and upper middle (M=7.98) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean aggressive behaviour scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 106.89, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their aggressive behaviour. The mean value indicates that the aggressive behaviour is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=11.76) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=7.77), lower middle (M=6.75), and upper middle (M=6.42) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean thought problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 293.17, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their thought problem. The mean value indicates that the thought problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=15.74) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=10.15), lower middle (M=7.61), and upper middle (M=8.08) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean attention problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 189.41, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their attention problem. The mean value indicates that the attention problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=14.92) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=9.78), lower middle (M=9.82), and upper middle (M=8.08) socio

economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean social problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 102.75, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their social problem. The mean value indicates that the social problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=16.58) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=11.07), lower middle (M=9.03), and upper middle (M=9.45) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean academic problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 182.74, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their academic problem. The mean value indicates that the academic problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=15.51) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=9.23), lower middle (M=8.27), and upper middle (M=8.55) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean internalizing problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 66.99, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their internalizing problem. The mean value indicates that the internalizing problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=34.81) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=26.66), lower middle (M=24.52), and upper middle (M=26.83) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean externalizing problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 93.79, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their externalizing problem. The mean value indicates that the externalizing problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=24.54) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=16.66), lower middle (M=14.29), and upper middle (M=14.88) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean mixed category problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 285.99, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their mixed category problem. The mean value indicates that the mixed category problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=61.32) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=39.73), lower middle (M=33.02), and upper middle (M=35.15) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean total social, emotional and behaviour problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 285.99, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their total social, emotional and behaviour problem. The mean value indicates that the total social, emotional and behaviour problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=123.62) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=85.76), lower middle (M=74.73), and upper middle (M=78.87) socio economic status.

Table-1
COMPARISON OF MEAN SOCIAL, EMOTIONAL AND BEHAVIOUR PROBLEM OF STUDENTS WITH RESPECT TO THEIR SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS

Dimensions	Source of variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	'F' Value	Level of Significance at 0.05 level
Withdrawn Problem	Between Groups	575.02	3	191.67	30.40	Significant
	Within Groups	5490.68	871	6.30		
	Total	6065.70	874			
Somatic Complaints	Between Groups	1239.06	3	413.02	55.27	Significant
	Within Groups	6508.41	871	7.47		
	Total	7747.47	874			
Anxious or Depression Problem	Between Groups	1491.95	3	497.31	42.52	Significant
	Within Groups	10185.59	871	11.69		
	Total	11677.55	874			
Delinquent Behaviour	Between Groups	3479.45	3	1159.81	119.96	Significant
	Within Groups	8421.00	871	9.66		
	Total	11900.46	874			
Aggressive Behaviour	Between Groups	2605.60	3	868.53	106.89	Significant
	Within Groups	7077.29	871	8.12		
	Total	9682.90	874			
Thought Problem	Between Groups	6210.94	3	2070.31	293.17	Significant
	Within Groups	6150.69	871	7.06		
	Total	12361.63	874			
Attention Problem	Between Groups	4881.39	3	1627.13	189.41	Significant
	Within Groups	7482.06	871	8.59		
	Total	12363.46	874			
Social Problem	Between Groups	5472.77	3	1824.25	102.75	Significant
	Within Groups	15463.87	871	17.75		
	Total	20936.64	874			

Academic Problem	Between Groups	5393.56	3	1797.85	182.74	Significant
	Within Groups	8569.18	871	9.83		
	Total	13962.74	874			
Internalizing Problem	Between Groups	9938.89	3	3312.96	66.99	Significant
	Within Groups	43070.07	871	49.44		
	Total	53008.97	874			
Externalizing Problem	Between Groups	10177.82	3	3392.60	93.79	Significant
	Within Groups	31503.57	871	36.16		
	Total	41681.39	874			
Mixed Category	Between Groups	76934.72	3	25644.90	285.99	Significant
	Within Groups	78102.09	871	89.66		
	Total	155036.81	874			
Total Problem	Between Groups	229740.74	3	76580.24	237.64	Significant
	Within Groups	280675.67	871	322.24		
	Total	510416.41	874			

FINDINGS

1.The students belonging to various socio economic status differ significantly in the various dimensions of social, emotional and behaviour problems such as withdrawn, somatic complaints, delinquent behaviour, thought problem, anxious or depression problem, aggressive behaviour, attention problem, academic problem, social problem, internalizing problem, externalizing problem and total social, emotional and behaviour problem.

2.For all the above mentioned problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status than the students belonging to upper lower, lower middle and upper middle socio economic status.

CONCLUSION

The present study indicates that the students belonging to various socio economic status differ significantly in the internalizing problem, externalizing problem, mixed category problem and total social, emotional and behaviour problem. It further indicates that for all the above mentioned problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status than the students belonging to upper lower, lower middle and upper middle socio economic status. Proper efforts can be made for the desired care, treatment and progress of the children with social, emotional and behaviour problems through collaborated approach involving effective behavioural and educational intervention. There is real need of awakening the masses including the government agencies for taking due recognition of these disorders in the students studying in Adi-dravidar Welfare schools and should take all the possible

diagnostic and treatment measures for its prevention and treatment. Equipping and training the teachers for being capable of teaching and handling the children with social emotional and behaviour problems, bringing adaptation and structuring in the classroom and other work situation, environment, providing individual attention and extra special time or attending and solving the learning and behaviour problems of the children may help in achieving much in terms of the education of these children.

REFERENCES

- 1.Achenbach, T.M., and Edelbrock, C., (1981). Behavioural problems and competencies reported by parents of normal and disturbed children aged four to sixteen. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 46, (Serial No. 188).
- 2.Achenbach, T.M., Verhulst, F.C., Baron, G.D., and Althaus, M. (1987). A comparison of syndromes derived from the Child Behaviour Checklist for American and Dutch boys aged 6 – 11 and 12 – 16. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 28:437 – 453.
- 3.Bateman, B.D., (1969). An Educator's View of a Diagnostic Approach to Learning Disorders in J. Hellmuth (Ed.) *Learning Disorders* (Vol. I, pp. 219-239), Seattle, W.A.: Special Child Publications.
- 4.Boss, C.S. and S. Vaughn, (2002). *Strategies for Teaching Students with Learning and Behaviour Problems* (5th ed.), Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- 5.Bradley, R., L.Danielson and D.P. Hallahan (Eds.) (2002), *Identification of Learning Disabilities: Research to Practice*, Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- 6.Crijnen, A.A.M., Achenbach, T.M., and Verhulst, F.C., (1997). Comparisons of problems reported by parents of children in twelve cultures: total problems, externalizing, and internalizing. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 36:1269 – 1277.
- 7.Ekblad, S., (1990). The children's behavior questionnaire for completion by parents and teachers in a Chinese sample. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 31:775-791.
- 8.Frisk, M., (1995). Mental and somatic health and social adjustment in ordinary school children during childhood and adolescence related to central nervous functions as expressed by a complex reaction time. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 4:197-208.
- 9.Gates, A.I., A.S. McKillop and R. Horowitz, (1981). *Gates – McKellop – Horowitz Reading Diagnostic Tests*, New York: teachers College Press.
- 10.Gjone, H., and Novik, T.S., (1995). Parental ratings of behavior problems: a twin and general population comparison. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 16:1215-1224.
- 11.Gresham, F. M., MacMillan, D. L., and Bocian, K., (1996). Behavioral Earthquakes: Low-frequency Salient Behavioral Events that Differentiate Students at Risk of Behavior Disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*, 21,(4), 277–292.
- 12.Janet W.Lerner and Frank Kline, (2006). *Learning Disabilities and Related Disorders*. New York:Houghton Mifflin Company.
- 13.Kavale, K.A. and S.R. Forness, *The Science of Learning Disabilities*, San Diego, CA: College Hill, 1985.
- 14.Kirk, S.A. and W.D. Kirk, (1971). *Psycholinguistic Learning Disabilities: Diagnosis and Remediation*, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- 15.Kornfalt, T., (1981). Behavioural assessment in the school health service. *Scandinavian Journal of Social Medicine*, 9:63-73.
- 16.Kvernmo, S., and Heyerdal, S., (1998). Influence of ethnic factors on behavior problems in indigenous Sami and majority Norwegian adolescents. *Journal of American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 37:743-751.

17. MaccFarlane, J.W., Allen, K., Honzik, M.P., (1954). A Developmental Study of the Behaviour Problems of Normal Children between Twenty-one Months and Fourteen years. Berkely & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
18. McLoughlin, J.A. and A. Betick, (1983). Defining Learning Disabilities: A New and Cooperative Direction. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 16, pp. 21-23.
19. Rutter, M., (1967). A children's behavior questionnaire for completion by teachers: Preliminary findings. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 8:1-11.
20. Stanger, C., Fombonne, E., and Achenbach, T.M., (1994). Epidemiological comparisons of American and French children: parent reports of problems and competencies for ages 6-11. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 3:16-28.
21. Telford, C.W., and J.M., Sawrey, (1977). *The Exceptional Individual*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
22. Tsiantis, J., Motti-Stefanidi, F., Richardson, C., Schmeck, K., and Poustka, F., (1994). Psychological problems of school-age German and Greek children: A cross-cultural study. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 3:209-219.

Publish Research Article

International Level Multidisciplinary Research Journal For All Subjects

Dear Sir/Mam,

We invite unpublished Research Paper, Summary of Research Project, Theses, Books and Book Review for publication, you will be pleased to know that our journals are

Associated and Indexed, India

- ★ International Scientific Journal Consortium
- ★ OPEN J-GATE

Associated and Indexed, USA

- Google Scholar
- EBSCO
- DOAJ
- Index Copernicus
- Publication Index
- Academic Journal Database
- Contemporary Research Index
- Academic Paper Database
- Digital Journals Database
- Current Index to Scholarly Journals
- Elite Scientific Journal Archive
- Directory Of Academic Resources
- Scholar Journal Index
- Recent Science Index
- Scientific Resources Database
- Directory Of Research Journal Indexing

Indian Streams Research Journal
258/34 Raviwar Peth Solapur-413005, Maharashtra
Contact-9595359435
E-Mail-ayisrj@yahoo.in/ayisrj2011@gmail.com
Website : www.isrj.org