

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ANXIETY AND FRUSTRATION AMONG GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Dr. Anjana Srivastava¹, Dr. Sadia Habib² & Dr. Vijayshri³

¹Assistant Professor (Psychology) M M Mahila College, Ara.

²Assistant Professor (Psychology) M M Mahila College, Ara.

³Assistant Professor (Psychology) M M Mahila College, Ara.

Abstract

The changing life style and competitive environment have increased so many problems, in which anxiety and frustration are found the most common psychological consequences in school going children and adolescent. There were so many physical, psychological changes occurred in this stage and due to this reason students have faced so many challenges and sometimes they feel anxiety and frustration. The aim of this research is to assess the comparison of anxiety and frustration of government and private high school children. Sample was collected randomly from different schools of Allahabad city which consisted of 50 male (25 government+ 25 private) and 50 female (25 governments + 25 private) students. They were administered Sinha Anxiety Scale (1973) and Frustration Scale by Dixit & Srivastava (2004) to test their anxiety and frustration level. Mean, SD and t-value was calculated to find out the results. Mean score shows that there is significant mean difference on anxiety between government and private school students at 0.05 levels. On the dimension of frustration, no significant mean difference was found. t value is also observed between government and private school children as well as male and female students.

Key words: anxiety, frustration, t-test, school children

Introduction

Adolescence is a period of great stress and storm as rapid physical and mental changes occur during this period and the individual comes under social pressure and faces new condition for which he received little training during childhood. At this stage emotional fluctuations occurs very frequently and quickly.

These figures could be underestimated since anxiety among a large number of children and adolescents goes undiagnosed owing to the internalized nature of its symptoms (Tomb and Hunter, 2004) Anxiety is associated with substantial negative effects on children's social, emotional and academic success (Essau, Conradt and Petermann, 2000) Specific effects include poor social and coping skills, often leading to avoidance of social interactions (Albano, Chorpita and Barlow, 2003, Weeks, Coplan and Kingsbury, 2009) Loneliness, low self-esteem, perceptions of social rejection, and difficulty forming friendships. (Bookhorst, Goossens and Ruyter, 2001, Weeks et. al, 2009). Anxiety is considered to be a universal Phenomenon existing across cultures, although its contexts and manifestations are influenced by cultural beliefs and practices (Good and Kleinman, 1985) Now a days in changing pattern of our society have increased the level of anxiety among high school student.

Adolescence is the period of psychological and social transition between childhood and adulthood. Adolescents struggle with their anxieties, conflicts and confusion. In today word most of adolescent face problem in making adjustment with others which leads to frustration. The inability to reach a goal or achieve something caused frustration. Family problems, economic and financial problems, bullying etc may also frustrate an individual.

The concept of frustration was developed by Freud (1943) first time in human beings. Frustration is 'motivational or affective state resulting from being blicked, thwarted, disappointed or defeated', (English and English, 1959), has a different mechanism of behaviour, locking goal-orientation, having feeling of intensity, compulsiveness, appearing a product of need - deprivation. (Chauhan & Tiwari 1972).

In a study on frustration tolerance among adolescents¹⁴ the result revealed that most of the respondents possessed low frustration tolerance and a very few adolescent respondents showed high frustration tolerance. Dove (2013)¹⁴ investigated the gender effect on frustration and find gender does not create effect on frustration.

Several studies by sociologist, psychologist and Educationists showed that the type of schools a learner attends has profound influence on his academic achievement. In a study investigator noted that children who attended private primary schools performed better than pupils in government schools. Although this finding may be supported by several studies but here it has been investigated that do the students of Government and private High School have similar Anxiety and frustration level they are different from each other.

Objectives of the study

- To find out the mean difference for anxiety between government and private school adolescents.
- To find out the mean difference for frustration between government and private school adolescents.
- To find out the mean difference for anxiety between male and female adolescents.
- To find out the mean difference for frustration between male and female adolescents.

Hypotheses of the study

- There will be no significant mean difference between government and private school adolescents for anxiety.
- There will be no significant mean difference between government and private school adolescents for frustration.
- There will be no significant mean difference between male and female adolescents for anxiety.
- There will be no significant mean difference between male and female adolescents for frustration.

Methodology

Sample

A sample of 100 students, age ranged from 12 to 18 years, was collected randomly from different schools of Allahabad city. Sample was further divided into male (N=50) and female (N=50) adolescents. Again the sample was categorized into government school adolescents (N=50) and private school adolescents (N=50). Thus sample was categorized into two categories based on gender and type of school. Informed consent was obtained from the students after which a name list was prepared for each school and students were requested to report on specific days for the test.

Tools used:

Sinha Anxiety Scale (1973): ‘Sinha Anxiety Scale’, constructed by D. Sinha (1973) was used to measure anxiety level of adolescents in the present study. The scale is a self-administering inventory, reliable and valid measure of anxiety in the field of psychological research. Split half reliability is calculated $r = .93$ while test retest reliability is calculated as $r = .91$ validity of the test is $.73$ It consists of 100 items related to the anxiety of the individual in different aspects of life like society, family, friend circle, self personality, self analysis, service area and future plans. Calculated ‘yes’ for all the items are presented in a form of categories like A⁺, A, B, C and C- depending on the quantity of ‘yes’ responses for both male and female respondents. Category B is considered as normal range of anxiety (percentile 50).

Reactions to Frustration Scale (RFS): This scale was constructed and standardized by Dr. B.M. Dixit and Dr. D.N. Srivastava (2004). This scale covers four reactions namely-aggression, resignation, fixation and regression to meet the growing demands of the psychologists engaged in the measurement of reactions to frustration. It is an objective measure of reactions to frustration, (Maier 1949). It consists of 40 items out of which each reaction to frustration has 10 items equally divided into positive and negative items. The test items are presented in the form of simple statements and provide six alternative responses. The test-retest reliability of the test ranges from 0.62 to 0.82 and the internal consistency reliability ranges from 0.61 to 0.78. The validity against different criteria ranged from 0.42 to 0.80. Obtained correlation coefficient was found significant, providing evidence for sufficient degree of validity coefficient.

Procedure and Statistical Analysis:

The participants were contacted personally. The scales were administered to the subjects in groups in regular classroom situation. The self explanatory instructions were provided on the first page of the scale booklet. Scoring was done according to the instructions given in the manual. Thus data was collected and t-test analysis was done to find out the results.

Results and discussion

Table-1: Showing mean difference for anxiety among government and private school adolescents:

Variable	Groups	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value
Anxiety	Government	50	37.28	11.025	98	10.180*
	Private	50	74.60	13.360		

*Significant at .05 level

As we can see mean, standard deviation and t-value score in table no 1 is presented to know the mean difference between government and private school adolescents for anxiety. We find that t-value ($t=10.180$) is significant at .05 level of significance, which indicates a significant difference between adolescents of private and government schools for anxiety. The mean score of private school adolescents that is $M=74.60$ is very much higher than the mean score of government school adolescents which is $M=37.28$. It shows that private school adolescents are more anxious than the adolescents of government school adolescents. So the hypothesis that there will be no significant mean difference between government and private school adolescents for anxiety is rejected.

Table-2: Showing mean difference for frustration among government and private school adolescents:

Variable	Groups	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value
Frustration	Government	50	72.25	24.113	98	1.102
	Private	50	66.45	16.537		

Table-2 is showing mean, SD and t-value along with df for frustration between government and private schools adolescents. We find that t-value ($t=1.102$) is insignificant which represents an insignificant mean difference between the two groups on frustration variable. So the hypothesis that there will be no significant mean difference between government and private school adolescents on frustration level is accepted.

Table-3: Showing mean difference for anxiety among male and female adolescents:

Variable	Groups	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value
Anxiety	Male	50	56.87	26.294	98	4.510**
	Female	50	70.28	21.653		

**Significant at .01 level

Above table no 3 is presenting mean value, standard deviation and t-value to show the mean difference between male and female adolescents for the variable anxiety. We can see that t value ($t=4.510$) is significant at .01 level which represents that the two groups differ significantly with each other on anxiety. Mean value for male adolescent group ($M=56.87$) is lower than the mean value of female group ($M=70.28$) which represents that female adolescents are more anxious than the male adolescents. So the hypothesis that there will be no significant mean difference between male and female adolescents on anxiety is rejected.

Table-4: Showing mean difference for frustration among male and female adolescents:

Variable	Groups	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value
Frustration	Government	50	54.46	22.164	98	.059
	Private	50	53.83	21.237		

Table-4 is showing mean, SD and t-value along with df for frustration between male and female adolescents. We find that t-value ($t=.059$) is insignificant which represents an insignificant mean difference between the two groups on frustration variable. So the hypothesis that there will be no significant mean difference between male and female adolescents on frustration level is accepted.

Conclusion

On the basis of results, we can conclude that:

- Government and private school adolescents differ significantly on anxiety variable.
- Private school adolescents are more anxious than government school adolescents.
- There is no difference between government and private school adolescents on frustration.
- Male and female adolescents differ significantly on anxiety level.
- Female adolescents have more anxiety than male adolescents.
- There is no difference between male and female adolescents on frustration level.

Recommendation

Anxiety and frustration can be a big problem among adolescent and high school students and which may cause some other psychological problems. Students of all academic achievement levels suffer mostly from academic anxiety. This problem has been mostly found in very high amount among private school students. The reason behind these finding is that in private school the students have faces so many tests, grades, studying self imposed need to succeed, high expectation settled by parents, competition with classmates, etc. and the pressure of fulfilling these tasks become more anxious to the students. These problems are found in very less amount among government school student.

There is a need to prepare the students to develop a mentally healthy personality and it is only possible with the combined effort by teachers and parents because these two person play a vital role in development of student and person.

Teachers can teach students to use methods such as relaxation, mindfulness, meditation etc. The teachers and parents should be aware of the complication and try to reduce force of the student and motivate them to develop a healthy personality through which they become a good student and later on they develop a perfect personality who gave his best effort for himself and society too. In modern era mental health knowledge is very essential for every person so there should be a mental health professional is appointed in every institution.

References

1. Costello E.J., Mustillo S., Erkanli A., Keeler G. & Angold A. (2003). Prevalence and development of psychiatric disorders in childhood and adolescence. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 60, 837-844.
2. Bernstein, G.A. & Borchardt, C.M. (1991). Anxiety disorders of childhood and adolescence: A critical review. *Journal of the American Academy of child and Adolescence Psychiatry*, 30, 519-532.
3. Boyd, C.P., Kostanski, M., Gullone, E., Ollendick, T.H. & Shek, D.T.L. (2000) Prevalence of anxiety and depression in Australian adolescents: Comparisons with Worldwide data. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology* 161, 479-492.
4. Tomb M. & Hunter L. (2004). Prevention of anxiety in children and adolescents in a school setting: The role of school - based practitioners. *Children & School*, 26, 87-101.
5. Essau, C.A., Conradt, J., Petermann, F. (2000), Frequency, comorbidity and psychosocial inspairment of anxiety disorders in German adolescents. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 14, 263-279.
6. Albano, A.M., Chorpita, B.F. & Barlow, D.H. (2003). Childhood anxiety disorders. In E. J. Mash & R.A. Barkely (Edy)., *Child Psychopathology* (PP. 279-329). New York: Gailford Press.

7. Weeks, M. Coplan, R.J. & Kingsbury, A. (2009). The correlates and consequences of early appearing social anxiety in young children. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, In Press, accepted manuscript.
8. Bookhorst, K., Goossens, F.A. & de Ruyter, P.A. (2001). Early detection of social anxiety: Reliability and Validity of a teacher questionnaire for the identification of social anxiety in young children. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 29, 787-798.
9. Donovan. C.L. and Spence S.H. (2000). Prevention of childhood anxiety disorders, *Clinical Psychology Review* 20; 509-531.
10. McLoone J., Hudson J.L. and Rapee. R. (2006). Treating anxiety disorders in a school setting, *Education and treatment of children* 29; 219-242.
11. Rapee R.H., Kennedy S., Ingram M. Edwards S. and Sweeney L. (2005). Prevention and early intervention of anxiety disorders in inhibited preschool children. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology* 73, 488-497.
12. Good, B.J. & Kleinman, A.M. (1985). Culture and anxiety: Cross- cultural evidence for the patterning of anxiety disorders. In H.A. Tuma. & J.D. Maser (Eds.), *Anxiety and anxiety disorders* (PP. 297-323). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
13. Deb, S. (2001, October). A study on the negative effects of academic stress. Paper presented at the International Seminar on Learning and Motivation, Kedah Darul Aman, Malaysia.
14. Freud, S. *A general introduction to psychoanalysis*, New York: Garden City Publishing Company; 1943.
15. Robinson S.M. *Juvenile delinquency: Its nature and control*. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston; 1961.
16. English HB, English, AC *A comprehensive dictionary of psychological and psychoanalytical terms*. Longmans; 1959.
17. Chauhan NS, Tiwari GP. *Manual of frustration scale*. Agra: Agra Psychological Cell; 1972.