



ISSN Print: 2394-7500  
ISSN Online: 2394-5869  
Impact Factor: 5.2  
IJAR 2015; 1(12): 468-471  
www.allresearchjournal.com  
Received: 10-09-2015  
Accepted: 19-10-2015

**Dr. R Gnanadevan**  
Professor, Department  
Of Education Annamalai  
University, Annamalainagar-  
608002.

**Dr. A Selvaraj**  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Education  
Annamalai University  
Annamalainagar

**G Sivakumar**  
Research Fellow  
Department of Education  
Annamalai University  
Annamalainagar

## **Influence of Socio Economic Status on Social, Emotional and Behaviour Problem of Students**

**R Gnanadevan, A Selvaraj, G Sivakumar**

### **Abstract**

This study aimed to find out the influence of socio economic status on social, emotional and behaviour problem, 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 of Tamilnadu, India. The social, emotional and behaviour problem scale standardized by R. Gnanadevan *et al.* (2015) and socio economic status tool standardized by Kuppuswamy (1913) have been used for collecting data from the sample. The present study indicates that the socio economic status significantly contributed to the social, emotional and behaviour problem of students. 29.2% of the total variance in socio-economic status is attributed by the social, emotional and behaviour problem of students studying in Adi-dravidar welfare schools. 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

### **Introduction**

The scheduled caste students have been handicapped in matters of education because of socio-economic and cultural reasons. 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. All these problems affects the academic achievement of students. 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.

### **Need and Importance of the Study**

Socio-economic status positively relates to behavioral health in every age-group and social context in which it has been studied. The relation is monotonic – meaning that at every level of socio-economic status, health and well-being are usually better at the level above and poorer at the level below. Youths from higher socio-economic status backgrounds exhibit fewer internalizing and externalizing problems, fewer social skills deficits, and higher life satisfaction (Tremblay, 1999). According to the National Research Council and Institute of Medicine (O'Connell *et al.*, 2009), about 17% of children and youth suffer from diagnosable mental health problems, with internalizing and externalizing behavior problems being the most common at a prevalence rate of 13 and 11%, respectively. Behavior problems in children may impact adolescence and adulthood. Although some children recover, many develop chronic and debilitating mental health problems in adulthood, encounter academic

**Correspondence**  
**Dr. R Gnanadevan**  
Professor, Department  
Of Education Annamalai  
University, Annamalainagar-  
608002.

problems in school, have difficulty finding long-term employment, and become involved in criminal activity. 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. Capaldi and Stootmiller, (1999); Maughan and Rutter, (1998) found out that the problem behaviours during adolescence might foreshadow impaired adult functioning, including poor mental health, substance abuse and problematic social relationships. 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 came to know that over the last ten years, a growing body of research has highlighted the adverse psychological effects of socio-economic status on social, emotional and behaviour problem of children and young people. Most of the studies have been conducted in the western countries. Only very few studies have been conducted in India. Hence, the investigator felt it necessary to study about the influence of socio-economic status on social, emotional and behaviour problem of students.

**Method of Study**

The survey method has been used for the present study to find out the influence of socio economic status on social, emotional and behaviour problems of students. 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 of Tamilnadu, India. 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) and socio economic status tool standardized by Kuppuswamy (1913) have been used for the present study to collect the data from the sample.

**Analysis of data and interpretations**  
**Comparison of Socio-economic status on Social, Emotional and Behaviour Problem of Students**

The mean scores 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 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.

**Table 1:** Comparison of Mean Social, Emotional and Behaviour Problem Scores of Students With Respect To Their Socio Economic Status

Dimensions	Source of variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	‘F’ Value
Internalizing Problem	Between Groups	9938.89	3	3312.96	66.99**
	Within Groups	43070.07	871	49.44	
	Total	53008.97	874		
Externalizing Problem	Between Groups	10177.82	3	3392.60	93.79**
	Within Groups	31503.57	871	36.16	
	Total	41681.39	874		
Mixed Category	Between Groups	76934.72	3	25644.90	285.99**
	Within Groups	78102.09	871	89.66	
	Total	155036.81	874		

\*\* Significant at .01 level of significance

**Influence of Socio-Economic Status on Social, Emotional and Behaviour Problem of Students**

The regression analysis has been carried out to find out the influence of socio economic status on social, emotional and behaviour problems of students studying in Adi-Dravidar

welfare schools. The result of the analysis is presented in table-2.

The table-2 shows the R square value, which is found to be 293. It is evident that 29.2% of the total variance in socio-economic status attributed by the social, emotional and

behaviour problems of students studying in Adi-dravidar welfare schools.

**Table 2:** Model Summary for the Influence Socio Economic Status on Social, Emotional and Behaviour Problem Students

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.541 <sup>a</sup>	.292	.292	20.33970

### Findings

- The students belonging to various socio economic status differ significantly in the various dimensions of social, emotional and behaviour problems such as internalizing problem, externalizing problem and mixed category problem. 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.
- There is significant contribution found between the socio economic status and social, emotional and behaviour problem of students. 29.2 % of the total variance in socio-economic status is attributed by the different dimensions of social, emotional and behaviour problem of students studying in Adi-dravidar welfare schools.

### Conclusion

The present study indicates that there is significant contribution found between the socio economic status and social, emotional and behaviour problem of students. 29.2 % of the total variance in socio-economic status is attributed by the different dimensions of social, emotional and behaviour problem of students studying in Adi-Dravidar welfare schools. 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 TM, Edelbrock C. 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, 1981; 46:(Serial No. 188).
2. Achenbach TM, Verhulst FC, Baron GD, Althaus M. 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. 1987; 28:437-453.
3. Bateman BD. An Educator's View of a Diagnostic Approach to Learning Disorders in J. Hellmuth (Ed.) Learning Disorders Seattle, W.A.: Special Child Publications. 1969; 1:219-239.
4. Boss CS, Vaughn S. Strategies for Teaching Students with Learning and Behaviour Problems (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2002.
5. Bradley R, Danielson L, Hallahan DP. (Eds.) Identification of Learning Disabilities: Research to Practice, Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum, 2002.
6. Crijnen AAM, Achenbach TM, Verhulst FC. 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. 1997; 36:1269-1277.
7. Ekblad S. The children's behavior questionnaire for completion by parents and teachers in a Chinese sample. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry. 1990; 31:775-791.
8. Frisk M. 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 1995; 4:197-208.
9. Gates AI, McKillop AS, Horowitz R. Gates – McKellop – Horowitz Reading Diagnostic Tests, New York: teachers College Press, 1981.
10. Gjone H, Novik TS. Parental ratings of behavior problems: a twin and general population comparison. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry. 1995; 16:1215-1224.
11. Gresham FM, MacMillan DL, Bocian K. Behavioral Earthquakes: Low-frequency Salient Behavioral Events that Differentiate Students at Risk of Behavior Disorders. Behavioral Disorders, 1996; 21(4):277-292.
12. Janet Lerner W, Frank Kline. Learning Disabilities and Related Disorders. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2006.
13. Kavale KA, Forness SR. The Science of Learning Disabilities, San Diego, CA: College Hill, 1985.
14. Kirk SA, Kirk WD. *Psycholinguistic Learning Disabilities: Diagnosis and Remediation*, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1971.
15. Kornfalt T. Behavioural assessment in the school health service. Scandinavian Journal of Social Medicine. 1981; 9:63-73.
16. Kvernmo S, Heyerdal S. Influence of ethnic factors on behavior problems in indigenous Sami and majority Norwegian adolescents. Journal of American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. 1998; 37:743-751.
17. MaccFarlane JW, Allen K, Honzik MP. A Developmental Study of the Behaviour Problems of Normal Children between Twenty-one Months and Fourteen years. Berkely & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1954.
18. McLoughlin JA, Betick A. Defining Learning Disabilities: A New and Cooperative Direction. Journal of Learning Disabilities. 1983; 16:21-23.
19. Rutter M. A children's behavior questionnaire for completion by teachers: Preliminary findings. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry. 1967; 8:1-11.
20. Stanger C, Fombonne E, Achenbach TM. Epidemiological comparisons of American and French children: parent reports of problems and competencies

- for ages 6-11. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 1994; 3:16-28.
21. Telford CW, Sawrey JM. *The Exceptional Individual*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
  22. Tsiantis J, Motti-Stefanidi F, Richardson C, Schmeck K, Poustka F. Psychological problems of school-age German and Greek children: A cross-cultural study. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 1994; 3:209-219.