



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2022; SP-11(4): 1497-1505
© 2022 TPI
www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 13-02-2022
Accepted: 15-03-2022

Mukta G Sthavarmath
M.Sc. Scholar, Department of
Human Development and
Family Studies, College of
Community Science, University
of Agricultural Sciences,
Dharwad, Karnataka, India

Manjula Patil
Jr. Scientist, AICRP (CD),
Department of Human
Development and Family
Studies, College of Community
Science, University of
Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad,
Karnataka, India

Corresponding Author
Mukta G Sthavarmath
M.Sc. Scholar, Department of
Human Development and
Family Studies, College of
Community Science, University
of Agricultural Sciences,
Dharwad, Karnataka, India

Influence of stress and anxiety on scholastic performance and socio-emotional behaviour of urban and rural high school students

Mukta G Sthavarmath and Manjula Patil

Abstract

Stress and anxiety are common psychological problems which were adversely affecting the high school students academic performance and socio-emotional behavior. A study was made on influence of stress and anxiety on scholastic performance and socio-emotional behavior of urban and rural high school students to study the stress and anxiety among urban and rural high school students and to examine the influence of stress and anxiety on scholastic performance and socio-emotional behavior of urban and rural high school students. The population for the study comprised of Kannada medium government and private aided high school students, where 240 students from each urban and rural areas were drawn from Dharwad taluk of Karnataka. For the present study, the permission was sought from Block Education Officer and the Heads of the schools were contacted and permission was taken for conducting the study. From each class, 20 students were taken for the study randomly. Structured questionnaire on stressors (Targar 2009) [22], Study anxiety questionnaire (Vitasari *et al.* 2010) [23] and academic anxiety questionnaire (Andreson 2007) were used to know the stress, study anxiety and academic anxiety of students. Scholastic performance of the children-Rutter proforma-A (1967) [18] and child behavior checklist-teacher report form (Achenbach, 2001) [2] were used to know the scholastic performance and socio-emotional behavior of students. Result revealed that, higher the level of stress and anxiety lower the scholastic performance of high school students and majority of students with high level of stress and anxiety were in clinical range of behavior problems and low level of stress and anxiety among students were in normal behavior. This indicates the immediate need for counseling programmes for high school students to reduce the stress and anxiety during study period as well as during exams and to increase the scholastic performance and to reduce behavior problems of students.

Keywords: Stress, anxiety, high school students, scholastic performance and socio-emotional behavior

Introduction

Adolescence is a transition stage between childhood and adulthood and characterized by rapid physical changes and mental development. According to Ablard and Parker (2010) adolescence stage is defined as the time when individuals begin to function independently of their parents. It is the period of life when a child develops into an adult and generally seen from the age of 12 to 19 years.

Anxiety is the most common psychological turmoil facing school adolescent function in everyday life. In school life, every school adolescent in one way or another is a victim of anxiety disorders. The young people/students with anxiety disorder are so afraid, worried and cannot function normally. Anxiety has been defined as a future oriented mood or feelings characterized of negative affective state accompanied by self-focused, psychological and self-preoccupation within the controllability of future threat or potentially negative situation (Figuroa, 2013) [10]. It is estimated that 13 to 25 per cent of the world adolescents in schools face anxiety (Walsh *et al.*, 2010) [24]. In India, the prominent documented effect of anxiety among school children and adolescents is decreased scholastic performance and behavioural problems. This is amplified in secondary school where all 16-year old children attempt the class X first board examination, known as the secondary examination. Results of the secondary examination are vital for individuals since this is the main determining criteria for future admission to a high quality senior secondary school and a preferred academic stream.

Stress is a normal part of life. It can come from any situation or thought that makes you feel frustrated, angry or anxious. A low level of stress could be good. It can motivate and help a person to become more productive. It provides the means to express talents and energies and pursue happiness. However, too much stress or a strong response to stress can be harmful.

A high level of stress may have negative effect on cognitive functioning and learning of students. It can affect student's grades, health and socio-emotional behavior. Young adults today are engaging in a variety of risky behaviors that are increasing their chances of involvement in destructive and even deadly situations.

Additionally students have to face many academic demands, for example, school examination, answering questions in the class, showing progress in school subjects, understanding what the teacher is teaching, competing with other class mates, fulfilling teachers and parent's academic expectations. These demands may tax or exceed available resources of the students. As a consequence, they can be under stress, since the demand is related to achievement of an academic goal. So, stress is related to the achievement of an academic goal.

In view of the challenges associated with the stress and anxiety, it is important to study influence of stress, anxiety among high school students and its effect on their scholastic performance and socio-emotional behaviour. In this context, the present study was conducted with the following objectives.

Objectives

1. To study the stress and anxiety among urban and rural high school students
2. To examine the influence of stress and anxiety on scholastic performance and socio-emotional behavior of urban and rural high school students

Methodology

Research Design: The differential design was used to know the difference between urban and rural high school student's anxiety and 'chi square' analysis was employed to know the influence of personal characteristics on anxiety among urban and rural high school students.

Population and Sample

There were total 98 high schools in urban locality and 188 high schools in rural locality of Dharwad taluk. Twelve schools were randomly selected, within twelve schools, about 4 per cent of 98 urban schools (four schools: 2 govt, 2 private aided) and 2 per cent of 188 rural schools (four schools: 2 govt, 2 private aided) were randomly selected for the study who were willing to participate and had co-operation for the study. In the present study, the sample comprised of 480 high school students (240 boys and 240 girls) studying in 8th, 9th and 10th classes of schools (government and private aided) situated in urban and rural localities of Dharwad taluk.

Tools used for assessment

The following tools were used to collect different information of the school children for the study.

Structured questionnaire on stressors

Structured questionnaire on stressors developed by Targar (2009) [22], the questionnaire consisted of 59 items and 8 areas of stressors like school stressors (4 items), parental stressors (7 items), personal stressors (19 items), peer stressors (5 items), external stressors (5 items), physiological stressors (7 items), socio-economic stressors (2 items) and teacher stressors (10 items). For each item, 4 alternative answers are given like 4- extreme stress, 3- a lot of stress, 2- slight stress and 1- no stress and scoring is done as follows

Stress and scoring is done as follows

Level of stress	Range of score
Low stress	87 and below
Average stress	88-143
High stress	144 and above

Study anxiety questionnaire

Study anxiety questionnaire which was developed by Vitasari *et al.* (2010) [23] - The questionnaire contains 40 items, each of item has five scale that ask respondents to answer of questions base on student experiences, feeling, and thought about anxiety felt along study in campus. The scale format uses answering ranging from 1 being an answer of never, 2 for an answer almost never, 3 for an answer rare, 4 for an answer fairly often and 5 being an answer of very often. The total scores of respondent ranges from 1 to 200. Based on these total scores respondents are divided into 3 categories as follows.

Based on these total scores respondents are divided into 3 categories as follows.

Category	Score range
High anxiety	133-200
Average anxiety	65 – 132
Low anxiety	< 65

Academic anxiety questionnaire

Academic anxiety questionnaire developed by Andreson (2007) the questionnaire contains 16 items, each question has either true or false response, for each true response 1 score and for false response 0 score is given and for false items (10 and 13), reverse score is given. Total scores ranges from 0-16 and the scores above 12 or more indicative of test anxiety.

Scholastic performance of the children-Rutter proforma (1967) [18]

The proforma consists of qualitative information about scholastic performance, consistency in academic work, school attendance, leadership qualities, sports and extracurricular activities, reading and writing difficulties, presence of any illness, physical handicapness and the teacher's opinion about the need for psychological help. All together the proforma has 9 items consisting of sub items, for each item a score of one was given. So child can score a minimum of '9' scores and maximum of '22' scores. Based on obtained scores, respondents will be classified under 3 categories as follows:

Based on obtained scores, respondents will be classified under 3 categories as follows

Level	Scores
Low	9-13
Average	14-18
High	19-22

Child behavior checklist-teacher report form (Achenbach, 2001) [2]

The child behavior was measured through the teacher report form developed by Achenbach (2001) [2] which is a component in the Achenbach system of Empirical Based Assessment (ACEBA). The tool is used to identify the problem behavior in children given by the teacher who knows the child very well.

The checklist consists of 113 statements about the child's behavior, e.g. acts too young for his/her age where the responses are recorded on likert scale: 0= not true, 1= sometimes true, 2= very true or often true. The questions are grouped into a number of syndromes. There are eight syndrome subscales namely anxious/depressed, withdrawn/depressed, somatic complaints, social problems, thought problems, attention problems, rule breaking behavior and aggressive behavior. Among these, the subscales withdrawn, somatic complaints and anxious/depressed are grouped as externalizing problems.

The total behavior problem is also obtained by summing up the scores of all the items. For each syndrome, problem scale and the total score, tables are given that determine whether, the score represents normal, borderline and clinical behavior. The raw scores are then converted into T scores based on age and gender.

The classification of internalizing, externalizing and total behavior problems on the basis of T-scores are as follows

The classification of internalizing, externalizing and total behavior problems on the basis of T-scores are as follows

Levels	T-scores
Clinical range	>64
Borderline	60-63
Normal	<59

Data collection procedures

For the present study, high schools were randomly selected and the Heads of the of the schools were contacted and permission was taken for conducting the study. Twenty students (both boys and girls) from each class were selected randomly. The concerned class students were approached and explained about the study so as to seek their honest answers. The questionnaires were distributed to respective class students with right instructions. It took nearly one hour of 4 visits for the completion of all questionnaires for all selected classes. The filled questionnaires were collected and the doubts were cleared on the spot by the interviewer.

Statistical analysis: Frequency and percentages were used to

interpret the personal characteristics and anxiety among high school students. t-test was used to know the differences in selected independent variables and Chi-square was used to know the influence of personal characteristics on anxiety among urban and rural high school students.

Results and Discussion
Stress among urban and rural high school students

Table 1: Differences in stressors among urban and rural high school students N=480

Areas of stressors	Urban (240)		Rural (240)		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
School	7.84	2.31	17.27	7.69	8.69**
Parental	14.08	3.85	6.37	2.97	5.22**
Personal	38.01	8.20	31.73	8.69	7.92**
Peer	9.68	3.22	8.36	2.57	7.55**
External	9.35	2.90	13.54	3.69	6.28**
Teacher	17.24	6.13	10.69	2.45	3.61**
Physiological	11.24	3.63	7.69	2.13	1.17
Socio-economic	6.39	2.13	15.39	4.69	1.01

It was observed that, in urban locality, the highest mean (38.12) belonged to personal stressors followed by teacher stressors (17.24) and parental stressors (14.08). The least mean (6.39) belonged to socio-economic stressors. In rural locality also, the highest mean (31.73) personal, parental, familial) belonged to personal stressors followed by school stressors (17.27) and external stressors (13.54). The least mean (6.37) belonged to parental stressors. On statistical analysis significant difference found between urban and rural high school students on school, parental, personal, peer, external and teacher stressors at 0.01 level. Only with physiological stressors and socio-economic stressors not found significant difference. Paul and Damodaran (2016) [17] have expressed similar opinion regarding the various characteristics responsible for causing stress besides concern about academic ability and scheduling classes. As per Okwara-Kalu *et al.* (2014) [16] some of the significant sources of stress included academic, intra-personal and environmental.

Table 2: Association and difference between stress among urban and rural high school students

Locality	Levels of stress						χ ² value	Mean ± SD	t-value			
	Low		Medium		High					Total		
	n	%	N	%	N	%						
Urban	50	20.83	75	31.25	115	47.91	240	100	23.52**	143.25 ± 38.23	6.95**	
Rural	62	24.58	54	29.58	124	45.83	240	100				153 ± 40.20
Total	112	23.33	129	26.87	239	49.79	480	100				

The result of table 2 shows that, levels of stress among high school students in urban and rural localities. It was found that in urban locality, majority (47.91%) of students were in high level of stress followed by medium level of stress (31.25%) and 20.83 per cent of students belonged to low level of stress. In rural locality, the same trend was followed that, 45.83 per cent of students were in high level of stress followed by medium level (29.58%) and 24.58 per cent of students were in low level of stress. When both urban and rural localities considered, 49.79 per cent of students were in high level of stress followed by medium level (26.87%) and 23.33 per cent of students belonged to low level of stress. On statistical analysis the 'chi square' value was found to be significant at 0.01 level. The mean score of rural students with regard to

level of stress was found to be high (163.78) compared to mean score of urban locality students (143.25) and 't' value was found to be significant between levels of stress and locality. Similar significant relationship is also reported by Kadapatti (2017) [12]. However, in the present study, the rural students were observed having more stress. It appears rural students will be facing extra pressure to perform as a key element of the family's drive to promote their social and economic status in comparison to their urban counterparts as reported by Ai-qiang Xu *et al.* (2014) [4]. Sarada (2017) [19] also revealed that, the rural students were under more stress than urban students and statistical significance difference was also found between the groups.

Study anxiety among urban and rural high school students

Table 3: Association and difference between study anxiety among urban and rural high school students N=480

Locality	Levels of study anxiety								χ^2 value	Mean \pm SD	t-value
	Low		Average		High		Total				
	n	%	N	%	n	%	N	%			
Urban	45	18.75	93	38.75	102	42.50	240	100	1.23	113.29 \pm 23.29	0.72
Rural	41	17.08	86	35.83	113	47.08	240	100		109.32 \pm 20.12	
Total	86	17.91	179	37.29	215	44.79	480	100		110.98 \pm 20.18	

Study anxiety among high school students in urban and rural localities is presented in Table 4. It was found that, in urban locality, majority (42.5%) of students had high study anxiety followed by average (38.75%) study anxiety 18.75 per cent of students were belonged to low study anxiety group. In rural locality also followed the same trends that, majority (47.08%) of students were under high anxiety followed by 35.83 per cent of students were in average anxiety and 17.08 per cent of students were in low level of study anxiety. In total students, majority had high anxiety (44.79%) followed by average level and low level (37.29% and 17.91% respectively) of study anxiety. On statistical analysis, the ‘chi square’ value not found be significant indicated that, there is no association between study anxiety and locality. The mean score of urban locality students (113.29) slightly higher than rural locality

students (110.32) and ‘t’ value not found to be significant indicated that there was no difference found between locality and study anxiety of high school students. Similar results have been reported by Banga and Sharma (2016) [7] who found no significant difference in the study anxiety among rural and urban secondary school students. However, students coming from urban locality had slightly higher study anxiety than students coming from rural locality but this difference was not significant statistically. Sharma *et al.*, (2016) [7] also reported that, non-significant difference in the study anxiety among rural and urban secondary school students.

Academic anxiety among urban and rural high school students

Table 4: Association and difference between academic anxiety among urban and rural high school students N=480

Locality	Levels of academic anxiety						χ^2 Value	Mean \pm SD	t-value
	Presence of academic anxiety		Absence of academic anxiety		Total				
	N	%	N	%	n	%			
Urban	159	66.25	81	33.75	240	100	8.31**	8.59 \pm 2.59	2.19**
Rural	138	57.5	102	42.5	240	100		6.71 \pm 1.39	
Total	297	61.87	183	38.12	480	100		7.79 \pm 1.28	

** Significant at 0.0 1 level

It was found that, in urban locality, majority (66.25%) of students were under presence of academic anxiety followed by absence of academic anxiety (33.75%). In rural locality also same trend was followed that, 57.5 per cent of students were in presence of academic anxiety and 42.5 per cent of students were in absence of academic anxiety. In total sample, 61.87 per cent of students had academic anxiety and 38.12 per cent of students had not academic anxiety. On statistical analysis the ‘chi square’ value found to be significant at 1 per cent level indicated that, there was association found between academic anxiety and locality. The mean of urban locality

students (8.59) higher than rural locality students (6.71%) and ‘t’ value found to be highly significant. Kumar *et al.* (2015) [13] reported similar result that, there was significant difference found between rural and urban adolescents on the variable of academic anxiety. Banga and Sharma (2016) [7] reported that, there was significant difference in the academic anxiety among rural and urban secondary school students. However, students coming from urban locality had slightly higher academic anxiety than their counterparts coming from rural locality but this difference was not significant statistically.

Table 5: Differences in mean score of academic anxiety among urban and rural high school students N=480

Sl. No.	Statements	Urban (240)		Rural (240)		Range
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1	While taking an important exam, I perspire a great deal	0.97	0.50	0.57	0.49	0-1
2	I feel very panicky when I have to take a surprise test.	0.71	0.45	0.73	0.44	0-1
3	During tests, I find myself thinking of the consequences of failing.	0.35	0.47	0.61	0.48	0-1
4	After important tests, I am frequently so tense that my stomach gets upset.	0.18	0.39	1.00	0.49	0-1
5	While taking an important exam, I find myself thinking of how much brighter the other students are rather than how bright I am.	0.71	0.45	0.65	0.47	0-1
6	I freeze up on final examinations.	0.43	0.49	0.61	0.48	0-1
7	If I were to take a difficult course I would worry a great deal before taking it.	0.72	0.44	0.74	0.43	0-1
8	During exams I find myself thinking of things unrelated to the course material.	0.15	0.35	0.24	0.42	0-1
9	During exams I frequently get so nervous that I forget facts that I already know.	1.00	0.49	0.70	0.45	0-1
10	If I knew I was going to take a very difficult course, I would feel confident and relaxed beforehand.	0.12	0.32	0.11	0.31	0-1
11	I usually get depressed after taking a test.	0.46	0.49	0.63	0.48	0-1
12	I have an uneasy, upset feeling before taking a final.	0.77	0.41	0.93	0.44	0-1
13	When taking at test, I always feel I have done better than I actually did.	0.21	0.40	0.10	0.31	0-1

14	Getting a good grade on one test doesn't seem to increase my confidence on the second test.	0.28	0.45	0.24	0.42	0-1
15	After taking a test, I always feel I have done better than I actually did.	0.15	0.35	0.38	0.32	0-1
16	I sometimes feel my heart beating very fast during important exams.	0.716	0.451	0.79	0.40	0-1

The difference in mean scores of academic anxiety among urban and rural high school students is presented in table 5 It was noticed that, in urban locality, highest mean (1.00) belonged to 9th statement that, during exams I frequently get so nervous that I forget facts that I already know followed by first statement that, while taking an important exam, I perspire a great deal (0.98). The lowest mean (0.15) belonged to 15th statement that, after taking a test, I always feel I have done better than I actually did. In rural locality, highest mean (1.00) belonged to 4th statement that, after important tests, I am

frequently so tense that my stomach gets upset followed by 12th statement that, I have an uneasy, upset feeling before taking a final (0.93). The lowest mean (0.15) belonged to 15th statement that, after taking a test, I always feel I have done better than I actually did.

Influence of stress on scholastic performance and socio-emotional behavior of urban and rural high school students

Table 6: Association between stress and scholastic performance of urban and rural high school students N=480

Levels of stress	Levels of scholastic performance												χ^2 value
	Urban (240)						Rural (240)						
	High (112)		Average (97)		Low (31)		High (89)		Average (108)		Low (43)		
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
High	26	23.21	27	27.83	17	54.83	19	21.34	29	26.85	25	58.13	8.69**
Medium	33	29.46	35	36.08	8	25.80	29	32.58	31	28.70	10	23.25	
Low	53	47.32	35	36.08	6	19.35	41	46.06	48	44.44	8	18.60	

** Significant at 0.01 level

Table 6 visualized that, association between stress and scholastic performance of urban and rural high school students. In urban locality, with regard to high scholastic performance, majority (47.32%) of students were in low level of stress followed by medium level of stress (29.46%) and 23.21 per cent of students were in high level of stress. With regard to average scholastic performance, the students were equally distributed in medium and low level of stress (36.08%) and 27.83 per cent students were in high level of stress. Majority (54.83%) of low scholastic performed students were under high level of stress followed by medium level of stress (25.80%) and 19.35 per cent of students were in low level of stress.

In rural locality, with regard to high achieved students, majority (46.06%) of students were in low level of stress followed by medium level and high level of stress (32.58% and 21.34% respectively). With regard to average scholastic

performed students, 44.44 per cent of students were in low level of stress followed by medium level of stress (28.70%) and 26.85 per cent of students were in high level of stress. Among low performed students, majority (58.13%) of students were prone to high level of stress followed by medium level of stress (23.25%) and 18.6 per cent of students were in low level of stress. On statistical analysis, results showed that, there was significance association found between stress and scholastic performance of urban and rural high school students at 0.01 level. Similarly Aghdasi and Hasani (2014) [3] reported that, there was significant relationship found between academic performance and stress and also there was a strong inverse relationship between academic performance and stress. Stubbe (2017) [21] showed that, increased stress impaired the attention and concentration of the students which naturally had adverse effect on academic performance.

Table 7: Association between stress and internalizing problems of urban and rural high school students N=480

Levels of stress	Levels of internalizing problems												χ^2 value
	Urban (240)						Rural (240)						
	Normal (123)		Borderline (85)		Clinical (32)		Normal (147)		Borderline (65)		Clinical (28)		
N	%	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
High	26	21.13	33	38.82	18	56.25	31	21.08	28	43.07	14	50.00	10.87*
Medium	52	42.27	24	28.23	6	18.75	49	33.33	35	53.84	8	28.57	
Low	35	28.45	28	32.94	8	25.00	67	45.57	2	3.07	6	21.42	

Table 7 indicates the association and difference between internalizing problems and stress among urban and rural high school students. It was observed that, students with normal behavior, majority (42.27%) were in medium level of stress followed by low level of stress (28.45%) and 21.13 per cent students were in high level of stress. Among borderline behavior students, 38.82 per cent of students were in high level of stress followed by low level of stress (32.94%) and 28.23 per cent students were in medium level of stress. With regard to clinical range behavior, majority (56.25%) were in high level of stress followed by low level of stress (25%) and 18.75 per cent of students were in medium level of stress. On

statistical analysis, it was found that significant association between internalizing problems and stress among urban high school students at 0.01 level.

In rural locality, with regard to normal behavior, 45.57 per cent were in low level of stress followed by medium stress (33.33%) and 21.08 per cent were in high level of stress. Among borderline behavior majority (53.84%) were in medium level of stress followed by high level of stress (4.07%) and only 3.07 per cent of students were in low level of stress. With regard to clinical behavior, 50 per cent of students were in high level of stress followed by medium level (28.57%) and 21.42 per cent of students were in low

level of stress. On statistical analysis, it was found that significant association between internalizing problems and

stress among rural high school students at 0.05 level.

Table 7.1: Association between stress and externalizing problems of urban and rural high school students N=480

Levels of stress	Levels of externalizing problems														
	Urban (240)							χ^2 value	Rural (240)						
	Normal (80)		Borderline (119)		Clinical (41)		Normal (117)		Borderline (98)		Clinical (25)		χ^2 value		
	N	%	n	%	n	%	n		%	n	%	n		%	
High	20	25.00	47	39.49	17	41.46	2.01	31	26.49	35	35.71	13	52.00	1.36	
Medium	22	27.50	43	36.13	17	41.46		27	23.07	37	37.75	7	28.00		
Low	38	47.50	29	24.36	7	17.07		59	50.42	26	26.53	5	20.00		

Table 7.1 indicates the association and difference between externalizing problems and stress among urban and rural high school students. It was found that non-significant association

between externalizing problems and stress among urban and rural high school students.

Table 7.2: Association between stress and socio-emotional behavior of urban and rural high school students N=480

Levels of stress	Levels of socio-emotional behavior														
	Urban (240)							χ^2 value	Rural (240)						
	Normal (153)		Borderline (59)		Clinical (28)		Normal (123)		Borderline (84)		Clinical (33)		χ^2 value		
	N	%	n	%	N	%	n		%	n	%	n		%	
High	38	24.83	24	40.67	16	57.14	0.87	31	25.20	34	40.47	21	63.63	7.18**	
Medium	18	11.76	20	33.89	7	25.00		34	27.64	25	29.76	4	12.12		
Low	97	63.39	15	25.42	5	17.85		58	47.15	25	29.76	8	24.24		

** Significant at 0.01 level

Table 7.2 indicates that, association between socio-emotional behavior and stress among urban and rural high school students. In urban locality, no association found between stress and socio-emotional behaviour among urban high school students. In rural locality, majority (47.15%) of normal students were in low level of stress followed by medium level and low level of stress (27.64% and 25.20% respectively). With regard to borderline behaviour 40.47 per cent of students were in high level of stress and students in medium level and low level of stress were distributed equally (29.76%). Among clinical behaviour students, majority (63.63%) were in high level of stress followed by low level of stress (24.24%) and 12.12 per cent of students were in medium level of stress. The

statistical analysis showed significant association between stress and socio-emotional behaviour among rural high school students. Similar findings are reported by Garsia (2011) reported that, students with higher levels of acculturative stress tend to demonstrate lower scores on the measure of social-emotional behaviour. Feld (2011) [9] reported, a high prevalence of harmful behaviour such as widespread and chronic sleep deprivation correlates of stress among the students.

Influence of study anxiety on scholastic performance and socio-emotional behavior of urban and rural high school students

Table 8: Association between scholastic performance and study anxiety among urban and rural high school students N=480

Levels of study anxiety	Levels of scholastic performance														
	Urban (240)							χ^2 value	Rural (240)						
	High (112)		Average (97)		Low (31)		High (89)		Average (108)		Low (43)		χ^2 value		
	N	%	n	%	N	%	n		%	n	%	n		%	
High	20	17.85	26	26.80	15	48.38	12.39*	15	16.85	21	19.44	31	72.09	1.23	
Average	41	36.60	32	32.98	8	25.80		28	31.46	24	22.22	5	11.62		
Low	51	45.53	39	40.20	8	25.80		46	51.68	63	58.33	9	20.93		

*Significant at 0.05 level

Result of Table 8 shows, association between study anxiety and scholastic performance of urban and rural high school students. In urban locality, majority (45.53%) of students with high scholastic performance were in low level of study anxiety followed by average level of study anxiety (36.60%) and 17.85 per cent of students were in high level of study anxiety. With regard to average achieved students, 40.20 per cent of students were in low level of study anxiety followed by average level and high level of study anxiety (32.98% and 26.80% respectively). In case of low performed students, 48.38 per cent of students were in high level of study anxiety and 25.8 per cent of students were equally distributed between average level and low level of study anxiety. The ‘chi square’ analysis showed significance association between the levels

of scholastic achievement and levels of stress among students at 0.05 level of significance. These results are in line with the study by Erlina *et al*, (2012) [12] who also reported that, students who were high achievers had lower levels of study anxiety, while low achieving students had high levels of study anxiety. This was because high achievers had a strong understanding of subjects and had more confidence than low achievers. Lawrence (2014) also reported that, there was significant association found between the study anxiety and scholastic performance of secondary school students. In rural locality, the ‘chi square’ value showed non-significant association between scholastic achievement and study anxiety among high school students.

Table 9: Association between internalizing problems and study anxiety among urban and rural high school students N=480

Levels of study anxiety	Levels of internalizing problems													
	Urban (240)							Rural (240)						
	Normal (123)		Borderline (85)		Clinical (32)		χ^2 value	Normal (147)		Borderline (65)		Clinical (28)		χ^2 Value
	N	%	n	%	N	%		N	%	n	%	n	%	
High	34	27.64	32	37.64	16	50.00	3.25	32	21.76	28	43.07	15	53.57	2.87
Average	36	29.26	27	31.76	10	31.25		52	35.37	32	49.23	3	10.71	
Low	53	43.08	26	30.58	6	18.75		63	42.85	5	7.69	10	35.71	

Table 9 depicts the association between internalizing problem behavior and study anxiety among urban and rural high school students. The ‘chi square’ analysis showed non-

significance association between the internalizing problems and study anxiety among urban and rural high school students.

Table 9.1: Association between externalizing problems and study anxiety among urban and rural high school students N=480

Levels of study anxiety	Levels of externalizing problems													
	Urban (240)							Rural (240)						
	Normal (80)		Borderline (119)		Clinica (41)		χ^2 value	Normal (117)		Borderline (98)		Clinical (25)		χ^2 Value
	N	%	n	%	N	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	
High	19	23.75	45	37.81	18	43.90	5.23	27	23.07	38	38.77	17	68.00	3.69
Average	19	23.75	63	52.94	16	39.02		41	35.04	43	43.87	8	32.00	
Low	42	52.50	11	9.24	7	17.07		49	41.88	17	17.34			

Table 9.1 depicts the association between externalizing problem behavior and study anxiety among urban and rural high school students. The ‘chi square’ analysis showed non-

significance association between the externalizing problems and study anxiety among urban and rural high school students.

Table 9.2: Association between socio-emotional behavior and study anxiety among urban and rural high school students N=480

Levels of study anxiety	Levels of socio-emotional behavior													
	Urban (240)							Rural (240)						
	Normal (153)		Borderline (59)		Clinical (28)		χ^2 value	Normal (123)		Borderline (84)		Clinical (33)		χ^2 value
	N	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	
High	34	22.22	17	28.81	17	60.71	0.74	28	22.76	19	22.61	21	63.63	3.58
Average	46	30.06	19	32.20	5	17.85		33	26.82	33	39.28	3	9.09	
Low	73	47.71	23	38.98	6	21.42		62	50.40	32	38.09	9	27.27	

Table 9.2 depicts the association between socio-emotional behavior and study anxiety among urban and rural high school students. The ‘chi square’ analysis showed non-significance association between the socio-emotional behavior and study anxiety among urban and rural high school students. Ammara (2016) [5] found that, construct of bullying and behaviour problems demonstrated positive correlation and bully as significant positive predictor of

anxiety. Victim behaviour was also found to be significant predictor of anxiety. However, the association between study anxiety and behaviour not found to be significant.

Influence of academic anxiety on scholastic performance and socio-emotional behavior of urban and rural high school students

Table 10: Association between scholastic performance and academic anxiety among urban and rural high school students N=480

Levels of academic anxiety	Levels of scholastic performance													
	Urban (240)							Rural (240)						
	High (112)		Average (97)		Low (31)		χ^2 value	High (89)		Average (108)		Low (43)		χ^2 Value
	N	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	N	%	n	%	
Presence of academic anxiety	27	24.10	32	32.98	23	74.19	4.36**	17	19.10	19	17.59	33	76.74	6.58**
Absence of academic anxiety	85	75.89	65	67.01	8	25.80		72	80.89	89	82.40	10	23.25	

** Significant at 0.01 level

Table 10 indicates that, association between academic anxiety and scholastic achievement of urban and rural high school students. In urban locality, it was clear that, majorities (75.89%) of high achievers were in absence of academic anxiety and 24.10 per cent of students were in presence of academic anxiety. With regard to average achievers 67.01 per cent and 32.98 per cent of students were in absence of academic anxiety and presence of academic anxiety respectively. Among low achievers majority (74.19%) of students had academic anxiety and 25.80 per cent had not academic anxiety.

In rural locality, 80.89 per cent and 82.4 per cent of students were in absence of academic anxiety that students were high achievers and average achievers respectively. 19.10 per cent and 17.59 per cent of students were in absence of academic anxiety that students were high achievers and average achievers respectively. 76.74 per cent of low achievers had academic anxiety and 23.25 per cent had not academic anxiety. The statistical analysis showed significance association between the scholastic achievement and study anxiety in urban and rural locality at 0.01 level of significance. Norgate *et al.* (2012) [15] found that, higher

levels of academic anxiety was significantly related to lower academic performance and also associated with higher levels of worry which in turn was related to lower academic performance. Higher levels academic anxiety was

significantly related to lower academic performance. Xiao (2013) [25] reported that, there was significant association was found between scholastic performance and academic anxiety of secondary school students.

Table 11: Association between internalizing problems and academic anxiety among urban and rural high school students N=480

Levels of academic anxiety	Levels of internalizing problems													
	Urban (240)						χ^2 value	Rural (240)						
	Normal (123)		Borderline (85)		Clinical (32)			Normal (147)		Borderline (65)		Clinical (28)		χ^2 value
N	%	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%			
Presence of academic anxiety	42	34.14	52	61.18	21	65.62	1.12	46	31.29	46	70.76	28	100	3.58*
Absence of academic anxiety	81	65.85	33	38.82	11	34.37		101	68.70	19	29.23	-	-	

*Significant at 0.05 level

In urban locality, non-significance association was found between internalizing problems and academic anxiety among urban high school students. In rural locality, among normal behavior students, majority (68.7%) were in absence of academic anxiety category followed by presence of academic anxiety (31.29%). Among borderline behavior students, majority (70.76%) were in presence of academic anxiety

category followed by absence of academic anxiety (29.23%). With regard to clinical range behavior, all students (100%) were in presence of academic anxiety category. On statistical analysis significant association was found between internalizing problem behavior and academic anxiety among rural high school students.

Table 11.1: Association between externalizing problems and academic anxiety among urban and rural high school students N=480

Levels of academic anxiety	Levels of externalizing problems													
	Urban (240)						χ^2 value	Rural (240)						
	Normal (80)		Borderline (119)		Clinical (41)			Normal (117)		Borderline (98)		Clinical (25)		χ^2 value
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
Presence of academic anxiety	27	33.75	49	41.17	38	92.68	1.26	39	33.33	53	54.08	21	84.00	4.87
Absence of academic anxiety	53	66.25	70	58.82	3	7.31		78	66.66	45	45.91	4	16.00	

Table 11.1 depicts the association between externalizing problems and academic anxiety among urban and rural high school students. The ‘chi square’ analysis showed non-

significance association between the externalizing problems and academic anxiety among urban and rural high school students.

Table 11.2: Association between socio-emotional behavior and academic anxiety among urban and rural high school students N=480

Levels of academic anxiety	Levels of socio-emotional behavior													
	Urban (240)					χ^2 Value	Rural (240)							
	Normal (153)		Borderline (59)		Clinical (28)		Normal (123)		Borderline (84)		Clinical (33)	χ^2 Value		
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%			
Presence of academic anxiety	47	30.71	59	100	28	100	0.36	23	18.69	74	88.09	33	100	17.84**
Absence of academic anxiety	106	69.28	-	-	-	-		100	81.30	10	11.90	-	-	

** Significant at 0.01 level

Table 11.2 shows the association between academic anxiety and socio-emotional behaviour of urban and rural high school students. In urban locality, The ‘chi-square’ value showed no association between the socio-emotional behaviour and academic anxiety among urban high school students. In rural locality, it was found that 81.30 per of students were in absence of academic anxiety and 18.69 per cent of students were in presence of academic anxiety that all were under normal behaviour. With regard to borderline behavior, majority (88.09%) of students had academic anxiety and 11.90 per cent of students had not academic anxiety. Among clinical behaviour students, all were under presence of academic anxiety category (100%). The ‘chi square’ value showed significance association between the socio-emotional behaviour and academic anxiety among rural high school students.

Conclusion

Stress and anxiety are adversely affecting the scholastic performance as well as socio-emotional behavior of urban and

rural high school students. High level of stress was found among rural students and anxiety found more among urban students. It was noticed that, high level of stress and anxiety led to decreased scholastic performance and increased behaviour problems of urban and rural high school students.

Reference

1. Ablard KE, Parker WD. Parent’s achievement goal perfectionism in their academically talented children. *J. Youth Adolescence*. 2010;26(6):651-667.
2. Achenbach TM. *Manual for the ASEBA School-Age Forms and Profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Res. Centre for children, youth and families. ISBN 0-938565-73-7. 2001.
3. Aghdasi BS, Hasani AN. Study of the relationship between academic performance and satisfaction with stress (tension) of 2nd grade female students of Urmila city’s zone 1 high schools. *Indian. J. Fund. Appl. Life Sci*. 2014;4(4):3136-3141.
4. Ai-qiang S, Rao C, oyeesie R. Educational stress among

- Chinese adolescents: individual, family, school and peer influences. *Ind. J Ped.* 2014;76:495-499.
5. Ammara Asif A. Relationship between bullying and behavior problems (anxiety, depression, stress) among adolescence: Impact on academic performance. *Pub. Med. Crave Group LLC.* 2016, 36.
 6. Anderson MM. Academic anxiety questionnaire. *J. American Psy.* 2007;4(6):21-22.
 7. Banga CL, Sharma SK. A study of academic anxiety of secondary school students of Kangra district in relation to gender, locale and social category. *Int. Multidisc. e-J.* 2016;5(4):46-55.
 8. Erlina A, Effandi E, Normalizam Z, Nur AA. Mathematics anxiety and achievement among secondary school students. *American J Appl. Sci.* 2012;9(11):1828-1832.
 9. Feld DF. Student stress in high-pressure college preparatory schools. B.A. Thesis, Wes. Univ. 2011, 112.
 10. Figueroa L. Teachers' awareness and skills in addressing students with anxiety symptoms. *American J. Psychiat.*, 2013;4(2):232-243.
 11. Garcia MC. Examining relationships between social-emotional, cultural and academic outcomes of culturally diverse adolescents. M.A. Thesis. Univ. Calif. Riverside. 2011, 37.
 12. Kadapatti M. Prevalence of academic stress among students. *Int. J. H.Sc.* 2017;3(3):461-463.
 13. Kumar-Das S, Halder UK, Mishr B. A study on academic anxiety and academic achievement on secondary level school students. *Ind. Streams Res. J.* 2015;4(12):1-6.
 14. Lawrence AS. Relationship between study habits and test anxiety of higher secondary students. *Int. J Teacher Edu Res.* 2014;3(6):1-9.
 15. Norgate M, Stevensen J, Julie A. Anxiety and depression in academic performance: An exploration of the mediating factors of worry and working memory. *School Psych. Int.* 2012;33:433-449.
 16. Okwara-Kalu, Akande JA, Olowonirejuaro AO. A study of level and sources of stress among secondary school students. *J. Res. Method Edu.* 2014;4(5):32-36.
 17. Paul V, Damodaran DK. Stress management among adolescents. *The Int. J. Ind. Psych.* 2016;3(1):104-11.
 18. Rutter M. A children's behavior questionnaire for completion by teacher: Priliminary findings, *J. Child. Psy and Psychiatry.* 1967;8:1-11.
 19. Sarada M. The effect of anxiety and emotional intelligence on students' learning process. *J. Edu. Soc. Policy.* 2017;1(2):115-122.
 20. Sharma DL, Raoa MA, Ruea LDL. Current research on school-based bullying: A social-ecological perspective. *J. Soc Distress. Homeless.* 2016;22(1):21-27.
 21. Stubbe H. The effect of anxiety and emotional intelligence on students' learning process. *J. Edu. Soc. Policy.* 2017;1(2):115-122.
 22. Targar Shilpa. Stressors among the students of high school, *Ms.c Thesis*, University of agricultural sciences, Dharwad; Karnataka. 2009.
 23. Vitasari Prima, Muhammad Nubli, Abdul Wahab, Ahmad Othman, Muhammad Ghani Awang. A research for identifying study anxiety sources among university students. *Int. Edu. Studies.* 2010;3(2):14-16.
 24. Walsh K, Deb S, Chatterjee P. Anxiety among high school students in India: Comparisons across gender, school type, social strata and perceptions of quality time with parents. *Austr. J Edu. Devp. Psych.* 2010;10:18-31.
 25. Xiao IE, Zenab AEO, Lamia HE, Karema IE. The effect of birth order and socio demographic characteristics on anxiety and depression among adolescents. *Int. J Nursing Sci.* 2013;5(3):110-121.