COMPARISON OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND ATTENTION DEFICIT DISORDER OF STUDENTS STUDYING IN COASTAL AREA SCHOOLS

Dr.R.GNANADEVAN[*]
Dr. A. SELVARAJ, Ph.D.[**]
Mr.G. Sivakumar[***]

Abstract

The aim of the study is to compare the socio economic status and attention deficit disorder of students studying in coastal area 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 coastal area schools of Cuddalore and Nagapattinam Districts of Tamilnadu. The Attention Deficit Disorder Scale standardised by R.Gnanadevan etal. (2015) have been used to measure the attention deficit disorder of students. The present study reveals that the students belonging to various socio-economic status differ significantly in the various dimensions of attention deficit disorder such as inattention, hyperactivity, combined type problem, class room academic performance problem and class room behavioural performance problem. For all the above mentioned problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio-economic status than the students belonging to middle and upper socio-economic status. Proper efforts can be made for the desired care, treatment and progress of the children with attention deficit disorder through collaborated approach involving effective behavioural and educational intervention.

Keywords- Socio-Economic Status, Attention Deficit Disorder of Coastal Area Schools.

[*] Professor, Department of Education, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar-608002

[**] Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar

[***] Research Fellow, Department of Education, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar

1. INTRODUCTION

Coastal Tamil Nadu is a disaster-prone area. It is regularly affected by the natural disaster. The maximum loss of life was reported in the Cuddalore and Nagappattinam Districts. All the young people involved in a natural disaster have experienced an extremely frightening event. They face psychological problems, social problems, financial problems and legal problems. Students exposed to natural disaster are likely to experience one or more of the many psychological triggers that can lead to attention deficit disorder. A child with attention deficit disorder (ADD) is usually described as having a short attention span and as being distractible. The students with attention deficit disorder often fails to give close attention to details or makes careless mistakes in schoolwork, work, or other activities. It also affects their study habit and achievement in school subjects, which in turn leads to wastage and stagnation.

2. NEED AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The Attention Deficit Disorder is a very common problem in students and a major concern for many families and schools in the coastal area. Attention is an essential skill for the student's academic achievement. The difficulty in concentration is termed as Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD). The school experience can be challenging for students with ADD. Studies found that students with ADD, compared to students without ADD, had persistent academic difficulties that resulted in lower average marks, more failed grades, more expulsions, increased dropout rates, (Weiss & Hechtman as cited in Johnston, 2002; Ingersoll, 1988). A study by Barkley and colleagues (1990) found that 46 percent of the student having ADD. It can make meeting the daily rigors of school challenging (Zentall, 1993). Daily tasks such as getting up in the morning, preparing to leave the house for school, arriving at school on time, and being productive on their study can be especially challenging for students with ADD. Hence, a study of the students having Attention Deficit Disorder is essential if one were to find out the nature, extent and causes of Attention Deficit Disorder, as also to devise ways and means of helping these students both at home and at school. Hence, the investigator felt it necessary to do the present investigation.

3. OBJECTIVES

The following are the objectives of the present study:

1. To examine whether there is any significant difference in the attention deficit disorder of students studying in coastal area schools with respect to their socio-economic status.

4. METHOD OF STUDY

The survey method has been adapted to examine the level of students having attention deficit disorder studying in coastal area schools. The sample of the study includes the adolescent students studying in coastal area of Cuddalore and Nagapattinam Districts of Tamilnadu. From the coastal area schools 950 students studying at secondary level (8th, 9th and 10th standard) has been selected by using random sampling method. Attention Deficit Disorder Scale standardized by the investigator have been used for the present study. It includes four dimensions, such as, inattention, hyperactivity, academic performance and behavioural performance. Socio Economic Status tool standardized by Kuppuswamy (2013) have been used for the present study to find out the socio-economic status of students studying in coastal area schools.

5. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND INTERPRETATIONS

The mean scores of various dimensions of attention deficit disorder 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 inattention problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 794.55, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their inattention problem. The mean value indicates that the inattention problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=20.78) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=15.49), lower middle (M=10.24), and upper middle (M=8.38) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean hyperactivity problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 137.03, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their hyperactivity problem. The mean value

indicates that the hyperactivity problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=15.60) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=11.63), lower middle (M=9.17), and upper middle (M=7.23) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean combined type problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 391.91, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their combined type problem. The mean value indicates that the hyperactivity problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=36.39) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=27.41), lower middle (M=19.76), and upper middle (M=15.61) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean class room academic performance problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 52.27, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their class room academic performance problem. The mean value indicates that the class room academic performance problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=14.46) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=11.53), lower middle (M=11.13), and upper middle (M=10.80) socio economic status.

The Table-1 shows the result of the 'F' test carried out to compare the mean class room behavioural performance problem scores with respect to their socio economic status. The 'F' value is found to be 181.22, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, it is concluded that the students belonging to different socio economic status differ significantly in their class room behavioural performance problem. The mean value indicates that the class room behavioural performance problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio economic status (M=15.83) than the students belonging to upper lower(M=13.18), lower middle (M=8.87), and upper middle (M=7.85) socio economic status.

Table-1

COMPARISON OF MEAN ATTENTION DEFICIT DISORDER SCORES OF STUDENTS WITH RESPECT TO THEIR SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS

Dimensions	Source of variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	'F' Value	Level of Significance at 0.05 level
Inattention Problem	Between Groups	3	15806.37	5268.79	794.55	Significant
	Within Groups	946	6273.01	6.63		
	Total	949	22079.39			
Hyperactivity Complaints	Between Groups	3	6178.605	2059.53	137.03	Significant
	Within Groups	946	14217.88	15.02		
	Total	949	20396.48			
Combined Type Problem	Between Groups	3	41377.08	13792.36	391.91	Significant
	Within Groups	946	33292.05	35.19		
	Total	949	74669			
Class Room Academic Performance	Between Groups	3	1187.04	395.68	52.27	Significant
	Within Groups	946	7160.93	7.57		
	Total	949	8347.97			
Class Room Behavioural Performance	Between Groups	3	7685.99	2561.99	181.22	Significant
	Within Groups	946	13373.72	14.13		
	Total	949	21059.71			

6. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The students belonging to various socio-economic status differ significantly in the various dimensions of attention deficit disorder such as inattention, hyperactivity, combined type problem, class room academic performance problem and class room behavioural performance problem. For all the above mentioned problem is high for the students belonging to lower socio-economic status than the students belonging to middle and upper socio-economic status.

The studies conducted by Pickett et al., (2005), Elgar et al., (2005 and (2009), Pickett and Wilkinson, (2007) also indicates that the socio-economic status relates to child behavioural

problems in part through upward social comparisons of social class. Reiss(2013) found that the children from families with lower socio-economic status were about two to three times more likely to have mental health problems than children from more advantaged families. Hence, the early childhood interventions to reduce mental health problems in families with low socio-economic status is very essential. It is also important to consider policy approaches for reducing relative poverty. However, programmes that strive to reduce socio-economic status differences in child behaviour disorders must align with broader social and economic policy in order to change the social conditions that give rise to these differences in the first place.

7. CONCLUSION

Proper efforts can be made for the desired care, treatment and progress of the children with ADHD through collaborated approach involving effective medication, behavioural and educational intervention. The lack of awareness and proper diagnosis of ADHD has made quite number of countries and people too away from the attempts of fighting with this disorder. There is real need of awakening of our masses including the government agencies for taking due recognition of the ADHD disorder in the children and have all the possible diagnostic and treatment measures for its prevention and treatment. Children with ADHD require education for controlling their ADHD problems as well as for the proper adjustment and progress in their life. Equipping and training the teachers for being capable of teaching and handling the children with ADHD, 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 behavioural problems of the children with ADHD may help in achieving much in terms of the education of these children.

8. REFERENCES

Accardo, P.J., Blondis, T.S., Whitman, B. Y., & Stein, M. A. (2000). Attention Deficits and Hyperactivity in Children and Adults. New York: Marcel Dekker.

American Psychiatric Association. (1994/2000). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorder (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

American Academy of Pediatrics, (2000).Clinical Practice Guideline: Diagnosis and Evaluation of the Child with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. *Pediatrics*, 105, 5, 1158-1170.

American Academy of Pediatrics (2001) Clinical Practice Guideline: Treatment of the School-aged Child with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. *Pediatrics*, 108, 1033-1044. Retrieved from www.aap.org/policy0120.html.

Anderson, J. C., Williams, S. C., McGee, R., and Silva, P. A. (1987). DSM-III disorder in preadolescent children: Prevalence in a large sample from the general population. Archives of General Psychiatry, 44, 69-76.

Barkley, R.A., (1990). Comprehensive Evaluation of Attention Deficit Disorder with and without Hyperactivity as Defined by Research Criteria. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 58, 775-789.

Barkley, R.A.(1997). Behavioral Inhibition, Sustained Attention, and Executive Functions: Constructing a Unifying Theory of ADHD. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121:1, 65-94.

Barkley, R.A. (1998). Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. *Scientific American*, 279, 3.

Cantwell, D. P., and Basker, L. (1991). Association Between Attention Deficit -Hyperactivity Disorder and Learning Disorder. *Journal of Disabilities*, 24, 88-95.

Carlson, C. L., Pelham, W. E., Milich, R., and Dixon, J. (1992). Single and Combined Effects of Methylphenidate and Behavior Therapy on the Classroom Performance of Children with Attention - Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 20, 213-232.

Dykman, R.A., Akerman, p. t., and Raney, T.J. (1994). Assessment and Characteristics of Children with Attention Deficit Disorder. Prepared for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Service, U.S. Department of Education.

Grad L. Flick, (2010). Managing ADHD in K-8 Classroom: a Teacher's Guide. New Delhi:SAGE India Pvt. Ltd.

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.

Ingersoll, B. (1988). Your Hyperactive Child. New York: Doubleday.

Johnston, c. (2002). The impact of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder on social and vocational functioning in adults. In P.S. Jenson and Cooper (Eds.), attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: State of the science, Best Practices. (Chapter 6, pp 1-21). Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute.

Nahmias, M.L. (1995). Communication and Collaboration Between Home and School for Students with ADHD. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 30, 241-247.

National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). (2000). Research on Treatment for Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). The Multimodal Treatment Study-Questions and Answers.(Online).Retrieved from www.nimh.nih,gov/events/ mtaqa.cfm.

Pelham W.E., and Fabiano, G. (2001). Behavior Mmodification. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry Clinics of North America*, 9, 3, 671-688.

Pelham, W.E., Jr., Gnagy, E.M., Greenslade, K.E., and Milich, R. (1992). Teacher Ratings of DSM-III-R Symptoms for the Disruptive Behavior Disorders. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 31, 210-218.

Rapport, M.D., Stoner, G., and Jones, J. T. (1986). Empirically Supported Psychological Treatment for Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 27, 190-205.

Zentall, S.S. (1993). Research on the Educational Implications of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. *Exceptional Children*, 60, 143-153.