

**Impact  
Factor  
3.025**

**ISSN 2349-638x**

**Refereed And Indexed Journal**

**AAYUSHI  
INTERNATIONAL  
INTERDISCIPLINARY  
RESEARCH JOURNAL  
(AIIRJ)**

**UGC Approved Monthly Journal**

**VOL-IV**

**ISSUE-XII**

**Dec.**

**2017**

**Address**

• Vikram Nagar, Boudhi Chouk, Latur.  
• Tq. Latur, Dis. Latur 413512 (MS.)  
• (+91) 9922455749, (+91) 8999250451

**Email**

• aiirjpramod@gmail.com  
• aayushijournal@gmail.com

**Website**

• www.aiirjournal.com

**CHIEF EDITOR – PRAMOD PRAKASHRAO TANDALE**

**A Study of Relationship between Learned Helplessness and Socio Economic Status  
among Adolescent Students of Private and Government Schools**

**Dr. Sujata Atul Sharma**

**Abstract**

*Learned helplessness in humans can begin at a very early age if they see no correlation between their actions and outcomes. In 1975, Seligman formulated the theory of helplessness. Helplessness is a condition in which a person comes to believe that success is beyond his or her ability. The condition does not happen without repeated exposure to failure. As a result of experiencing repeated failure a person comes to believe failure will occur regardless of the amount of effort put forth towards the task. The findings of the earlier studies indicate that LH has got relationship with Socio Economic Status. Socio Economic Status (SES) is an economic and sociological combined total measure of a person's work experience and of an individual's or family's economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, and occupation. The objective of the present paper is to find out the relationship of LH & its components with SES & its components. The total sample consist 500 students from class IX & X and CASQ & SESS tools were used to access the relationship between LH and SES among adolescent students. The results were obtained by computing Pearson's correlation coefficient on LH and SES and their dimensions. The results of the study reveal that Education & Caste (components of SES) emerge out to be the strong determinants of LH among adolescents. The researcher has extrapolated the measures that society should consider in order to shape the student's behavior in positive direction.*

**Key Concepts:** Learned Helplessness, Internality, Stability, Globality, Socio Economic Status, Caste, Education, Income, Possession, Occupation, Status.

**Introduction**

The concept of "learned helplessness" is popular today in many circles, both clinical and experimental. The term has been applied to the failure of human beings to seek, utilize, or learn adaptive instrumental responses, as seen most dramatically in the depressed person who seems to have given up hope that effective voluntary control over important environmental events is possible (Seligman, 1975). Individuals who exhibit learned helplessness "learn" that their actions do not have any relation to the outcome of an event. Learned helplessness is the behavioral outcomes of cognitive representations of actions, which are either believed to be random or related and controlled by the individual. Learned helplessness is more likely to result from situations where failure is uncontrollable.

Learned helplessness is a phenomenon containing three components: Internal, Stable and Global. An internal attribution assigns causality to factors within the person. A stable attribution occurs when the individual believes the cause to be consistent. A global attribution occurs when the individual believes that the cause of negative events is consistent across different contexts.

In this research paper Learned Helplessness has been correlated and studied with a factor called Socio Economic Status. Socio economic status is a factor that defines the position or state of a person and its family in the society. A family's SES is based on family income, parental education level, parental occupation and social status in the community. In the present study we have considered 6 components of SES – Caste, Education, Income, Possession, Occupation, and Status.

### Review of Literature

A significant body of research (Dunn & Dunn, 1992; et al) indicates that the achievement of all students could be improved by providing initial instruction in a manner consistent with each student's learning style. Based on studies (Johnson, 1984; et al) using the Dunn and Dunn model of learning styles and the Learning Style Inventory (Dunn, Dunn & Price, 1989), many high school dropouts have learning styles that are miss-matched with the traditional instructional mode. While low SES is highly correlated with low achievement, some low SES students are academically successful. The purpose of this study is to determine if there is a difference in the learning style of low SES high achievers and low SES low achievers, in math and reading.

Researcher Hobbs, (1990) asserts that socio economic status (SES) is the single best predictor of academic achievement; low SES predicts low achievement. Programs such as Title I, which began in the 1960s, have attempted to remediate the problems associated with being economically disadvantaged. Studies (Hubbell, 1983; White, 1985) indicate that participation in these programs initially increases achievement, but that these academic gains fade over time. This suggests that the methods currently being used to remediate the educational deficits associated with being economically disadvantaged should be revised.

Students cite numerous reasons for dropping out of school. These reasons are frequently complex and involve several factors. Researchers (Dunn & Griggs, 1988) have grouped these factors into four general categories: familial factors, personal characteristics, socio economic factors, and educational achievement and school behaviors. Of these factors, educational achievement and school behaviors are the only factors that can be altered by educators. Other studies (Texas Education Agency, 1986; Hahn, 1987) reveal that lack of academic achievement is the single best predictor of dropping out of school. Thus, if dropout rates are to be significantly lowered, strategies to improve the academic achievement of at-risk students must be developed.

### Objectives

- To study relationship of LH with Socio Economic Status and its components (Caste, Education, Income, Occupation, Possession, Status).
- To study relationship of Internality attribution style with Socio Economic Status and its components (Caste, Education, Income, Occupation, Possession, and Status).
- To study relationship of Stability attribution style with Socio Economic Status and its components (Caste, Education, Income, Occupation, Possession, and Status).
- To study relationship of Globality attribution style with Socio Economic Status and its components (Caste, Education, Income, Occupation, Possession, and Status).

### Hypotheses

- There will be significant relationship of LH with Socio Economic Status & its components (Caste, Education, Income, Occupation, Possession, and Status).
- There will be significant relationship of Internality attribution style with Socio Economic Status & its components (Caste, Education, Income, Occupation, Possession, and Status).
- There will be significant relationship of Stability attribution style with Socio Economic Status & its components (Caste, Education, Income, Occupation, Possession, and Status).
- There will be significant relationship of Globality attribution style with Socio Economic Status & its components (Caste, Education, Income, Occupation, Possession, Status).

**Methodology:** Survey method has been used in the present research.

**Sample :** The samples comprise 500 male and female students of class IX & X from different government and private schools.

**Variables :** The dependent variable is LH and its dimensions (Internal, Stable and Global). The independent variable is Socio Economic Status & its components (Caste, Education, Income, Occupation, Possession, and Status).

**Tools :** To assess Learned Helplessness “CASQ (Children’s Attribution Style Questionnaire)” developed by F.M. Sahoo (1987) was used.

To assess Socio Economic Status “Socio Economic Status Scale” developed by Shah (1986) was used.

**Procedure :** The data was collected from the male and female students studying in government run schools and private run schools. Students were approached personally. The objective of the study was explained to them and was asked to fill the scales after the instructions made clear to them. After completion, the scales were taken back from them. Obtained data was tabulated for statistical analysis.

**Statistical Technique :** The Pearson’s correlation coefficient was computed using SPSS version 16.

**Analysis Interpretation:** The analyzed data has been presented in the Table -1:-

**Table- 1 Showing Coefficient of Correlation for LH & its components with Socio Economic Status & its components.**

Occupation	Education	Income	Possession	Status	SES Total
-.036	-.153**	-.028	-.058	.016	-.093*
-.116**	-.174**	.095*	-.174**	-.048	-.190**
.089*	-.014	-.027	.016	.045	.050
-.042	-.141**	-.113*	.021	.035	-.061

\*\*, Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

\*, Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

**From the correlation table it is observed that –**

The Caste component of SES factor is significantly and positively associated with the Stability and Globality explanatory style. Higher the scores on Caste component higher will be Stability & Globality attribution style. This means that the students belonging to higher castes in the society like Brahmins, Kshatriyas etc. feel that the bad events will remain constant and also the causes of bad events are consistent across different contexts.

The Occupation component of SES factor is perceived to the people with prestigious and renowned occupation in the society. It is found out to be significantly and negatively related with the Internality attribution style. Higher the scores on Occupation component lower will be Internality

attribution style. Also Occupation is significantly and positively associated with Stability attribution style, which means higher the scores on Occupation section, higher will be Stability attribution style. This means that the students belonging to the family with reputed occupation show less Internality & more Stability attribution style.

It is observed that the Education component of SES is significantly and negatively associated with the Internality, Globality and Total LH. Higher the score on Education component lower will be LH, Internality & Globality attribution style. By this it is meant that when education level of the student is high and also he/she belongs to a family where all the members are highly educated feel less LH and suffer less from the Internality & Stability attribution style.

The table indicates that the Income factor of SES is significantly and positively associated with the Internality & significantly and negatively associated with the Globality. Higher the scores on Income component higher will be Internality attribution style and also higher scores on Income component indicates lower Globality attribution style. It means that the students belonging to the higher income group of the family and also with high economic status show more Internality attribution style. Also the student with low income group shows more Globality type of attribution.

The table shows that the Possession component of SES is significantly and negatively associated with the Internality component of LH. Higher the scores on Possession component lower will be Internality attribution style. The term Possession indicates the facilities provided to the student in the family which includes the infrastructure, materialistic facilities like LCD, laptop, Air conditioner etc. Students who are provided with all this type of possessions suffer less Internality type of attribution.

It is observed from table that the Total SES factor is significantly and negatively associated with the Internality and Total LH. Higher the scores on SES scale lower will be LH and Internality attribution style. SES is defined as the relative standing in the society of a student based on the aspects that they are highly educated, possess well economic conditions, provided with many facilities, belonging to a higher social and caste group along with designated family members.

**Conclusion :** Thus from the results of the correlation table we can conclude that –

- There is significant relationship of Caste with Stability and Globality attribution styles.
- There is significant relationship of Occupation with Internality and Stability attribution style.
- There is significant relationship of Education with LH and Internality & Globality attribution styles.
- There is significant relationship of Income with Internality and Globality attribution styles.
- Also, significant relationship between Possession and Internality attribution style.
- At last, there is significant relationship of main factor SES with LH and Internality attribution style.

### **Educational Implications**

The finding of the present study has implications in education system. The present study's results reveal that Education & Caste (components of SES) emerge out to be strong determinants of LH among adolescents.

Due to reservations in different sectors, the students of General caste despite of many efforts and hard work are lagged behind in certain fields like education; jobs etc. Also the adolescents from less educated families feel learned helplessness.

Since adolescence stage is a very crucial stage and child learns many things which have impact on their life. Adolescents with low education, high caste, low possession & low occupation are more susceptible in developing LH and destructive behavior and may go into depression. So students need

social acceptance, social awareness and emotional handling from the society members. Future research and practice should include a consideration of the social context in which attributions are shaped.

## References

1. Dunn, R., & Griggs, S.A. (1988). High school dropouts: Do they learn differently from those who remain in School. *The Principal*, 34, 1-8.
2. Dunn, R., Dunn, K., & Price, G.E. (1989). *Learning style inventory*. Lawrence, KS: Price Systems, Inc.
3. Dunn, R., & Dunn, K. (1992). *Teaching elementary students through their individual learning styles*. Needham Heights MA: Allyn and Bacon.
4. Hahn, A. (1987). Reaching out to America's dropouts: What to do? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73(4), 290-294.
5. Hobbs, D. (1990). School based community development: Making connections for improved learning. In S. Rafferty & D. Mulkey (Ed). *The Role of Rural Schools in Community Development* (pp. 57-64). Mississippi State, MS. Southern Rural Development Center.
6. Hubbell, R. (1983). *A Review of Head Start Since 1970*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
7. Johnson, C.D. (1984). Identifying potential school dropouts. (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University.) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 45, 2397A.
8. Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). *Helplessness: On Depression, Development, and Death* San Francisco: Freeman, W.H., 212-576-9400. Retrieved from [www.whfreeman.com](http://www.whfreeman.com)
9. Texas Education Agency. (1986). Characteristics of at-risk youth. *Practitioner's Guide*, Series Number One. 26.
10. White, K.R. (1985). Efficacy of early intervention. *Journal of Special Education*, 19, 401-416.

