A STUDY OF ANXIETY VALUE AMONG CHILD LABOUR WITH SARASON'S GENERAL ANXIETY SCALE

Neelam

Research Scholar,

Dept. of humanities and social sciences,

Sunrise University, Alwar, Rajasthan

Dr.Manju Shukla

Research Supervisor,

Dept. of humanities and social sciences,

Sunrise University, Alwar, Rajasthan

ABSTRACT

A moral value is a universally accepted ethical principle that governs the day to day living of life. These principles are important in maintaining unity, harmony and honour between people. Moral values are usually communal and shared by the public in general, thus if there is no agreement among community members no moral values will be established. The Kohlberg Model of Moral Development, Brain Areas and Mirror Neurons have been discussed in respect to Moral Values.

Kew word-: *Behaviour, Child Labour, Psycho-socially, Anxiety, Depression, Psychological*

INTRODUCTION

Child is the father of man and today's child is tomorrow's citizen. Well–nourished, educated and socialized child may well prove to be a strong foundation of nation's development. So it is our duty to look after them; protect them and provide them better care for their physical and mental growth. In a welfare state it also becomes the duty of the government to promote children welfare through different schemes and policies, so that they will not be exposed to any sort of hazards, which may damage their groth, which ultimately damages political, social as well as economic growth of the society.

Every child has the right to receive the best that the country and community have to offer. Every child should grow in an environment that helps him or her to live a life of freedom in dignity, in an atmosphere that provides education and opportunities help the child grow into a worthy citizen. Unfortunately, a large chunk of child population is forced to work often in the most hazardous conditions. Child labour is a national and global phenomenon.

The number of working children is increasing from year to year. Some reasons are economic situation of their

family, lack of employment opportunities for the adult member,and the preference of then employers to hire children to save on production costs. The childloses all the pleasures of life and potentials of growth and development.

Child labour has a negative impact on children's psychosocial health and development. Understanding the impact of work on child's mental and social health is essential to inform policy and future research as well as to improve the lives of children.

Those Psychological problemsdisorders and symptoms are like; Anxiety, Depression, Migraines, Insomnia, Irritability, Enuresis and Asthenia; Impaired Memory, Emotional Problems, Mental Health Problems, Psychiatric Disorders, Emotional and Conduct Disorders, Behavioural and Anxiety Disorders. Further the Frustration and Inadequacy resists eventually in building their Emotional Cognitive Skills and they become Withdrawn, Introvert and Uncommunicative and developed Psychological Immaturity. The most of the studies fall into Clinical and Psychiatric domain.

METHDOLOGY

The Child Labour are those Boys and Girls aged between 8 years and 14years who do household jobs and other odd jobs in families, shops, tea stalls, dhabas, hotels,factories, and at railway platforms etc. The 'Child Labour' constitutes of the working boysand girls residing and working in urban as well as in rural localities. This target group is theExperimental Group for the present investigation.

A matched group of Non-working Boys and Girls of age group 8 years to 14 years living and studying in Urban and Rural settings were selected. This group of non-working participants was matched to the working participants on the basis of age, sex and locality

SAMPLE & SAMPLING

The sample was selected in the following categories of working and non-workingchildren:-

WUB- Working Boys living and working in urban locality (N=50) NUB- Non-

Working Boys living and studying in urban locality (N=50)WUG- Working Girls

living and working in urban locality (N=50) NUG- Non-Working Girls living and

studying in urban locality (N=50)WRB- Working Boys living and working in

rural locality (N=50)

NRB- Non-Working Boys living and studying in rural locality (N=50)WRG-

Working Girls living and working in rural locality (N=50) NRG- Non-

Working Girls living and studying in rural locality (N=50)

The investigator adopted the following Criteria for Selection (inclusion/exclusion) of the Sample for the

present study.

1. The Non-Working Children constituting the Control Group (Matched Group) were full time students studying in different schools.
2. The Non-Working Children selected as Control Group were in the age range of 8 years to 14 years.
3. The Non-Working Children selected as Control Group were all living in their families and studying in the Urban or Rural areas of Meerut District
4. The Non-Working Children selected as Control Group belonged to both the sexes.

The Distribution of Sample has been presented in the following Table.

TABLE-3.1- DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE FOR THE PRESENT INVESTIGATION

		A- Work Status				
		Working		Non-Working		
	B- Sex	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Total
C- Urbanization	Rural	50	50	50	50	200
	Urban	50	50	50	50	200
Total		100	100	100	100	400

The sampling technique employed for the purpose of selection of sample was Purposive Random Sampling, because the Random or even the Stratified Random Sampling techniques were neither suitable nor possible for selecting such a special class of sample i.e. the 'Child Labour', for the present investigation

TOOLS

The appropriate tools for the problem under investigation were selected after careful review of the related literature. The tools were selected with the criteria that (i) all the tests were in Hindi Language, (ii) Indian adaptations or indigenously made, (iii) standardized, and (iv) suitable for the population to be tested, i.e. apt and appropriate for the population of Working Children (Child Labour) (Experimental Group) and Non-Working Children (Control Group- Matched Group) aged between 8 years to 14 years.

Thus the tests found apt and appropriate for the purpose of carrying out the measurements on the variables of the investigation i.e.

1. **SARASON'S GENERAL ANXIETY SCALE FOR CHILDREN (GASC) by Anil Kumar**

The present instrument is the Indian adaptation of Sarason's General Anxiety Scale For Children developed by Anil Kumar, for use in Indian Culture andis helpful in locating level of anxiety of children up to the age of 17 or 18 years. The scale categorizes the Anxiety of children into five categories, viz. Very Low, Low, Average, High and Very High. The scale was adapted in Hindi language and due care was exercised to employ simple Hindi words generally used by the children of the target age group. The scale constituted of forty five (45) items related to varied situations. These items contain an element of anticipation of dangerous and painful consequences. The various situations, with which the items are generally related, are as follows:-

(a) Health, Physical appearance, and injury.

(b) Success or failure in his work.

(c) Afraid from animals and strange things.

(d) Social Relations and social approvals.

(e) Worries regarding family members and other relatives.

(f) Worries regarding the future happenings.

(g) Afraid in loneliness.

A few examples of items are presented in the following table. However, any time limit has not been prescribed for completion of the test but individual generally takes about 15 minutes to complete the test.

TABLE-3.7- ITEMS OF HINDI VERSION OF GENERAL ANXIETY SCALEFOR CHILDREN (A FEW ITEMS - FOR EXAMPLE)

Item Number	Items
2	क्या कभी –कभी यह चिन्ता रहती है कि अन्य बच्चे आपसे अधिक सुन्दर हैं**?**
12	क्या आपको कभी यह चिन्ता रहती है कि जो काम आप करना चाहते हैं उसे नहीं कर पायेंगे **?**
26	क्या आपको बन्दूक**,** पिस्तौल आदि से डर लगता है **?**
21	यदि आप घर में अकेले हों और कोई दरवाजा खटखटाये तो आपको चिन्ता होने लगती है **?**
28	क्या आपको कुत्ते से काटे जाने का डर लगता है **?**
37	क्या आप यह सोच कर चिन्तित रहते हैं कि क्या होने वाला है **?**
39	क्या चोट लगने के भय से आप लड़ाई--झगड़ा नापसन्द करते हैं **?**
40	क्या आपको यह चिन्ता रहती है कि आपके पिता बीमार हो जायेंगे **?**
45	क्या आप चिन्तित रहते हैं **?**

SCORING: It is an easily scorable scale. The 'Yes' answer to an item means admitting anxiety and a 'No' answer to an item is contra indicative. The total number of 'Yes' answers denote the Raw Score of Anxiety.

RELIABILITY: The reliability of the instrument was established in two ways viz. by Split- half Method and

by Kudur Richardson Formula -20. The Reliability Coefficients are presented in the following table:-

TABLE-3.8- RELIABILITY OF GENERAL ANXIETY SCALE FOR CHILDREN

S.No.	Method of Reliability	Reliability Coefficient
1.	Split- Half Method	0.79
2.	Kudur Richardson Formula -20	0.81

The high index of reliability i.e. **0.80** provides evidence of a high degree of internal consistency of GASC. The low value of Standard Error of Measurement ($SE_m = 2.7538$) further confirms that the scale is quite reliable for use on Indian children.

VALIDITY: Sarason and his associates through their different studies have established the High 'Content Validity' and 'Construct Validity' of the original scale. The same i.e. High 'Content Validity' and 'Construct Validity' can be assumed for the present scale as it is an Indian adaptation of the original scale. The 'Concurrent Validity' of the scale was established against two criterions (i) teacher's rating of 17 items for rating school going children and (ii) against 'Sinha's Anxiety Scale'. The correlations between Teacher's ratings and GASC scores, was found significant at 0.01 level of significance. The correlations between scores of 'Sinha's Anxiety Scale' and GASC scores i.e. the size of Validity was found to be 0.736. Thus the Validity of the Scale i.e. Indian adaptation of GASC was found satisfactory.

NORMS: Percentile Norms have been computed for the test. Separate norms are there for both the sexes i.e. males and females. The Anxiety level of the subjects have been classified into five categories on the basis of their raw scores. These are presented in tables given below:-

TABLE-3.9- PERCENTILE NORMS OF MALES AND FEMALES

Percentile	Males	Females
P_{90}	34.40	38.19
P_{80}	32.13	34.30
P_{70}	29.77	32.50
P_{60}	27.74	29.80
P_{50}	25.54	27.80
P_{40}	23.38	25.80
P_{30}	21.23	23.80
P_{20}	18.57	21.39
P_{10}	17.38	20.00
Mean	25.03	27.10
Md.	25.54	27.80
S.D.	7.98	6.95

TABLE-3.9- CATEGORIES OF ANXIETY IN CHILDREN

Categories	Range of Scores	
	Males	Females
Very High	42 & above	42 & above
High	33 – 41	35 – 41
Average	18 - 31	22 - 34
Low	10 - 17	15 - 21
Very Low	9 & below	14 & below

RESULT & DISCUSSION

A. Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Boys-Rural

The significant *t- ratio* was found for the variable **Anxiety** of Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Boys-Rural, whereas the *t- ratios* for **Moral Value** and **Emotional Stability** were found insignificant.

Anxiety t (198) = **4.16**, p = 0.000, X WorkingBoysRural = 31.22> X NonWorkingBoysRural = 25.88

Moral Value t (198) = -1.946, p = 0.055, X WorkingBoysRural = 22.22< X NonWorkingBoysRural = 24.36;

Emotional Stability t (198) = -1.046, p = 0.298, X WorkingBoysRural = 7.6< X NonWorkingBoysRural = 8.04

The significant '***t-ratio***' supported the interpretation that certainly there existed differential effect of the two factors of Independent Variable i.e. Work Status - Sex - Urbanization jointly (i.e. Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Boys-Rural) on the Dependent Variable i.e**. Anxiety**. It further implied that the differences between the Means of this category of Dependent Variables (D.Vs.) i.e**. Anxiety** of children formed on the basis of Work Status, Sex and Urbanization (I.Vs.) of children were not real and reliable and due to chance alone. This in turn suggested the rejection of any Null Hypothesis that would have been formed and formulated for the variable and directed to the acceptance of the conerened directional hypothesis foremd and formulated. Thus the hypothesis *Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Boys-Rural differ significantly on their Anxiety'* stands accepted.

The insignificant '*t-ratios'* supported the interpretation that the apparent differential effect of the two factors of Independent Variables i.e. Work Status - Sex - Urbanization jointly (i.e. Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Boys-Rural) on the two Dependent Variables i.e. **Moral Value** and **Emotional Stability** is not real and reliable and is due to chance alone. It further implied that the differences between the Means of this category of Dependent Variables (D.Vs.) i.e. **Moral Value** and **Emotional Stability** of children formed on the basis of Work Status, Sex and Urbanization (I.Vs.) of children were not real and reliable and due to chance alone. This in turn suggested the non- rejection of any Null Hypotheses that would have been formed and formulated for the variables and the rejection of the directional hypotheses formed and formulated. Thus the hypotheses *'Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Boys-Rural differ significantly on their Moral Value'* and *'Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Boys-Rural differ significantly on their Emotional Stability'* stand rejected.

The Working-Boys-Rural are superior to the Non-Working-Boys-Rural on Anxiety. The Non-Working-Boys-Rural are superior to Working-Boys-Rural the on Moral Value and Emotional Stability (though without any degree of certainity- the *'t-ratios'* being insignificant) . *Thus the Working-Boys-Rural possess high level of Anxiety.* They have low Moral Value and low Emotional Stability.

B. Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Boys-Urban

The significant *t- ratios* were found for all the three variables **Moral Value, Anxiety** and

Emotional Stability of Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Boys-Urban.

Moral Value t (198) = **-2.295**, p = 0.024, X WorkingBoysRural = 22.22< X NonWorkingBoysUrban = 24.7; **Anxiety** t (198) = **6.568**, p = 0.000, $\overline{X}$ WorkingBoysRural = 31.22> X NonWorkingBoysUrban = 23.22 **Emotional Stability** t (198) = **3.48**, p = 0.001, X WorkingBoysRural = 7.6> X NonWorkingBoysUrban = 6.34

The significant'*t-ratios'* supported the interpretation that certainly there existed differential effect of the two factors of Independent Variable i.e. Work Status - Sex - Urbanization jointly (i.e. Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Boys-Urban) on all the Dependent Variables i.e. **Moral Value, Anxiety** and **Emotional Stability.** It further implied that the differences between the Means of this category of Dependent Variables (D.Vs.) i.e. **Moral Value, Anxiety** and **Emotional Stability** of children formed on the basis of Work Status, Sex and Urbanization (I.Vs.) of children were real and reliable and not due to chance alone.This in turn suggested the rejection of any Null Hypotheses that would have been formed and formulated for these variables and directed to the acceptance of the conerened directional

hypotheses formed and formulated. Thus the hypotheses *'Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Boys-Urban differ significantly on their Moral Value', 'Working-Boys-Ruraland Non-Working-Boys-Urban differ significantly on their Anxiety'* and *'Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Boys-Urban differ significantly on their Emotional Stability'* stand accepted.

The Working-Boys-Rural are superior to the Non-Working-Boys-Urban on the the dependent variables Anxiety and Emotional Stability. But the Non-Working-Boys-Urban are superior to the Working-Boys-Rural on Moral Value. Thus the Working-Boys-Rural possess low Moral Value, high level of Anxiety and high Emotional Stability.

C. Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Girls-Rural

The *t- ratios* was found significant for the variable **Moral Value** and **Anxiety** of Working- Boys- Rural and Non-Working-Girls-Rural, whereas the *t- ratio* for **Emotional Stability** was found insignificant.

Moral Value t (198) = **-2.24**, p = .027, X WorkingBoysRural = 22.22< X NonWorkingGirlsRural = 24.52

Anxiety t (198) = **3.853**, p = 0.000, X WorkingBoysRural = 31.22> X NonWorkingGirlsRural = 26.5

Emotional Stability t (198) = 1.035, p =0.303, X WorkingBoysRural = 7.6> X NonWorkingGirlsRural = 7.18

The significant '*t-ratios'* supported the interpretation that certainly there existed differential effect of the two factors of Independent Variable i.e. Work Status - Sex - Urbanization jointly (i.e. Working- Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Girls-Rural) on the Dependent Variables i.e**. Moral Value** and **Anxiety.** It further implied that the differences between the Means of this category of Dependent Variables (D.Vs.) i.e**. Moral Value,** and **Anxiety** of children formed on the basis of Work Status, Sex and Urbanization (I.Vs.) of children were real and reliable and not due to chance alone. This in turn suggested the rejection of any Null Hypotheses that would have been formed and formulated for the variables and directed to the acceptance of the conerened directional hypotheses foremd and formulated. Thus the hypotheses *'Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Girls-Rural differ significantly on their Moral Value'* and *' Working- Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Girls-Rural differ significantly on their Anxiety'* stand accepted.

The insignificant '*t-ratio'* supported the interpretation that the apparent differential effectof the two factors of Independent Variables i.e. Work Status - Sex - Urbanization jointly (i.e. Working- Boys-Rural and Non-

Working-Girls-Rural) on the two Dependent Variable i.e**. Emotional Stability** is not real and reliable and is due to chance alone**.** It further implied that the difference between the Means of this category of Dependent Variables (D.Vs.) i.e**. Emotional Stability** of children formed on the basis of Work Status, Sex and Urbanization (I.Vs.) of children was not real and reliable and due to chance alone. This in turn suggested the non- rejection of any Null Hypothesis that would have been formed and formulated for the variable and the rejection of the directional hypothesis formed and formulated. Thus the hypothesis *'Working- Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Girls-Rural differ significantly on their Emotional Stability'* stands rejected.

The Non-Working-Girls-Rural are superior to the Working- Boys-Rural on Moral Value but Working- Boys-Rural are superior to the Non-Working-Girls-Rural on Anxiety. The Working- Boys-Rural are superior to the Non-Working-Girls-Rural on Emotional Stability (though without any degree of certainity- the *'t-ratios'* being insignificant). *Thus the Working-Boys-Rural possess high level of Anxiety and low Moral Value .* They also have high Emotional Stability.

D. Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Girls-Urban

The *t- ratios* were found significant for all the three variables **Moral Value, Anxiety** and

Emotional Stability of Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Girls-Urban.

Moral Value t (198) = **-3.507**, p = 0.001, X WorkingBoysRural = 22.22< X NonWorkingGirlsUrban = 26

Anxiety t (198) = **5.947**, p = 0.000, X WorkingBoysRural = 31.22> X NonWorkingGirlsUrban = 24.4

Emotional Stability t (198) = **-3.794**, p =0.000, X WorkingBoysRural = 7.6< X NonWorkingGirlsUrban = 8.82

The significant '*t-ratios'* supported the interpretation that certainly there existed differential effect of the two factors of Independent Variable i.e. Work Status - Sex - Urbanization jointly (i.e. Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Girls-Urban) on all the Dependent Variables i.e**. Moral Value, Anxiety** and **Emotional Stability.** It further implied that the differences between the Means of this category of Dependent Variables (D.Vs.) i.e**. Moral Value, Anxiety** and **Emotional Stability** of children formed on the basis of Work Status, Sex and Urbanization (I.Vs.) of children were all real and reliable and not due to chance alone. This in turn suggested the rejection of any Null Hypotheses that would have been

formed and formulated for these variables and directed to the acceptance of the conerened directional hypotheses formed and formulated. Thus the hypotheses ' Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Girls-Urban differ significantly on their Moral Value', 'Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Girls-Urban differ significantly on their Anxiety' and 'Working-Boys-Rural and Non-Working-Girls-Urban differ significantly on their Emotional Stability' stand accepted.The Working-Boys-Rural are superior to the Non-Working-Girls-Urban on Anxiety whereas the Non-Working-Girls-Urban are superior to the Working-Boys-Rural on Moral Valueand Emotional Stability. Thus the Working-Boys-Rural possesses high level of Anxiety but are lowat Moral Value and Emotional Stability.

CONCLUSION

Out of three Two Way Interaction Effects of the three Independent Variables Work Status, Sex and Urbanization on Moral Value of Children only one i.e. Work Status* Urbanization was foundsignificant and revealed the existence of the following hierarchy [Non-Working Urban Children> Non-Working Rural Children> Working Rural Children> Working Urban Children] of Moral Value. The other two Way Interaction Effects [Work Status*Sex and Sex* Urbanization] and Three Way Interaction Effect [Work Status*Sex*Urbanization] for Moral Value were found insignificant.All the three Main Effects of each of the three Independent Variables Work Status, Sex and Urbanization on Moral Value of Children were significant which revealed the superiority of Non-Working Children over Working Children, Girls over Boys and Rural Children over Urban Children on their Moral Value.

REFERENCES

1 Khan H, Hameed A, Afridi AK.(2007) Study on child labour in automobile workshops ofPeshawar, Pakistan. East Mediterr Health J. *13*, 1497–502. [PubMed]

2. Laraqui CH, Caubet A, Laraqui O, Belamallem I, Harourate K, Curtes JP, et al.(2000). Child labourin the artisan sector of Morocco: Determinants and health effects. Sante Publique. *12,* 31–43. [PubMed]

3. Saddik B, Nuwayhid I, Williamson A, Black D. Evidence of neurotoxicity in working children inLebanon. Neurotoxicology. 2003;24:733–9. [PubMed]

4. Fekadu D, Alem A, Hägglöf B. (2006). The prevalence of mental health problems in Ethiopianchild labourers. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. *47*, 954–9. [PubMed]

5. Thabet AA, Matar S, Carpintero A, Bankart J, Vostanis P. (2010). Mental health problems amonglabour children in the Gaza Strip Child: Care, health and development.*1*, 1–7.

6. Abiodun, O.A. (1993). Emotional illness in a pediatric population in Nigeria. J Trop Pediatr, 39: 49-51.

7.Benvegnu, L.A., Fassa, A.G., Facchini, L.A., Wegman, D.H., Dall'Agnol, M.M. (2005). Work andbehavioural problems in children and adolescents. Int J Epidemiol, 34: 1417-1424

8. Mamun, Rashed; Nazrul Islam Mondal; Rafiqul Islam; and M. Kabir (2008) "Impact of Some KeyFactors on Health Complication of the Child Laborers during Work: A Study on Rangpur, Bangladesh", *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences. 5(3),* 262-267.

9. Murshed, Madiha (2001) "Unraveling Child Labor and Labor Legislation", *Journal of International Affairs. 5(1)* 169-189.

10. Ahmed, M. A. (1991). Child labor in Pakistan: a study of the Lahore area. *Child Welfare*, 70:261–7.

11. Brady, Erika U., Kendall, Philip C. (1992). Comorbidity of anxiety and depression in children and adolescents. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111(2), 244-255.

12. Broeren, S. and Muris, P. (2009). The Relation between Cognitive Development and Anxiety Phenomena in Children, *Journal of Child Fam Stud.*18 (6): 702-709.

13. Channar, M.S., Khichi, G.Q.K. (2000). Determinants of child labour in Bahawalpur City.*Journal of the College of Physicians and Surgeons- Pakistan*, 10:395–8.

14. Hadi, A. (2000). Child abuse among working children in rural Bangladesh: prevalence and determinants. *Public Health*, 114:380–4.

15. Hyder, A.H. & Malik, F.A. (2007). Violence against Children: A Challenge for Public Health in Pakistan, *Journal of Health Population Nutrition*, 25(2): 168-178.