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#### Abstract

$\square$ ABSTRACT : The study was conducted to identify prevalence of behaviour problem among the students of Government Primary School in urban area. The population of this study consisted of all the students of urban Government Primary Schools from $1^{\text {st }}$ to $4^{\text {th }}$ standard in Dharwad Taluka. There were 232 Government Primary Schools, among them 166 schools were in rural area. Out of which 5 schools from urban area were selected randomly, 2 male and 2 female students from $1^{\text {st }}$ to $4^{\text {th }}$ standard from each school were selected randomly, the sample consisted of 38 female and 40 male students aged 5-10 years. So, the sample of this study was 78 students. Class teacher of each standard assessed 2 male and 2 female students of the class by answering to Behaviour Rating Questionnaire. The data were subjected to percentage and Chi-square analysis. The prevalence of anxious/depressed problem, hostile/aggressive, withdrawal/solitary, conduct, hyperkinetic, learning and emotional/impulsive problem was $64,43,35,23,10,6$ and 6 per cent as assessed by the mothers.

■KEY WORDS: Behavioural problems, Government primary schools, Mothers, Urban ■HOW TO CITE THIS PAPER : Sowmya, K., Yadav, V.S. and Khadi, Pushpa (2015). Behaviour problem among the students of government primary schools in urban. Asian J. Home Sci., 10 (1) : 45-53.


According to Thomas and Chess's (1977) goodness-of-fit theory, the development of problem behaviour has its origins in the child's temperament and in its interaction with the socializing environment. When there is a mismatch between a difficult temperament and parenting practices, behavioural disturbances may develop. In theory, temperament does not lead to behavioural problems by itself; it only has an effect in conjunction with particular environments (Bates et al., 1998). At present, there is some empirical evidence underscoring the importance of interactions between child characteristics and parenting in the prediction of child problem behaviour.

The behaviour problem is defined as "deviations. The behaviour problem is defined as "deviations from the accepted norms of behaviour on the part of the child, when the child is exposed to inconsistent social or cultural environment". Many of these problems are of transient nature and are often not even noticed or sometimes neglected. In USA in year 1995, there were 37.8 per cent school children, involved in physical fights or aggressive behaviour. The school based studies in India also quoted prevalence of behaviour problems up to 38 per cent amongst primary school children. Various factors play role in causation of behaviour problems. The internal factors of child includes, child characteristics including
neurobiological factors and genetic factors, emotions and intelligence. These interact with external factors like family environment or social environment. External factors also include nature of discipline given to children, attachment relationship, size and socio-economic status of family or family stressors etc. Family or home environment is a microenvironment having direct effect on the psychological development of children.

The review of literature revealed that many studies on prevalence of behaviour problem in Indian contexts covered rural school children, Very few studies, focused on the sample of the students of urban areas therefore the present study was undertaken to identify the prevalence of behaviour problems among students of primary schools in urban areas.

## - RESEARCH METHODS

The population of the study consisted all students of urban Government Primary Schools from 1st standard to 4th standard in Dharwad Taluka. There were totally 231 Government Primary schools. Among them 65 schools were in urban area. Out of which 5 schools from urban area were selected randomly, 2 male and 2 female students from $1^{\text {st }}$ to $4^{\text {th }}$ standard from each school were selected randomly, the sample consisted of 38 female and 40 male students aged 5-10 years. Out 80 students of urban schools, two students data was not obtained because the selected students were absent on the data collection day, therefore, final sample considered of 78 students. Class teacher of each standard assessed 2 male and 2 female students of the class by answering to

Behaviour Rating Questionnaire (Robinson et al., 1995). The data were subjected to percentage and Chi-square analysis.

## ■ RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results obtained from the present investigation as well as relevant discussion have been summarized under following heads :

## Hyperkinetic problem :

The results of Table 1 revealed that majority of urban boys ( $87.50 \%$ ) and urban girls $(92.10 \%$ ) were low in hyperkinetic problem, then, some of urban boys ( $12.50 \%$ ) and urban girls ( $7.90 \%$ ) were medium in hyperkinetic problem. These results revealed that around 90 per cent and 10 per cent of urban students had low and medium level of hyperkinetic problem, respectively. The prevalence of hyperkinetic problem among urban students was around 10 per cent. The results revealed that the girls and boys who were similar in levels of hyperkinetic problem.

The results of Table 1a noted the association between age and hyperkinetic problem assessed by the mothers. The results revealed that $92,8.00$ per cent of students in the age group of 7.1 to 8 years were having low and medium level of hyperkinetic problem, respectively. Similarly, 89.50 and 10.50 per cent of the students in the age group of 8.1 to 9 years were low and medium level of hyperkinetic problem. Correspondingly, 77.80 and 22.20 per cent of the students in the age group of 7 and below 7 years were having low and medium

| Table 1 : Association between gender and hyperkinetic problem assessed by the mothers |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sr. No. | Particulars | Low | Level of hyperkinetic problem |  |
|  | Gender | $35(87.50)$ | Medium | High |
| 1. | Urban boys $(\mathrm{n}=40)$ | $5(12.50)$ | 0 |  |
| 2. | Urban girls $(\mathrm{n}=38)$ | $35(92.10)$ | $3(7.90)$ | 0 |
| Total |  | $70(89.74)$ | $8(10.26)$ | 0 |

NS $=$ Non-significant. Values in parenthesis indicate percentage

| Table 1a: Association between age and hyperkinetic problem assessed by the mothers |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age in years and months | Level of hyperkinetic problem |  |  |  |
|  | Low | Medium | High | Total |
| $9.1-10$ | $16(100)$ | 0 | 0 | $16(100)$ |
| $8.1-9$ | $17(89.50)$ | $2(10.50)$ | 0 | $19(100)$ |
| $7.1-8$ | $23(92.00)$ | $2(8.00)$ | 0 | $25(100)$ |
| $<7$ | $14(77.80)$ | $4(22.20)$ | 0 | $18(100)$ |
| Total | $70(89.74)$ | $8(10.26)$ | 0 | $78(100)$ |

NS=Non-significant
level of hyperkinetic problem, respectively. Then, 100 per cent of students belonged to 9.1 to 10 years of age were in low level of hyperkinetic problem, respectively. The Chi-square value of age and hyperkinetic problem assessed by the mothers was 4.768 , which was not significant even at 0.05 degree of significance.

These results revealed that up to 10 years of age the students were more or less similar in the levels of hyperkinetic problem

Jyothisna and Anuja (2013), who reported that the prevalence of attention deficit hyperactivity among primary school children was found to be 11.32 per cent. The present study prevalence of hyperkinetic problem was lesser than the results of Pushpa and Pushpa (2002), who reported that more percentage of boys with behavioural problems had medium level of hyperkinetic problems ranged from 52.94 to 94.87 per cent. Romano et al. (2002) reported that hyperactivity, impulsivity, and inattention are among the most common behaviour problems in children. Findings indicated that between 5 per cent and 17 per cent of 2-11-year-old girls and between 9 per cent and 23 per cent of 2-11-year-old boys often manifested hyperactive-impulsive behaviours and inattention. Lambert et al. (1978) reported that there were six to eight times more boys than girls who were hyperactive.

## Conduct problem :

The results of Table 2 revealed that majority of urban boys ( $72.50 \%$ ) and urban girls ( $81.58 \%$ ) were low in conduct problem, many of urban boys ( $27.50 \%$ ) and
urban girls ( $18.42 \%$ ) were medium in conduct problem. These results revealed that around 77 per cent and 23 per cent of urban students had low and medium level of conduct problem, respectively. The prevalence of conduct problem in urban area was around 23 per cent. The results revealed that the girls and boys who were similar in levels of conduct problem.

The results of Table 2a noted the association between age and conduct problem assessed by the mothers. The results revealed that 68.00 and 32.00 per cent of students in the age group of 7.1 to 8 years were having low and medium level of conduct problem, respectively. Similarly, 73.70 and 26.30 per cent of the students in the age group of 8.1 to 9 years were low and medium level of conduct problem. Correspondingly, 77.80 and 22.20 per cent of the students in the age group of 7 and below 7 years were having low and medium level of conduct problem, respectively. Then, 93.80 and 6.20 per cent of students belonged to 9.1 to 10 years of age were in low and medium level of conduct problem, respectively. The Chi-square value of age and conduct problem assessed by the mothers was 3.793, which was not significant even at 0.05 degree of significance.

These results revealed that up to 10 years of age the students were more or less similar in the levels of conduct problem.

The prevalence of conduct problem of present study was higher than results of Weisz (1980) study reported a prevalence rate of conduct problems of 3.06 per cent. Deivasigamani (1990) reported the prevalence of CD to be 11.13 per cent. Nicholi (1999) found that among 3.75

| Table 2 $\mathbf{~ : ~ A s s o c i a t i o n ~ b e t w e e n ~ g e n d e r ~ a n d ~ c o n d u c t ~ p r o b l e m ~ a s s e s s e d ~ b y ~ t h e ~ m o t h e r s ~}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sr. No. | Particulars | Level of conduct problem |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | Low | Medium | High |  |  |  |
| 1. | Urban boys $(\mathrm{n}=40)$ | $29(72.50)$ | $11(27.50)$ | 0 |  |  |  |
| 2. | $31(81.58)$ | $07(18.42)$ | 0 | Modified $\chi^{2}$ value |  |  |  |
| Total | Urban girls $(\mathrm{n}=38)$ | $60(76.92)$ | $18(23.08)$ | 0 |  |  |  |

NS=Non-significant. Values in parenthesis indicate percentage

Table 2a: Association between age and conduct problem assessed by the mothers

| Age in years and <br> months |  |  |  |  |  | Low | Medium | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $9.1-10$ | $15(93.80)$ | $1(6.20)$ | 0 | $16(100)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $8.1-9$ | $14(73.70)$ | $5(26.30)$ | 0 | $19(100)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $7.1-8$ | $17(68.00)$ | $8(32.00)$ | 0 | $25(100)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $<7$ | $14(77.80)$ | $4(22.20)$ | 0 | $18(100)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | $60(76.92)$ | $18(23.08)$ | 0 | $78(100)$ |  |  |  |  |  |

NS=Non-significant
per cent of boys and 1.85 per cent of girls had conduct problems. The prevalence of CD in children between the ages of 5 and 10 years is 1.7 per cent for boys and 0.6 per cent for girls (Howard et al., 2000).

## Hostile/aggressive problem :

The results of Table 3 revealed that many of urban boys ( $42.50 \%$ ) and majority urban girls ( $71.10 \%$ ) were low in hostile/aggressive problem, around half of urban boys ( $55 \%$ ) and many of urban girls ( $28.90 \%$ ) were medium in hostile/aggressive problem. But few of urban boys ( $2.50 \%$ ) had high level of hostile/aggressive problem. The prevalence of hostile/aggressive problem among urban girls was around 29.00 per cent and among urban boys was around 57.50 per cent. It means that the prevalence of hostile/aggressive problem among urban girls was lesser than urban boys students. The results revealed that the girls and boys who were similar in levels of hostile/aggressive problem.

The results of Table 3a noted the association between age and hostile/aggressive problem assessed by the mothers. The results revealed that 52.00 and 48.00 per cent of students in the age group of 7.1 to 8 years were having low and medium level of hostile/aggressive
problem, respectively. Similarly, 57.90 and 42.10 per cent of the students in the age group of 8.1 to 9 years were low and medium level of hostile/aggressive problem. Correspondingly, 61.10, 33.30 and 5.60 per cent of the students in the age group of 7 and below 7 years were having low, medium and high level of hostile/aggressive problem, respectively. Then, 56.20 and 43.80 per cent of students belonged to 9.1 to 10 years of age were in low and medium level of hostile/aggressive problem, respectively. The Chi-square value of age and hostile/ aggressive problem assessed by the mothers was 4.040, which was not significant even at 0.05 degree of significance.

These results revealed that up to 10 years of age the students were more or less similar in the levels of hostile/aggressive problem.

The prevalence of aggressive/hostile problem of present study was lesser than the results results by Nadagouda et al. (1996), they found that 66.00 per cent of children with behavioural problems reported to be aggressive. The prevalence of hostile/aggressive problem of present study was more than the results of Natesan (1995), he reported that among standard I to V in primary schools revealed that about 23 per cent of the students

| Table 3 : Association between gender and hostile/aggressive problem assessed by the mothers |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sr. No. | Particulars |  | Level of hostile/aggressive problem |  |
|  | Gender | Low | Medium | High |
| 1. | Urban boys $(\mathrm{n}=40)$ | $17(42.50)$ | $22(55.0)$ | $1(2.50)$ |
| 2. | Urban girls $(\mathrm{n}=38)$ | $27(71.10)$ | $11(28.90)$ | 0 |
| Total |  | $44(56.42)$ | $33(42.30)$ | $1(1.28)$ |

Values in parenthesis indicate Percentage. ** indicate significance of value at $\overline{\mathrm{P}=0.01 \text {, respectively }}$

| Age in years and months | Level of hostile/aggressive problem |  |  | Total | Modified $\chi^{2}$ square |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low | Medium | High |  |  |
| 9.1-10 | 9(56.20) | 7(43.80) | 0 | 16(100) | $4.040^{\text {NS }}$ |
| 8.1-9 | 11(57.90) | 8(42.10) | 0 | 19(100) |  |
| 7.1-8 | 13(52.00) | 12(48.00) | 0 | 25(100) |  |
| <7 | 11(61.10) | 6(33.30) | 1(5.60) | 18(100) |  |
| Total | 44(56.42) | 33(42.30) | 1(1.28) | 78(100) |  |

NS = Non-significant

Table 4 : Association between gender and emotional/impulsive problem assessed by the mothers

| Sr. No. | Particulars | Level of emotional/impulsive problem | Medium | Modified $\chi^{2}$ <br> square |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Gender | $38(95.00)$ | $2(5.00)$ | 0 |
| 1. | Urban boys $(\mathrm{n}=40)$ | $35(92.10)$ | $3(7.90)$ | 0 |
| 2. | Urban girls $(\mathrm{n}=38)$ | $73(93.60)$ | $5(6.40)$ | $0.272^{\text {NS }}$ |
| Total |  |  | 0 |  |

NS=Not-significant. Values in parenthesis indicate percentage
had hostile/aggressive problem.

## Emotional/impulsive problem :

The results of Table 4 revealed that majority of urban boys ( $95 \%$ ) and urban girls ( $92.10 \%$ ) were low in emotional/impulsive problem, few of urban boys (5\%) and of urban girls (7.90\%) were medium in emotional/ impulsive problem. These results revealed that around 94 per cent and 6 per cent of urban students had low and medium level of emotional/impulsive problem. The prevalence of emotional/impulsive problem in urban students was 6 per cent. The results revealed that the girls and boys who were similar in levels of emotional/ impulsive problem.

The results of Table 4 a noted the association between age and emotional/impulsive problem assessed by the mothers. The results revealed that 88.00 and 12.00 per cent of students in the age group of 7.1 to 8 years were having low and medium level of emotional/impulsive problem, respectively. Similarly, 100 per cent of the students in the age group of 8.1 to 9 years were low level of emotional/impulsive problem. Correspondingly, 100 per cent of the students in the age group of 7 and
below 7 years were having low level of emotional/ impulsive problem, respectively. Then, 87.50 and 12.50 per cent of students belonged to 9.1 to 10 years of age were in low and medium level of emotional/impulsive problem, respectively. The Chi-square value of age and emotional/ impulsive problem assessed by the mothers was 4.825, which was not significant even at 0.05 degree of significance.

These results revealed that up to 10 years of age the students were more or less similar in the levels of emotional/impulsive problem.

The prevalence of emotional/impulsive problem of present study was similar to the results of Richman et al. (1975), they reported 7 per cent and also Earls (1980) reported 11 per cent of children had emotional/impulsive problem. The prevalence of emotional/impulsive problem of present study was lesser than the results of Verhulst et al. (1985), they found the prevalence rate of emotional/ impulsive problem was 26 per cent.

## Withdrawal/solitary problem :

The results of Table 5 revealed that majority of urban boys ( $67.50 \%$ ) and urban girls ( $60.50 \%$ ) were low in

| Age in years and months | Level of emotional/impulsive problem |  |  | Total | Modified $\chi^{2}$ square |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low | Medium | High |  |  |
| 9.1-10 | 14(87.50) | 2(12.50) | 0 | 16(100) | $4.825^{\mathrm{NS}}$ |
| 8.1-9 | 19(100) | 0 | 0 | 19(100) |  |
| 7.1-8 | 22(88.00) | 3(12.00) | 0 | 25(100) |  |
| <7 | 18(100) | 0 | 0 | 18(100) |  |
| Total | 73(93.60) | 5(6.40) | 0 | 78(100) |  |

NS=Non-significant

| Sr. No. | Particulars | Level of withdrawal/solitary problem |  |  | Modified $\chi^{2}$ square |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gender | Low | Medium | High |  |
| 1. | Urban boys ( $\mathrm{n}=40$ ) | 27(67.50) | 13(32.50) | 0 |  |
| 2. | Urban girls ( $\mathrm{n}=38$ ) | 23(60.50) | 15(39.50) | 0 | $0.412^{\text {NS }}$ |
| Total |  | 50(64.10) | 28(35.90) | 0 |  |

NS=Non-significant. Values in parenthesis indicate percentage

Table 5a : Association between age and withdrawal/solitary problem assessed by the mothers

| Age in years and <br> months | Level of withdrawal/solitary problem |  | Total | Modified $\chi^{2}$ <br> square |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $9.1-10$ | $14(87.50)$ | Medium | High | 0 |
| $8.1-9$ | $13(68.42)$ | $2(12.50)$ | 0 | $16(100)$ |
| $7.1-8$ | $13(52.00)$ | $6(31.58)$ | $19(100)$ |  |
| $<7$ | $10(55.56)$ | $12(48.00)$ | 0 | $25(100)$ |
| Total | $50(64.10)$ | $8(44.44)$ | 0 | $18(100)$ |

NS = Non-significant
withdrawal/solitary problem, many of urban boys ( $32.50 \%$ ) and urban girls ( $39.50 \%$ ) were medium in withdrawal/solitary problem. These results (Table 5) revealed that around 64 per cent and 36 per cent of urban students had low and medium level of withdrawal/solitary problem. The prevalence of withdrawal/solitary problem among urban students was around 36 per cent. The results revealed that the girls and boys who were similar in levels of withdrawal/solitary problem.

The results of Table 5a noted the association between age and withdrawal/solitary problem assessed by the mothers. The results revealed that 52.00 and 48.00 per cent of students in the age group of 7.1 to 8 years were having low and medium level of withdrawal/solitary problem, respectively. Similarly, 68.42 and 31.58 per cent of the students in the age group of 8.1 to 9 years were low and medium level of withdrawal/solitary problem. Correspondingly, 55.56 and 44.44 per cent of the students in the age group of 7 or below 7 years were having low and medium level of withdrawal/solitary problem, respectively. Then, 87.50 and 12.50 per cent of students belonged to 9.1 to 10 years of age were in low and medium level of withdrawal/solitary problem, respectively. The Chi-square value of age and withdrawal/solitary problem assessed by the mothers was 6.123, which was not significant even at 0.05 degree of significance.

These results revealed that up to 10 years of age the students were more or less similar in the levels of withdrawal/solitary problem.

The prevalence of withdrawal/solitary problem
among children of present study was more than the report of Jyoti (1996), she reported that the prevalence of withdrawal problems in pre-school children as reported by their mothers was 7.4 per cent.

The prevalence of withdrawal/solitary problem of present study was lesser results reported by Pushpa and Pushpa (2002), they found that prevalence of withdrawal/ solitary was ranged from 44.44 to 66.66 per cent. Berguno et al. (2004) reported that 68 per cent of children claimed to have been bullied, with lonely children being more likely to be victimized by peers.

## Anxious/depressed :

The results of Table 6 revealed that many of urban boys ( $35 \%$ ) and urban girls ( $36.80 \%$ ) were low in anxious/depressed problem, majority of urban boys ( $65 \%$ ) and urban girls ( $63.20 \%$ ) were medium in anxious/ depressed problem. These results revealed that around 44 per cent and 56 per cent of urban students had low and medium level of anxious/depressed problem. The prevalence of anxious/depressed problem among urban students was 64 per cent. The results revealed that the girls and boys who were similar in levels of anxious/ depressed problem.

The results of Table 6a noted the association between age and anxious/depressed problem assessed by the mothers. The results revealed that 28.00 and 72.00 per cent of students in the age group of 7.1 to 8 years were having low and medium level of anxious/depressed problem, respectively. Similarly, 42.10 and 57.90 per cent of the students in the age group of 8.1 to 9 years were

| Sr. No. | Particulars | Level of anxious/depressed problem |  |  | Modified $\chi^{2}$ square |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gender | Low | Medium | High |  |
| 1. | Urban boys ( $\mathrm{n}=40$ ) | 14(35.00) | 26(65.00) | 0 | $0.029^{\text {NS }}$ |
| 2. | Urban girls ( $\mathrm{n}=38$ ) | 14(36.80) | 24(63.20) | 0 |  |
| Total |  | 28(35.90) | 50(64.10) | 0 |  |

NS=Non-significant; Values in parenthesis indicate percentage

Table 6a: Association between age and anxious/depressed problem assessed by the mothers

| Age in years and <br> months | Level of anxious/depressed problem |  | Total | Modified $\chi^{2}$ square |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $9.1-10$ | $9(56.20)$ | Medium | $7(43.80)$ | 0 |
| $8.1-9$ | $8(42.10)$ | $11(57.90)$ | 0 | $16(100)$ |
| $7.1-8$ | $7(28.00)$ | $18(72.00)$ | 0 | $19(100)$ |
| $<7$ | $4(22.22)$ | $14(77.78)$ | 0 | $25(100)$ |
| Total | $28(35.90)$ | $50(64.10)$ | 0 | $18(100)$ |

NS= Non-significant
low and medium level of anxious/depressed problem. Correspondingly, 22.20 and 77.78 per cent of the students in the age group of 7 or below 7 years were having low and medium level of anxious/depressed problem, respectively. Then, 56.20 and 43.80 per cent of students belonged to 9.1 to 10 years of age were in low and medium level of anxious/depressed problem, respectively. The Chi-square value of age and anxious/ depressed problem assessed by the mothers was 5.339 , which was not significant even at 0.05 degree of significance.

These results revealed that up to 10 years of age the students were more or less similar in the levels of anxious/depressed problem.

The results of present study support the report of Angold and Costello (1996), who revealed that depression in preadolescent with a prevalence of about 2.60 per cent for boys and girls of age 6-11 years. About 25-50 per cent of depressed youth have comorbid anxiety disorders and about 10-15 per cent of anxious youth have depression. Findings indicate that 15.9 to 61.9 per cent of children identified as anxious or depressed have comorbid anxiety and depressive disorders (Brady and Kendall, 1992).

## Learning problem :

The results of Table 7 revealed majority of urban boys ( $92.50 \%$ ) and urban girls $(94.74 \%)$ were low in learning problem, few of urban boys (5\%) and urban girls (2.63) were medium and also few of urban boys
( $2.5 \%$ ) and urban girls ( $2.63 \%$ ) were high in learning problem. These results revealed that around 93 per cent, 5 per cent and 2 per cent of urban students had low, medium and high level of learning problem. The prevalence of learning problem among the students in urban was 6 per cent. The results revealed that the girls and boys who were similar in levels of learning problem.

The results of Table 7a noted the association between age and learning problem assessed by the mothers. The results revealed that 96.00 and 4.00 per cent of students in the age group of 7.1 to 8 years were having low and medium level of learning problem, respectively. Similarly, 94.70 and 5.30 per cent of the students in the age group of 8.1 to 9 years were low and high level of learning problem. Correspondingly, 88.88 and 5.56 per cent of the students in the age group of 7 or below 7 years were having low, medium and high level of learning problem, respectively. Then, 93.80 and 6.20 per cent of students belonged to 9.1 to 10 years of age were in low and medium level of learning problem, respectively. The Chi-square value of age and learning problem assessed by the mothers was 3.389 , which was not significant even at 0.05 degree of significance.

These results revealed that up to 10 years of age the students were more or less similar in the levels of learning problem.

The prevalence of learning problem in the present study lesser to the report of Afreen and Dilshad (2006),

Table 7: Association between gender and learning problem assessed by the mothers

| Sr. No. | Particulars | Level of learning problem |  | Modified $\chi^{2}$ square |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Gender | Low | Medium | $01(2.50)$ |
| 1. | Urban boys $(\mathrm{n}=40)$ | $37(92.50)$ | $02(5.00)$ | $01(2.63)$ |
| 2. | Urban girls $(\mathrm{n}=38)$ | $36(94.74)$ | $01(2.63)$ | $02(2.60)$ |
| Total |  | $73(93.60)$ | $03(3.80)$ | $0.296^{\mathrm{NS}}$ |

NS = Non-significant; Values in parenthesis indicate percentage

Table 7a : Association between age and learning problem assessed by the mothers

| Age in years and months | Level of learning problem |  |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low | Medium | High | Modified $\chi^{2}$ square |
| $.1-10$ | $15(93.80)$ | $1(6.20)$ | 0 | $16(100)$ |
| $8.1-9$ | $18(94.70)$ | 0 | $1(5.30)$ | $19(100)$ |
| $7.1-8$ | $24(96.00)$ | $1(4.0)$ | 0 | $25(100)$ |
| $<7$ | $16(88.88)$ | $1(5.56)$ | $1(5.56)$ | $18(100)$ |
| Total | $73(93.60)$ | $3(3.80)$ | $2(2.60)$ | $78(100)$ |

NS=Non-significant
she found that prevalence of learning difficulties/disability was found to an extent of 21 per cent, among which 17 per cent of children had learning difficulties and 4 per cent had learning problem.

The results of present study support the report of Nadgouda and Saroja (1996), she reported that the prevalence of learning problems in pre-school children as reported by their mothers was 13.33 per cent.

Kapur et al. (1995) reported that prevalence of learning disorders range from 2 to 10 per cent in school age children. Preeti et al. (2013) reported that several studies have been conducted in India to determine the prevalence of learning problems/disabilities in school children which has been reported to be 3-10 per cent among students population.

[^0]
## - REFERENCES

Afreen, Heena and Dilshad, M. (2006). Prevalence of learning difficulties / disability among primary school children: effect on emotional Problems and academic achievement, M.H.Sc. Thesis, University of Agricultural Science, Dharwad, KARNATAKA (INDIA).

Angold, A. and Costello, E.L. (1996). Depressive comorbidity in children and adolescents: Empirical, Theoretical and Methodological Issues. Am. J. Psychol., 150 (12) : 1779-1791.

Bates, J.E., Pettit, G.S., Dodge, K.A. and Ridge, B. (1998). Interaction of temperamental resistance to control and restrictive parenting in the development of externalizing behaviour. Develop. Psychol., 34 (5) : 982-995.

Berguno, George, Leroux, Penny, McAinsh, Katayoun and Shaikh, Sabera (2004). Children's experience of loneliness at school and its relation to bullying and the quality of teacher interventions, Qual. Report, 9(3):483-499.

Brady, E.U. and Kendall P.C. (1992). Comorbidity of anxiety and depression in children and adolescents. Psychol Bull., 111(2):244-255.

Deivasigamani, T.R. (1990). Psychiatric morbidity in primary school children: An epidemiological study. Indian J. Psychol., 32 (3): 235-240.

Dodge, K.A. (1997). The structure and function of reactive and proactive aggression. In: Pepler D, Rubin K, Editors. The development and treatment of childhood aggression. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum;. 201-218pp.

Earls, F. (1980). Prevalence of behaviour problems in 3-yearold children: a cross national replication. Arch. Gen. Psychol., 37 (10) : 1153-1157.

Hart, S.D., Cox, D.N. and Hare, R.D. (1995). The hare psychopathy checklist: Screening version. ON: Multi-Health Systems, TORONTO.

Jyothsna,A.V. and Anuja, S.P. (2013).Prevalence of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in primary school children. Indian J. Psychol., 55(4):338-342.

Kapur, M. Kellam, Tarter, R.S. and Wilson, R. (1995). Child mental health of the Indo-US symposium NIMHANS India. 224-232pp.

Lambert, N., Sandoval, J. and Sassone, D. (1978). Prevalence of hyperactivity in elementary school children as a function of social system definers. Am. J. Orthopsych., 48 (3) : 446-463.

Nadgouda, Jyothi C. and Saroja, K. (1996). Prevalence of behavioural problem among pre-school children; Parent educational needs of their Mothers. J. Commu. Guid. Res., 13(1):27-39.

Natesan, H. (1995). Behavioural problems of primary school children and the methods of handling them by the teachers. Res. highlights JADU, 6:135-138.

Nicholi Armand, M. (1999). The Harvard guide to psychiatry. $3^{\text {rd }}$ Ed., The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, CAMBRIDGE.

Preeti, Mogsale and Vinod (2013). Prevalence of learning problems in school children. Australian J. Adv. Mental Health, 2 (3): 241-253.

Pushpa, M. and Pushpa, K. (2002). Behavioural problems among school age children: prevalence and intervention. M.H.Sc. Thesis, University of Agricultural Science, Dharwad, KARNATAKA (INDIA).

Richman, N., Stevenson, J.E. and Graham, P.J. (1975). Prevalence of behaviour problems in 3-year-old children: an epidemiological study in a London borough. J. Child Psychol. Psy., 16 (4): 277-287.

Romano, Elisa, Raymond, H., Baillargeon and Tremblay, Richard E. (2002). Prevalence of hyperactivity-impulsivity and inattention among canadian children: findings from the first data collection cycle (1994-1995) of the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth, Final Report, Applied Research Branch Strategic Policy, Human Resources Development, CANADA.

Thomas, A. and Chess, S. (1977). Temperament and development. Brunner/Mazel, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

Verhulst, F.C., Akkerhuis, G.W. and Althaus, M. (1985). Mental health in Dutch children: I.A. cross cultural comparison. Acta Psychiatr Scand Suppl., 323 : 1-108.
Weisz, John R. (1980). Parents reports of behavioural and emotional problems among children in Kenya, Thailand and the United states. J. Child Develop., 64 (1) : 98-100.

## ■WEBLIOGRAPHY

Howard, Meltzer, Goodman, Robert, G. Rebecca and Ford,
Tamsin (2000). The mental health of children and adolescents in Great Britain, The report of a survey carried out in 1999 by Social Survey Division of the Office for National Statistics on behalf of the Department of Health, the Scottish Health Executive and the National Assembly for Wales, The Stationery Office,London.http://www.dawba.info/abstracts/BCAMHS99_original_ survey_ report.pdf.


[^0]:    Authors' affiliations:
    V.S. YADAV, Department of Psychology, University of Agricultural Sciences, DHARWAD (KARNATAKA) INDIA
    Email: yadav.vithalrao@gmail.com
    PUSHPA KHADI, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Rural Home Science, University of Agricultural Sciences, DHARWAD (KARNATAKA) INDIA
    Email : pkhadi@gmail.com

