Research Paper
Impact Factor: 3.029
Peer Reviewed & Indexed Journal

IJMSRR
E- ISSN - 2349-6746
ISSN -2349-6738

GUIDANCE NEEDS AND MENTAL HEALTH OFHIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN NORTH KARNATAKA

Vasanthalaxmi P* Romate J**
**Research scholar, Department of Psychology, Gulbarga University, Gulbarga.*
***Associate Professor and Head, Department of Psychology, Central University of Karnataka, Gulbarga. Karnataka, India.*

Abstract
This study was aimed at assessing guidance needs and mental health of high school students (N=700) from Hyderabad-Karnataka regions namely, Yadageri, Gulbarga, Raichur, and Bidar districts. Guidance needs inventory (Grewal, 1982) and Mental health battery (Arun Kumar Singh &AlpanaSen Gupta (2005) were used to identify their guidance needs and to assess their mental health status. Data obtained were analyzed to determine the sex differences and type of school management in terms of the variables assessed under the study.

The findings revealed that there were highly significant differences between the private and governments schools students (at 0.01 level) on variables assessed such as social, psychological, educational areas of guidance needs and emotional stability, adjustment, autonomy dimensions of mental health. Further, the findings revealed that there were no significant differences between private and government school students on variables such as physical, vocational areas of guidance needs and security – insecurity and self –concept dimensions of mental health. The findings also revealed that there were highly significant differences (at 0.01 level) between the scores of the rural and urban students on variables such as physical, social, psychological areas of guidance needs and emotional stability, adjustment, autonomy dimensions of mental health. The findings revealed that there were no significant differences found between rural and urban school students on variables such as educational, vocational areas of guidance needs and security – insecurity and self –concept dimensions of mental health with reference to place of living.

Key Words: Guidance Needs; Mental Health; High School Students.

I: Introduction

Guidance is a pervasive activity in which many persons and organizations take part. It is afforded to individuals by their parents, relatives, and friends and by the community at large through various educational, industrial, social, religious, and political agencies. A part of such guidance may be giving information that enables others to increase the scope of their exploratory behaviour. Teenage years and high school can be very stressful with all the physical, psychological and social changes that occur. Preparedness and guidance can mean a big deal in supporting young people through this challenging time.

Mental health is created in individual's interactions with the world around them, and is determined by individual's sense of control in dealing with their circumstances and by the support (CMHA-NL, 2001). An individual who has good mental health is able to realize his own abilities, cope with the stress of everyday life, work productively, and contribute to the community (WHO, 2001). Good mental health protects and helps to avoid risk taking behaviours that contribute to poor mental health (Moodie and Jenkins, 2005).

The WHO theme for mental health week for the year 2003 was *Emotional and Behavioural problems of children and adolescents*. Epidemiological research in developing countries including India shows prevalence rate of 7 to 9% of emotional and behavioural problems in children. As one–third of our population are children and adolescents their mental health needs to go geared -up. Graduate Student Mental Health: Needs Assessment and Utilization of Counselling Services study was conducted by Jenny Hyun, Brian et al. (2010). Findings suggested a need for increased attention to graduate student mental health needs especially the role of financial confidence in student well-being and the relationship of graduate students with their advisor.

This study also reveals that students from rural areas and students studying in government schools have a high need for guidance. The results of the present study suggest the need for providing guidance programmes to student's especially in rural areas and in government schools. Guidance prepares the adolescents for future life as well as helps them acquire appropriate attitudes and values that enable them to become productive and active members of their communities. Most importantly, Guidance programmes help students to develop a positive self-image and a sense of identity.

II: Methodology

A.Statement of the problem: To assess the Mental Health Status and Guidance needs of High School Students.

B. Objectives: To assess the mental health status and guidance needs of high school students of North Karnataka

To compare the guidance needs and mental health status of students representing private and government, urban and rural schools.

c. Hypotheses : There will be no significant difference in the guidance needs of students in the government and private, urban and rural schools.

There will be no significant difference in the mental health status of students studying in government schools and private, rural and urban schools.

d. Samples:A random sample consisted of 700 high school students, which included government and private, urban and rural school students from the North Karnataka districts (Yadgiri, Gulbarga, Raichur and Bidar).

e. Assessment Tools

i. Guidance Needs Inventory (GNI): In the present study the Guidance needs inventory scale (Grewal, 1982) was used to assess guidance needs experienced in five different areas involving physical, social, psychological, educational and vocational of the adolescents studying in high schools. The test – retest reliability was estimated at 0.82 by administering to the group of fifty students over an interval of four weeks.

ii. Mental Health Battery (MHB): This Battery intends to assess the status of mental health of students in the age range of 13 to 22 years. This Battery was developed by Arun Kumar Singh and AlpanaSen Gupta (2005). This Battery consists of 130 items, with 6 dimensions viz., Emotional stability (EM), Over – all adjustment (OA), Autonomy (AY), Security-insecurity (SI), Self-concept (SC), Intelligence (IG). Emotional stability (EM), Over – all adjustment (OA), Security-insecurity (SI) and Self-concept (SC) dimensions have to be answered as Yes/No. There are two alternatives for Autonomy (AY) dimension andfour alternatives for Intelligence (IG) dimension have also chosen.

III: Result and Disscusion

The finding of study keeping in view of objectives of the study is depicted in the following table.

Table No. 1: Shows the mean, SD and‘t’ values of government and private school students on guidance needs

Variables	**School management**		**‘t’ value**
	Government (N = 443)	**Private (N = 257)**	
Physical	11.54 (6.74)	12.28 (6.26)	1.42 N.S
Social	18.33 (9.68)	22.39 (10.45)	5.19**
Psychological	17.73 (8.10)	20.47 (9.79)	3.98**
Educational	20.17 (10.87)	22.88 (11.45)	3.11**
Vocational	9.05 (5.70)	9.73 (4.92)	1.59 N.S
Total guidance needs	76.76 (33.78)	87.77(35.50)	4.07**

**Significant at 0.01 level; NS: Not Significant

The mean scores obtained on the first area of the total guidance needs i.e., physical area for the government school sample was 11.54 (SD 6.74) and private school sample it was 12.28 (SD 6.26). The obtained‘t’ value of 1.42 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no significant difference between government and private school children on their physical area of guidance needs is accepted.

The mean scores obtained on the second area of the total guidance needs i.e., social area for the government sample was 18.33 (9.68) and private sample was 22.39 (SD 10.45). The obtained‘t’ value of -5.19 shows a high significant difference (at 0.01 level) between the two groups. The mean scores obtained on the third area of the total guidance needs i.e., psychological area for the government sample was 17.73 (8.10) and private sample was 20.47 (9.79). The obtained‘t’ value of 3.98 implies a statistically high significant differenceat 0.01 level between two groups. The mean scores obtained on the forth area of the total guidance needs i.e., educational area for the government sample was 20.18 (10.87) and private sample was 22.88 (11.45). The obtained‘t’ value 3.11 implies a high statistically significant difference at 0.01 level between two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no significant difference between the above areas of guidance needs is rejected.

The mean scores obtained on the fifth area of the total guidance needs i.e., vocational area for the government sample was 9.05 (5.70) and private sample was 9.73 (4.92). The obtained't' value of 1.59 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between these two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no significant difference between the government and private groups on vocational area of guidance needs is accepted. The mean scores obtained on the fifth area of the total guidance needs i.e., vocational area for the government sample was 9.05 (5.70) and private sample was 9.73 (4.92). The obtained't' value of 1.59 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no significant difference between the government and private groups on vocational area of guidance needs is accepted.

The mean scores obtained on the total guidance needs including five areas for the government sample was 76.76 (33.78) and private sample was 87.77 (35.50).The obtained 't' value of 4.07 implies that there is a statistically high significant difference (at 0.01 level) between two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no significant difference between the government and private groups on guidance needs is rejected. From the above findings it is observed that there is a variation in guidance needs among students from government and private management schools. Students from private schools have shown lower guidance needs in physical and vocational components compared to government school students. But this difference is statistically insignificant. Whereas in guidance needs viz., social, psychological and educational there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of private and government school students. Lower guidance needs are shown among private school students compared to government school students. Overall, when compared to private school students, government school students have shown higher guidance's needs.

Table No. 2:The mean, SD and 't' values of government and private sample on mental health

Variables	School management		't' value
	Government (N = 443)	Private (N = 257)	
Emotional stability	7.72 (2.33)	9.15 (3.11)	6.89**
Over–all adjustment	23.94 (5.29)	25.70 (4.34)	4.53**
Autonomy	9.40 (2.38)	10.24 (5.32)	2.87**
Security insecurity	8.86 (2.40)	8.67 (2.38)	1.00 N.S
Self-concept	8.68 (2.22)	8.70 (2.03)	0.88 N.S
Overall mental health	58.24 (9.72)	62.46 (7.87)	5.92**

** Significant at 0.01 level, NS- Not Significant

The mean scores obtained on first dimension of overall mental health i.e., emotional stability of the government sample population was 7.72 (2.33) and private sample populations was 9.15 (3.11). The obtained't' value of 6.89 shows that there is a statically a high significant difference (at 0.01 level) between two groups, implying that students from the private schools is having higher scores on emotional stability compared to the students of the government schools. The mean scores obtained on second dimension of overall 'mental health' i.e., over- all -adjustment for government sample was 23.94 (5.29) and private sample was 25.70 (4.34). The obtained 't' value of 4.53 reveals that there is a statically high significant difference (at 0.01 level) between these two groups, implying that private school students is having scores on the over-all-adjustment dimension of the guidance needs compared to the government school children.

The mean scores obtained on third dimensions of overall mental health i.e., 'autonomy' for government sample was 9.40 (2.38) and private sample was 10.24 (5.32). The obtained't' value of 2.87 shows that there is a statically high significant difference (at 0.01 level) between these two groups, implying that the private school students is having higher scores on autonomy compared to the government students. The mean scores obtained on overall mental health (including five dimensions) for government school students sample was 58.24 (9.72) and private school student sample was 62.46 (7.87). The obtained't' value of 5.92 shows that there is a statistically high significant difference (at 0.01 level) between two groups, implying that the government school students have higher scores on overall mental health compared to the students of the private schools. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating those there will be no significant difference between the students of the government schools and private schools groups on mental health is rejected.

The mean scores obtained on fourth dimension of overall mental health i.e., security – insecurity for government sample was 8.86 (SD 2.40) and private sample was 8.67 (SD 2.38). The obtained't' value of 1.00 shows that there is no significant difference between two sample groups. The mean scores obtained on fifth dimension of overall mental health i.e., self - concept for government sample was 8.68 (2.22) and private sample was 8.70 (2.03). The obtained 't' value of .08 shows that there is no significant difference between two groups in the overall mental health scores. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating there will be no significant difference between government and private school children on self- concept dimension of mental health is accepted. Whereas the study was conducted by Jayashree Reddy (2011) to determine whether girls and boys

and government and private of high school students differ with regarding guidance needs. Finding revealed that there was no significant difference in the guidance needs of X^{th} standard students with reference to their school management and locality.

Table No.:3 Shows the mean, SD and 't' values of urban and rural sample on guidance needs

Variables	Locality		't' value
	Urban (N = 450)	Rural (N = 250)	
Physical	12.25 (6.62)	11.02 (6.42)	2.39**
Social	20.70 (9.85)	18.24 (10.51)	3.09**
Psychological	19.68 (8.87)	17.05 (8.57)	3.80**
Educational	21.62 (10.70)	20.34 (11.91)	1.45 N.S
Vocational	9.34 (5.21)	9.24 (5.82)	.22 N.S
Total guidance needs	83.53 (33.15)	75.90 (37.16)	2.79**

**Significant at 0.01 level, NS- Not Significant

The mean scores obtained on the first area of the total guidance needs i.e., physical area for the urban sample was 12.25 (6.62) and rural sample was 11.02 (6.42). The obtained 't' value of 2.39 implies that there is a statistically high significant difference (at 0.01 level) between these two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no significant difference between the urban and rural groups on physical area of guidance needs is rejected. The mean scores obtained on the second area of the total guidance needs i.e., social area for the urban sample was 20.70 (9.85) and rural sample was 18.24 (10.51). The obtained 't' value of 3.09 implies that there is statistically high significant difference (at 0.01 level) between two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no significant difference between urban and rural groups on social area of the guidance needs is rejected.

The mean scores obtained on the third area of the total guidance needs i.e., psychological area for the urban sample was 19.68 (8.87) and rural sample was 17.05 (8.57). The obtained 't' value of 3.86 implies that there is a statistically high significant difference (at 0.01 level) between two groups implying that the urban group is higher than the rural group on psychological area. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no significant difference between the urban and rural group on psychological area of guidance needs is rejected. The mean scores obtained on the forth area of the total guidance needs i.e., educational area for the urban sample was 21.62 (10.70) and rural sample was 20.34 (11.91). The obtained 't'value of 1.456 shows that there is no significant difference between two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no significant difference between urban and rural groups on educational area of guidance needs is accepted.

The mean scores obtained on the fifth area of the total guidance needs i.e., vocational area for the urban sample was 9.34 (5.21) and rural sample was 9.24 (5.82). The obtained 't' value of 0.227 reveals that there is no significant difference between two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no significant difference between urban and rural groups on vocational area of guidance needs is accepted.

The mean scores obtained on the total guidance needs including five areas for the urban sample was 83.53 (33.15) and rural sample was 75.90 (37.16). The obtained' value of 2.79 shows that there is statically high significant difference (at 0.01 levels) between two groups, implying that the urban group is higher than rural group on guidance needs. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no significant difference between urban and rural groups on guidance needs is rejected.In this study, urban students have shown lesser guidance needs compared to rural students in all the components viz., physical, and social, psychological, educational and vocational. But they are similar in educational and vocational components. There is significant difference among rural and urban students on the components of psychological, social and physical guidance.

Table No.4: Shows the mean, SD and't' values of the students on mental health drawn from urban and rural schools

Variables	Locality		't' value
	Urban(N = 450)	Rural(N = 250)	
Emotional stability	8.62(2.78)	7.58(2.52)	4.93**
Over–all adjustment	25.53(4.47)	22.88(5.52)	6.90**
Autonomy	9.97(4.24)	9.24(2.60)	2.46**
Security insecurity	8.75(2.38)	8.81(2.42)	0.15 N.S
Self-concept	8.59(2.22)	8.87(2.01)	1.65 N.S
Over all mental health	61.47(8.23)	56.76(10.33)	8.61**

**Significant at 0.01 level, NS- Not Significant

The mean scores obtained on first dimension of overall mental health i.e., emotional stability for urban sample was 8.62 (2.78) and rural sample was 7.58 (2.52). The obtained't' value of 4.93 shows that there is a statically high significant difference (at 0.01 level) between two groups, implying that urban group is higher than rural group on emotional stability. The mean scores obtained on second dimension of overall mental health i.e., over- all- adjustment for urban sample was 25.53 (4.47) and private sample was 22.88 (5.52). The obtained't' value of 6.90 shows that there is a statistically high significant difference between (at 0.01 level) two groups, implying that the urban group is higher than rural group on the over- all- adjustment. The mean scores obtained on third dimensions of overall mental health i.e., autonomy for the urban sample was 9.97 (4.24) and rural sample was 9.24 (4.24) and rural sample was 9.24 (2.60). The obtained't' value of 2.46 shows that there is statistically high significant difference (at 0.01 level) between two groups on autonomy, implying that the urban group is higher than rural group on autonomy. The mean scores obtained on overall mental health for urban sample was 61.47 (8.23) and rural sample was 56.76 (10.33). The obtained't' value of 6.61 shows that there is a statistically high significant difference (at 0.01 level) between two groups, implying that the urban group is higher than rural group on mental health. The mean scores obtained on fourth dimension of overall mental health i.e., security – insecurity for urban sample was 8.75 (2.38) and rural sample was 8.81 (2.42). The obtained't' value of 1.5 shows that there is no significant difference between two groups. The mean scores obtained on fifth dimension of overall mental health i.e., self- concept for urban sample was 8.59 (2.22) and rural sample was 8.87 (2.01). The obtained't' value of 1.65 reveals that there is a statistically no significant difference between two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there will be significant difference between urban and rural groups on self- concept is accepted.

The findings discussedabove are not in accordance with the earlier findings reported by Roshmi (2008) substantiating that there was no significant difference between boys and girls on the areas of problems experienced. Whereas a study was conducted by Jayashree Reddy (2011) to determine whether girls and boys and government and private of high school students differ with regarding guidance needs revealed that there was no significant difference in the guidance needs of X^{th} standard students with reference to their school management and locality.

Conclusions

a. Government schools students have indicated more guidance needs compared to Private school students , namely in areas like , social, psychological, education and total guidance needs.
b. Private and urban schools were better in overall mental health and its dimensions viz., emotional stability over all adjustment and autonomy compare to government and rural school students.
c. Rural students were more in need of psychological, social and physical areas of total guidance needs compared to urban school students.

References

1. Anuradha (2009).Mental health status of pre-university students with reference to their gender.Unpublished P. G. Dissertation, Gulbarga University, Gulbarga.
2. Arun Kumar Singh and AlpanaSen Gupta (2005).Mental Health Battery.
3. Bargava M. (2006). Prospects of Mental Health: Concept of Mental Health (pp 1-26). H. P. Bhargava Book House: Agra.
4. Bhola (2010). Guidance and counselling: Meaning and Nature of Guidance (pp. 1-37). LakshiNarainAgrawal Educational Publisher: Agra.
5. Burks and Stefflre (1979).Current trends in the practice of counselling :Guidance and Counselling. Retrieved October 25, 2011, from http://www.psychology4all.com
6. Canadian Psychiatric Association (1993). Mental health and high school: Teachers and School Staff; Youth: Introduction. Retrieved December 28, 2011, from http://www.cmha.ca/highschool/t_intro.htm.
7. Census (2001). Mental health promotion: A literature Review, prepared for the mental health promotion working group of the provincial wellness advisory council by Heather Pollett, Policy Analyst, Canadian mental health association June 18, 2007:Introduction.Retrieved December 28,2011,fromhttps://docs.google.com viewer?A=v& q=cache:m8twa9gr5wkj:www.cmhanl.ca/pdf/Mental
8. CMHA-NL (2001). Mental health promotion: A literature Review, prepared for the mental health promotion working group of the provincial wellness advisory council by Heather Pollett, Policy Analyst, Canadian mental health association, June 18, 2007: Introduction. Retrieved December 28, 2011,
9. Elizabeth OmotundeEgbochuku (2008). An Assessment of Counselling Needs of Nigerian University Graduate Students Study, European journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences. Retrieved January3, 2012, from htt://www.eurojournalsn.com

10. Jayashree Reddy (2011). Guidance needs among girls and boys and government and private of high school students, global values 2(1):73-79.
11. Jenny K Hyun, Brian C. Quinn, TeminaMadon, Steve Lustig (2010). Graduate Student Mental Health: Needs Assessment and Utilization of Counselling Services, Psychoinfo Database Record (c) 2010: APA.
12. Knox,-Michele; Funk,-Jeanne; Elliott,-Robert; Bush,-Ellen-Greene (2000). Gender differences within adolescents' "possible selves,' to better understand gender differences in global self-esteem at adolescence. Retrieved from ERIC database.
13. Lowden,-Kevin; Powney,-Janet (1993). A three-strand study and examined the availability, provision and effectiveness of educational guidance to adults in Scotland. .Retrieved from ERIC database.
14. Luyckx, Koen; Vansteenkiste, Maarten; Goossens, Luc; Duriez, Bart (2009). Psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness as postulated within self-determination. Journal of Counselling Psychology 56(2):276-288.
15. Mau, W.C., Hitchcock, R., and Calvert, C. (1998). High school students' career plans: The influence of others' expectations. Professional School Counselling, 2:2, 161-166. Retrieved December 28, 2011
16. Moodie and Jenkins (2005). Mental health promotion: A literature Review, prepared for the mental health promotion working group of the provincial wellness advisory council by Heather Pollett, Policy Analyst, Canadian mental health association June 18, 2007: Introduction. Retrieved December 28, 2011,
17. Nanjundappa Report of Hyderabad Karnataka (2002).Retrieved January 2012, from https://docs.google.com/
18. NCERT (2009). Department of psychology and Foundations of Education, National Counselling of Educational Research and Training: Assessment and Appraisal in guidance and counselling II (13):1-5. NCERT publication: New Delhi.
19. Nelmh (2004). Mental health promotion: A literature Review, prepared for the mental health promotion working group of the provincial wellness advisory council by Heather Pollett, Policy Analyst, Canadian mental health association June 18, 2007: Introduction, p. 1. Retrieved December 28, 2011
20. Pepinsky and Pepinsky (1954).Guidance and Counselling.Retrieved October 25, 2011.
21. Raina (2004). Prospects of Mental Health: Concept of Mental Health (pp 1-26). H. P. Bhargava Book House: Agra.
22. Ram NathSharm (2008). Guidance and counselling (pp. 15-22).Surjeet Publications: Delhi.
23. Reedy S.V. and Nagarathnamma (1993). Mental health status among rural and urban students a comparative study. The Indian academy of applied psychology 19(1-2): 25-29.
24. Roshni (2008).Assessing the gender differences in adolescence problems and guidance needs. Unpublished P.G. Dissertation, Bangalore University Bangalore.