

IMPACT OF GENDER IN GUILT AND SHAME ON ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AMONG HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

V.SURIYAKUMAR

Abstract: The study aims to find the impact of guilt and shame on academic achievement among higher secondary school students for which the investigator has chosen the sample of 300 students from three different schools in Chennai city. The research is based on quasi experimental design without control group. Personal data sheet developed by the investigator, Guilt and scale Taya R. Cohen are used to collect pre test and post test scores. Then anger and stress management techniques are given to the students for about 3 months. Then the data are analyzed and the interpretations are drawn and finally it is concluded that there are no significant differences between Guilt and shame of Boys and Girls from the total sample.

Keywords: Guilt Shame and academic achievement.

Introduction: Shame and guilt are two closely related self-conscious emotions of negative affect that give rise to disparate motivational and self-regulatory behaviors (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). While shame has been associated with a host of maladaptive functioning variables and life difficulties, guilt has been consistently associated with adaptive self-regulation outcomes (Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007). In recent times, several researchers have begun to explore the respective implications of shame and guilt-proneness for the experience of substance use-related disorders (e.g. Dearing, Stuewig, & Tangney, 2005; Meehan et al., 1996; O'Conner, Berry, Inaba, Weiss, & Morrison, 1994). Preliminary research suggests that while guilt-proneness is inversely related to alcohol misuse, shame-proneness appears to share a positive relationship with alcohol problems (Dearing et al., 2005). In elaborating upon the apparent link between shame and alcohol problems, several theorists have hypothesized that shame-prone individuals may be inclined to drink as a means of down-regulating experiences of shame and other negative affect (Dearing et al., 2005; Potter-Efron, 2002; Stuewig & Tangney, 2007; Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Wiechelt, 2007). While this drinking-to-cope strategy may be effective in the short term, Tangney and Dearing (2002) suggest that a destructive cycle of negative effect, alcohol use, and the experience of negative alcohol use-related consequences may result if 2 this substance use as a coping strategy is frequently relied upon. Providing additional support for the existence of a —shame-alcohol use shame spirall, experiences of shame are commonly experienced as a result of alcohol problems and it appears that shame, in particular, serves as a substantial barrier to treatment seeking behavior and positive therapeutic outcomes (Potter-Efron, 2002).

II. Related Work: Recent theoretical and empirical work has facilitated the drawing of sharp conceptual distinctions between shame and guilt. A clear view of these distinctions has permitted development of a

research literature aimed at evaluating the differential associations of shame and guilt with depressive symptoms. This study quantitatively summarized the magnitude of associations of shame and guilt with depressive symptoms. Two hundred forty-two effect sizes were obtained from 108 studies employing 22,411 participants. Shame showed significantly stronger associations with depressive symptoms ($r = 0.43$) than guilt ($r = 0.28$). However, the association of shame and depressive symptoms was statistically indistinguishable from the associations of 2 maladaptive variants of guilt and depressive symptoms ("contextual-maladaptive" guilt, involving exaggerated responsibility for uncontrollable events, $r = 0.39$; generalized guilt, involving "free-floating" guilt divorced from specific contexts, $r = 0.42$). Other factors also moderated the effects. "External shame", which involves negative views of self as seen through the eyes of others, was associated with larger effect sizes ($r = 0.56$) than "internal shame" ($r = 0.42$), which involves negative views of self as seen through one's own eyes. Depressive symptom measures that invoked the term guilt yielded stronger associations between guilt and depressive symptoms ($r = 0.33$) than depressive symptom measures that did not ($r = 0.21$). Age, sex, and ethnicity (proportion of Whites to Asians) did not moderate the effects. Although these correlation data are ambiguous with respect to their causal interpretation, results suggest that shame should figure more prominently in understandings of the emotional underpinnings of depressive symptoms. (Kim et al 2011). The purpose of this study was to investigate coming out to family and friends and their relationships to shame, internalized heterosexism, lesbian identity, and perceived social support in Chinese lesbians from 2 different cultural settings-- Mainland China ($N = 244$) and Hong Kong ($N = 234$). Results of structural equation modeling showed that, in both samples, a sense of shame was related to internalized heterosexism and a devaluation of one's

lesbian identity, which in turn was related to a decreased likelihood of coming out to others. Shame was also associated with a reduced perception of support from friends, which seemed in turn to exacerbate internalized heterosexism among lesbians. Family support was generally unrelated to countess, except for countess to friends in the Hong Kong sample. Results are discussed in relation to the cultural stigma attached to same-sex orientation and the cultural practice of shaming that parents use to socialize children. (Sheung-Tak et al 2010). A study was conducted on Parents participation in children’s Academic Activities in relation to their Academic achievement at primary level. The study research that commonly parents do not realize the significance of their participation in children’s academic activities. Significant influence on the child’s personality is mostly related to parent’s outcome of all influences. And most influencing factor of educational interference or the academic achievement in commerce. (Agarwal 1998). In this study Parental Involvement and student Achievement a Meta Analysis indicate that the academic achievement score distribution or range of scores for children whose parents were highly involved in their education was substantially higher than that of their counter parts whose parents were less involved. (Keynes. H. 2005). In the light of this context the present study is entitled as “The impact of guilt and shame on academic achievement among higher secondary school students” for the present research has been taken up. The focus for this study is on higher secondary school students. A convenient random Sampling technique that was used for the selection of the sample in this case was random sampling technique. A total of 50 school students were selected from three different schools in Chennai city. The investigator selected 300 students.

III. Sample: The focus for this study is on higher secondary students. Convenient random sampling technique is used for the selection of the sample. Total of 300 students were randomly selected from three different types of schools in Chennai district. The investigator selected 100 students’ 50 boys and 50 girls from Government school, 100 students 50 boys and 50 girls from Government Aided School and 100 students 50 boys and 50 girls from Private school..

IV. Objectives of The Study: To find the impact of gender of guilt and shame on academic achievement of higher secondary school student.

V. Hypotheses of The Study:

- 3) There are no significant differences between Guilt of boys and girls from the total sample.
- 4) There are no significant differences between Shame of boys and girls from the total sample.

5) There are no significant differences between Academic Achievement of boys and girls from the total sample.

VI. Research Tools Selected For the Present Study: The following tools have been used by the investigator to carry out this study.

- 3) Personal data sheet developed by the investigator.
- 4) Guilt and shame scale Taya R. Cohen (April 2011).
- 5) Academic achievement their marks in school.(quarterly examination marks of the higher secondary students from teachers)

Hypothesis-1

There are no significant differences between guilt of Boys and Girls from the total sample

Table 1: Differentiation of guilt in Boys and Girls from government school.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	C.R	L.S
Guilt	Boys	50	57.69	6.89	1.004	N.S
	Girls	50	59.33	9.69		

N.S- Not Significant

Table 2: Differentiation of guilt Boys and Girls from Government Aided School.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	C.R	L.S
Guilt	Boys	50	61.33	7.38	1.076	N.S
	Girls	50	60.08	3.63		

N.S- Not Significant

Table 3: Differentiation of guilt Boys and Girls from Private School.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	C.R	L.S
Guilt	Boys	50	63.65	6.27	1.982	0.05
	Girls	50	61.45	4.67		

From the table 1 and 2 it is understood that the calculated ‘Critical Ratio’ values are less than that of table ‘Critical Ratio’ values. Hence the hypothesis is accepted and proved that there is no significant difference between guilt of boys and girls of Government and Government Aided from the total sample. From the table 3 it is understood that the calculated ‘Critical Ratio’ values are more than that of table ‘Critical Ratio’ values. Hence the hypothesis is rejected and proved that there is significant difference between guilt of boys and girls of Private School from the total sample.

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences between Shame of Boys and Girls from the total sample

Table 4: Differentiations of Shame Boys and Girls from Government School.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	C.R	L.S
Shame	Boys	50	52.39	7.06	1.49	N.S
	Girls	50	54.98	10.05		

N.S - Not Significant

Table - 5 Differentiations of Shame Boys and Girls from Government Aided School.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	C.R	L.S
Shame	Boys	50	57.41	9.798	1.87	N.S
	Girls	50	60.20	3.84		

N.S - Not Significant

Table 6: Differentiations of Shame Boys and Girls from Private School.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	C.R	L.S
Shame	Boys	50	56.35	6.25	3.69	0.01
	Girls	50	61.33	7.199		

From the table 6 it is understood that the calculated 'Critical Ratio' values are more than that of table 'Critical Ratio' values. Hence the hypothesis is rejected and proved that there is significant difference between Shame of boys and girls Private School from the total sample. From the table 4 and 5 it is understood that the calculated 'Critical Ratio' values are less than that of table 'Critical Ratio' values. Hence the hypothesis is accepted and proved that there is no significant difference between Shame of boys and girls of Government and Government Aided from the total sample.

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences between Academic achievement of Boys and Girls from the total sample.

Table 7: Differentiation of Academic achievement in Boys and Girls from government school.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	C.R	L.S
Academic achievement	Boys	50	1056.63	75.13	5.465	0.01
	Girls	50	1146.78	89.23		

Table-8 Differentiation of Academic achievement in Boys and Girls from government aided school.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	C.R	L.S
Academic achievement	Boys	50	1124.35	137.05	1.803	N.S
	Girls	50	1162.70	61.94		

N.S- Not Significant

Table-9 Differentiation of Academic Achievement in Boys and Girls from Private School.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	C.R	L.S
Academic achievement	Boys	50	1741.69	82.36	0.491	N.S
	Girls	50	1750.59	102.67		

N.S- Not Significant

From the table 7 it is understood that the calculated 'Critical Ratio' values are more than that of table 'Critical Ratio' values. Hence the hypothesis is rejected and proved that there is significant difference between Academic achievement of boys and girls Government School from the total sample. From the table 8 and 9 and also from figure H and I it is understood that the calculated 'Critical Ratio' values are less than that of table 'Critical Ratio' values. Hence the hypothesis is accepted and proved that there is no significant difference between Academic achievement of boys and girls Government Aided and Private school from the total sample.

IX. Educational Implications: In India the quality improvement in education is the greatest need of the day. The quality education can be measured through academic achievement of the students. To achieve this goal positive attitude towards education should be inculcated in children. So that there may be higher motivation to develop their innate skills and become useful citizens of India. Though the present study highlights there is no significant difference between boys and girls in their academic achievement, but students belonging to difference types of schools differ among themselves in their academic achievement. Hence, the educators and school management should take some effort to bring all round development of the students for better achievement under any circumstances. Mind plays a flexible role in accomplishing variety of tasks. It is therefore important for the parents and the teachers to understand the nature of the student's mind and its functions in different styles of learning and thinking. Teachers can only make a child to mold the behavior dominance according to the different types of activities dominance.

X. Delimitations:

- 3) The sample is restricted to higher secondary school students from Chennai district
- 4) The sample size is restricted to 300 students only.

XI. Conclusion:

➤ **There are no significant differences between Guilt of Boys and Girls from the total sample:** Hypothesis is accepted and proved that there are no significant differences between guilt of boys and girls from the Government and Government Aided School Hypothesis is rejected and proved that there are significant differences between guilt of boys and girls from the Private school.

➤ **There are no significant differences between Shame of boys and girls from the total sample:** Hypothesis is accepted and proved that there are no significant differences between Shame of boys and girls from the Government and Government Aided School. Hypothesis is rejected and proved that

there are significant differences between Shame of boys and girls from the Private School.

➤ **There are no significant differences between academic achievement of boys and girls from the total sample:** Hypothesis is rejected and proved that there is a significant difference between

academic achievement of boys and girls from the Government School. Hypothesis is accepted and proved that there is no significant difference between academic achievement of boys and girls from the Government Aided and Private School.

References:

1. **Ferguson, Tamara J.; Stegge, Hedy; Miller, Erin R.; Olsen, Michael E.** *Developmental Psychology*, v35 n2 p347-57 Mar 1999
2. **Golshani, Mehdi**, 2003. Does Science Offer Evidence of a Transcendent Reality?
3. **Grünberg, David, (A)** "The Meaning of Life Vis-A-Vis the Challenges of the Present Day World," in Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka (ed.),
4. **Grünberg, David, (B)** 2005. Etik ve Ya"amin Anlamı, Erdem, 44.
5. **Guastello, Stephen, Chaos, Catastrophe, and Human Affairs:** Applications of Nonlinear Dynamics to Work, Organizations, and Social Evolution, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ, 1995.
6. **Hesse, Herman, Siddartha**, New Directions Paper Book, 1957
7. **Hursthouse, Rosalind**, 2003, "Virtue Ethics", Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), retrieved 6 April, 2010 from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-virtue/#2>
8. **Johnson, Diane Elizabeth** *College Student Journal*, v46 n1 p3-17 Mar 2012
9. **Johnson, Veronica R. F.; Yarhouse, Mark A.** *Counseling and Values*, v58 n1 p85-103 Apr 2013
10. **Joske, W., D. (2004).** Philosophy and the Meaning of Life. In David Benatar (ed.), *Life, Death and Meaning: Key Philosophical Readings on the Big Questions* (pp. 49 - 62). USA, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc. Kraut, Richard, (2001). "Aristotle's Ethics", Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved August 01, 2010, from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-ethics/>
11. **Kamper, Heidrun** *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, v25 n5-6 p497-511 2004
12. **Kamper, Heidrun** *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, v25 n5-6 p497-511 2004 <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals>
13. **Kim, Jungmeen; Talbot, Nancy L.; Cicchetti, Dante** *Child Abuse & Neglect: the International Journal*, v33 n6 p362-371 Jun 2009
14. **Kim, Sangmoon; Thibodeau, Ryan; Jorgensen, Randall S.** *Psychological Bulletin*, v137 n1 p68-96 Jan 2011
15. **Kim, Sangmoon; Thibodeau, Ryan; Jorgensen, Randall S.** *Psychological Bulletin*, v137 n1 p68-96 Jan 2011
16. **Kolves, Kairi; Ide, Naoko; De Leo, Diego** *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, v41 n2 p149-159 Apr 2011
17. **Konstam, Varda; Chernoff, Miriam; Deveney, Sara** *Counseling and Values*, v46 n1 p26-39 Oct 2001
18. **Kristin; Rhea, Deborah J.; Oomen, Jody** *American Journal of Health Education*, v35 n3 p152-157 May-Jun 2004 <http://www.ahperd.org>
19. **Luby, Joan; Belden, Andy; Sullivan, Jill; Hayen, Robin; McCadney, Amber; Spitznagel, Ed** *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, v50 n9 p1156-1166 Sep 2009 <http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/>
20. **Megan L.; Hagewood, J. Houston** *Behavior Therapy*, v42 n4 p740-750 Dec 2011
21. **Meyer, Janet R.** *Western Journal of Communication*, v77 n2 p210-230 2013 <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals>
22. **Mills, R.S.L.** *Developmental Review*, v25 n1 p26-63 Mar 2005
23. **New Directions for Youth Development**, n136 p75-93 Win 2012 <http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA>
24. **Thomaes, Sander; Stegge, Hedy; Olthof, Tjeert** *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, v25 n4 p559-577 Nov 2007
25. **Updike, Thomas L., Jr.; And Others** *Psychology: A Quarterly Journal of Human Behavior*, v24 n1-2 p60-64 1987.

V. Suriyakumar

PhD Research Scholar, Meston College of Education (Autonomous), Royapettah,
Chennai-600014, Tamil Nadu, India