

SELF-ESTEEM IN RELATION TO COPING STRATEGIES AMONG ADOLESCENT

Nirupama Garg*, Tamanna Gupta **

*Student, Chaudhary Bansilal University, Bhiwani, Haryana, India.

**Assistant Professor, Dept. Of Psychology, Maharana Pratap Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Bhiwani, Haryana, India.

ABSTRACT

The present study was aimed to investigate the relationship between self-esteem and coping strategies in adolescent. The sample comprised of 140 adolescent randomly drawn from bhiwani, Haryana. The participants were tested on the self-esteem inventory (SEI; Prasad and Thakur (1977) and coping strategies scale (CSS; Srivastava (2002). Data were analysed with the help of ANOVA. Results showed significant difference between negative self-esteem and behavioural avoidance coping strategies.

Keywords: self esteem, coping style, coping strategies, positive self esteem, negative self esteem.

INTRODUCTION

Self-esteem reflects person's emotional evaluation of own worth. It is a subjective judgment of an attitude toward the self. It is essential for healthy development. It is related to our self image. It is essential for positive attitude toward living. Low self esteem leads to poor self image. And high self esteem leads to good self image.

Coping strategies are referring to conscious effort to solve personal and interpersonal problems. It is also helpful in minimize or tolerate stress or conflict. There are broadly two types of coping strategies. These are: problem focused and emotion focused coping strategies.

Chapman and Mullis (1999) revealed that adolescents with lower self-esteem utilized more avoidance coping strategies than adolescents with higher self-esteem. J. Hotez, et.al.(2013) Students with high self-esteem used problem focused followed by emotion focused coping activities. Students should be encouraged to use problem focused coping activities. Bélanger, et.al. (2014) results confirm the presence of a relationship between self-esteem, specific coping strategies and marital adjustment in men and women. High self-esteem and marital adjustment are associated with the use of problem solving strategies and less avoidance as a way of coping.

OBJECTIVE:

To compare three groups classified on basic of self esteem scores, i.e. the positive, negative and balance self-esteem on coping strategies.

HYPOTHESES:

There would be a significant group difference on coping strategies (Behavioural Approach, Cognitive Approach, Cognitive behavioural Approach, and Behavioural Avoidance, and Cognitive Avoidance) among three groups classified as positive, negative and balance self-esteem.

METHOD**SAMPLE:**

A total sample of 140 participants from Bhiwani, Haryana fulfilling the specific inclusion and exclusion criteria was taken up for the study often obtaining written informed consent.

Inclusion Criterion:

- Age rage – 13 – 18 years
- Gender – Both male and female
- Education – School student

Exclusion Criterion:

- Age rage- Below 13 and after 18 years
- Education – PG students

SAMPLING:

Random sampling method was used

TOOLS USED:

Following tools were used to assess the variable.

- **Self-esteem inventory:**

(SEI; Prasad and Thakur (1977): It consists 60 items. It is a seven point likert scale. Reliability co-efficient of the scale was assessed on a sample of 400 students. Split-half reliability co-efficient were calculated for both the sets of inventory which came out to be .82 and .78 for personality-perceived self, socially--perceived self respectively and balanced self-esteem.

- **Coping strategies scale:**

(CSS; Srivastava (2002): It consists 50 items. It is a five- point likert scale. There are five categories. First is behavioural – Approach (2,4,5,6,12,20,21,26,29,33,35,41,45,47,48). Second is cognitive – Approach items of 3, 7, and 8,25,42,43. Third is cognitive – behavioural - Approach items of 11, 13,17,23,30,31,37,49. Fourth is behavioural-Avoidance items of 1,10,15,16,18,19,22,27,28,34,36,39,44,50. Fifth is a cognitive–Avoidance item of 9,14,24,32,38,40,46.

PROCEDURE:

After establishing proper rapport with the participants they were assured regarding the confidentiality of personal information. Afterwards, they were provided with the questionnaire. All the participants completed the questionnaire independently and their responses were collected for scoring before taking back the response sheets it was ensure that none of the items or statement left unattended. With the vote of thanks the session was ended. The score was done for all questionnaires. Results & interpretation were made by applying predefined statistical method.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:

The data was analyzed using SPSS (version 20) the mean and standard deviation for the self-esteem inventory and coping strategies scale were analyzed. Results were calculated using one way ANOVA test

RESULTS:

Table 1. showing mean and standard deviation of self-esteem and coping strategies measure for three group positive, negative and balance.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	S.D.
Behavioural Approach	Positive	51	29.75	6.50
	Negative	41	29.05	8.57
	Balance	48	28.28	6.81
	Total	140	29.25	7.34
Cognitive	Positive	51	12.59	3.35

Approach		Negative	41	12.68	4.13
		Balance	48	11.56	3.18
		Total	140	12.45	3.63
Cognitive behaviour- Approach	-	Positive	51	18.49	5.43
		Negative	41	17.88	6.39
		Balance	48	15.11	5.95
		Total	140	17.71	5.95
Behavioural Avoidance	-	Positive	51	21.65	6.73
		Negative	41	23.63	6.89
		Balance	48	18.83	7.27
		Total	140	21.93	7.01
Cognitive Avoidance	-	Positive	51	13.88	3.76
		Negative	41	13.85	4.03
		Balance	48	14.94	3.04
		Total	140	14.05	3.75

Table 2. Showing the summary of one way ANOVA among self esteem and coping strategies.

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Behavioural Approach	Between Groups	31.17	2	15.59	.286NS	.752
	Within Groups	5839.20	137	54.57		
	Total	5870.37	139			
Cognitive Approach	Between Groups	17.60	2	8.80	.665NS	.516
	Within Groups	1415.68	137	13.23		
	Total	1433.27	139			
Cognitive behaviour-Approach	Between Groups	153.78	2	76.89	2.218NS	.114
	Within Groups	3708.91	137	34.66		
	Total	3862.69	139			
Behavioural Avoidance	Between Groups	295.76	2	147.88	3.126*	.048
	Within Groups	5061.66	137	47.31		
	Total	5357.42	139			
Cognitive Avoidance	Between Groups	17.41	2	8.71	.616NS	.542
	Within Groups	1513.36	137	14.14		
	Total	1530.77	139			

Note : *P <.05, NS (Not significant).

DISCUSSION

The aim of the study was to compare the coping strategies based on self-esteem. The current study was done on sample of 140 adolescent. Our hypothesis was that there would be a significant group difference on coping strategies (Behavioural Approach, Cognitive Approach, Cognitive behavioural

Approach, and Behavioural Avoidance, and Cognitive Avoidance) among three groups classified as positive, negative and balance self-esteem. We partially accept the hypothesis because there is a significant difference between behavioural avoidance coping strategy and negative self-esteem (F value is 3.126 ($p < .05$), but there is no significant difference between behavioural approach, cognitive approach, cognitive behavioural approach, cognitive avoidance approach and self-esteem. The results of the current study is similar to the previous study Chapman and Mullis (1999). His study revealed that adolescents with lower self-esteem utilized more avoidance coping strategies than adolescents with higher self-esteem.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Authors appreciate to all those who participate in this study.

REFERENCES

1. Chapman, P. L., & Mullis, R. L. (1999). Adolescent coping strategies and self-esteem. *Child Study Journal*, 29(1), 69-69.
 2. Bélanger, C., Di Schiavi, M. F., Sabourin, S., Dugal, C., El Baalbaki, G., & Lussier, Y. (2014). Self-esteem, coping efforts and marital adjustment. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 10(4), 660-671.
 3. J., Hotez, P., Junghanss, T., Kang, G., Laloo, D., & White, N. J. (2013). *Manson's tropical diseases*. Elsevier Health Sciences.
 4. Karl Perera(2016).
- Retrieved from:- <https://www.more-selfesteem.com/whatisselfesteem.htm>