The International Journal of Indian Psychology ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print) Volume 9, Issue 3, July- September, 2021 DIP: 18.01.179.20210903, ODI: 10.25215/0903.179 http://www.ijip.in



**Research Paper** 

# Assessment of Counseling Needs and their Correlation with

# **Friendship Patterns among Adolescents**

Vanika<sup>1</sup>\*, Seema Sharma<sup>2</sup>

## ABSTRACT

Guidance and counseling needs of adolescents are those needs necessary to resolve their problems which they experience in day-to-day life, help to improve their personal development and encourage individual welfare. Friendship is the warp and woof of the social fabric. It does not merely bind society together but provides essential emotional sustenance, buffering against stress and preserving physical and mental health. To assess the provision status of counseling services and identify and compare the counseling needs and friendship patterns of adolescents in government and private schools among adolescents in private and government schools of Ludhiana city. The study was conducted on 240 adolescents (120 government and 120 private). Psychological Counseling Needs Scale by Chouhan and Arora (2009) was used to assess the counseling needs. Dimensions of Friendship Scale by Chandna and Chadha (1986) was used to assess the friendship patterns among adolescents. A selfstructured questionnaire was used to assess the provision status of guidance and counseling services to adolescents. The results revealed that there was inadequacy of counselor in the government schools. Government school adolescents significantly showed high requirement for psychological counseling needs as compared to private school adolescents. Irrespective of the gender and type of school, results of correlation analysis revealed that the adolescents who have better friendships are in lesser need of counseling services.

# **Keywords:** Psychological Counseling Needs, Friendship Patterns, Provision Status, Adolescents Guidance

dolescence is the period in life of an individual where he/she hunts for his/her identity which may be personal, social or occupational. It is the period which starts in biology and ends in the society. Adolescents have to deal with many challenges in day-to-day life. They are often in a confused state about the changed roles and are pressurized between their responsibilities as growing adults resulting in overly emotional behavior (Vinutha and Indiramma 2017). Adolescence acts as a bridge between the childhood and adulthood, the age where a child loosens the ties with parents and is directed more towards their peers. Typically spending more time with friends than they spend with

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Research scholar, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Community Science, Punjab Agricultural University, Punjab, India

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Research scholar, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Community Science, Punjab Agricultural University, Punjab, India

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding Author

**Received:** July 10, 2021; Revision Received: September 13, 2021; Accepted: September 26, 2021 © 2021, Vanika & Sharma S.; licensee IJIP. This is an Open Access Research distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any Medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

their parents, siblings or any other social contacts is what adolescents love the most during this phase. As friends and peers become more important in the life of an adolescent, he/she begins with the process of forming an identity and develops life's philosophy. Adolescents tend to have likeminded friends who become ever more important and influence the life choices of them strongly (Moore 2019). The social energy of the adolescents is often inclined to new friendships and social groups.; this gives them a feel that they are an important and accepted part of the society. Friendships during this phase are more open, intense, and intimate. Struggling to adjust in the ever-changing societies they often experience doubts, anxieties or resentment which requires to be concealed in most of the situations, friendship being the most important influencing factor in the life of an adolescent, a close friend might help in fighting back against the same (Kumari 2008). Healthy friendships provide a warm soothing balm to soften the edges and dull some of the pain. But if things feel strained, one might consider 'friendship counseling' which is a growing therapeutic practice in US and UK. If there are problems in your friendship then probably you need to go for counseling (Adeeyo 2013). Adolescents feel better when their friends distract them from problems. The lack of validation might affect the individual's belief of what is needed by them and what they should feel about the same, which as a consequence may create a "suffer in silence" atmosphere further making it more difficult for the individual who is suffering. One may need help and assistance during this phase. Selfacceptance and self-image of the child are associated very closely as how he/she is treated by his/her peers. Social comparison among the peers is used for the self-evaluation in a child and this has been seen remarkably increasing in primary school years (Zarbatany et al 1990). Friendships are linked to the feeling of emotional and social well-being during the period of adolescence. Adolescents with no close friendships or who don't enjoy each other company are seen to suffer from the feeling of loneliness and depression (Buhrmester 1990). Based on Aristotle's modern reading of theory of friendship, virtual friendship doesn't qualify as genuine friendship. Virtual friendship exists on internet and seldom or never has a connection with real life. On the other hand, real friendships are traditionally more genuine where one can share things, feelings and rely on the other in the time of crisis (Froding and Peterson 2012). It has been observed that absence of friends can be emotionally disturbing (Williams 2012). Friends serve as a provider of positive socialization throughout the life of an individual (Hartup and Stevens 1999).

## **Objective of the study**

- To identify and compare the counseling needs and friendship patterns of adolescents in government and private schools among both the gender groups.
- To explore the correlation between friendship patterns of adolescents with their counseling needs.

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

A research was conducted to study the levels of self disclosure and intimacy corresponding to a close friend by Camarena *et al* (1990). Questions were asked from 148 girls and 130 boys of 8<sup>th</sup> standard regarding a close friend corresponding to the levels of self disclosure and intimacy. According to the results of the research, the level of self disclosure and intimacy related to emotional closeness, in girls, was more significant.

Male friendships focus less on communicating to each other than on shared activities, usually sports and games whereas on the opposite hand females tend to have a conversational bond like sharing all day long chores or sharing a secret (Buhrmester 1996).

Relationship between friendship and interpersonal values was examined by Begum and Khanam (1990). Sex differences in adolescent friendship were found in students. Leadership, support and independence were the value which showed significant difference. Females were seen to have comparatively low scores on leadership and independence as compared to males.

Results of the research conducted by Asher and Parker (1993) on the distinction between friendship adjustment and acceptance by the peer group revealed that many low accepted children had best friends and were satisfied with their friendships. The measures of having a friend, friendship quality and group acceptance made separate contributions to the prediction of loneliness.

A study was carried out by Harris and Wentzal (1999) to distinguish various friendship patterns on the basis of conflict and support from their friends. It was concluded that adolescent adjustment and patterns of friendship are associated in the areas of depressive feeling self- perception, sense of alienation, expectations, lying, aggression, sense of alienation and disobedience.

Friendship is relevant to emotional status of adolescents and involves attachment processes. Accordingly, there are various aspects to be taken care of; the emotional intensity of interactions between friends, the level of intimacy deriving from self disclosure developed by friends (Laghi *et al* 2013; Miller and Hoicowitz 2004). Considering adolescents spend more time with friends than their parents and consider their friend as a source of both emotional support and prime source of intimacy and disclosure (Baiocco *et al* 2011; Wilkinson 2008).

Kumar (2011) conducted a study which revealed that changing lifestyle of people in the society, unemployment, increase of insecurities among people, rapid increase in globalization and urbanization have lead to psychological disorders among people and thus they are in need of psychological counseling.

A study on the guidance needs of adolescents studying in government and private schools in Jammu district was conducted by Kalhotra (2012). The results showcased that the students studying in private schools are in less need for guidance than students studying in government schools. Girls need less counseling than boys.

Chouhan and Joshi (2014) explored the counseling needs of adolescents. The psychological counseling needs scale (2009) was used for appropriate assessment. The result indicated that there was no significant difference between the need of psychological counseling of girls and boys.

Lu *et al* (2020) conducted a study on importance of friendship and found out that prioritizing friendships in life was associated with better mental health and well being.

Narr *et al* (2020) conducted a research to study close friendship strength and broader peer group desirability as differential predictors of adult mental health. The results of the study revealed that close friendship strength in mid adolescence predicted relative increase in self worth and decrease in anxiety and depressive symptoms.

#### METHODOLOGY

The sample was drawn randomly from the selected Government and Private Senior Secondary Schools of Ludhiana city.

#### Sample

The sample size for the present study was 240 adolescents in the age group of 14-16 years selected randomly from Private and Government Senior Secondary Schools of Ludhiana city. The selection was done to have equal number of male and female respondents, i.e. 120 adolescents each (60 females and 60 males) from Government and Private Senior Secondary Schools.

#### **Criteria of Selection**

The criterion of selection that was used to collect the sample from government and private senior secondary schools is as following:

- Respondent were in the age group of 14-16 years old.
- Respondents were from Ludhiana city only.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

School wise differences in the distribution of respondents across various levels of psychological counseling needs.

Table 1 shows school wise distribution of respondents across various levels of psychological counseling needs. The results revealed that majority (46.25%) of the total population was seen at high level of psychological needs, 37.08 per cent of them were found to be at average level of psychological counseling needs followed by 16.67 per cent of them at low level of psychological counseling needs. Sati and Vig (2016) conducted a study which gave similar results that majority of the population was at level of high psychological counseling needs.

55 per cent of the government school respondents and 37.50 per cent of the private school respondents were significantly observed to be at high level of psychological counseling needs (z value- 2.77:  $p \le 0.01$ ) followed by 33.33 per cent of the government school respondents and 40.83 per cent of private school respondents at average level of psychological counseling needs and the rest 11.67 per cent of the government school respondents and 21.67 per cent of the private school respondents were found to be at low level for psychological counseling needs.

Psychological Counseling	Government (n <sub>1</sub> =120)		Private (n <sub>2</sub> =120)		Z value	Total (n=240)	
Needs	f	%	f	%		f	%
High	66	55.00	45	37.50	2.77***	111	46.25
Average	40	33.33	49	40.83	1.38 <sup>NS</sup>	89	37.08
Low	14	11.67	26	21.67	1.50 <sup>NS</sup>	40	16.67
** <0.05	*** ~0 (	\1					

Table 1 School wise differences in the distribution of respondents across various levels of psychological counseling needs.

\*\*p≤0.05 \*\*\*p≤0.01

Lack of awareness, less exposure to talking about concerns, reserved school environment and lack of openness with family might be a few reasons for high psychological counseling

needs among government students. Taking psychological counseling is linked with the social stigma of the society and thus many of the needy people don't seek help or assistance because of the same. (Williams and Polaha 2015).

# Gender wise differences in the distribution of respondents across various levels of psychological counseling needs.

When analyzed on the basis of gender, it was seen that 45.83 per cent of the female respondents and 46.66 per cent of the male respondents fell into the category of high psychological counseling needs followed by 34.17 per cent of the female respondents and 40 per cent of the male respondents who were found to be at average level of psychological counseling needs and the rest 20 per cent of the female respondents and 13.33 per cent of the male respondents were seen at low level of psychological needs. Since there was a non-significant difference observed between both the gender groups, it could be concluded that both males and females are proportionately seeking for psychological help.

With the advancement of technology and ever developing society, there has been fragmentation in the society and thus there is a gap that has formed due to which people are not able to find adequate support. They are in need of help so that their problems can be listened and then resolved.

 Table 2 Gender wise differences in the distribution of respondents across various levels of psychological counseling needs. (n=240)

Psychological	Female (n <sub>1</sub> =120)		Male (n <sub>2</sub> =120)		Z value
Counseling Needs	f	%	f	%	
High	55	45.83	56	46.66	1.19 <sup>NS</sup>
Average	41	34.17	48	40.00	1.07 <sup>NS</sup>
Low	24	20.00	16	13.33	1.50 <sup>NS</sup>

# School wise differences in the distribution of respondents across various dimensions of friendship patterns.

Table 3 shows school wise respondents' distribution across various levels of different friendship dimensions. There are eight dimensions across which the friendship patterns have been measured i.e., Enjoyment, Acceptance, Trust, Respect, Mutual Assistance, Confiding, Understanding and Spontaneity.

**1. Enjoyment:** Overall, 86.67 per cent of the respondents were found at high level of 'enjoyment' dimension, followed by 9.58 per cent at average level and the rest 3.75 per cent at low level of enjoyment.

When analyzed on the basis of the type of school, no significant differences were observed at any level of enjoyment, a dimension of friendship patterns. 85.00 per cent of private school respondents and 88.33 per cent of government school respondents were seen to be at high level of enjoyment while at average level of enjoyment, 12.50 per cent of the private school respondents and 6.67 per cent of government school respondents were seen followed by 2.50 per cent of private school respondents and 5.00 per cent of government school respondents at low levels of enjoyment. This indicates that private school students may like

spending time with their friends and enjoy each other's company more than government school students do.

**2.** Acceptance: Overall, 68.75 per cent of the respondents were observed to be at high level of 'acceptance' dimension, followed by 20.00 per cent at average level and the rest 11.25 per cent at low level of acceptance. 74.17 per cent of government school respondents and 63.33 per cent of private school students were found to be at high level of acceptance which means that government school students probably had more acceptance towards their friends as they are. 25.83 per cent of private school students and 14.17 per cent of government school students were seen at average level of acceptance and the rest 10.83 per cent of private school students and 11.67 per cent of government school students were seen at low level of acceptance. Since there were no significant differences observed at any level of acceptance, it could be said that acceptance is a personal trait and depends on individual friendship.

**3. Trust:** Overall, 78.75 per cent of the respondents were found at high level of 'trust' dimension and the rest 21.25 per cent at average level of trust dimension. It was observed that government school respondents (80.00%) had more trust in their friends than private school respondents (77.50%). 20.00 per cent of government school respondents and 22.50 per cent of private school respondents were seen at average level of trust.

**4. Respect:** Overall, 83.33 per cent of the respondents were found at high level of 'trust' dimension and the rest 16.67 per cent at average level of respect. 83.33 per cent of both private and government school students showed high respect towards their friends and the rest 16.67 per cent of private and government school respondents were seen at average level of respect.

**5. Mutual Assistance:** Overall, 88.75 per cent of the respondents were found at high level of 'mutual assistance' dimension and the rest 11.25 per cent at average level. No significant differences were observed at any level of mutual assistance. The results revealed that majority of both, government school respondents (90.83 per cent) and private school respondents (86.67 per cent) were seen at high level of mutual assistance whereas 13.33 per cent of government school students and 9.17 per cent of private school students were seen at average level of mutual assistance.

**6.** Confiding: Overall, 56.25 per cent of the respondents were found at low level, 37.92 per cent of the respondents at average level and the rest 5.83 per cent at high level of 'confiding' dimension.

Least number of both government school respondents (6.67%) and private school respondents (6.67%) were found to be confiding in their friends. 40.00 per cent private school respondents and 35.83 per cent government school respondents were seen at average level of confiding whereas 53.33 per cent government school students and 59.17 per cent private school respondents were found to be at low level of 'confiding' dimension.

**7. Understanding:** Overall, 48.75 per cent of the respondents were found at low level, 33.33 per cent of the respondents at average level and the rest 17.92 per cent at high level of the 'understanding' dimension of friendship scale. No significant differences were found at any level of 'understanding' dimension.

20.83 per cent of government school respondents and 15.00 per cent of private school students were found at high levels of understanding. 34.17 per cent of government school respondents and 32.50 per cent of private school students were seen at average level of understanding and 45.00 per cent government school respondents and 52.50 per cent private school students at low level of understanding. As majority of both the school respondents were found at low level of understanding. As the results reveal that both government and private school students non-significantly score low on understanding dimension, it could be said that when it comes to understanding their friends, respondents from both the school type tend to fail.

		Type of School							
Dimensions of Friendship Patterns		Government (n <sub>1</sub> =120)		Private (n <sub>2</sub> =120)		Z value	Total (n=240)		
		f %		f %			f	%	
Enjoyment	Low	3	2.50	6	5.00	0.18 <sup>NS</sup>	9	3.75	
	Average	15	12.50	8	6.67	$0.44^{NS}$	23	9.58	
	High	102	85.00	106	88.33	0.71 <sup>NS</sup>	208	86.67	
Acceptance	Low	13	10.83	14	11.67	$0.07^{NS}$	27	11.25	
	Average	31	25.83	17	14.17	0.94 <sup>NS</sup>	48	20.00	
	High	76	63.33	89	74.17	1.50 <sup>NS</sup>	165	68.75	
Trust	Average	24	20.00	27	22.50	0.22 <sup>NS</sup>	51	21.25	
	High	96	80.00	93	77.50	0.42 <sup>NS</sup>	189	78.75	
Respect	Average	20	16.67	20	16.67	0.00 <sup>NS</sup>	40	16.67	
	High	100	83.33	100	83.33	0.00 <sup>NS</sup>	200	83.33	
Mutual	Average	16	13.33	11	9.17	0.33 <sup>NS</sup>	27	11.25	
Assistance	High	104	86.67	109	90.83	0.96 <sup>NS</sup>	213	88.75	
Confiding	Low	64	53.33	71	59.17	0.68 <sup>NS</sup>	135	56.25	
	Average	48	40.00	43	35.83	0.41 <sup>NS</sup>	91	37.92	
	High	8	6.67	6	5.00	0.13 <sup>NS</sup>	14	5.83	
Understanding	Low	54	45.00	63	52.50	0.81 <sup>NS</sup>	117	48.75	
	Average	41	34.17	39	32.50	0.16 <sup>NS</sup>	80	33.33	
	High	25	20.83	18	15.00	0.49 <sup>NS</sup>	43	17.92	
Spontaneity	Low	58	48.33	47	39.17	0.94 <sup>NS</sup>	105	43.75	
	Average	51	42.50	66	55.00	1.34 <sup>NS</sup>	117	48.75	
	High	11	9.17	7	5.83	0.26 <sup>NS</sup>	18	7.50	

Table 3 School wise differences in the distribution of respondents across various dimensions of friendship patterns.

**8. Spontaneity:** Overall, 43.75 per cent of the respondents were found at low level, 48.75 per cent of the respondents at average level and the rest 7.50 per cent at high level of 'spontaneity' dimension. Similar to all the others dimensions of friendship patterns between government and private schools, no significant differences were observed at 'spontaneity', one of the 8 dimensions of friendship patterns.

From the school groups, 48.33 per cent of government school respondents and 39.17 per cent of private school students were seen at low level of spontaneity, followed by 42.50 per

cent government school students and 55.00 per cent of private school respondents at average level and the least number of respondents at high level of spontaneity (9.17 % government, 5.83% private).

# Gender differences in the distribution of respondents across various dimensions of friendship patterns.

**1. Enjoyment:** When analyzed on the basis of gender, 89.17 per cent of female respondents and 84.17 per cent of male respondents were seen at high level of 'enjoyment' dimension. At average level of enjoyment level, 5.00 per cent of the females and 14.17 males were seen followed by 5.83 per cent of females and only 1.67 per cent of males at low levels of enjoyment. No significant differences were observed at any level of enjoyment among both the gender groups.

**2**. **Acceptance:** 74.17 per cent of females and 63.33 per cent of males were seen at high level of acceptance which signify that female probably have more acceptance towards their friends. 11.67 per cent of females and 28.33 per cent of males were seen at average level and 14.17 per cent and 8.33 per cent of males were seen at low level of acceptance. As there was no significant difference, it could be said that acceptance depends on individual friendships.

**3. Trust:** Significant difference was seen at high level of trust (z value-2.40;  $p \le 0.05$ ). It was seen that female respondents (85.83%) had more trust in their friends than male respondents (71.67%). 14.17 per cent of female respondents and 28.33 per cent of male respondents were seen at average level of trust. A research study conducted by Bukowski (2001) gave similar results that females share a better bonding with their friends as compared to their male counterparts.

**4. Respect:** Females (93.33%) showed significantly higher respect for their friends than males (73.33%) at high level (z value-3.88;  $p \le 0.01$ ) whereas the rest 6.67 per cent females and 28.33 per cent males were seen at average level of respect. No data was recorded for low level of respect dimension.

**5. Mutual Assistance:** Males were found to be highest in number (95.83%) at high level of mutual assistance whereas similar trend was observed for female respondents who were also highest in number (81.67 per cent) at high level of mutual assistance with a significant difference (z value-3.34; p $\leq$ 0.01). 18.33 per cent of females and 4.17 per cent of males were seen at average level of mutual assistance. This indicates that male respondents voluntarily assist and are more helpful towards their friends as compared to female respondents.

**6. Confiding:** Least number of both males (1.67%) and females (10%) were seen to be confiding in their friends (z value-2.08;  $p \le 0.05$ ). 26.67 per cent females and 49.17 per cent males were seen at average level of confiding (z value-1.65;  $p \le 0.10$ ). 63.33 per cent females and 49.17 per cent males were found at low level of 'confiding' dimension. Similar results were seen in a study conducted by Pauriyal (2008) which revealed that females were observed to be predominantly confiding more in their friends.

**7. Understanding:** 20.00 per cent of females and 15.83 per cent of males were found at high levels of understanding. 43.33 per cent of females and 54.17 per cent of males were seen at low level of understanding followed by 36.61 per cent females and 30.00 per cent males at average level of understanding. As majority of both the gender were found at low level of

understanding, it could be said that both males and females tend to fail at understanding their friends.

**8. Spontaneity:** Maximum number of both the gender groups were seen at low level of spontaneity (45.00% females and 42.50% males), followed by 54.17 per cent males more than 43.33 per cent of females at average level and the least number of respondents at high level of spontaneity.

While calculating the overall response of the respondents, maximum number of respondents were seen high level of enjoyment, acceptance, trust, respect and mutual assistance whereas maximum number of respondents were found at low level of 'confiding' and 'understanding' which indicated that these dimensions are not of much importance to both male and female respondents.

Table 4 Gender differences in the distribution of respondents across various dimensions of friendship patterns. (n=240)

Dimensions of Friendship Patterns		Female (n <sub>1</sub> =120)			Z value
		%	f	%	
Low	7	5.83	2	1.67	0.24 <sup>NS</sup>
Average	6	5.00	17	14.17	0.60 <sup>NS</sup>
High	107	89.17	101	84.17	1.06 <sup>NS</sup>
Low	17	14.17	10	8.33	0.45 <sup>NS</sup>
Average	14	11.67	34	28.33	1.24 <sup>NS</sup>
High	89	74.17	76	63.33	1.50 <sup>NS</sup>
Average	17	14.17	34	28.33	1.12 <sup>NS</sup>
High	103	85.83	86	71.67	2.40 **
Average	8	6.67	32	26.67	1.21 <sup>NS</sup>
High	112	93.33	88	73.33	3.88 ***
Average	22	18.33	5	4.17	0.79 <sup>NS</sup>
High	98	81.67	115	95.83	3.34 ***
Low	76	63.33	59	49.17	1.65*
Average	32	26.67	59	49.17	2.08 **
High	12	10.00	2	1.67	0.38 <sup>NS</sup>
Low	52	43.33	65	54.17	1.16 <sup>NS</sup>
Average	44	36.67	36	30.00	0.63 <sup>NS</sup>
High	24	20.00	19	15.83	0.35 <sup>NS</sup>
Low	54	45.00	51	42.50	0.26 <sup>NS</sup>
Average	52	43.33	65	54.17	1.16 <sup>NS</sup>
High	14	11.67	4	3.33	0.49 <sup>NS</sup>
	Low Average High Low Average High Average High Average High Low Average High	(n1=120)           f           Low         7           Average         6           High         107           Low         17           Average         14           High         89           Average         17           High         103           Average         12           High         98           Low         76           Average         32           High         12           Average         32           High         24           Low         54           Average         52           Average         52           High         14	Image: matship         (n1=120)           f         %           Low         7         5.83           Average         6         5.00           High         107         89.17           Low         17         14.17           Average         14         11.67           High         89         74.17           Average         17         14.17           Average         17         14.17           High         103         85.83           Average         8         6.67           High         112         93.33           Average         22         18.33           Average         32         26.67           High         12         10.00           Low         52         43.33           Average         44         36.67           High         24         20.00           Low         54         45.00           Average         52         43.33           Average         52         43.33           Average         52         43.33           Average         52         43.33	(n1=120)         (n2=120)           f         %         f           Low         7         5.83         2           Average         6         5.00         17           High         107         89.17         101           Low         17         14.17         10           Average         14         11.67         34           High         89         74.17         76           Average         17         14.17         34           High         103         85.83         86           Average         8         6.67         32           High         103         85.83         86           Average         8         6.67         32           High         103         85.83         86           Average         32         115         15           Low         76         63.33         59           Average         32         26.67         59           High         12         10.00         2           Low         52         43.33         65           Average         44         36.67         36	(n <sub>1</sub> =120)         (n <sub>2</sub> =120)           f         %         f         %           Low         7         5.83         2         1.67           Average         6         5.00         17         14.17           High         107         89.17         101         84.17           Low         17         14.17         10         8.33           Average         14         11.67         34         28.33           High         89         74.17         76         63.33           Average         17         14.17         34         28.33           High         89         74.17         76         63.33           Average         17         14.17         34         28.33           High         103         85.83         86         71.67           Average         8         6.67         32         26.67           High         112         93.33         88         73.33           Average         22         18.33         5         4.17           High         98         81.67         115         95.83           Low         76         63.33         5

\*p≤0.10 \*\*p≤0.05 \*\*\*p≤0.01

# Correlation between different dimensions friendship patterns and psychological counseling needs among adolescents as per their gender.

Table 5 shows gender wise correlation analysis between psychological counseling needs and various dimensions of friendship. Significant negative correlation was seen between respect

(r=0.436; p≤0.05), confiding (r=0.312; p≤0.05) and understanding (r=0.244; p≤0.05) and psychological counseling needs for female respondents whereas in accordance with the male respondents, it was recorded that understanding (r=0.193; p≤0.10) and spontaneity (r=0.373; p≤0.05) showed significant negative correlation with psychological counseling needs. As seen in the results earlier that both male and female respondents. This indicates that males have low score for understanding and spontaneity whereas females were seen having low score for understanding and thus the need of psychological therapy arises. The results from a study conducted by Murray-Harvey and Slee (2007) concluded that supportive friendships help in maintaining a proper psychological health and help in improving individuals' resilience and thus helping in overcoming the psychological uncertainties.

counseing needs among adorescents as per men gender. (n=240)					
Psychological Counseling Needs Scale					
Dimensions of friendship	Females	Males			
patterns	$(n_1=120)$	(n <sub>2</sub> =120)			
Enjoyment	0.021 <sup>NS</sup>	0.027 <sup>NS</sup>			
Acceptance	0.028 <sup>NS</sup>	0.134 <sup>NS</sup>			
Trust	-0.146 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.031 <sup>NS</sup>			
Respect	-0.436**	-0.175 <sup>NS</sup>			
Mutual Assistance	-0.129 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.165 <sup>NS</sup>			
Confiding	-0.312**	-0.091 <sup>NS</sup>			
Understanding	-0.244**	-0.193*			
Spontaneity	-0.091	-0.373**			

Table 5 Correlation between different dimensions friendship patterns and psychologicalcounseling needs among adolescents as per their gender. (n=240)

\**p*≤0.10 \*\**p*≤0.05

Correlation between different dimensions of friendship patterns and psychological counseling needs among adolescents as per their school type

Table 6 Correlation between different dimensions of friendship patterns andpsychological counseling needs among adolescents as per their school type. (n=240)

Psychological Counseling Needs Scale					
Dimensions of friendship	Government	Private			
patterns	$(n_1=120)$	$(n_2=120)$			
Enjoyment	-0.068 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.178 <sup>NS</sup>			
Acceptance	-0.040 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.259**			
Trust	-0.074 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.023 <sup>NS</sup>			
Respect	-0.249**	-0.273**			
Mutual Assistance	-0.070 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.158 <sup>NS</sup>			
Confiding	-0.169 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.241**			
Understanding	-0.170 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.295**			
Spontaneity	-0.006 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.091 <sup>NS</sup>			
Total FPS	-0.179 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.051 <sup>NS</sup>			

\*\*p≤0.05

Table 6 shows school wise correlation analysis between psychological counseling needs and dimensions of friendship patterns. Significant negative correlation was seen between respect (r=0.273; p $\leq$ 0.05), confiding (r=0.241; p $\leq$ 0.05) and understanding (r=0.295; p $\leq$ 0.05), dimensions of friendship patterns and psychological counseling needs for private school respondents. For government school respondents, significant negative correlation was seen only between respect (r=0.249; p $\leq$ 0.05) and psychological counseling needs, though the

direction of correlation was negative for almost every dimension of friendship patterns and psychological counseling needs. As a large number of both government and private school students were found at high level of respect, thus the need of psychological counseling is significantly less required. Private school students were seen at a high level for acceptance dimension thus they had low requirement for psychological counseling whereas large number of private school students were found at low levels of both confiding and understanding dimension of friendship, thus the requirement of psychological counseling was seen in context to both the dimensions.

## CONCLUSION

Counselling of adolescents is the need of the hour. Friendships play a vital role in the life of an adolescents. Adolescent with better friendships are at a less need of counselling services. Hence better friendship helps the adolescents overcome loneliness, anxiety and other psychological problems.

### Limitations

- The study was limited to Ludhiana city only.
- The respondents included for the study were only from urban locality of Ludhiana city
- The sample was limited to 14-16 years old adolescents.

### REFERENCES

- Adeeyo D (2013) Would You Take Your BFF to Friendship Counseling? Retrieved from http://www.google.com/style-beauty/fashion/news/amp11315/friendshipcounselling/
- Asher S R and Parker J G (1993) Friendship and friendship quality in Middle Childhood: Links with Peer Group Acceptance and Feelings of Loneliness and Social Dissatisfaction. *Dev Psychol* 29: 611-21.
- Baiocco R, Laghi F, Schneider B H, Dalessio M, Hamburger Y A, Coplan R J, Koszcki D and Flament M (2011) Daily patterns of communication and contact between Italian early adolescents and their friends. *Cyberpsycho Beh Social Networking* 14: 467-71.
- Begum H A and Khanam M (1990) Interpersonal Values and Friendship. *Ind Psychol Rev* 35: 27-33.
- Buhrmester D (1990) Perceptions of sibling relationships during middle childhood and adolescence. *Child Dev* 61: 1387-98.
- Buhrmester D (1996) Need fulfillment, interpersonal competence and the development contexts of early adolescents' friendship: The company they keep: Friendship in childhood and adolescence. Pp. 158-85. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Bukowski W M (2001) Friendship and the worlds of childhood. In D W Nangle and C A Erdley (Eds), *The role of friendship in psychological adjustment*. Pp. 93-105. Jossey-Bass, San Fransisco.
- Camarena P M, Sariganib P A and Peterson A C (1990) Gender specific pathways to intimacy in early adolescence. *J You Adol* 19:19-31.
- Chouhan V and Joshi V (2014) Sex difference in counseling needs: A study among adolescents. *Ind J Psyc Edu* 4: 40-42.
- Chouhan V L and Arora G G (2009) *Psychological Counselling Needs Scale*. National Psychological Corporation, Agra.
- Denton K and Zarbatany L (1996) Age differences in support processes in conversations between friends. *Child Dev* 67: 1360-73.

- Froding B and Peterson M (2012) Why virtual friendship is no genuine friendship. *Eth Inf Tech* 14: 201-07.
- Harris J R and Wentzal M (1999) *The nurture assumption: Why children turn out the way they do.* Pp. 23-26. Free Press, New York.
- Hartup W W and Stevens N (1997) Friendship and adaptation across the life span. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 8: 76-79.
- Kalhotra S K (2012) A study of guidance needs of adolescents studying in government and private secondary schools in Jammu district. *Int J Edu App Soc Sci* 3: 32-76.
- Kumar A (2011) Mental health services in rural India: challenges and prospects. Retrieved from http://www.scrip.org/journal/HEALTH
- Kumari S (2008) Importance of Counseling in Present Day Context- With Special Reference to Adolescent Needs. In: Sharma N R, Kalia A K and Husain (ed) *Counseling: Theory, Research and Practice.* Pp 39-42. Global Vision Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Laghi F, Schneider B H, Vitoroulis I, Coplan R J, Baiocco R, Hamburger Y A, Hudek N, Koszycki D, Miller S and Flament M (2013) Knowing when not to use the Internet: Shyness and adolescents' on-line and off-line interactions with friends. *Com Hum Beh* 29: 51-57.
- Lu P, Oh J, Leahy K E and Chopik W J (2020) Friendship importance around world: Links to cultural factors, health and well-being. *Frontiers Psychol* 11: 55-67.
- Miller J B and Hoicowitz T (2004) Attachment contexts of adolescent friendship and romance. *J Adol* 27:191-206.
- Moore A (2019) Teenagers and Importance of Friends. Retrieved from https://oureverydaylife.com/teenagers-importance-friends-6135.html
- Murray-Harvey R and Slee P T (2007) Supportive and stressful relationships with teachers, peers and family and their influence on students' social, emotional and academic experience of school. *Australian J Guidance Counsel* 17:126-47.
- Narr R K, Allen J P, Tan J S and Loeb E L (2019) Close friendship strength and broader peer group desiribility as differential predictors of mental health. *Child Dev* 90: 298-313.
- Pauriyal K (2008) Impact of friendship patterns on self- concept of urban adolescents (14-17 years). M.Sc. thesis, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, India.
- Sati L and Vig D (2016) Need of psychological counseling among adolescents. *Int J Appl Home Sci* 3: 441-46.
- Vinutha R and Indiramma B S (2017) Guidance Needs of Urban Adolescents. J Soc Sci Hum 3: 18-23.
- Williams A (2012) Why is it hard to make friends over 30? Retrieved fromhttps://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/15/fashion/the-challenge-of-making-friends-as-an-adult.html?pagewanted=all
- Williams S L and Polaha J (2015) Rural parents perceived stigma of seeking mental health services for their children *J Psych Ass* 26: 763-73.
- Zarbatany L, Hartman D P and Rankin D P (1990) The psychological functions of preadolescents peer activities. *Child Dev* 61: 1067-80.

#### Acknowledgement

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

# **Conflict of Interest**

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

*How to cite this article:* Vanika & Sharma S. (2021). Assessment of Counseling Needs and their Correlation with Friendship Patterns among Adolescents. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(3), 1895-1907. DIP:18.01.179.20210903, DOI:10.25215/0903.179