International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education (INT-JECSE)
DOI:10.9756/INTJECSE/V14I5.315 ISSN: 1308-5581 Vol 14, Issue 05 2022

CAREER ANXIETY AND ITS CORRELATES

[1]Shivani Rathore
[2]Dr. Prashasti Jain
[1]Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Manipal University Jaipur, Jaipur, Rajasthan; shivanirathore1827@gmail.com
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Manipal University Jaipur, Jaipur, Rajasthan; prashasti.jain@jaipur.manipal.edu

Abstract: A person's career may be defined as their progression and activities throughout time, particularly in relation to their profession. Rather than referring to one's position, a career is typically made up of the positions had, titles gained, and work completed over a long period of time. Choosing a career path is a crucial decision that will have long-term consequences for the rest of one's life. The authors looked at the relationship between adolescent Career decision self-efficacy (CDSE), Career Decision ambiguity tolerance (CDAT), and career anxiety(CA). Anxiety is a persistent fear of impending damage. Anxiety that occurs before to making a professional decision or choice is referred to as career anxiety. The capability of our beliefs, particularly the strength to overcome problems and barriers in our lives, is known as self-efficacy. When making a professional choice, people's ambiguity tolerance relates to how they analyze and respond to difficult, new, or contradicting information. People who score high on the job choice ambiguity tolerance scale are more comfortable with risk during the decision-making process, and even discover it exciting and interesting, while those who score less find it dull and even undesirable. A total of 500 students in grades X and XII from Jaipur, Rajasthan, India, answered questions on CDSE, CDAT, and CA. The results revealed a strong negative relationship between CA and CDSE in job choice (r = -.10, p.05). There was a negative connection between CA and CDAT (r =.02, p >.05). There's also a strong link with CDSE and CDAT in professional decisions (r =.98, p.01).

Key Words -Career decision, Self-efficacy, Ambiguity tolerance, Career anxiety, Adolescents.

INTRODUCTION

Careers are very dynamic nowadays, and making professional decisions in an environment where the only constant is change may be tough. The concepts of career choice self-efficacy, uncertainty tolerance in career decisions, and career anxiety may assist teenagers plan for their future professions. Choosing a job is a life-changing choice that affects a person's whole future. Career exploration refers to the extent to which possible employment are researched and analysed. Fuqua and Newman (1987) discovered a robust, unidimensional association between career indecision and anxiety in their investigation.

Self-efficacy refers to the capacity of our beliefs, specifically the power to combat the barriers and limits in our lives. It is a personal assessment of how successfully one can carry out the measures necessary to cope with future problems, according to Albert Bandura (1997) Teens' ability or inability to make professional decisions is impacted by their self-efficacy about professional planning, judgement abilities, coping methods, and employment interests, according to Betz and Voyten (1997). In a research that looked into the effects of adolescents' career uncertainty on effectiveness of career decisions, position of control, personality traits, and parental support, Starica (2012) found that personality traits, academic self-esteem, ,career locus of control and family involvement all had a significant impact on adolescent career indecision. The three-part ambiguity tolerance model developed by Budner in 1962, which assesses a person's capacity for accepting novel, difficult, or contradictory information, serves as the foundation for the job choice scale.People's judgements and reactions to new, complex, or contradictory information are operationalized as ambiguity tolerance in professional decision-making.

Low-scoring people may experience anxiety,as a result of uncertain knowledge, leading to avoidance behaviour. Those who have a high degree of ambiguity tolerance for professional judgments are comfortable with and even like uncertainty, while those who have a low level of ambiguity tolerance are not. In challenging choice tasks, self-efficacy and ambiguity tolerance are found to be linked (Endres, Chowdhury, and Milner, 2009), suggesting that ambiguity tolerance is a desirable quality in decision settings that are ambiguous. While Xu and Tracey (2015b)offered a four-factor model of ambiguity resistance in vocation choice, the most current CDAT edition indicated a three-factor model based on inclination, resilience, and repugnance. The term inclination refers to a distinct proclivity for being attracted and energised by ambiguity in the workplace. Resilience is defined as the ability to adjust to employment uncertainty and a strong desire to be valued for ambiguity. Abhorrence is a term

used to indicate a strong desire to avoid and disconnect from workplace uncertainty. The rare between-factor connections also showed that the three CDAT components are often independent of one another, each indicating a distinct stage of development. The CDAT was also shown to predict all components of career reluctance, when measured by the Career Decision-making Difficulty Questionnaire (Gati et al., 1996), profession dynamic self-adequacy, and profession flexibility (Savickas and Porfeli, 2012).

Anxiety is described as a pervasive fear of impending damage. Anxiety is a more vague set of feelings that includes negative affect at a high level, worry about a possible threat or danger, and the idea that if a threat does exist, it will be anticipated or managed. Professional anxiety is defined as anxiety that occurs before to making a vocation decision or choosing a career. Hardin et al. (2006) argued in their study that anxiety relates to commitmentand career exploration. According to a study of 161 samples, those who were more anxious had lower levels of occupational commitment. Pisarik, Rowell, and Thomson (2017) found seven themes in their qualitative research of college students that might be used in the implementation of treatments for minimising career anxiety. There were themes such as existential concerns, pressure, a lack of job counselling, general anxiety symptoms, cognitive distortions, social comparisons, and vocation uncertainty.

The study's purpose was to discover whether there is a relationship between adolescent career decisions, self-efficacy, job choice ambiguity tolerance, and career anxiety. The following objectives and assumptions were developed.

Objectives

This study attempted to examine if there was a correlation between career anxiety, ambiguity tolerance, and self-efficacy in adolescent chosen career.

Hypotheses

1) CDSE and anxiety will have a negative association.
2) CDAT and career anxiety will have a negative link.
3) CDSE and CDAT have a substantial link.

Scope and Significance of the study

In the former times, it has been observed that students in the 10th and 12th grades are under a great deal of academic stress, and that, as a result of their inability to cope with stress, they commit suicide or enter a depressive state. Anxiety, in clinical terms, is linked to depression and suicide. Professional ambiguity becomes a significant cause of worry throughout the decision-making process, which may lead to job indecisiveness and poor career choices. The research will benefit not only pupils, but also school counsellors and psychologists in offering better counselling to those who are afflicted. This kind of research may also be utilized to develop solutions for students who are worried about their future careers. The possibilities for a career have shifted dramatically. Ambiguity is on the increase as a result of the different profession possibilities accessible these days. Because all of the employment alternatives are comparable, such inconsistencies develop, causing even more uncertainty and worry among teens.

Method

Participants

A sample size of 500 students of X and XII grades from different Public Schools of Jaipur was taken using purposive sampling technique.

Measures

1)Betz, N. E., and Taylor, K.M.developed the Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale (2012). The Professional Decision Self-Efficacy Scale (CDSE) assesses a person's confidence in their ability to complete activities related to important professional decisions. Based on John O.Ccrites Theory of Career Maturity, the CDSE includes of five dimensions that measure his five Career Choice Skills. The CDSE is offered in two versions: a 50-item version and a 25-item version. It has to do with making effective educational and career decisions.

2)Ambiguity Tolerance Scale for Career Decisions (Xu. H&Tracey T.J.G, 2015). When making professional choices, the CDAT (Xu& Tracey, 2015b) is an 18-item questionnaire intended to examine people's responses to innovative, complicated, inconsistent, and unexpected information. Subscales include liking (6 items), endurance (6 items), and repulsion (6 items). It is determined how much individuals like uncertainty in their employment selections. Tolerance is examined while making professional choices (for example, tolerating uncertainty and feeling competent of coping with it). It's something I like doing to take on difficult professional decision-making duties. Aversion to ambiguity in professional decision-making is a measure of a person's inclination to resist and retreat from uncertainty in professional decision-making.

3)Brown and Strange's Workplace Anxiety Scale (1981) The measure was designed to represent a broad variety of professional anxiety, from concern about career choices to apprehension about discussing work alternatives. The CAS has a total of twelve elements. Participants are asked, "How strong is the agreement with the propositions?"

The answer choices, which range from 1- "strongly disagree" to 6-"strongly agree", with no neutral alternatives (After reverse scoring suitable items, the overall value is the average of the replies to the twelve things.). Aversion is a metric that assesses a person's proclivity to avoid and retreat from uncertainty in their work choices

Analysis and Interpretation of data

Mean, Standard Deviation and correlation was computed for the analysis of the data.

Results

Hypothesis I: CDSE and anxiety will have a negative association.

Table 1

Choosing a Career There is a link between CDSE and career anxiety.

Scales	N	M	Correlation	P value
Career Decision Self- Efficacy	500	86.26	-.10**	.000
Career Anxiety	500	41.62		

Note n=500 comprises of students from Grade X and XII.
*p<0.05.** p<0.01.

Hypothesis II: CDAT and career anxiety will have a negative link

Table 2

The Relationship Between Happiness and CDAT and Job Anxiety

Scales	N	M	Correlation	P value
Career Decision Ambiguity Tolerance	500	28.27	.026	.482
Career Anxiety	500	41.56		

Note n=500 comprises of students from Grade X and XII.
p<0.05-significant

Hypothesis III: CDSE and CDAT have a substantial link.

Table 3

Correlation Between CDSE and CDAT

Scales	N	M	Correlation	P value
Career decision self- efficacy	500	22.54	.98	.0031
Career decision ambiguity tolerance.	500	31.89		

Note n=500 comprises of students from Grade X and XII.
p<0.05-significant

Discussion

The study aims at learning more about the association or linkage between teenage CDSE, CDAT, and CA.The outcomes of this study corroborate previous research that found a link between anxiety and self-efficacy in job selection. Table 1 represents significant negative connection between CDSE and CA. (p.05, r = -.10)

Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy hypothesis, or one's assessment of one's capacity to do various activities has been researched upon for more than 30 years. Self-efficacy is assessed using a variety of methods that range from basic to sophisticated. The research aims to contribute to the existing literature about the link between work and health. According to the research, there is some evidence to substantiate this link. This pattern of impact is consistent with previous research (Ye J.2020). No discernible difference has been found betweenCDSEand the source of life and whether or not there is only one child, but significant difference is found in job-seeking anxiety between the place of

birth and whether or not the only child is born; some socioeconomic factors, such as age and gender, and whether they are student cadres etc., have a significant impact on CDSE;between the source of life and whether or not it is possible to find work, there is a significant difference in worry (Zeidner 2007).

Students' capacity to make career judgments is likewise hampered by this mindset. According to Fouad, those who have trouble making job choices are more prone to develop work-related anxiety (2007). When a person struggles to pick a career path and is unwilling to commit to one, they experience work decision anxiety (Jung, Park, &Rie, 2015). The positive impact of anxiety, which is the foundation of human power, may be crucial in professional choice because it affects self-efficacy assessment by producing thoughts about success during a decision-making moment (Bandura, 2000).

Lent, R. W., and Penn, L. T. (2019) looked at the effects of Big Five personality traits and self-efficacy on job choice status and decisional complexity. Based on assumptions from the social cognitive model of professional self-management, they expected that self-efficacy would buffer the linkages between personality characteristics and degree of decidedness, as well as choice/commitment anxiety (CCA), a primary source of reluctance. According to the results, lower career anxiety is linked to stronger self-efficacy in making professional choices. The results are in line with earlier studies that employed the same settings.

Due to a lack of precise criteria for selecting the right job, as well as a lack of information and unpredictability in the process, making career decisions is tough. As a consequence, it's logical to assume that those who can deal with uncertainty effectively make better professional decisions. Ambiguity tolerance (AT) refers to how people react to a variety of odd, confusing, or contradicting signs in ambiguous situations or stimuli (Nauta, 2010; Spokane, Meir, & Catalano, 2000). According to Furnham and Ribchester (1995), those who have a poor ambiguity threshold are more likely to be afraid. While people with high ambiguity endurance find ambiguous situations/stimuli intriguing and do not reject or misread the intricacy of incongruity, those with low ambiguity tolerance respond quickly and avoid ambiguous stimuli. Numerous research have shown a connection between the symptoms of anxiety disorders and ambiguity intolerance. Ambiguity intolerance was a significant feature in separating GAD patients from non-clinical people, showing that it was connected to increased future worry (Dugas, Gagnon, Ladouceur, and Freeston (1998). Researchers found a connection between ambiguity intolerance and worry, obsessions/compulsions, and panic symptoms in non-clinical samples (Buhr&Dugas, 2006; Dugas, Gosselin, &Ladouceur, 2001). High anxiety and worry have been linked to issues with focus, memory, and understanding, as well as a depletion of cognition and emotional stability. As a result, it's likely that a lack of ambiguity tolerance influences bad professional judgement. Given the significance of ambiguity tolerance in ambiguous decision-making and the link between ambiguity intolerance and negative anxiety, it makes sense to assume that ambiguity tolerance is tied to professional decision-making. The significance of ambiguity tolerance in choice effects is shown inresearches related to economic decision-making (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981).

Individuals make choices based on their need for ambiguity as well as the information available, according to Tversky and Kahneman (1981).Rational choice theory, on the other hand, concentrates on acquiring and analyzing data while disregarding the inherent knowledge gap. Agroup of informed indecisive persons has also been found (Larson, Heppner, Ham, and Dugan, 1988) wherein, the group was well-informed, but still expressed substantial doubt in their choice, indicating that ambiguity can be overcome just by learning more information, but rather by developing a new coping style that allows for more flexibility.

Furthermore, it is thought that the relationship between environmental and personal search and career hesitancy is moderated by tolerance for ambiguity, as people with a high tolerance for ambiguity are more likely to use information gained during professional development to make career decisions, whereas people who are intolerant of ambiguity may feel threatened by a lack of information and conflicts.

Table 3 shows a strong link between job choice self-efficacy and career decision ambiguity tolerance (r =.98, p.01), validating the assumption that the two have a connection. These findings are similar to those of Xu and Tracey (2014, 2015a), who discovered that lack of readiness,inconsistent informationandlack of information, were negatively related to the CDAT's Preference and Tolerance subscales (coefficients ranging from.32 to.24) and positively related to the CDAT's Aversion dimension (coefficients ranging from.32 to.24) (Coefficients ranged from.46 to.60.) Tolerance was consistently non predictive for all CDDQ subdimensions when the CDAT subscales were included in the same regression model (Xu& Tracey, 2010). Our projections concerning the CDAT's criterion validity are backed up by these data. On the one hand, the study provides a finer-grained view of the association between CDSE and professional decision-making worries, and on the other hand, it provides a finer-grained picture of the link between CDSE and career decision-making. CDSE and professional decision-making challenges are predicted by avoidant behaviour toward demanding career information (aversion) and positive cognitive motivational assessments of harsh and new work knowledge, according to M. Storme, P. Celik, and N. Myszkowski (2019). The association between CDAT and professional decision-making barriers among French-speaking

university students was explored. The French CDAT Scale demonstrated sufficient scale score reliability, a factor structure equivalent to the original three-factor structure, and additional predictive value above general ambiguity tolerance when predicting career choice self-efficacy and career adaptability, according to the findings. According to a second study (N 14 422) based on social cognitive career theory by T. J. Tracey and H. Xu (2014), professional choice self-efficacy influences the association between CDAT and career decision-making concerns.The impact of ambiguity tolerance in professional decision-making was investigated in a study of 275 college students. It was claimed that ambiguous tolerance has a moderating influence on the interaction between external and self-explorations and career aversion, as well as a direct link between ambiguous tolerance and career hesitation through external and knowledge. The findings revealed that uncertainty tolerance predicts overall hesitation, cognitive distortions, a lack of knowledge, and inconsistent information, as well as reducing the forecast of environmental exploration based on conflicting information. Finally, the results, when combined with those of a previous study, imply that one's perceived capacity to cope with work informational ambiguity is not the most relevant predictor of professional decision-making issues, which has both theoretical and practical consequences.

Implications

Finding out about their professional decision-making issues is quite possibly the earliest move toward supporting consumers. One of the most well-known issues in professional decision-making is the trouble of pursuing a decision. Exact and broad examinations of decision making are a fundamental part of professional directing. Anxiety might be a significant obstacle to decision-production since it influences both the mental and social parts of the vocational training process. For instance, guides might see that these clients need help with dealing with their tension while doing apparently routine undertakings like meetings. The review's outcomes might give essential data to profession guides in conceiving successful treatments to help clients who are having issues settling on vocation choices. This study could help with case conceptualization. Quite possibly, the main ramifications of the finding are that client issues aren't guaranteed to be divided into expert and individual close to career decisions. An experimental connection between anxiety and decision-making might urge vocation guides to adopt a more all-encompassing strategy for their clients' challenges. When clients come to specialists with work concerns, experts ought to think about their nervousness as well as their current state of mind. Then again, vocation concerns in regards to uncertainty and low self-viability might bring about anxiety and self-adequacy appraisals. The discoveries underscore the need to bring down tension for improved results. As an outcome, experts ought to remember both work and social emotional objectives for treatment plans.

Limitations

It's important to keep in mind the study's limitations. There are several limitations to the research. We were unable to identify causality based on the association observed. The relationships between these conceptions are likely to be complicated and reciprocal. There was no way to see whether there was a reciprocal link or how much the factors influenced each other. Students from public schools made up the sample. It's also possible that a sample was collected from government and rural schools.

Recommendations for future research

Future study is required to see whether teaching or developing emotional intelligence has a positive impact on behavioural outcomes and emotional intelligence itself. The use of emotional knowledge and skills in the creation of emotional intelligence training programmes may be included to explore many elements of career choice. The cultural differences might be the topic of future study. To get a more thorough knowledge of the ways the factors impact each other, more complicated models of students must be examined, including interests, objectives, and perceptions of impediments.

References

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York, NY: Freeman.

Bandura, A. (2008). An agentic perspective on positive psychology. In S. J. Lopez (Ed.), Positive psychology: Exploring the best in people. Portsmouth, NH: Greenwood.

Betz, N. E., &Voyten, K. K. (1997). Efficacy and outcome expectations influence career exploration and decidedness. The Career Development Quarterly, *46*(2), 179–189. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.1997.tb01004.x

Budner, S. (1962). Intolerance of ambiguity as a personality variable. *J. Pers.* 30, 29–50. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1962.tb02303.x

Buhr, K., &Dugas, M. J. (2006).Investigating the construct validity of intolerance of uncertainty and its unique relationship with worry. Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 20, 222–236.

D. Fuqua, Timothy B. Seaworth, J. Newman(1987)The relationship of career indecision and anxiety: A multivariate examination.Psychology Journal of Vocational Behavior

De Visser, L., Van Der Knaap, L., van de Loo, A., van der Weerd, C., Ohl, F., & Van Den Bos, R. (2010). Trait anxiety affects decision-making differently in healthy men and women: Towards gender-specific endophenotypes of anxiety. Neuropsychologia, 48, 1598–1606

Dugas, M. J., Gosselin, P., &Ladouceur, R. (2001). Intolerance of uncertainty and worry: Investigating specificity in a nonclinical sample. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 25, 551–558.

Endres, Megan &Chowdhury, Sanjib& Milner, Morgan.(2009). Ambiguity tolerance and accurate assessment of self-efficacy in a complex decision task.Journal of Management & Organization. 15. 31-46. 10.5172/jmo.837.15.1.31.

Fouad, Nadya. (2007). Work and Vocational Psychology: Theory, Research, and Applications. Annual review of psychology. 58. 543-64. 10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085713.

Fuqua, D. R., Seaworth, T. B., & Newman, J. L. (1987). The relationship of career indecision and anxiety: A multivariate examination. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 30*(2)*, 175–186. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(87)90017-0

Furnham, A., &Ribchester, T. (1995). Tolerance of ambiguity: A review of the concept, its measurement and applications. Current Psychology, 14, 179–199

Hardin, Erin & Varghese, Femina& Tran, Uyen& Carlson, Aaron. (2006). Anxiety and career exploration: Gender differences in the role of self-construal. Journal of Vocational Behavior. 69. 346-358. 10.1016/j.jvb.2006.05.002.

Gati, I., Krausz, M., &Osipow, S. H. (1996).A taxonomy of difficulties in career decision making. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43, 510–526.http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-012372545-5/50011-3

Hardin, Erin & Varghese, Femina& Tran, Uyen& Carlson, Aaron. (2006). Anxiety and career exploration: Gender differences in the role of self-construal. Journal of Vocational Behavior. 69. 346-358. 10.1016/j.jvb.2006.05.002.

Larson, L. M., Heppner, P. P., Ham, T., & Dugan, K. (1988).Investigating multiple subtypes of career indecision through cluster analysis.Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35, 439–446.

Miu, A. C., Heilman, R. M., & Houser, D. (2008). Anxiety impairs decision-making: Psychophysiological evidence from an Iowa Gambling Task. Biological Psychology, *77*(3), 353–358. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2007.11.010

Nancy E. Betz,Karla Klein Voyten (2012)Efficacy and Outcome Expectations Influence Career Exploration and Decidedness. The Career Development Quarterly https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.1997.tb01004.x

Nauta, M. M. (2010). The development, evolution, and status of Holland's theory of vocational personalities: Reflections and future directions for counseling psychology. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57, 11–22. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018213

Park, In-Jo & Jung, Heajung. (2015). Relationships Among Future Time Perspective, Career and Organizational Commitment, Occupational Self-efficacy, and Turnover Intention. Social Behavior and Personality. 43. 1547-1562. 10.2224/sbp.2015.43.9.1547.

Penn, L. T., & Lent, R. W. (2019). The joint roles of career decision self-efficacy and personality traits in the prediction of career decidedness and decisional difficulty. Journal of Career Assessment, *27*(3), 457–470. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072718758296

Pisarik, Christopher & Rowell, P. & Thompson, Laura. (2017). A Phenomenological Study of Career Anxiety Among College Students. The Career Development Quarterly. 65. 339-352. 10.1002/cdq.12112.

Savickas, Mark &Porfeli, Erik. (2012). Career Adapt-Abilities Scale: Construction, reliability, and measurement equivalence across 13 countries. Journal of Vocational Behavior. 80. 661-673. 10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.011.

Starica,C.E..(2012). Predictors for career indecision in adolescence.Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 33:168–172 DOI:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.01.105

Storme, M., Celik, P., &Myszkowski, N. (2019). Career Decision Ambiguity Tolerance and Career Decision-Making Difficulties in a French Sample: The Mediating Role of Career Decision Self-Efficacy. Journal of Career Assessment, 27(2), 273–288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072717748958.

Tversky, A., &Kahneman, D. (1981).The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. Science, 211, 453–458.

Vignoli, E. (2015). Career indecision and career exploration among older French adolescents: The specific role of general trait anxiety and future school and career anxiety. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 89, 182–191.

Xu ,Hui, &Tracey,T. J.G. (2014).The role of ambiguity tolerance in career decision making,Journal of Vocational Behavior, 85 (1), 18-26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.04.001.

Xu, H., & Tracey, T. J. (2014).The role of ambiguity tolerance in career decision making. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 85, 18–26. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2014.04.001

Xu, H., & Tracey, T. J. (2015a). Ambiguity tolerance with career indecision: An examination of the mediation effect of career decision-making self-efficacy. Journal of Career Assessment, 23, 519–532. doi:10.1177/ 1069072714553073

Xu, H., & Tracey, T. J. (2015b). Career Decision Ambiguity Tolerance Scale: Construction and initial validations. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 88, 1–9. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2015.01.006

Ye J. (2020) An Analysis of the Relationship Between Career Decision-Making Self- efficacy and Career Selection Anxiety of Senior Students. In: Yang CT., Pei Y., Chang JW. (eds) Innovative Computing. Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering, vol 675. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-5959-4_4

Zeidner, M. (2007). Test Anxiety in Educational Contexts: Concepts, Findings, and Future Directions. In P. A. Schutz, & R. Pekrun (Eds.), Emotion in Education (pp. 165-184). Boston, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.