Test Anxiety: Exploring Performance, Results and Test Familiarity in Group Situational Tasks used for Personality Assessment in Selection

Anam Masood and Durlabh Singh Kowal

Abstract -Test anxiety is defined as perceived arousal, reported worry, self-denigrating thoughts, tension, and reports of somatic symptoms in exams or similar evaluative situations. There are two dimensions of test anxiety viz. Worry and Emotionality. This paper examined the role of Test Anxiety in selection context. Relations were explored between dimensions of Test Anxiety with respect to Applicant's Performance (average/below average), Test familiarity (fresher/repeater) and Results (recommended/not recommended) in group testing. It consists of leaderless group situations in which the applicants have freedom to choose their own behavioral roles, lay down their own priorities for action and engage themselves in collective group activity, hence, bringing about changes in their own and other's behavior. A sample of 109 male subjects (71 fresher and 38 repeater) pooled through purposive sampling had undergone group situational tasks. Test Anxiety Inventory was administered prior to the group situational task. The results of the study reveal that there was a significant difference between Familiarity and Performance (χ^2 (1)=5.8, p<0.05); Result and Performance (χ^2(1)=41.39, p<0.01). However, no difference was found between Test Familiarity, Result and Performance in relation to dimensions of test anxiety. This finding is consistent with the assessment of behavior made on the basis of overall group effectiveness of the subject in relation to his group. Similar study can be replicated for interview, at the time of facing panel of experts and projective test based settings.

Index Terms: Group Situational Tasks, Personality Assessment, Result, Selection, Performance, Test Anxiety, Test Familiarity.

1 INTRODUCTION

A test is an assessment tool intended to measure an individual's knowledge, skill, aptitude, physical fitness and personality. Tests vary on their classification, administration, characteristics, context and uses. Irrespective of variation in test, every testing condition induces anxiety. Anxiety refers to a negative emotional response such as worry, fear, apprehension and agitation. Anxiety is a basic human emotion consisting of fear and uncertainty that typically appears when an individual perceives an event as being a threat to the ego or self-esteem [17]. Anxiety can be divided into two domains: trait and state [18]. Trait anxiety is more permanent and deeply rooted in individual's personality while state anxiety is characterized as a temporary change in a person's emotional state due to an outside factor, and it is experienced in relation to some particular event or act [1].

·*Anam Masood is Masters in Clinical Psychology from Barkatullah University, Bhopal, India. PH-+918109389731, E-mail: anasince1993@gmail.com*
·*Durlabh Singh Kowal,Ph.D is the scientist 'D' in Defence Research and Development Organization, serving at selection centre central, Bhopal, India.PH- +919301043434, E-mail: durlabhsinghk@gmail.com*

outside factor, and it is experienced in relation to some particular event or act [1].

Test anxiety is a form of state anxiety. Spielberger and Sarason [21] defined test anxiety as a situation-specific trait that refers to the anxiety states and worry conditions that are experienced during examinations. Test anxiety is composed of three major components: cognitive, affective, and behavioral. Worry dimension of test anxiety denotes cognitive aspect wherein individuals reflect lack of self-confidence, negative thoughts, doubt academic ability and intellectual competence [16], overemphasize the potential negative results and feel helpless in testing situations [25]. From the affective perspective, test anxiety causes some subjects to experience physiological reactions such as increased heart rate, feeling nauseated, frequent urination, increased perspiration, cold hands, dry mouth, and muscle spasms [25]. These reactions may be present before, during, and even after the test is completed. In conjunction with the physiological reactions, emotions such as worry fear of failure, and panic may be present. When students are not able to control their emotions, they may experience higher levels of stress, thereby making it more difficult for them to concentrate. Test-anxious students express anxiety behaviorally by procrastinating and having inefficient study and test-taking skills. Zeidner [25] contends that test-anxious students have more difficult time interpreting information and organizing it into larger patterns of meaning. In addition, some students may physically feel tired or exhausted during test administration because they

do not have a healthy diet, have poor sleeping habits, and fail to routinely exercise.

Past researches on test anxiety generally focused to understand it in relation to ability test performances. Now, it has become established fact that hightened test anxiety is negatively related to ability test performance [10], [24], while test familiarity is positively, though weakly, related to ability test performance [2], [4]. Hence it gives food for thought, as high levels of test anxiety may have detrimental effects on test performance, resulting in scores that do not accurately reflect an individual's true levels of the respective attributes [3]. This may ultimately result in the selection of less promising job applicants [3] [19]. Although the theories of test anxiety provide important insights regarding the process (interference model, deficits model, or information processing model)by which test anxiety affects performance, most researches on test anxiety have focused on the differential impact of emotionality and worry factors of test anxiety on performance [10].

According to Johnson and Johnson [11], no relationship exists between type of test (either computer or paper and pencil), test anxiety in computer based settings and performance. Majority of the studies examining the impact of emotionality factor on performance have found that the emotionality factor (i.e., physiological arousal) has weak or insignificant effects on performance [10]. Researches have repeatedly demonstrated that test anxiety is negatively associated with overall test performance, academic achievement, and intellectual aptitude tests [5], [7], [22], [25]. In addition to causing profound impairment in the academic realm, test anxiety is often detrimental to the students' mental and physical health, including being a factor in issues with depression, hopelessness, and decreased immune responses that result in higher rates of illness [6], [13], [23], [25].

The present study investigates the role of test anxiety in selection context, where job applicant's personality have been assessed through observational technique while undergoing group situational tasks for the selection in Armed Force as an officer. While the effects of both test anxiety and group settings have been demonstrated to influence behavior in many situations, few investigators have focused on the possible interaction between them.

Studies of test anxiety in group testing conditions with learning tasks, revealed no significant difference between subjects who had learned in groups and those who learned alone regardless of anxiety level. With the performance tasks, the group situation was found detrimental for both the high and middle-anxious subjects while facilitative for the low-anxious [15]. Ganzer [9] examined the relationship of test anxiety and performance for a learning task in group settings. The findings depicted that overall learning of observed subjects was less efficient than that of non observed subjects, observers were detrimental, for only the high and middle-anxious groups but not the low-anxious groups.

According to Eysenck & Cavlo [8], Yerkes Dodson law also explains why high-test anxious people perform worse than low-test anxious people. This law assumes an inverted U-shaped curvilinear relationship between arousal and performance. The law dictates that when arousal becomes too high, performance will decrease. Cognitive tasks require low to mid levels of arousal for optimal performance. Therefore, the arousal level of test anxious people is typically too high to result in good performance [8]. While time pressure has been shown to increase the rate of individual or group performance [12] performance quality is shown to be less consistent.

2 Objectives of the Study

1. To find the relationship of Test Familiarity with Worry, Emotionality, Total Test Anxiety Score and Performance.

2. To find the relationship of Result with Worry, Emotionality, Total Test Anxiety Scores and Performance.

3. To find the relationship of Performance with Worry, Emotionality and Total Test Anxiety Scores.

3 Research Hypotheses

1) There will be no significant difference between Fresher and Repeater (Test Familiarity) on Worry scores of Test Anxiety.

2) There will be no significant difference between Fresher and Repeater (Test Familiarity) on Emotionality scores of test Anxiety.

3) There will be no significant difference between Fresher and Repeater (Test Familiarity) on Total Scores of Test Anxiety.

4) There will be no significant difference between Fresher and Repeater (Test Familiarity) with respect to performance.

5) There will be no significant difference between Recommended and Not recommended (Result) subjects with respect to performance.

6) There will be no significant difference between Recommended and Not recommended (Result) subjects on Worry scores of Test Anxiety.

7) There will be no significant difference between Recommended and Not recommended (Result) subjects on Emotionality scores of Test Anxiety.

8) There will be no significant difference between Recommended and Not recommended (Result) subjects on Total Scores of Test Anxiety.

9) There will be no difference between Level of Performance (Average and Below Average) and Worry Scores of Test Anxiety.

10) There will be no difference between Level of Performance (Average and Below Average) and Emotionality scores of Test Anxiety.

11) There will be no difference between Level of Performance (Average and Below Average) and Total scores of Test Anxiety.

4 METHODOLOGY

4.1 SAMPLE

Sample consisted of 109 male job applicants who were highly motivated and reported voluntarily at Selection Centre Central, Bhopal for their selection as an officer in the Armed Force. The sample was pooled through purposive sampling and was matched with respect to adolescent age group ranging from 16 year and 6 months to19 years, and Education standards ranging from higher secondary to first year of graduation. The sample was further bifurcated on the basis of familiarity to the test. Out of these, 71 were fresher who were attempting Group Situational Tasks for the first time, and remaining 38 were repeater subjects who had attempted the Group Situational Task not more than twice at different Selection Centres spread all over India for selection of candidates as an officer in Indian Armed Force. The demographic distribution of sample was mostly representative of Northern-Central states of India, which is as follows:

Table 1: *Demographic distribution of sample*

TABLE 1
DEMOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION CF SAMPLE

STATE	BIHAR	CHANDIGARH	CHHATTISGARH	DELHI	HARYANA	HIMACHAL PRADESH	JAMMU & KASHMIR	KARNATAKA	MAHARASHTRA	MADHYA PRADESH	ODISHA	PUNJAB	RAJASTHAN	UTTARAKHAND	UTTAR PRADESH	TOTAL
N	11	2	1	8	20	6	14	1	2	4	2	3	5	17	13	109

4.2 TOOL USED

Test Anxiety Inventory (TAI) developed by Spielberger et al. [20] was used in the present study. Liebert and Morris [14] have identified Worry and Emotionality as two major components of Test Anxiety, defined Worry as 'cognitive concerns about the consequences o failure and Emotionality as 'reactions of the autonomic nervous system that are evoked by evaluative stress.' Subjects responded on a four-point scale with response alternatives; 'almost never',' sometimes',' often' and 'almost always'; to depict how frequently people experience specific symptoms of anxiety in test situations. It consisted of twenty items that were divided into two subscales viz. Emotionality (E) and Worry (W). All the twenty items were used to determine the total anxiety score. The raw scores were converted into normalised T scores for Worry, Emotionality and Total Anxiety. The mean, standard deviation and alpha reliability coefficient of the TAI scale and Worry and Emotionality sub-scales are as Table 2 for college freshmen.

TABLE 2
MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION AND ALPHA RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT OF THE TAI SCALE

DIMENSIONS	TAI TOTAL			WORRY			EMOTIONALITY		
	MEAN	SD	ALPHA	MEAN	SD	ALPHA	MEAN	SD	ALPHA
COLLEGE FRESHMEN (MALE)	39.28	10.99	0.92	14.26	4.39	0.83	16.58	4.78	0.85

The construction and development of TAI was guided by the concepts of Worry and Emotionality as given by Liebert and Morris [14]. Reliability and validity coefficients as reported are:

TABLE 3
TEST RETEST RELIABILITY FOR TAI TOTAL SCORES

INVESTIGATOR	N	SUBJECTS	TIME LAPSE	R
CLAWSON	31	GRADUATE STUDENTS	2 WEEKS	.80
WOOD	159	COLLEGE STUDENTS	3 WEEKS	.80
ROSS	42	H.S. STUDENTS	1 MONTH	.81
	42	H.S. STUDENTS	6 MONTHS	.62

TABLE 4
VALIDITY FOR TAI

MALES (N=115)			
MEASURES	TAI	W	E
TEST ANXIETY SCALE (TAS)	.82	.79	.73
WORRY AND EMOTIONALITY QUESTIONNAIRE (WEQ- WORRY)	.73	.74	.59
WORRY AND EMOTIONALITY QUESTIONNAIRE (WEQ- EMOTIONALITY)	.77	.71	.71
STATE TRAIT ANXIETY INVENTORY (STAI, A-TRAIT)	.54	.51	.46
STATE TRAIT ANXIETY INVENTORY (STAI, A-STATE)	.67	.54	.67
EXAM A -STATE	.86	.70	.86

4.3 PROCEDURE

Group testing attempts to evaluate individuals in the context of group. The role of group testing in Services Selection Board is to determine an individual's ability to function as a group based on this functional capacity, to assess his suitability for the Armed Forces. Group testing technique assesses an individual in the context of an experimental group which is subjected to considerable physical and mental stress on ground. The assessor seeks to observe and evaluate an individual's group effectiveness and the sum total of an individual's contribution to the group and the task. The subjects were briefed about the situational group tasks they were to undergo. These tasks were Group Discussion, Group Planning Exercise, Progressive Group tasks and Group Obstacle Race. The tasks were scheduled in morning session that lasted for three hours and consisted of leaderless group situations in which the subjects had freedom to choose their own behavioural roles, lay down their own priorities for action and engage themselves in collective group activity, hence, bringing about changes in their own and other's behaviour.

The subjects were also briefed about the purpose of present study and henceforth their Socio-demographic details were

taken and informed consent was sought. Further, they were requested to complete the Test Anxiety Inventory which was administered before starting of Group Situational Tasks. They were also informed that the scores on Test Anxiety Inventory were independent of their selection criteria. Participants were assured of confidentiality of responses and they were fully debriefed following the study.

5 Result and Discussion

Table 5a
Descriptive Statistic

Dimensions	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	SEm
Worry	109	34.00	36.00	70.00	47.46	7.8	0.75
Emotionality	109	38.00	32.00	70.00	45.19	8.8	0.84
Total Test Anxiety	109	28.00	39.00	67.00	50.15	5.9	0.56

Table 5b
Dimension wise descriptive statistics

Dimensions		N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Worry	High	19	56.00	70.00	60.37	4.58
	Low	5	36.00	36.00	36.00	0..00
	Average	85	38.00	54.00	45.26	4.93
Emotionality	High	14	55.00	70.00	61.92	4.76
	Low	11	32.00	34.00	33.09	1.04
	Average	84	36.00	55.00	43.99	5.44
Total test anxiety	High	15	57.00	67.00	60.60	2.87
	Low	81	39.00	54.00	47.44	3.73
	Average	13	52.00	58.00	55.00	1.52

Table 5c
Dimension and performance wise descriptive statistics

Dimensions		Performance	N	Mean	SD
Worry	High	Average	6	58.17	2.77
		Below Avg	13	61.38	4.97
	Low	Average	1	36.00	0.00
		Below Avg	4	36.00	0.00
	Average	Average	31	45.12	4.04
		Below Avg	54	45.33	5.41
Emotionality	High	Average	4	65.00	4.97
		Below Avg	10	60.70	4.32
	Low	Average	2	33.00	1.41
		Below Avg	9	33.11	1.05
	Average	Average	31	44.06	4.65
		Below Avg	53	43.94	5.90
Total test anxiety	High	Average	4	61.50	1.91
		Below Avg	11	60.27	3.16
	Low	Average	31	47.61	3.08
		Below Avg	50	47.34	4.10
	Average	Average	4	56.25	1.29
		Below Avg	9	54.44	1.33

Table 5d
Dimension and result wise descriptive statistics

Dimensions		Result	N	Mean	SD
Worry	High	Recommended	5	59.00	3.08
		Not recommended	14	60.85	5.02
	Low	Recommended	1	36.00	0.00
		Not recommended	4	36.00	0.00
	Average	Recommended	18	45.67	5.22
		Not recommended	67	45.14	4.89
Emotionality	High	Recommended	4	64.00	5.83
		Not recommended	10	61.10	4.33
	Low	Recommended	2	33.00	1.41
		Not recommended	9	33.11	1.05
	Average	Recommended	18	43.83	5.81
		Not recommended	66	44.03	5.38
Total test anxiety	High	Recommended	4	61.00	2.30
		Not recommended	11	60.45	3.14
	Low	Recommended	18	47.39	3.85
		Not recommended	63	47.46	3.73
	Average	Recommended	4	56.00	1.41
		Not recommended	9	54.55	1.42

Table 5e
Dimension and test familiarity wise descriptive statistics

Dimensions		Test familiarity	N	Mean	SD
Worry	High	Fresher	19	60.37	4.58
		Repeater	0	0.00	0.00
	Low	Fresher	5	36.00	0.00
		Repeater	0	0.00	0.00
	Average	Fresher	71	46.52	4.39
		Repeater	14	38.86	1.02
Emotionality	High	Fresher	14	61.93	4.76
		Repeater	0	0.00	0.00
	Low	Fresher	11	33.09	1.04
		Repeater	0	0.00	0.00
	Average	Fresher	71	42.45	4.40
		Repeater	13	52.38	1.26
Total test anxiety	High	Fresher	15	60.60	2.87
		Repeater	0	0.00	0.00
	Low	Fresher	71	46.63	3.23
		Repeater	10	53.20	0.42
	Average	Fresher	13	55.00	1.52
		Repeater	0	0.00	0.00

Table 6 reveals that on average repeater applicants showed greater worry (M=48.02) than fresher applicants (M=47.17). This difference was not significant t (107) =0.54, p>.05. Hence the null hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between Fresher and Repeater (Familiarity) on Worry scores of Test Anxiety was accepted.

Table 6
showing comparison of test familiarity and worry scores

Worry		N	Mean	S.D.	t	df	Level of significance	Null Hypothesis
Familiarity	Fresher	71	47.17	8.8	0.54	107	Not significant	Accepted
	Repeater	38	48.02	5.72				

Table 7 reveals that on average repeater applicants showed greater emotionality (M=46.1) than fresher applicants (M=44.7). This difference was not significant t (107) =0.79, p>.05. Hence the null hypothesis there will be no significant difference between Fresher and Repeater (Familiarity) on Emotionality scores of test Anxiety was accepted.

Table 7
showing comparison of test familiarity and emotionality scores

Emotionality		N	Mean	S.D.	t	df	Level of significance	Null Hypothesis
Familiarity	Fresher	71	44.7	8.9	0.79	107	Not significant	Accepted
	Repeater	38	46.1	8.7				

Table 8 reveals that on average repeater applicants had greater total test anxiety (M=50.95) than fresher applicants (M=49.73). This difference was not significant t (107) =1.02, p>.05.Hence the null hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between Fresher and Repeater (Test Familiarity) on Total Scores of Test Anxiety was accepted.

TABLE 8
SHOWING COMPARISON OF TEST FAMILIARITY AND TOTAL TEST ANXIETY SCORES

TOTAL TEST ANXIETY		N	MEAN	S.D.	T	DF	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE	NULL HYPOTHESIS
FAMILIARITY	FRESHER	71	49.73	6.39	1.02	107	NOT SIGNIFICANT	ACCEPTED
	REPEATER	38	50.95	4.9				

Table 9 reveals that there was a significant association between the familiarity and level of performance, χ^2 (1)=5.8,p<0.05. This seems to represent the fact that with respect to level of performance, fresher applicants performed better (f_o=27) than repeater applicants (f_o =6). It can be deduced that test familiarity negatively impacted level of performance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between Fresher and Repeater (Familiarity) with respect to level of performance was rejected.

TABLE 9
SHOWING COMPARISON OF TEST FAMILIARITY AND LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE

		LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE		N	X2	DF	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE	NULL HYPOTHESIS
		AVERAGE	BELOW AVERAGE					
FAMILIARITY	FRESHER	27	44	71	5.8	1	SIGNIFICANT AT .05 LEVEL	REJECTED
	REPEATER	6	32	38				

Table 10 reveals that there was a significant association between result and level of performance, χ^2 (1)=41.39,p<0.01. This seems to represent the fact that with respect to level of performance, recommended applicants performed better (f_o=18) than not recommended applicants (f_o =15). Hence, the null hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between Recommended and Not recommended (Result) subjects with respect to performance was rejected.

TABLE 10
SHOWING COMPARISON OF RESULT AND LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE

		LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE		N	X2	DF	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE	NULL HYPOTHESIS
		AVERAGE	BELOW AVERAGE					
RESULT	RECOMMENDED	18	2	20	41.39	1	SIGNIFICANT AT .01 LEVEL	REJECTED
	NOT RECOMMENDED	15	74	89				

Table 11 reveals that on average, recommended applicants experienced greater worry (M=48.6) than not recommended applicants (M=47.21). This difference was not significant t (107) =0.71, p>.05. Hence, null hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between Recommended and Not recommended (Result) subjects on Worry scores of Test Anxiety was accepted.

TABLE 11
SHOWING COMPARISON OF RESULT AND WORRY SCORES

WORRY		N	MEAN	S.D.	T	DF	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE	NULL HYPOTHESIS
RESULT	RECOMMENDED	20	48.6	8.65	0.71	107	NOT SIGNIFICANT	ACCEPTED
	NOT RECOMMENDED	89	47.21	7.69				

Table 12 reveals that on average, recommended applicants experienced greater emotionality (M=47.15) than not recommended applicants (M=44.75). This difference was not significant t (107) =1.09, p>.05. Hence, null hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between Recommended and Not recommended (Result) subjects on Emotionality scores of Test Anxiety was accepted.

TABLE 12
SHOWING COMPARISON OF RESULT AND EMOTIONALITY SCORES

EMOTIONALITY		N	MEAN	S.D.	T	DF	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE	NULL HYPOTHESIS
RESULT	RECOMMENDED	20	47.15	8	1.09	107	NOT SIGNIFICANT	ACCEPTED
	NOT RECOMMENDED	89	44.75	9				

Table 13 reveals that on average, recommended applicants experienced greater total test anxiety (M=51.2) than not recommended applicants (M=49.92). This difference was not significant t (107) =0.87, p>.05. Hence, null hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between Recommended and Not recommended (Result) subjects on Total Scores of Test Anxiety was accepted.

TABLE 13
SHOWING COMPARISON OF RESULT AND TOTAL TEST ANXIETY SCORES

TOTAL TEST ANXIETY		N	MEAN	S.D.	T	DF	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE	NULL HYPOTHESIS
RESULT	RECOMMENDED	20	51.2	5.39	0.87	107	NOT SIGNIFICANT	ACCEPTED
	NOT RECOMMENDED	89	49.92	6.04				

Table 14 reveals that on average, applicants of average level of performance experienced greater worry (M=48.33) than applicants of below average level of performance (M=47.09). This difference was not significant t (107) =0.75, p>.05. Hence, null hypothesis that there will be no difference between Level of Performance (Average and Below Average) and Worry Scores of Test Anxiety was accepted.

TABLE 14
SHOWING COMPARISON OF LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE AND WORRY SCORES

WORRY		N	MEAN	S.D.	T	DF	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE	NULL HYPOTHESIS
LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE	AVERAGE	33	48.33	9.96	0.75	107	NOT SIGNIFICANT	ACCEPTED
	BELOW AVERAGE	76	47.09	6.78				

Table 15 reveals that on average, applicants of average level of performance experienced greater emotionality (M=45.94) than applicants of below average level of performance (M=44.87). This difference was not significant t (107) =0.58, p>.05. Hence, null hypothesis that there will be no difference between Level of Performance (Average and Below Average) and Emotionality scores of Test Anxiety was accepted.

TABLE 15
SHOWING COMPARISON OF LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE AND EMOTIONALITY SCORES

EMOTIONALITY		N	MEAN	S.D.	T	DF	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE	NULL HYPOTHESIS
LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE	AVERAGE	33	45.94	8.75	0.58	107	NOT SIGNIFICANT	ACCEPTED
	BELOW AVERAGE	76	44.87	8.9				

Table 16 reveals that on average, applicants of average level of performance experienced greater total test anxiety (M=50.67) than applicants of below average level of performance (M=49.93). This difference was not significant t (107) =0.6, p>.05. Hence, null hypothesis that there will be no difference between Level of Performance (Average and Below Average) and Total scores of Test Anxiety was accepted.

TABLE 16
SHOWING COMPARISON OF LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE AND TOTAL TEST ANXIETY SCORES

TOTAL TEST ANXIETY		N	MEAN	S.D.	T	DF	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE	NULL HYPOTHESIS
LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE	AVERAGE	33	50.67	6.21	0.6	107	NOT SIGNIFICANT	ACCEPTED
	BELOW AVERAGE	76	49.93	5.82				

6 CONCLUSION

There were very few studies available that examined the relationship of test anxiety and group situational tasks used for personality assessment in selection context. Though test anxiety has been studied with performance, result and familiarity individually in academic and computer-based settings, their integration has been studied seldom in group observational settings.

The results of the study reveal that there was a significant difference between Familiarity and Performance ($\chi^2(1)=5.8$, $p<0.05$); Result and Performance ($\chi^2(1)=41.39$, $p<0.01$). This seems to represent the fact that with respect to level of performance, on one hand the fresher applicants performed better than repeater applicants while on the other, recommended applicants performed better than not recommended applicants. It can be deduced that test familiarity negatively impacted level of performance. However, no difference was found between Familiarity, Result and Performance in relation to dimensions of test anxiety. Differential effects of test anxiety and its dimensions concerning Familiarity, Result and Performance though prevalent, do not differ significantly. As found earlier in [10], [15] present study also supports the findings that impact of emotionality factor on performance was not significant. As a matter of fact, neither total test anxiety nor the dimension of test anxiety i.e. emotionality or worry impacted the performance. Hence, test anxiety and its dimensions in selection context where job applicant's personality has been assessed through observational technique while undergoing group situational tasks for selection in armed forces as an officer have not impacted performance and results of either fresher or repeater.

This finding is consistent with the assessment of behaviour made on the basis of overall group effectiveness of the subject in relation to his group. Similar study can be replicated for interview, at the time of facing panel of experts or projective test based settings.

7 REFERENCES

[1] A. Anastasi, *Differential psychology*, New York: Macmillan., 4th eds., pp. 47-77, 1981.

[2] A.A. Wadee, R.H. Kuschke, S. Kometz, S., and M. Berk, "Personality Factors, Stress, and Immunity", *Stress and Health*, vol. 17, New York: Plenum Press, pp. 25–40, 2001.

[3] A.M. Pederson, "Effects of Test Anxiety and Co-acting Groups on Learning and Performance", *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, vol. 30, pp. 55-62, 1970.

[4] B.R. Sarason, I.G. Sarason, and G.R. Pierce, "Traditional Views of Social Support and Their Impact on Assessment", *Social Support: An Interactional View*, B.R. Sarason, I.G. Sarason and G.R. Pierce, eds., New York: Wiley, pp. 9-25, 1990.

[5] C.D. Spielberger, "Conceptual and methodological Issues in Anxiety Research", *Anxiety: Current Trends in Theory and Research*, C.D. Spielberger, eds., New York: Academic Press, pp. 481– 492, 1972.

[6] C.D. Spielberger, and I.G. Sarason, *Stress and Anxiety*, Washington: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, 1989.

[7] C.D. Spielberger, and P.R. Vagg, "Test Anxiety: A Transactional Process Model", *Test Anxiety: Theory, Assessment, and Treatment*, C.D. Spielberger and P. R. Vagg, eds., Washington, D.C.: Taylor & Francis, pp. 3-14, 1995.

[8] C.D. Spielberger, H.P. Gonzalez, C.J. Taylor, B. Algaze, and W.D. Anton, "Examination Stress and Test Anxiety", *Stress and Anxiety*, C.D. Spielberger and I.G. Sarason, eds., vol. 5, New York: Hemisphere/Wiley, 1978.

[9] D.B. .Akman-Yesilel, "Test Anxiety in ELT Classes. Frontiers of Languge and Teaching", *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, vol. 46, pp. 102-109, 2012.

[10] I.G. Sarason, "Anxiety, Self-Preoccupation, and Attention", 1988.

[11] J. Johnson, and K. Johnson, "Psychological Considerations Related to the Development of Computerized Testing Stations", *Behaviour Research Methods and Instrumentation*, vol. 13, pp. 421–424, 1981.

[12] J.R. Kelly, and S.J. Karau, "Entrainment of Creativity in Small Groups", *Small Group Research*, vol. 24, pp. 179-198, 1993.

[13] M. Benjamin, W.J. McKeachie, Y. Lin, and D.P. Holinger, "Test Anxiety: Deficits in Information Processing", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 73, pp. 816–824., 1981.

[14] M. Zeidner, "Personality Trait Correlates of Intelligence", *International handbook of personality and intelligence: Perspectives on individual differences*, D. Saklofske and M. Zeidner, eds., New York: Plenum Press, pp. 299-319, 1995.

[15] M. Zeidner, *Test Anxiety: The State of the Art*, New York: Plenum Press, 1998.

[16] M.S. Chapell, Z.B. Blanding, M.E. Silverstein, M. Takahashi, B. Newman, A. Gubi, and N. McCann, "Test Anxiety and Academic Performance in Undergraduate and Graduate Students", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 2nd eds., vol. 97, pp. 268-274, 2005.

[17] M.W. Eysenck, and M.G. Calvo, "Anxiety and Performance: The Processing Efficiency Theory", *Cognition and Emotion*, 1992.

[18] N.J. King, A. Mietz, L. Tinney, and T.H. Ollendick, "Psychopathology and Cognition in Adolescents Experiencing Severe Test Anxiety", *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, vol. 24, pp. 49–54., 1995.

[19] P. Borella, A. Bargellini, S. Rovesti, M. Pinelli, R. Vivoli, V. Solfrini., and G. Vivoli, " Emotional Stability, Anxiety, and Natural Killer Activity Under

Examination Stress", *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, vol. 24, pp. 613–627, 1999.

[20] R. Hembree, "Correlates, Causes, Effects, and Treatment of Test Anxiety", Review *of Educational Research*, vol. 58, pp. 47-77, 1988.

[21] R. M. Liebert, and L.W. Morris, "Cognitive and Emotional Components of Test Anxiety: A Distinction and Some Initial Data", *Psychological Reports*, no. 20, pp. 975-978, 1967.

[22] R. Topp, "Effect of Relaxation or Exercise on Undergraduates' Test Anxiety", *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, vol. 69, pp. 35–41, 1989.

[23] R..D. Arvey, W. Strickland, G. Drauden, and C. Martin, "Motivational Components of Test Taking.", *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 43, 1990.

[24] R.L. Bangert-Drowns, J.A. Kulik, and C.L. Kulik., "Effectiveness of Computer-Based Education in Secondary Schools", *Journal of Computer-Based Instruction,* vol. 12, pp. 59-68, 1985.

[25] V. Ganzer, "Effects of Audience Presence and Test Anxiety on Learning and Retention in a Serial Learning Situation", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 8, pp. 194-199, 1968.