SELF-CONTEX INSECURITY': A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF UPPER AND LOWER CLASS YOUTH

Dr.Sandipkumar N. Patel

Assistant professor, Department of psychology, Nalini-arvind and T.V.Patel arts college, Sardar Patel University, Vallabh Vidyanagar Email: sandip.patel704@gmail.com M – 09727805062

Abstract:

Present study represents a comparative account of 'Insecurity' in upper and lower class youth. Here we have chosen 18 to 35 years old fellows in both upper and lower class category.Insecurity measurement was carried out by using 'Scale of Insecurity' created by Dr. Beena Shah. After statistical analysis of all data, we found vast different in degree of Insecurity between Upper and lower class youth. We have studied Selfcontext Insecurity by taking three independent variables using F-Anova test with 2x2x2 factorial design.

Keywords: Insecurity; Self context Insecurity; F-Anova test

Introduction:

Man likes to live in group, and this is believed to be one of the major factors that affect the psychological feathers man develops during his life regarding the 'Insecurity'. Man interacts with man by many ways during his whole life and strikes with many hurdles while interacting with such biotic factors. He faces many state of his own mind. One of these state is Inferiority complex. When man does not get his basic requirements, he gradually develops Inferiority complex in his mind. And this Inferiority complex gradually develops in to 'Insecurity'. Insecurity means "The Inferiority complex created due to the external factors/catalysis of surrounding environment". Moreover Dr Sigmund Freund said that man suffered by inferiority complex with rather higher intensity in groups. Here we try to measure the degree of Self-context Insecurity by taking three independent variables in account (Raja, 1982).

Objectives:

1. To measure degree of Self context Insecurity in upper and lower class youth
2. To compare degree of Self context Insecurity between upper and lower class youth

Research Methodology:

(Dhila, 2004; Shah, 1989)

1. Independent Variables

A = Economical Status A_1 = Upper class (Annual income > 20,000 rupees)

                               A_2 = Lower class(Annual income $\leq$ 20,000 rupees)

B = Area\Location B_1 = City (Town)

                               B_2 = Rural

C = Sex C_1 = Boys

                               C_2 = Girl

2.   Dependent Variables

 Degree of Self contextInsecurity

Hypothesis:

Ho$_1$: There is no significant difference between Means(M) of the degree of Self context Insecurity between Upper and lower class youth.

Ho$_2$: There is no significant difference between Means(M) of the degree ofSelf context Insecurity between city and rural area youth.

Ho$_3$: There is no significant difference between Means(M) of the degree of Self context Insecurity between boys and girls.

Tools:

1.   Personal information sheet
2.   Insecurity measurement scale (Dr. Beena Shah)
3.   Statistical analysis of data by F-Anova test using 2x2x2 factorial design

Sample:

Total 240 youngsters were selected. Out of 240, 120 were of Upper class and 120 were of lowerclass. Out of these 120, 60 were from city/town area and 60 were from rural area. Sex ratio was maintained 1:1 in these sample of 60. It means out of these 60, 30 were boys and 30 were girls.

Statistical analysis:

(Parekh and Dixit, 1995)

Table -1

Summary of the 2x2x2 analysis of variance based on degree of Self context Insecurity with respect to three independent variables

Score of Variable	Sum of Square	DF	Mean of Square	F	Sig.
Status (A)	357.70	1	357.70	25.88	0.01
Aria (B)	10.004	1	10.004	7.24	0.01
Sex (C)	85.20	1	85.20	6.77	0.05
A x B	1.20	1	1.20	0.87	N.S.
B x C	55.10	1	55.10	3.98	N.S.
A x C	47.70	1	47.70	3.45	N.S.
A x B x C	23.43	1	23.43	1.69	N.S.

Table -2

Mean Scores and difference of Mean degree of SelfSelf Insecuritywith respect to three independent variables

Independent Variables		N	Mean(M)	Difference Of Mean
Status (A)	Upper	120	9.69	0.39
	Lower	120	10.06	
Aria (B)	City(Town)	120	11.09	2.44
	Rural	120	8.65	
Sex (C)	Boys	120	9.28	1.19
	Girls	120	10.47	

Results and Discussion:

Ho$_1$: There is no significant difference between Means(M) of the degree of Self context Insecurity between Upper and lower class youth.

The 'F – Value' for first set of independent variable was found 2.57 as shown in table-1. This result has 0.01 significance value. So above said hypothesis **Ho$_1$**can not be accepted because result has significant difference. Thus statistical data of table-1 clearly shown that there is significant difference in the degrees of SelfcontextInsecuritybetween Upper and lower class youth. Mean values for Upper and lower class were 9.87 and 10.06 respectively (Table-2).These mean values concluded that the degree of Selfcontext Insecurity is significantly higher in lower class than that in higher class youth.

Ho$_2$: There is no significant difference between Means(M) of the degree of Self context Insecurity between city and rural area youth.

The 'F – Value' for second set of independent variable was found 2.51 as shown in table-1. This result has 0.01 significance value. So above said hypothesis **Ho$_2$** can not be accepted because result has significant difference. Thus statistical data of table-1 clearly shown that there is significant difference in the degrees of SelfcontextInsecurity between city and rural area youth. Mean values for city and rural areawere 11.09 and 8.05 respectively (Table-2). These mean values concluded that the degree of Selfcontext Insecurity is significantly higher in city area than that rural area youth.

Ho$_3$: There is no significant difference between Means(M) of the degree of Self context Insecurity between boys and girls.

The 'F – Value' for first independent variable was found 3.31 as shown in table-1. This result has 0.05 significance value. So above said hypothesis **Ho$_3$**can not be accepted because result has significant difference. Thus statistical data of table-1 clearly shown that there is significant difference in the degrees of SelfcontextInsecurity between boys and girls. Mean values for Upper and lower class were 9.28 and 10.97 respectively (Table-2). These mean values concluded that the degree of Selfcontext Insecurity is significantly higher in girls that that in boys.

Conclusion:

Finally we can conclude this study in following three conclusions:

- Self context Insecurity is significantly higher in lower class than that of upper class.
- Self context Insecurity is significantly higher in city area than that rural area youth.
- Self context Insecurity is significantly higher in girls that that in boys.

Reference:
1. Basgell, J.A. and Snyber, C.R.(1988) Excuses in waiting external locus of control and social psychology Vol-54, pp 656-662.
2. Bhogle, S., and Jay Prakash, I.S. (1995) Development of the psychological well being questionnaire, Journal of personality and clinical studies, Vol 11 (1&2) pp 5-9.
3. Boor, M. (1976) Relationship of internal / external control and national suicide rates journal of social psychology Vol 100 pp. 143-144.
4. Burger, J.M. (1984) Desire for control, locus of control and proneness to depression journal personality, Vol-34, pp 71-89.
5. Dhila B.D., (2004). Research Methodology, M.S. Shah mahila arts college, Kadi, North Gujarat.
6. Parekh A.C., Dixit S.K., (1995). Statistical analysis in psychological research, Champa publication, Junagadh.
7. Patel S.N. (2013). A comparative study of 'self-context insecurity' in upper and lower class youth. Global research analysis. Vol-2, issue-10, page-28.
8. Raja B., (April-1982). A comparative study of the feelings of insecurity and degree of purpose in life among the aurallyhendicapped and non-handicapped males and females, A dissertation Report - Guide Dr. I.D. Bhatt, Baroda.
9. Shah A.G., (1989). Research Methodology, 3rd edition, Anada publication, Ahemdabad.