Research Paper   **Psychology**

A Comparative Study of 'Survival Contex Insecurity' in Upper and Lower Class Youth

* Mr. Sandipkumar N. Patel

* Adhoc Lecturer, Department of psychology, Nalini, arvind and T.V. Patel arts college, Sardar Patel University, Vallabh Vidyanagar

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 Survival context Insecurity by taking three independent variables using F-Anova test with 2x2x2 factorial design.

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

Introduction:

"SURVIVAL OF THE FITEST"- this is very popular principle of Charls Darwin. It describes interaction between man and man as well as men and nature. Man strikes with many hurdles during their whole life while interacting with biotic and abiotic components of his surroundings. Due to these types of interaction, 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". There are main three types of Insecurity: Social Insecurity, Psychological Insecurity and Ecological Insecurity. Here we try to measure the degree of Insecurity in higher and lower class youth. We mainly focused our study on mainly three components of Insecurity which are Survival context Insecurity, Survival context Insecurity (Raja, 1982).

Objectives:

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

Hypothesis:
Ho_1 : There is no significant difference between Means(M) of the degree of Survival context Insecurity between Upper and lower class youth.

Ho_2 : There is no significant difference between Means(M) of the degree of Survival context Insecurity between city and rural area youth.

Ho_3 : There is no significant difference between Means(M) of the degree of Survival 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 survival context Insecurity with respect to three independent variables

Score of Variable	Sum of Square	DF	Mean of Square	F	Sig.
Status (A)	37.90	1	37..90	2.57	0.05
Aria (B)	36.23	1	36.23	2.51	0.05
Sex (C)	56.35	1	56.35	3.91	0.05
A x B	2.50	1	2.50	1.74	N.S.
B x C	37.09	1	37.09	2.57	N.S.
A x C	8.57	1	8.57	5.95	N.S.
A x B x C	133.59	1	133.59	9.27	0.05

Table -2
Mean Scores and difference of Mean degree of Survival survival Insecurity with respect to three independent variables

Independent Variables		N	Mean(M)	Difference Of Mean
Status (A)	Upper	120	6.86	0.75
	Lower	120	6.11	
Aria (B)	City(Town)	120	6.08	0.81
	Rural	120	6.89	
Sex (C)	Boys	120	6.01	0.94
	Girls	120	6.95	

Results and Discussion:
Ho_1 : There is no significant difference between Means(M) of the degree of survival 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 0.05 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 Survival context Insecurity between Upper and lower class youth. Mean values for Upper and lower class were 6.86 and 6.11 respectively (Table-2). These mean values concluded that the degree of Survival context Insecurity is significantly higher in upper class than that in lower class youth.

Ho_2 : There is no significant difference between Means(M) of the degree of Survival 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 0.05 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 Survival context Insecurity between city and rural area youth. Mean values for city and rural area were 6.08 and 6.89 respectively (Table-2). These mean values concluded that the degree of Survival context Insecurity is significantly higher in rural area than that city area youth.

Ho_3 : There is no significant difference between Means(M) of the degree of Survival 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 Survival context Insecurity between boys and girls. Mean values for Upper and lower class were 6.1 and 6.95 respectively (Table-2). These mean values concluded that the degree of Survival context Insecurity is significantly higher in girls that that in boys.

Conclusion:
Finally we can conclude this study in following three conclusions:

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

REFERENCES

Raja B., (April-1982). A comparative study of the feelings of insecurity and degree of purpose in life among the aurally hendicapped and non-handicapped males and females, A dissertation Report - Guide Dr. I.D. Bhatt, Baroda. | Shah A.G., (1989). Research Methodology, 3rd edition, Anada publication, Ahemdabad. | Dhila B.D., (2004). Research Methodology, M.S. Shah mahila arts college, Kadi, North Gujarat. | Parekh A.C., Dixit S.K., (1995). Statistical analysis in psychological research, Champa publication, Junagadh.