Peer-group context insecurity' in upper and lower class youth

Mr. Sandipkumar N. Patel*

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

INTRODUCTION:

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 Peer Group-context Insecurity by taking three independent variables in account (Raja, 1982).

OBJECTIVES:

- To measure degree of Peer Group context Insecurity in upper and lower class youth

- To compare degree of Peer Group context Insecurity between upper and lower class youth

_____

***Research Scholar, Department of psychology, Sardar Patel University, Vallabh Vidyanagar, Gujarat

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

(Dhila, 2004; Shah, 1989)

- 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

- Dependent Variables

Degree of Peer Group context Insecurity

HYPOTHESIS:

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

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

Ho_3 : There is no significant difference between Means(M) of the degree of Peer Group context Insecurity between boys and girls.

TOOLS:

- Personal information sheet
- Insecurity measurement scale (Dr. Beena Shah)
- 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 lower class. Out of these 120, 60 were from city/town area and 60 were from rural area. Sex ratio was maintained 1:1 in this 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 Peer Group context Insecurity with respect to three independent variables

Score of Variable	Sum of Square	DF	Mean of Square	F	Sig.
Status (A)	611.204	1	1.204	11.29	0.01
Aria (B)	5.704	1	5.704	5.33	0.01
Sex (C)	49.504	1	49.504	4.62	N.S.
A x B	44.204	1	44.204	4.12	N.S.
B x C	27.334	1	27.339	2.55	N.S.
A x C	71.504	1	71.504	6.58	0.05
A x B x C	105.337	1	105.337	9.84	0.01

Table -2

Mean Scores and difference of Mean degree of Peer Group Peer Group Insecurity with respect to three independent variables

Independent Variables		N	Mean(M)	Difference Of Mean
Status (A)	Upper	120	12.18	3.2
	Lower	120	8.98	
Aria (B)	City(Town)	120	10.43	0.3
	Rural	120	10.73	
Sex (C)	Boys	120	10.73	6.9
	Girls	120	11.03	

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

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

The 'F – Value' for first set of independent variables were shown in table-1. This result has 0.01 significance value. So above said hypothesis **Ho$_1$** cannot be accepted because result has significant difference. Thus statistical data of table-1 clearly shown that there is significant difference in the degrees of Peer Group context Insecurity between Upper and lower class youth.

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

The 'F – Value' for second set of independent variables were shown in table-1. This result has 0.01 significance value. So above said hypothesis **Ho$_2$** cannot be accepted because result has significant difference. Thus statistical data of table-1 clearly shown that there is significant difference in the degrees of Peer Group context Insecurity between city and rural area youth. Mean values for city and rural area were 11.09 and 8.05 respectively (Table-2). These mean values concluded that the degree of Peer Group context 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 Peer Group context Insecurity between boys and girls.

The 'F – Value' for first independent variables were shown in table-1. This result has no significance value. So above said hypothesis **Ho$_3$** can be accepted because result has significant difference. Thus statistical data of table-1 clearly shown that there is no significant difference in the degrees of Peer Group context Insecurity between boys and girls.

CONCLUSION:

Finally we can conclude this study in following three conclusions:

- Peer Group context Insecurity is significantly higher in lower class than that of upper class.
- Peer Group context Insecurity is almost equal in city area than that rural area youth.
- Peer Group context Insecurity is insignificantly differ between girls and boys.

REFERENCE:

1. Anderson, Christopher J.; Pontusson, Jonas (2007): Workers, worries and welfare states: Social protection and job insecurity in 15 OECD countries. In: *European Journal of Political Research*46 (2), S. 211–235.

2. Anderson, John R. (1995): Learning and Memory. An integrated approach. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

3. Auer, Peter; Cazes, Sandrine (2000): The resilience of the long-term employment relationship: Evidence from the industrialized countries. In: *International Labour Review* 139 (4), S. 379–408.

4. Benito, Andrew (2005): Does job insecurity affect household consumption? In: *Oxford Economic Papers* 58 (1), S. 157–181.

5. Böckerman, Petri (2004): Perception of Job Instability in Europe. In: *Social Indicators Research* 67 (3), S. 283–314.

6. Borg, Ingwer; Elizur, Dov (1992): Job Insecurity: Correlates, Moderators and Measurement. In: *International Journal of Manpower* 13 (2), S. 13–26.

7. Castel, Robert (2000): Die Metamorphosen der sozialen Frage. Eine Chronik der Lohnarbeit. Deutsche Ausg. Konstanz: UVK.

8. Chung, Heejung; van Oorschot, Wim (2011): Institutions versus market forces: Explaining the employment insecurity of European individuals during (the beginning of) the financial crisis. In: *Journal of European Social Policy* 21 (4), S. 287–301.

9. Clark, Andrew; Postel-Vinay, Fabien (2008): Job security and job protection. In: *Oxford Economic Papers* 61 (2), S. 207–239.

10. Dingeldey, Irene (2007): Between workfare and enablement? The different paths to transformation of the welfare state: A comparative analysis of activating labour market policies. In: *European Journal of Political Research* 46 (6), S. 823–851.

11. Drobnič, Sonja; Beham, Barbara; Präg, Patrick (2010): Good Job, Good Life? Working Conditions and Quality of Life in Europe. In: *Social Indicator Research* 99 (2), S. 205–225.

12. Erlinghagen, Marcel (2008): Self-Perceived Job Insecurity and Social Context: A Multi-Level Analysis of 17 European Countries. In: *European Sociological Review* 24 (2), S. 183–197.

13. Erlinghagen, Marcel (2010): Mehr Angst vor Arbeitsplatzverlust seit Hartz?: Langfristige Entwicklung der Beschäftigungsunsicherheit in Deutschland. In: *SOEPpapers*.

14. Erlinghagen, Marcel; Knuth, Matthias (2004): In search of turbulence Labour market mobility and job stability in Germany. In: *European Societies* 6 (1), S. 49–70.