

Educational, Vocal and Economical Development of Rural and Urban Children

Dr. Binda Ram

Associate Professor

Head Department of Psychology

Jiwachh College Motipur

B.R.A. Bihar University, Muzaffarpur

Introduction

Besides the economic factor there are several other factors, which have facilitated the breaking up of large-sized joint families into small-sized nuclear families. For example, modern education and other modern means of communication have infused a spirit of romantic individualism into the youth, who rather than working for family solidarity often disintegrate it. Education, urban contacts disgust with old out of date ways of life, and desire for greater personal respectability according to accepted social standards, in some cases, have set in motion efforts at vertical movements in families on the lower level. Due to the growth of individualism among the younger people, especially those who have some education or urban contacts, the desire to go to the city is manifesting increasingly.

Researchers in the west have also concluded that young people's desire for independence, and social mobility are at the root of difficulties in family adjustment causing disintegration in families. According to Hurlock (1956) adjustments within the family have been made more difficult by a number of factors of recent origin :- (1) There is a keen desire for independence among the young married couples today because of the greater independence which they enjoy throughout their childhood and adolescence. They expect complete independence even after they enter the family life. They rebel against parental advice and guidance even when they must accept parental financial aid. Many young couples move for a way from their families to make interference difficult if not impossible. In spite of their desire for independence many young adults remain emotionally dependent on their parents, especially their mothers and this dependency is resented by their spouses and result in family tussle (2) When young adults want to rise above their family status and when higher education makes it possible they must keep the other members of the family in the background unless those relatives have acquired the appearance and the behaviour patterns of the new social group with which they are trying to become identified. Many parents and relatives resent this attitude and treatment and this leads to hostility and disintegration. (3) The presence of old dependent parents with decreasing income (because of the shrinkage of the value of money and inflation) increases the economic pressure on the earning young adult. This leads to aggression and tension in the family and ultimately the family breakup into small units. (4) Besides this the presence of the dependent old parents is a complicating factor in family adjustment because of the present day's concept of old people as 'intruders' 'unwelcome people' and 'trouble makers'. For example, there is a widespread and widely accepted stereotype of the typical mother-in-law, which causes unfavourable mental sets even before marriage. Mother-in-law as well as other elderly relatives is depicted in those stereotypes, as bossy, interfering and troublesome. Although mother-in-law jokes are of the early origin, the comic element is now replaced by bitter resentments leading to trouble in the family.

A large family said, Harry, J. Johnson, sometimes splits up because of personality clashes. According to the ideal, a man's relation with his father and mother was expected to take precedence over his relation with his wife. Though it was not always easy to follow.

Even Tarachand (1951) has said that all this has been changing. By the use of international commerce and by the rise of international markets assisted by the extension of railways and roads, the old self-sufficiency of the village has been progressively worn down.

Thus it can be seen that even in western society social and economic factors have been working against the large sized joint families and the old order is changing yielding place to new.

Aim of the Present Study

Taking all these into consideration the present study was undertaken with a view to make a comparative assessment of effects of two types of families : the joint and the unit families on children's growths and adjustments in various fields.

Hypothesis

The following hypothesis were formulated :

- 1) A significant difference will be found between child of joint and unit family in respect of their development.
- 2) A significant difference will be found between child of rural and urban backgrounds.
- 3) Said, educational, economical, emotional and vocal development will differ significantly in respect of their rural and urban backgrounds.
- 4) The social development of rural and urban children will be significantly related to their family environment in both the group.

Method of Sample Selection:

For selecting the sample, the author visited many schools of Chapra district Urban, Rural area and gathered information regarding the socio-economic status of children, studying in those schools. From this it became clear that children coming from middle class socio-economic group mainly populated some schools. Only such schools were selected for the purpose of this study. Schools in which large number of children came from high S.E.S. group or from low S.E.S. group were not selected. The writer picked up the names of about 2,000 children aged 9 to 10 years.

Table – 1

Table of Means, Differences between Means and Z-ratios of School Marks of Urban group.

Subject	Family Testing	U.F.	J.F.	Diff.	Z-ratio
Educational	First-Mean	43.40	32.81	10.59	6.13 H.S
	Second-Mean	50.45	47.95	2.50	1.609 N.S
	Diff.	7.05	15.14		
	Z-ratio	4.46 H.S.	8.91 H.S.		
Economical	First-Mean	47.224	5.156	2.932	1.823 N.S.
	Second-Mean	56.367	50.299	9.068	4.58 H.S.
	Diff.	9.143	2.857		
	Z-ratio	4.67 HS	1.75 NS		
Emotional	First-Mean	54.040	45.088	8.933	5.595 H.S.
	Second-Mean	45.537	46.476	0.939	0.571 N.S.
	Diff.	8.803	1.388		
	Z-ratio	5.28HS	0.878 HS		
Vocal	First-Mean	43.387	34.585	8.802	5.47 H.S.
	Second-Mean	51.775	44.510	7.265	4.10 H.S
	Diff.	8.388	9.925		
	Z-ratio	5.38 HS	5.45 HS		

Table – 2

Table of Means, Differences between Means and Z-rations of School Marks of Rural group.

Subject	Family Testing	U.F.	J.F.	Diff.	Z-ratio
Educational	First-Mean	45.49	52.165	5.675	3.93 H.S.
	Second-Mean	50.262	38.708	11.554	5.98 H.S.
	Diff.	4.772	13.457		
	Z-ratio	2.51 Significant below 0.05	5.78 H.S.		
Economical	First-Mean	47.097	46.689	0.408	0.163 H.S.
	Second-Mean	54.495	46.967	8.428	3.63 H.S.
	Diff.	7.398	0.622		
	Z-ratio	3.11 HS	0.255 NS		
Educational	First-Mean	46.145	28.103	17.941	7.73 H.S.
	Second-Mean	50.815	46.533	4.282	2.11 Significant above 0.05 below 0.01
	Diff.	4.67	18.129		
	Z-ratio	2.45 Significant above 0.05 below 0.01	7.57 HS		
Vocal	First-Mean	44.676	34.941	9.735	4.82 H.S.
	Second-Mean	49.427	45.650	3.77	1.85 N.S.
	Diff.	4.751	11.809		
	Z-ratio	2.39 Significant above 0.05	5.73 HS		

One the other hand in Economical and Emotional studies the marks of the joint family boys were little higher than the marks of the unit family boys in the first year. The differences were of 2.93 and 0.84 per cent respectively, but in the second year the unit family boys exceeded the

joint family boys by 9.07 and 8.95 per cent respectively. That is, the difference in favour of the unit family boys increased. In other words the unit family boys made greater progress in one year's time in Arithmetic and social studies. So far as the two groups of girls were concerned the unit family girls were superior to the joint family girls in both the years but the differences increased in Arithmetic from 0.41 to 8.41 per cent, and in social studies the difference decreased from 17.94 to 4.28 percent. Thus in one case the unit family girls progressed month that the joint family girls and in the other the joint family girls showed greater progress.

In Vocal the unit family boys and girls were better than the joint family boys and girls in both the first and second years, but the amount by which they differed had decreased from 8.80 to 7.27 per cent in boys groups and from 9.34 to 3.76 per cent in girls group. Thus the joint family children had made relatively greater progress than the unit family children in one years time, so far as their progress in science subject was concerned.

Hence, on the basis of subject-wise analysis of result no very definite conclusion regarding the different school subjects can be drawn. But excepting one i.e. the joint family group of girls whose performance in Hindi was better than the performance of unit family girls both the first and the second years, all other groups of joint family children were exceeded by the unit family children in second year, even though they had done better than the unit family children in the first year. Taking all the means at a time in a total number of 10 first mean comparisons the joint family children exceeded the unit family children in five, and they exceeded them in five. However, four out of five differences in favour of the joint family children were statistically not significant where as four out of the five differences in favour of the unit family children were significant. In the second year nine out of the ten differences were in favour of the unit family children of which six were statistically significant. In only one comparison the difference was in favour of the joint family children but it was small and statistically not significant.

Applying the signed rank test (table Nos. 21 and 22 of this chapter) to compare all pairs of means taken together, the difference between the first means of the unit and joint families was not significant but the difference between the second means of the two family types was highly significant above 0.01 level.

Anderson, J.e. (949) : The psychology of Development and Personal Adjustment ; Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

Garrett, 11. E. : General Psychology. Garrett, H.E. (1954) ; Statistics in Psychology and Education, Longmans, Green & Co., New York.

Guilford, J.P. (1965) : Fundamental statistics in Psychology and Education, Me. Grew Hill Book Co. New York.

Hildreth (1934) : Occupation Status and Intelligence, personal. 1.1 XIII.

Kagan. J. And Haveman, E. : Psychology on Introduction.

Kuppuswamy, B. (1962) : Manual of Socio-economic Statistics (Urban) ; Mansayan, New Delhi. 1 al (19/1) ; 1 he 111 udu family in Pali in , Ph. D). I licsis, Pallia 1 Jni versily, Patna.

Pillai, N.P. (1966) : An Investigation into the Organizational and Administrative Factors which Affect the Achievement of Pupils in Secondary Schools ; Indian Educational Review, Vol. 1. No. 1, July.

Secord and Bachman (1974) : Social Psychology, II Edition, McGraw Hill, Kogakuslui Lid.

Vernon, P.E. (1963) : Intelligence and Cultural Environment Reprint Methuen's Co. Ltd., London.

McLeod, Saul (2013) [2008], :“Erik Erikson”, Simply psychology, retrieved 23 July 2016.

Twenge, Jean M/ (2008) : “Review of emerging adulthood; The winding road from the late teens through the twenties.” American Journal of Psychology. 121 (4); 682 – 687.

Aldridge, F.I., Gibbs, V.M. Schmidhofer, K. & Williams at (2012) : Investigating the clinical usefulness of the social Responsiveness scale (SRS) in a tertiary level, autism spectrum disorder specific assessment clinic. Journal of Autism and Development Disorders. 42 (2), 294 – 300.

Grant, R & Nozyce, M. (2013) :Proposed changes to the American Psychiatric Association diagnostic criteria for autism Spectrum disorder; Implications for young children and their families. Maternal and child Health Journal, 17 (4), 586 – 592.