

Women in Respect of Economic Status

Dr. Akhilendra Kumar Singh

Deptt of Psychology

Dr. Jagannath Mishra College, Muzaffarpur

B.R.A.B.U. Muzaffarpur

Introduction: The spirit in which Mahatma Gandhi had involved women in the struggle for freedom has now come to be firmly enshrined in the Constitution of Independent India, It Promises to Secure to all its citizens, “Justice – social, economic and political, liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship, equality of status and opportunity, and to promote among them all fraternity, assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity of the Nation.”

To attain these objectives the Constitution guarantee certain fundamental rights. Indian women are the beneficiaries of these rights in the same manner as Indian men. Art. 14 ensures “equality Before the law” and Art. 15 prohibits “any discrimination”. Art. 16 (I) guarantees “equality of opportunity for all citizens in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the State”. Art. 526 stresses that “elections are to be strictly on the basis of adult franchise”. While these four Articles, together with the omnibus provision of Art. 38 which in brief, directed the State to ensure just social, political and economic order for equality for women, there are several other Articles that protect and cover the equality of women indirectly or by implication. These Articles are : 39 (b) (c) (f) relating to ownership of material resources, Art. 40 (organization of panchayats for self-government), Art. 41 (right to work, employment and public assistance), Art 43 (provision of work, a living wage etc.), Art 44 (a uniform Civil Code), Art. 45 (free and compulsory education for all children up to the age of 14) and Art. 47 (raising the standard of nutrition, standard of living and public health).

In addition there are some articles that have been described by commentators on the Indian Constitution as “Women-specific”, these are : Art. 16(2) which “forbids discrimination in respect to any employment of office under the state” on the grounds only of “religion, race, caste, sex, descent, place of birth, residence or any one of them” ; Art. 39 (i) which promises the right to an adequate means of livelihood to men and women equally ; Art. 39 (d) “equal pay for equal work for both men and women” ; Art 39 (e) “protection of the health and strength of workers – men, women and children from abuse and entry into avocations unsuited to their age and strength” ; Art. 42 “just and human conditions of work and maternity relief” ; Art. 325 which says that “no special electoral rules can be made on the grounds of religion, race, caste and sex” ; and above all Art. 15(3) which in fact provides for affirmative action and for protection discrimination by empowering the state to make “any special provision for women and children”.

Hypothesis :-

There would be significant relationship between urban and rural women in respect of Economical Status.

Sample and sampling Technique :-

Sample is an essential part of a research work. The term “Sample” refers to the portion of the population to which it is supposed to be representative. There are main two types of sampling techniques namely probability sampling and non-probability sampling the probability sampling includes random sampling and stratified sampling techniques. The non-probability sampling includes incidental sampling purposive

sampling and quota sampling techniques. Each sampling technique has its own advantages and disadvantages. In the present study incidental-cum-purposive sampling technique was found suitable and practicable.

Thus in the present study an incidental-cum-purposive sample and Random Sampling consisting of two hundred working women urban area and two hundred working women in rural area was used. Half of the sample consisted of urban and half of the rural respondents belonging to different socio-economic condition. Those women serving in Government jobs or in private jobs were treated as working females. All sample selected on parsauri Block of Sitamarhi District.

Method Socio-Economic Status Scales :-

Two types of Ses scales were used to determine the socio-economic statuses of the subjects. Sharma SES scale (1975) was used to determine the SES of urban and rural subjects. This scale consists of Twenty (20) items pertaining to educational professional, income, future saving housing and other facilities which the family has. Each item has different alternative choices from which the respondent has to select on alternative choice. The reliability co-efficient or this scale is 0.91 and 0.94 by test retest method and split half method (odd-even Method) respectively the validity of this scale is also very high (0.94).

Scoring Procedure

The procedure of scoring of this scale is very much simple. The number of scores is determined by the ordinal position of the alternative choices against each of the twenty (20) items. All the 20 items are divided into four types on the basis of the number of the alternative choices.

- a. One item of the scale (item No. 5) has only two alternative choice and so for the first alternative choice two scores are given.
- b. There are 15 item (Item No. 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20) which have three alternative choice each and so 3, 2 and 1 scores are given for choice no. 1, 2 and 3 respectively.
- c. There is one item (No. 12) which contains four alternative choices and hence 4, 3, 2 and 1 scores are given to the respondent for the choice No. 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively.
- d. There are two items (items No. 1 and 4) which contains give alternative choices and hence scoring is made as 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 for the respective ordinal position of the choices.
- e. One item (item No. 6) has six alternative choices and hence in accordance with the usual ordinal position of the choices scoring is made. Thus the maximum score which respondent can obtain on this scale is 69 and the minimum score 20, The higher score indicates higher socio-economic status and vice-versa.

Result :-

Comparison between working urban and working rural women in economic independence :-

It was attempt to examine the impact of economic independence affiliation on psychological differentiation of both the working urban and working rural women taken together. Sharma, 1975 socio-economic scale administered to both the urban and rural women (N = 200) and (200) on the basis of the obtained data the respondents were divided into the field independent group and the field dependent group. Those falling at and above of the Median Value were Placed in field dependent group and those falling below the median value were placed in field independent group. The non-parametric test namely chi-Square test was used for the analysis and treatment of the data and the result thus obtained were recorded in table 1.

The results contained in table –1, indicated insignificant difference in psychological differentiation between the urban and the rural women. While 54% of urban women and 53% of rural women were found belonging to field dependent group, 46% urban and 47% rural women were found belonging to field independent group But the difference between the groups in terms of psychological differentiation was found significant even at .05 level of confidence ($X^2 = 0.021$, $df = 1$, $P = .05$). Thus the hypothesis number three was

Table No. 1

Chi-Square Showing the Significance of the Difference between the urban and rural women in terms of Economic independence

Subject	N	Urban Economic Independence	Rural Economic Independence	X^2	df	P
Urban Working Women	200	109 54 %	93 46 %			
				0.021	1	.05
Rural Working Women	200	107 53%	95 47 %			

Rejected. In chapter three of the present study it was hypothesized that urban subject would be found more field independent, while rural subjects would be found more field dependent. But it was rejected in the light of the statistics given in table 1. The finding might be interpreted in terms of increasing psychological similarity between urban and rural subjects due to frequent interactions between them (Sinha, 1968).

However, it was thought proper to verify the findings based on chi-square test. Using critical ratio test which is more robust and reliable (Siegel, 1956) Mean, S.D. and S.E. were calculated for urban and rural women on the basis of economic scales. The T-Value was ascertained to examine the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the two groups. The result thus obtained was recorded in table – 2.

Table – 2

Mean, S.D., SE and T showing the Significance of the Difference Between the Urban and Rural Women in terms of Economic Independence

Subject	N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	T	Df	P
Urban	200	57.89	32.89	2.27			
					1.24	398	.05
Rural	200	53.97	33.77	2.33			

The Statistics contained in table 2 clearly showed significant effect of economic independence on psychological differentiation of working urban and working rural women. The urban women having a mean scores of 57.88 did not differ significance from the rural women having a mean value of 53.57 ($T = 1.24$, $df = 398$, $P = .05$). Thus hypothesis No. 3 was rejected. In the third chapter of the present study. It was hypothesized that urban women would be found more field independent, while the rural women would be found more field dependent. But it was collected in the light of the results obtained on the basis of statistics. Thus the findings based on T-Test, table 7 were consistent with those based on chi-square Test, Table 6 in the interpretation of the finding remaining the same before.

Reference :-

Bingelow, G.S. (1971) : Field Dependence/Independence in 5 to 10 Year old children, *J. Of Educational Psychol.*, 64. 307,-400.

Gesell, A. And Lord, E.E. (1927) : Psychological Comparison of Nursery School Children from Women of Low and High Economic Status, *J. Of Genetic Psychol.* (90).

Pandey (1977) : Effect of Leadership Role Playing on Dependence proneness Responses, *Journal of Social and Economic Study*, Vol. 5 (I), pp. 111-116.

Pareek, U. And Trivedi, G (1964) : Socio-Economic Status Scale (Rural), Delhi, Manasayan.

Pervin (1970) : Personality Theory, Assessment of Research : New York, psychological Differentiation, New York.

Shweta Singh (2009) : Examining the Dharma Driven Identity of Women :Mahabharata S Kunti- in the women Question in the Contemporary Indian English Women Writings, Ed. Indu Swami, Sarup : Delhi.

Singh, S. & Huge, G. (2010) : Debating out comes for working women Illustration from India, *The Journal of Pouerty*, 14(2) pp. 197-215.

Sinha, J.B.P. (1970) : A forcible Choice Scale of Dependence Proneness, *SamajVigyan*, 2, pp. 75-76.

Witkin, H.A. and Berry, J.W. (1975) : Psychological Differentiation in a Cross Cultural Perspective, *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychol.*, Vol. 6 (1), pp. 84-87.

Woodworth, H.E. (1939) : Psychological Issues, Selected Papers, New York, Columbia University Press.