

ADJUSTMENT PATTERN OF BOY'S AND GIRL'S IN DIFFERENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS

Dr. Shyam Sunder Prasad

Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, R.R.P. College Bherawan, Patna-804451.

Abstract: Attachment is a powerful and natural part of life. Individuals can be attached to almost anything - their pets, homes, friends, cloths etc. It can develop in many ways and for many reasons. Emotional attachment begins with physical attachment for example - touching and cuddling between infant and parents. Babies who are given adequate development (lovely, 1969). The present study was conducted to assess the difference in attachment behavior of children in upper and lower socioeconomic groups. For this purpose it was hypothesized that children of upper socioeconomic group would have more attachment toward other person, while those of lower socioeconomic class would have more attachment toward their parents. For the verification of this hypothesis 60 children of both sexes were selected. Personal data and attachment information were collected from parents. The result showed that majority children of upper socio-economic group had high attachment toward their parents. Thus the hypothesis formulated in this context was confirmed.

Keywords: Human lives, Emotional glue, Parental behavior, Intimacy Stereotypes. Romantic love, etc.

1. INTRODUCTION

Attachment is powerful and natural part of human lives. Individual can be attached to almost anything their pets, homes, friends, partners, spouses, social groups, cloths, cars, work-mates and just about anything at all. Each individual's ability to form and maintain relationships using this emotional glue is different. Some people seem naturally capable of loving. They form numerous intimate and caring relationships and in doing so get pleasure. Others are not so lucky. They feel no pull to form intimate relationships; find little pleasure in being with or close to others. Attachment is both historical and emotional. It usually involves some nostalgia, can have a sense of commitment for whatever reason, involves, liking but not necessarily loving someone, attributing emotional value and worth to objects, people or pets (Garelli, 1984, 1992). Attachment can include dependence, but not necessarily, does not require obligation, but values reciprocity.

The parents have an attachment to child, which can be described as love, but is probably best described as parental founding (Ainsworth, Blehar 1978). Attachments develop in many ways and for many reasons. They also can be expressed very differently depending on the bonding process itself and with whom the attachments are being developed. One should look at the history of his/her friendship and relationship very carefully and try to work or makes them fall apart. This attachment behavior is held to be kind of social behavior Tanta mount to that of mating or parental behavior and is deemed to have a function specified to itself (Erikson, 1963). Emotional attachment begins with physical attachment for example touching and cuddling between infant and parent. Babies who are given adequate food, water and warmth, but who are deprived of being touched and held show retarded emotional and physical development (Bowlby, 1969). When infants are consistently deprived of soial contacts, affection and cuddling, the effects can be disastrous and long lasting. Insecurely attached infants, often grow into children who have a number of behavior-problems (spelt/,Greenberg & Deklyen 1990).

The stereotypes suggest that men are more lucid and avoidant than women and those women are more romantic and anxious and than men; but like all stereotypes these over simplify. There is no evidence that one sex shows more attachment than the other over the long haul (dion & Dion, 1993, Fehar & Russel, 1991, Harfield & sprechir, 1986, Hendrisk & llendrick, 1992). Both sexes become equally attached and both suffer when a love relationship ends. The stereotype of the avoidant male and the pursuing female often blinds people to greater evidence of the similarities between men and women in their need. For example, one popular theory posed by Carolog Gilligan (1982) holds that many men regard attachment as a source of safety and intimacy. But in some studies gender difference has been found most clearly so far the intimacy and love are concerned, young women are somewhat more pragmatic and less lucid than men in their characteristic love styles and sexual behavior (Dion & Dion 1993).

Gender differences in people's ideas about love also depend on social and economic factors. For a many years studies found that western men were more romantic than women, who were in turn for more pragmatic than men. One reason was that a woman did not just marry a man; they married a standard of living (Waller, 1983). Therefore she could not afford to marry someone unsuitable or was her time in a relationship that was not going anywhere, even if she loved him. In contrast, a man could afford to be sentimental in his choice of partner. In the 1960s two thirds of a sample of college men said they would not marry someone they did not love, but only a few of the women ruled out the possibility (Kephart, 1967). As women entered the work force and as two incomes become necessary in most families, the gender difference in romantic love wane. Most Canadian and American women are as romantic and erotic as man (Dion & Dion 1993).

2. Objective of the study

Main objective of the study was to find the direction of attachment among children of upper and lower socio-economic groups. In other words to find out the difference in children's attachment toward parents and those toward other persons. That is, whether or not children of upper and lower classes different significantly in term of their attachment toward parents and toward other persons.

3. Hypothesis

Children are the collection of small group of representative units drawn from the population. For the present study 30 children from upper socio-economic class and 30 children from lower socio-economic class were purposefully selected their age ranged between 3 and 4 years. In each group there were 15 male and 15 female.

4. Research Tool

For obtaining information regarding age, sex, socio-economic status etc. a personal data schedule was prepared and used. This information was obtained through their parents. Further, for obtaining nature and direction of attachment an attachment interview schedule was prepared, and administered on the mothers, who were selected for the study.

5. Results and Discussion

It may be recalled that the study was conducted to assess the nature and direction of attachment in children of upper and lower socio-economic groups. In order to test the hypothesis that children of upper socio-economic group would have more attachment toward other related people than toward parents compared to those of lower socio-economic group, frequencies were counted and chi-square was calculated. The results were obtained as follows.

Table 1: Chi-square Test Result between two groups

Groups	Toward	Toward parent	X ² other	Df	P value
High socio-economic group	8	22	8.14	1	<01
Low socio-economic group	19	11			

It is obvious from table noted above that majority of children of high socio-economic group (73.33%) had shown their attachment toward other persons than their parents whereas majority of children of lower socio-economic group (63.33) showed attachment toward their parents. The reason behind this finding may be that upper class parents had insufficient time to interact or to spend time with their children, where as parents of lower socio-economic group spend much of the time in evening with their children. Since children of upper socio-economic group spend much time with other people or other members of the family they develop attachment with them. The finding gets support from Harlow's (1951) theory of attachment hence the hypothesis formulated for the study was confirmed.

References

1. Anisworth, MDS Blehar, M.C., Waters, E., and Wall, S. (1978) : Patterns of attachment, hillsdale, N.J. : Erlbaum.
2. Anisworth, M.D.S., Waters, J.C., Blehar, A., and wall, J.C. (1978) : Patterns of attachment, N.J. : Lawrence Erlbaum.
3. Anisworth, Marry D.S. (1979) : Infant mother attachment. American Psychologist, 31, 932-937.
4. Bowlby, John (1969) : Attachment and loss. Vol. 1 : Attachment New York : Basic Books.
5. Bowlby, J (1980) : Attachment and loss : Vol. 3 Loss New York : Basic Books.
6. Erikson, E. (1963) : Childhood and society, 2nd ed. New York Nortone.
7. Garelli, J.C. (1984) : Ethological roots of the theory of attachment. Beunos Aires, Psicoanalysis, 6, 119-145.
8. Garelli, J.C. (1992) : Ethological roots of the theory of attachment. In E. Waczda and H. 9.
9. Trumpet (Eds.), Early Development Today. New York : Basic Books.
10. Krikpatrick, Lee A., & Davis, Keith A. (1994) : Attachment style, gender and relationship stability : A longinudianal analysis. Journal of personality and social Psy., 66, 502-512.
11. Anisworth, MDS, Waters, JC, Blehar.