



## Insecurity: A comparative Study of Hindu and Muslim college Students

**Dr.Sandipkumar N. Patel**

Assistant professor,  
Department of Psychology,  
Nalini, Arvind and T.V.Patel Arts College,  
Vallabh Vidyanagar

E-Mail: [sandip.patel704@gmail.com](mailto:sandip.patel704@gmail.com)

Mo. 09727805062

### **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.

### **1 What is Insecurity?**

**'Insecurity is a lack of self-worth, a doubt and uncertainty, and feeling of not measuring up to society's standards'**. It is often subconscious, and is thought to drive afflicted individuals to overcompensate, resulting either in spectacular achievement or extreme antisocial behaviour. The term was coined to indicate a lack of covert self esteem. For many, it is developed through a combination of genetic personality characteristics and personal experiences.

Research on the psychological consequences of Insecurity is reviewed, showing that insecurity reduces psychological well-being and satisfaction, and increases psychosomatic complaints and physical strains. Next, three additional research questions are addressed, since these questions did not receive much attention in previous research.

## 2. Aims and Objectives

1. To measure the degree of Insecurity in Hindu and Muslim community
2. To measure the degree of Insecurity in Arts and Science students
3. To measure the degree of Insecurity in Boys and Girls
4. To compare the degree of Insecurity in Hindu and Muslim community
5. To compare the degree of Insecurity in Arts and Science students
6. To compare the degree of Insecurity in Boys and Girls

## 3. Hypothesis

**Ho1:** Interaction of Community, Education stream and Gender has no significant effect on the Aggression

**Ho2:** ‘There is no significant difference between the mean of insecurity among the Hindu and Muslim community students

**Ho3:** ‘There is no significant difference between the mean of insecurity among the science and arts student

**Ho4:** ‘There is no significant difference between the mean of insecurity among the girls and boys student

**Ho5:** Interaction of community and education stream has no significant effect on the insecurity.

**Ho6:** Interaction of community and Gender has no significant effect on the insecurity.

**Ho7:** Interaction of Education and Gender has no significant effect on the insecurity.

**Ho8:** Interaction of Community, Education stream and Gender has no significant effect on the insecurity.

## 4. Sample categorized as under:

Hindu	Arts	Boys	40	80	160	320
		Girls	40			
	Science	Boys	40	80		
		Girls	40			
Muslim	Arts	Boys	40	80	160	
		Girls	40			
	Science	Boys	40	80		
		Girls	40			

## 5. Research Design (2x2x2) Factorial Design

Source	A1		A2		Total
	B1	B2	B1	B2	
C1	40	40	40	40	160
C2	40	40	40	40	160
<b>Total sample</b>	80	80	80	80	320

### Clarification of above classification

- A. Community
  - A1- Hindu community
  - A2- Muslim community
- B. Education
  - B1-Arts faculty
  - B2- Science faculty
- C. Gender
  - C1- Girls
  - C2- Boys

### 6. Tool used in the present study

1. Insecurity scale Developed by Dr. Bina Shah

### 7. Variable

#### A. Independent Variables

<b>Community</b>	Hindu and Muslim
<b>Education</b>	Arts and Science stream.
<b>Gender</b>	Boys and Girls

#### B. Dependent Variables

- Aggression
- Insecurity
- Personality trait

#### C. Control Variables

- Equal numbers of gender
- Same time for all experiments (Test time)
- Same test will be given to all students
- Same method will be used for data analysis
- Age limit taken: 18-25 years
- Only undergraduate (UG) students will be taken in account

### 8. Methods of Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed by  $2 \times 2 \times 2$  Factorial. F-test ANOVA was used for statistical analysis of data. The difference in mean is counted for each independent factor. The value of mean and their graphs were taken in account to analyze raw data.

### 9. Result:

#### Dependent Variable:- Insecurity

Summery of ANOVA ( $2 \times 2 \times 2$ ) analysis of community, education stream and gender context insecurity (Level of Significant  $0.05 < 3.87$  and  $0.01 < 6.72$ )

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Sum of Squares	F Value	Level of Sig
Community (A)	948.753	1	948.753	3.61	N.S
Stream (b)	1212.903	1	1212.903	4.62	0.05
Gender (C)	729.028	1	729.028	2.77	N.S
AxB	2570.778	1	2570.778	9.80	0.01
AxC	9127.128	1	9127.128	34.78	0.01
BxC	1509.453	1	1509.453	5.75	0.05
AxBxC	166.753	1	166.775	.636	N.S
Error	81867.575	312	262.396		
Total	4206617.00	320			
T.S.S.	98132.372	319			

### **Type of community and insecurity**

To know that, is there any difference in mean of insecurity between the Hindu and Muslim community, the null hypothesis was constructed previously.

**‘There is no significant difference between the mean of insecurity among the Hindu and Muslim community students**

The means of insecurity of hindu and muslim community student are 115.03 and 111.58. The difference between means is 3.45. This is very high. It also shows that the F- value of between type of community and insecurity is 3.61. Here, on the basis of the obtained results, the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant difference is observed between the insecurity between the muslim and hindu community student.

### **Education stream and insecurity**

To know that, is there any difference in mean of insecurity between the science and arts student, the null hypothesis was constructed previously.

**‘There is no significant difference between the mean of insecurity among the science and arts student**

Insecurity of the science and arts student are 111.36 and 115.25. The difference between mean is 3.89. It also shows that the F- value of between type of community and insecurity is 4.62. This value is significant with the p-value 0.05. Here, on the basis of the obtained results, the null hypothesis is rejected and there is the significant difference is observed between the insecurity between the science and arts student.

### **Gender and insecurity**

To know that, is there any difference in mean of insecurity between the girls and boys student, the null hypothesis was constructed previously.

**‘There is no significant difference between the mean of insecurity among the girls and boys student**

Insecurity of the girls and boys student are 114.81 and 111.80. The difference between mean is 3.01. It also shows that the F- value of between type of community and insecurity 2.77. This value is significant with the p-value 0.01. Here, on the basis of the obtained results, the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant difference is observed between the insecurity between the girls and boys student.

**Effect of Interaction between Community and Education stream on insecurity (AxB)**

To know that, is there any effect of interaction of community and education stream on the mean of insecurity, the null hypothesis was constructed previously.

**Interaction of community and education stream has no significant effect on the insecurity.**

The F- value for the interaction of community and education stream on the mean of insecurity is 9.80. This value is significant with the p-value 0.01. Here, on the basis of the obtained results, the null hypothesis is rejected and there is the significant effect of interaction of community and education stream on the insecurity.

**Effect of Interaction between Community and Gender on insecurity (AxC)**

To know that, is there any effect of interaction of community and Gender on the mean of insecurity, the null hypothesis was constructed previously.

**Interaction of community and Gender has no significant effect on the insecurity.**

The F- value for the interaction of community and Gender on the mean of insecurity is 34.78. This value is significant with the p-value 0.01. Here, on the basis of the obtained results, the null hypothesis is rejected and there is the significant effect of interaction of community and gender on the insecurity.

**Effect of Interaction between Education and Gender on insecurity (BxC)**

To know that, is there any effect of interaction of Education and Gender on the mean of insecurity, the null hypothesis was constructed previously.

**Interaction of Education and Gender has no significant effect on the insecurity.**

The F- value for the interaction of Education and Gender on the mean of insecurity is 5.75. This value is significant with the p-value 0.05. Here, on the basis of the obtained results, the null hypothesis is rejected and there is the significant effect of interaction of Education and Gender on the insecurity.

**Effect of Interaction between Community, Education stream and Gender on insecurity (AxBxC)**

To know that, is there any effect of interaction of Community, Education stream and Gender on the mean of insecurity, the null hypothesis was constructed previously.

**Interaction of Community, Education stream and Gender has no significant effect on the insecurity.**

The F- value for the interaction of Community, Education stream and Gender on the mean of insecurity is 0.636. This value is significant with the p-value 0.01. Here, on the basis of the obtained results, the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant effect of interaction of Community, Education stream and Gender on the insecurity.

## 10. References

- A. P. Singh (1984)** ‘A Study of Occupational Stress, Insecurity and Work. Involvement among the First Class Industrial Supervisors’
- A.K.S. Kushwaha and B. Hasan (January-July, 2005)** Career Decision Making as a Function of Personality Dimension and Gender.
- Archana Tyagi (January, 2008)** Personality Profiles Identification Using MBTI Test for Management Students: An Empirical Study.
- Argyle, M.(1987)** The psychology of happiness, London: Methuen.
- Argyle, M.(1999)** causes, and N. Scjwarzcorrelates of happiness in D. Kahneman, E. Diener and Schwarz; (Eds). Well being: the foundation of hedonic psychology (pp 353-375) New York: Sag.
- Basgell, J.A. and Snyber, C.R.(1988)** Excuses in waiting external locus of control and social psychology Vol-54.
- Berkowitz :** “A survey of social psychology.
- Bhogle, S., and Jay Prakash, I.S. (1995)** Development of the psychological well being questionnaire, Journal of personality and clinical studies, Vol 11 (1&2).
- Bindu Gupta (January, 2008)** Role of Personality in Knowledge Sharing and Knowledge Acquisition Behaviour.
- Boor, M. (1976)** Relationship of internal / external control and national suicide rates journal of social psychology Vol 100.
- Hilgard Ernest R (1962) :** “introduction to psychology” repeat hart davis Ltd. Sonosauare London 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.
- J. M. Asgarali Patel and K. Rajendran (January, 2007).** E-Culture and Personality Dimensions among University Students.
- Lefcourt H.M. (1982)** Locus of control: current in theory and research hills dele NJ: Erlbaum.