

A Study of Socio-Economical Status among Tribal and Non-Tribal College Student

Manoj M. Gamit^{1*}, Dr. Pankaj S. Suvera²

ABSTRACT

Main purpose of the research is to study the socio-economical status among Tribal and Non-Tribal college students so investigator selected Tribal and Non-tribal college students. Both groups have 240 students. In each group has 120 tribal area and other group has 120 Non-tribal area college students. Data were collected from Tapi district. Scale was use for data collection personal datasheet and socio-economical status scale developed by Singh, Shyam& Kumar (2006). 2x2x2 factorial design was planned where types of students, gender and types of faculty were considered as independent variables and socio-economical status as dependent variables. Accordingly, 2x2x2 ANOVA was carried out to test the hypothesis. The non-tribal college student socio-economical status is better than tribal college student. The Male college student socio-economical status is better than female college student. The science college student socio-economical status is better than arts college student. The socio-economic status are significant effect of types of student and gender (AxB) of college students. The interaction effect (AxC), (BxC) and (AxBxC) are not significant.

Keywords: *Socio-Economical Status, Tribal, Non-Tribal, College Student*

The tribal development schemes and program of government have always stressed upon unfolding the capabilities of tribal communities through strategic Planning in accordance with their culture and values. These schemes and program aimed at mainstreaming tribal, so as to bring prosperity in their lives. Towards accomplishment of the said objective and bringing qualitative change in the lives of tribal people, the State Government is implementing and further planning to implement several large scale projects with the help of commercial partners like private sector units, cooperative and public sector undertakings to double the income of ITDP Talukas in next five years with the involvement of BPL families as major participants. This goal is now feasible due to enhanced funding under TASP, high economic growth rate of the State,

¹M. Phil. Research Scholar, Sardar Patel University, Vallabhvidhyanager, India

²Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Sardar Patel University, Vallabhvidhyanager, India

*Responding Author

Received: February 22, 2017; Revision Received: May 21, 2017; Accepted: June 15, 2017

A Study of Socio-Economical Status among Tribal and Non-Tribal College Student

increased opportunities in dairy, horticulture and service sectors, and involvement of private sector organizations on PPP model Govt.

Generation of productive and gainful employment with decent working conditions on a sufficient scale to absorb the growing labor force is a critical element in strategy plan for achieving inclusive growth. In terms of most social indicators the Scheduled Castes (SCs) and the Scheduled Tribes (STs) among social groups are the most marginalized section. The development of the tribal population in India has been a major concern of the Government, Voluntary agencies, NGOs, Social reformers, Social scientists, etc. Unemployment leading to immense poverty can be directly linked to the increase in terrorism and rising membership of tribal in the ranks of Maoists and Naxals.

Tribal Economy The socio-economic structure in tribal communities is markedly different from that of the non-tribal or advanced groups of people. They have a very simple technology which fits well with their ecological surroundings and conservation outlook. Moreover, their economy can be said to be 'subsistence type'. They practice different type of occupation and sustain themselves and live on marginal economy.

Socioeconomic Status

"Social class refers to the hierarchical distinctions between individuals or groups in societies or cultures." Social class influences socioeconomic status because of how people are treated depending on the class they come from, which may be determined by various factors. Socioeconomic status strongly influences the varying student perspectives on the value and attainability of higher education. The probability of students attending schools of higher education is more likely in students from higher socio-economic backgrounds of Education can increase opportunities for income and job security. One's level of education can also be an indicator of socioeconomic status. Socioeconomic status is based on income, but too often is connected to race as well. Individuals with lower incomes and less education (usually women and members of racial/ethnic groups) have higher death rates than better educated, wealthier people, and the differences between these groups are increasing.

Socioeconomic status(SES) is an economic and sociological combined total measure of a person's work experience and of an individual's or family's economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, and occupation.

When analyzing a family's SES, the household income, earners' education, and occupation are examined, as well as combined income, versus with an individual, when their own attributes are assessed.

A Study of Socio-Economical Status among Tribal and Non-Tribal College Student

Socioeconomic status is typically broken into three categories, high SES, middle SES, and low SES to describe the three areas a family or an individual may fall into. When placing a family or individual into one of these categories any or all of the three variables (income, education, and occupation) can be assessed.

Aims Of The Study

1. To study the socio-economical status among the tribal and Non-tribal college student.
2. To study the socio economical status among the male and female college student.
3. To study the socio-economical status among arts and science college student.
4. To study the interaction effect between types of student, and gender on socio-economical status of the college student.
5. To study the interaction effect between the types of student and types faculty on socio-economical status of the college student.
6. To study the interaction effect between the gender and types of faculty on socio-economical status of the college student.
7. To study the interaction effect between types of student, gender and types of faculty on socio-economical status of the college student.

Hypothesis

1. There is no difference between the socio economics status of the Tribal and Non Tribal college students
2. There is no different between the socio economical status of the male and female college student.
3. There is no different between the socio economical status of the arts and science college students.
4. There is no interaction effect on the socio economical status of the types of the students and gender of college students.
5. There is no interaction effect on the socio economical status of the types of the students and types of faculty college students.
6. There is no interaction effect on the socio economical status gender and types of faculty college students.
7. There is no interaction effect on the socio economical status of the types of the students, gender and types of faculty college students.

METHOD

Participants

The aim and object of this research is to study of socio economical status among the Tribal and Non Tribal college students. For this purpose, areas of Tapidistic were selected. For this research 240 college students would be selected as a sample from selected Tribal and Non Tribal areas of Tapi district by random system. Out of which 120 would be tribal and 120 Non-tribal areas

A Study of Socio-Economical Status among Tribal and Non-Tribal College Student

college students. Out of which 60 would be male and 60 would be female. From each of these 30 arts and 30 science college student.

Research Design

This research was adopted 2x2x2 factorial design with 2 types of student (tribal and Non-tribal), 2 gender (male and female) and 2 types of faculty (arts and science).

N=240	Tribal(A1)		Non-tribal(A2)	
Variables	Male(b1)	Female(b2)	Male(b1)	Female(b2)
Arts (c1)	30	30	30	30
Science(c2)	30	30	30	30

Materials

For this research to collect the required information following tools was used.

Personal Data Sheet

Certain personal information about respondents included in the sample of research is useful and important for research. Here also, for collecting such important information, personal data sheet was prepared. With the help of this personal data sheet, the information about types of student, gender and types of faculty of the college students.

Socio economical status

Socio-economic Questionnaire developed by Singh, Shyam & Kumar (2006). The questionnaire contains 25 items. The test- retest reliability coefficients is 0.65 and internal consistency coefficient is 0.94. The author has reported satisfactory validity of the questionnaire.

Statistical Analysis

ANOVA test was used to get information about socio-economical status with reference to types of students, gender and types of faculty.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Socio economical status with reference to types of students, gender and types of faculty of the college students.

The objective was to study Socio economical status with reference to types of student, gender and types of faculty of the college students in this context, 7 null hypotheses (Ho. 1 to 7) were constructed. For this purpose 2x2x2 factorial design was framed. To examine these null hypotheses, statistical techniques of three ways ANOVA was used. The results obtained are presented in Table No. 1 to 3.

A Study of Socio-Economical Status among Tribal and Non-Tribal College Student

Table 1 Mean and SD of socio-economical status with reference to types of student, gender and types of faculty of the tribal and non-tribal college students (N=240)

Independent Variables→			Types of Faculty	
↓	↓	↓	Arts C1	Science C2
			Types of Students	Tribal A1
Female B2	M =56.37 SD =16.59 N =30	M =55.67 SD =20.43 N =30		
Non-Tribal A2	Gender	M =16.17 SD =15.04 N =30		M =65.10 SD =19.64 N =30
	Female B2	M =71.67 SD =17.12 N =30		M =83.17 SD =24.85 N =30

According to 2x2x2 factorial design, ANOVA of types of student, gender and types of faculty with reference to socio economical status of the tribal and non-tribal college students in table No. 2

Table 2 ANOVA summary of socio-economical status with reference to types of student, gender and types of faculty of the tribal and non-tribal collage students.

Source of Variance	Sum square	of df	Mean Sum of Square	F	Level of Significant
Types of Students(A)	14899.50	1	14899.50	46.32	0.01
Gender (B)	5014.20	1	5014.20	15.59	0.01
Types of Faculty(C)	2464.00	1	2464.00	7.66	0.01
AxB	1909.70	1	1909.70	5.94	0.05
AxC	196.20	1	196.20	0.61	NS
BxC	61.00	1	61.00	0.19	NS
AxBxC	1105.10	1	1105.10	3.44	NS
Error (SSW)	74632.17	232	321.69		
SST	100281.87	239			

** P < 0.01,*P>0.05, NS = Not Significant.

The result according to 2x2x2 factorial design, ANOVA of types of student, gender and types of faculty with socio economical status of the tribal and non-tribal college students in table No. 3

Table 3 (N=360) Mean score of socio-economical status with reference to types of student, gender and types of faculty of the tribal and non-tribal college students.

Independent Variables	Categories	N	Mean	Difference between the mean
Types of Students(A)	Tribal A1	120	54.27	15.76
	Non-Tribal A2	120	70.03	
Gender (B)	Male B1	120	57.56	9.16
	Female B2	120	66.72	
Types of Faculty(C)	Arts C1	120	58.94	6.41
	Science C2	120	65.35	

A Study of Socio-Economical Status among Tribal and Non-Tribal College Student

Socio-economical status with reference to tribal and non-tribal of the college students. To study about there is significant difference or not between Socio-economical status of tribal and non-tribal areas college students, null hypothesis No. 1 was constructed. Ho. 1: There is no difference between the Socio-economical status of tribal and non-tribal areas college students. The F value of types of students of the (Table No. 2) is 46.32. The present value is statistically significant at 0.01 levels. When check the difference between Socio-economical status of tribal and non-tribal areas college students by F test, significant F value was found. Table No. 3 reveals that the mean scores of Socio-economical status of tribal and non-tribal college students are 54.27 and 70.03 respectively and the difference between two is 15.76 which is high and not negligible. Hence the null hypothesis No. 1 is rejected and it is conclude that there is significant difference between the Socio-economical status of tribal and non-tribal areas college students.

The non-tribal areas students possess high socio-economical status than the tribal areas college students. Social atmosphere of tribal students is rather narrow than the other students. Less importance is given to eruptive activity in this atmosphere. Their financial facilities than other students comparatively. There is no such atmosphere like other students that they can discuss freely. Sometimes tribal students have to face injustice in their study, which leads them to narrow mindedness. Tribal society lives in remote and forest area. As a result of that there is less difficulty in their dress and day to day needs due to their poor economic position. In this situation they feel difficulty in inter-retiling with other people. Therefore tribal students being in less contact with other students, which can affect to their socio-economical status.

Socio-economical status with reference to male and female related college students. To study about there is significant difference or not between Socio-economical status of male and female related college students, null hypothesis No. 2 was constructed. Ho. 2: There is no difference between the Socio-economical status of male and female related college students. When F test was applied to check difference between Socio-economical status of male and female related college students, significant F value was found. The F value (Table No. 2) is 15.59 and which is statistically significant at level 0.01. Table No. 3 reveals that the mean scores of Socio-economical status of male and female college students of are 57.56 and 66.72 respectively and the difference between two is 9.16 which is high and not negligible. Hence the null hypothesis No.2 is rejected and it is conclude that there is significant difference between the Socio-economical status of male and female related college students.. The male students possess more Socio-economical status than the female college students.

The possible reason of this result can be said that more importance is given to male in Indian society. There work and activities are inspired family and social decisions are taken by male people in male centered Indian society. Male and female are differently considered for the same work in Indian society. Male person are encouraged for their logical and creative work while female persons are pressurized to behave in society and out of society considering limitations of

A Study of Socio-Economical Status among Tribal and Non-Tribal College Student

society. Boy's students enjoy comparatively more freedom. They have external work and activities also female persons are centered to domestic work and domestic decisions only. Hence their socio-economical status can be less than their counter part.

Socio-economical status with reference to arts and science students college student. To study about there is significant difference or not between Socio-economical status of arts and science college student, null hypothesis No. 3 was constructed. Ho. 3: There is no difference between the Socio-economical status of arts and science students college student.. In first sight to show the mean of faculty it seen that, there is significant difference between Socio-economical status of arts and science students college student.. . When F test was applied to check difference between Socio-economical status of male and female related college students, significant F value was found. The F value (Table No. 2) is 7.66 and which is statistically significant at level 0.01. Table No. 3 reveals that the mean scores of Socio-economical status of arts and science college students are 58.94 and 65.35 respectively and the difference between two is 6.41 which is high and not negligible. Hence the null hypothesis No.3 is rejected and it is conclude that there is significant difference between the Socio-economical status of arts and science college students. The arts students possess more Socio-economical status than the science college students.

The possible reason for the result can be attributed that, in present times, interaction of student among each other in science stream is comparative more than that of arts students. Moreover, they maintain close control among each other due to practical work and tuition closer. Hence they exchange their views and thoughts among each other. They can get novel knowledge and information due to this interaction. Arts faculty students generally belong to middle and poor economic class. Their family and social atmosphere also does not encourage then their maturity. As a result of that, their socio-economical status may be loss. In present times, loss importance is given of arts faculty students, which creates disappointment in students.

Table 4 Mean score of socio-economical status with reference to interaction effect of types of students and gender of the college students.

Independent Variables →		Gender (B)	
↓	↓Categories→	Male B1	Female B2
Types of Students (A)	Tribal A1	52.52	56.02
	Non-Tribal A2	62.63	77.42

According to table No. 2 the F value (5.94) shows significant interaction effect of types of students and gender on socio-economical status of the college students. The F value is statistically significant at 0.05 levels so the null hypothesis No. 4 is rejected and it is conclude that there is significant interaction effect of types of students and gender on socio-economical status of the college students. Table No. 4 also indicate that the significant interaction effect of types of students and gender (AXB) on socio-economical status of the college students.

A Study of Socio-Economical Status among Tribal and Non-Tribal College Student

Table 5 Mean score of socio-economical status with reference to interaction effect of types of students and types of faculty of the college students.

Independent Variables →		Types of Faculty (C)	
↓	↓Categories→	Arts C1	Science C2
Types of Students (A)	Tribal A1	51.97	56.57
	Non-Tribal A2	65.92	74.13

Socio-economical status with reference to interaction effect of types of students and types of faculty of the college students. To check the interaction effect of types of students and types of faculty of the college students null hypothesis No. 5 was framed. Ho. 5: There is no interaction effect of the types of students and types of faculty on socio-economical status of the college students. To show the table No.2 the F value of socio-economical status of college students with reference to interaction between types of students and types of faculty (AXC) is 0.61 found. The value is statistically not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis No. 7 is accept and it is conclude that there is no significant interaction effect of types of students and types of faculty on socio-economical status of the college students.

Table 6 Mean score of socio-economical status with reference to interaction effect of gender and types of faculty of the college students.

Independent Variables →		Types of Faculty (C)	
↓	↓Categories→	Arts C1	Science C2
Gender (B)	Male B1	53.87	64.02
	Female B2	61.28	69.42

The socio-economical status with reference to interaction effect of gender and types of faculty of the college students. To check the interaction effect of gender and types of faculty of the college students null hypothesis No. 6 was framed. Ho. 6: There is no interaction effect of the gender and types of faculty on socio-economical status of the college students. To show the table No.2 the F value of socio-economical status of college students with reference to interaction between types of students and types of faculty (BXC) is 0.19 found. The value is statistically not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis No. 6 is accept and it is conclude that there is no significant interaction effect of gender and types of faculty on socio-economical status of the college students.

Socio-economical status with reference to interaction effect of types of students, gender and types of faculty of the college students. To check the interaction effect of types of students, gender and types of faculty on socio-economical status of the college students null hypothesis No. 7 was framed. Ho. 7: There is no interaction effect of the types of students, gender and types of faculty on socio-economical status of the college students. To show the table No.2 the F value of Socio-economical status of college students with reference to interaction between types of students, gender and types of faculty (AXBXC) is 3.44 found. The value is statistically not

A Study of Socio-Economical Status among Tribal and Non-Tribal College Student

significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis No. 7 is accept and it is conclude that there is no significant interaction effect of types of students, gender and types of faculty on socio-economical status of the college students.

CONCLUSION

1. There is significant mean difference between the socio economics status of the Tribal and Non Tribal college students as non-tribal students have more socio economical status.
2. There is significant mean difference between the socio economics status of the male and female college students as female students have more socio economical status.
3. There is significant mean difference between the socio economics status of the arts and science college students as science student have more socio economical status.
4. There is significant mean interaction effect of the socio economical status of the types of students and gender of the college students.
5. There is no interaction effect of the socio economical status in the types of students and types of faculty of the college students.
6. There is no interaction effect of in the socio economical status in the gender and types of faculty of the college students.
7. There is no interaction effect of the socio economical status in the types of the students, gender and types of faculty of the college students.

Acknowledgments

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interests

The author declared no conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- Australian Bureau of Statistics (1994). *National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Survey*, AGPS, Canberra.
- Kapoor, S. D and Singh, R. N. (1998). *Socio-economic status scale Questionnaire (SESSQ-Urban)*, the psycho center, New Delhi.
- Kulshrestha, S.P. and De, P. (1970). *Socio-economic status scale for urban*, from A.G.V.M Sardarshahar (Rajasthan).
- Panday, R. N. (1996). Development of questionnaire for social class evaluation. *Indian Psychological Review*, 1, 53-54
- Pareek, U. and Trivedi, G. (1964). Categorization of rural socio-economic group. *Journal of Social Work*, 24, 293-303.
- Raudhar, W. B. (1960). *A scale for measuring socio-economic status of farm families*. Nagpur Agricultural college, Naggpur (M.H.).

A Study of Socio-Economical Status among Tribal and Non-Tribal College Student

- Shah, B.(1986). *Social Distance Scale*, Agra Psychological Research Cell.
- Singh, R. A. and saxena, S. K. (1981). *Socio-economic status Scale*, Agra Psychological Research Cell.
- Tell, J. E. ; Jones, J.; Bonizzato, P. ; Mazzi, M. ; Amaddeo, F. and Tansella, M. (2005). A Census based socio-economic status (SES) index as tool to examine the relationship between mental health service use and deprivation. *Social science Medicine*, 25, PMID, 15937059.
- Varma, R. M. (1962). Development of a tool to appraise socio-economic status. *Journal of Psychological Research*, 6, 35-38

How to cite this article: Gamit M, Suvera P (2017), A Study of Socio-Economical Status among Tribal and Non-Tribal College Student, *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Vol. 4 (3), DIP:18.01.233/20170403