



DISSIMILARITIES IN THE BEHAVIOURAL PROBLEMS OF CHILDREN IN RURAL AND URBAN AREA

Dr. Pradeep Kumar

Associate Prof & Head, Department of Education, D.S.College, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

It is the behavioural pattern of a child deciding what type of citizen he/she is going to become. A comparative study was conducted to know behaviour problems shown by children in rural and urban communities at school level. The design selected for this study is comparative research design which is descriptive in nature. To carry out the present study the population comprises of children from urban and rural areas of Etah & Kasganj cities of Uttar Pradesh. A sample size of 200 was arbitrarily taken (100 from rural & 100 from urban areas) of Etah & Kasganj cities 10 villages of these areas. Researcher employed random sampling technique to select sample units of the study. The findings of the study show that rural children do not differ significantly than urban children in personality problems. Urban children significantly have much more anti-social problems than rural children. Urban children are going to form better human capital with more anti-social behaviour in comparison to rural children, which in the present socio-economic and political context is sure to increase the disparity in urban & rural development.

KEYWORDS: *Behaviour problems, Home-school influences, Rural/urban communities*

INTRODUCTION

Child is the responsible citizen of tomorrow. The behavioural pattern of a child goes a long way in deciding what type of citizen he/she is going to become. The child is the future human capital and the efficiency of capital depends upon the behavioural pattern during his childhood.

“All men are created equal” is a phrase so often used, but it is not always meaningful. All are equal before law, equal in their claims to freedom, equal in right to learn, but certainly not equal in the facilities provided to them for development.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this paper are to examine whether behavioural pattern of the children depends on the external surroundings they live in. Specifically, the objective of this paper is to examine whether rural & urban surrounding have any influence over the behavioural pattern of children.

HYPOTHESIS

In this paper, the following hypothesis is proposed to be tested, “There is significant difference in the pattern of behavioural problems of children rural & urban fields.”

METHODOLOGY

For the present study three behavioural problems of the children have been studied i.e.

1. Scholastic Problem
 - a. Lack of reading ability
 - b. Lack of understanding
 - c. Lack of interest for the study

- d. Lack of playing habits
- e. Lack of cleanliness
- f. Lack of interest for school
2. Personality Problems
 - a. Timidity
 - b. Irritability
 - c. Lack of sociability
 - d. Lack of possessive friendly values
3. Anti-social Problems
 - a. Lying
 - b. Disobeying
 - c. Mischievous behaviour
 - d. Truancy

On the basis of rating scale, children were classified in three grades, first, second & third. The children of age group of 5-15 (both inclusive) were taken as population for the purpose of the present study. Grades were assigned on the basis of marks obtained by each child & marks were given on the basis of few prepared questions by the researcher themselves. To find out any disparities between behavioural pattern of children of rural & urban areas, χ^2 test was applied (contingency table).

SAMPLING

A sample size of 200 was arbitrarily taken (100 from rural & 100 from urban areas) for the study of children of urban areas, Etah & Kasganj cities were selected and for rural areas 10 villages were randomly selected. For the selection of

children the institutions & students were also selected randomly.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The results are given in 3 tables:

Table 1
Distribution of Cases on the Basis of Scholastic Problems
(Higher the grade more the problem)

Grades & Rating	Mild (0-4)	Moderate (5-8)	Extreme (9-12)	Total
Rural	16	35	49	100
Urban	46	32	22	100
Total	62	67	71	100

$\chi^2 = 24.89$ (significant at .01 level) $df = 2$

It is clear that in scholastic problems, the children of rural & urban areas differ significantly.

A glance at the distribution of cases makes it clear that the children of rural areas are at disadvantages in scholastic problems. While in rural areas, almost half (49) of children has extreme scholastic problems contrary to this only (22 less than one forth) had extreme problems. Viewing the same thing from the other side of children having no significant

scholastic problems were 46 out of 100 in urban areas and 16 rural areas. The difference in moderate problem is not much, i.e., 35 & 32 in rural & urban areas.

The message is very clear that the rural children are from poor human capital, in comparison to urban children, thereby widening the gap between development level of rural & urban areas

Table 2
Frequency Distribution of Cases on the Basis of Personality Problems
(Higher the grade more the problem)

Grades & Rating	Mild (0-4)	Moderate (5-8)	Extreme (9-12)	Total
Rural	26	50	24	100
Urban	24	56	20	100
Total	50	106	44	100

$\chi^2 = 77$ (not significant at .01 level) $df = 2$

It is clear that in the case of personality problems, there is no significant difference between rural & urban areas ; this

means that the children of both reasons faces same type of personality problems, i.e., mild moderate and extreme.

Table 3
Frequency Distribution of Cases on the Basis of Anti-social Problems
(Higher the grade more the problem)

Grades & Rating	Mild (0-4)	Moderate (5-8)	Extreme (9-12)	Total
Rural	39	36	25	100
Urban	22	33	45	100
Total	61	69	70	100

$\chi^2 = 10.57$ (not significant at .01 level) $df = 2$

The difference between children of rural & urban areas is clear significantly in anti-social behaviour in favour of urban children.

CONCLUSION

1. Rural children significantly have much Scholastic Problem than urban children
2. Rural children do not differ significantly than urban children in personality problems
3. Urban children significantly have much more anti-social problems than rural children
4. Apparently, it is a paradoxical situation that urban children having less scholastic problems are more anti-social in behaviour and rural children having extreme scholastic problems are comparative less anti-social.
5. The above analysis lead us only one conclusion that urban children are going to form better human capital with more anti-social behaviour in comparison to rural children, which in the present socio-economic and political context is sure to increase the disparity in urban & rural development.

SUGGESTIONS

Government policies should be so framed as to reduce the scholastic problems of rural children, so that they can be at par with the urban children and the quality of human capital formation in rural areas may not be poorer to that of urban areas.

More funds should be allocated to execute Guidance and Counselling services in school, through a trend specialist, and by up lifting the standard of education, by imparting value education, to reduce the anti-social behaviour among children of urban areas.

REFERENCES

1. Arnold, F., Bulatao, R. A., Buripakdi, c., Chung, B. , Fawcett, J. T., Iritani, T., Lee, S. I., & Wu, T. S. (1975). *The value of children: Vol. 1. Introduction and comparative analysis. Honolulu, HI: East-West Population Institute.*
2. Bharat, S. (2001). *On the periphery: The psychology of gender. In J. Pandey (Ed.), Psychology in India revisited: Developments in the discipline, Vol. 2 (pp. 300- 355). New Delhi: Sage.*

3. Government of India (2002). *Economic Survey 2001-2002*. Government of India: Ministry of Finance, Economic Division.
4. Hoffman, L. W. (1988). Cross-cultural differences in childrearing goals. In R. A. LeVine, P. M. Miller, & M. M. West (Eds.), *Parental behavior in diverse societies. New directions for child development* (pp. 99-122).
5. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. Hoffman, L. W., & Hoffman, M. L. (1973). *The value of children to parents*. In I. T. Fawcett (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on population* (pp. 19-76). New York: Basic Books.
6. Mishra, R. C. (1994). Individualist-collectivist orientations across generations. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and practice* (pp. 225-238). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
7. Mishra, R. C. (1997). Family support and health care in a culturally changing community in northern India. *Social Science International*, 13, 10-18.
8. Mishra, R. C. (2001). Health cognition and practices among the Kharwars of Naugarh region of Varanasi. Paper presented at the National Seminar on Tribal Health in India: Present Status and Future Perspectives, Department of Social Sciences, National Institute of Health and Family Welfare, New Delhi, February 8-10.
9. Rao, T.V. (1981). Psychology of population and family planning. In U. Pareek (Ed.), *A survey of research in psychology, 1971-1976, Part II*. (pp. 714-746). Bombay: Popular Prakashan.
10. Saraswathi, T. S., & Dutta, R. (1988). Current trends in developmental psychology: A life span perspective. In J. Pandey (Ed.), *Psychology in India: The state-of-the-art* (pp. 93-152). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
11. Schwarz, B., Chakkarath, P., Trommsdorff, G., Schwenk, O., & Nauck, B. (2001). Report on selected instruments of the value of children main study. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany.
12. Sinha, D. (1969). *Indian villages in transition*. New Delhi: Asia Publishing Company.
13. Sinha, D. (1988). The family scenario in a developing country and its implications for mental health: The case of India. In P. R. Dasen, I. W. Berry, & N. Sartorius (Eds.), *Health and cross-cultural psychology: Toward applications* (pp. 48-71). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
14. Sinha, D., & Tripathi, R. C. (1994). Individualism in a collectivist culture: A case of coexistence of opposites. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and practice* (pp. 123-136). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
15. Thurstone, (1947). *Multiple factor analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
16. Trommsdorff, G., Zheng, G., & Tardif, T. (2002). Value of children and intergenerational relations in cultural context. In P. Boski, F. I. R. van de Vijver, & A. M. Chodrynica (Eds.), *New directions in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 581-601). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Psychologii.