

A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF SOCIAL SUPPORT, LOCUS OF CONTROL OF UNTOUCHABLES

ANIL KUMAR L.TENGLI, DR.BABURAO.H.MUDDANKAR AND DR S.P.MELKERI

Abstract: The present research is designed to explore A Psychological study of Social Support, Locus of Control of Untouchables of Hyderabad Karnataka Region, (Gulbarga, Bidar, Raichur, Ballary and Kopal Districts). Hyderabad Karnataka region is Socio-economically backward and the presence of individuals with Social Support and locus of control is lower compared to other developed parts of the Karnataka state. This leads to many psychological consequences of negative nature on the person, family and society. Totally 400 sample constituted in the study in which 200 rural and 200 are from urban areas, it was decided to use "P.G.I. Social Support Questionnaire" developed and standardized by RituNehara, P.Kulhara and S.K.Verma., (1988)., and "Locus of Control Scale" (LOC) developed by Sanjay Vohara., This paper depicts that the empirical evidence on "A Psychological Study of Social Support, Locus of Control of Untouchables" in Hyderabad Karnataka region, Kalburgi in Karnataka State.

Key words: Locus of Control, Social Support.

Introduction: Since 2000 years caste system is in practice in India based on this sudhars have lost their rights and they remain untouchable. Many social reformers, sadus and santhas and political luminaries tried hard to eliminate this practice of untouchability. It could not removed still it is in practice. Dr B R Ambedkar took the initiation for elimination for caste system and untouchability by peaceful way of editation later he could not find solution to it, he felt that the practice of cast system and untouchability is the barriers for development of nation until it removed there is no development for the society particularly untouchables.

The elected representatives of other than untouchables are not changed their mindset of discrimination. They have full of prejudice and stereotypic attitude towards untouchables. Now there is need to give a thought on Essence of reintroduction of separate electorate system for untouchables. This research proposes that "A Psychological study of Social Support, Locus of Control of untouchables". The study wants to seek mandate of social support and the locus of control of the people.

Social support: Social support is concept that is generally understood in an intuitive sense as the help from other people in a difficult life situation. One of the first definitions was put forward by (Cobb-1976). He defined social support as "the individual belief that one is cared for and loved, esteemed, valued, and belongings to a network of communication and mutual obligations".

Stephen explained that social support is "resources from the environment that can be beneficial to psychological and physical health" according to encyclopedia of psychology (Alan E. KazclinsChiefed) The terms social support refers to the process through which help is provided to others. This

process is influenced by characteristics of the social environment and individual participants, transactions that occur between participations, the resources that are provided and participant's perceptions of these transactions and their implications.

Locus of control: The concept of locus of control as derived from social learning theory (Rotter-1954), provides a useful means for measuring individual difference in the extent to which reinforcement is viewed as a consequence of one's own behavior or a consequence of such forces as "chance" "fate" or 'powerful other'.

Concept of Internal-External Control of reinforcement was developed from social learning theory which describes the degree to which an individual believes that reinforcements are contingent upon his own behavior. Internal control refers to individuals who believe that reinforcement is contingent upon their own behavior, capacities or attributes. External controls refer to individuals who believe that reinforcements are not under their personal control but rather are under the control of powerful others, luck, chance, fate etc. thus depending on his past reinforcement experiences, a person will have developed a consistent attitude tending towards either an internal or external locus as the source of reinforcement.

Statement of the problem:

A Psychological Study of Social Support, Locus of Control of untouchables.

Hypothesis: The following are major objectives of the study:

- 1). To assess the effect of Locus of control on gender of the sample sub groups.
- 2). To examine the effect of Locus of control on Rural and Urban of the sample sub groups.
- 3). To study the domicile differences in social support on rural and urban of the sample sub groups.

4). To examine the gender differences in social support on male and female of the sample sub groups.

Objectives:The following are the hypotheses of the study:

1). There would be significant effect of Locus of control on gender of sc and non sc participates.

2). There would be significant effect of Locus of control on domicile of sc and non sc participates.

3). There would be significant differences in gender of social support of sc and non sc Participants.

4). There would be significant differences in domicile of social support of sc and non sc Participants.

Sample design:

Gender	Domicile				Total
	Rural		Urban		
Male	25	25	25	25	100
Female	25	25	25	25	100
Total	50	50	50	50	200

In the present study, the total sample consists of 200, Rural Male Sc 25, Urban Male Sc 25 and Rural female Sc 25 and Urban female Sc 25, Rural Male Non Sc 25, Urban Male Non Sc 25, and Rural Female Non Sc 25, Urban Female Non Sc 25 and grand total is 200.

The setting:The field work for the present study will conduct in Gulbarga, District of Hyderabad Karnataka

Region. The main reason for choosing Hyderabad Karnataka region is that it is backward area.

Tools:To study the above hypotheses, the following standardized tools were used. Descriptions of the Tolls are:

1). Personal Data Schedule.

2). P.G.I. Social Support Questionnaire.

By:-RituNehara, P.Kulhara and S.K.Verma.,(1988).

3).Locus of Control Scale. By: - Sanjay Vohara (LOC).

Statistical analysis:Keeping in view the research objectives and hypothesis of the study the statistical analysis, like-Mean, SD and t-test, was applied on the collected data.

Discussion:Table-1: Shows the Mean, SD and t-value of Locus of Control of Male and Female Sc and non Sc.

Variables		N	Mean	SD	t-value	Level of Significance
Powerful	Male	200	8.49	1.41	2.73	**
	Female	200	8.06	1.72		
Chance Control	Male	200	8.08	1.55	5.52	**
	Female	200	7.12	1.91		
Individual Control	Male	200	4.64	2.16	0.55	NS
	Female	200	4.52	2.24		

**Significant at 0.01 level, NS-Not significant.

The above table shows the mean, SD and t-value of powerful locus of control of male sc and non sc participant's is 8.49 and 1.41 is higher than the female participant's i.e. 8.06 and 1.72 respectively. The calculated t-value 2.73 is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is significant difference between male and female sc and non sc participant's powerful locus of control.

The mean and SD of chance control of locus of control of male sc and non sc participant's is 8.08 and 1.55 is higher than the female sc and non sc participant's i.e. 7.12 and 1.91 respectively. The calculated t-value 5.52 is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is significant t difference in chance control between of male and female sc and non sc participant's. Hence formulated hypothesis is rejected.

The mean and SD of individual control of locus of control of male sc and non sc male participant's is 4.64 and 2.16 is higher than the sc and non sc female participant's i.e. 4.52 and 2.24 respectively. The calculated t-value 0.55 is not significant, at 0.05 level of significance. There is no significant difference between sc and non sc male and female participant's individual control of locus of control.

Table-2: Shows the Mean, SD and t-value of Locus of Control of Rural and Urban Sc and non Sc.

Variables and Groups		N	Mean	SD	t-value	Level of Significance
Powerful	Urban	200	8.33	1.41	0.62	NS
	Rural	200	8.23	1.64		
Chance Control	Urban	200	8.56	1.71	0.49	NS
	Rural	200	7.65	1.89		
Individual Control	Urban	200	4.59	2.26	0.09	NS
	Rural	200	4.57	2.14		

NS-Not Significant.

Table 2 shows the mean and SD of powerful locus of control of sc and non scParticipant’s of urban is 8.33 and 1.54 is higher than the rural sc and non sc Participant’s i.e. 8.23 and 1.64 respectively. The calculated t-value 0.62 is not significant. There is no significant difference between urban and rural sc and non sc participant’s powerful locus of control.

The mean and SD of chance of locus of control of sc and non sc rural participant’s is 7.65 and 1.89 is higher than the urban sc and non sc participant’s i.e. 7.56 and .71 respectively. The calculated t-value 0.49

is not significant. There is significant difference in chance control of locus of control between urban and rural participant’s of sc and non sc.

The mean and SD of individual locus of control of urban sc and non sc participant’s is 4.59 and 2.26 is higher than the rural sc and non sc participant’s i.e. 4.57 and 2.14 respectively. The calculated t-value 0.09 is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is no significant difference between urban and rural sc and non sc participant’s individual control of locus of control. Hence the hypothesis is rejected.

Table-3: Shows the Mean, SD and t-value of Social Support of Male and Female Sc and non Sc.

Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-value
Male	100	6.28	0.96	24.22**
Female	100	8.46	0.85	

**Significant at 0.01 level

Table 3 shows the Mean, SDs and t-value of Gender on high social support and low social support sample. The mean score of high social support group is 6.28 and low social support is 8.46 respectively. The t-value is 24.22 which is significant at 0.01 level. It shows that the male sample group have high social support and Female sample group showed low social support.

Table-4: Shows the Mean, SD and t-value of Social Support of Rural and Urban Sc and non Sc.

Social Support	N	Mean	SD	t-value
Rural	100	9.85	1.94	19.85**
Urban	100	5.62	2.30	

**Significant at 0.01 level

Table 4 shows the mean, SDs and t-value of Domicile on high social support and low social support sample. The mean score of high social support group is 9.85 and low social support is 5.62 respectively. The t-value is 19.85 which is significant at 0.01 level. It shows that the rural sample group have high social support and urban sample group showed low social support.

Lower social support have sadness, anxiety, helplessness and anger are also common. Stigmatization and isolation are major stressors. Bereavement is complicated by fear, shame, dependency and hopelessness. Therefore social support is essential to maintain integrity and supportiveness of the sample’s social unity by encouraging open communication between those involved and by educating about social communications.

Conclusions: Majour findings of the study as fallows:

- 1.Males scparticepant’s have significantly higher locus of control than females.
2. The rural and urban sc and non scparticepant’s locus of control in the Powerful, Chance control, Individual control no significant difference.
- 3.Malesc respondents have shown high social support as comared to female sc and non scparticepant’s.
- 4.The rural sc sample are found to have greater social support than the urban sample group.

Limitations of the study: The findings of the study have for reaching implications in the area of Sc and Non Sc Adolescent's issues like Education and challenges of learning process science social support is a part of life event which re-gives to be reduce in order to improve Locus of control of the adolescents.

References:

1. Achamamba. B and Gopikumar. K (1990): Locus of control and job involvement among men and omen bank employees. *Indian Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol-27.
2. Ashok D. Holkar and S.P.Melkeri (2013) the impact of socio-cultural deprivation on personality, social distance and locus of control of deprived and non deprived. An unpublished Ph.D thesis, Gulbarga University, Gulbarga.
3. John Poulin Rong Deng; Travis Sky Ingersoll; Heather Witt; Melanie Swain, 2012 Perceived Family and Friend Support and the Psychological well-Being of American and Chinese Elderly Persons. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology*. Vol 27; No 4; 305-317.
4. Kureshi and Husain A (1981): LOC among the Indian, Iranian and Palestinian students. *Psychological studies*, vol-26, No:1.
5. Marion T. Wallace Christopher T. Barry; Virgil Zeigler-hill ; Bradley A. Green, 2012 Locus of Control as a Contributing Factor in the Relation between Self-perception and Adolescent Aggression *Aggressive Behavior*. Vol 38; No 3; 213-221.
6. Roland Imhoff; Julia Recker, 2012. Differentiating Islamophobia: Introducing a New Scale to Measure Islam prejudice and *Secular Islam Critique Political Psychology*. Vol 33; No 6; 811-824.
7. Seger Charles; Corr Philip, 2012, Prejudice and Personality: A Role for Positive-Approach Processes? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. Vol 35; No 6 446411-447.

Anil kumarl.tengli

Research scholar department of psychology,
Gulbarga university, gulbarga. Karnataka. India.

E-mail: aniltengli39@gmail.com

Dr.baburao.h.muddankar

Guest lecturer in psychology,
Govt. Degree college gulbarga. Karnataka. India.

E-mail: baburao_8088@rediffmail.com

Drs.p.melkeri

Chairman department of studies and research in psychology,
Gulbarga university, gulbarga. Karnataka. India.

E-mail: spmelkeri@gmail.com