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ABSTRACT

The aim of the study is to find the relationship between inferiority and dependence proneness among college students and to study is there any significant difference between study variables among college students in terms of gender as well as residence. 240 samples have been selected by the method of convenient sampling technique. The result indicated there is a significant positive relationship between dependence proneness and inferiority among college students in Trichy district. The study also revealed that there is no significant differences were found between inferiority and dependence proneness in terms of residence.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Dependence Proneness: Dependence generally refers to the seeking of nurturance, affection and protection. Dependency is the basic necessity of man. Man is a social animal and he/she is dependent on others for meeting various needs for his/her survival. Dependency is also one of the basic modes of interpersonal relationship. A new born baby is totally dependent on its mother for survival. Dependency in children is said to be initiated at first as an instrumental act in response to the nurturing behavior of adults especially the mother.
As the child grows older and older, it acquires independent behaviour gradually. But if the dependency is prolonged, a positive affect is likely to be attached to these nurturing cues leading to a condition in which dependency may turn into motivational tendency—ready to be activated at the instance of minimum cues in situation where dependency is not necessarily called for. A person having a large share of this tendency is known as dependence prone. Dependence proneness is thus a response disposition. Sinha and Khan (1971) defined dependence proneness as a motivational habit to depend on others in situations where such dependence is neither functional nor required.

According to Sinha (1968) characteristics of person with dependence proneness include “anxious, fatalist, unpractical and traditional, confides uncritically, likes to follow others, obeys elders and gets discouraged if he is not nurtured, not that committed to his or her work, nor does try to work hard for success”. Sinha has identified four types of dependence proneness, as given below

- **Affection-Affiliation** - To seek support, advice, and/or order from others; desires to be encouraged, helped and/or protected by others.
- **Lack of internal control** - Is not accountable and gets discouraged easily.
- **Evading responsibility** - Refusing or displacing responsibility for an unfavorable outcome; Try to avoid risk taking behavior; having escape behavior.
- **Conformity** - To confide with others uncritically; Lacking initiative; Lacking independent judgment or weak judgment.

Bornstein (1993) suggested that a dependency is best conceptualized as consisting of four separate but related concepts, such as:

- **Motivational** (i.e., a marked need for guidance, approval and support from others).
- **Cognitive** (i.e., a perception of self as powerless and ineffectual along with the belief that others are powerful and in control of the outcomes of the situation).
- **Affective** (i.e., a tendency to become anxious and fearful when required to function independently, especially when the products of one’s effort will be evaluated by others, or when the situation is likely to yield negative outcomes).
- **Behavioral** (i.e., a tendency to seek help, approval, guidance and reassurance from others).

Bandura and Walters (1963) have shown two varieties of dependency include:

- **Task oriented or instrumental dependency**, seeking help from other person to reach a goal.
- **Person-oriented or emotional dependency**, seeking emotional satisfaction from other persons.

Dependence proneness is a cultural characteristic typical of Indians and ingrained in their personality (Sinha, 1970). Indian social setting is predominantly authoritarian where compliance, submission and docility are the most priced virtues. Person who show dependence and satisfy the vanity of those who are in authority have less adjustment problems as compared to those who challenge the authority (Pandey and Sinha, 1968).

2. **INFERIORITY FEELINGS**

Ansbacher (1956) defined “inferiority complex is the presentation of the person to himself and others that he is not strong enough to solve the problem in a socially useful way”. 
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Inferiority complex is a depressive feeling of hopelessness or worthlessness; it is feeling that one is a failure, a personal disaster, nobody likes him/her, that one is not as good as other persons. It is feeling that one is unattractive, unintelligent or don’t have much ability as others. Becoming sensitive, nervous, self-conscious, etc., which are expressed in the form of hesitation, speechlessness, stammering, sweating, avoidance of works and responsibility, etc. are the few indicators of the presence of inferiority feelings. Inferiority complex can give rise to negative emotions in psyche, i.e., frustration, uncontrolled anger, bitterness, excessive shame, guilt, arrogance, envy, jealousy, greed, fear, suspicious nature, persistent agony or melancholy, mental instability, escapism tendencies, communication apprehension, poor will power, low grasping, absentmindedness, laziness, etc. These negative emotions can trigger emotional imbalance, which might affect the health.

According to Adler, inferiority complex arises when a person finds himself in a situation where his abilities and attitudes are denigrated or rejected by other people. Anything in the individual that is below the average, that provokes unfavourable comment or gives him/her a feeling of impotency or ineptitude leads to inferiority complex. Adolescents who consistently fail or repeat classes are found to develop inferiority complex and a non-progressive attitude towards school and peers. High degree of parental demands and expectations may lead to inferiority feelings. Rejection by family and peers, or exceedingly high expectations is often the root cause for inferiority complex. A bad relationship, history of abuse, poor self-image, stress, frustration and many other actors can damage their overall attitude towards life, which may directly affect the overall performance of a person. Such tendencies are deep-rooted in mind and nurtured by excessive negative emotions.

Inferiority complex among college students can manifest itself in several ways such as feeling of rejection, of being unloved, of being treated coldly and without affection, of being hated, of being despised, feelings of isolation, aloofness, or being out of it, perception of the world as threatening, dangerous, hostile or challenging, feelings of mistrust, of envy or jealousy toward others, general pessimism, feelings of tension, fatigue, strain or conflict, stomach and other psychosomatic disturbances, nightmares, emotional instability, uncertainty and inconsistency, acute conscious of self, etc. Inferiority complex is an exaggeration of normal inferiority feelings and individuals with inferiority complex display a tendency towards over compensation and over reaction.

3. OBJECTIVES
The objective of the study were to:

- Determine the relationship between inferiority and dependence proneness among college students.
- Find out the gender differences between inferiority and dependence proneness among college students.
- Find out if there is any significant difference between hostellers and day scholars in inferiority and dependence proneness among college students.

4. HYPOTHESIS

- There will be no significant relationship between inferiority and dependence proneness among college students.
- There will be no significant gender differences between inferiority and dependence proneness among college students.
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- There will be no significant difference between hostellers and day scholars in inferiority and dependence proneness among college students.

5. METHODS

Sample: A total of 240 college students from Arts and Science College situated in urban area of Trichy district were included in the study by using convenient sampling technique.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hosteller</th>
<th>Day Scholar</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study was conducted after the approval and ethical clearance from the College.

6. INSTRUMENTS

The data were collected using the following instruments:

- **Socio Demographic Data:** Socio demographic information of the participant were obtained through items focussing on the participant’s Age, Gender, Family type, Number of Siblings, Education, Residence and Birth Order.

- **Dependence Proneness Scale:** Dependence proneness scale developed by J.B.P.Sinha (1968). It consists of 20 items describing dependency or initiative taking behaviour. It is a likert type 5-point scale ranging from totally wrong to totally right. The scale has a reliability of approximately around 0.94 when administered individually.

- **The Inferiority-Insecurity Questionnaire:** The inferiority - insecurity questionnaire was developed by Dr.G.C.Pati (1976). It consists of 20 questions with dichotomous responses “yes” or “no”. The reliability of the questionnaire is 0.92 and its validity coefficient is 0.717.

7. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

In order to test the hypothesis, the following statistical analysis were used,

- To see the relationship between the inferiority and dependence proneness, Pearson”s coefficient of correlation test was used.

- “t” test was used to check the differences.

8. RESULTS

Demographic profile: There is equal respondents from male (50%) and female (50%); the majority of the respondents were form science stream (72.5%); having one sibling (64.2%) and were first born (60.8%); from nuclear family (61.7%) and urban domicile (67.5%).
Table 1 Relationship between inferiority feelings and dependence proneness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>‘r’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority</td>
<td>0.605*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence Proneness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows the relationship between inferiority and dependence proneness among college students. The correlation value for inferiority and dependence proneness is 0.605, which is significant at the level 0.05. This reveals that there is a significant positive relationship between inferiority and dependence proneness.

Table 2: Gender difference in the level of inferiority feelings and dependence proneness among college students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Variables</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>51.45</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>-1.107</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>53.39</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence Proneness</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>63.32</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>-1.705</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>68.35</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In inferiority, males’ mean and standard deviation values are 51.45, 9.29 and females’ mean, standard deviation values are 53.39, 9.89 respectively. The overall ‘t’ value is -1.107, which indicates that there is no significant difference between inferiority and gender.

In dependence proneness, males’ mean and standard deviation values are 63.32, 6.84 and females’ mean and standard deviation values are 68.35, 7.80 respectively. The overall ‘t’ value is -1.705, which indicates that there is no significant difference between dependence proneness.

Table 3: Difference between in the level of inferiority feelings and dependence proneness among college students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Variables</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority</td>
<td>Hosteller</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>51.82</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>-0.683</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day Scholar</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>53.02</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence Proneness</td>
<td>Hosteller</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>66.20</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>0.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day Scholar</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>65.47</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In inferiority, hostellers’ mean and standard deviation values are 51.82, 9.36 and day scholars’ mean, standard deviation values are 53.02, 9.08 respectively. The overall ‘t’ value is -0.683 which indicates that there is no significant difference between inferiority and residence.

In dependence proneness, hostellers’ mean and standard deviation values are 66.20, 7.54 and day scholars’ mean, standard deviation values are 65.47, 7.97 respectively. The overall ‘t’ value is 0.518 which indicates there is no significant difference between dependence proneness and residence.
9. DISCUSSION

The present study is aimed at finding the relationship between dependence proneness and inferiority among college students and to study the difference between the variables among college students in terms of gender and residence. Equal respondents from male and female were participated; the majority of the respondents were form science stream; having one sibling and were first born; from nuclear family and urban domicile. Among the participants 3.3% having low level, 62.5% having moderate level, and 34.2% of participants having high level of dependence proneness.

Pearson correlation yielded ‘r’ value (0.603*), which shows significant positive correlation at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). This reveals that when the level of inferiority is high, the level of dependence proneness also tends to be high or vice versa. Thus, as the inferiority increases, dependence proneness also increases. This may be because a person who is dependent prone would run to others for support, suggestions, and help even if confronted with a relatively minor problem. He would be a person who needs frequent encouragements and emotional supports and feels reluctant to take initiative of independent judgments and actions. Rather, demanding situations make him uncomfortable so much so that he would avoid making decisions. These characteristics would imbibe feelings of low self-esteem in individuals which might in turn give rise to inferiority. Or a person with inferiority might think low of him/her and may run to others for support and avoid taking responsibility which in turn would give rise to dependence proneness.

There is a significant gender difference in the level of dependence proneness. The level of dependence proneness is higher among girls than the boys. This may be due to the reason that girls have more affiliation tendency than that of boys and the differences in child rearing practices and may be parents” over-protectiveness towards girl children than boy children.

There is no significant gender differences in the level of inferiority and there is no significant difference between hostellers and day scholars in the level of dependence proneness and in the level of inferiority which may be due to the reason that the subjects fall under late-adolescent category, during which the individual have almost developed self-esteem, thus lower level of inferiority and are mostly from the urban part of the city.

10. CONCLUSION

- There is a significant relationship between inferiority and dependence proneness.
- There is no significant gender difference in dependence proneness and inferiority.
- There is no significant difference were found between inferiority and dependence proneness in terms of residence.

REFERENCES


