



ISSN Print: 2664-9799  
ISSN Online: 2664-9802  
Impact Factor: RJIF 8.2  
IJHER 2024; 6(1): 25-28  
[www.humanitiesjournal.net](http://www.humanitiesjournal.net)  
Received: 26-11-2023  
Accepted: 30-12-2023

**Gobind**  
Research Scholar, Department  
of Applied Psychology, Guru  
Jambheshwar University of  
Science & Technology, Hisar,  
Haryana, India

**Pinki**  
Student, Department of  
Psychology, CBLU, Bhiwani,  
Haryana, India

**Krishan Kumar**  
Associate Professor,  
Department of Psychiatry,  
PGIMER, Chandigarh, India

**Rakesh Behmani**  
Professor, Department of  
Applied Psychology, Guru  
Jambheshwar University of  
Science & Technology, Hisar,  
Haryana, India

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Gobind**  
Research Scholar, Department  
of Applied Psychology, Guru  
Jambheshwar University of  
Science & Technology, Hisar,  
Haryana, India

## **A comparative study of male and female with different socio-economic backgrounds on the variable of modernization (education, parent-child relationship, politics, status of women, marriage and socio-cultural)**

**Gobind, Pinki, Krishan Kumar and Rakesh Behmani**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33545/26649799.2024.v6.i1a.66>

### **Abstract**

The aims of this research are to explore the gender and socioeconomic status differences among young adults on the variable of modernization (parent-child relationship, education, political, marriage, social-cultural and status of women). For this study, a sample of 400 young adults of the age group between 21-30 years from different districts of Haryana. Comprehensive modernization inventory is administrated on the subjects.

Data was analysed by using ANOVA by SPSS. The results reveal that gender differences and socio-economic status differences are found among young adults on the variables of education and politics but on the variables of parent-child relationship and status of women, only gender differences were found, socio-economic status differences were not seen on both variables. On the variables of marriage and social- culture, both gender and socio-economic status differences were not found.

**Keywords:** Parent-child relationship, status of women, marriage, social- cultural, gender, socio-economic status (SES), politics, society, discrimination, education

### **Introduction**

Modernization is a multifaceted process encompassing economic, social, and cultural transformations. One significant aspect of modernization is economic development, which often entails shifts in labour markets, employment patterns, and access to resources. Historically, economic modernization has been associated with the feminization of certain industries, such as textiles or electronics assembly, while simultaneously reinforcing gender wage gaps. Modernization has significantly influenced gender dynamics and socio-economic status worldwide. Additionally, modernization may exacerbate gender disparities in access to education and financial resources, further entrenching gender inequalities.

### **Modernization**

Modernization represents a fundamental transformation in the way societies function, driven by technological advancements, economic development, and social change. It encompasses a wide range of processes, including industrialization, urbanization, globalization, and democratization, among others. As societies progress along the path of modernization, they experience profound shifts in their economic structures, social institutions, cultural norms, and political systems. Advances in science and technology, such as the digital revolution, automation, and biotechnology, have played a pivotal role in driving modernization by revolutionizing production processes, communication networks, and lifestyle patterns (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005) <sup>[5]</sup>. This paper aims to explore the concept of modernization in depth, exploring the gender and socio-economic differences in modernization, and examining its various dimensions and implications for contemporary society.

### Modernization and Gender Differences

The relationship between modernization and gender is complex and multifaceted, encompassing economic, social, and technological dimensions. While modernization has the potential to empower women and challenge traditional gender norms, it also presents challenges and risks perpetuating inequalities. As societies modernize, traditional gender roles and norms transform. Males received more social support compared to females in achievements (Bhatnagar *et al.* 2023) [7]. Education is another key driver of modernization that intersects with gender dynamics. Increased access to education, particularly for girls, has been associated with greater gender equality and empowerment (Buchmann & Hannum, 2001) [1]. Gender pay gaps, glass ceilings, and work-life balance issues persist, hindering women's advancement and full participation in the workforce (World Economic Forum, 2020) [8]. Social support has a significant impact at the workplace and on the advancement of working women (Gobind *et al.*, 2023) [3]. However, modernization is not always synonymous with progress in gender equality; in some contexts, it may reinforce conservative gender ideologies or generate a backlash against women's rights (Htun & Weldon, 2012) [4].

### Modernization and Socio-Economic Status

The modernization process presents both challenges and opportunities for socioeconomic development. Inadequate infrastructure, limited access to education, and disparities in healthcare provision pose significant challenges for marginalized populations (Kabeer, 2005) [6]. Modernization, characterized by urbanization, industrialization, and globalization, reshapes traditional social structures, altering individuals' roles and opportunities within society (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005) [5]. As societies modernize, traditional agrarian economies transition into industrial and service-based economies, leading to shifts in employment patterns, income distribution, and access to resources (Easterly, 2002) [2].

### Aim of Study

To study the differences across gender and socioeconomic status among young adults on the variable of modernization (parent-child relationship, status of women, education, marriage, politics and social-cultural).

### Hypothesis of Study

1. There will be significant differences across gender and SES among young adults on the variable of education (modernization).
2. There will be significant differences across gender and SES among young adults on the variable of parent-child relationship (modernization).

3. There will be significant differences across gender and SES among young adults on the variable of politics (modernization).
4. There will be significant differences across gender and SES among young adults on the variable of the status of women (modernization).
5. There will be significant differences across gender and SES among young adults on the variable of marriage (modernization).
6. There will be significant differences across gender and SES among young adults on the variable of social-cultural (modernization).

### Method

**Sample:** The sample of this research would consist of 400 Young Adults (21-25 years) from Hisar and adjoining districts of western Haryana. Out of these 400 adolescents, 200 would be males and 200 would be female. Out of 200 males, 100 would be from the APL family and 100 would be from the BPL family. In the same manner, out of 200 females, 100 would be from the APL family, and 100 would be from the BPL family.

### Instrument / Tools

Comprehensive Modernization Inventory (CMI) Developed by Dr S.P. Ahluwalia and Dr A. K. Kalia. (1985), was used to measure modernization in young adults. This is 49 items constructed with seven Dimensions, which are Parent-child relationship, Status of Women, Marriage, Education, Religion, Politics, and Socio- culture. The responses were obtained on a 5-point rating, for positive items (5- 1), S A-5, A-4, U-3, D-2, SD-1 and for negative items (1- 5) SA-1, A-2, U-3, D-4, SD-5, rating scale. The reliability was measured by test-retest methods; the Correlation coefficient was found 0.85.

### Procedure

To build a proper connection, the subjects were first given an explanation of the goal of the study. Information confidentiality was guaranteed and each participant received an individual communication. Participants were questioned about information pertaining to demographic characteristics after developing a connection with them. For every tool, there were separate instructions offered.

### Results

The objective of the study is to explore differences across gender and socioeconomic status among young adults on the variables of politics, parent-child relationship, the status of women, marriage, education and social-cultural

**Table 1:** Two-way ANOVA (2 X 2) results on education

Source	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean	F	Sig
Gender	441.000	1	441.000	23.313**	.000
SES	906.010	1	906.010	47.896**	.000
Gender * SES	42.250	1	42.250	2.234	.136
Error	7490.780	396	18.916		
Total	298970.000	400			

\*\*Significant at  $p < .01$  level, \*Significant at  $p < .05$  level

Table 1 shows F value for gender [ $F = 23.313$ ,  $p < .01$ ] and socio-economic status (SES) [ $F = 47.896$ ,  $p < .01$ ] is highly significant. Males and females from above the poverty line

(APL) and below the poverty line (BPL) differ on the variable of education (Modernization).

**Table 2:** Two-way ANOVA (2 X 2) results on parent-child relationship

Source	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean	F	Sig.
Gender	49.000	1	49.000	7.132**	.008
SES	22.090	1	22.000	3.215	.074
Gender * SES	9.610	1	9.610	1.399	.238
Error	2720.660	396	6.780		
Total	204582.000	400			

\*\*Significant at  $p < .01$  level, \*Significant at  $p < .05$  level

Table 2 shows F value for gender [ $F = 7.132, p < .01$ ] is highly significant. The table shows that the two groups of gender differ on the variable of the parent-child relationship

(Modernization) and females score higher on this dimension than males.

**Table 3:** Two-way ANOVA (2 X 2) results on politics

Source	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean	F	Sig.
Gender	455.822	1	455.282	28.950**	.000
SES	251.222	1	251.222	15.956**	.000
Gender * SES	58.523	1	58.523	3.717*	.055
Error	6235.030	396	15.745		
Total	300277.000	400			

\*\*Significant at  $p < .01$  level, \*Significant at  $p < .05$  level

Table 3 shows F value for gender [ $F = 28.950, p < .01$ ] and socio-economic status (SES) [ $F = 15.956, p < .01$ ] is highly significant. Males and females from above the poverty line (APL) and below the poverty line (BPL) differ in their way of life (Religiosity). The interaction effect of gender X

socio-economic status (SES) [ $F = 3.717, p < 0 .5$ ] is significant. Further, gender and socioeconomic status (SES) together have an impact on the variable of politics (Modernization).

**Table 4:** Two-way ANOVA (2 X 2) results on the status of women

Source	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean	F	Sig.
Gender	72.250	1	72.250	12.312**	.001
SES	29.160	1	29.160	4.969	.026
Gender * SES	1.690	1	1.690	.288	.592
Error	2323.860	396	5.868		
Total	191478.000	400			

\*\*Significant at  $p < .01$  level, \*Significant at  $p < .05$  level

Table 4 shows F value for gender [ $F = 12.312, p < .01$ ] is highly significant. The table shows that the two groups of gender differ on the variable of status of women

(Modernization) and females score higher on this dimension than males.

**Table 5:** Two-way ANOVA (2 X 2) results on marriage

Source	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean	F	Sig.
Gender	1.210	1	1.210	.0145	.704
SES	14.440	1	14.440	1.725	.190
Gender * SES	2.890	1	2.890	.345	.557
Error	3314.300	396	8.369		
Total	228578.000	400			

\*\*Significant at  $p < .01$  level, \*Significant at  $p < .05$  level

Table 5 shows no significant results on the variable of marriage.

**Table 6:** Two-way ANOVA (2 X 2) results on socio-cultural

Source	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean	F	Sig.
Gender	13.690	1	13.690	2.207	.138
SES	1.000	1	1.000	.161	.688
Gender * SES	11.560	1	11.560	1.864	.173
Error	2456.140	396	6.202		
Total	220478.000	400			

\*\*Significant at  $p < .01$  level, \*Significant at  $p < .05$  level

Table 6 shows no significant results on the variable of social -culture.

## Discussion

In the results, significant gender and socio-economic differences were found among young adults on the variable

of modernization (education and politics), so hypothesis no.1 and hypothesis no.3 are accepted but hypotheses 2 and 4 are partially accepted because only gender differences were found on the variable of parent-child relationship and status of women. On the variables of marriage and social-cultural, no significant gender and socioeconomic status differences were found, so hypotheses 5 and 6 are rejected. So findings of the study reveal that in education and political dimensions, gender and SES both differences were found but in parent-child relationship and status of women only gender differences were found. No Significant differences were found in marriage and social-cultural dimensions.

### Limitations and Future Implications

There are certain important limitations of the current study that must be considered. The study was first limited to a specific demographic in terms of age and background range. Studies including a range of age groups and backgrounds may also be conducted on it. Second, we can use self-reported parameters to assess the variation in modernization by gender and socioeconomic status. Third, it was not possible to investigate the connection between modernization and socioeconomic status disparities in a single study. Understanding the complex relationship between modernization and gender is essential for crafting effective policies aimed at promoting gender equality. By recognizing the intersectionality of modernization and gender and implementing targeted interventions, societies can harness the opportunities of modernization while ensuring that its benefits are equitably distributed among all genders.

### Conclusions

In conclusion, modernization profoundly shapes gender dynamics, influencing economic opportunities, social norms, and technological access. Modernization and socioeconomic status are intricately linked, with modernization processes shaping socioeconomic dynamics in complex ways. While modernization can contribute to economic development, technological progress, and social advancement, its benefits are not distributed equally, leading to disparities in SES within and between societies. Addressing these disparities requires comprehensive strategies that address structural inequalities, promote inclusive growth, and prioritize social justice. Modernization has the potential to advance gender equality; it also poses challenges and risks exacerbating existing inequalities.

### References

1. Buchmann C, Hannum E. Education and stratification in developing countries: A review of theories and research. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 2001;27:77-102.
2. Easterly W. The elusive quest for growth: Economists' adventures and misadventures in the tropics. MIT Press; c2002.
3. Gobind, Nitika, Pinki. Role of Social Support in Work Motivation and Quality of Work Life among Working Women in Haryana, *Int. J. Soc. Sci. Rev.* 2023;11(3):442-445. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.8433426
4. Htun M, Weldon SL. The logic of gender justice: State action on women's rights around the world. Cambridge University Press; c2018.
5. Inglehart R, Welzel C. Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: The human development sequence. Cambridge University Press; c2005.
6. Kabeer N. Gender equality and women's empowerment: A critical analysis of the third Millennium Development Goal. *Gender Dev.* 2005;13(1):13-24.
7. Bhatnagar S, Gobind and Pinki. Impact of social support on achievement motivation and emotional maturity of young adults. *Int. J. Psychol. Sci.* 2023;5(1):24-30. DOI: 10.33545/26648377.2023.v5.i1a.32
8. World Economic Forum. Global Gender Gap Report; c2020. Retrieved from [http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\\_GGGR\\_2020.pdf](http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2020.pdf)