

Impact of socio-economic factor on resiliency of children in late childhood

■ K.M. SANGMA AND P.B. KHADI

Received: 08.07.2016; Revised: 19.09.2016; Accepted: 05.10.2016

■ **ABSTRACT** : Resilience is the capacity to bounce back from adversity. Protective factors increase resilience, whereas risk factors increase vulnerability. The present study examined socio-economic status effect on resiliency and vulnerability of children in late childhood. The sample consisted of 310 children *i.e.*, 145 from Dharwad, Karnataka and 165 from Tura, Meghalaya regions. The samples were drawn by sociometric technique. Child's resiliency was assessed by using Embury's (2006) scale, whereas socio-economic status was measured by using socio-economic status scale by Aggarwal *et al.* (2005). Results revealed positive significant correlation between resiliency and socio-economic status. Further, children from low socio-economic status were found to be vulnerable than high and medium level of socio-economic status children.

■ **KEY WORDS**: Resilience, Vulnerability, Socio-economic status

■ **HOW TO CITE THIS PAPER** : Sangma, K.M. and Khadi, P.B. (2016). Impact of socio-economic factor on resiliency of children in late childhood. *Asian J. Home Sci.*, 11 (2) : 298-305, DOI: 10.15740/HAS/AJHS/11.2/298-305.

See end of the paper for authors' affiliations →

K.M. SANGMA

Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Rural Home Science, University of Agricultural Sciences, DHARWAD (KARNATAKA)

INDIA

Email : kasanchisangma89@gmail.com

It is a universal capacity that allows a person to prevent, minimize or overcome the damaging effects of adversity. Despite their exposure to severe risk factors children who are resilient thrive and excel under such circumstances. Resilience and adversity are distributed unequally across the population and are related to broader socio-economic inequalities which have common causes—the inequities in power, money and resources that shape the conditions in which people live and their opportunities, experiences and relationships.

Good housing and a standard of living reasonably above poverty levels are major resilient factors in children's lives. Poor families face many challenges besides their standard of living. It touches all aspects of

human life: the quality of housing and health care, access to education and recreational facilities, and even one's own safety as one walks along the street. This has consistently been implicated as a risk factor for many of the problems that plague children. Families of high socio-economic status families afford their children an array of services, goods, parental actions, and social connections that potentially redound to the benefit of children and a concern that many low socio-economic status children lack access to those same resources and experiences, thus, putting them at risk for various problems. So, with these a connotation is attached that children from economically disadvantaged families are at an elevated risk for various problems compared with

children who are from higher socio-economic class. However, not all poor children encounter problems and some of these resilient children function better than expected. Despite of living under high-risk circumstances, a significant proportion of adolescents growing up in urban slums show resilience, *i.e.*, they manage to stay in and do well in school and avoid engagement in risk behaviours Kabiru *et al.* (2012). Many children “make it” that is, progress successfully through despite living in such adverse conditions. In other words, they are resilient in spite of the odds against them. The present study was taken up with an objective to know the influence of socio-economic factor on resiliency.

■ RESEARCH METHODS

The sample of present investigation conducted during (2013-2014) consisted of 310 children (145 from Dharwad, Karnataka and 165 from Tura, Meghalaya) who were studying in third, fourth, fifth and sixth standard from government and private schools. Two each government and private schools were selected randomly from each region. Five accepted and five rejected were selected through sociometry from the four selected schools. Thus, a total of twenty accepted and twenty rejected children from each school comprised the sample for the study. The age of the subjects ranged from 8-12 years who are in late childhood.

Child’s resiliency and was assessed using “Resiliency scale for children and adolescents” by Embury (2006). A four point likert style format in which students were asked to rate 64 items as never(0), rarely (1), sometimes (2), often (3) and almost always(4). It assesses resilience of an individual through its sub scales namely: (i) Sense of Mastery with 20 items which includes 3 sub scales : Optimism, self efficacy and adaptability. (ii) Sense of Relatedness with 24 items which has 4 sub scales *viz.*, trust, support, comfort and tolerance. (iii) Emotional reactivity with 20 items which includes sensitivity, recovery and impairment. The socio-economic status was ascertained by using socio-economic status scale by Aggarwal *et al.* (2005) which consists of 22 statements. The pretesting of resiliency and socio-economic status tool on a sample of 32 was done by the split half method. Reliability was 0.72 for resiliency and 0.71 for socio-economic status tool which was found to be statistically significant. Chi-square test

of association, Karl Pearson correlation co-efficient and one way ANOVA was used to know the influence of socio-economic factor on resiliency in late childhood.

■ RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The comparison is made component wise and on total resiliency and vulnerability which is as follows:

Sense of mastery and socio-economic factor:

As depicted in Table 1, with sub component of sense of mastery, higher number of children from Dharwad who are from high socio-economic status were in average level with 45.5 per cent, respectively. While in below average and low level children from low economic status showed higher number of 57.1 per cent and 28.6 per cent, respectively. Among medium socio-economic status, children were found in higher percentage in average category with 35 per cent. But with Tura region, children from high socio-economic status showed higher number in high and average level with 3 per cent and 39.4 per cent, respectively. Whereas, in below average and low level, children from medium socio-economic status had 35.4 per cent and 26.3 per cent, respectively. But, statistical analysis revealed no significant association between optimism and socio-economic status in both the regions.

Values in Table 1 showed second sub component *viz.*, self efficacy, where children from high socio-economic status reported 63.6 per cent in average level, while medium socio-economic status children showed higher percentages in high level with 0.8 and 6.7 per cent in above average. In low level, 42.9 per cent were observed among children who had low socio-economic status.

With Tura region, children from medium socio-economic status showed 3 per cent in high level and 31.3 per cent in low level. Whereas, among high socio-economic status children, higher number were observed in above average with 7.6 per cent and 25.8 per cent in average category. However, no significant association was observed between self efficacy and socio-economic status in both the regions.

Sense of relatedness and socio-economic factor :

With regard to trust it was depicted that higher number of children from Dharwad who are from high socio-economic status had above average and average

level of trust with 9.1 per cent, 45.5 per cent, respectively. While in below average and low level children from low economic status showed higher number of 35.7 per cent and 57.1 per cent, respectively. Whereas, with Tura children, medium socio-economic status had higher number in above average with 3 per cent and 40.4 per cent in below average, while children from high socio-economic status had average with 39.4 per cent and 28.8 per cent in low level (Table 2). However, no significant association was observed between self efficacy and socio- economic status in both the regions.

With support among children of Dharwad, similar trend was observed, where, high socio-economic status had above average and average level with 18.2 per cent, 45.5 per cent, respectively. While in below average and low level children from low economic status showed higher number of 28.6 per cent and 71.4 per cent, respectively. With children from medium socio-economic status, higher per centages were noticed in average with 22.5 per cent and 49.2 per cent in low level. While in Tura region, in above average and average levels, children from high socio-economic status had

12.1 per cent and 40.9 per cent, respectively, while in below average and low levels, children from medium socio-economic status had 26.3 per cent and 35.4 per cent, respectively. Chi-square revealed no significant association, whereas, mean scores showed that children from higher socio-economic status had higher support at 1 per cent level of probability but negative relation was observed which indicates with high level of socio-economic status decreases their support.

A perusal of Table 2 explored the association of comfort and socio-economic status, in Dharwad region, where children from medium socio-economic status showed higher number in above average with 11.7 per cent, while higher socio-economic status children had 45.5 in average levels. Whereas, in low level, 57.1 per cent were noticed among children who belonged to low socio-economic status. Among Tura children, those who hailed from high socio-economic status had average level of comfort with 37.9 per cent, while, children from medium level of socio-economic status had higher per centages of 32.3 in below average and 29.3 in low level. Further, statistical analysis revealed no significant

Table 1 : Sense of mastery and socio-economic status among children of Dharwad and Tura region (n=310)

Category	Dharwad				Tura			
	High (n=11)	Medium (n=120)	Low (n=14)	Optimism Total (n=145)	High (n=66)	Medium (n=99)	Low	Total (n=165)
High	1(9.1)	6(5.0)	-	7(4.8)	2(3.0)	1(1.0)	-	3(1.8)
Above average	2(18.2)	11(9.2)	-	13(9.0)	4(6.1)	8(8.1)	-	12(7.3)
Average	5(45.5)	42(35.0)	2(14.3)	49(33.8)	26(39.4)	29(29.3)	-	55(33.3)
Below average	2(18.2)	33(27.5)	8(57.1)	43(29.7)	20(30.3)	35(35.4)	-	55(33.3)
Low	1(9.1)	28(23.3)	4(28.6)	33(22.8)	14(21.2)	26(26.3)	-	40(24.2)
Modified ²		10.84 NS				3.04 NS		
Mean(SD)	18.36(6.34)	15.84(6.18)	(12.79)		15.86(5.09)	15.46(5.14)	-	
F-value		2.65 NS				0.24 NS		
r		0.19*				-0.03 NS		
S.E.±		0.71				7.2		
Self efficacy								
High	-	1(0.8)	-	1(0.7)	-	3(3.0)	-	3(1.8)
Above average	-	8(6.7)	-	8(5.5)	5(7.6)	6(6.1)	-	11(6.7)
Average	7(63.6)	36(30.0)	4(28.6)	47(32.4)	17(25.8)	22(22.2)	-	39(23.6)
Below average	1(9.1)	40(33.3)	4(28.6)	45(31.0)	25(37.9)	37(37.4)	-	62(37.6)
Low	3(27.3)	35(29.2)	6(42.9)	44(30.3)	19(28.8)	31(31.3)	-	50(30.3)
Modified ²		8.21 NS				2.43 NS		
Mean(SD)	22.45(7.17)	20.87(7.43)	17.86(7.07)		20.83(6.72)	20.80(7.25)	-	
F-value		1.37 NS				0.00 NS		
r		0.11 NS				-0.00 NS		
S.E.±		0.86				0.7		

* and ** indicate significance of values at P<0.05 and 0.01, respectively

NS=Non-significant

association between comfort and socio-economic status in both the regions.

Emotional reactivity and socio-economic factor :

With regard to sensitivity the first dimension of emotional reactivity among Dharwad children, in average level, the frequency distribution of percentages were similar across all the three categories of socio-economic status with 72.7 per cent (high socio-economic status), 73.3 per cent (medium socio-economic status) and 71.4 per cent (low socio-economic status). But in

low level, children from higher socio-economic status showed higher percentage of 27.3 (Table 3).With regard to Tura region, children from medium level of socio-economic status were observed in above average with 11.1 per cent and 73.7 per cent in average category. While, those who belonged to high socio-economic status had higher number in below average with 22.7 per cent and 1.5 per cent in low level of sensitivity. On comparison of mean scores, result depicted that children from lower socio-economic status had higher level of sensitivity in Dharwad region and it was found significant

Category	Dharwad				Tura			
	High (n=11)	Medium (n= 20)	Low (n=14)	Trust Total (n=145)	High (n=14)	Medium (n=99)	Low	Total (n=165)
High	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Above average	1(9.1)	7(5.8)	-	8(5.5)	-	3(3.0)	-	3(1.8)
Average	5(45.5)	20(16.7)	1(7.1)	26(17.9)	26(39.4)	30(30.3)	-	56(33.9)
Below average	1(9.1)	37(30.8)	5(35.7)	43(29.7)	21(31.8)	40(40.4)	-	61(37.0)
Low	4(36.4)	56(46.7)	8(57.1)	68(46.9)	19(28.8)	26(26.3)	-	45(27.3)
Modified ²		9.08 NS				3.84 NS		
Mean(SD)	14.91(7.48)	13.43(6.29)	12.43(3.81)		15.64(4.53)	15.62(5.15)		
F-value		0.49 NS				0.00 NS		
r		0.09 NS				-0.00 NS		
S.E. ± (C.D.)		0.7				0.54		
Support								
High	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Above average	2(18.2)	3(10.8)	-	5(10.3)	8(12.1)	1(1.0)	-	9(5.5)
Average	5(45.5)	27(22.5)	-	32(22.1)	27(40.9)	37(37.4)	-	64(38.8)
Below average	2(18.2)	21(17.5)	4(28.6)	27(18.6)	15(22.7)	26(26.3)	-	41(24.8)
Low	2(18.2)	59(49.2)	10(71.4)	71(49.0)	16(24.2)	35(35.4)	-	51(30.9)
Modified ²		12.35 NS				10.87 NS		
Mean(SD)	17.00(6.75)	13.99(6.33)	11.93(3.68)		17.14(4.93)	15.03(5.13)	-	
F-value		2.08 NS				6.87**		
r		0.17*				-0.20**		
S.E. ± (C.D.)		0.72				0.3(0.77)		
Comfort								
High	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Above average	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21(12.7)
Average	5(45.5)	38(31.7)	5(35.7)	48(33.1)	25(37.9)	23(23.2)	-	48(29.1)
Below average	2(18.2)	16(13.3)	1(7.1)	19(13.1)	20(30.3)	32(32.3)	-	52(31.5)
Low	4(36.4)	52(43.3)	8(57.1)	64(44.1)	15(22.7)	29(29.3)	-	44(26.7)
Modified ²		4.83 NS				4.75 NS		
Mean(SD)	7.91(3.78)	8.19(4.24)	6.93(3.40)		8.68(3.96)	8.43(3.95)	-	
F-value		0.59 NS				0.15 NS		
r		0.08 NS				-0.03 NS		
S.E.±		0.48				0.43		

* and ** indicate significance of values at $P \leq 0.05$ and 0.01 , respectively

NS=Non-significant

at one per cent level of probability.

A glance at Table 3 highlights the association of recovery and socio-economic status in Dharwad region, where children from low socio-economic status showed 14.3 per cent in high level, while 81.8 per cent of children from high socio-economic status were observed in average category. In below average and low level, 15 per cent and 0.8 per cent, respectively were noticed for children who are from medium socio-economic status.

Whereas, in Tura region, children who had medium level of socio-economic status, had higher number in

high with 7.1 per cent and 14.1 per cent in above average level. While, for those who belonged to high socio-economic status, showed higher number in average with 66.7 per cent and 18.2 per cent in below average category. But, on comparison of mean scores, children from lower socio-economic status had higher level of recovery in Dharwad region and it was found significant at five per cent level of probability.

Regarding impairment among Dharwad children, in average level 81.8 per cent was noticed for children who had high socio-economic status, while 16.7 per cent

Table 3 : Emotional reactivity and socio-economic status among children of Dharwad and Tura region (n=310)								
Category	Dharwad				Tura			
	High (n=11)	Medium (n=120)	Low (n=14)	Sensitivity Total (n=145)	High (n=14)	Medium (n=99)	Low	Total (n=165)
High	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Above average	-	9(7.5)	1(7.1)	10(6.9)	4(6.1)	11(11.1)	-	15(9.1)
Average	8(72.7)	88(73.3)	10(71.4)	106(73.1)	46(69.7)	73(73.7)	-	119(72.1)
Below average	3(27.3)	23(19.2)	3(21.4)	29(20.0)	15(22.7)	15(15.2)	-	30(18.2)
Low	-	-	-	-	1(1.5)	-	-	1(0.6)
Modified ²		1.17 NS				3.95 NS		
Mean(SD)	6.73(2.86)	8.72(3.32)	10.36(3.93)		8.27(3.41)	8.90(3.46)		-
F-value		3.60*				1.31 NS		
r		-0.21*				0.08 NS		
S.E. ±(C.D.)		0.39(0.77)				0.37		
Recovery								
High	-	8(6.7)	2(14.3)	10(6.9)	3(4.5)	7(7.1)	-	10(6.1)
Above average	1(9.1)	19(15.8)	2(14.3)	22(15.2)	7(10.6)	14(14.1)	-	21(12.7)
Average	9(81.8)	74(61.7)	10(71.4)	93(64.1)	44(66.7)	64(64.6)	-	108(65.5)
Below average	1(9.1)	18(15.0)	-	19(13.1)	12(18.2)	13(13.1)	-	25(15.2)
Low	-	1(0.8)	-	1(0.7)	-	1(1.0)	-	1(0.6)
Modified ²		5.46 NS				2.16 NS		
Mean(SD)	1.91(1.97)	3.68(3.32)	5.50(3.45)		2.94(2.96)	3.89(3.68)		-
F-value		3.78*				3.06 NS		
r		-0.13 NS				0.13 NS		
S.E.±		0.39(0.38)				0.37		
Impairment								
High	-	-	-	-	2(3.0)	2(2.0)	-	4(2.4)
Above average	-	20(16.7)	2(14.3)	22(15.2)	9(13.6)	13(13.1)	-	22(13.3)
Average	9(81.8)	71(59.2)	9(64.3)	89(61.4)	43(65.2)	66(66.7)	-	109(66.1)
Below average	2(18.2)	29(24.2)	3(21.4)	34(23.4)	12(18.2)	18(18.2)	-	30(18.2)
Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Modified ²		2.89 NS				0.18 NS		
Mean(SD)	11.00(5.62)	12.78(6.12)	13.57(5.76)		13.59(6.27)	14.06(6.76)		-
F-value		0.58 NS				0.20 NS		
r		-0.03 NS				0.03 NS		
S.E.±		0.71				0.72		

* and ** indicate significance of values at P<0.05 and 0.01, respectively

NS=Non-significant

were observed in above average and 24.2 per cent in low level for children who had medium socio-economic status. Children from low socio-economic status had 14.3 per cent in above average and 64.3 per cent in average category.

With regard to Tura region, across all the levels of socio-economic status *i.e.* from high to below average, it was noticed that the frequency distribution of percentages was found similar between children from high and medium socio-economic status as depicted in Table 3.

Tolerance and socio-economic factor among 12 year olds :

Among children from medium level of socio-economic status, 5.3 per cent were in above average level and 39.5 per cent were in low level. The frequency distribution of percentages was similar with 50 per cent for children from high socio-economic status in average and below average levels (Table 4).

With Tura region, in average and low levels, children of high socio-economic status were noticed in higher number with 40 per cent, while, 54.5 per cent were in below average for children who were from medium level of socio-economic status. However, Chi-square indicates non-significant association between tolerance and socio-economic status.

Resiliency and socio-economic factor :

With regard to resiliency among Dharwad children, in high and above average level, 2.5 per cent and 0.8 per cent were observed for children who had medium socio-economic status. While, children from high socio-

economic status had higher percentages of 9.1 in average in 18.2 per cent in below average category. In low level, 100 per cent was observed among children who had low socio-economic status. Further, statistical analysis revealed no significant association between resiliency and socio-economic status in Dharwad region. But, positive significant correlation was observed as indicated in the Table 5 among Dharwad children. When resiliency was observed in Tura region, it was found that in low level, 92.4 per cent of children who had high level of socio-economic status were noticed. Whereas, among medium level of socio-economic status, 4 per cent were noticed in average and 5.1 per cent in below average category. Further, statistical analysis revealed no significant association between resiliency and socio-economic status in Tura region.

Vulnerability and socio-economic factor :

With respect to vulnerability among Dharwad children, 92.9 per cent were observed in high level for children who had low socio-economic status. In above average and average level, children from high socio-economic status showed 27.3 per cent and 36.4 per cent, respectively. Whereas, medium socio-economic status children had 3.3 per cent in below average and low levels. The association between vulnerability and socio-economic status was found to be non-significant in Dharwad region. But, on comparison of mean scores, the result revealed that children from lower socio-economic status are found to be more vulnerable in Dharwad region. Further, there was a negative significant correlation as indicated ($r = -0.27$) (Table 5).

Whereas, in Tura region, children who had medium

Category	Dharwad			Total (n=42)	Tura			Total (n=38)
	High (n=2)	Medium (n= 38)	Low (n=2)		High (n=14)	Medium (n=24)	Low	
High	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Above average	-	2(5.3)	-	2(4.8)	-	-	-	-
Average	1(50.0)	6(15.8)	-	7(16.7)	6(42.9)	4(16.7)	-	10(26.3)
Below average	1(50.0)	15(39.5)	2(100)	18(42.9)	3(21.4)	8(33.3)	-	11(28.9)
Low	-	15(39.5)	-	15(35.7)	5(35.7)	12(50.0)	-	17(44.7)
Modified ²		5.12 NS				3.14 NS		
Mean(SD)	17.00(0.00)	13.34(6.10)	15.00 (0.00)		15.36(4.58)	12.62(4.53)		
F-value		0.41 NS				3.18 NS		
r		-0.05 NS				0.30 NS		
S.E. _±		1.29				1.04		

* and ** indicate significance of values at $P \leq 0.05$ and 0.01 , respectively

NS=Non-significant

level of socio-economic status had 77.8 per cent in high level of vulnerability, while, for those who had high level of socio-economic status, showed 18.2 per cent in above average, 12.1 per cent in average and 1.5 per cent in below average category. Statistical analysis revealed no significant association between socio-economic status and vulnerability in Tura region.

With regard to socio-economic status and resiliency the study revealed that Tura children from higher socio-economic status were significantly higher but negative relation was observed which indicates with high level of socio-economic status decreases their support. With Dharwad region, positive significant relation was noticed between optimism, support and resiliency but negative significant relation was observed with sensitivity and vulnerability. Further, significant difference was found with children from low income and sub component of emotional reactivity *i.e.* recovery.

Findings are consistent with Kabiru *et al.* (2012), who reported that children from high socio-economic status receive and support protection from peer, family,

school and other social environment that promotes prosocial or healthy enhancing behaviours. However, Kabiru *et al.* (2012), indicated that despite living under high risk circumstances, a significant portion of urban slums showed resilience. Jessor *et al.* (1998), also reported that under conditions of high risk, adolescents with higher level of protective factors were likely to be resilient.

Similar findings are reported by Olatunji *et al.* (2010), who found that African American parents had coping mechanisms and demonstrated resilience despite systemic and personal stressors, such as poverty. Their coping mechanisms may be rooted in cultural patterns and through, intergenerational support received from grandparents. But, Devine and Wright (1993), indicated that living in poverty constitutes significant risks along a number of dimensions. The findings are in line with Egeland *et al.* (1993), who suggested that poverty and factors associated with poverty have a pervasively negative effect on child's adaptation. Children living in poverty function poorly in a number of areas. Further,

Table 5 : Resiliency-vulnerability and socio-economic status among children of Dharwad and Tura region (n=310)

Category	Dharwad				Tura			
	High (n=11)	Medium (n= 120)	Low (n=14)	Total (n=145)	High (n=14)	Medium (n=99)	Low	Total (n=165)
	Resiliency							
High	-	3(2.5)	-	3(2.1)	-	-	-	-
Above average	-	1(0.8)	-	1(0.7)	-	-	-	-
Average	1(9.1)	4(3.3)	-	5(3.4)	2(3.0)	4(4.0)	-	6(3.6)
Below average	2(18.2)	7(5.8)	-	9(6.2)	3(4.5)	5(5.1)	-	8(4.8)
Low	8(72.7)	105(87.5)	14(100)	127(87.6)	61(92.4)	-	-	151(91.5)
Modified ²	6.29 NS				0.14 NS			
Mean(SD)	30.09(13.47)	27.00(11.66)	21.75(5.90)		27.51(9.37)	26.55(9.95)	-	
F-value	1.84 NS				0.62 NS			
r	0.18*				-0.04 NS			
S.E.±	1.33				1.07			
	Vulnerability							
High	4(36.4)	88(73.3)	13(92.9)	105(72.4)	45(68.2)	77(77.8)	-	122(73.9)
Above average	3(27.3)	12(10.0)	1(7.1)	16(11.0)	12(18.2)	12(12.1)	-	24(14.5)
Average	4(36.4)	12(10.0)	-	16(11.0)	8(12.1)	9(9.1)	-	17(10.3)
Below average	-	4(3.3)	-	4(2.8)	1(1.5)	1(1.0)	-	2(1.2)
Low	-	4(3.3)	-	4(2.8)	-	-	-	-
Modified ²	15.45 NS				1.92 NS			
Mean(SD)	14.82(13.57)	23.23(15.45)	33.43(8.25)		23.18(13.65)	25.90(12.90)	-	
F-value	5.05**				1.29 NS			
r	-0.27**				0.10 NS			
S.E. ±	1.73(1.73)				1.45			

* and ** indicate significance of values at P<0.05 and 0.01, respectively

NS=Non-significant

Egeland *et al.* (1993), revealed that as a result of adverse effects of poverty children showed maladaptive patterns of development in a number of areas. Their decline in functioning observed at each developmental period seemed to have been related to adverse living conditions, not inherent factors and traits within the child.

There are some indications available in this direction for instance by Barbarin and Soler (1993), who reported that poverty has broad empirical support as risk factors for behavioural and emotional difficulties. Further, Barbarin (1999) confirmed poverty to be risk factor. Poor children scored significantly higher on immaturity, hyperactivity, and social problems than non poor children.

Conclusion:

Exposure to social and economic disadvantage is a risk factor where children from low socio-economic status were found to be more vulnerable. This suggest need for programmes to help low socio-economic families on parenting issues so that children could receive protection and support from parents even in such adverse conditions and family relations. An intersystem collaboration can also be made at the community level where intense network of protection can be provided for disadvantaged children and families.

Authors' affiliations:

P.B. KHADI, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Rural Home Science, University of Agricultural Sciences, DHARWAD (KARNATAKA) INDIA

■ REFERENCES

- Aggarwal, O.P., Bhasin, S.K., Sharma, A.K., Chhabra, P., Aggarwal, K. and Rajoura, O.P. (2005).** A new instrument (scale) for measuring the socio-economic status of family. Preliminary study. *Indian J. Comm. Med.*, **34**(4): 111-114.
- Barbarin, O. and Soler R. (1993).** Behavioural, emotional and academic adjustment in a national probability sample of African American children: Effects of age, gender and family structure. *J. Black Psych.*, **19** : 423-446.
- Barbarin, O.A. (1999).** Social risks and psychological adjustment: A comparison of African American and South African children. *Child Dev.*, **70**(6) : 1348-1359.
- Devine, J.A. and Wright, J.D. (1993).** The greatest of evils: Urban poverty and the American underclass. A.De Gruyter, NEW YORK, U.S.A.
- Egeland, B., Carlson, E. and Sroufe, L.A. (1993).** Resilience as a process: *Development & Psychopathol.*, **5** : 517-528.
- Embury, S. (2006).** Resiliency scales for children and adolescents: A profile of personal strengths manual.
- Jessor, R., Turbin, M.S. and Costa, F.M. (1998).** Risk and protection in successful outcomes among disadvantaged adolescents. *Appl. Dev. Sci.*, **2**(4):194-208.
- Kabiru, C.W., Beguy, D., Ndugwa, R.P., Zulu E.M. and Jessor, R. (2012).** Making it: understanding adolescent resilience in two informal settlements (slums) in Nairobi, Kenya. *Child & Youth Services*, **33** : 12-32.
- Olatunji, C.W., Sanders, T., Mehta, S. and Horenstein, B.L. (2010).** Parenting practices among low-income parents/guardians of academically successful fifth grade African American Children. *National Assoc. Multicultural Edu.*, **12**(3): 138-144.

11th
Year
★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★