Available online at www.pelagiaresearchlibrary.com



Pelagia Research Library

Advances in Applied Science Research, 2013, 4(3):374-379



Family structure and sense of security (The sample, Zanjan province)

Maryam Pourkasmaei¹, Rouhollah Fallahi Gilan², Shamsodin Nikmanesh³ and Mohammadnabi Aghataghi⁴

¹Sociology Department, Hashtgerd Branch, Payame Noor University, Hashtgerd, Iran
 ²Sociology Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran
 ³Accounting and Management Department, Tehran Allameh Tabatabai University, Tehran, Iran
 ⁴Political Department, Sharzaa Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

ABSTRACT

This paper purpose is to consider distribution of family structure and quality interaction of them with children, sense of security, and effect of sexuality regard to family structure. The main claim of this article is including cases that cause to safety and unsafety environment community of family. This study has been based on survey interviews and distributing the Questionnaire, and included the set of individuals (female & men) 15 year and older are whom Zanjan province residents, and sample volume according to the Cochran formula 610 people have been selected. The finding show that traditional family have enjoyed sense of security more than democratic family and sense of security of women in the modern and traditional family lower than men, and also women in the modern family has been less than the traditional family enjoyed sense of security.

Keywords: sense of security, power structure in the family, socialization, personality, society

INTRODUCTION

Symbol of security is peace and overall willingness and basis evolutionary interactive and dynamics of interactional in the human history. From this general perspective, security associated with all dimensions and aspects of human life and society, and constantly has been greatest necessities and concerns of humankind. Early, the human have been organized assembling for their security that was created by nature; however, it wasn't long time changing to kind of this form threats, nature and human society that have brought many kind of insecurities for man. There is this question that whether in that time a phenomenal had been safe in the specific condition of time and place, and the element of threatening to became in other places.

The concept of security has been similar many others of concepts such as authority, sovereignty, legitimating to change and displacement in social sciences. If, this evolution of security concept to make difference views on security and this change conceptual in security and consideration to society perspective and context leaded to security discussion and study as absolute phenomenal. whit this end in view, including context that raising a social force under his embrace are in flounce to significant event in manner and nature and leads to safe or unsafe conditions which caused the family.(Couks.129;1380).

Although, has been done works and studies about family issues; but can less to trace sigh of new and critical approach on its. In addition, many of them focus on family as shelter and special center for emotional needs and union and consonance on society.

Family most important role in children socialization process, furthermore ,its all the world that surround him.((based on, the family play origin role in forming attitudes, values, and believes child, and can affects on relationships of individual class with factors and social institutions.))(koen,1381).((in general, e.g. image child is an emotional reflection that family members have related to him, and so, person has image from self and about his world and people who are surrounding him, directly affect on attitudes and believes of their family.))(Tavasoli1379; 84)

Therefore, to discuss about the question of this article such as does distribution of respondent family structure and how interaction of them with children on relationship with their sense of security? In addition, if sexuality regards to family structure is affect on sense of security.

Concepts and Theories

Based on (Giddens44.1377) security can be a situation which deal with a specific threat or minimized, experience security is depends on risk and reliability balance

In his opinion, risk and security make are two sides of the same coin. As, if risk has departed when security is, and on the contrary, security is disorder and un- manifested when we at grips with danger. Nevertheless, senses of security are social- psychological phenomenon that has various dimensions. This sense results in person's direct and indirect experience from a circumstance surrounding, and different people experience to different form. Sources supply for sense of security for individuals and group different from each other's. Therefore, sense of sense of security relate to many factors and elements of community.

However, sense of security may be real or un real. In other word, identical structure and essential criterion(like policy and judicial criterion) sometimes may be demonstrate the high security at community, but understandings of people from social space or their information about others to feeling of insecurity and mental distress them. On the contrary, sometimes some people have been lived completely unsafe terms, but do not show any sense of insecurity; therefore, this sense of security is psychological and social process only does not impose to individuals rather most of people in community based on needs interest, demands, and personal ability and mental have basic share its making or divested.

People believe that though individual act within the framework social system, but it's have voluntary and rational aspect and creativity and choices and evaluation force. According to People, there is two kind of method or practices against the individuals; one based on personal motivation and relies on self-interest, and other conform it to individuals' motivation with being value social system (here family structure). (Tavsoli241, 1380).

Hence, for perception rate social unit from sense of security should be note to relations and nature of members' common separate dependence and groups in term of quality first or second relationship. The most important socialization in major modern community is family. (Rash ,1377). Mental sensitiveness's child ,his flexibility, particularly, make a duality primary effect of family, accumulation of any external influence in his unconscious to informed him. In this context to appear many of works that imply to effect training in family.(sorrokhani,1377). On the other hand, in addition of norms family internalized the norms of community and its section of his personality.

Quality contact with child it leads to build his character. With this assumption most sociologists tent to psychoanalysis, claim that somehow influence of childhood experience which become some aspects of behavior to behavior ((invariable or secondary nature) in community. (Ezazi63;13282). According to this, Laing (1995) suggested that after physical birth and biological life, follow another generation which is a being birth and whereby child feels herself as being real and live. The effect of this metabolism, get certainty in individual that all other certain rely on it. Then, individual may experience herself as being live and full and complete ,such individual, is kind of enjoyed a central core being security .

Furthermore, it can be consideration the character about social system. Character needs to social system support and social system to approve in character. Thus, mental actors communication and interaction with other actors that social actor for it, and at the same time, they are social actor for them. This foundation is the something that Pasonz called it mutual dependence. In any social relationship, free will stipulated that actor seeking it, on the other hand, the rewards that other actor scan give him and beside hoping for him.(Gyroshe163;1376) As a result can be claimed that family as place for this mutual dependence and social system.

Therefore, family can be seen as global bite –existence, which the everyday interactions mediated that is, constructed and reproduce. Participate in world of common meaning not only identity the family reality, but also continually, it is reconfirming now. Hence, family both inherent and within each one (in term a combine together)

and it has been growing and excellent, because it face within the form of objective which can be seen in all cases, except themselves.(Bordive2004)

It has been shown that public understanding regularly increasing about family as safe place and shelter. (Wurzbacher-kipp1895) It is the family as one of the remain social stability tries against abstract force attack, modernity and increasing pressure of being impersonal relation, commitment to tasks and trend as emphasis and conformity between members. So far, we can assume that the family in entirely competitive world is a safe place. Nevertheless, it is not a whole story. Because in any system family, interweaving a set of authority relation, based on training practice in any community, lead to structural enrage which its trends nature developed base on internal logic.

According to chang Bourdieu,(2004) can be considered a family as field space and its relationship with a range of principles and rules , and it is adopting necessary for one who member of this set. However, this adjustment is not a knowing compute or designed and purposed, rather it is from sagacity. Sagacity, which do and do not, learned experience. Bourdieu believes that individuals in every field, engaged in struggle over the real definition and every time established equilibrate, is threatened, increased conflicts on (recapture reality) and in general family can as kind of social space and at the same time is a field strength, which impose his will on social factor, both a field of conflict that involves inner factors.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this study, according to study and research facilities, survey interview and distributing considered as most proper practice for data collection. It is a mention that have been document method used to develop a theoretical framework's research.

Population of this study including a set of people (man and woman) 15 years old and the older than, in Zanjon province. These differences are in social and economic characteristics between the individual province and distribution in the center of province and cities and suburbs.

Using multi-stage classification sampling proportional to population size in each of the cities (proportion demography 1385); sampling method is a cluster and the use of Cochran formula has been selected 610 people. Due to removal 16 questionnaires, data analysis has about 594 respondents.

For data analysis, the statistical software, SPSS is employed in this study. Description and analysis of two – dimensional table and explanatory and statistical test such as L-Escoer and vi-Cramer correlation coefficient were used. Nearby in the study of seven – item measure of bower in family was used.

Seven statements show the power of structure in family. Each of these items scales with a five part graded measurement totally agree, agree, to the extent, disagree, and quiet disagree. These statements have been included; 1. C children should not allow to response their parents, because respect of parent is lost.

- 2. A worst person is who does not respect for his parents.
- 3. T although the kid is naughty and messy, it is a fault of mother not father.
- 4. T here, it is not should be take woman superior to men.
- 5. The future goodness and wealfear's children base on parents' style and opinion.
- 6. For women relationship with opposite sex in during premarital worse than men do.
- 7. In the gender equality are some good, but man should always say last word.

It is a mention that measuring the sense of security, asked respondents respond a question in the five part graded ((how the extent you have felt security in the current situation.))

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Characteristics of the sample population

Based on results, it is found that between Zanjan province respondent, with average 37 years old, 45 percent men and 55 percent women. About 95 percent say their ethnicity as Turkey and rest of them Fars and etc.28 percent diploma, 35 percent undergraduated, and 3 percent Masters and PhD.

65 percent individuals surveyed is married and 33percent are single.inaddition,22 percent have enjoyed very little sense of security and 18 percent low ,25 percent som,17 percent high and 18 percent very high.

About 38 percent of respondents surveyed living in the modern family and 62 percent in the traditional, means age men in modern family 35.7year, and most educated are undergraduate. Means age of women in family modern are 34, 7 years, and most educated are undergraguated. Average of age women in traditional family are 38.4 years and most educated are undergraguated peoples.

| Total | power struc | safety | | |
|-------|-------------|------------------|-----------|--|
| | traditional | Modern | | |
| 125 | 75 | 50 | very low | |
| 21 | 20.3 | 22.3 | | |
| 107 | 59 | 48 | Low | |
| 18 | 15.9 | 21.4 | | |
| 150 | 86 | 64 | | |
| 25.3 | 23.2 | 28.6 | some | |
| 104 | 74 | 30 | High | |
| 17.5 | 20 | 13.4 | - | |
| 108 | 76 | 32 | Very high | |
| 18.2 | 20.5 | 14.3 | | |
| 594 | 370 | 224 | Total | |
| 100 | 100 | 100 | | |
| | Sig=.000 | Significance lev | el | |

Table 1: Distribution of respondents in terms of safety and traditional families

Sense of security and authority structure in the family

Relationship between authority structure and sense of security represented that authority structure in the family affects on level of sense of security. So that can say with confidence ,traditional family are enjoy the most sense of security and modern family have less sense of security.

As it is represented in table 1, about 44percent of respondents which lives in modern family have enjoyed a low and very low sense of security, against, in traditional family, about 36 percent enjoyed a low and very low sense of security. Furthermore, about 41 percent of respondents which lives in traditional family have enjoyed high and very high sense of security, and against, in modern family, about 28percent have high and very high sense of security.

Sense of security and sexuality in modern family

Relationship between sexuality and sense of security in modern family represented that sexuality affects on level sense of security ,so that can say with confidence, women in the modern family to men in the same family have enjoyed low sense of security. As it is represented in table 2, about 48 percent of women respondents in modern family, have enjoyed low and very low sense of security. Moreover, about 24 percent of women, respondents have high and very high sense of security, and men, against, about 34 percent have high and very high sense of security.

| SEX | | | | | |
|----------|--------|------|-------------|--------------------|--|
| total | | | | safety | |
| | female | men | | | |
| 50 | 39 | 11 | Frequently | Vom low | |
| 22.4 | 27.1 | 13.9 | Row percent | Very low | |
| 48 | 30 | 18 | Frequently | low | |
| 21.5 | 20.8 | 22.8 | Row percent | IOW | |
| 64 | 41 | 23 | Frequently | | |
| 28.7 | 28.5 | 29.1 | Row percent | some | |
| 29 | 12 | 17 | Frequently | 1.1.1 | |
| 13 | 8.3 | 21.5 | Row percent | high | |
| 32 | 22 | 10 | Frequently | Very high | |
| 14.3 | 15.3 | 12.7 | Row percent | | |
| 223 | 144 | 79 | Frequently | 4-4-1 | |
| 100 | 100 | 100 | Row percent | total | |
| chi=11.1 | | | Sig=000 | Significance level | |

Table 2: Distribution of respondents in terms of Sense of security and sexuality in modern family,

Sense of security and sexuality in traditional family

Relationship between sexuality and sense of security in traditional family represented that sexuality affects on level sense of security, so that can say with confidence, women in the traditional family to men in the same family have enjoyed low sense of security. As it is represented in table3.about 38 percent of women respondents in traditional family have enjoyed low and very low sense of security, men, against, about 34percent, have enjoyed low and very low sense of security. Moreover, about 40 percent of women respondents have high and very high sense of security. Men, against, about 34 percent, have high and very high sense of security.

| | SEX | | | | |
|----------|--------|-------|-------------|--------------------|--|
| total | | | | safety | |
| | female | men | | | |
| 75 | 51 | 24 | Frequently | Varia la ser | |
| 20.3 | 27.9 | 12.8 | Row percent | Very low | |
| 59 | 19 | 40 | Frequently | low | |
| 15.9 | 10.4 | 21.4 | Row percent | | |
| 86 | 41 | 45 | Frequently | some | |
| 23.2 | 22.4 | 24.1 | Row percent | | |
| 74 | 36 | 38 | Frequently | high | |
| 20 | 19.7 | 20.3 | Row percent | | |
| 76 | 36 | 40 | Frequently | Very high | |
| 20.5 | 19.7 | 21.4 | Row percent | | |
| 370 | 183 | 187 | Frequently | total | |
| 100 | 100 | 100 | Row percent | | |
| chi=17.6 | | Sig=0 | 00 | Significance level | |

 Table 3: Distribution of respondents in terms of Sense of security and sexuality in traditional family

Women's Sense of security and power structure in the family

Relationship between authority structure family and women's sense of security represented that, authority structure family affects on level sense of security; so that can say with confidence, women's in the traditional family have more enjoyed sense of security, and democratic family women, have low sense of security. As it is represents in table4. About 48percent of women respondents, which lives in modern family, have enjoyed low and very low sense of security. Women in traditional family, against about 38 percent have enjoyed low and very low sense of security. In addition, about 40 percent of women which lives in traditional family, have high and very high sense of security and modern family against, about 24 percent have high and very high sense of security.

Table 4: Distribution of respondents in terms of Women's Sense of security and power structure in the family

| power structure | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------|--|
| total | | | | Safety | |
| | Female in traditional family | Female in modern family | | | |
| 90 | 51 | 39 | Frequently | Very low | |
| 27.5 | 27.9 | 27.1 | Row percent | | |
| 49 | 19 | 30 | Frequently | Low | |
| 15 | 10.4 | 20.8 | Row percent | | |
| 82 | 41 | 41 | Frequently | Some | |
| 25.1 | 22.4 | 28.5 | Row percent | | |
| 48 | 36 | 12 | Frequently | High | |
| 14.7 | 19.7 | 8.3 | Row percent | | |
| 58 | 36 | 22 | Frequently | Very high | |
| 17.7 | 19.7 | 15.3 | Row percent | | |
| 327 | 183 | 144 | Frequently | Total | |
| 100 | 100 | 100 | Row percent | | |
| | chi=15.1 | Sig=05 | Significance level | | |

Table5: Distribution of respondents in terms of safety of men and power structure

| power structure | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------|--|
| total | | | | Safety | |
| | men in traditional family | men in modern family | | | |
| 35 | 24 | 11 | Frequently | Very low | |
| 13.2 | 12.8 | 13.9 | Row percent | | |
| 58 | 40 | 18 | Frequently | Low | |
| 21.8 | 21.4 | 22.8 | Row percent | | |
| 68 | 45 | 23 | Frequently | Some | |
| 25.6 | 24.1 | 29.1 | Row percent | | |
| 55 | 38 | 17 | Frequently | High | |
| 20.7 | 20.3 | 21.5 | Row percent | | |
| 50 | 40 | 10 | Frequently | Very high | |
| 18.8 | 21.4 | 12.7 | Row percent | | |
| 266 | 187 | 79 | Frequently | Total | |
| 100 | 100 | 100 | Row percent | | |
| chi=2.945 | | Sig=56 | Significance le | evel | |

Men's Sense of security and authority structure in the family

Relationship between authority structure family and men's sense of security represented that, authority structure family don't affects on level sense of security.(see table 5)

This study in order to survey family structure on sense of security; this article indicate that concept's security can be constructed social space, especially family structure, and developed in the context of social. Based on findings, it can be concluded that one of the major forms is obtained with by transmission formative's concept, that is through internal interaction and ego dialogue and meditation method and both by Interaction and talk with non-self 's and others. Security that embodies in itself and evidence example, does not have significant apart a form of social world, and it completely constructed in social. That defines and redefines in the Process socialization and Current processes of social interaction. It is evident that insecurity to be considerate when individuals of community or Specific group do not accept the same and standard definition of security, and willing a various meaning. Because standard definition establishes a security thus, it is clearly; People who feel insecure to follow give a meaning in conditions, which feel that this condition is insecure.

As many proposed, security in term of nature is a relative concept. Then, it cannot be an absolute definition provided. The analytical is necessarily internal and direct relationship with Distinguish and assessment external threats, because always the external threat Within the context origin of the internal vulnerable, then, planning any system of secure require Involves external and internal threats identifying potential and actually requires simultaneous assessment of aspects, weaknesses, strengths, limits, own possible(Moazen jami,791378, Babakhanlo20, 1382)

On the other hand, there are differences significant about sense of security between the men and women in difference structure. In other word, sense of insecurity women on construction of social and particularly family system that it is positivity inside defined social structure and family, and adaptationable. In general, this attitude represented underside layers. Finally, though sex differences based on physical differences, but how does the behavior of each gender proceeds of structure family, and also this structure lead to insecurity of them.

REFERENCES

[1] Ezazi, Shalla, (1382), Sociology of the family, Thran, Roshangran and Women Study Publication.

[2] Bordrive, Peier, (1380), Theory of Action, Siyed Mortz Mrdiha. Nagsh Afrin Publication.

[3] Tavasoli, Golam Abas, (1380) Sociological Theories, Thran, Samt

[4] Tavasoli, Golam Abas(autm1379), Social Sciences and Education, Education journal, Ministry of Education, Thran, 16

[5] Rash. Micheal,(1377), Custom and Community; Introduction to Sociology Traditional, Samt press

[6] Wurzbacher, Hyvi(1367), Family As Structure Against Community, Mohammad Sadeg Mahdavi, Tehran, Center of University The Tehran.

[7] Roshe. Gyi,(1376), Talcott Parsons Sociology, Translator, Abdol Hossian Nik Gohar, Tebyan Publication

[8] Sorrokhani, Bager(1377) Introduction on Family Sociology, Tehran, Sorosh Publication.

[9] Couks, Raber Tadbilo(1380). New Rralism, Perspective on Some Aspects And World Order, Research And Stratgic Studies.

[10] Koen. Bros,(1381), Principles of Sociology, Golam Abas Tavsoli, Reza Fazel, Tehran, Samt.

[11] Giddens, Anthony(1377), Modernity And Dignity. Translator, Nser Mofagiyan, Ney Nashr.

[12] Laing, R, D,(1374). Four Self Interrupted, Bageri Khosro, Tehran, Samt.