



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

Journal homepage: <http://www.journalijar.com>
Journal DOI: [10.21474/IJAR01](https://doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01)

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
OF ADVANCED RESEARCH**

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Assessment of perception of objective well being (OWB) by urban families belonging to expanding stage of family life cycle in Udaipur city.

Neetu Singh¹, Suman Audichay².

1. PhD Research Scholar, College of Home Science, Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur.
2. Professor, College of Home Science, Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur.

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History:

Received: 12 February 2016
 Final Accepted: 25 March 2016
 Published Online: April 2016

Key words:

Perception, Objective Well Being, Urban Families, Expanding Stage of Family Life Cycle.

***Corresponding Author**

Neetu Singh.

Abstract

The study was undertaken to assess the perception of objective well being (OWB) by urban families belonging to expanding stage of family life cycle in Udaipur city. The study was based on the sample of 400 respondents (200 husbands and 200 wives) belonging to middle socio- economic status selected purposively from Udaipur city. Data was collected through an objective well being scale developed by an investigator and was standardized by calculating validity and reliability of the scale. Percent distribution of urban respondents revealed that the majority (91%) of respondents had perceived a high level of objective well being. Only 9 per cent of total respondents had a moderate level of perception for objective well being, whereas none of the respondent identified in the present study that had a low level of perception for OWB.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2016., All rights reserved.

Introduction:-

Well-being is essentially multidimensional and includes the following dimensions: material living standards (income, consumption and wealth), health, education, personal activities including work, political voice and governance, social connections, environment (present and future conditions), and personal and economic security (Thorbecke, 2009).

Wellbeing is difficult to define but it is even harder to measure. In general, wellbeing measures can be classified into two broad categories: objective and subjective measures. The first category measures wellbeing through certain observable facts such as economic, social and environmental statistics. On the other hand, subjective measures of wellbeing capture people's feelings, aspirations or real experience in a direct way (van Hoorn 2007).

Objective Well-being theories are usually supported by a list of requirements that people should have satisfied in order to lead a good life, those requirements are universal and do not vary among societies. Subjective Well-being theories base their notion of well-being on the fact that people are reckoned to be the best judges of the overall quality of their lives, and it is a straightforward strategy to ask them about their well-being (Frey and Sutzter, 2002)

Objective well-being is based on hard data, i.e. it represents an external view of well-being and is measured by statistical indicators usually obtained from official statistical sources. Objective well-being of a society assumes achieving and sustaining economic development, which is why, Interpretation of the economic development of the eighteenth and nineteenth century as the increased total output of an economy or income per capita is at the present time considered as economic well-being, though it does not totally correspond with economic development (Ivkovic et al., 2014).

Methodology:-

The present study was conducted within the municipal limits of Udaipur city. The total sample for the present study consisted of 200 urban families (i.e. 200 husbands and 200 wives) having monthly income ranging from Rs. 15001 – 45000 per capita (Urban Improvement Trust, Udaipur 2007). Data of 200 families were classified on the bases of family structure i.e. 100 families (100 husbands and 100 wives) were selected from joint families and 100 families (100 husbands and 100 wives) were selected from nuclear families. Total of 400 preliminary samples were distributed personally to families selected from different zones, from which 332 was received back and 68 of families were discarded as they did not fulfill the criteria for the sample selection. Thus the total eligible families were 229. Out of 229, 200 families were selected on the basis of convenience of the researchers to contact them and families assurance of cooperation in data collection.

Scale for measuring Objective Well Being (OWB):-

In order to assess the perception of Objective Well Being by urban families, a scale was developed by an investigator and was standardized by calculating validity and Reliability of the scale. Items related to four dimension areas namely personal, financial physical, socio-emotional were formulated. The final version of the inventory constituted 51 items. On the basis of scoring, three level criteria namely agree (3), partial agree (2) and disagree (1) were formulated which was used for analyses of the data. So, the score range of OWB is 51 and 153 where the minimum score is 51 and the maximum score is 153. The reliability score of the overall measuring OWB of urban families is 0.86. Dimension wise reliability score for personal (0.79), financial (0.74), physical (0.78), socio-emotional (0.68) were calculated. The validity score of the overall measuring OWB of urban families is 2.49. For the standardization of the scale, the scale was given to a panel of 6 experts from the field of Human Development and Family Studies, Psychology, sociology, Foods and Nutrition, Family Resource Management, home science extension and communication management to evaluate the suitability and relevance of the items for assessment of perception of family well being by adults families.

Result and discussion:-

Table clearly shows that the majority (79.75) of respondent perceived a high level of **personal well being** (aspects included as- Competence and ability to take responsibility, Ability to take decision, maintaining social relationship) followed by 19.75 per cent of respondents perceived a moderate level of personal well being. It was only 0.5% of urban respondent who perceived a low level of personal well being. The finding of present study is comparable to Erdogam *et al.*, (2012) which states that individual with higher life satisfaction are more likely to have higher level of career satisfaction optimistic and hopeful, lower turnover intentions and higher organizational commitment. Thus personal well being might be measured in term of how happy and satisfied people are with their life or aspect of their life like Job, Education, health, achievements, goals etc (ABS 2006).

Table: 1 Dimension wise Percentage distribution of urban families for their level of perceived Objective Well Being (OWB)

(N=400)

Dimensions of OWB	Levels of perceived OWB		
	High	Moderate	Low
Personal well being	79.75	19.75	00.50
Financial well being	66.00	30.00	04.00
Physical well being	94.50	05.25	00.25
Socio-Emotional well being	90.75	08.50	00.75
Overall OWB	91.00	9.00	0.00

It is perceptible from table 9 and Fig 2 that 66 per cent of the respondents perceived a high level of **financial well being** (aspects included as- Basic needs / comfortable living, Planning of financial resources / planning for future of children, financial support system) followed by 30 per cent of the respondents perceived a moderate level of financial well being, whereas only 4per cent of respondents showed a low level of perception for the financial well being. According to Varhely and Corozza (2000), the mean of the household income and monthly housing costs have a strong positive effect on housing satisfaction. Higher housing income implies a nicer and better situated house.

With regard to **physical well being** (aspects included as Exercise and yoga / enough sleep and rest, Healthy eating habits / avoidance of alcohol and smoking, Home environment / hygiene, Regular medical check-up / access to health services) it was found that the majority of respondents i.e. 94.5 per cent had perceived high level of physical well being, whereas 5.25 per cent and only 0.25 per cent of respondents had moderate and low level of perception for physical well being respectively. A recent studies found that educated people and people with higher educational status combine health and fitness and show a much more sophisticated understanding of health (Wollny *et al.*, 2010) and they also observed that cleanliness, proximity to nature, absence of pollution were mentioned by them also contributing factor to quality of living area and therefore to well being and (Well being report by TNS Qual, 2011). The finding of perception of physical well being was also supported by Petty (2008) study who found that person high in life satisfaction was more likely to be a healthy weight, exercise and eat healthy food.

Similarly it was found that, in **socio-emotional well being** (aspects included as Social skills / competence and social adequacy, Quality of relationship, Social participation/ freedom of expression, Family connectedness and emotional bounding between family members.), 90.75 per cent of respondent had perceived high level of socio-emotional well being whereas 8.5 per cent of respondent had moderate level of perception for socio-emotional wellbeing only 0.75 per cent of respondent had perceived low level of socio-emotional well being. According to Patterson (2002) family relationship and functioning is concerned with the processes by which a family attains its various functions such as emotional and economic support and protection of vulnerable person. Considerable evidence suggested that experiences within and outside the family have a major influence on the well being of adults and children. For adults, there is extensive research show that marriage is strongly associated with physical and mental health and with life satisfaction. The well being of children is closely associated with a parent-child relationship. Harmony in social relations, good social networks/contacts, exchange of ideas and emotions was identified as one of the few factors that influence well being that does not have a straightforward connection to money (Wollny *et al.*, 2010).

After area wise discussion, it was observed that the majority (91%) of respondents had perceived high level of **objective well being**. Only 9 per cent of total respondents had a moderate level of perception for objective well being, whereas none of the respondent identified in the present study that had a low level of perception for OWB. The finding of present study confirm with another research which argues that most experts and ordinary people around the world would agree that objective well being requires meeting various human needs, some of which are essential (e.g. being in good health), and includes the ability to pursue one's goals, to thrive and feel satisfied with their life (OECD, 2011)

Conclusion:-

Objective well being is necessary to maintain a good quality of life. A major driving force in human activity is the desire for optimal health, for better living conditions, well being of family members and improved quality of life. Individuals seek to achieve these for themselves, for their family, and for the communities of which they are a part. It was concluded from present investigation that perception of well being varies from person to person, family to family and culture to culture like middle social groups emphasize the importance of employment and making money as associations with well-being, some people in the higher middle social groups focus more on psychological associations with well-being than other practical factors, People with low levels of income/ low skills/ education do not value job satisfaction as much as people with high income, education or skill levels.

References:-

- 1) Frey, B. S., & Slutzer, A. 2002. "What can economist learn from happiness research?" *Journal of Economic Literature*, **XL**: 402-435.
- 2) Veenhoven, R. 2007. Subjective measures of well-Being, In: Mc Gillvray (Ed.) *Human Wellbeing, Concepts and Measurement*, Palgrave/McMillan, 2007, Houndmills, New Hampshire, USA, Chapter 9, pp.214-239 ISBN 10-0-230-00498-9.
- 3) Thorbecke, E. 2009. Measurement of Social Well-being and Progress. Paper prepared for the International Seminar, Organized by INEGI at CIDE, Mexico City. http://www.inegi.org.mx/prod_serv/contenidos/espanol/bvinegi/productos/integracion/especiales/revista-inter/RevistaDigital2/Doctos/RDE_02_Art6.pdf
- 4) Ivković, F. A., Ham, M., and Josipa, M. 2014. Measuring Objective Well-Being and Sustainable Development Management. *Journal of Knowledge Management, Economics and Information Technology* **4**:45-68.
- 5) Erdogan, B., Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., & Mansfield, L. R. 2012. Whistle while you work: A review of the life satisfaction literature. *Journal of Management* **38**: 1038-1083.

- 6) Australian Bureau of Statistics 2006.Measures of Australia's Progress, 2006. (cat. no. 1370.0)
- 7) Varady, D. P., Carozza, M. A., 2000. Towards a better way to measure customer satisfaction levels in public housing, a report from Cincinnati. *Housing Studies*, **15**:797–825.
- 8) Pettay, R. S. 2008. Health behaviors and life satisfaction in college students. Doctoral Dissertation, Kansas State University.
- 9) Wollny, I., Apps, J. and Henricson, C. 2010. Can government measure family wellbeing? London: Family and Parenting Institute.
- 10) Well-being- Eurobarometer Qualitative studies, Aggregate Report (2011) Conducted by TNS Qual+ at the request of the European Commission, Directorate-General for Communication, "Research and Speechwriting" Unit.
- 11) Patterson, J.M. 2002. Integrating family resilience and family stress theory. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **64**:349—360.
- 12) Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 2011: Economic well-being. OECD Framework for Statistics on the Distribution of Household Income, Consumption and Wealth © OECD 2013.Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/statistics/OECD-ICW-Framework-Chapter2.pdf>