Volume : 3 | Issue : 4 | April 2014 • ISSN No 2277 - 8160

Research Paper Social Science

Joyful Living and Freedom in Family Environment

Dr. K. C. Barmola Lecturer, Amity Institute of Behavioural and Allied Sciences, Amity University Rajastha.

ABSTRACT *Present study explores the role of freedom/restrictiveness of family environment in joyful living of students. This is done in the present study by finding the relationship between freedom/restrictiveness of family environment and joyful living applying statistical measure Chi-square ($\chi 2$) test. No significant relationship ($\chi 2=2.037$) is found between freedom/restrictiveness of family environment and joyful living among high school students. Therefore it can be concluded that to have joyful living among children it may not require to have cordial partnership between child and parents. On the other hand joyful living among students can not indicate a warm relationship between parent and child.*

KEYWORDS : Joyful living, freedom/restrictiveness, family environment, high school students.

To get happiness forget about it; then, with any luck, happiness will come as a by-product in pursuing meaningful activities and relationships. This adage is known as the paradox of happiness, but actually it contains a number of different paradoxes concerning aims, success, freedom, and attitudes. These paradoxes enhance our understanding of the complexity of happiness and its interaction with other values in good lives, that is, lives which are happy as well as morally decent, meaningful, and fulfilling. Yet, each paradox conveys a one-sided truth that needs to be balanced with others. Happiness, understood as subjective well-being, involves positively evaluating our lives and living with a sense of well-being. As such, it should not be confused with either pleasure or normative conceptions of true happiness (Mike, 2013). According to Websters joyful living is a state of well-being characterized by emotions ranging from contentment to intense joy and a pleasurable or satisfying experience. Many people believe in joy of choosing that one need free choice in order to be happy. However, research on choice has actually turned up some interesting and contradictory data. Some studies have shown that economic development, democratization, and rising social tolerance have increased the extent to which people perceive that they have free choice. This, in turn, has led to higher levels of happiness around the world (Inglehart et al., 2008). People who feel they have freedom of choice tend to be happier than those who do not. In other words, it is not sufficient to have more choice, one need to feel in control of these choices to be happier (Paolo, 2009). The Declaration of Independence spells out unalienable rights as life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It's no wonder that these rights are grouped together; the belief that one has free choice and control over one's life is closely linked with happiness (Johnson and Krueger, 1996). Choice can have a negative component as well. When people have the opportunity to make a choice, they have a goal of either satisfying their needs or satisfying or maximizing every possible angle to find the best possible choice. Satisfying needs can be difficult but maximizing in every decision can be paralyzing. When a person is faced with many options and must make a choice, that decision can be enslaving because the likeliness that they we make a suboptimal choice rises (Schwartz et al., 2002). Present study is related to school students therefore their school experience matter for joyful living. The results of longitudinal cross-lagged structural equation modeling support the notion of an upward spiral of positive school experiences and happiness over time. Positive school experiences had a stable lagged effect on happiness, and, in turn, happiness had a lagged effect on future positive school experiences (Barbara et al., 2013). Students being satisfied at home and school lead to joyful life. . It was found that there was a positive linear relationship between life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction and perceived freedom in leisure. There was no difference between leisure satisfactions according to gender; however there was a significant difference between perceived freedoms according to gender. A significant difference between Leisure Satisfaction and Perceived Freedom according to age and income was also found (Tennur, 2013)

Erich Fromm, in his seminal work, Escape from Freedom, describes the dual aspects of freedom: one can have both freedom from restrictions and freedom to what one wants to do. When people experience freedom from restrictions placed on them by other people or institutions, they do not always experience enjoyment. Instead, they are often left with feelings of emptiness and anxiety. Convicted criminals who are released from jail but end up committing a subsequent crime in order to return to jail are a perfect example of this phenomenon. When one has unfamiliar freedom, often crave someone to lead us or so as not to have to make decisions on our own. However, if people can become more spontaneous and independent in their thinking, individuals have a better chance to use our freedom for positive outcomes, such as happiness (Fromm, 1941). There could be an important role of home environment in expression of freedom which may contribute in joyful living of students. The results of a correlation analysis revealed a positively significant relationship of psychological well being with protectiveness, conformity, reward and nurturance dimensions of home environment among adolescents. However, a negatively significant relationship of psychological well being with control and punishment dimensions of home environment among adolescents was observed. A stepwise multiple regression analysis was run to examine the extent to which the various dimensions of home environment contributed to the variability in psychological well being among adolescents. The results indicated that only the conformity, reward and nurturance dimension of home environment were the significant predictors of psychological well being among adolescents. (Kaur, 2013). Regression analyses suggest that that the extent to which a society allows free-choice has a major impact on happiness. Since 1981, economic development, democratization, and increasing social tolerance have increased the extent to which people perceive that they have free choice, which in turn has led to higher levels of happiness around the world, as the human development model suggests (Inglehart et al., 2008). The preoccupation with economic growth has not led to increase in happiness in the developed world. More than that, the world experienced the worst financial crisis of 2008 since the Great Depression. It is drawn from Sen's work Development as Freedom and research on economics of happiness to explore the situations when increasing instrumental freedoms have not resulted in overall increase in happiness (Gorovaia and Zenios, 2013).

Research has produced many different views on causes of happiness, and on factors that correlate with happiness, Wallis and Haidt (2009) say that happiness may be the label for a family of related emotional states, such as joy, amusement, satisfaction, gratification, euphoria, and triumph. Psychologist Martin Seligman (2004) asserts that happiness is not solely derived from external, momentary pleasures, and provides the acronym PERMA to summarize Positive Psychology's correlational findings: humans seem happiest when they have 1) Pleasure 2) Engagement 3) Relationships 4) Meaning and 5) Accomplishments. Thus in continued exploration of joyful living in life among students, the present study is intended to find the role of family environment in joyful living among school students. And above all in family the significance of freedom/restrictiveness in family climate for students could be important in context of their happiness.

Objective

To study the role of freedom/restrictiveness of family environment in joyful living of students.

Hypothesis
There would be no significant relationship between joyful living and freedom/restrictiveness of family environment.

METHODOLOGY

Sample: Sample of the present study is consisted of 152 high school students who are selected randomly from different public schools of Haridwar and Dehradun district of Uttarakhand: India. The age range of the students is 14 to 16 years.

Research Design and Data Analysis: The present study is a quantitative research to assess the relationship between joyful living and freedom/restrictiveness of family environment among high school students. Chi-square test is used to find the relationship between joyful living and freedom/restrictiveness of family environment among high school students.

Tools: The following Questionnaires are administered for the present investigation:-

Mental Health Scale (Bhatia and Sharma, 1998): The M.H.S. measures a total of five dimensions of the mental health of the students. It contains a total of 50 items (10 items in each dimension with some of positive and negative items). The respondents are to respond on a five point scale. In the current study researcher has used only joyful living dimension. The total score ranges for the present study from 0 to 50. Its' reliability on emotional stability dimension is 0.77 and overall reliability 0.79.

Family Climate Scale (Beena and Shah, 1990): The complete scale is consisted of 90 items but having used only one dimension (freedom/restrictiveness of family environment) in the current study it is of only 9 items. There are three choices to respond to: always, sometime and never. For negative items choices for always, sometime and never 0, 1, 2 respectively and for positive items this is reverse. The total score ranges for the current study from 0 to 18. The reliability of the used dimension is 0.75 and overall reliability coefficient of the scale is 0.76

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Findings of the currents study is presented below in 2x2 Chi-square ($\chi 2$) table. Joyful living is shown in two levels of high and low on the other hand family environment is shown freedom and restrictiveness level. On one finding there are found 74 on high and 78 students on low level of joyful living. In another finding there are found 88 students on freedom and 64 on restrictiveness level of family environment. Overall relationship ($\chi 2$=2.037) is not found significant. Therefore the null hypothesis of no difference between joyful living and freedom/restrictiveness of family environment is accepted. Thus it may be estimated from the current findings that there is not any significant relationship between joyful living and freedom/restrictiveness of family environment among high school students.

Table: Showing the Relationship between Joyful Living and Family Environment (Freedom/Restrictiveness)

Joyful Living	Family Environment		Total
	Freedom	Restrictiveness	
High	38 (42.8)	36 (31.2)	74
Low	50 (45.2)	28 (32.8)	78
Total	88	64	152

$\chi 2$ =2.037 (df=1, Not Significant)

So it may be estimated from the current findings that there is not any significant role of freedom/restrictiveness of family environment in joyful living among high school students. In other words it can be said that the role of freedom and restrictiveness in family environment could not have such impact which can influence the joyful living of students. Reasons behind this non significant relationship could be the lack of strong attachments between parent and child, poor parenting style and neglected familial involvement.

CONCLUSION

There are many studies which say that family environment could play a significant role in overall development of a child. Therefore the current study is designed to find the role of familial freedom and restrictiveness on joyful living of high school students. Findings suggest that there is not any significant role of freedom/restrictiveness in joyful living of students. Although this finding is not in line with many such findings which suggest significant role of freedom/restrictiveness in joyful living and happiness of an individual even if one can imagine the result of current findings could be as one of possible outcome.

REFERENCES

Barbara, S., Timo, G., Manuela, G. and Bernad, B. (2013) The upward spiral of adolescents' positive school experiences and happiness: Investigating reciprocal effects over time. Journal of School Psychology, 51(2), 231–242. | Bhatia and Sharma (1998). Mental Health Scale. Published by Prakhar Psychological Testing and Research Centre, Orai (Jaulan). | Beena and Shah (1990). Family Climate Scale. Published by National Psychological Coroporation, Agra. | Fromm, E. (1941) Escape from Freedom, New York: Henry Holt and Company. | Gorovaia, N. and Zenios, S. A (2013) Does freedom lead to happiness? Economic growth and quality of life. Global Business and Economics Review, 15(2 – 3). | Inglehart, R., Foa, R., Peterson, C. and Welzel, C. (2008) Development, Freedom, and Rising Happiness A Global Perspective (1981-2007). Perspectives on Psychological Science, 3(4), 264-285. | Johnson, W. and Krueger, R.F. (1996) How Money Buys Happiness: Genetic and Environmental Processes Linking Finances and Life Satisfaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90(4), 680-691. | Kaur, J. (2013) Home environment as a predictor of psychological well being among adolescents. International Journal of Education and Psychology in the Community, 3(1), 22-33 | Mike W. Martin (2013) Paradoxes of Happiness. The Exploration of Happiness: Happiness Studies Book Series, 31-46. | Paolo, V. (2009) Happiness, Freedom and Control, Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 71(2), 146-161 | Schwartz, B., Andrew, W., Monterosso, J., Sonja, L., Katherine, W. and Darrin, L. (2002) Maximizing Versus Satisficing: Happiness is a Matter of Choice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83(5), 1178-1197. | Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). Can Happiness be Taught? Daedalus Journal | Tennur, Y. L. (2013) Life Satisfaction, Leisure Satisfaction and Perceived Freedom of Park Recreation Participants Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 93, | Wallis, S. A. and Haidt. J. (2009) The Journal of Positive Psychology, 3. |