RESEARCH PAPER | Management | Volume : 3 | Issue : 2 | February 2013 | ISSN - 2249-555X

A Comparative Study of the Impact of Perceived Adequacy of Resources (PAR) on Quality of Life (QOL) of Working and Non-Working Home Makers

KEYWORDS: Adequacy, Quality of Life, Homemaker, Scales, Reliability and Validity.

Dr. Purva Jaggi

Research Associate, National Agricultural Innovation Project., CSKHPKV, Palampur, Himachal Pradesh.

ABSTRACT *Due to vast changes in the modern era, material happiness has become one of the primary goals of every human being, as a result changes and conflicts have taken place in the life of people and in their standard of living. Hence an attempt has been made to compare the impact of perceived adequacy of resources on quality of life of working and non working homemakers for which two scales have been constructed namely PAR (Perceived Adequacy of Resources) and QOL (Quality of Life). The correlation coefficient between PAR and QOL revealed that non-working homemakers had low correlation between PAR and QOL. This showed that working women perceived the resources well than the non-working women.*

INTRODUCTION

Due to the fast changes in day today the possession of resources does not match with the variety and quality of resources available in the society and the purchasing power has ended in the conflicting situation for the common man. Hence, the feeling of adequacy and satisfaction is of vital importance in today's world. It is therefore, very important that how the adequacy of resources is perceived by the individual and how this can affect the person in all aspects of life. Happiness or well-being has been one of the primary goals of human beings in all the cultures ever since dawn of civilization. If truth be told "to a great extent, well-being depends on person's ability to choose a direction in life, to form intentions and then to make sure that the preferred path is being tracked" (Boniwell 2007). But the consumerist and capitalistic modern society dominating the west explicitly encourages obtaining wealth and status and extrinsic goals such as financial success, social recognition and appearance (Craig 2009). Objective situations affect individuals through their perceptions of them (Luthans 2007) and therefore, individuals are the best judges of their well-being. Such perceptual indication can be useful in identifying conditions affecting quality of life or lifestyle satisfaction among different groups. They also provide a basis for understanding the relationships of objective conditions and changes in these conditions to the subjective sense of well - being. Perceptual indicators are therefore, essential for understanding the impact of objective conditions upon individual satisfaction. Since, the individual perception of resources is more important than actual resources in explaining the variance of outcome measures (Goldsmith et al. 1988). Perception of level of resource adequacy for human and non - human resources, ultimately, leads to happiness and satisfaction in one's life. It was with this background that the present work was planned to study Perceived Adequacy of Resources (PAR) separately for human and non - human resources in Indian settings and then the effect of Perceived Adequacy of Resources on Quality of Life of urban homemakers (working) and urban homemakers (non- working) were compared to study the correlation between the two.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Locale of the study

The study was conducted within the municipal limits of Udaipur City.

Sample Selection

Samples of 30 subjects were selected for item analysis and a sample of 100, (50 working and 50 non working) home makers were taken.

Selection and development of tool

Two scales namely PAR and QOL were developed using Likert Summated Rating method and standardized in the following manner.

1. Listing of items

For developing a scale on PAR, an exhaustive list of various types of resources both human and non-human was made. Similarly, a list of various aspects of life like physical health, environmental, cognitive and social aspect etc. were noted. Out of 75 statements, 49 statements for PAR and 34 for QOL scale were finally accepted after being evaluated by a team of experts.

2. Item analysis

Item analysis of each item of the two scales were carried out by calculating the t-values. 30 statements for each scale having higher t-values were selected and rest was rejected. The statements were then arranged in the increasing order of t-values.

3. Converting the statements into scale form

50% of the statements were converted into positive or favourable and 50% into negative or unfavourable statements and the responses were sought in the form of scales on 5 degree continuum ranging from 0-4. Thus, the score of an individual in the scale could be 120 at maximum and 0 at minimum.

4. Reliability and validity of the scales were calculated

Reliability and validity of the scales was determined by calculating the reliability score and validity score of the scale using Spearman's Brown Prophecy Formula and by calculating the index of Reliability.

Collection of Data

The data regarding various aspects of PAR and QOL of each subject was collected with the help of developed scales. The responses of the subjects were demanded on a five point continum namely : Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Generally agree, strongly agree.

Analysis of data

The data obtained was analysed using suitable statistical applications to study the impact of Perceived Adequacy of Resources on Quality of Life.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of table 1 reveals that the reliability of the PAR scale was found to be 0.973 and validity of PAR was 0.986 at 0.01 level of significance which indicates that the PAR scale was highly reliable and valid to measure PAR. The results of Table II reveals that the reliability of QOL scale was found to be 0.959 and the validity of QOL was 0.978 at 0.01 level of significance which indicates that the QOL scale was highly reliable and valid to measure QOL. Table III reveals that in case of homemakers (Non-working), nearly 60% had "Above average" PAR. None had "Extremely poor" or "poor" PAR whereas 20% possessed "Average" PAR and "Excellent" PAR

Volume : 3 | Issue : 2 | February 2013 | ISSN - 2249-555X

but in case of home-maker (working), 68% had "Above Average" PAR, 14% had "Average" PAR and 18% had "Excellent" PAR. None of the subjects had "Extremely Poor" or "Poor" PAR. On comparing the mean scores it was observed that non working home makers and working women showed no difference in their PAR, the values being very close to one another i.e. 83.76 and 84.54 respectively.

Table I : Reliability and Validity of PAR scale

Correlation Score	Reliability score	Index of Reliability Score
0.948*	0.973*	0.986*

*Significant at 0.01 level of significance.

Table II : Reliability and Validity of QOL scale

Correlation Score	Reliability score	Index of Reliability Score
0.920	0.959*	0.978*

*Significant at 0.01 level of significance.

Table III : Frequency and percentage distribution of the sample at different levels of PAR and their mean score

Level	Non Working home maker (N=50)	Working home makers (N=50)	Total N = 100
Extremely Poor (0-24)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Poor (25-48)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Average (49-72)	10(20)	7(14)	17(17)
Above average (73-96)	30(60)	34(68)	64(64)
Excellent (97-120)	10(20)	9(18)	19(19)
Mean Score Max. Score - 120	83.73	84.54	84.16
Level	Above average	Above average	Above average

Figures in parenthesis denotes percentage.

Table IV: Frequency and percentage distribution of the sample at different levels of QOL and their mean score

Level	Non Working home maker (N=50)	Working home maker (N=50)	Total N = 100
Extremely Poor (0-24)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Poor (25-48)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Average (49-72)	3(6)	1(2)	4(4)
Above average (73-96)	34(68)	26(52)	60(60)
Excellent (97-120)	13(26)	23(46)	36(36)
Mean Score Max. Score - 120	93.94	89.78	91.86
Level	Above average	Above average	Above average

Table IV reveals that for QOL scale, 68 of the non working home makers had "Above Average" QOL while 26% had "Excellent" QOL and only 6% had "Average" QOL. In case of working women, 52% had "Above Average" QOL and 46% had "Excellent" QOL. Only 2% had "Average QOL". The mean score in case of non working home makers was 93.94 whereas for working homemakers it was 89.78. Table V reveals that in the case of non working homemakers, none of them had "Extremely Poor" and "Poor" PAR and QOL. Further, 20% of the non working homemakers had "Average" PAR while only 6% had "Average" QOL. The results also indicate that out of 50 a samples of working homemakers, 60% had "Above Average" PAR while 68% had "Above Average" QOL. At the highest level, i.e. "Above Average: PAR while 68% had "Above Average" QOL. At the highest level, i.e. "Excellent", 20% non working homemakers had "Excellent" PAR while 26% of them had "Excellent" QOL. The mean score of PAR was 83.76 whereas for QOL, it was found to be 93.94 respectively. But in case of working home makers, none had "Extremely Poor", "Poor" PAR as well as QOL. 14% of the working home makers had "Average" PAR while only 1% of them had "Average" QOL. 68% of the working home makers had "Above Average" PAR and only 52% had "Above Average" QOL. At "Excellent" level, 18% of the working women were there for PAR and 46% for QOL. The mean score of PAR was 84.54 and that of QOL was 89.78 respectively.

Table V : Comparison of PAR and QOL of the sample for different categories at different levels

Level	Non working home makers(N=50)		Working home makers(N=50)		Total sample N=100	
	PAR	QOL	PAR	QOL	PAR	QOL
Extremely Poor (0-24)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Poor (25-48)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Average (49-2)	10(20)	3(6)	7(14)	1(2)	17(17)	4(4)
Above average (73-96)	30(60)	34(68)	34(68)	26(52)	64(64)	60(60)
Excellent (97-120)	10(20)	13(26)	9(18)	23(46)	19(46)	36(36)
Mean Score Max. Score - 120	83.76	93.94	84.54	89.78	84.16	91.86
Level	Above average	Above average	Above average	Above average	Above average	Above average

The results of Table VI reveal that, all the three correlations were found to be significant at 0.01 level of significance which indicates that PAR has a significant role to play in the QOL of an individual. Further, non working home maker showed low correlation between PAR and QOL in comparison to working home makers, but both the values were significant at 0.01 level of significance.

Table VI : Correlation Coefficients obtained between PAR and QOL of working and non-working homemakers

	Category	Correlation coefficients between PAR and QOL
1.	Homemaker (N=50)	0.607**
2.	Working Women (N=50)	0.690**
	Total sample (N=100)	0.641**

CONCLUSION

It is evident from the results that PAR scores of human resources were significantly higher than the PAR scores of non - human resources. The study has also concluded that there was no significant difference between PAR scores of males and females this indicates a better coherence and lesser conflicts between husband and wife that may lead to breaks. The results here also are in concurrence with the present day data on family and social conflict leading to separation, breaks and divorces, which are at very low rate than elsewhere on the globe. In the present study, maximum respondents' PAR falling at 'above average' level is an encouraging note. Efforts are required that same ideology is transmitted to younger generation also so that the problems of divorces, corruption, conflicts, and stresses remain at their low in future also.

REFERENCE Boniwell I (2007) Developing conceptions of well-being: Advancing subjective, hedonic and eudaimonic theories. Social Psychology Review 9(1): 3–18. | Craig C (2009) www.centre forconfidence. co.uk/ | Giri A (1995) Science technology and quality of life. Y.K. Publishers. pp 26-53. | Goldsmith R, Radin N and Eccles J (1988) Objective and subjective reality: The effect of job loss and financial stress on fathering behaviours. Journal of Family Perspectives, 22: 309 - 325. | Luthans F (2007) Organizational Behaviour. McGraw Hill , New York. | Mc George L T and Goldsmith, E B (1998) Expanding our understanding of quality of life. | Standard of living and well-being. Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 90(2) : 2-6 | Nickell P (1985) Management in Family Living. John Wiley and Sons, New York, USA.