

# A study on association between the perception and implications of family well being on self, family and society by wives of nuclear and joint families belonging to expanding stage of family life cycle in Udaipur city

Neetu Singh<sup>1</sup>, Suman Audichay<sup>2</sup>

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

Email - neetusingh31cd@gmail.com

**Abstract:** The study was undertaken to assess the association between the perception and implications of family well being on self, family and society by wives of nuclear and joint families belonging to expanding stage of family life cycle in Udaipur city. The study was based upon the sample of 200 respondents (100 wives of joint families and 100 wives from nuclear families) belonging to middle socio economic status selected purposively from Udaipur city. Data was collected through a perception scale and implications proforma developed by an investigator and was standardized by calculating validity and Reliability of the scale. Association between perception and its implications of perceived **overall family being**, results depicts that, there was non-significant association between perception of personal and financial well being and its implications on self and family. Meanwhile, it was also clear from the data that for the wives of nuclear families, there was non-significant ( $r = -0.058$ ) negative association between perception of physical well being and its implications on society, whereas, for the wives of joint families the data reported that there was non-significant ( $r = 0.148$ ) positive association between perception of physical well being and its implications on society for perceived overall family well being.

**Keys words-** Perception, implication, family well being, self, family, society, Expanding Stage of Family Life Cycle.

## INTRODUCTION:

Wellbeing refers to a desired state of being. For individual's this includes having good health and being well-off in other aspects of life such as family life, work, housing, and so on. Hence the use of terms such as individual wellbeing, family wellbeing, and societal wellbeing involving groups of people including families, communities and society as a whole.

Families experience well-being when all family members are healthy, safe, and financially secure. When families face challenges in one or more of these areas, their ability to support family strength can be affected. Engaging families as active participants in problem solving can help family members to identify and use their own strengths to address the challenges they face. 'Family relationships are regarded as a contributing factor to well-being, and can either have a positive or negative influence depending on the nature of the relationships and the presence or absence of family. Family relationships are strongly linked to a person's emotional well-being and, the nature of such family interactions will greatly influence an individual's general well-being. Emotionally close relationships such as marriage and partnerships were considered to be a great source of love which has a strong positive influence on wellbeing (North *et al*, 2008).

A contemporary urban family has change and they experiences ambiguity in family roles, relationship, and responsibility. The emotional support structure is weakening and external entities (school, religious institutions) are taking part of socializing roles earlier played by families. An urban middle class family has undergone drastic change in response to development in terms of industrialization, women's education and workforce participation. Industrialization, education and

urbanization, leading to accelerated rate of migration, late marriages, change in fertility rate, rising divorce rates, marriage conflicts, cohabitation before marriage, increasing numbers of single-parent families and single person households, diversification of gainful economic activities and individual-friendly property laws, have had consequential impact in terms of drastic reduction in the size of family.

There are changes in the internal structure of families too. Families are more materialistic oriented and main concepts of their life are earning more money, buying more happiness for their family. Family cohesiveness, emotional attachment, tolerance and resiliency between members are decreases and their happiness depends upon their economic status. They are too busy in their personal and professional life and don't have time for their family and children. The relationships among the family members have also changed with changes in family obligations, decision-making power, socialization practices and child-rearing practices. The central authority of the eldest male is weakening and there is a reworking of power and authority among family members (Ruchismita, 2012).

Disappearance of emotional attachment between family members affects the socio-psychological environment of the individuals and family. A person feels alienated. The community is disappearing due to self centeredness of individual and lower participation of families in social gathering. Modern progress brings individualistic way of thinking; this causes increasing frustration, emotional insecurity and low tolerance level among the younger generation. Individualism and urbanization affect emotional resilience. The disadvantages of the nuclear families are: lack of support to take care of things/children in absence or emergency of one member, limited social interactions/close relationships, considerable erosion of traditional support systems and increased stress and pressure on nuclearized families, leading to an increased vulnerability to emotional problems and disorders.

#### **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 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 couples (100 husbands+100 wives) were selected from joint families and 100 couples (100 husbands+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 PERCEPTION AND IMPLICATIONS OF FAMILY WELL BEING:**

In order to assess the perception of family Well Being by urban families, a scale (measuring objective well being (OWB) + subjective well being (SWB)) 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 item and 45 items in OWB and SWB scale respectively. 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 SWB is 45 and 135 where the minimum score is 45 and the maximum score is 135 and the score range of OWB is 51 and 153 where the minimum score is 51 and the maximum score is 153.

The proforma assesses the implications of perceived FWB on self, family and society. 20 items of implication were formulated on the basis of perceived personal, financial, physical and socio-emotional well being. The scores of 20 items were based on preference ranking by respondents to rank 1, 2 and 3 to self, family and society. In implication proforma, 1<sup>st</sup> ranking means high preference, 2<sup>nd</sup> ranking for

moderate preference and 3<sup>rd</sup> ranking for low preference. The reliability score of the overall measuring SWB and OWB is 0.82 and 0.72. The validity score of measuring SWB, OWB and implication proforma is 2.58, 2.67 and 2.52 respectively.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

Result presented in the table shows the association between the various dimensions of perceived family well being and its implications on self, family and society by wives from both family structures.

For the wives of nuclear families the data related to dimension of **personal well being** elucidate that there was non-significant negative ( $r = -0.042$ ) association between perception of personal well being and its implication on self whereas for the wives of joint families the data reveals that there was non-significant positive association between perception of personal well being and its implication on self. There was non-significant association between perception of financial and physical well being and its implication on family and society respectively for the wives of joint and nuclear families.

Similarly for **financial well being** it was observed from the table that there was no significant association between perception of personal, financial and physical well being and its implication on self, family and society for wives of joint and nuclear families.

Data related to **physical well being** it was concluded from the table that there was no significant association between perception of personal, financial and physical well being and its implication on self, family and society for wives of joint and nuclear families.

For the dimension of **socio-emotional well being**, data for the wives of nuclear families elucidate that there was non-significant ( $r = -0.016$ ) negative association between perception of physical well being and its implication on society whereas for the wives of joint families the data reported that there was non-significant ( $r = 0.005$ ) positive association between perception of physical well being and its implication on society. There was non-significant association between Perception of personal and financial well being and its implication on self and family respectively for the wives of joint and nuclear families.

**Table: Association between the perception and implications of family well being on self, family and society by wives from both family structures (N=200)**

| Dimensions of perception of FWB (Xs) | Dimensions of implication of FWB (Ys) | r-Value                      |                            |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
|                                      |                                       | Nuclear(n <sub>1</sub> =100) | Joint(n <sub>2</sub> =100) |
| <b>Personal well being</b>           |                                       |                              |                            |
| Personal well being                  | Self                                  | -0.042                       | 0.026                      |
| Financial well being                 | Family                                | 0.155                        | 0.019                      |
| Physical well being                  | Society                               | 0.052                        | 0.002                      |
| <b>Financial well being</b>          |                                       |                              |                            |
| Personal well being                  | Self                                  | 0.011                        | 0.124                      |
| Financial well being                 | Family                                | 0.026                        | 0.155                      |
| Physical well being                  | Society                               | 0.023                        | 0.156                      |
| <b>Physical well being</b>           |                                       |                              |                            |
| Personal well being                  | Self                                  | 0.143                        | 0.127                      |
| Financial well being                 | Family                                | 0.140                        | 0.056                      |
| Physical well being                  | Society                               | 0.136                        | 0.155                      |
| <b>Socio-emotional well being</b>    |                                       |                              |                            |
| Personal well being                  | Self                                  | 0.007                        | 0.032                      |
| Financial well being                 | Family                                | 0.029                        | 0.065                      |

|                                  |         |        |       |
|----------------------------------|---------|--------|-------|
| Physical well being              | Society | -0.016 | 0.005 |
| <b>Overall family well being</b> |         |        |       |
| Personal well being              | Self    | 0.034  | 0.184 |
| Financial well being             | Family  | 0.054  | 0.031 |
| Physical well being              | Society | -0.058 | 0.148 |

Association between perception and implication of perceived **overall family being** results depicts that, for the wives of nuclear and joint families, there was non-significant association between perception of personal and financial well being and its implication on self and family. Meanwhile it was also clear from the data that for the wives of nuclear families, there was non-significant ( $r = -0.058$ ) negative association between perception of physical well being and its implication on society whereas for the wives of joint families the data reported that there was non-significant ( $r = 0.148$ ) positive association between perception of physical well being and its implication on society for perceived overall family well being.

### CONCLUSION:

From this wide spectrum of viewpoints regarding perception of family well being and its implication on self, family and society, it can be concluded that for the joint families, both family and society are important for maintaining the well being of family members, whereas, society is less important for the well being of nuclear families as compared to self and family.

Family structure and economic well-being are correlated. Economic well-being can be quantified in various ways, such as through household income, employment status, net worth, poverty, and the receipt of welfare. There is an intimate relationship between income and wealth and our sexual culture. They rise or fall together; there is a significant connection between our sexual culture and our national economic strengths and weaknesses (Fagan *et al*, 2012). Frey and Stutzer (2002) argue that “additional material goods and services initially provide extra pleasure, but it is usually only transitory. Higher happiness with material things wears off. Satisfaction depends on change and disappears with continued consumption”.

### REFERENCES:

1. Fagan, F. P., Kidd, J. A. and Potrykus, H. 2012. Marriage and economic well-being: A synthesis of the research. Retrieved from <http://sutherlandinstitute.org/>. Date on 23.9.15.
2. Frey, B. S. & Slutzer, A. 2002. What can economist learns from happiness research?" *Journal of Economic Literature* **40**: 402-435.
3. North, R.J., Holahan, C.J., Moos, R.H. & Cronkite, R.C. 2008. Family support, family income, and happiness: A 10-year perspective. *Journal of Family Psychology* **22**(3):475—483.
4. Ruchismita G. 2012. Essay on the process of change in the Indian Family System. Retrieved from <http://www.preservearticles.com>. Date on 12.8.15.