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

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” (Bonwiss2007). 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 indicators 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 continuum 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 I 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.
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                        | PAR       | QOL       | 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                   | 83.73     | 84.54     | 84.16         |

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

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**                                     |
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