

# A study on subjective well-being among working & non-working women of Agra city

Rashmi Sharma and Ranjana Gupta  
Institute of Home Science  
Khandari, Agra  
*rashmi22sharma@gmail.com*

## Abstract

People's assessments of their own life are referred to as subjective well-being. These assessments can include cognitive judgments, such as life satisfaction and emotional responses to events, such as feeling happy. In the present paper, the well-being level of both working & non-working women was compared and similarly observed as those factors which affect their subjective well-being positively or negatively. As a result, it has been concluded that both working and non-working women have the same level of subjective well-being at present. Positive attitude, negative attitude, and life satisfaction were the three components to measure subjective well-being.

**Keywords:** *subjective well-being, working and non-working women,*

## Introduction:

***“We all live with the objective of being happy: Our lives are all different and yet the same”***

**(Anne Frank)**

The subject of what makes people happy has been a critical preoccupation since humans began to think systematically, but it is astonishing how little most people understand their feelings. Some people cannot determine what makes them happy or even whether they are ever happy.

Psychologists rediscovered the happiness study in the twentieth century. Subjective well-being is the scientific word for an individual's appraisal of their own experiences, the excellent and negative impacts, happiness or contentment with life. Although the phrases are sometimes used interchangeably, subjective well-being is not the same as happiness. The two names represent individual and distinguishable conceptions. Humans have pondered what constitutes a good existence since the dawn of time. Subjective well-being researchers believe that one of the most important aspects of a successful life is that the individual enjoys it (Diener et al.). (2002).

According to Urry et al. (2004), there are two types of well-being: psychological and subjective (or hedonic) well-being. The respondents' permitted degree of freedom, environmental mastery, individual advancement, pleasant relationships with others, persistence in life, and self-acceptance are all factors in psychological well-being. Subjective well-being is described as a person's subjective assessment of their own affective and cognitive state.

Happiness is virtually always on the list of things people want out of life, and it is typically at the top of the list. When individuals talk about what they want for their children in life, they usually cite health and prosperity. They infrequently add celebrity or success—but happiness is virtually always mentioned.

### **Happiness: the science of subjective well-being**

Happiness and life satisfaction are scientific terms for believing and feeling that your life is going well rather than terribly. Scientists generally use self-report questionnaires to gauge people's happiness, although these scales have been verified using various data. People's subjective well-being is impacted by both internal and external elements, such as their personality and viewpoint and the society in which they live. A person's inborn temperament, the quality of their social interactions, the cultures they live in, and their capacity to satisfy their fundamental requirements are all key factors of subjective well-being. To some extent, adapt to circumstances such that, over time, our surroundings may not have as much of an impact on our pleasure as one might expect. Importantly, studies have looked into the effects of subjective happiness and shown that "happy" people are healthier, live longer, have better social interactions, and are more productive at work. In other words, persons who have a high level of subjective well-being appear to be healthier and operate better than people who are persistently worried, sad, or furious. As a result, happiness feels wonderful, but it also benefits people and others around them.

### **Life contentment of working & non-working women**

Life satisfaction focuses formally on who is happy, whether they are married, affluent, spiritual, or otherwise. Temperament and personality appear to be a strong force in people's lives, impacting their happiness (Diner, et al. 1999). The current study's goal was to regulate life satisfaction among working and non-working women. Life satisfaction can be defined in various ways, including well-being and life satisfaction.

According to **Beutell (2006)**, "Life satisfaction is the desire to change one's life; satisfaction with past; satisfaction with future; and significant other's views of one's life."

Arshad et al. (2015) showed a study to assess working and non-working women's life satisfaction. The 5-item Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), created by Ed Diener and colleagues (1984), was administered to a sample of (N=100) people from various organizations and neighbourhoods in Islamabad and Faisalabad. The sample was split into two groups. A total of 50 working and non-working women were selected, with 25 working and 25 non-working women from Faisalabad and 25 working and 25 non-working women from Islamabad. A t-test was used to analyze the data, and all hypotheses were significant at the p.05 level. Consequently, they concluded that there was a substantial difference in positive well-being between working and non-working women.

**Choudhary et al. (2017)** wanted to see how well housewives and working women in Mithila, North Bihar, were doing psychologically. The overall sample consisted of 120 women, including housewives (n=60) and working women (n=60) from various organizations with whom they are involved, as well as homemakers from various families where women are reliant on their husbands. The study found that senior housewives had a lower psychological well-being than old working women. Still, it's worth noting that both groups of elderly women, according to them, require social and emotional support from their respective social and familial institutions.

**Life satisfaction and optimism in connection to psychological well-being among working and non-working women were presented by Shaheen (2015).** A total of 150 Aligarh women (75 working and 75 non-working) were included in the study. Women's life satisfaction was measured using the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS, Diener et al. 1985).

In group differences, the author discovered a significant positive association between life satisfaction and psychological well-being, as well as a significant positive correlation between psychological and optimism well-being. According to the study, working women scored much better on life satisfaction than non-working women.

According to the research, working women counted much higher on optimism than non-working women. According to the findings, working women scored much better on five of the six categories of psychological well-being than non-working women. According to the study, working women also counted much better on amalgamated well-being than non-working women.

**Agarwal (2001) did research in which she looked at the significant differences in life satisfaction between working and non-working women. Her findings revealed that nonworking women had greater life satisfaction than working women.**

**Working and non-working women were studied by Akbari (2012) for the presence of stress and life satisfaction. As a result, there was a considerable difference in physical and familial stress between the resonances. However, working women's role stress was shown to be much greater than non-working women's, and working women's life happiness was higher than non-working women's.**

**Working as well as non-working women were investigated on the degree of marital adjustment, life satisfaction, and stress by Kumar, et al. (2018). They found that housewives have lower stress levels and better marital adjustment than employed women in their study. The findings found no substantial variance in life satisfaction between working and non-working women.**

#### **Objectives of the study:**

**Primary objective:** A study on the subjective well-being among working and non-working women in Agra city.

**Secondary objectives:** There are some other objectives along with the primary purpose and can be classified as follows:

1. To study the demographic profile of working & non-working women.
2. To access the subjective well-being of working & non-working women.
3. To study the significant difference between the subjective well-being of working and non-working women
4. To study the significant relationship between certain demographic variables and subjective well-being of working and non-working women.

#### **Survey design:**

**Population:** Since the Agra city was divided into 11 wards, we did select only 4 wards to study. Therefore, the population of the survey was the women residing in these 4 selected wards in Agra city.

**Sampling unit:** Keeping in the view, information's to be collected in the survey and the practical consideration of fieldwork; an individual household has been chosen as a sampling unit from these 4 wards, where the researcher could find working and non-working women.

#### **Sampling techniques and sample size**

Out of the 4 wards, we did select a sample of size 80. We did select the sampling units from each of the 4 wards; ward no. 38, 69, 73 and 96. The sample was selected with a multistage random sampling technique.

In the first stage, 4 wards were selected out of 11 wards of Agra city. We did select 2 colonies from ward no from each of the selected wards. (38), 3 from ward no. (73), and 4 colonies from both wards no. (69) and (96) randomly in the second stage. In the third stage, 20 household units were selected randomly from the colonies of each ward.

Therefore, a sample of working and non-working women was selected with a size 80 from the 4 wards of Agra city.

## Methodology:

### Preparation of schedule:

The first step of the survey methodology is to prepare the schedule for collecting the primary data. A plan is a list of questions about the investigation and where space is provided in the form for recording the answers to the questions asked.

### Description of the schedule:

For practical convenience and to take information easily from the respondents, the schedule was divided into four sections:

**First Section** was designed with the respondent's demographic profile, which covered all the general information like age, education, family types, number of family members, family income, working status, etc.

**Second Section** was related to the information on the respondent's positive attitude towards life. The three-point rating scale was used to measure respondents' positive feeling or happiness level.

**The third section** was related to the information on the respondent's negative attitude toward life. In this section, also three-point rating scale was used to measure the negative feeling of respondents.

**Fourth Section** was related to the information on the respondent's satisfaction with life. The three-point rating scale was used to measure the life satisfaction level of the respondent.

### Method of data collection:

The method of the personal interview was decided for data collection. The objectives of the survey could clearly be explained by this method. So, the required information was quickly collected.

### Statistical methods used in the analysis:

The following statistical procedure was adopted on the basis of collected data for drawing different conclusions and important inferences.

### The specific purpose for which statistical techniques were used

S. No.	Statistical analysis	Purpose
1.	Percentage	To investigate the distribution of both dependent and independent variables.
2.	Arithmetic mean	To understand the central value
3.	Standard deviation	To identify the variability among the observation.
4.	t-test	To assess the significant difference between the two means.
5.	Correlation coefficient	To regulate the association between dependent & independent variables.

### Statistical formulas used in the analysis

#### 1. Percentage

The % was used to make a single comparison. The frequency of a given cell was multiplied by 100 and divided by the total number of respondents in the category they belonged to get the percentage.

$$P = \frac{n}{N} \times 100$$

Where, P= Percentage, N= Total Observations., and n= No. of observations in a particular cell.

## 2. Arithmetic mean

The arithmetic mean is the average used in the present study. “Arithmetic mean of a series is that figure obtained by dividing the total values of various items by their number” (Elhance,2000).

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{n}$$

where  $\bar{X}$  = Arithmetic mean,  $\sum X$  = Sum of all values of the variables, and n = Total number of observations.

## 3. Standard deviation

It is a measure of dispersion and is commonly represented by the Greek letter  $\sigma$  (small sigma). The standard deviation is the square root of the arithmetic mean (average) of the squares of the deviations measured from the mean or assumed mean (Elhance,2000).

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{1}{(n-1)} \sum (X - \bar{X})^2}$$

where,  $\sigma$  = Standard Deviation, n = Number of observations.

## 4. ‘t’ test for hypothesis testing of mean

### Test statistics

$$t = \frac{|\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2|}{C.S.E}$$

where,  $\bar{X}_1$  and  $\bar{X}_2$  are the first and second groups’ mean. The C.S.E. stands for combined standard error. The following formula is used to compute it:

$$C.S.E = C.S.D \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}$$

The number of observations in the first and second groups, respectively, is given by  $n_1$  and  $n_2$ .

The combined standard deviation is abbreviated as C.S.D. The following formula is used to compute it:

$$C.S.D = \sqrt{\frac{(n_1 - 1)\sigma_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)\sigma_2^2}{(n_1 + n_2 - 2)}}$$

## 5. Correlation coefficient (r)

Karl Pearson proposed a mathematical approach for assessing the strength and amplitude of the linear connection between two series variables in 1936.

The following formula is used to compute the coefficient of correlation, also known as the product-moment correlation:

$$r = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})(Y_i - \bar{Y})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2}}$$

where  $r$  = stands for correlation coefficient,  $n$  = number of observations,  $\bar{X}$  = Mean of Variable X, and  $\bar{Y}$  = Mean of Variable Y

## 6. Testing the significance of the correlation coefficient

### Test statistics

$$t = r \sqrt{\frac{(n-2)}{(1-r^2)}} \text{ for } (n-2) \text{ degree of freedom}$$

where,  $n$  = number of observations, and  $r$  = correlation coefficient.

### Statistical Analysis:

The process of statistical analysis is a method of observing significant facts from the collected mass of numerical data.

According to the given objectives of the present paper, frequency tables and statistical analysis have been made and separately discussed:

1. To study the demographic profile of working & non-working women.
2. To access the subjective well-being of working & non-working women.
3. To study the significant alteration between the subjective welfare of working as well as non-working women.
4. To study the significant relationship between certain demographic variables and subjective or particular well-being of working and non-working women.

### 1. To study demographic profile of working as well as non-working women.

**Table –1.1: Distribution of the working and non-working women based on their age**

Age in years	Working women		Non-working women	
	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%
<b>20-30</b>	3	10%	9	18%
<b>30-40</b>	12	40%	12	24%
<b>40-50</b>	13	43.3%	25	50%
<b>50-60</b>	2	6.6%	4	8%
<b>Total</b>	30	100%	50	100%

**Conclusion:** Table 1.1 shows the distribution of the respondents on the basis of their age. It was found that out of the total sample of working women, 10% belonged to the age group of 20-30 years, 40% were working women from the age group of 30-40 years, 43.35% were belonging to the age group 40-50 years, and only 6.6% women were of the age group of 50-60 years.

Similarly, among the sample of non-working women, nearly 18% of women belonged to the age group of 20-30 years, 24% were in the age group 30-40 years, 50% of women were belonging to 40-50 years and only 8% non-working women were belonging to the age group of 50-60 years. Therefore, from the above discussion, it is clear that most working and non-working women were of age 40-50 years in the sample.

**Table-1.2: Distribution of working and non-working women according to the family member**

Family member	Working women		Non-working women	
	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%
2 – 4	13	43.3%	12	24%
4 – 6	11	36.6%	25	50%
6 – 8	3	10%	8	16%
>=8	3	10%	5	10%
<b>Total</b>	30	100%	50	100%

**Conclusion:** Table 1.2 shows the distribution of working and non-working women on the basis of family members in the family. It was clear from the table that out of the sample of working women, 43.3% of women had 2-4 family members, 36.6% had 4-6 members, and only 10% had 6-8 and more than 8 members in the family. Likewise, from the sample of non-working women, nearly 24% of non-working women were having 2-4 members, 50% of women were having 4-6 members, 16% were having 6-8 family members and only 10% of non-working women were having more than eight family members in the family.

Therefore, it is observed from the above discussion that in our sample most of the families have more than 2 and a maximum of 6 members in the family.

**Table-1.3: Circulation of working along with non-working women according to their number of siblings in the family**

Number of siblings	Working women		Non-working women	
	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%
1	5	16.6%	0	0%
2	16	53.3%	29	58%
3	5	16.6%	13	26%
4	3	10%	6	12%
>4	1	3.3%	2	4%
<b>Total</b>	30	100%	50	100%

**Conclusion:** Table 1.3 expresses the distribution of working as well as non-working women on the basis of the number of siblings in the family. It was found that out of the total sample of working women 16.6% of women were having only one child and also 3 children, 53.3 % were having 2 children, 10% of women had 4 siblings, and a significantly less percentage say 3.3% had more than 4 children.

In the case of the sample of non-working women, maximum of 58% of women were having 2 children, 26% were having 3 siblings, 12% had 4 children, and only 4% had more than 4 siblings. In the sample of non-working women, not a single woman was having one child.

Therefore, from the above discussion, it is clear that almost 50% of our respondents have 2 children.

**Table- 1.4: Distribution of working and non-working women according to family monthly income**

Family monthly income (in Rs.)	Working women		Non-working women	
	No. of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%
Lower class <10,000	6	20%	15	30%
Lower-middle class 10,000-20,000	8	26.6%	21	42%
Middle class 20,000-50,000	16	53.33%	14	28%
Upper class >50,000	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Conclusion:** Table 1.4 demonstrates the distribution of working along with non-working women based on the family monthly income. Out of the sample of working women, 20% of families belonged to the lower class, 26.6% were associated to the lower middle class, and 53.33% of families were going to the middle class. Likewise, from the sample of non-working women, 30% of families belonged to the lower class, 42% were associated with the lower middle class, and 28% of families fit the middle class. Therefore, from the above observations, it is clear that in our sample of working women, almost half families were middle class. Out of the sample of non-working women, most of the families belonged to the lower middle class.

## 2. To access the subjective well-being of working and non-working women.

**Table 2.1: Distribution of working as well as non-working women concerning their subjective welfare score**

Well-being scores	Working women		Non-working women	
	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%
Low Score (30-49)	0	0%	1	2%
Moderate Score (50-69)	17	56.67%	30	60%
High Score (70-90)	13	43.33%	19	38%
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Conclusion:** Table 2.1 shows the distribution of respondents based on their overall subjective well-being scores. It is well seen from the table that the subjective well-being of most of the working as well as non-working women lies in the moderate score range, which was (50-69), i.e. not much low and not much high. Therefore, it concludes that the subjective welfare of working as well as non-working women was almost the same; they have the same type of positive feelings, negative feelings and satisfaction towards life, even if they are working or housewives.



### 3. To study the significant difference between the groups of working and non-working women on their level of perceived subjective well-being

**Table-3.1: Comparative difference between working as well as non-working women on their subjective well-being scores**

	N	Mean score (well-being)	SD	t-value	p-value	Result
Working women	30	66.63	5.18	0.22	0.826	Not significant
Non-working women	50	66.94	7.23			

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is no significant statically difference between the subjective well-being of working and non-working women.

**Comment:** Table 3.1 shows the significant difference between working as well as non-working women on the basis of their subjective welfare. The evidence from the result shows that there was no significant difference between the working and non-working women based on their respective well-being scores. As obtained *p-value* for *t-test* was not significant at a 5% level of significance.

It concludes that the subjective well-being is independent of the working status of the women i.e. it means that for both working as well as non-working women level of subjective well-being was the same.

### 4. To study the significant relationship between demographic variables and subjective well-being of working and non-working women.

**Table- 4.1: Relationship between certain demographic variables and subjective well-being of working women**

Working Women				
Variables	r	t-value	p-value	Result
Age	- 0.270	- 1.5	0.1448	Not Significant
Number of family members	- 0.268	- 1.5	0.1448	Not Significant
Number of siblings	- 0.193	- 1.04	0.3072	Not Significant
Family income	- 0.150	- 0.795	0.4333	Not Significant

Level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between the subjective well-being of working women with their age, number of family members, number of siblings, and family income.

**Comment:** Table 4.1 shows the relationship of different demographic variables with the subjective well-being scores of the working women. It is clear from the above table that the subjective well-being scores were very less negatively correlated with the independent variables like age, number of family members, number of siblings, and family income. It concludes that as the age of respondents, number of family members, family income, and number of siblings increases, subjective well-being decreases.

It is also evident from the result that there is no significant relationship between subjective well-being with age, number of family members, family income of working women, and number of siblings.

**Table-4.2: Relationship between certain demographic variables and subjective well-being of non-working women**

<b>Non-working Women</b>				
<b>Variables</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>t value</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Result</b>
<b>Age</b>	<b>-0.277</b>	<b>- 2.07</b>	<b>0.0438</b>	<b>Significant*</b>
<b>Number of family members</b>	<b>0.050</b>	<b>0.347</b>	<b>0.7301</b>	<b>Not Significant</b>
<b>Number of siblings</b>	<b>- 0.025</b>	<b>- 0.17</b>	<b>0.8657</b>	<b>Not Significant</b>
<b>Family income</b>	<b>0.217</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.1401</b>	<b>Not Significant</b>

Level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between the subjective well-being of non-working women with their age, the quantity of family affiliates, family income, and number of siblings.

**Comment:**

Table 4.2 shows the relationship of different demographic variables with the particular well-being scores of the working women. It is clear from the table that subjective well-being was less negatively correlated with age and number of siblings. It means that as the respondent's age and the number of siblings in the family increase, subjective well-being decreases. Also, subjective well-being was very less positively correlated with the number of family members and family income. It means that if the size of the family and family income increase, their subjective well-being will also increase.

The results also observed that age was the only factor that showed a significant relationship with subjective well-being for non-working women. Therefore, it concluded that the subjective well-being was affected by the age of the non-working women rather than the other remaining variables.

**Summary and interpretation:**

The present research proposed “A study on subjective well-being among working and non-working women in Agra city”. To know the particular well-being of working as well as non-working women the positive effect, the negative effect and the life satisfaction of women were recorded.

As a report of the analysis, firstly, it was observed that in the sample, the percentage of working women is less than non-working. The age group of (40-50) years was in the majority for both working and non-working women. Respondents were not very educated. Some of the working women were illiterate but they were doing some work for earning. More than 50% of working and non-working women were belonging to joint families. Average

family members in their family were 4 to 6 and 50% to 60% family have 2 children. Almost 50% of working women were belonging to a middle-class family and a maximum of 42% of non-working women belonged to the lower-middle class. No family as belonging to the upper class.

The subjective well-being scores of more than 50% of working and non-working women were laid in the moderate range. It revealed that the subjective well-being was the same for both the working and non-working women. Also, it has been observed that no significant difference was present in both the groups of women by using the hypothesis testing. It was also very clear from the analysis that the demographic factors like age, number of family members, number of siblings and family income were very less negatively correlated with the subjective well-being of working women. Also, there was no significant relationship between these factors and the subjective well-being scores. It concluded that subjective well-being is no longer affected by these demographic variables for the group of working women.

In the same way, for the group of non-working women factors, age and number of siblings were less negatively correlated. The number of family members and family income were less positively correlated. For the group of non-working women, age was one of the factors that showed a significant relationship with subjective well-being. The remaining factors showed an insignificant relationship with SWB.

Therefore, from the above discussion, it is very clear that both working and non-working women have the same level of subjective well-being in the present time. Positive attitude, negative attitude and life satisfaction were the three components to measure subjective well-being.

Based on the result obtained it may be concluded that the SWB of working and non-working women was not very high or not very low. It was moderate for both the groups, i.e. both the groups have average subjective well-being. Overall socio-demographic variables have minimal effect on SWB among working and non-working women. This is to be needed to explore other predictors of SWB.

### Bibliography:

1. Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larson, J., and Griffin, S. (1985): "Satisfaction with life scale", *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75.
2. Diener, E., Suh, E., Lucas, R. E., and Smith, H. L. (1999): "Subjective well being; Three decades of progress, *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 276-302.
3. Agarwala, S. (2001): "Life satisfaction: working verses non-working", [cited 2011 July] available from <https://www.hdl.handle.net/10755/183562>.
4. Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., and Oishi, S. (2002): "Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and life satisfaction", In C. R. Snyder and S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 63-73). New York: Oxford University Press.
5. Urry, H. L., Nitschke, J. B., Dolski, I., Jackson, D. C., Dalton, K. M., Mueller, C. J., and Davidson, R. J. (2004): "Making a life worth living- Neural correlates of well being", *Psychological Science*, 15(6), 367-372.
6. Buetell, N. (2006): "Life satisfaction, a Sloan Work and Family Encyclopedia entry." [https://wfnetwork.bc.edu/encyclopedia\\_entry.php?id=3283&area=academics](https://wfnetwork.bc.edu/encyclopedia_entry.php?id=3283&area=academics).
7. Akbari, A. J. (2012): "Life satisfaction and stress among working and non-working women", *Indian Journal of Research*", vol 1 issue 9, 174-176.
8. Arshad, M., Gull, S. and Mahmood, K. (2015): "Life satisfaction among working and non-working women", *European Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, vol 3, No. 1, 121-127.
9. Shaheen, F. (2015): "A study the life satisfaction and optimism in relation to psychological well-being among working and non-working women", *Journal of Education and Psychological Research*, vol 4, issue 4, 81-85.

10. **Choudhary, L., and Ahmad, A. (2017):** “A study of psychological well-being among the housewives and working women of Mithila region, North Bihar, India”, *International Journal of Resource and Industrial Research*, vol 4, issue 2, 8-15.
11. **Kumar, S. and Kumar, U. (2018):** “A comparative study among working and non-working women on the level of marital adjustment, stress and life satisfaction”, *International Journal of Applied Research*, 4(4), 421-424.

