

Life Satisfaction Among Working and Non-Working Women

Yogesh V. Machhi^{1*}, Prof. Dr. Indrajitsinh D. Thakor²

ABSTRACT

The assessment of an individual's quality of life is known as life satisfaction. It is evaluated in terms of a person's mental state, level of satisfaction with relationships, goals achieved, self-perceived abilities for coping, and self-concept. A positive outlook on life is a necessary component of life satisfaction, not an evaluation of one's present feelings. Life satisfaction has been measured in connection to a number of factors, including residence, experiences, education level, and economic standing. The purpose of the present study is to determine the level of life satisfaction among working and non-working women in urban and rural locations. The sample of the study will comprise 120 working and non-working women. The sample randomly selected through random method from various urban and rural area in Panchmahal district in Gujarat state as per the requirement of the research design of this study. Life satisfaction scale developed by Dr. Pramodkumar and Dr. Jayshree Dhyani were used to collect data. Level of Life satisfaction measured by the result indicates that there is significant difference between working and non-working women on life satisfaction but there is not significant difference between women living in urban and rural area on life satisfaction and interaction effect of working – non-working women and area not significantly differ on life satisfaction score.

Keywords: *Life Satisfaction, Area and Working and Non-Working Women*

The Latin term for satisfaction means "to make or do enough." A person who is satisfied with their life is either satisfied or accepts their current circumstances, or their needs and wants have been met for every moment of their life. Life satisfaction can be described as a personal subjective assessment of an individual's level of happiness. Life satisfaction judgments have a significant cognitive component because they are by their very nature an assessment.

A person's overall assessment of their feelings and thoughts towards their life at any time, ranging from negative to positive, is called life satisfaction. According to Diener (1984), life satisfaction is one of the three main measures of well-being along with positive affect and negative affect. Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith (1999) include the following under life satisfaction: desire to change one's life; satisfaction with the past; satisfaction with the future; and significant other's views of one's life, even though satisfaction with current life circumstances is frequently assessed in research studies.

¹Ph.D. Research Scholar, Shri Govind Guru University, Godhra, Gujarat, India

²Assistant Professor, M & V Arts and Commerce College, Halol, Panchmahal, Gujarat, India

*Corresponding Author

Received: February 04, 2024; Revision Received: March 04, 2024; Accepted: March 07, 2024

Definitions of life satisfaction

“An overall assessment of feelings and attitudes about one’s life at a particular point in time ranging from negative to positive.” (Buetell, 2006)

“Life satisfaction is the degree to which a person positively evaluates the overall quality of his/her life as a whole. In other words, how much the person likes the life he/she leads.”

Ruut Veenhoven (1996)

Ways to Improve Life Satisfaction

life satisfaction by nature is a subjective measure. Contrary to happiness, which is just one positive experience that feels good, this is not the same thing. Instead of focusing on the here and now, life satisfaction takes a longer view and considers a person's overall experience with life. Even though it appears to be a complex concept, it is usually measured using a single, simple question: "How satisfied are you with your life right now?". if the answer is negative. The question turns into "How can I improve my life satisfaction?"

- 1. Be positive:** Want to feel satisfied in life? Think positively, and the outcomes will come! Even while it sounds a little unrealistic to believe that just thinking or feeling good will have positive effects, science at least supports this theory. Positive feelings expressed in the moment or consistently optimistic thinking are often found to be predictive of higher levels of life satisfaction in studies. It seems that experiencing happy emotions and feeling happy is more significant than being depressed or feeling negative emotions.
- 2. Find a hobby:** While finding a job that you love isn't always possible, the same can't be true for a hobby. A hobby is, after all, what you make of it. Put on your fly-fishing boots, start writing down your ideas, or save money for a wood-cutting crossword puzzle—do anything to add a little bit of personal fulfilment to your work life. You'll probably feel very satisfied with the outcome.
- 3. Establish and achieve goals:** For a considerable time now, social scientists have been actively researching the concept of goal setting and achievement. Goals related to relationships, finances, careers, or physical fitness can all benefit from the idea of committing to something and seeing it through to completion.
- 4. Surround yourself with friends:** Social scientists have been praising social support networks for years as a means of improving life satisfaction and quality of life in general. Even though social support can come from a variety of sources, such as friends, family, partners, coworkers, community organizations, or medical experts, it's usually the closer friendships or partnerships that have the biggest positive effects on life satisfaction.
- 5. Stay healthy:** Beyond just enhancing your physical health, leading a healthy lifestyle that incorporates exercise, a balanced diet, and avoiding risky situations (like smoking) has other benefits as well. Your mental health will be significantly impacted by leading a healthy lifestyle. Your confidence in yourself will increase as you become more physically fit and healthy. This confidence will surely translate to other areas of your life, such as your relationships, career, and so forth. You'll be able to make the biggest impact by addressing all of these topics at once and focusing on your life happiness from different perspectives.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Chipper field and Havens (2001) conducted a study to compare life satisfaction among people whose marital status changed over a seven-year period and those whose status remained stable. Among those people whose conjugal status remained stable over the 7

Life Satisfaction Among Working and Non-Working Women

years, ladies' life satisfaction declined and men remained con-stand. Among the people who encountered a transition - specifically, the deficiency of companion - a de-cline in life fulfilment was found for both men and ladies decline being more predominant for men. Likewise, men's life satisfaction expanded over the 7 years' time frame if they gained a companion, whereas the equivalent was not true for ladies. For the most part, these findings suggest that the progression of marital status or women and men are different.

Uthso NA, Akter NJ. Determinants of life satisfaction among women of reproductive age (15-49 years) in Bangladesh: A cross-sectional analysis. In this study, bivariate analysis was applied to demonstrate significant relationships between determinants and life satisfaction. Multinomial logistic regression analysis was performed to draw valid conclusions about the influence of potential determinants on life satisfaction. The study found that satisfaction increases with age, education level, and wealth status. For the marital status variable, which included three categories: currently married, previously married, and unmarried, current marriage was strongly associated with higher life satisfaction. In contrast, previous marriage and never marriage were associated with lower life satisfaction. Migration status was also significantly related to life satisfaction, with women who changed locations being more satisfied than women who did not change their current location.

The factors that determine employee satisfaction were studied by **Alam Sageer, Dr. Sameena Rafat, Ms. Puja Agarwal (2012)**. These factors included organisation growth, job security, work tasks, policies about compensation and benefits, and opportunities. The study came to the conclusion that in order to improve employee performance and productivity, which in turn leads to high profits, customer satisfaction, and customer retention, an organisation should create strategies that fortify the work environment and raise employee morale and satisfaction. and offered many suggestions for raising worker satisfaction.

The goal of the research conducted by **Jamal Nazrul Islam, Haradhan Kumar Mohajan, and Rajib Datta (2012)** was to ascertain whether or not employee morale and job satisfaction are significant factors in their overall performance at work. The survey found that the top three reasons for working in banks were having a stable employment, having helpful coworkers, and having a high social position. It was stated that the three main areas for improvement in the work environment were compensation, decision-making power, and promotional strategy.

Objectives of the Study

The prime objectives of the study were as under:

1. To identify and compare difference between working and non-working women on the level of life satisfaction.
2. To identify and compare the difference between women living in an urban and rural area on the level of life satisfaction.
3. To identify and compare differences among interactions of working and non-working women living in Urban and Rural Areas on the level of life satisfaction.

Hypotheses of the Study

The following hypotheses were tested to fulfil the objectives of the study:

1. There is no significant difference between working and non-working women on the level of life satisfaction.

Life Satisfaction Among Working and Non-Working Women

2. There is no significant difference between women living in an urban and rural area on the level of life satisfaction.
3. There is no significant difference among interactions of working and non-working women living in Urban and Rural Areas on the level of life satisfaction.

Variables

The following variables were treated as independent and dependent variable:

1. Independent Variables

The present investigation was designed to study the effects of two independent variables shown as below:

- Working and non-working women
- Urban and Rural Area

2. Dependent Variables

The investigator has measured the level of life satisfaction. The score achieved by each subject, were considered as dependent variable for data analysis.

Sample

In the primary stage, a very huge sample of 150 women was taken Purposive Sampling. Since the study aimed at studying the two variables namely: Working – Non-Working women and Urban and Rural area. It was required to take a very large sample to cover all the two variables. Eventually for the data analysis, a concluding sample of 120 to fit sufficiently various cells of design was confirmed. 60 working women and 60 non-working women selected with the equal number of Urban and Rural area drawn from the Panchmahal District of Gujarat region as per the requirement of research design of this study.

Tools

Life Satisfaction scale (LSS)

This scale has been developed to know the level of life satisfaction. This scale developed by Dr. Pramodkumar and Dr. Jayshree Dhyani. The life satisfaction scale with 74 was then administered to a group of 100 married, educated, urban – based adults, both male and female in the age bracket of 35-58 years. In the initial scale, there were 57 positively worded and 17 negatively worded items. The life satisfaction scale in its final finale form consists of 54 highly discriminating items – 45 positively and 9 negatively worded items, given in a 3-point rating format i.e., **True, Partially True and False**. In this study Gujarati version of Life satisfaction scale will be used.

- **Reliability:** The Reliability of the scale was calculated by spit-half and Test – Retest Method. The scale was given to a fresh sample of 30 subjects and calculated reliability. The split-half reliability coefficient was found to be 0.68, with an index of reliability of 0.82. The test-retest reliability of the coefficient was found to be 0.67, with an index of reliability of 0.81.

Table: showing split-half and retest reliability coefficient N = 30

Indices	N	r-value	Index of reliability
Split-half	30	0.68	0.82*
Re-test	30	0.67	0.81*

* Significant at 0.01 level of significance.

Life Satisfaction Among Working and Non-Working Women

- **Validity:** The face validity of the scale appeared to be fairly high as the items were prepared following intensive interviews of 50 married subjects regarding their concept of total life satisfaction. The content validity was adequately assured as only those items were selected for the initial scale for which there was 100 percent agreement amongst the judges. Further, only items which showed a fairly high discriminating value (between 0.20 to 0.59) following item-analysis were selected for the final scale. As such the scale could be considered as a valid tool.

Procedure for Statistical Analysis

The data obtained from 120 subjects are arranged in a (2x2) factorial design were subjected to adequate technique of statistical analysis, viz., technique of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) in order to examine the roll of main variables and to study their main as well as interaction effects.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table: 01 Showing Analysis of Variance for life satisfaction in relation to working and non-working women and area

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Sum of Square	F Ratio	Significant
Working – non working women (A)	6526.875	1	6526.875	38.625	0.05
Area (B)	143.008	1	143.008	1.18	NS
A x B	267.008	1	267.008	1.58	NS
Error	19601.700	116	168.980		
Total	2193873.000	120			
Corrected Total	26538.592	119			

- **Significant level of 'F' value**

0.05 level 3.89 (df = 1),

0.01 level 6.76 (df = 1)

Main Effects

It could be seen from the Table No. 01 that the one main variables i.e. working and non-working women (F=38.625) is significantly difference the life satisfaction, while Area (F=1.18) variable is not found to be significant. The closer examination of area variable in Table No. 03 reveals that two groups of area (urban and rural) are not differing on mean score.

The null hypothesis regarding the working and non-working women variable can be stated in following manner.

HO₁: There is no significant mean difference between working and non-working women on Life satisfaction.

Table: 02 Showing Mean Scores on Life satisfaction with regard to working and non-working women.

Women	N	Mean Score	F	Significant
Working Women (A1)	60	141.77	38.625	0.05
Non – Working Women (A2)	60	127.02		
Grand Mean = 134.39				

Life Satisfaction Among Working and Non-Working Women

F ratio for Ass (Working – Non-working Women) is 38.625, which is significant at 0.05 and 0.01 significant levels. It means working and nonworking women differ on life satisfaction score. By the same point of view Table: 02 shows mean score of working women is 141.77 and non – working women mean score is 127.02, it can be clearly said that significant difference is existed between working and non-working women on life satisfaction score. Table: 02 reveals that the mean scores of two groups as regards Working and Non-working women are similar with each other on Life satisfaction score. Therefore, null hypothesis No.1 is rejected.

The null hypothesis concerning the Area variable can be stated in following manner.

HO₂: There is no significant mean difference among Urban and Rural area on Life Satisfaction.

Table: 03 Showing Mean Scores on Life satisfaction with regard to Area.

Area	N	Mean Score	F	Significant
Urban (B1)	60	133.30	1.18	NS
Rural (B2)	60	135.48		
Grand Mean = 134.39				

F ratio for Bss (Area) is 1.18, which is not significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level. It means women living in Urban and Rural area are significant not differ on Life satisfaction score. By the same point of view table No.: 03 show mean score of women living in Urban Area are 133.30 and women living in Rural area mean score is 135.48, it can be clearly said that not significant difference is existed between Women living in Urban and Rural area on Life satisfaction score. Table No.: 03 reveals that the mean score of two groups as regards Area are similar with each other on life satisfaction score. Therefore, null hypothesis No.2 is accepted.

Interaction Effects

The main effects, significant or insignificant have to be understood with caution and reconsidered in light of significant interaction of the variables. Here, interaction effects have been discussed below.

The null hypothesis regarding the interaction between variable of working and non-working women and Area can be stated in following manner.

HO₃: There is no significant interaction effect among the mean score of gender and educational streams on internet and social networking sites attitude.

Table: 04 Showing Mean Scores on Internet and Social Networking Sites Attitude as held by Groups Gender X Educational Streams. (A x B)

Area (B)	Women (A)		F	Significant
	Working (A1)	Non – Working (A2)		
Urban (B1)	142.17	124.43	1.58	NS
Rural (B2)	141.37	129.60		
Grand Mean = 134.39				

Life Satisfaction Among Working and Non-Working Women

F ratio for A X Bss (Working – Non-working Women X Area) is 1.58, which is not significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level. It means Working – Non-working Women and Area is not differed significantly on life satisfaction score. By the same point of view Table No. 04 shows the mean score of working women living in urban area is 142.17, working women living in Rural area is 141.37, non – working women living in urban area is 124.43, non – working women living in Rural area is 129.60, which are differently interaction each other not significantly on life satisfaction score. Therefore, null hypothesis No.3 is accepted.

CONCLUSION

The difference between working and non-working women on life satisfaction score is found to be significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level ($F=38.625$). The working women have high life satisfaction level ($M=141.77$) than that of non-working women ($M=127.02$).

The difference between women living in Urban and Rural area on life satisfaction is found to be no significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level ($F=1.18$). women living in Rural area ($M=135.48$) have high levels of life satisfaction than that of women living in Urban area ($M=133.30$).

The interaction effects regarding working – non-working women & Area on level of life satisfaction are found to be no significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level ($F=1.58$); in this case working women living in urban area ($M=142.17$) exhibit high level of life satisfaction score, while non-working women living in urban area ($M=124.43$) shows the low level of life satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- Beutell, N. J. (2006). Life satisfaction in relation to domain satisfaction, mental health, and physical health. Unpublished research.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542–575. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542>
- Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(2), 276–302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.2.276>
- Pramod Kumar and Jayshree Dhyani., Life satisfaction scale (revised). *Agra: National Psychological Corporation.*
- Top 10 Proven Ways to Improve Life Satisfaction.* (n.d.). Media Relations. Retrieved February 29, 2024, from <https://www.wku.edu/news/articles/index.php?view=article&articleid=903&return=archive>
- Veenhoven, R. (1996). The study of life satisfaction. In W. E. Saris, R. Veenhoven, A. C. Scherpenzeel, & B. Bunting (Eds.), *A comparative study of satisfaction with life in Europe* (pp. 11-48).

Acknowledgment

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Machhi, Y.V. & Thakor, I.D. (2024). Life Satisfaction Among Working and Non-Working Women. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 12(1), 1676-1682. DIP:18.01.155.20241201, DOI:10.25215/1201.155