



ISSN: 2395-7476  
IJHS 2016; 2(2): 370-373  
© 2016 IJHS  
www.homesciencejournal.com  
Received: 29-03-2016  
Accepted: 30-04-2016

**Mayurakshee Gangopadhyay**  
Research Scholar Department of  
Home Science University of  
Calcutta, Kolkata West Bengal,  
India

**Dr. Debomita Sikdar**  
Assistant Professor Department  
of Home Science University of  
Calcutta, Kolkata West Bengal,  
India

## Effect of personal values on psychological well-being of urban and rural youth

**Mayurakshee Gangopadhyay and Dr. Debomita Sikdar**

### Abstract

The aim of the present study is to find out the effect of personal values on psychological well-being of urban and rural youth. To serve this objective a sample of 600 youth were selected by stratified random sampling. They were college students aged between 18-21 years. The data was collected from Kolkata and its adjacent areas. A general information schedule, Personal Values Questionnaire by Sherry and Verma (1978) and Psychological Well-Being Scale by Sisodia and Choudhary (2005) were administered on the samples. The findings revealed that the means of dimensions of values like democratic, aesthetic, economic, knowledge, hedonistic and power value and dimensions of psychological well being like satisfaction, efficiency, sociability, mental health, interpersonal relations and over all psychological well-being are higher in case of urban youth than rural youth. And for other dimensions of values like religious, social, family prestige and health value the mean values of rural youth are higher than that of the urban youth. But rural youth are not higher in any dimension of psychological well-being than the urban youth. It also showed that there is significant difference between rural and urban youth in terms of values and psychological well-being. There exists significant impact of values on psychological well-being of youth. Life satisfactions, efficiency, sociability, mental health, inter personal relations etc. are major components of a person's psychological well-being that get shaped or influenced by the value system being it an important socio-cultural component.

**Keywords:** Youth, values, psychological well-being

### 1. Introduction

Youth in the age group of 15-29 years comprise 27.5% of the population. At present, about 34% of India's Gross National Income (GNI) is contributed by the youth, aged 15-29 years. However, there exists a huge potential to increase the contribution of this class of the nation's citizenry by increasing their labour force participation and their productivity. Youth have their own value system that guides them in making and taking decisions. Their well-being is thus important.

Personal values evolve from circumstances with the external world and can change over time. Integrity in the application of values refers to its continuity; persons have integrity if they apply their values appropriately regardless of arguments or negative reinforcement from others. Values are applied appropriately when they are applied in the right area. For example, it would be appropriate to apply religious values in times of happiness as well as in times of despair. There are different types of personal values like religious value, social value, democratic value, aesthetic value, economic value, knowledge value, hedonistic value, power value, family prestige value and health value.

According to Diener and Smith (1999) <sup>[1]</sup>, psychological or subjective well-being as a broad construct encompassing four specific and distinct components including (a) pleasant or positive well-being (e.g., joy, elation, happiness, mental health), (b) unpleasant affect or psychological distress (e.g., guilt, shame, sadness, anxiety, worry, anger, stress, depression), (c) life satisfaction (a global evaluation of one's life) and (d) domain or situation satisfaction (e.g. work, family, leisure, health, finance, self). The dimensions of psychological well-being include life satisfaction, efficiency, sociability, mental health and inter personal relations.

A study of Kumar and Subramanian (2012) <sup>[5]</sup> found out that hedonistic values provide significantly lesser psychological well-being. Self enhancement values are negatively and self-transcendence values are positively correlated with psychological well-being.

**Correspondence**  
**Mayurakshee Gangopadhyay**  
Research Scholar Department of  
Home Science University of  
Calcutta, Kolkata West Bengal,  
India

Parikh (2015) [9] showed no significant correlation between values and psychological well-being among adults in her study. Oishi *et al.* (1999) [8] and Sagiv and Schwartz (2000) [10] have done studies on values and subjective well-being. There were considerable individual differences in the domain of subjective well-being that was most strongly associated with global life satisfaction. Moreover these individual differences in the patterns of subjective well-being were systematically related to value orientations. Sheldon *et al.* (2004) [11], Lu (2006, 2008) [6, 7], Grossi *et al.* (2010) [4] in their researches have found that culture is consistently related to subjective well being. George and Uyanga (2014) [3] in their study on youth and their moral values have revealed that as youth get prepared for leadership roles, it is pertinent to acquire moral standards and values that will mold them into personalities ready to lead for the progress of the society. Diener *et al.* (2003) [2] had revealed in their research that personality, culture and subjective well-being are interrelated factors and culture also moderates the variables that influence subjective well-being.

This present study is aimed at finding out the whether values influence the psychological well-being of urban and rural youth.

**1.1 Objectives of this study include**

- To assess the effect of area of living (urban and rural) on personal values of youth.
- To assess the effect of area of living (urban and rural) on psychological well-being of youth.
- To assess the relationship between values and psychological well-being of youth.

**2. Methodology**

**2.1 Hypothesis**

1. Area of living (urban and rural) has significant effect on the different dimensions of personal values of youth.
2. Area of living (urban and rural) has significant effect on the different dimensions of psychological well-being of youth.
3. Different dimensions of values have significant relationship with the different dimensions of psychological well-being of youth.

**2.2 Sample:** The samples were collected from colleges situated in Kolkata and its adjacent rural areas using stratified random sampling method. The sample size was 600 aged between 18-21 years. Out of 600 samples 300 are urban and 300 rural.

**2.3 Tools used**

The following tools were used in collecting data from the samples

**2.3.1 General Information Schedule**

The General Information Schedule was used to get the demographic data. A questionnaire has been prepared to acquire knowledge from the sample such as age, type of family, rituals within family, influencing person in the individual's life etc.

**2.3.2 Personal Values Questionnaire: Dr. G.P. Sherry and Prof. R.P. Verma (1978)**

PVQ is prepared to assess human values in the indigenous cultural milieu of India. It contains 40 questions based on 10 types of values like religious, social, democratic, aesthetic, economic, knowledge, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health value.

**2.3.3 Psychological Well Being Scale (PWBS): Dr. Devendra Singh Sisodia and Ms. Pooja Choudhary (2005)**

PWBS is aimed at finding out the psychological well being among individuals in five areas such as satisfaction, efficiency, sociability, mental health and inter personal relations. It consists 50 statements for each of which 5 response options are assigned. The test-retest reliability of the scale was 0.87 and the consistency value for the scale is 0.90. The scale was validated against the external criteria and coefficient obtained was 0.94.

**2.4 Statistical Analysis**

Descriptive Statistics, One Way Anova, and Correlation are being applied for the verification of hypotheses.

**3. Result and Discussion**

**Table 1:** Distribution of Samples according to Area of Living and Gender

Gender	Area Of Living		Total
	Urban	Rural	
Male	150	150	300
Female	150	150	300
Total	300	300	600

Table 1 indicates that total 600 samples are there in the study among which 300 are urban youth and 300 are rural youth. And it also shows that among the urban youth 150 are male and 150 are female. Again in the case of rural youth 150 are male and 150 are female.

**Table 2:** Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Mean			Std. Deviation			
	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	
INDEPENDENT	Religious value	10.93	15.78	13.35	2.02	3.26	3.64
	Social value	13.94	17.53	15.73	3.67	3.50	4.01
	Democratic value	17.10	13.92	15.51	2.65	2.69	3.12
	Aesthetic value	13.32	12.20	12.76	2.97	2.56	2.83
	Economic value	13.79	11.87	12.83	2.59	2.18	2.58
	Knowledge value	13.94	11.26	12.60	2.26	2.31	2.65
	Hedonistic value	13.00	11.35	12.18	1.80	2.14	2.14
	Power value	13.43	9.72	11.57	2.26	3.09	3.28
	Family prestige value	12.65	15.58	14.12	3.04	2.82	3.27
	Health value	10.29	12.07	11.18	2.36	1.90	2.32
DEPENDENT	Satisfaction	33.59	28.37	30.98	4.17	2.42	4.29
	Efficiency	37.23	32.45	34.84	3.80	3.91	4.53
	Sociability	37.93	31.86	34.89	3.73	3.59	4.75
	Mental Health	37.06	30.65	33.86	3.67	4.04	5.02
	Interpersonal Relations	37.89	36.88	37.39	3.91	4.00	3.99
T	PWBS	183.68	160.01	171.85	8.83	8.69	14.73
	No. of Samples	300	300	600(N)	300	300	600(N)

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics i.e. the mean and standard deviation of the samples in both the areas, i.e. urban and rural and also of the total sample. It reveals that the means of different dimensions of values like democratic, aesthetic, economic, knowledge, hedonistic and power value and different dimensions of psychological well-being like satisfaction, efficiency, sociability, mental health, interpersonal relations and over all psychological well-being are higher in case of urban youth than rural youth. And for other dimensions of values like religious, social, family prestige and health value the mean values of rural youth are higher than that of the urban youth.

**Table 3:** Summarized Result of One Way ANOVA for Personal Values with respect to Area of Living

Dimensions of Personal Values	df	F
Religious values	1,598	480.80**
Social value	1,598	149.94**
Democratic Value	1,598	213.79**
Aesthetic Value	1,598	24.15**
Economic Value	1,598	95.58**
Knowledge Value	1,598	205.21**
Hedonistic Value	1,598	104.65**
Power Value	1,598	281.86**
Family Prestige Value	1,598	150.07**
Health Value	1,598	103.80**

\*\*p<0.01

The findings of One Way ANOVA indicate that the impact of area of living on the different dimensions of personal values have been found to be largely significant. That proves that there is difference between urban and rural youth in terms of their value system. Therefore the hypothesis I, i.e. Area of living (urban and rural) has significant effect on the different dimensions of personal values of youth, is accepted.

**Table 4:** Summarized Result of One Way ANOVA for Psychological Well-Being with respect to Area of Living

Dimensions of Psychological Well-Being	df	F
Satisfaction	1,598	352.47**
Efficiency	1,598	230.03**
Sociability	1,598	411.41**
Mental Health	1,598	414.26**
Interpersonal Relations	1,598	9.90**
PWBS	1,598	1095.19**

\*\*p<0.01

The findings of One Way ANOVA indicate that the impact of area of living on the different dimensions of psychological well-being have been found to be largely significant. That means urban and rural youth differ significantly in terms of their psychological well-being. Therefore the hypothesis II, i.e. Area of living (urban and rural) has significant effect on the different dimensions of psychological well-being of youth, is accepted.

**Table 5:** Summarized Result of Correlation for Personal Values and Psychological Well-Being with respect to Area of Living

Dimensions of Values		Satisfaction	Efficiency	Sociability	Mental health	Interpersonal relations	PWBS
Religious Value	Correlation	-.455**	-.325**	-.420**	-.382**	.000	-.507**
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600
Social Value	Correlation	-.377**	-.341**	-.360**	-.242**	.056	-.406**
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600
Democratic Value	Correlation	.333**	.275**	.376**	.335**	.097*	.439**
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600
Aesthetic Value	Correlation	.041	.019	.075	.204**	.042	.122**
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600
Economic Value	Correlation	.186**	.177**	.221**	.230**	.056	.269**
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600
Knowledge Value	Correlation	.350**	.247**	.264**	.303**	-.049	.361**
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600
Hedonistic Value	Correlation	.224**	.228**	.265**	.231**	.065	.315**
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600
Power Value	Correlation	.401**	.327**	.270**	.396**	-.074	.426**
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600
prestige Family value	Correlation	-.287**	-.333**	-.423**	-.299**	-.127**	-.457**
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600
Health Value	Correlation	.283**	.261**	.260**	.205**	-.066	.337**
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600

\*\*p<0.01

\*p<0.05

Correlation has been found to be highly significant between most of the dimensions of values and psychological well-being among urban and rural youth. Religious value, social value, economic value, knowledge value, hedonistic value, power value and health value have significant relationship with satisfaction, efficiency, sociability, mental health and overall psychological well-being. Aesthetic value has significant correlation with mental health and psychological-well-being in totality. Democratic value and Family prestige value has significant correlation with all the dimensions of psychological well-being. Therefore the hypothesis III, i.e. Different

dimensions of values have significant relationship with the different dimensions of psychological well-being of youth, is accepted.

**4. Conclusion**

The analysis of the findings reveals that there is significant difference between urban and rural youth in terms of personal values. Urban and rural culture and its practices, family structure and traditional practices, social norms and values are reasons behind this difference. The analysis also reveals that there is significant difference in terms of psychological well-

being among youth based on their area of living, i.e. urban and rural. The reason could be the impact of personal values and its components on psychological well-being of youth as depicted from the analysis.

Therefore it can be said that the personal values of individuals influence their psychological well-being. The social norms, practices, customs, rituals, traditional norms, ethics, cultural components are important factors in shaping one's personal values and thus invariably in influencing the psychological well-being of the individual.

### 5. Implication

Thus in the development of psychological well-being of an individual there is reflection of personal values as these two are interrelated and inter-influencing factors. Family is the core of social structure and a unit to carry forward the culture and value system. Urban families and rural families depict different culture and thus the value systems they have are also different in nature and practice. Though it is said that globalization is affecting even the rural areas, still there lies certain core cultural components that mark the differences between rural and urban people. It is obvious that these differences will create differences in psychological well-being of rural and urban people. Therefore a better family life is needed to ensure better psychological well-being of youth. The component of psychological well-being is as important as other components of well-being because well-being is a composite process and without betterment in one the other will not be bettered as required for an individual, for a society and for a nation to develop.

### 6. References

1. Diener E, Smith H. Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress, *psychological bulletin*. 1999; 125:276-302.
2. Diener E, Oishi S, Lucas RE. Personality, Culture and Subjective Well-Being: Emotional and Cognitive Evaluations of Life, *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2003; 54:403-420.
3. George IN, Uyanga UD. Youth and Moral Values in a Changing Society, *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. 2004; 19(6):40-44.
4. Grossi E, Sacco PL, Blessi GT, Cerutti R. The Impact of Culture on the Individual Subjective Well-Being of the Italian Population: An Exploratory Study. *Applied Research Quality Life*, Springer. 2010, 1-24.
5. Kumar VVB, Subramanian S. Correlates of Psychological Well-Being with Reference Personal Values, *Indian Journal of Health and Well-Being*. 2012; 3(3):711-715.
6. Lu L. Cultural Fit: Individual and Societal Discrepancies in Values, Beliefs and Subjective Well-Being, *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 2006; 146(2):203-221.
7. Lu L. Culture, Self and Subjective Well-Being: Cultural, Psychological and Social Change Perspective, *Psychologia*. 2008; 51:290-303.
8. Oishi S, Diener E, Suh E, Lucas RE. Values as a Moderator in Subjective Well-Being, *Journal of Personality*. 1999; 67(1):158-179.
9. Parikh P. Impact of Values and Spiritual Quotient on Psychological Well-Being among Adults, *Journal of Social Science*. 2015; 19:1-8.
10. Schwartz S, Sagiv L. Value Priorities and Subjective Well-Being: Direct Relations and Congruity Effect, *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 2000; 30:177-198.

11. Sheldon KM, Elliot AJ, Ryan RM, Chirkov V, Kim Y, Wu C *et al*. Self Concordance and Subjective Well-Being in Four Cultures, *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*. 2004; 35(2):209-223.
12. Swami Y. Values and Ourselves, *Vivekananda Nidhi, Kolkata*, 1989, 13-27, 56-60, 110-114.