



ISSN: 0975-833X

Available online at <http://www.journalcra.com>

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
OF CURRENT RESEARCH

International Journal of Current Research
Vol. 11, Issue, 07, pp.5406-5410, July, 2019

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24941/ijcr.36094.07.2019>

RESEARCH ARTICLE

SES IMPACT ON QOL OF PRIMARY STAKEHOLDERS OF NGOS

*Dr. Balaraju, K.

Head, Department of Social Work, University PG College Secunderabad, Osmania University

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 27th April, 2019
Received in revised form
20th May, 2019
Accepted 17th June, 2019
Published online 25th July, 2019

Key Words:

NGOs, Quality of Life (QOL),
Primary Stakeholders,
Being,
Belonging and Becoming.

ABSTRACT

This paper intends to measure the impact of Socio-economic status on quality of life of primary stakeholders of NGOs working in rural areas of Telangana state. The objectives are to know the socio economic status of primary stakeholders of NGOs and to assess impact of socio economic status on quality of life of the primary stakeholders adopted by the sample NGOs. The descriptive and analytical research design is adopted to measure the quality of life of the primary stakeholders of NGOs. Using stratified disproportionate random sampling method NGOs were selected for the present study. The results of this study revealed that those who are having 4 to 9 acres of land have perceived more on QOL dimensions namely "Psychological Being", "Spiritual Being", "Physical Belonging", "Social Belonging", "Practical Becoming", "Leisure Becoming", "Growth Becoming". The stakeholders' monthly income range of Rs. 4,001/- to 12,000/- of are enjoying more quality of life of dimensions of namely "Physical Being", "Social Belonging", "Community Belonging", "Practical Becoming" and "Growth Becoming" than other monthly income range group. Study also revealed that stakeholders' caste has an effect on their quality of life. The upper caste stakeholders are enjoying more quality of life than BC, SC and ST's.

*Corresponding author:

Copyright © 2019, Balaraju. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Dr. Balaraju, K. 2019. "SES impact on qol of primary stakeholders of NGOs", *International Journal of Current Research*, 11, (07), 5406-5410.

INTRODUCTION

Measuring socio economic status reveals the information about an individual's access to social and economic resources and also helps to understand changes in the structure of a society as a result of the policy measures of government. Socioeconomic status is commonly conceptualized as the social standing or class of an individual or, group. It is often measured as a combination of education, income and occupation (American Psychological Association, 2013). Individual or family's annual income, land holdings and other assets are the most commonly used indicators of socio economic status. Sources of income and number of members earning income within the family are important for a family to maintain its social status. The National Centre for Education Statistics (2003) defined SES as "one's access to financial, social, cultural, and human capital resources". The National Education Performance Monitoring Taskforce (2000) considers SES as a finely graded hierarchy of social positions which can be used to describe a person's overall social position or standing. In Behavioural and Social Science Research, SES indicates one's access to collectively desired resources like material goods, money, power, friendship networks, healthcare, leisure time, or educational opportunities, and access to such resources enables individuals or groups to prosper in the social world (Oakes, 2013).

Quality of life is a broad and encompassing construct defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) as "...perceptions of [an individual's] position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards, and concerns". Many factors influence quality of life, i.e. physical, spiritual and health state, independence level, social relationship with the environment and others (Shin, 1979). To put it in other words quality of life can be defined as satisfaction of a person with the current life dimensions in comparison with the pursued or ideal quality of life. The assessment of quality of life depends on person's value system as well as cultural environment to which he/she belongs to (Gilgeous, 1998; Suber, 1996; Fitzpatrick, 1996). All the aspects of health status and life style, mental health, and wellbeing together reflect the multi-dimensional nature of quality of life in an individual. (Barua, 2007).

Significance of the Study: Quality of life of the NGOs' primary stakeholders has been grossly underrepresented in previous research. The reason for such gap in research could be due to the undisputed focus on understanding socio economic development of the primary stakeholders rather than their quality of life. Quality of life basically is of two factors namely subjective and objective. Objective quality of life is considered to be of material benefits which helps people fulfill their needs, whereas, the subjective QOL is more of perception of the ideal experiences of life.

In this study subjective QOL is adopted. Therefore the present study contributes towards understanding quality of life experiences of NGO's primary stakeholders according to their socioeconomic status.

Literature Review: Falkenberg, (1998) argues that human development is closely related or to a large extent can be explained by using quality of life. Quality of life is an indicator of the extent of the human development. Falkenberg, while refereeing to Richard Coleman (1977) work, argues that quality of life is primarily depending upon relative access to arenas. The study first looks at Coleman's identification of resources. Hammel, (1998) defined "Being" as time taken to reflect, be introspective or meditative, discover the self, savour the moment, appreciate nature, art or music in a contemplative manner and to enjoy being with special people. Falkenberg (1998), explains the framework as follows, "For example, we take our talent for learning our financial resources and our social background into the school system and later into the university system to convert this talent into a law degree. Then we enter the arena of the legal profession, where we convert our law degree into another resource, for example income, which in turn is used to buy a nice place to live and a social standing in the local community in the form of a country club membership."

Hammel (2003), states that "Becoming" describes the idea that people can envision future selves and possible lives, exploring new opportunities and harbour ideas who or what they wish to become over the course of their biographies and how their lives might be experienced as worthwhile. Ventegodt (2003) states that all great religions and philosophies have a notion of a good life ranging from saying that a good life is attained by practical codes of conducts to requests to engage in a certain positive attitude to life or to search in to the depths of your own being. Notions about a good life are closely linked to the culture of which you are a part. These notions can be divided in to three separate groups, each concern with an aspect of good life. Azar (2004) opined that social norms effects human needs when aggregating them to overall individual assessment of social well being. And also policy decisions about social investments in improving opportunities. Social norms evolve overtime due to collective population behaviour.

According to Dalia Susniene, Algirdas Jurkauskas (2009) Happiness is a subjective factor depending on person's outlook that depends on philosophy and balance of:

- Meaningful life philosophy and balance of mind
- Importance of personal financial solution
- Background
- Religiousness
- Understanding of one's own place in a society.

Literature shows how human development leads into quality of life. Nongovernmental organisations are trying to improve quality of life of their primary stakeholders thorough increased human development; there are instances where they are directly trying to improve quality of life aspects as well. However, the instances where the role of NGOs have been evaluated or studied from the perspective of primary stakeholders are very rare.

Objectives of the study

- To know the socio economic status of primary stakeholders adopted by NGOs

- To assess the impact of Socio economic status on quality of life of the primary stakeholders of NGOs.

Hypothesis: There is no impact on perceived QOL of primary stakeholders of NGOs according to their SES in relation to "extent of land", "monthly Income" and "Caste"

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The descriptive and analytical research design is adopted to measure the quality of life of the primary stakeholders of NGOs. Using stratified disproportionate random sampling method NGOs were selected for the present study. The study was conducted in three districts of Telangana state namely Nalgonda, Mahabubnagar and Ranga Reddy. The primary data was collected on socio-economic status (SES) of NGOs' primary stakeholders by using a structured interview schedule

Impact of SES on QOL of Primary Stakeholders of NGOs

QOL of NGO's Primary Stakeholders by Extent of Land:

Data pertaining to the quality of life of NGO's primary stakeholders in all the nine dimensions and the extent of land of the respondents were collected. Results in this regard were presented in Table 1. The table 1 presented mean scores and Std. Deviation of QOL of NGO's primary stakeholders in nine dimensions of QOL with respect to extent of land of primary stakeholders as perceived by the respondents in all the development blocks (Under Developed, Developing and Developed) of Telangana region.

As regards the dimensions of QOL of NGOs' primary stakeholders' extent of land those who are having 4 to 9 acres of land have perceived in all the nine dimensions of QOL better namely "Physical Being" (6.99) "Psychological Bing" (6.28), "Spiritual Being" (6.15), "Physical Belonging" (6.09), "Social Belonging" (9.33), "Practical Becoming" (6.89), "Leisure Becoming" (7.06), "Growth Becoming" (6.68). Further it is observed that primary stakeholders who are having 1 to 3 acres of land have per have perceived in the dimensions better than land less primary stakeholders namely Physical Being (6.54), Psychological Belonging(6.02), Physical Belonging (5.92), Community Belonging (5.97), Practical Becoming (6.6) Leisure Becoming (6.75) and Growth Becoming (6.53).

QOL of NGO's Primary stakeholders by Monthly Income:

Data pertaining to the quality of life of NGO's primary stakeholders in all the nine dimensions and the monthly income of the respondents were collected. Results in this regard were presented in Table 2. The table 2 presented mean scores and Std. Deviation of QOL of NGO's with respect to monthly income of the primary stakeholders as perceived by the respondents .As regards dimensions of QOL of the NGO's primary stakeholders of monthly income range between Rs.4001/-Rs.12000/- are perceived the dimensions of better namely "Physical Being"(7.13), "Social Belonging"(9.67) "Community Belonging"(6.3) "Practical Becoming"(6.72) "Growth Becoming"(6.7) followed by monthly income range of Rs.2001-4000 are perceived the QOL dimensions of better namely "Psychological Being"(6.1), "Physical Belonging"(5.94) "Leisure Becoming"(6.8). Lastly, monthly income range of Rs.1000-Rs.2000 are perceived the dimensions of better namely "Spiritual Beling" (5.99), than other monthly income range primary stakeholders.

Table 1. QOL of NGOs' Primary Stakeholders by Extent of Land

Dimensions	Extent of Land	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F value	d.f	P=
Physical Being	0	107	6.36	1.34	6.227	2,99	0.002
	1-3 acres	100	6.54	1.29			
	4-9 acres	93	6.99	1.22			
Psychologica Being	0	107	5.9	1.4	4.53	2,99	0.01
	1-3 acres	100	6.02	0.34			
	4-9 acres	93	6.28	0.50			
Spiritual Being	0	107	5.86	0.48	4.46	2,99	0.01
	1-3 acres	100	5.71	1.28			
	4-9 acres	93	6.15	1.20			
Physical Belonging	0	107	5.66	1.00	3.398	2,99	0.035
	1-3 acres	100	5.92	1.18			
	4-9 acres	93	6.09	1.28			
Social Belongng	0	107	9.21	0.64	3.10	2,99	0.04
	1-3 acres	100	9.12	0.71			
	4-9 acres	93	9.33	0.85			
Community Belonging	0	107	5.56	1.02	8.133	2,99	0.00
	1-3 acres	100	5.97	1.12			
	4-9 acres	93	6.17	1.15			
Practical Becoming	0	107	6.26	1.29	6.497	2,99	0.002
	1-3 acres	100	6.6	1.19			
	4-9 acres	93	6.89	1.22			
Leisure Becoming	0	107	6.38	1.53	6.308	2,99	0.002
	1-3 acres	100	6.75	1.29			
	4-9 acres	93	7.06	1.20			
Growth Becoming	0	107	6.28	0.37	7.62	2,99	0.001
	1-3 acres	100	6.53	0.21			
	4-9 acres	93	6.68	1.24			

Table 2. QOL of NGO's Primary Stakeholders by Monthly Income

S.No	Dimension	Monthly Income	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F value	d.f	P=
1	Physical Being	1000-2000	101	6.32	1.35	8.261	2,299	0.00
		2001-4000	132	6.58	1.33			
		4001-12000	67	7.13	1.04			
2	Psychological Being	1000-2000	101	6.05	0.40	3.60	2,299	0.02
		2001-4000	132	6.1	0.40			
		4001-12000	67	5.99	0.49			
3	Spiritual Being	1000-2000	101	5.99	0.21	4.66	2,299	0.01
		2001-4000	132	5.85	0.46			
		4001-12000	67	5.87	0.31			
4	Physical Belonging	1000-2000	101	5.91	0.12	3.70	2,299	0.02
		2001-4000	132	5.94	0.21			
		4001-12000	67	5.72	1.13			
5	Social Belonging	1000-2000	101	8.88	1.75	4.325	2,299	0.014
		4001-12000	67	9.67	1.58			
		2001-4000	132	5.83	1.09			
6	Community Belonging	1000-2000	101	5.68	1.07	6.528	2,299	0.002
		2001-4000	132	5.83	1.09			
		4001-12000	67	6.3	1.15			
7	Practical Becoming	1000-2000	101	6.48	0.25	3.90	2,299	0.02
		2001-4000	132	6.57	0.35			
		4001-12000	67	6.72	1.07			
8	Leisure Becoming	1000-2000	101	6.64	0.38	5.17	2,299	0.00
		2001-4000	132	6.8	0.22			
		4001-12000	67	6.66	0.66			
9	Growth Becoming	1000-2000	101	6.43	0.16	3.67	2,299	0.02
		2001-4000	132	6.42	0.26			
		4001-12000	67	6.7	1.50			

QOL of NGO's Primary stakeholders by Caste: Data pertaining to the quality of life of NGO's primary stakeholders in all the nine dimensions of QOL and the caste of the respondents were collected. Results in this regard were presented in table 3. The Table 3 presented mean scores and Std. Deviation of QOL of NGO's primary stakeholders in nine dimensions of QOL with respect to caste of the primary stakeholders as perceived by the respondents in all the development blocks (Under Developed, Developing and Developed) of Telangana region. As regards dimensions of QOL of the beneficiary's caste of OC's are perceived in all the nine dimensions of better namely "Physical Being"(6.94), "Psychological Being"(6.38), "Spiritual Being"(6.42),

"Physical Belonging"(6.13), "Social Belonging"(9.69), "Community Belonging"(6.35), "Practical Becoming" (7.04) "Leisure Becoming"(7.13), and "Growth Becoming"(7.1) than other castes. Further it is found that out of nine dimensions of QOL of the NGOs primary stakeholders of caste of SC's perceived in eight dimensions of very low namely "Physical Being"(6), "Psychological Being"(5.51), "Spiritual Being"(5.38), "Social Belonging"(8.93), "Community Belonging"(5.4), "Practical Becoming"(6.09), "Leisure Becoming" (6.29), "Growth Becoming"(5.98) than other castes.

Status of hypothesis testing: The status of hypothesis testing had been asserted with the help of f-test values obtained.

Table 3. QOL of NGO's Primary stakeholders by Caste

S. No	Dimension	Social Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F value	d.f	P=
1	Physical Being	OC	48	6.94	0.99	5.149	3,299	0.002
		BC	139	6.76	1.34			
		SC	45	6	1.43			
		ST	68	6.5	1.26			
2	Psychological Being	OC	48	6.38	1.48	3.805	3,299	0.011
		BC	139	6.01	1.35			
		SC	45	5.51	1.50			
		ST	68	6.29	1.36			
3	Spiritual Being	OC	48	6.42	1.02	9.84	3,299	0.00
		BC	139	5.65	1.41			
		SC	45	5.38	1.38			
		ST	68	6.38	1.10			
4	Physical Belonging	OC	48	6.13	0.10	2.72	3,299	0.00
		BC	139	5.81	0.27			
		SC	45	5.87	1.1			
		ST	68	5.87	1.02			
5	Social Belonging	OC	48	9.69	1.57	3.01	3,299	0.03
		BC	139	9.15	0.89			
		SC	45	8.93	1.9			
		ST	68	9.21	1.28			
6	Community Belonging	OC	48	6.35	0.93	5.999	3,299	0.001
		BC	139	5.85	1.17			
		SC	45	5.4	1.13			
		ST	68	5.96	1.01			
7	Practical Becoming	OC	48	7.04	1.03	6.948	3,299	0.00
		BC	139	6.41	1.38			
		SC	45	6.09	1.08			
		ST	68	6.88	1.07			
8	Leisure Becoming	OC	48	7.13	1.17	3.261	3,299	0.022
		BC	139	6.78	1.36			
		SC	45	6.29	1.67			
		ST	68	6.57	1.26			
9	Growth Becoming	OC	48	7.1	1.07	7.768	3,299	0.00
		BC	139	6.58	1.35			
		SC	45	5.98	1.15			
		ST	68	6.21	1.19			

Table 4. Status of hypotheses testing for impact of SES on QOL

S.No	Variables	Significance
1	Extent of Land and QOL of the Primary Stakeholders	Significant
2	Monthly Income and QOL of the Primary Stakeholders	Significant
3	Caste and QOL of the Primary Stakeholders	Significant

It can be observed from the table 4, that the perceived quality of life of primary stakeholders of NGOs was effected by according to the SES namely "extent of land", "monthly income" and "caste" significantly. Thus the null hypothesis "There is no impact on perceived QOL of primary stakeholders of NGOs according to their SES in relation to "extent of land", "monthly Income" and "Caste" has been rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Major Findings and Conclusion: The results of this study revealed that those who are having 4 to 9 acres of land have perceived more on "Psychological Bing", "Spiritual Being", "Physical Belonging", "Social Belonging", "Practical Becoming", "Leisure Becoming", "Growth Becoming" for further it is found that those who are not having land are perceived the dimensions of better namely "Community Belonging" and "Physical Being" than others. In India, the semi-medium formers own land of around 2 – 4 hectares of land and below them two more groups exist and two more above them exist. This shows that they are in the middle. Therefore, they are neither very rich nor very poor. They are a sought of middle income group as such they are found experiencing more quality of life.

Rs. 4,001/- to 12,000/- of are enjoying more quality of life of dimensions of namely "Physical Being", "Social Belonging", "Community Belonging", "Practical Becoming" and "Growth Becoming" than other monthly income range group. Primary stakeholders, who are earning a less monthly income (Rs. 2001/- to Rs. 4000/-), are enjoying more quality of life dimensions of namely psychological being, physical belonging and leisure becoming. The reasons for this result could be, these income range group primary stakeholders not having heavy work pressure and satisfied with limited earnings and existing living conditions like house and the neighborhood where they are living. Interestingly it is revealed that those primary stakeholders' monthly earnings below Rs. 2,000/- are enjoying more quality of life dimension of "Spiritual Being" due to still they have hopes for their better future and these primary stakeholders are opined that they are in a respectable position in existing society and they are getting moral and emotional support from their family though their monthly earnings are very low.

REFERENCES

- Azar, 2004. whatsustains social Norms & How They Evolve? The case of tipping. Journal of Economic and Behavioral Organisation, 54(91)49-64.

- Barua A., Mangesh R., Harsha Kumar HN., Mathew S. 2007. A Cross-Sectional Study on Quality Of Life in Geriatric Population. *Indian J Community Med.*, 32(2): 146-147.
- Dalia Susniene & Algirdas Jurkauskas, 2009. The Concepts of Quality Of Life and Happiness – Correlation and Differences, *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics* (3).work humanism.
- Fitzpatrick, R. 1996. Quality Of Life and Health: Concepts, Methods And Applications. *Health Policy*, 37(1), 53-72.
- Falkenberg 1998. Quality of life: efficiency, equity and freedom in the United States and Scandinavia, *Journal of Socio Economic*.27 (1).
- Gilgeous, V. 1998. Manufacturing Managers: Their Quality of Working Life. *Integrated Manufacturing Systems* (9), 173-181.
- Hammell, K. W. 1998. *From The Neck Up : Quality In Life Following High Spinal Card Injury*. Vancouver, BC: The University Of British Columbia.
- Hammell K. W. 2003. *Intrinsically: Reflections on Meanings And Mandates*. In M.A. Mccoll (Ed.) *Spirituality and Occupation Therapy* (Pp.67-82) Ottawa, ON: CAOT Publications ACE.
- <https://www.apa.org/topics/socioeconomic-status>
http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/50718/13/13_chapter4.pdf
- Shin, D. 1979. The Concept of Quality of Life and the Evaluation of Development Effort. *Comparative Politics*, 299-304.
- Suber, P. 1996. *Against The Sanctity of Life*: <Http://Www.Earlham.Edu/~Peters/Writing/Sanctity.Htm>.
- Ventegodt, S., Merrick, J. & Andersen, N.J. (2003). Quality of Life Theory III. Maslow Revisited. *Scientific World Journal* (3), 1050-7.
- World Health Organization 1998. *The World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment (WHOQOL) Development and psychometric properties*. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 1998;46:1569-85.
