SUMMARY

Inspite of the expenditure worth crores, on campaigns for smaller family, by the various Govt agencies, population has increased dramatically. At the same time due to increased urbanization, the space available has reduced. Thus, the crowding of the persons in the limited space has become a major and a universal phenomenon. Workers are crowded in an industrial setup, students are crowded in schools and educational institutes or even libraries, roads are crowded by vehicles, vehicles are crowded by a very high number of passengers..., indeed, the entire sections of the cities are densely populated. Whenever & wherever, an experience of crowding indicates a variety of problems.

Sinha, (1979a) has studied the rapid rise in the elderly population and its possible impact on their health, overall lifestyle, and structural changes in family and society. He has argued that developing countries are not yet geared up to cope with this challenge.

Being one of the most densely populated countries in the world and because of the traditional of extended family, India faces a unique a problem of crowding where crowding occurs not only outside but also inside the house. However, the wide disparity in economic classes has resulted in large variability in density levels and types of housing in India compared to many other countries. Regarding
perceived control, India presents a special case. The traditional Hindu belief in fatalism encourages people to be more accepting and emphasizes controlling one's own emotions rather than the environment. (Pandey, 1999).

Studies in India have shown that crowding leads to greater competition, tolerance, and a reduction in task performance; moreover, individuals residing in high density areas have been observed to experience greater crowding, to perceive the interpersonal climate as less supportive, and to exhibit more adjustment problems. Further crowding has been reported to have negative effects upon such as deterioration in the performance of complex tasks. (Swain & Verma, 1997).

Population density means population in a limited space. It is operationalised in two terms – inside density or the number of inhabitants in a house in proportion to available space, and outside density or the total population of a given locality in proportion to available space. Density perse cannot always lead to a feeling of crowding. There is a consensus among researchers that crowding deals with the subjective state which typically has a stress component. Some researchers have argued that such feelings are associated with perception of reduced physical or psychological space. In general, all these studies emphasis that subjective crowding is a state of stress which is due to the presence of others; how many others would be tolerated will vary from one individual to another depending upon the individual's awareness of the presence of others and the resultant feeling of
stress. The invasion of personal space and crowding involves subjective discomfort and arousal (Swain & Verma).

Personality characteristics also affect the reactions to high density. People who screen themselves from interaction and organise their surroundings are better able to cope with social density than are people who did not screen themselves. (Baum, Danis, Calensnick and Gathel 1982).

On the basis of their personal space requirement, it seems likely that the experience of crowding will be more severe for introverts than for extroverts.

Men appears too more negatively affected by small space than are women. Freedman et al, (1972) found that increasing spatial density was associated with increasingly aggressive behavior among men but not among women. There is also evidence that high spatial density leads to lower attraction in male than in females (Epstein & Karlin, 1975, Freedman, Lkevansky & Enrich, 1971; Rose et al., 1973; Stokols et al., 1973). So it can be concluded that crowding acts as a stressor due to its unpleasant affect which may lead to poor SWB in an individual.

Subjective well being (SWB) is a field of psychology that attempts to understand people's evaluations of their lives. These evaluation may be primarily cognitive (like life satisfaction or martial satisfaction) or may consist of the frequency with which people experience pleasant emotions (like joy) and unpleasant emotion (like depression) (Diener, Suh & Oishi, 1967).
Subjective well being has multiple facets that must be assessed through global judgements, momentary mood reports, physiological memory and emotional expression.

Subjective well being can be defined as a general area of scientific interest rather than a single construct (Diener et al., 1999). The general consensus is that SWB consists of three dimensions: (a) positive affect (how much positive affect one experiences), (b) negative affect (how much negative affect one experiences), and (c) life satisfaction (cognitive evaluation) (Feist et al., 1995). Bradburn, Caploritz (1965) suggest that pleasant affect and unpleasant affect form two independent factors and should be measured separately. Researchers have attempted to map the personality traits of extraversion and neuroticism on to pleasant and unpleasant affect respectively (Larson, Ketelars, 1991). Costa and McCrea (1980) posited that extraversion influences positive affect, whereas neuroticism influences negative affect.

Subjective well being is a rapidly growing research and applied area. Several potential causes of the individual differences in SWB have been explored and temperament looms as an important influence. People’s goals, cognitive styles and activities are also likely influences of SWB. External circumstances are often less important to SWB than is often believed, probably. Values are related to
positive SWB in that people who are involved in goal activities that they believe important are more likely to experience feelings of well being (Diener et al 1997).

Subjective well being is a new field of research that focuses on understanding the complete range of well being from ultra depair, to election and total life satisfaction (Diener et al (1997).

Crowding is considered as a negative state (Griffitt and Veitch, (1971). It has been consistently linked to negative emotional tone. So it is linked to unpleasant affect. Unpleasant affect is one of the major component of SWB.

In fact subjective well being is an important variable which has not got enough attention in India.

So keeping in mind the importance and applied utility of SWB and the prediction of its possibility to be influenced by stressful environment, following hypotheses were formulated to conduct the study.

1. High level of perceived household crowding would lead to poor subjective well being.
2. Higher perceived household crowding would lead the introverts to exhibit poor SWB level than the extroverts.
3. Males in high perceived crowding household group would show a lower level of SWB than the females.
4. There may be interactions amongst the main effects.

A sample of about 1000 Ss (500 males and 500 females) was taken from varied zones of population in Haryana (Rohtak, Bhiwani, Kharkhoda, Asthal
Bohar and Meham). The age of the subjects ranged 18 to 38 years. In the first phase, all the subjects were given the “Residential crowding Experience Scale”, by Nagar and Paulus and Hindi version of “Esynec Personality Inventory” by Gupta. Mean and SD of these Ss were computed. For the second phase, total 240 Ss were selected by Mean ± 1 SD criteria.

A 3x2x2 factorial design was employed. Three independent variables taken were perceived household crowding, sex and personality dimension. SWB was measured as dependent variable. The results indicated that perceived household crowding affected the SWB significantly i.e. higher the level of perceived household crowding, poor will be the SWB. The component of SWB, General well-being, positive affect, confidence in coping and transcendence are also negatively affected by perceived household crowding. But the other eight components were not affected. So, the first hypothesis was proved.

There was found no significant difference between the F values of extroverts & introverts. It means that perceived household crowding affected the SWB of extroverts and introverts equally.

There was a significant difference between the mean scores of component transcendence for extraverts & introverts. So the second hypothesis was rejected, it was proved only for one component of SWB.
It was observed that perceived household crowding equally affected the males and females. The fourth hypothesis was not verified by the results as the sex and personality dimensions did not influence the effect of perceived household crowding. In line with these findings, the F-values for intersectional effect between AxB, BxC & AxC were found to be non-significant. Even the third hypothesis did not proved.