IJournals: International Journal of Social Relevance & Concern
ISSN-2347-9698
Volume 5 Issue 5 May 2017

Family Profile & its Impact on Lifestyle of Adolescents

Swiny Sandhvi[1]; Mukul Sinha[2] ; Pooja Kumari[3]
Ex-Senior Research Fellow; Associate Professor[2]; Ex- Research Scholar[3]
Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, Pusa, Samastipur (BIHAR)-848125
E-mail: swinysandhvi@gmail.com[1]; sinhamukul24@gmail.com[2];pspoojasingh32@gmail.com[3]

ABSTRACT

Adolescence is the period during which lifestyle patterns are being formed. These behaviours set the stage for one's future health, and are viewed as crucial determinants of health, illness, disability, and premature mortality through life span. Being physically active is good for one's health. There are many dimensions of the adolescent- parent relationship that might influence adolescent health and developmental outcome, as well as developmental risky behaviors. Education can help to minimize economic burden of early parental hood by helping young parents to identify lifetime goal. Pusa block Samastipur district is though not an urban area but parents of this locality are educated. Therefore Pusa block was selected for this study. The total sample size was 120 adolescent. Information on general background of the adolescent was collected through interview scheduled. Mother's education was positively correlated to body mass index of girls and that too of Government school students only whereas father's education correlated positively to boy's height of private school student. Therefore this study suggests that the Family profile & its impact on lifestyle of Adolescents should further be done for coming to a conclusion.

Key words:- Lifestyle, Family size, Family income, Adolescents

INTRODUCTION

The population of adolescents in world is 1.2 billion and in India is around 243 million. Adolescents are those between the ages of 10 and 19 years old. Adolescence is a period of rapid growth, up to 45 percent of skeletal growth and 15 to 25 percent of adult height is achieved during adolescence. Adolescence is a transitional phase between childhood and adulthood characterized by marked acceleration in growth. On the contrary, a rising prevalence of obesity in India may be attributed to various factors like sedentary life-style, unhealthy food habits, cultural practices and increasing affluence of middle class population. Further, obesity is associated with multiple co-morbidities such as type 2 diabetes mellitus, dyslipidemia, polycystic ovarian disease, hypertension and the metabolic syndrome which are increasingly becoming common among children and urban adolescents.

There are many dimensions of the adolescent- parent relationship that might influence adolescent health and developmental outcome, as well as developmental risky behaviors. Micronutrient deficiency disorder in the adolescent phase results in growth retardation, low immunity and impaired reproductive functions that at times contribute to pregnancy related complications and result in low birth weight babies, thus perpetuating the trans-generation cycle of malnutrition (Bhaskram *et al* 2001). Education can help to minimize economic burden of early parental hood by helping young parents and other desire lifetime goals. More and more people recognize education is the game-changer in global economy. Peer pressure, parent's dietary habits and media exposure influence the dietary intake of this age group.

Therefore the present study was planned to see if the family profile has any impact on the lifestyle patterns of adolescents. Adolescent school students between the age of 10-19 were selected for the purpose, comprising of boys & girls both.

Method & Material

Two private and Two Government Schools of Samastipur district of Bihar were selected. A sample of 120 adolescent students (60 each from private and government schools consisting both girls & Boys) were selected by purposive sampling method.General information regarding caste, religion, family size, and types of family as well as their socio-economic status was obtained from each subjects. To measure the Family size and family income & impact on life style pattern of adolescent, a questionnaire was developed. Direct interview method was adopted to collect relevant information from the respondent. The data have been presented in mean, SD and correlation between the variables.

Result and Discussion:-

General information

General information about the subjects have been presented in Table 1. Which inferred that majority of the adolescent i.e., 41.6 percent and 38.4 percent from government and private school were of the age of 14 years followed by 33.4 percent and 26.6 percent of 15 years age group adolescent of government and private school. The table 1 further showed that 20 and 30 percent of adolescent from government and private school were of 13 years and 5 percent each were of 16 years.

Table 1 also showed that 50 percent of adolescents were from both the government and private school studying in VIIIth and IXth class.

Table 1 further revealed that majority of the adolescents i.e., 63.3 percent from government school and 66.6 percent from private school were non-vegetarian followed by 16.6 percent and 30 percent lacto-vegetarian from government and private school. The vegetarian from government school constitute 18.3 percent and from private school 1.6 percent. The Ovo-vegetarian both from government and private school constituted 1.6 percent.

Types and size of family of Subjects

It is evident from the Table 1 that majority of the government school students i.e., 65 percent belonged to nuclear family followed by 26.6 percent of joint family and 8.3 percent of extended family. In private school, majority of the students belonged to nuclear family i.e., 53.3 percent followed by 36.6 percent of joint family and 10 percent of extended family.

Table 1 reflected that the family size of 1-4 members, the subjects in government and private schools were 20 percent and 28.3 percent. Students belonging to 5-7 family members family member were 63.3 percent in government school and 53.3 in private school. Family size, >7<10 were found 9 percent in government school adolescent and 15 percent in private school adolescent. The government and private school adolescent of family size 10 and > constitute 1.6 percent and 3.3 percent.

Family Income

Table 1 implied that majority of the government school students i.e.,53.3 percent and private school students i.e., 61 percent had family income between Rs.(>20000-40000)per months followed by 25 percent of government and 13.3 percent of private school students had family income between Rs.(5,000-20,000) per month, 10 percent of government and 15 percent of private school students having family income Rs.(>40000-60000) per months, 8.3 percent of government and 6.6 percent of private school students having family income Rs.(>60000-80000) per months and 3.3 percent both from government and private school students having family income Rs.(.80000 and above) per months.

Mother's education

Table 1 inferred that maximum (43.3%) mothers of government school adolescent's were graduate but contrary to general belief majority (53.3%) of mothers of private school students were just matriculate.

Father's education

Table 1 inferred that maximum (30%) fathers of government school students were graduate but contrary to general belief majority (33.3%) fathers of private school students were just matriculate.

But in case of higher education, percentage of fathers of private school students were more than that of government school students.

It is evident from the Table 1 that majority of the government school students i.e., 65 percent belonged to nuclear family followed by 26.6 percent of joint family and 8.3 percent of extended family. In private school, majority of the students belonged to nuclear family i.e.,53.3 percent followed by 36.6 percent of joint family and 10 percent of extended family.

Table No. 1: General information of the subjects

Particulars	(N=120)			
	Government school students (60)		Private school students (60)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
A.Age(years)				
13	12	20	18	30
14	25	41.6	23	38.4
15	20	33.4	16	26.6
16	3	5.0	3	5.0
B.Education				
8th	30	50	30	50
9th	30	50	30	50
C.Food habits				
Vegetarian	11	18.3	1	1.6
Non-vegetarian	38	63.3	40	66.6
Ovo-vegetarian	1	1.6	1	1.6
Lacto-vegetarian	10	16.6	18	30
D.Types of family				
Nuclear	39	65	32	53.3
Joint	16	26.6	22	36.6
Extended	5	8.3	6	10
E.Family size				
1-4	12	20	17	28.3
5-7	38	63.3	32	53.3
>7<10	9	15	9	15
10 &>	1	1.6	2	3.3
F.Income(Rs)				
5,000-20,000	15	25	8	13.3
> 20,000-40,000	32	53.3	37	61
> 40,000-60,000	6	10	9	15
> 60,000-80,000	5	8.3	4	6.6
81,000& above	2	3.3	2	3.3
G.Mother's education				
Non-matric	3	10	2	6.6
Matric	7	23.3	16	53.3
Intermediate	5	16.6	4	13.3
Graduate	13	43.3	7	23.3
Pg&Phd	2	6.6	1	3.3
H.Father's education				
Non-matric	5	16.6	0	0
Matric	7	23.3	10	33.3
Intermediate	7	23.3	7	23.3
Graduate	9	30	9	30
Pg&Phd	2	6.6	4	13.3

Table No. 2: Anthropometric measurements of subjects

Particulars	(N=120)			
	Government school students (60)		Private school students (60)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
A.Height (cm)				
133-145	1	1.6	-	-
145-151	26	43.3	28	46
152-158	32	53.3	32	53.3
159-165	1	1.6	-	-
B.Weight (kg)				
30-40	21	35	22	36.6
40-50	36	60	33	55
50-60	3	5	5	8.3
C.BMI(kg/m^2)				
15-<18	17	28.3	20	33.3
18-<21	37	61.6	29	48.3
21-<24	6	10	11	18.3

Height

Table 2 inferred that 53.3 percent of subjects both from government and private school falls in the highest range of (152-158) cm, followed by 43.3 percent subjects from government school and 46 percent subjects from private school in the range of (145-151)cm and 1.6 percent subjects from government school falls in the range of (159-165)cm and (133-145)cm. Table 2 inferred that the height of government school adolescent were less compared to the height of private school subjects. This may be attributed due to the fact that government school subjects have poor nutritional intake than the private school subjects.

Weight

In relation to weight 35 and 36.6 percent of subjects from government and private school falls in between (30-40) kg, followed by 60 & 55 percent subjects from government and private

school in the range of (40-50) kg and 5 & 8.3 percent of subjects from government and private school fell in between (50-60) kg. The weight range of (30-40) kg of both government and private school adolescent were approximately same.

BMI

BMI is the parameter to denote a person is of ideal weight, over weight and obese. It is observed from the table that 61.6 and 48.3 percent of subjects from government and private school were having BMI 18-<21,28.3 and 33.3 percent of subjects from government and private school were in the range of 15-<18 and 10 and 18.3 percent of subjects from government and private school were in the range of 21-<24. This inferred that the private school adolescent had lower BMI compared to the government school adolescent. This reason may be because the government school adolescent would have eaten more green leafy vegetable, cereals and pulses than private school adolescents, because of their economic condition but as the family income increases, the tendency towards eating green leafy vegetable by the adolescent specially decreases & other costly items increases, including junk foods.

Table No. 3: Life style patterns of subjects .

Table 3 showed that the participation of subjects in various sports varies between government & private schools. From the government school maximum subject i.e., 36.6 percent played cricket while no one played kho-kho and skipping while from private school too maximum subjects i.e., 50 percent played cricket while no one played table tennis and chess.

Parameters	**(N=120)**			
	Government (60)		**Private (60)**	
	Frequency	**Percentage**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
A. Sports				
Cricket	22	36.6	30	50
Volleyball	8	13.3	6	10
Football	6	10	3	5
Carem	7	11.6	12	20
Ludoo	6	10	5	8.3
Table tennis	4	6.6	-	-
Badminton	15	25	24	40
Kho-Kho	-	-	3	5
Kabaddi	11	18.3	3	5
Skipping	-	-	5	8.3
Chess	1	1.6	-	-
B. Domestic work				
Brooming	25	83.3	20	66.6
Moping	14	46.6	2	6.6
Cleaning clothes	20	66.6	15	50
Cleaning utensils	24	80	19	63.3
Vegetables cutting	25	83.3	23	76.6
Cooking	27	90	20	66.6
Arranging bed	25	83.3	24	80
Gardening	0	0	0	0
Helping younger brother or sister in getting ready	3	10	0	0
parental seva	9	30	5	16.6
C. Activity				
Cycling	43	71.6	40	66.6
Walking	14	23.3	18	30
Watching TV	54	90	57	95
Networking	25	41.6	30	50

The table 3 further showed the participation of government and private school adolescent girls in domestic work. The maximum participation i.e., 83.3 percent of the subjects from government school were in brooming, vegetable cutting and arranging bed while the least in gardening while the maximum subjects i.e., 80.0 percent from private school participated in arranging beds and least in gardening and helping younger brother or sister in getting ready.

The Table 3 also showed the participation of subjects in activities. The government school subjects participated maximum in watching T.V. (90%) while from private school maximum subjects participated in watching T.V., (95%). While from both the government and private school, adolescent participated minimum in walking.

Table 3 further inferred that more number of children from private school was participating in activity like walking, watching T.V. and networking while government school adolescent were participating more in cycling. This may be attributed to the fact that the socio-economic

condition of almost private school adolescent was good compared to the government school adolescent. Ninety-five percent of private school adolescent and 90 percent of government school adolescent were watching T.V., 66.6 percent adolescent from private school and 71.6 percent from government school were doing cycling, 30 percent from private school and 23.3 percent adolescent from government school were doing morning or evening walk and 50 percent adolescent from private school and 41.6 percent from government were using networking sites.

Table No. 4. Correlation coefficient between socio-economic variables and anthropometric parameters.

	Government			Private		
	Ht.	**Wt.**	**BMI**	**Ht.**	**Wt.**	**BMI**
Income	0.281*	0.270*	0.114	-0.009	0.205	0.219
Family Size	0.285*	0.055	-0.073	0.285*	0.489**	0.416**

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 4 inferred that the correlation coefficient between income and height (r=0.281) and weight (r=0.270) of government school adolescent was positive and significant at 5 percent level while with BMI was non significant. The correlation coefficient between income and height, weight and BMI of private school adolescent was not significant. Further the correlation coefficient between family size and height (r=0.285) of government & private school adolescents were positive and significant at 5 percent level of significance and weight and BMI of government school adolescent were not significant. The weight and BMI of private school adolescent with Family size was highly significant at 1percent level of significance.The findings were supported byGuerzkonska B. *et. al*., (2014), Marruf F. *et.al*., (2013), Rebato E. *et.al*., (2005).

Table No. 5:Correlation coefficient between socio- economic variables and anthropometric parameters of girls.

	Government school girls (30)			Private school girls (30)		
	Height	**Weight**	**BMI**	**Height**	**Weight**	**BMI**
Mother's education	0.168	0.355	0.388*	0.240	0.226	0.189
Father's education	0.085	0.236	0.352	0.278	0.221	0.239

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 5 inferred that only mother's education was positively correlated to body mass index of girls and that too of Government school students only.

Table No. 6: Correlation coefficient between socio-economic variables and anthropometric parameters of boys.

	Government school boys (30)			Private school boys (30)		
	Ht.	**Wt.**	**BMI**	**Ht.**	**Wt.**	**BMI**
Mother's education	-0.033	0.010	0.092	0.128	0.023	0.027
Father's education	-0.331	-0.287	0.179	0.625**	0.351	0.181

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

Whereas Table 6 states that father's education has strong positive correlation with the height of private school boys.

Conclusion:-

Education can help to minimize economic burden of early parental hood by helping young parents and other desired lifetime goals. More number of children from private school was participating in activity like walking, watching T.V. and networking while government school adolescent were participating more in cycling. This may be attributed to the fact that the socio-economic condition of almost private school adolescent was good compared to the government school

adolescent. The correlation coefficient between income and height (r=0.305) of private school adolescent was positive and significant at 5 percent level of significance while with weight and BMI of government school adolescent was not significant. Mother's education was positively correlated to body mass index of girls and that too of Government school students only. Father's education has strong positive correlation with the height of private school boys. A periodical and regular health check-up with concerted efforts towards nutrition of adolescents along with focused health education will improve the health and nutritional status of these schools going adolescents in the future. In general it can't be concluded that family profile has any positive or negative impact on lifestyle of the adolescents.

Reference:-

[1].Adolescence- An age of opportunity. An state of world's children 2011.UNICEF

[2].Adolescents Nutrition.(2005). A review of the situation in selected South - East Asian countrie World Health Organization. Regional office of South East Asia.

[3].Anand K, Kant S, and Kapoor SK.(1999).Nutritional status of adolescents school children in rural north India. India *pediatr*.**36**:810-5

[4].Bhaskarm, P. (2001). The cycle of malnutrition and women's health. *Nutr News*.Vol. **22**: 1-6.

[5].Gurzkonska, Beata.,Kulaga, Zbignew., Lituri, Mieczyslaw., Grajda, Aneta., Suiden, Anna.,Kulaga, Katarzyna., Gozdz, Magdalena., and Wojtylo, Malgozata. (2014). The relationship between selected socio-economic factors and basic anthropometric parameters of school-aged children and adolescent in Poland. *Eur J. Pediatr*.Vol.**173**(1): 45-52.

[6].Maruf, F., Akinpdu, A., Aronu, U., and Akinpelu, A. (2010). Socio-Economic Differentials in Height ,Weight and BMI of school adolescents in Nnewi, south-eastern Nigeria .*The internet journal of biological anthropology*. Vol.**4**(2).

[7].Rebato, E., Salces, I., Saha, R., Sinha, M., Susnne, C., Hauspie, R.C., and Gupta, P.D (2005). Age trends of sibling resemblance for Height, Weight & BMI during growth in amixed longitudinal sample from Sarsuna-Barisha, India. *Annuals of human biology*.Vol.**32**(3): 339-350.

[8].World Health organ.(1995). Physical status the use and interpretation of anthropometry. Report of the WHO Expert committee. World Health Organ Tech Rep ser.854:1-452.

.