

Assessment of Psychological well-being and its predictors among housewives: A cross-sectional study in rural and urban areas of Jammu, UT of J&K, India

Rashmi Kumari¹, Chaitanya Kailu², Rishab Gupta³, Rajiv Kumar Gupta⁴, Jyoti Bala⁵

^{1,4,5}Department of Community Medicine, GMC Jammu

²Department of Medicine, ASCOMS Jammu

³Department of Psychiatry, ASCOMS Jammu

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Dr Jyoti Bala, Senior Resident, Department of Community Medicine, GMC Jammu

Email: dr.bhagat.jyoti@gmail.com

CITATION

Kumari R, Kailu C, Gupta R, Gupta RK, Bala J. Assessment of Psychological well-being and its predictors among housewives: A cross-sectional study in rural and urban areas of Jammu, UT of J&K, India. Indian J Comm Health. 2026;38(2):298-302.

<https://doi.org/10.47203/IJCH.2026.v38i02.014>

ARTICLE CYCLE

Received: 13/03/2026; Accepted: 23/03/2026; Published: 31/03/2026

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

©The Author(s). 2026 Open Access

ABSTRACT

Background: Psychological well-being, is a subjective feeling of happiness, satisfaction in one's life and satisfaction with life's experiences. Psychological wellbeing among housewives is crucial for to enhance their overall health and well-being. **Aim and objectives:** To compare the psychological well-being among rural and urban housewives and to study the association of various socio-demographic with the psychological well-being. **Methods:** This was a community based cross-sectional study conducted among housewives residing in field practice areas of PG Department of Community Medicine, GMC, Jammu for a period of 6 months. Apparently healthy housewives in the selected areas, who were willing to give informed consent were interviewed. The questionnaire used are- Socio-demographic details, personal details and the Ryff Psychological Well-Being Scale. **Results:** 495 eligible women were interviewed. A significant difference ($p < 0.05$) was observed among most of the domains in rural and urban housewives, with a higher score observed among urban residents. Variables like monthly income, decision making, relation with family/husband, helper at home, assault/abuse from family and gender discrimination emerged to be independent predictors of psychological well-being. **Conclusion:** Higher scores of Psychological well-being in the present study reflect that factors like stress, environmental pollution, lifestyle etc. have a role to play in overall mental health of the individuals..

KEYWORDS

Psychological Well-being, Housewives, Predictors, Jammu

INTRODUCTION

Psychological well-being, is a subjective feeling of happiness, satisfaction in one's life and satisfaction with life's experiences and of one's commitment in the world of work, a sense of achievements, functionality, belongingness etc. Psychological well-being has been recognised in terms of six important components: Autonomy, Competence, Healthy relationships, Self-acceptance, Personal growth and Purpose in life. The role of homemakers is mostly considered as foundation of society, yet it more often remain underappreciated and misunderstood. It is found that society imposes more expectations on women to showcase an obedient, emotional, selfless, and caring behaviours(1). Such demanding roles can result in anxiety, depression, stress related disorders and diminished life satisfaction which potentially affect various aspects of their overall well-being. Women's psychological well-being (PWB) is a significant concern because they experience severe mental problems(2). Housewife's Psychological wellbeing is very crucial for developing an efficient

interventions and social support to enhance their overall well-being. Since there is a paucity of literature on comparison of psychological well-being between rural and urban housewives in India especially North India, the present study is planned. This research endeavours to gain insights into factors influencing psychological well-being among housewives and provide a foundation for developing targeted interventions and supportive environment in order to enhance their overall well-being.

Aim & Objective(s)

- To compare the psychological well-being among rural and urban housewives
- To study the association of various socio-demographic and other factors with the psychological well-being.

MATERIAL & METHODS

Setting and Study Design: The present community based cross-sectional study was conducted among housewives residing in both the rural as well as urban field practice areas of PG Department of Community Medicine, Govt.

Medical College Jammu. The department caters to the health services of Rural health block, R.S.Pura, through a CHC and a network of PHCs and Sub centres, whereas Trikuta Nagar UHTC provides urban health care services. Study duration: 6 months (Feb -July 2024)

Ethical permission: The study was conducted after obtaining permission from Institutional Ethical Committee of the institution vide order no. IEC/GMCJ/2023/1626.

Sample size calculation: The sample size was calculated using the formula $n=4pq/d^2$. Since no prior local study on psychological well-being among housewives in Jammu region was found, the prevalence was assumed to be 50% to obtain the maximum sample size. With an allowable error of 5%, and non-response rate of 20%, the calculated sample size was 480, which was further divided into two groups i.e. rural & urban.

Sampling Technique: With the purpose to provide effective health care services, Block R S Pura has been further divided into eight zones. Out of all these zones, Simbal zone was selected by a technique of Simple Random sampling. Followed which, two villages falling in Simbal zone were identified for the study purpose by convenience sampling method. Urban area is divided into Wards and sectors. For the purpose of study, all the sectors were included to ensure adequate representation and to meet the required sample size.

Method of Data collection: Before the actual commencement of study, the local leaders within the community of the respective regions were approached and explained in detail about the purpose of the study. All the housewives in the selected regions constituted the sampling frame. A lay out map including all detailed information about households and all major known landmarks in the study area was prepared. House to house survey was done. A standard technique of data collection was followed on reaching the house, including knock the door, introducing oneself and exchange of greetings, explaining in detail the purpose of visit and study. Following this, a list of all the eligible participants was made. Further these identified participants were asked to go through the consent form, prepared in local language and simpler to understand. Subjects who are not able to read due to poor eyesight or illiteracy, the investigator helped to read out for them. Those who agreed to participate, written consent was taken and were included in the study while those who did not agree were again requested for participation and if still not willing, were excluded. To ensure privacy interview was conducted in a separate room. To ensure anonymity, no question about the name of participant or any other personal identifier was included in the questionnaire. If more than one eligible housewife was present in a household, all the eligible participants were included in the study to avoid any selection bias that could arise from randomly selecting only one individual. Also, this approach prevented the feeling of exclusion or neglect

that might arise, if only one member from the household was selected.

Inclusion Criteria: Apparently healthy housewives in the selected areas, who were willing to give written informed consent.

Exclusion Criteria: Women who were not willing to give consent, bereavement in the family or among near or dear ones in the last one year, on medication for psychiatric disorders, presence of some social problem in the family like alcoholism, drug addiction etc

Study Tool: The questionnaire used for the study purpose comprised of three parts:

- a. Socio-demographic details
- b. Personal details
- c. The Ryff Psychological Well-Being Scale3.

The Ryff scale consists of 42 items and the scores ranges from 1 to 6 (i.e., 1= very strongly disagree and 6=very strongly agree). Among 42 items, 22 items are positively scored and 20 items are negatively scored (i.e., if the score is 6 then it is adjusted to 1 and vice versa). The scale has 6 dimensions like Autonomy, Environmental mastery, Personal growth, Positive relations, Purpose in life and Self-acceptance. Higher scores indicate greater well-being in that dimension, while lower scores suggest areas where the individual may struggle.

Statistical analysis: Data collected was compiled and then analysed using SPSS version 27.0. The categorical variables were reported in percentages (%) while quantitative variables were presented as Mean \pm Standard Deviation. Student's t-test and ANOVA were used to find out the significant difference between the mean scores of various domains among different groups. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was done to predict the role of most significant variables in determining the overall scores of Psychological well-being. P value less than 0.05 was taken as significant.

RESULTS

A total of 495 eligible women were interviewed, out of which 250(50.5%) were rural residents and 245(49.5%) urbans. 69% of the participants belonged to the age group of 40-60 years, with the mean age of 48.12 ± 5.12 years in rural subjects and 52.78 ± 7.37 years in urban subjects. Majority (77.3%) of them were married. Hindus constituted 86.35% of study population. Almost half of the participants were educated up to higher secondary and above level (49.7%) and were having Monthly Family income (INR) of 50,000-100,000. Majority (54.1%) of the study subjects belonged to nuclear family.

Comparison of mean scores for different domains of psychological well-being between rural and urban participants is shown in table 1. A significant difference ($p < 0.05$) was observed among domains like autonomy, personal growth, positive relations, purpose in life between rural and urban housewives, with a higher score observed among urban residents.

Table 1: Comparison of Mean scores of different domains of Psychological well-being among rural and urban housewives

Domain	Rural (n=250) Mean \pm SD	Urban (n=245) Mean \pm SD	T test	P value
Autonomy	29.45 \pm 6.1	31.52 \pm 6.5	-3.65	<0.001
Env. Mastery	25.38 \pm 3.3	25.12 \pm 3.5	0.85	0.39
Personal growth	30.01 \pm 6.1	31.76 \pm 5.9	-3.24	0.001

Domain	Rural (n=250) Mean±SD	Urban (n=245) Mean±SD	T test	P value
Positive relations	31.36±5.6	33.23±6.0	-3.58	<0.001
Purpose In life	28.54±5.6	30.42±5.3	-3.83	<0.001
Self-acceptance	31.18±5.4	31.73±5.6	-1.47	0.14

Association of various socio-demographic variables with different domains of psychological well-being is depicted in Table 2. It was observed that as the age advances, scores for psychological well-being in all the domains decrease, however, domains of personal growth and purpose in life were only significantly associated with age (p<0.05). Domains like Env. mastery, personal growth,

positive relations and purpose in life were significantly associated with marital status. Personal growth, positive relations, purpose in life and self-acceptance domains have shown significant association with education while all the domains were found to be significantly associated with monthly family income (p<0.05).

Table 2: Association of various socio-demographic variables with different domains of psychological well-being of study participants (n=495)

Variables	N (%)	Mean (SD) Scores of various Domains of Psychological well-being						
		Autonomy	Env. mastery	Personal growth	Positive relations	Purpose In life	Self - acceptance	
Age (Years)								
20-40	55 (9.2)	28.38± 6.2	25.13± 3.3	32.58 ±5.6	34.05± 5.4	31.31 ± 5.4	31.8 ± 4.9	
40-60	412(69.2)	29.53 ±6.1	25.25± 3.5	30.88± 6.0	32.7± 5.8	29.39± 5.5	31.5± 5.6	
>60	28(4.7)	29.75± 5.2	25.43± 3.3	27.54 ±6.7	31.75± 5.8	27.14± 5.5	30.2 ± 6.6	
P value		0.407	0.93	0.002	0.163	0.004	0.427	
Marital Status								
Divorced/widow	35(5.9)	28.26± 6.8	24.0 ±3.5	28.43 ±5.9	29.43 ±5.1	27.34± 6.3	30.37± 4.5	
Married	460(77.3)	29.5± 6.1	25.34± 3.4	31.06± 6.1	33.05± 5.7	29.63± 5.4	31.53 ±5.6	
P value		0.246	0.029	0.013	<0.001	0.018	0.233	
Education								
Illiterate	30(6.1)	29.73±6.7	25.27±3.3	27.97±6.0	30.13±5.4	26.9±5.8	29.97±5.4	
Up to high school	219 (44.2)	28.78±6.3	25.25±3.6	29.32±6.2	32.42±6.3	28.16±5.4	30.96±5.9	
Higher and above	246(49.7)	29.94±5.8	25.24±3.3	32.62±5.5	33.45±5.2	30.95±5.2	32.07±5.2	
P value		0.117	0.999	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.031	
Monthly Family income (INR)								
10,000-50,000	66(13.3)	28.27±5.8	24.12±4.1	27.55± 5.6	31.06±5.8	27.35±5.5	29.05±6.5	
50,000-100,000	244(49.3)	28.71±6.4	25.27±3.4	30.66 ± 5.9	32.31±5.9	29.50±5.6	31.2±5.4	
>100,000	185(37.4)	30.75±5.7	25.62±3.1	32.35± 5.9	33.56±5.5	30.45±5.1	32.65±5.1	
P value		0.001	0.010	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.000	
Type of family								
Joint	227(45.9)	28.89±6.3	25.22±3.4	30.53±5.9	32.48±5.7	29.13±5.9	31.31±5.4	
Nuclear	268(54.1)	29.86±5.9	25.28±3.5	31.17±6.2	33.06±5.8	29.76±5.1	31.57±5.7	
P value		0.077	0.846	0.248	0.268	0.207	0.596	
Religion								
Hindu	427(86.3)	29.56±6.2	25.33±3.4	31.05±6.2	32.92±5.8	29.67±5.6	31.52±5.6	
Islam	42(8.5)	27.57±5.5	23.83±3.2	29.9±4.9	31.07±5.1	28.93±4.3	30.45±5.4	
Sikh	26(5.3)	30.04±5.1	26.12±3.2	29.54±5.2	33.46±5.5	27.12±6.2	31.96±4.5	
p value		0.115	0.01	0.261	0.118	0.058	0.442	

As depicted in table 3 personal details of the participants were studied across various domains of psychological well-being. It was observed that a comparatively higher scores of psychological well-being was seen among all domains in the absence of any co-morbidity. A significant association was observed between presence of comorbidities and domains like env. Mastery and positive relations. Similarly, higher scores among all domains of Psychological Well-being was observed when women were always involved in decision making, having good relation with husband & family, no assault from family, presence of helper at home, no gender discrimination

and when women wants to remain housewife by choice only. There was significant association (p<0.05) between all domains of Psychological Well-being and involvement in decision making, relation with family & husband and having helper at home.

On multiple linear regression analysis as given in Table 4, it was found that variables like monthly family income, involvement in decision making, relation With family & husband, helper at home, Assault/abuse from family and gender discrimination emerged to be independent predictors of psychological well-being of housewives.

Table 3: Association of personal details of study participants with different domains of psychological well-being (n=495)

Variables	N (%)	Mean (SD) Scores of various Domains of Psychological well-being					
		Autonomy	Env. mastery	Personal growth	Positive relations	Purpose In life	Self acceptance
Any co-morbidity							
Yes	129(69.1)	29.28±6.1	24.91±3.5	30.88±6.1	32.35±5.8	29.55±5.5	31.42±5.4
No	366(73.9)	29.79±6.2	26.22±2.9	30.88±6.3	34.05±5.4	29.75±5.8	31.56±6.1
P value		0.413	0.000	0.999	0.004	0.591	0.802
Involvement in decision Making							
Always	300(60.6)	30.78±5.1	25.92±3.1	31.18±5.8	33.94±5.0	30.49±5.2	32.48±5.2
Sometimes	170(34.3)	27.94±6.3	24.37±3.3	29.8±5.9	31.52±6.3	28.16±5.2	30.43±5.3
Never	25(5.1)	23.04±8.8	23.12±5.1	26.16±7.5	27.72±6.7	26.24±7.9	26.08±6.9
P value		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Relation With family & husband							
Good	447(90.3)	29.89±5.8	25.6±3.2	31.44±5.8	33.38±5.5	29.85±5.3	32.11±4.9
Average	42(8.5)	25.12±6.7	22.36±3.9	25.64±6.6	27.55±6.4	25.83±6.1	24.79±6.9
Bad	6(1.2)	23.67±10.1	19.5±2.4	25.33±4.9	26.17±1.2	27.17±6.0	29.0±4.9
P value		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Helper at home							
No	337(68.1)	28.88±6.4	25.01±3.4	30.17±6.0	32.16±5.8	28.83±5.6	30.56±5.6
Yes	158(31.9)	30.54±5.2	25.75±3.4	32.38±5.9	34.15±5.6	30.84±5.1	33.14±5.2
P value		0.005	0.027	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Assaults/Abuse from Family							
No	470(94.9)	29.72±5.9	25.43±3.3	31.11±5.9	33.03±5.8	29.57±5.5	31.76±5.3
Yes	25(5.1)	23.64±7.4	21.92±4.22	26.44±6.2	28.4±4.5	27.60±5.9	25.72±6.8
P value		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.082	0.000
Gender Discrimination							
No	467(94.3)	29.59±6.1	25.31±3.4	30.98±6.1	32.91±5.7	29.60±5.5	31.66±5.3
Yes	28(5.7)	26.46±6.3	24.25±3.9	29.21±5.3	30.82±6.8	27.43±5.9	27.93±7.7
P value		0.008	0.113	0.137	0.064	0.044	0.001
Reason for Housewife							
By choice	358(72.3)	30.22±6.6	25.63±3.8	32.69±6.6	33.56±5.6	31.43±5.2	32.66±5.1
Pressure from family/husband	67(13.5)	29.17±6.1	24.63±3.5	30.49±5.9	32.55±5.7	29.20±5.5	31.31±7.1
Couldn't find a job	70(14.1)	29.86±5.7	25.29±3.3	31.11±6.1	33.28±6.4	29.01±5.6	31.24±5.3
P value		0.40	0.11	0.013	0.411	<0.001	0.04

Table 4: Predictors of overall scores of Psychological well-being among housewives

Variables	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised coefficients	t	Sig. (p value)	95% CI for B	
	B	Std Error	Beta			Lower bound	Upper bound
Constant	154.241	9.925		15.541	0.000	134.739	173.744
Age	2.160	1.255	-0.073	-1.721	0.086	-4.625	0.306
Marital status	2.222	3.682	0.025	0.604	0.546	-5.013	9.457
Residence	1.166	2.099	-0.025	-0.555	0.579	-5.290	2.958
Education	2.452	1.904	0.064	1.288	0.198	-1.289	6.194
Monthly income	3.504	1.647	0.102	2.127	0.034	0.267	6.740
Type of family	1.282	1.869	0.028	0.686	0.493	-2.390	4.955
Religion	0.118	1.789	0.003	0.066	0.947	-3.397	3.634
Comorbidity	2.282	2.154	0.043	1.059	0.290	-1.950	6.514
Decision making	-4.886	0.931	-0.224	-5.248	0.000	-6.715	-3.057
Relation with family/husband	7.467	1.422	0.215	5.253	0.000	4.674	10.260
Presence of helper	5.968	2.131	0.120	2.800	0.005	1.779	10.156
Assault/abuse from family	-14.265	4.392	-0.135	-3.248	0.001	-22.895	-5.635
Housewife as a choice	0.673	1.294	0.021	0.521	0.603	-1.868	3.215
Gender discrimination	-14.347	3.943	-0.143	-3.639	0.000	-22.095	-6.599

DISCUSSION

Homemakers are an important part of community and their psychological well-being is important for overall

welfare of the family .The present study aimed to assess the Psychological well-being among rural and urban housewives in Jammu district of UT of J&K, India. It was

found that with advancing age, Psychological well-being decreases across all the domains. The education of the respondents was significantly associated with personal growth, positive relation, purpose of life and self acceptance domains of psychological well-being. In a study from Karnataka the authors reported that education was significantly and positively related to positive relations and purpose in life. Similar results were reported by Moe K (2012) and Ibitoye OG & Sanuade OA (2014).⁴⁻⁵ The results of present study revealed that monthly family income was significantly associated with all the domains of Psychological well-being which are in agreement with those reported by authors from Chile.⁶ The results showed that mean scores of Urban respondents were on higher side in all the domains of Psychological well-being except for environmental mastery. In a comparative study among rural and urban homemakers, authors noted no significant difference in overall psychological well-being⁷. Pratibha HD & Yenagi GV reported that more than half of rural adults had high levels of psychological well-being⁸. On similar note, Tripathi HGR *et al* reported that rural women significantly outperformed urban women in terms of psychological well-being⁹. Higher psychological well-being among rural respondents has been attributed to limited activity, peaceful living and less pollution. Variables like monthly family income, involvement in decision making, relation with family & husband, helper at home were found to be independent predictors of psychological well being among respondents. Some authors have reported that independent variables like age, occupation and income were not related to any dimension of Psychological well-being¹⁰.

CONCLUSION

Psychological well-being is important for an individual to perform optimally in personal & professional lives. Higher scores of Psychological well-being in urban respondents in the present study reflect that factors like stress, environmental pollution, lifestyle etc. have a role to play in overall mental health of the individuals. Involvement in decision making, monthly family income, gender discrimination were found to be independent predictors of psychological well-being among the respondents.

RECOMMENDATION

The factors like involvement in decision making, gender discrimination and domestic violence should be addressed to improve the well-being of women.

LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The cross-sectional nature of the study and small size are among the main limitations of the study. Authors

recommend more such studies with multicentric and large sample size to come to logical conclusions.

RELEVANCE OF THE STUDY

The present study highlights the need to provide a favourable domestic environment for the better psychological well-being of housewives.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

All authors have contributed equally.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT AND SPONSORSHIP

Nil

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There are no conflicts of interest.

DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE WRITING PROCESS

The authors haven't used any generative AI/AI assisted technologies in the writing process.

REFERENCES

1. Boz İ, Özçetin E, Teskereci G. Becoming a mother after infertility: A theoretical analysis. *Current Approaches in Psychiatry*. 2018;10(4):496–511.
2. Abirami, S., Suvetha, K. & Subhashini, G. (2019). Psychological well-being of women workers in a garment factory of South India: A cross sectional study. *National Journal of Research in Community Medicine*, 8(2), 189-191.
3. Ryff CD, Keyes C. The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1995; 69:719-727.
4. Moe K. Factors influencing women's psychological well-being within a positive functioning framework. Ph.D. Dissertation, College of education, Univ. Kentucky. Lexington, Kentucky, 2012.
5. Ibitoye OG, Sanuade OA. Psychological well-being and the elderly in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Sociol. Anthropol*. 2014; 12:74-85
6. Vera-Villaruel P, Celis-Atenas K, Lillo S, Contreras D, Diaz-Pardo N, Torres J *et al*. Towards a model of psychological well-being. The role of socioeconomic status and satisfaction with income in Chile. *University Psychology*. 2015; 14(3):1055-1066.
7. Teli K. Psychological Well-Being of Homemakers in Urban and Rural Areas—A Comparative Study. *International journal of multidisciplinary research*. 2023;5(3)
8. Devaramane PH, Yenagi GV. Psychological Well-being of Urban and Rural Adults. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 2019;8(6):247-51.
9. Mishra V and Tripathi HGR. A study of psychological well-being among rural and urban women. *International journal of advanced academic studies*. 2020;2(4)79-81.
10. Reshma NS, Manjula MY. Psychological well-being across gender and socio-economic status among middle adults. *International journal of Indian Psychology*. 2016;3(3):64-70.