The International Journal of Indian Psychology ISSN 2348-5396 (e) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (p)

Volume 6, Issue 4, DIP: 18.01.018/20180604

DOI: 10.25215/0604.018

http://www.ijip.in | October-December, 2018

Research Paper



Personal, Family Problems and Challenges Faced By Working Women Vs Housewives

Anitika Sharma¹, Maninder Kaur², Priya Sharma³, Sushma K Saini⁴*, Monika Pebma⁵, Dr Manmeet Kaur⁶

ABSTRACT

Women are vital elements of society. From ancient period women's role is confined to family as a home maker. In the modern era many women are working and hence, required to play dual role as working women as well as home maker. The change of role is posing many threats and challenges for the women. The present study is descriptive and comparative in nature. The study was done to assess and compare the personal, family problems and challenges faced by working women and housewives residing in PGIMER Campus, Sec-12, Chandigarh. Total 250 subjects were enrolled i.e.125 housewives and 125 working women by using convenient sampling technique. House to house survey was done to collect the data which comprises of socio-demographic profile, personal, family problems and challenges of housewives and working women, level of depression (Hamilton scale) and level of self esteem (Rosenberg's scale) and bio-physical profile of subjects. Results revealed that significantly higher percentage of housewives (38.4%) were having chronic illness as compare to working women (21.6%). The quarrel with spouse and crying spells reported significantly higher in working women (95.2%) as compare to housewives (76.0%). Mild depression was experienced by 2.4% of housewives. The study concluded that the housewives were satisfied in terms of relation with family, relatives and utilizing time for leisure activities but there was lack of recognition of their work. Working women were satisfied in terms of freedom to take decisions, their financial conditions and opportunities to go outside the home when required but have more workload and missing their meals.

Keywords: Working women, housewives, personal problems, family problems, depression and self esteem.

⁽National Institute of Nursing Education, PGIMER, Chandigarh, India)

⁽National Institute of Nursing Education, PGIMER, Chandigarh, India)

⁽National Institute of Nursing Education, PGIMER, Chandigarh, India)

⁴ (Lecturer, National Institute of Nursing Education, PGIMER, Chandigarh, India)

⁵ (National Institute of Nursing Education, PGIMER, Chandigarh, India)

⁶ (Professor, School of Public Health, PGIMER, Chandigarh, India)

^{*}Responding Author

Women play crucial role in a family and society. In Indian cultural context, historically, we see women as a care taker of the family. But now a day women also participate in work and earn money or add income to family. However, majority of population still think a woman is responsible only for the care of children and family. This will lead to a role conflict on the behalf of women. Today a woman plays all the roles simultaneously. She is a caring mother, a good home maker and a responsible member of society. The role of the women is changing continuously. She is taking dual responsibility of family as well as job and for that she is doing many adjustments in her daily life. Working women are stressed with double responsibilities of home and job. But in reality in case of working women society put some constrains which have produced its impact upon her physical and mental health. She also faces many problems associated with her time allocation while engaging in income generating activities outside. A housewife's role is running and managing home and needs of the family. Housewives are also called as 'stay at home mothers'. Housewives are full time homemaker and are always there for her family and acts as shoulder for all the family members. Although in many countries housewives are represented as minority and they don't have enough recognition. Recognition is the most important factor in everyone's life and it is one which most housewives thriving for. They have lesser paid support for their help in household activities.

The problems and challenges a women face may be due to her status in the family and community. Though women are participating in many activities such as sports, politics, arts and cultural activities etc and contributing to national development. But still many of them don't enjoy equal status with men. They have to suffer because of gender inequality in education, employment and health. They may be sexually harassed by their fellow men or while going through the crowd or while travelling. Her safety is always questioned at workplace as well as at home. Status of women may vary family to family. A woman with low education and no personal income may enjoy a very good status in a family but there may be another family in which women with well education and good earning doesn't get respect.²⁻⁴

Due to multiple roles of women they have many problems whether they are working or not though their problems may be different. They face personal as well as family problems. Personal problems are physical and mental stress, quality of life, financial satisfaction, self esteem level etc. Family problems may be due to lack of support in child care, non cooperative and non supportive families, unstable relationship with spouse and relatives etc. one of the study conducted by Kaur M et al. on domestic violence in Chandigarh revealed that domestic violence was 27.6% mostly done by husband and mother in law. The causes behind the abuse were due to extra marital affairs of husband and alcohol intake by husband etc. All these problems are affecting their health and quality of life which may be due to their neglecting behavior for self.

Both, housewives and working women are facing problems though the problems are different, so it is important to compare the problems they are facing. Thus there was need to explore and compare the problem and challenges of housewives and working women. While

working with women in the community the researchers had came across many problems faced by working women and housewives. By comparing the problems of working women and housewives one can find out the trigger of stress and issues. Comparison of burden, issues, and challenges of the women will help community health nurses and other health professionals working in community and identity and manage these issues and problems effectively.

Objectives of the study:

- 1. To assess the personal, family problems and challenges faced by working women residing in PGIMER-campus, Sec-12, Chandigarh.
- 2. To assess the personal, family problems and challenges faced by housewives residing in PGIMER-campus, Sec-12, Chandigarh.
- 3. To compare the personal, family problems and challenges faced by working women Vs housewives residing in PGIMER-campus, Sec-12, Chandigarh.

MATERIAL AND METHODS:

This was a descriptive and comparative study to assess and compare the personal, family problems and challenges faced by working women and housewives residing in PGIMER Campus, Sec-12, Chandigarh. Sample size for the present study was 250 women i.e. 125 housewives and 125 working women selected by using convenient sampling technique. Tool consisted of (a) Socio demographic profile of housewives and working women. (b) Interview schedule on personal and family problems. (c) Hamilton Depression scale: HAM-D is a multiple item questionnaire used to provide an indication of depression and as a guide to evaluate recovery. The scoring was 0-7 for no depression, 8-16 for mild depression, 17-22 for moderate depression, >22 for severe depression. (d) Rosenberg self-esteem scale: It is a widely used self-report instrument for evaluating individual self-esteem. It is a 10 item scale that measures global self work by measuring both positive and negative feeling about the self. All items are answered using a 4 point likert scale format ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree; strongly Disagree-1 point, Disagree-2 points, Agree-3 points and Strongly agree-4 points is given as per the response of the subject. Higher scores indicate higher self esteem. The score ranges from 0-40, score between 0-20 represent low self-esteem, score from 20-30 represent moderate self-esteem whereas >30 scoring represent high level of selfesteem. (f) Bio-physical profile of housewives and working women: It includes variables like weight, height, BMI and blood pressure. The tool was validated by experts in the field of nursing education and school of public health. Ethical clearance was obtained from Ethics Committee of NINE, PGIMER, Chandigarh. Firstly the researchers introduce self to the participants. Written informed consent was taken from each and every subject. After developing rapport with the participants they were explained about the objectives and purpose of the study. The data was collected over a period of 8 days in April, 2018 by 3 researchers with door to door visits. For data collection each subject was contacted in their house and was interviewed as per interview schedule. Each participant were made sit comfortably in a separate room. It took 20-30 minutes for each participant. Physical assessment of each participant was also done. Interview was closed with thanks note. The data was analyzed as per the objectives by using the descriptive and inferential statistics.

Calculation was done by using Microsoft excel and SPSS (20 version). The statistical measures used were frequency distribution, mean, standard deviation, chi-square etc. Findings were interpreted and presented with the help of tables and figures.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the socio demographic profile of the housewives and working women. Age of housewives ranged from 22-59 years with mean age 32.7±4.9 years while age of working women ranged from 24-52 years with mean age 44.3±1.0 years. One third (32.8%) housewives were in age group 31-40 years while (40.0%) working women were in age group of 41-50. Among housewives, majority (80.0%) have education up to secondary whereas among working women 76.0% were educated up to secondary level. As per occupational status 60.8% of working women were govt. employees, 20.0% were self employed and 19.2% were working in Pvt. Job. Spouse's occupation of housewives depicts (85.6%) govt. employees whereas in case of spouse's occupation of working women, 48.8% were govt. employee. Per capita income of housewives was ranged from Rs. 1750-33333/- with mean per capita income Rs. 9092±5019 while per capita income of working women ranged from Rs. 2500-30000/- with mean per capita income Rs. 4491±52335.9. The majority of housewives (78.4%) and working women (74.4%) was Hindu. More than half of housewives (51.2%) and working women (64.0%) were living in nuclear families. The difference in age, education status of participants and spouse, occupation of spouse in both groups (working women and housewives) was statistically significant (p<0.05) as per chi-square.

Table-2 depicts the bio-physical profile of housewives and working women. Significantly higher percentage of housewives was overweight and pre-obese (66.4%) as compare to working women (42.4%). There was no significant difference in blood pressure of housewives and working women.

Table-3 depicts the meal pattern of housewives and working women. Most of the housewives (92.8%) and working women (96.0%) were having 3 meals in a day. Significantly higher percentage of working women (68.0%) was taking breakfast before 9am as compared to housewives (45.6%). Nearly half of housewives (46.4%) and working women (56.0%) were having lunch from 1-2pm. Dinner timing of half of the working women (50.4%) and housewives (54.4%) was between 7-9pm. Significantly high percentage of working women were missing breakfast (31.3%), lunch (18.4%), dinner (8.6%) as compared to housewives were missing breakfast (12.8), lunch (3.2%) and dinner (2.4%). (p<0.05) as per chi-square.

Table–4 depicts workload among housewives and working women. Significantly higher percentage (20.0%) of working women were having domestic helper at home as compared to housewives (5.6%) (p<0.05) as per chi-square. Most of housewives (84.0%) were assisted in household chores by their husbands (43.2%), other family members (57.6%) whereas majority of working women (90.4%) were assisted in household chores by their husbands (28.0%), other family members (62.4%). Significantly higher percentage (32.0%) of housewives spends more than 8 hours in household activities as compared to working women (6.4%). Similar number of housewives (71.2%) and working women (72.0%) feel relax during weekend.

Table-5 depicts the physical activities of housewives and working women. Significantly higher percentage (79.2%) of housewives was doing walk/yoga as compared to working women (59.2%).

Table -6 depicts health status of housewives and working women. Significantly higher percentage (38.4%) of housewives was suffering from chronic illness as compared to working women (21.6%). All the housewives and working women were taking allopathic treatment for their illnesses out of which majority of (93.8%) housewives and (81.5%) working women were taking treatment from PGI. Significantly higher percentage (75.0%) housewives were accompanied by their husband whereas significantly higher percentage (63.0%) of working women was not accompanied by anyone. Most of (92.6%) working women and (89.6%) of housewives were able to maintain compliance to treatment and (66.7%) of housewives and (81.5%) of working women were have good health status at per the time of study.

Table-7 depicts about the abuse among housewives and working women. The abuse was reported by 5.6% of housewives among them all reported verbal abuse and few of them also reported physical abuse 03(2.4%) and sexual abuse 02(1.6%) whereas abuse reported by 12.8% of working women among them majority reported physical as well as verbal abuse (10.4%) and sexual abuse (0.8%). All the housewives reported the abuse to their family members whereas working women had reported the abuse to their family members (2.4%) and police/friends/relatives (2.4%). The reason for not reporting was fear of being alone in 04 housewives and fear of being beaten in one housewife. Whereas the reason for not reporting was fear of being alone in 04 working women and fear of being beaten in 06 working women. Half (50.0%) of the housewife's had reported abuse and undergone intervention and all (100%) of working women had undergone intervention after report. There was no significant difference in relation to experience of abuse on housewives and working women.

Table-8 depicts Personal problems among housewives and working women. Most of the housewives (80.0%) never felt overburden, did not miss sleep due to work, never felt burnout (87.2%) and did not get relationship worse due to work (92.8%). Whereas more than half of the working women (50.4%) felt burnout due to work, missed sleep due to work (57.6%), felt burnout (59.2%), get relationship worse due to work (59.2%). Most of the housewives (84.8%) had leisure time to spend whereas only (69.6%) of working women had leisure time to spend. Most of the housewives (82.4%) and working women (82.4%) often felt satisfied with their financial conditions. Most of the housewife's husbands (92.3%) and working women's husband (93.6%) often fulfill the demands. Only 1.6% of housewives often need to borrow money but in case of working women 62.4% often need to borrow money. Nearby half of housewives never had body aches(48.8%), never had insomnia(75.2%), sometimes felt less energetic (55.4%), never had an upset stomach (84.0%), never get easily agitated (64.8%), never felt lonely(83.2%), never cry without reasons(80.8%) but sometimes felt overwhelmed (88.0%), whereas most of the working women often had body aches(48.0%), often had insomnia(61.6%), felt less energetic sometime(59.2%), often had upset stomach(68.8%), often get easily agitated(44.8%), often felt lonely(72.8%), sometimes felt overwhelmed(67.2%), and often cry without any reason that is(78.4%).

Table -9 shows about the family problems among housewives and working women. Most of the housewives (93.6%) and working women (89.6%) often gave time to their spouse. In case of housewives 60% of housewife's spouse help them in work and support them in their decision whereas only 55.2% of working women's spouse help them in work and 87.2% of working women 'spouse support them in decision. Most of housewives (95.2%) and working women (95.2%) often felt comfortable to share their thoughts and feelings with their spouse. Maximum number of housewives often given full time in nurturing their child (97.6%), never been away from their children due to work (92.7%) and never ignore their children (96.6%) whereas lesser number of working women often given full time in nurturing their child (68.0%), sometime been away from their children due to work (56.8%) and often ignore their children (54.4%). Majority of (84.8%) housewife's families help them in domestic work, often supports them to go out with their friends (86.4%), allow them to work outside (65.6%), support them in their decisions (88.8%) and involve them in home decisions (88.8%), whereas in case of working women's families (76.8%) help them in domestic work, supports them to go out with their friends (88.8%). All of them allow working outside and supporting them in their decisions (91.2%) and involving them in home decisions (90.4%).

Table -10 depicts personal and family challenges among housewives and working women. Nearly half of housewives 48.8% often spend time on their health, 88.0% often able to fulfill demands of family and their own demands, 88.% were often able to spare time for their entertainment, 82.4% were often able to maintain work life balance, 62.4% were able to overcome their weakness sometimes , 59.2% were able to distress themselves sometimes, 67.2% were often able to take stand for their decisions, 49.6% were unable

to complete their studies and 76.0% were often able to speak up against any in justice. Similarly near half of working women 46.4% spend time on their health often and sometimes, 81.6% often able to fulfill demands of family, 88.0% were often able to fulfill their own demands, 76.8% were often able to spare time for their entertainment, 84.8% were often able to maintain work life balance, 56.0% were able to overcome their weakness sometimes, 53.6% were able to distress themselves sometimes, 71.2% were often able to take stand for their decisions, 68.0% were often able to complete their studies and 85.6% were often able to speak up against any in justice.

Table-11 depicts the level of depression according to Hamilton scale for depression and level of self-esteem using Rosenberg self-esteem scale among housewives and working women. Depression scale shows that 97.6% housewives have no depression and 2.4% housewives have mild depression whereas all the working women (100%) have no depression. Self-esteem scale shows that 32.0% housewives have moderate self-esteem and 68.0% have high self-esteem whereas 31.2% of working women have moderate of self-esteem and 68.8% working women have high self-esteem. There was no significant difference in depression and self-esteem among housewives and working women.

Significantly higher percentage of working women (79·2%) were having total sleeping hours between 9-11hours as compare to housewives (32.8%) (p< 0.05) as per chi-square. Significantly higher percentage of housewives (95·2%) were taking day naps as compare to working women (49.6%) (p< 0.05) as per chi-square. Nearly half of housewives (56.8%) and

72.8% of working women were sleeping at night between 10-11pm. Most of the housewives (76.8%) and 35.2% of working women were sleeping between 1-2pm at day. Getting up time in the morning of most housewives (72.0%) and working women (79.2%) was between 4-6am.

Burden of care of dependent member were almost equal in both groups (housewives 7.2% and working women 10.4%). Out of which 05(55.6%) were having one dependent member and 04(44.4%) were having two dependent members in the families of housewives whereas families of working women were having more dependent members in families 13(10.4%) out of which 11(84.6%) were having only one dependent member and 02(15.4%) were having two dependent members. There were 07(77.8%) dependent members of families of housewives who were partial dependent whereas 02(22.2%) were completely dependent on them.

Majority of housewives (73.6%) were having 1-2 children, (25.6%) were having 3-4 children and (0.8%) were having 5-6 children although (74.4%) of working women were having 1-2 children, (24.0%) were having 3-4 children and (1.6%) were having 5-6 children. Significantly higher percentage (40.0%) of working women were taking help of crèche as compare to housewives (21.6%) (p<0.05) as per chi-square. Nearly (60.0%) of housewives send their children to tuitions out of which 7.1% of mothers accompanied their children while sending them tuitions nearly half (48.8%) of working women send their children to tuitions and all are not accompanied by any one. Majority of (76.0%) housewives and working women (80.0%) attend parent's teacher meeting at their children's school.

Significantly higher percentage (95.2%) of working women were having quarrel with spouse/family as compared to housewives (76.0%). There were (5.6%) housewives who had left house temporarily due to quarrels and (1.6%) had attempted suicide due to quarrels whereas (4.0%) of working women had left house temporarily and (0.8%) had attempted suicide due to quarrels. Significantly higher percentage (94.4%) of working women were having crying spells as compared to housewives (77.6%) (p<0.05) as per chi-square.

Majority of housewives (86.4%) were visiting their relatives out of which (80.0%) were visiting occasionally and (6.4%) were visiting frequently and (13.6%) were not visiting their relatives. Similarly (87.2%) of working women were visiting their relatives in which (84.0%) of working women were visiting to their relatives occasionally and (3.7%) were visiting frequently. Majority of housewives (94.4%) had interaction with their neighbors and all the working women had interaction with their neighbors whereas (5.6%) of housewives had no interaction with their neighbors. All the working women had interaction with their neighbors and 52.8% of working women were interacting with 5-10 families. Most of the housewives (86.4%) received neighbor's help in need and more number of working women (89.6%) received neighbor's help when needed.

DISCUSSION

The woman in modern times entering into certain new fields that were unknown to the woman's sphere of role-set. Women face many problems whether they are working or not.

Problems and challenges faced by working women and housewives affect their quality of life. These problems result in personal, financial and family imbalance. Therefore the present study was conducted to explore and compare the problems and challenges of housewives and working women.⁵

There are various studies conducted on problems, challenges of working women and housewives. The variations are reported in the studies, some studies show housewives have more problems where as other studies depicts that working women have multitask to perform and thus have more problems. About half of (56%) of housewives and 30% of working women were illiterate or had low educational status so the data was collected by interview method in their local language (Hindi).

One of the study indicated that according to the National Family Health Survey (NFHS-4), one-fifth of Indian women, or 20.7 per cent to be precise, in the age group of 15-49 are overweight. Generally, obesity is caused by sedentary lifestyles or physical inactivity, same is observed in the present study that housewives were more overweight and pre-obese as compare to working women because of their sedentary lifestyle. Being obese puts you at a higher risk of developing a number of potentially serious health problems, including—heart disease, stroke, diabetes, breathing disorders, musculoskeletal disorders (especially osteoarthritis), alcoholic fatty liver disease, kidney disease and some cancers. Similarly chronic illnesses were seen more in the housewives as compare to working women but compliance to treatment was good in working women as compare to housewives. Working women were often missing their breakfast, lunch, dinner as compared to housewives because they have less time and hurry in their daily life. This may lead to bad impact on their health that's why it is observed that minor ailments were more commonly reported by working women like upset stomach, insomnia, body aches, less energetic etc.

Working women plays many roles simultaneously like a caring mother, a home maker, and as a member of society. This will results in increased workload and burden her. Though working women have more workload as compare to housewives but in the present study it was seen that working women were more assisted by their family members and domestic helpers as they are earning they can hire a domestic helper for assisting them in household work whereas housewives do their work by their own and have less help of their family members and domestic helper. Working women often felt burnout, miss their sleep because of workload but majority of housewives never feel burnout and never get worse relationship because they don't have much workload as compare to working women. Also workload will lead to quarrels with family/spouse. Majority of working women were having quarrels with their husbands as compare to housewives because they have less time to spend with them. Housewives had their meal after 9am because they had their meal after completing their household tasks while working women were having their breakfast before 9am as working women had duty schedule after that.

According to National Sleep Foundation, it is recommended that adults should have sleep of 7-9 hours for their well being and good health.⁷ In present study nearly half of the housewives were having sleep7-9 hours per day including day naps whereas majority of

working women were having sleep of 9-11 hours per day total because they get tired and get their sleep complete in mean time but more number of housewives were taking day naps as compare to working women because working women don't have time for day naps.

Abuse is another word for mistreating or misbehaving with other person that may be physical, emotional, or sexual. Abuse of women had been observed from ancient times. Abuse of women is not a new concept; it is something which is there in all the period. The thing that changes with time is that now it comes with new forms and types like financial abuse, abuse at workplace etc of working women. In the present study it was observed that working women faced more abuse and problems as compare to housewives but as they are well oriented and educated the reporting of abuse was done by them.

The present study shows that more housewives left house after having quarrel with their husband as compare to working women but the study on marital adjustment among working and non working women showed that working women have to face more adjustment problems related to their married life as compared to non working

The present study shows that mild depression is more among housewives than working women whereas a comparative study between working and non-working mothers concluded that there is significant increase in stress level and depression among working women as compare to housewives.⁹

The present study shows that working women have more outing and spend more time with their friends as compared to housewives whereas a study done on Constraints faced by working and non-working women in their families showed that working women have limited contact with society due to busy with work schedule while non-working women have enough time with friends and husband.¹⁰

The present study shows that working women feel more burnout due to work as compare to housewives and similar findings were shown in one of the study conducted to assess the stress level of working women and housewives in the Kerala state. The study shows that stress levels of working women are high as compare to housewives. The study on self esteem level of working and non working women in relation of psychological well being concluded that there was significant difference was found in working and non working women whereas the present study shows that there was no significant difference in relation of self esteem level between housewives and working women. It

The present study shows that the housewives were satisfied in terms of relation with spouse, family and relatives. They had enough leisure time for utilizing sin activities like walk and yoga. In spite of that they were obese and overweight and reported more chronic illnesses and some of them had mild-depression. The working women were satisfied in terms of freedom to take decisions, financial independence and opportunities to go outside the home when ever required. But due to busy schedule they skip meals, had lesser time for child care, feel more over burden though they were getting help of family members and domestic helper in

household work. They had problems in adjustment with family and spouse. They didn't have much time to do activities like yoga/walk. They reported more of minor ailments (body aches, insomnia, upset stomach and weakness). The compliance to their treatment was better in working women as compared to housewives. So it is recommended that Nurses, other health care professionals and workers (ASHAs, ANMs, AWWs) working in community should identify the problems and manage them accordingly.

REFERENCES:

- 1. Nezhad MZ, Goodarzi AM, Hasannejad L, Roushani Khadijeh. (2010). Occupational stress and family difficulties of working women. Current Research in Psychology, 1(2), 75-81. Retrieved from http://thescipub.com
- 2. Delina G, Prabhakara R. (2013). A study on work life balance in working women. International Journals of Commerce Business and Management, 2(5), 15-8. Retrieved from http://www.researchgate.net/.
- 3. Chakraboty P. Status of Indian Women. Slide share. Retrieved from https://www.slideshare.net/.
- 4. Shuani. Status of Indian Women in Ancient India. Your Article Library. Retrieved from www.yourarticallibrary.com.
- 5. Berntsson L. (2005). Total workload, work stress and perceived symptoms in Swedish male and female employees, 15(2), 209-14. Retrieved from http://acedemic.oup.com/.
- 6. Cloud D. National sleep foundation recommends new sleeping hours. National Sleep Foundation. Retrieved from https://sleepfoundation.org.
- 7. Patricelli K. Introduction to Abuse. Mental Help.net. Retrieved from https://www.mentalhelp.net/ .|
- 8. Adhikari H. (2012). Anxiety and Depression: Comparative study between working and non-working mother. Global Journal of Human Social Science, 2(5), 1-7. Retrieved from https://socialscienceeresearch.org/.
- 9. Zhu H, Khan HGA and Ilyas M. (2011). Challenges and risks faced by the working women in government organization: An insight from Asian countries. African Journal of Business Management, 6(45), 11368-74. Retrieved from http://www.academicjournals.org>article.
- 10. Sultana AM. (2013). Constrains faced by working and non-working women in their families. Australian Journal of Basic Applied Science, 7(6), 719-22. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/.
- 11. Akram M. (2015). A study on self esteem and psychological well being among working and non-working women. International Journal of Indian Psychology, 5(1), 147-53. Retrieved from https://www.ijip.in.

APPENDIX

Table-1: Socio demographic profile of housewives and working women N=250

| Characteristics | Housewives | Working women | Chi-square (df) |
|--------------------------------|------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Characteristics | n=125 | n=125 | P |
| | n(%) | n(%) | • |
| Age in years*:- | 11(70) | II(/0) | |
| 20-30 | 14(11.2) | 44(35.2) | 32.234(3) |
| 31-40 | 41(32.8) | 15(12.0) | <.001 |
| 41-50 | 41(32.8) | 50(40.0) | <.001 |
| 51-60 | 29(23.2) | 16(12.80 | |
| Educational status of | 27(23.2) | 10(12.00 | |
| participant: | 19(15.2) | 11(08.8) | 48.284(6) |
| illiterate | 09(07.2) | 04(03.2) | <.001 |
| Primary | 16(12.8) | 10(08.0) | <.001 |
| Middle | 26(20.8) | 12(09.6) | |
| Metric | 30(24.0) | 22(17.6) | |
| Secondary | 00(00.0) | 36(28.8) | |
| diploma | 25(20.0) | 33(24.0) | |
| Graduation and above | 23(20.0) | 33(24.0) | |
| | | | |
| Educational status of spouse:- | 02(1.6) | 08(06.4) | |
| l = | ` ' | ` , | 17.006(6) |
| illiterate | 08(6.4) | 01(00.8) | 17.996(6) |
| Primary | 09(7.2) | 04(03.2) | .006 |
| Middle | 23(18.4) | 26(20.8) | |
| Metric | 33(26.4) | 23(18.4) | |
| Secondary | 15(12.0) | 30(24.0) | |
| diploma | 35(28.0) | 33(26.4) | |
| Graduation and above | | | |
| Occupation of participants:- | 105(100) | 00(00 0) | |
| Housewife | 125(100) | 00(00.0) | |
| Govt. employee | 00(00.0) | 76(60.8) | |
| Self-employee | 00(00.0) | 25(20.0) | |
| Pvt. Job | 00(00.0) | 24(19.2) | |
| Occupation of spouse:- | 10=(0= 0 | 50 (10 0) | 10.055(1) |
| Govt. employee | 107(85.6) | 60(48.8) | 40.966(4) |
| Self-employee | 02(1.6) | 11(08.8) | <.001 |
| Unemployed | 12(9.6) | 40(32.0) | |
| Pvt. job | 02(1.6) | 03(02.4) | |
| Retired | 02(1.6) | 11(08.8) | |
| Per-capita income**:- | | 110(000) | |
| <10000 | 109(87.2) | 110(88.0) | 0.548(2) |
| 10000-30000 | 11(8.8) | 12(9.6) | .760 |
| >30000 | 05(4.0) | 03(2.4) | |
| Religion:- | | | |
| Hindu | 98(78.4) | 93(74.4) | 2.226(3) |
| Muslim | 01(00.8) | 00(00.0) | .527 |
| Sikh | 20(16.0) | 22(17.6) | |
| Christian | 06(4.8) | 10(8.0) | |
| Type of family:- | | | |
| Nuclear | 64(51.2) | 80(64.0) | 4.193(1) |
| Joint | 61(48.8) | 45(36.0) | .041 |

Table-2: Bio-physical profile of housewives and working women N=250

| Variables | Housewives | Working women | Chi-square (df) |
|-------------------------|------------|---------------|-----------------|
| | n=125 | n=125 | P |
| | n(%) | (%) | |
| BMI:- | | | |
| Underweight(<18.5) | 04(03.2) | 10(8.0) | 15.638(4) |
| Normal(18.5-22.9) | 38(30.4) | 62(49.6) | .004 |
| Overweight(23-24.9) | 34(27.2) | 20(16.0) | |
| Pre-obese(25-29.9) | 40(32.0) | 29(23.2) | |
| Obese(30-40) | 09(07.2) | 04(3.2) | |
| Blood pressure:- | | | |
| • Normal (<120/<80) | 76(60.8) | 74(59.2) | 3.440(3) |
| • Pre hypertension(120- | | | .350 |
| 139/80-89) | 33(26.4) | 42(33.6) | |
| Hypertension stage-1 | | | |
| (140-159/90-99) | 14(11.2) | 07(5.6) | |
| Hypertension stage-2 | | | |
| (>160/>100) | 02(1.6) | 02(1.6) | |

Table-3: Meal pattern of housewives and working women N=250

| Meal pattern | Housewives n=125 n(%) | Working women n=125 n(%) | Chi-square(df) |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Meals per day:- | | | |
| • 2 times | 7(5.6) | 1(0.8) | 5.234(2) |
| • 3 times | 116(92.8) | 120(96.0) | .073 |
| • 4 times | 02(1.6) | 4(3.2) | |
| Time of breakfast:- | | | |
| • 07:00-09:00am | 54(43.2) | 85(68.0) | 23.893(2) |
| • 09.01-10:00am | 57(45.6) | 40(32.0) | <.001 |
| • 10:01-12:00 pm | 14(11.2) | 00(00) | |
| Lunch:- | | | |
| • 12:00-01:00pm | 29(03.2) | 21(16.8) | 1.613(3) |
| • 01:01-02:00pm | 65(52.0) | 70(56.0) | .960 |
| • 02:01-03:00pm | 29(29.3) | 32(25.6) | |
| • 03:01-04;00pm | 02(01.6) | 2(1.6) | |
| Dinner:- | | | |
| • 07:00-09:00pm | 63(54.4) | 63(50.4) | 1.554(2) |
| • 09:01-11:00pm | 50(40.0) | 55(44.0) | .460 |
| • 11:01-01:00pm | 12(09.6) | 7(5.6) | |
| Miss breakfast:- | | | |
| • Yes | 16(12.8) | 39(31.2) | 12.331(1) |
| • No | 109(87.2) | 86(68.8) | <.001 |
| Frequency:- | | | |
| Occasionally | 08(6.4) | 26(20.8) | |
| • once a month | 02(1.6) | 04(3.2) | |
| • 2-3 times a week | 01(0.8) | 04(3.2) | |
| • Once a week | 05(4.0) | 05(4.0) | |

| h:- | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------|
| es 4(3 | (3.2) | 23(18.4) | 14.989(1) |
| 0 12 | 21(96.8) | 102(81.6) | <.001 |
| y:- | 2(02.4) | 15(12.0) | |
| casionany | 3(02.4) | 15(12.0) | |
| ice a month | 0(0.0) | 06(4.8) | |
| 3 times a week 01 | 1(0.8) | 02(1.6) | |
| ners:- | | | |
| es 03 | 3(2.4) | 11(8.6) | 4.843(1) |
| 0 12 | 22(97.6) | 114(91.2) | .028 |
| y:- | | | |
| ecasionally 02 | 2(1.6) | 04(3.2) | |
| , | 0(0.0) | 03(2.4) | |
| 01 | 1(0.8) | 03(2.4) | |
| | 0(00.0) | 01(0.6) | |
| es 03 o 12 y:- exacionally 02 nce a month 01 3 times a week 01 | 3(2.4) 22(97.6) 2(1.6) 0(0.0) 1(0.8) | 11(8.6) 114(91.2) 04(3.2) 03(2.4) 03(2.4) | ` ' |

Table-4: Differential workload among housewives and working women N=250

| Variables | Housewives | Working | Chi- |
|--|------------|------------|------------|
| , uriables | n=125 | women | square(df) |
| | n(%) | n=125 n(%) | P |
| Domestic helper at home:- | 07(5.6) | 25(20.0) | 11.611(1) |
| • Yes | 118(94.4) | 100(80) | <.001 |
| • No | | | |
| Working hours of domestic helper:- | | | |
| • 2-5hours | 07(100) | 19(76.0) | |
| whole day | 00(0.0) | 6(24.0) | |
| Family members help in work:- | 105(84.0) | 113(90.4) | 2.294(1) |
| ■ Yes | 20(16.0) | 12(9.6) | .130 |
| ■ No | | | |
| Who helps in household chores:- | | | |
| husband | 54(43.2) | 35(28,0) | |
| other family member | 51(57.6) | 78(62.4) | |
| Time in household activities:- | | | |
| • 1-4hours | 14(11.2) | 56(44.8) | 47.291(2) |
| • 4-8hours | 71(56.8) | 61(48.8) | <.001 |
| • >8hours | 40(32.0) | 08(6.4) | |
| Working hours outside the house:- | | | |
| • <6hours | 00 | 20(16.0) | |
| • 6-8hours | 00 | 92(73.6) | |
| • >8hours | 00 | 13(10.4) | |
| Feel relax during weekend:- | | | |
| ■ Yes | 89(71.2) | 90(72.0) | .020(1) |
| ■ No | 36(28.8) | 35(28.0) | .888 |
| vegetables and grocery brought by:- | | | |
| husband | 54(43.2) | 33(26.4) | 12.589(3) |
| • self | 24(19.2) | 31(24.8) | .006 |
| other family members | 20(16.0) | 39(31.2) | |
| both(husband, wife together) | 27(21.6) | 22(17.6) | |

Table-5: Physical and recreation activity of housewives and working women N=250

| Variables | Housewives n=125 n(%) | Working women n=125 n(%) | Chi-square(df) P |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| Walk/yoga:- | | | |
| ■ Yes | 99(79.2) | 74(59.2) | 11.730(1) |
| Hours spend per day:- | | | <.001 |
| • <30 min | 15(15.2) | 18(24.3) | |
| • 30-60 min | 62(62.6) | 43(58.1) | |
| • 1-2 hours | 16(16.2) | 13(10.4) | |
| • 2-2.5 hours | 06(6.1) | 00(0.0) | |

Table-6: Differential health status and treatment pattren (Chronic illness) of housewives and working women N=250

| Variable | Housewife n(%) | Working women n (%) | Chi- square(df) P |
|--|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Chronic illness:- | | | 8.400(1) |
| ■ Yes | 48(38.4) | 27(21.6) | .004 |
| No | 77(61.6) | 98(78.4) | |
| Type of illness:- | | | |
| Hypercholestremia | | | |
| Cervical pain | 04(8.3) | 02(7.4) | |
| Cholilithiasis | 02(4.2) | 02(07.4) | |
| Asthma | 05(10.4) | 02(07.4) | |
| Hypo/hyperthyroidism | 02(4.2) | 02(07.4) | |
| Diabetes mellitus | 05(10.4) | 02(07.4) | |
| Hypertension | 11(22.9) | 08(29.6) | |
| Heart attack | 05(10.4) | 06(22.2) | |
| anaemia | 02(4.2) | 00 | |
| | 02(4.2) | 00 | |
| • Skin allergy | 02(4.2) | 00 | |
| • DUB | 02(4.2) | 00 | |
| • Epilepsy | 04(8.3) | 00 | |
| • Cancer | 01(2.1) | 03(11.1) | |
| Rheumatoid arthritis | 01(2.1 | 00 | |
| Kind of treatment | | | |
| Allopathic | 48(100.0) | 27(100) | |
| Treatment taken from | | | |
| • PGI. / Other govt. | 45(93.8) | 24(88.9) | .555(1) |
| • Pvt. | 03(6.3) | 03(11.1) | .456 |
| Accompanied by | | | |
| No one | 10(20.8) | 17(63.0) | 22.417(2) |
| Husband | 36(75.0) | 05(18.5) | <.001 |
| Others members of family | 2(4.2) | 05(18.5) | |
| Compliance to treatment:- | | | |
| • Yes | 43(89.6) | 25(92.6) | .185(1) |
| ■ No | 05(10.4) | 02(7.4) | .667 |
| Present status of illness(as per participants) | () | - () | |
| Bad | 04(8.3) | 00 | 3.097(2) |
| • Good | 32(66.7) | 22(81.5) | .213 |
| Better than previous | 12(25.0) | 05(18.5) | |
| - Detter than previous | 1 () | (/ | |

Table-7: Abuse among housewives and working women N=250

| Abuse | Housewives n (%) 125 | Working women n (%) 125 | Chi-square(df) |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| Abuse | | | |
| ■ Yes | 07(5.6) | 16(12.8) | 3.879(1) |
| ■ No | 118(94.4) | 109(87.2) | .049 |
| Type of abuse:- | | | |
| Verbal | 07(5.6) | 13(10.4) | |
| Physical | 02(1.6) | 13(10.4) | |
| Sexual | 02(28.6) | 01(0.8) | |
| Reporting of abuse:- | | | |
| • Yes | 02(28.6) | 06(37.5) | .171(1) |
| ■ No | 05(71.4) | 10(62.5) | .679 |
| Abuse reported To | | | |
| Family members | 02(100) | 03(2.4) | |
| • Other than family(police, | 00 | 03 (2.4) | |
| friends, relatives) | | | |
| Reason for not reporting | | | |
| Fear of being alone | 04(80.0) | 04(40.0) | 2.148(1) |
| Fear of being beaten | 01(20.0) | 06(60.0) | .143 |
| Interventions done after | | | |
| reporting:- | 01(50.0) | 03(100.0) | 1.875(1) |
| ■ Yes | 01(50.0) | 00(0.0) | .171 |
| ■ No | | | |

Table-8: Personal problems among housewives and working women N=250

| Housewive | | | AMI ON THE CO | ***** | |
|-----------|---|---|--|--|---|
| | es | | Working | women | |
| | | | | | |
| ` , | | 6 2 | | | F 2 |
| never=0 | sometimes=1 | often=2 | Never=0 | sometimes=1 | often=2 |
| 100(00.0) | 24/10 2) | 01/0.0 | 17(12.6) | 45(25.0) | 62(50.4) |
| 100(80.0) | 24(19.2) | 01(0.8) | 17(13.6) | 45(36.0) | 63(50.4) |
| 100(00.0) | 24/10 2) | 01/0.0 | 1.6(12.0) | 27(20.6) | 72(57.6) |
| | | | | | 72(57.6) |
| | | | | | 74(59.2) |
| 116(92.8) | 09(7.2) | 00(00) | 29(23.2) | 22(17.6) | 74(59.2) |
| 04(3.2) | 15(12.0) | 106(84.8) | 11(8.8) | 27(21.6) | 87(69.6) |
| | | | | | |
| 03(2.4) | 19(15.2) | 103(82.4) | 10(8.0) | 12(9.6) | 103(82.4) |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 02(1.6) | 08(6.4) | 115(92.3) | 06(4.8) | 02(1.6) | 117(93.6) |
| | | | | | |
| 108(86.4) | 15(12.0) | 02(1.6) | 25(20.0) | 22(17.6) | 78(62.4) |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 61(48.8) | 55(44.0) | 09(7.2) | 14(11.2) | 51(40.8) | 60(48.0) |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | 77(61.6) |
| 50(40.0) | 69(55.4) | 06(4.8) | 07(5.6) | 74(59.2) | 44(35.2) |
| 105(84.0) | 15(12.0) | 05(4.0) | 08(6.4) | 31(24.8) | 86(68.8) |
| 81(64.8) | 37(29.6) | 06(4.8) | 15(12.0) | 54(43.2) | 56(44.8) |
| 104(83.2) | 21(16.8) | 00(00) | 06(4.8) | 28(22.4) | 91(72.8) |
| 15(12.0) | 110(88.0) | 00(00) | 38(30.4) | 84(67.2) | 03(2.4) |
| 10180.8) | 22(17.6) | 02(1.6) | 03(2.4) | 24(19.2) | 98(78.4) |
| | 03(2.4) 02(1.6) 108(86.4) 61(48.8) 94(75.2) 50(40.0) 105(84.0) 81(64.8) 104(83.2) 15(12.0) | n(%) sometimes=1 100(80.0) 24(19.2) 100(80.0) 24(19.2) 109(87.2) 13(10.4) 116(92.8) 09(7.2) 04(3.2) 15(12.0) 03(2.4) 19(15.2) 02(1.6) 08(6.4) 108(86.4) 15(12.0) 61(48.8) 55(44.0) 94(75.2) 28(22.4) 50(40.0) 69(55.4) 105(84.0) 15(12.0) 81(64.8) 37(29.6) 104(83.2) 21(16.8) 15(12.0) 110(88.0) | n(%) never=0 sometimes=1 often=2 100(80.0) 24(19.2) 01(0.8) 100(80.0) 24(19.2) 01(0.8) 109(87.2) 13(10.4) 03(2.4) 116(92.8) 09(7.2) 00(00) 04(3.2) 15(12.0) 106(84.8) 03(2.4) 19(15.2) 103(82.4) 02(1.6) 08(6.4) 115(92.3) 108(86.4) 15(12.0) 02(1.6) 61(48.8) 55(44.0) 09(7.2) 94(75.2) 28(22.4) 03(2.4) 50(40.0) 69(55.4) 06(4.8) 105(84.0) 15(12.0) 05(4.0) 81(64.8) 37(29.6) 06(4.8) 104(83.2) 21(16.8) 00(00) 15(12.0) 110(88.0) 00(00) | n(%) n(%) never=o sometimes=1 often=2 Never=0 100(80.0) 24(19.2) 01(0.8) 17(13.6) 100(80.0) 24(19.2) 01(0.8) 16(12.8) 109(87.2) 13(10.4) 03(2.4) 15(12.0) 116(92.8) 09(7.2) 00(00) 29(23.2) 04(3.2) 15(12.0) 106(84.8) 11(8.8) 03(2.4) 19(15.2) 103(82.4) 10(8.0) 02(1.6) 08(6.4) 115(92.3) 06(4.8) 108(86.4) 15(12.0) 02(1.6) 25(20.0) 61(48.8) 55(44.0) 09(7.2) 14(11.2) 94(75.2) 28(22.4) 03(2.4) 15(12.0) 94(75.2) 28(22.4) 03(2.4) 15(12.0) 105(84.0) 15(12.0) 05(4.0) 08(6.4) 105(84.0) 15(12.0) 05(4.0) 08(6.4) 81(64.8) 37(29.6) 06(4.8) 15(12.0) 104(83.2) 21(16.8) 00(00) 06(4.8) 15(12. | n(%) n(%) never=0 sometimes=1 often=2 Never=0 sometimes=1 100(80.0) 24(19.2) 01(0.8) 17(13.6) 45(36.0) 100(80.0) 24(19.2) 01(0.8) 16(12.8) 37(29.6) 109(87.2) 13(10.4) 03(2.4) 15(12.0) 36(28.8) 116(92.8) 09(7.2) 00(00) 29(23.2) 22(17.6) 04(3.2) 15(12.0) 106(84.8) 11(8.8) 27(21.6) 03(2.4) 19(15.2) 103(82.4) 10(8.0) 12(9.6) 02(1.6) 08(6.4) 115(92.3) 06(4.8) 02(1.6) 108(86.4) 15(12.0) 02(1.6) 25(20.0) 22(17.6) 61(48.8) 55(44.0) 09(7.2) 14(11.2) 51(40.8) 94(75.2) 28(22.4) 03(2.4) 15(12.0) 33(26.4) 94(75.2) 28(22.4) 06(4.8) 07(5.6) 74(59.2) 105(84.0) 15(12.0) 05(4.0) 08(6.4) 31(24.8) 81(64.8) 37(29.6 |

Table-9: Family problems among housewives and working women N=250

| Variables | | | | Working women n (%) 125 | | |
|---|----------|-------------|-----------|----------------------------|-------------|-----------|
| Spouse relationship | Never=0 | sometimes=1 | often=2 | Never=0 | Sometimes=1 | Often=2 |
| 1. Are you able to give time to your spouse? | 01(0.8) | 07(5.6) | 117(93.6) | 00 | 13(10.4) | 112(89.6) |
| 2. Does your spouse help you in your work? | 19(15.2) | 31(24.8) | 75(60.0) | 22(17.6) | 34(27.2) | 69(55.2) |

| | 1 | | I | | | |
|----------------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| 3. Does your | | | | 0.4/2.2 | 4.5 (0.5) | |
| spouse | 19(15.2) | 31(24.8) | 75(60.0) | 04(3.2) | 12(9.6) | 109(87.2) |
| support you | | | | | | |
| in your | | | | | | |
| decision? | | | | | | |
| 4. Do you feel | | | | | | |
| comfortable | | | | | | |
| to share your | | | | | | |
| thoughts and | 00(0.0) | 06(4.8) | 119(95.2) | 00(0.0) | 06(4.8) | 119(95.2) |
| feelings with | , , | , | , , | , , | , | , , |
| your | | | | | | |
| husband? | | | | | | |
| Involvement in | | | | | | |
| child care | | | | | | |
| 1. Have you | | | | | | |
| given your | 00(0.0) | 03(2.4) | 122(97.6) | 06(4.8) | 34(27.2) | 85(68.0) |
| full time in | 00(0.0) | 03(2.4) | 122(97.0) | 00(4.8) | 34(21.2) | 65(06.0) |
| | | | | | | |
| nurturing | | | | | | |
| your child? | | | | | | |
| 2. Have you | 115(02.5) | 07/5 6 | 00(1.6) | 10/14 4 | 71/560) | 26(20.0) |
| ever been | 115(92.7) | 07(5.6) | 02(1.6) | 18(14.4) | 71(56.8) | 36(28.8) |
| away from | | | | | | |
| your | | | | | | |
| children due | | | | | | |
| to work? | | | | | | |
| 3. Have you | | | | | | |
| ever ignore | | | | | | |
| /not given | | | | | | |
| quality time | 120(96.6) | 01(0.8) | 02(1.6) | 06(4.8) | 51(40.8) | 68(54.4) |
| to your | | | | | | |
| children? | | | | | | |
| Family | | | | | | |
| relationship | | | | | | |
| 1. Does your | | | | | | |
| family help | 07(5.6) | 12(9.6) | 106(84.8) | 04(3.2) | 25(20.0) | 96(76.8) |
| you in your | 0,(0.0) | 12(310) | 100(0.10) | 0.(0.2) | 20(20.0) | 70(70.0) |
| domestic | | | | | | |
| work? | | | | | | |
| 2. Does your | | | | | | |
| family support | 10(8.0) | 07(5.6) | 108(86.4) | 07(5.6) | 07(5.6) | 111(88.8) |
| | 10(8.0) | 07(3.0) | 100(00.4) | 07(3.0) | 07(3.0) | 111(00.0) |
| you for going | | | | | | |
| out with your | | | | | | |
| friends? | | | | | | |
| 3. Does your | 40(22.0) | 02(2.4) | 92(65.6) | 00 | 00 | 125(100) |
| family allow | 40(32.0) | 03(2.4) | 82(65.6) | 00 | 00 | 125(100) |
| you to work | | | | | | |
| outside the | | | | | | |
| home? | | | | | | |
| 4. Does your | | | | | | |
| family support | 07(5.6) | 07(5.6) | 111(88.8) | 00 | 11(8.8) | 114(91.2) |
| you in your | | | | | | |
| decision for | | | | | | |
| life? | | | | | | |
| 5. Does your | | | | | | |
| family involve | 04(3.2) | 11(8.8) | 110(88.0) | 05(4.0) | 07(5.6) | 113(90.4) |
| you in any | , , | | | | | ` ′ |
| decision | | | | | | |
| making? | | | | | | |
| maring. | 1 | l . | l | | l . | |

Table-10: Personal and family challenges among housewives and working women. N=250

| Variables | Housewiv n (%) 125 | 5 | | Working n (%) 125 | 5 | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------------|-------------|-----------|
| 1. Are you able to spend time on your health? | Never=1 | Sometimes=2 | Often=3 | Never=1 | Sometimes=2 | Often=3 |
| | 05(4.0) | 59(47.2) | 61(48.8) | 09(7.2) | 58(46.4) | 58(46.4) |
| 2. Are you able to fulfil demands of your family and relatives? | 01(0.8) | 14(11.2) | 110(88.0) | 02(1.6) | 21(16.8) | 102(81.6) |
| 3. Are you able to fulfil your own demands? | 02(1.6) | 13(10.4) | 110(88.0) | 02(1.6) | 13(10.4) | 110(88.0) |
| 4. Are you able to spare time for your entertainment? | 05(4.0) | 10(8.0) | 110(88.0) | 02(1.6) | 27(21.6) | 96(76.8) |
| 5. Are you able to maintain a balance between your life and work? | 01(0.8) | 21(16.8) | 103(82.4) | 01(0.8) | 18(14.4) | 106(84.8) |
| 6. Are you able to overcome your weakness? | 07(5.6) | 78(62.4) | 40(32.0) | 00 | 70(56.0) | 55(44.0) |
| 7. Are you able to distress yourself? | 07(5.6) | 74(59.2) | 44(35.2) | 06(4.8) | 67(53.6) | 52(41.6) |
| 8. Are you able to take stand for your decision? | 14(11.2) | 27(21.6) | 84(67.2) | 04(3.2) | 32(25.6) | 89(71.2) |
| 9. Are you able to complete your studies? | 62(49.6) | 07(5.6) | 56(44.8) | 25(20.0) | 15(12.0) | 85(68.0) |
| 10. Are you able to speak up against any injustice? | 06(4.8) | 24(19.2) | 95(76.0) | 02(1.6) | 16(12.8) | 107(85.6) |

Table-11: Hamilton scale for Depression and Rosenberg Self-esteem scale among housewives and working women N=250

| Variables | Housewives n (%) 125 | Working women n (%) 125 | Chi-square(df) |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Depression scale | 122(97.6) 03(2.4) | 125(100) 00 | 3.036(1) .081 |
| Self esteem level • 20-30(moderate self-esteem) • >30(high self-esteem) | 40(32.00) 85(68.0) | 38(30.4) 87(69.6) | .075(1) .785 |

Acknowledgments

The authors profoundly appreciate all the people who have successfully contributed to ensuring this paper is in place. Their contributions are acknowledged however their names cannot be able to be mentioned.

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Sharma, A, Kaur, M, Sharma, P, Saini, S.K, Pebma, M & Kaur, M (2018). Personal, Family Problems and Challenges Faced By Working Women Vs Housewives. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *6*(4), 154-171. DIP:18.01.018/20180604, DOI:10.25215/0604.018