



Quality of life of married women in rural area: a community based cross-sectional study

¹Dr. Manjusha Dhoble, Assistant Professor in Department of community medicine, Indira Gandhi Government Medical College Nagpur

²Dr. Anchlesh Tekam, Junior resident in Department of community medicine, Indira Gandhi Government Medical College Nagpur

³Dr. Priya Dhurve, Junior resident in Department of community medicine, Indira Gandhi Government Medical College Nagpur

⁴Dr. Ashok R. Jadhao, Professor and Head in Department of community medicine, Indira Gandhi Government Medical College Nagpur

Corresponding Author: Dr. Anchlesh Tekam, Department of Community Medicine ,Indira Gandhi Government Medical College ,Nagpur, CA road ,Near railway station ,Nagpur -440012

Citation this Article: Dr. Manjusha Dhoble, Dr. Anchlesh Tekam, Dr. Priya Dhurve, Dr. Ashok R. Jadhao, “Quality of life of married women in rural area: a community based cross-sectional study”, IJMSIR- July - 2020, Vol – 5, Issue - 4, P. No. 62 – 70.

Type of Publication: Original Research Article

Conflicts of Interest: Nil

Abstract

Background: Quality of life differs for different people in different situations and is related to one’s self-satisfaction with life. A married woman has many roles to play in the society. Her home responsibilities make a very demanding schedule. She has to work full time without any monetary gain as well as mental exhaustion of insecurities of not having freedom of doing things her way both financially and morally. Hence this study was carried out to assess the quality of life of housewives.

Objectives: To assess the quality of life of the housewives of the rural area and its association with the socio-demographic variables.

Methods: The present cross sectional study was conducted from June 2019 to September 2019. The House to house survey was carried out in the

community in rural field practice area of rural health training centre, Department of community medicine , Indira Gandhi Government Medical College, Nagpur. Out of 700 households 531 were selected. Data was analyzed using Epi info 7 and Microsoft excel.

Results: Education and occupation of head of family, type of family and lighting in the house had no statistical significant association with quality of life of the housewives ($p > 0.05$). Whereas socio-economic status, type of house, over-crowding, location of kitchen, type of kitchen and source of drinking water had statistical significant association with quality of life of the housewives ($p < 0.05$).

Conclusions: Housewives who belongs to upper socioeconomic status were having good quality of life score as well as those having pucca-house with no overcrowding, separate room for kitchen, smokeless

fuel for kitchen, drinking water facilities were having good quality of life score.

Keywords: Quality Of Life, socio-demographic variables, overcrowding ,Housewife ,Rural

Introduction

Women have been playing vital roles in households since ages. In the history of human development, women have been as vital in the history making as men have been [1]. A married woman has many roles to play in the society i.e. a wife, mother, and daughter in law etc. which was really a highly stressful Job. In married life women had a number of responsibilities to perform therefore women under go high amount of pressure [2]. A housewife is as good hard worker and a planner as any professional , it's only that she doesn't get paid. Every Indian housewife works at the cost of no worth of work and mental exhaustion of insecurities of not having freedom of doing things her way both financially and morally [3].

This pressure at the house may influence the quality of life differently. Quality of life differs for different people in different situations and is related to one's self-satisfaction with life [4]. Her home responsibilities make a very demanding schedule. "Quality of life relates both to adequacy of material circumstances and to personal feelings about these circumstances". It includes "overall subjective feelings of well-being that are closely related to morale, happiness and satisfaction [5]. The World Health Organization Quality of Life Group defines quality of life as 'individuals' perceptions of their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns [6],[7].

Therefore, quality of life might mean different things to different people and might also be influenced by many

factors including age, culture, gender, education, social class, social environment, diseases, and disabilities [8]. Since there was dearth of studies in this aspect therefore we planned to measure the Quality of Life among Housewives with the objective to assess the quality of life of the housewives of the rural area and its association with the socio-demographic variables.

Methodology

Study design and data collection: A cross-sectional study was carried out in Raipur village by house to house survey in the community in rural field practice area of rural health training centre, Department of Community Medicine, Indira Gandhi Government Medical College , Nagpur from June 2019 to September 2019. There are around 700 adopted families under rural health training centre in the village of Raipur, to which free treatment is provided. The married housewives from adopted families were approached and enrolled only after taking their consent. After obtaining the informed consent, they were interviewed by using a questionnaire. Total 531 participants were participated in this study who were available at the time of visit.

Socio-demographic characteristics: The socio-demographic characteristics were collected from the questionnaire including education of the head of family, occupation of the head of the family, socio-economic status, type of family, number of family members and monthly income. Education status was divided into graduate, higher secondary certificate, high school certificate, middle school certificate, primary school certificate, illiterate. According to Revised Kuppaswamy's socioeconomic status scale occupation of the head of the family was classified as professional, semi-professional, arithmetic skilled, skilled worker, semi-skilled worker, unskilled worker and unemployed.

According to census of India 2011 family type was classified as nuclear, joint and three generation. The socio economic status was classified according to the B.G. Prasad's scale [9].

Living conditions: The living conditions were assessed according to the type of the house, overcrowding in the house, lighting in the house, location of the kitchen, type of the kitchen, source of drinking water.

Measurement of Quality of life (QoL): In this study, we used the WHO's QoL scale (WHOQOLBREF), which is a short version of the WHOQOL-100, comprising 26 items. The four domains of the WHOQOL-BREF include physical health (7 items), psychological health (6 items), social relationships (3 items), and environmental conditions (8 items) [10]. The first two items of the WHOQOL-BREF scale assessed overall QoL and satisfaction with health and were not included in any of those four domains and thus excluded from subsequent analyses. Items were scored on a five-point scale (raw item score), which was standardized by multiplying the average of raw item score of each domain by 4. The subsequent data analyses used the standardized domain scores (ranging from 4 to 20), with higher standardized domain scores indicating better Quality of Life [11].

Statistical analysis

The mean scores of components of Quality of Life in different categories of sociodemographic variables and living /health conditions variables were tested by Student's t test or one-way ANOVA. All of the statistical analyses were performed with Microsoft Excel and Epi Info version 7 for Windows with a two-tailed P value of < 0.05 considered to be statistically significant.

Results

Table No.1 shows distribution of study subjects according to socio-demographic variables. Maximum number of head of family were educated upto primary school (27.5%). More than 90% of participants were below the level of Graduation. Majority of head of the family were unskilled workers (32.02%), occupation of the head of the family were professional (0.38%), semi-professional (0.56%), arithmetic skilled (29.57%), skilled worker (22.98%), semi-skilled worker (5.84%), unskilled worker (32.02%) and unemployed (8.65%). Maximum no. of study subjects belonged to the nuclear family (82.86%). According to the BG Prasad scale of socio-economic status, 70.05% subjects were belonging to class II, class III and class V.

Table no. 2 shows, the mean scores of quality of life of 531 subjects were physical health (55.87+13.64), psychological health (56.36+13.18), social relationship (60.24+15.03) and environment domain (53.21+12.14).

Table No.3 show association scores of Quality of life with socio-demographic variables. When the association of socio-demographic variables were analyzed with Quality of life scores, only socio-economic status was found significantly associated. The p value of ANOVA in different domains are physical health (0.144), psychological (0.000), social (0.000), environment (0.000).

Table no.4 shows association of quality of life scores with living conditions. The variables of living conditions were found to be significantly associated with quality of life scores. The type of house was significantly associated statistically with all the domains of Quality of Life. Psychological and environment domain were significantly associated with overcrowding in house $p < 0.005$ and 0.001 respectively, while quality of life score were not

associated with lighting in house. Psychological and environment domain were significantly associated with location of kitchen $p < 0.000$ and 0.011 respectively. Type of kitchen were significantly associated with psychological and social domain of quality of life $p = 0.027$ and 0.019 respectively. But the source of drinking water is statistically highly significant in all the domains of quality of life across all the variables.

Discussion

In our study the mean scores of quality of life of 531 study subjects were physical health ($55.87 + 13.63$), psychological health ($56.36 + 13.18$), social relationship ($60.24 + 15.03$) and environment domain ($53.21 + 12.14$). Ahdhi G reported the similar quality of life scores of women in rural India as physical health ($61.88 + 7.77$), psychological health ($61.19 + 13.55$), social relationship ($61.33 + 15.99$) and environmental domain ($57.16 + 13.39$) (12). Gezginç K et al [13] observed the higher scores of quality of life in women. The mean score were physical health ($61.96 + 10.08$), psychological health ($66.32 + 10.47$), social relationships ($67.12 + 11.92$) and environmental domain ($69.60 + 10.23$). The difference may be due different region.

Inceboz Ü et al [14] conducted a cross sectional study to assess the quality of life in women. They found the significant difference in Quality of Life scores across the education levels of family head and socioeconomic status. This is similar to our findings. Saxena S et al [15] concluded that higher education and the type of family has affected the Quality of Life scores significantly, which is different from our study findings. They also concluded that socioeconomic status has significant effect on Quality of Life scores which is similar to our study. Javed S et al [16] concluded that the educational level have significant

effect on Quality of Life scores, which is different from what we found. Hitimana R [17] concluded that the educational level have no effect on Quality of Life scores. But wealth quintiles can significantly change the Quality of Life scores. This is similar to our findings. Huang H [18] conducted a cross sectional study to determine the quality of life in women of rural china. They found that education have no effect and monthly income have significant effect on Quality of Life scores. This is similar to our findings.

The limitations of study can be few factors such as number of children, illnesses in the family, and recent traumatic events in the family which can affect the Quality of Life scores. Furthermore, a comparison group would have been helpful in consolidating a causal relationship. Hence it is recommended that the future studies should incorporate these factors.

Conclusions & Recommendations

The quality of life scores are low in the women in present study. The high socio-economic status and good living conditions have significant impact on quality of life. Hence measures should be taken to improve them.

Acknowledgement: -We sincerely acknowledge the support provided by the staff at Rural Health Training Centre and also all women for their participation in this study.

References

1. Ramasethu A. A Study on Problems and Challenges Faced by Urban Working Women in India, GLOBAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH ANALYSIS 2015;4(10):205–8.
2. Khan A. Quality of Life Among Married Working Women and Housewives. 2018;(July).
3. Your Story [Internet]. Available from: <https://yourstory.com/mystory/6ae2d00ca9-writing-in-respect-for-all-housewives-of-india>

4. Saravi FK, Navidian A, Rigi SN, Montazeri A. Comparing health-related quality of life of employed women and housewives: A cross sectional study from southeast Iran. *BMC Womens Health*. 2012;12:1-5.
5. McDowell I. *Measuring health: a guide to rating scales and questionnaires*. Oxford Univ Press USA. 2006;
6. WHO. World Health Organization's Quality of Life Group: *Measuring Quality of Life; Development of the World Health Organization Quality of Life Instrument (WHOQOL)*. 1992;
7. Nedjat S, Montazeri A, Holakouie K, Mohammad K MR. Psychometric properties of the Iranian interview-administered version of the World Health Organization's Quality of Life Questionnaire (WHOQOLBREF): a population-based study. *BMC Heal Serv Res*. 2008;8(61).
8. Brown J, Bowling A FT. *Models of Quality of Life: A Taxonomy, Overview and Systematic Review of the Literature*. *Eur Forum Popul Ageing Res*. 2004;
9. BG P. Social Classification of Indian families. *J Indian Med Assoc*. 1961;37:250-1.
10. The World Health Organization Quality of Life (Whoqol) -Bref. 1996; WHO Quality of Life Assessment Group. ((1996 / ?What quality of life . The WHOQOL Group. *World Health Forum 1996* ; 17((4-354 : 356 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/54358>
11. INTRODUCTION , ADMINISTRATION , SCORING AND GENERIC VERSION OF THE ASSESSMENT Field Trial Version December 1996 PROGRAMME ON MENTAL HEALTH WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION. 1996;(December)
12. Ahdhi G S, Subramanian R, Saya G, Yamuna TV. Prevalence of low back pain and its relation to quality of life and disability among women in rural area of Puducherry, India. *Indian J Pain*. 2016;30(2):111-115.
13. Gezginç K, Uguz F, Karatayli S, Zeytinci E, Aşkin R, Güler Ö, et al. The impact of obsessive-compulsive disorder in pregnancy on quality of life. *Int J Psychiatry Clin Pract*. 2008;12(2):134-7.
14. Inceboz Ü, Demirci H, Özbaşaran F, Çoban A, Nehir S. Factors Affecting the Quality of Life in Climacteric Women in Manisa Region ,*Trak Univ Tip Fak Derg*. 2010;27(2):111-6.
15. Saxena S, Misra PJ, Vishwanath N S , Varma RP, Soman B. Quality of life and its correlates in Central India. *Int J Res Dvelopment Health*. 2013;1(2):85-96
16. Javed S, Javed S, Khan A. Effect of Education on Quality of Life and Well Being. *Int J Indian Psychol*. 2016;3(3):1-10.
17. Hitimana R, Lindholm L, Krantz G, Nzayirambaho M, Condo J, Sengoma JPS, et al. Health-related quality of life determinants among Rwandan women after delivery: does antenatal care utilization matter? A cross-sectional study. *J Health Popul Nutr*. 2018;37 (12) :1-10.
18. Huang H, Liu S, Cui X, Zhang J, Wu H. Factors associated with quality of life among married women in rural China: a cross-sectional study. *Qual Life Res* 2018;27(12):3255-63.

Legends Tables

Table 1: Distribution of study subject according to socio-demographic variables

Variables	Categories	Number	Percentage
Education of Head of Family	Graduate	45	8.47%
	High School Certificate	139	26.18%
	Illiterate	62	11.68%
	Intermediate /Diploma	92	17.33%
	Middle School Certificate	47	8.85%
	Primary School Certificate	146	27.50%
Occupation of Head of Family	Arithmetic Skilled	157	29.57%
	Professional	2	0.38%
	Semi Professional	3	0.56%
	Semi-Skilled Worker	31	5.84%
	Skilled Worker	122	22.98%
	Unemployed	46	8.66%
	Unskilled Worker	170	32.02%
Type of Family	Joint	65	12.24%
	Nuclear	440	82.86%
	Three Generation	26	4.90%
Socioeconomic Status	1	37	6.97%
	2	122	22.98%
	3	154	29.00%
	4	168	31.64%
	5	50	9.42%
Type of House	Kutcha	82	15.44%
	Pucca	409	77.02%
	Semi Pucca	40	7.53%
Overcrowding In House	Absent	324	61.02%
	Present	207	38.98%

Lighting In House	Adequate	485	91.34%
	Inadequate	46	8.66%
Location of Kitchen	Outside The House	4	0.75%
	Separate Room	431	81.17%
	Within Other Room	96	18.08%
Type of Kitchen	Smokeless	474	89.27%
	Smoky	57	10.73%
Source of Drinking Water	Piped Water Into Dwelling	293	55.18%
	Protected Dug Well	40	7.53%
	Public Tap/Standpipe	157	29.57%
	Tube Well/Borehole	41	7.72%

Table No.2 Distribution Of Study Subject According To The Quality Of Life

Quality Of Life Scores			
Domain	N	Mean	Std.Deviation
Physical Health	531	55.87	13.637
Psychological	531	56.36	13.180
Social	531	60.24	15.035
Environment	531	53.21	12.142

Table No.3 Association Of Quality Of Life With Socio-Demographic Variables

Variables	No. (%)	Domains			
		Physical Health	Psychological	Social	Environment
Education Of Head Of Family					
Graduate	45 (8.47%)	57.13±11.84	60.33±11.20	60.71±11.58	53.15±11.71
Intermediate /Diploma	92 (17.33%)	55.86±13.00	56.53±11.00	59.46±13.49	52.19±10.80
High School Certificate	139 (26.18%)	55.88±14.17	56.24±13.15	61.68±14.50	53.82±12.52
Middle School Certificate	47 (8.85%)	54.78±13.33	55.51±12.78	62.06±14.81	54.55±11.00
Primary School Certificate	146 (27.50%)	55.05±13.66	56.04±13.10	59.80±15.90	53.08±13.32

Illiterate	62 (11.67%)	57.62±14.92	54.88±17.31	57.48±18.34	52.59±11.64
Anova P Value	531(100%)	0.817	0.394	0.485	0.883
Occupation Of Head Of Family					
Professional	2 (0.38%)	66.00±4.24	78.00±4.24	75.00±8.48	69.00±8.48
Semi-Professional	3 (0.56%)	46.00±6.92	50.00±10.39	56.33±10.96	48.00±9.16
Arithmetic Skilled	157 (29.57%)	55.12±13.61	56.07±13.15	59.42±15.49	52.75±12.85
Skilled Worker	122 (22.98%)	55.54±13.00	55.43±11.45	58.81±12.88	52.21±11.36
Semi-Skilled Worker	31 (5.84%)	61.48±14.87	61.41±13.71	64.70±11.70	55.80±10.13
Unskilled Worker	170 (32.02%)	55.32±13.35	56.15±12.53	61.70±15.15	53.59±12.02
Unemployed	46 (8.65%)	57.67±15.31	56.63±18.13	58.04±19.42	53.82±13.33
Anova P Value	531(100%)	0.144	0.075	0.172	0.352
Type Of Family					
Nuclear	440 (82.86%)	57.46±12.89	57.69±12.11	62.00±12.91	53.53±11.27
Joint	65 (12.24%)	57.00±14.22	58.32±14.96	61.45±12.80	55.95±11.73
Three Generation	26 (4.90%)	57.08±13.46	60.15±14.13	57.00±12.56	53.27±11.24
Anova P Value	531(100%)	0.959	0.600	0.156	0.267
Socioeconomic Status Bg Prasad Scale					
1	37 (6.97%)	66.21±9.88	71.00±10.65	74.02±12.83	70.16±9.28
2	122 (22.98%)	54.44±12.28	55.00±11.84	58.16±13.90	50.71±12.10
3	154 (29.00%)	57.09±12.30	56.16±10.80	62.02±11.86	53.62±10.14
4	168 (31.64%)	58.20±13.08	59.27±11.60	62.40±12.29	54.25±10.20
5	50 (9.41%)	40.04±12.05	39.64±11.99	42.36±19.62	41.92±11.23
Anova P Value	531(100%)	0.144	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table No.4 Association of Quality Of Life With Living Conditions

Variables	No. (%)	Domains			
		Physical Health	Psychological	Social	Environment
Type of House					
Pucca	409 (77.03%)	56.66±13.09	57.44±12.19	61.55±13.65	54.08±11.96
Semi-Pucca	40 (7.53%)	52.40±12.16	53.75±13.43	59.67±14.55	49.97±11.55
Kutcha	82 (15.44%)	53.57±16.33	52.24±16.54	53.98±19.74	50.40±12.76
Anova P Value	531(100%)	0.042	0.002	0.000	0.009
Overcrowding In House					

Absent	324 (61.02%)	56.37±12.86	57.63±12.57	60.59±14.50	54.56±11.62
Present	207 (38.98%)	55.07±14.76	54.38±13.88	59.71±15.85	51.08±12.65
Un-Paired T Test	531(100%)	0.284	0.005	0.511	0.001
Lighting In House					
Adequate	485 (91.34%)	55.70±13.35	56.33±12.81	60.11±14.84	53.57± 11.93
Inadequate	46 (8.66%)	57.56±16.39	56.63±16.72	61.58±17.07	49.32± 13.73
Un-Paired T Test	531(100%)	0.377	0.885	0.526	0.885
Location of Kitchen					
Separate Room	431 (81.17%)	56.32±13.44	57.38±12.64	60.20±14.68	53.96±11.84
Outside The House	4 (0.75%)	58.00±18.22	50.00±16.26	67.25±11.84	50.00±16.26
Within Other Room	96 (18.08%)	53.69±14.25	52.02±14.54	60.10±16.69	49.92±12.84
Anova P Value	531(100%)	0.220	0.000	0.645	0.011
Type of Kitchen					
Smokeless	474 (89.27%)	55.96±13.32	56.79±12.66	60.77±13.94	53.49±11.86
Smoky	57 (10.73%)	55.03±16.14	52.71±16.57	55.84±21.77	50.78±14.12
Un-Paired T Test	531(100%)	0.626	0.027	0.019	0.111
Source of Drinking Water					
Piped Water Into Dwelling	293 (55.18%)	57.16±12.82	56.89±12.71	61.72±13.42	53.22±11.87
Tube Well/Borehole	41 (7.72%)	59.95±14.03	63.70±12.34	65.87±15.51	61.80±12.21
Protected Dug Well	40 (7.53%)	54.12±13.08	56.12±13.60	55.32±17.44	50.72±12.19
Public Tap/Standpipe	157 (29.57%)	52.81±14.59	53.50±13.39	57.26±16.28	51.56±11.74
Anova P Value	531(100%)	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000