

## Dyadic adjustment, resilience and self dignity among non- working and working women in service sector

Nandhana Krishna <sup>1,\*</sup> and Sharmili Chatterjee <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, Currently in final semester MSc Counselling Psychology, Kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous), Bengaluru, Karnataka, India.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, Kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous), Bengaluru, Karnataka, India.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2025, 25(03), 956-961

Publication history: Received on 02 February 2025; revised on 10 March 2025; accepted on 12 March 2025

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2025.25.3.0740>

### Abstract

This study utilizes a quantitative approach to examine the relationship between employment status and various aspects of psychological and relational well-being among women. By employing standardized scales to measure dyadic adjustment, resilience, and self-dignity, it compares these aspects between 62 working women and 57 non-working women. An Independent Samples T-Test analysis finds no statistically significant substantially affect cognitive, relational, or resilience factors. This suggests that employment alone may not determine mental health or relationship satisfaction. The results highlight the potential influence of coping mechanisms, social support, and individual traits in shaping these outcomes, implying that mental health interventions should cater to individual needs rather than focusing solely on employment status. The study recommends a broader approach that encompasses both working and non-working women to better support mental health and relational well-being. Noted limitations include the sample size and exclusive reliance on quantitative measures.

Future research is encouraged to explore diverse samples and incorporate qualitative insights to deepen understanding of women's well-being across different employment contexts.

**Keywords:** Relational Well-Being; Dyadic Adjustment; Resilience; Self-Dignity; Coping Mechanisms.

### 1. Introduction

Working and non-working women have unique experiences and have to deal with different issues in relation to this concept at the age of middle age. One of the working women's issues is stress resulting from the work-home interface, job strain and the cultural pressures to execute both occupational and domestic roles. The women of such advancements, who restrict themselves to the home, on the contrary might confront social stigma, loss of personal agency and reduction of self-esteem, in particular those where social endorsement of status is emphasis/in importance. In both such cases, these factors contribute immensely to the psychologically ill, poor living condition and relationships of a woman. The present study intends to investigate the relations between Dyadic Adjustment and Resilience, and self-sensitivity among working and non-working middle-aged women. A better understanding of these psychological constructs will help to broaden existing information concerning the mental health of middle-aged women, as well as the new challenges and opportunities emerging with their work activities

#### 1.1. Dyadic Adjustment

This concept refers to the quality of the interpersonal relation obtained between the members forming a dyad based on some indicators like consensus, satisfaction, cohesion, and affection expression (Spanier, 1976). This concept serves a

\* Corresponding author: Nandhana Krishna

very significant role in the stability of marriages and relationships particularly middle age when the dynamics of relationships change quite a lot as a result of such things as children moving away from home and health issues. High dyadic adjustment increases positive mental health status and well-being amongst individuals.

### **1.2. Resilience**

Resilience represents the ability of an individual to cope positively with stress, trauma, or adversity. It comprises individual strengths such as optimism, flexibility, effective emotion regulation, and problem-solving skills (Masten, 2001). Resilience is essential for women of all ages because they face some unique stressors that are created by academic and career demands, family responsibilities, and, later on, midlife changes. Adaptive and effective strategies of coping plus resilience can be very helpful in strengthening psychological well-being throughout the life cycle.

### **1.3. Self-Respect and Dignity**

Intrinsic self-respect and dignity can be defined as the value and worth an individual attaches to herself or himself based upon the individual's past achievements, boundaries, and self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965). A close tie in many women's lives often exists between self-respect and roles, success, and contributions that were made toward family and society. No matter the age, dignity retention will involve a positive self-esteem and the ability to assert one's worth in hard times as within society and life.

---

## **2. Method**

### **2.1. Objectives**

The objectives of the study include studying the dyadic adjustment between working and non- working women. Exploring resilience among working and non-working women and focuses on the exploration of employment status that affects self-dignity between working and non-working women.

### **2.2. Hypothesis**

- $H_01$ : There is no significant difference in Dyadic Adjustment between working and non- working women.
- $H_02$ : There is no significant difference in Resilience between working and non-working women.
- $H_03$  There is no significant difference between Self-dignity between working and non-working women.

### **2.3. Research design**

A quantitative study with T Tests.

### **2.4. Participants**

The participants were working and non-working women above 19 years. All participants were Indian. Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

### **2.5. Sample**

The sample consisted of 119 women aged between 19-65 years, divided into two groups: 62 working women who are working different service sectors. 57 non-working women who are homemakers or unemployed. The inclusion criteria included married working women engaged in the service sector or not working. It consists of teaching, healthcare, and administrative professions and exclusion criteria include women with part-time jobs, women who had recently begun working, women with diagnosed mental disorders, acute mental conditions, or cognitive impairments. Exclusion Criteria: Individuals with diagnosed severe mental health conditions (e.g., severe depression, bipolar disorder) are excluded to avoid confounding results related to empathic distress and Emotion regulation.

### **2.6. Tool description**

The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) is a self-report instrument measuring relationship adjustment. It has 32 items and takes only 5 to 10 minutes in administration. Questionnaire of Sense of Self-Dignity (QSSD-3):

Questionnaire of Sense of Self- Dignity (QSSD-3) developed by Paweł Jan Brudek and Stanisława Steuden. Final version consists of 36 items used in 4 dimensions: Cognition, Loss, Relation and Experiencing.

RAQ 8. Resilience Assessment Questionnaire (RAQ 8). This is the Resilience Assessment Questionnaire by psychologist Derek Mowbray, in short form (RAQ8).

## 2.7. Procedure

The objective of such diverse sampling was achieved by enrolling participants through different combinations of online, community centers, and workforce linkages. Online recruited participants were reached via the social media channels: Whatsapp, and Instagram. The respondents were made aware of the nature and purpose of the research even before engaging in participation. The objective of the research was communicated clearly to the respondents, mentioning an investigation of dyadic adjustment, resilience, and self-dignity in women. JAMOV version 2.3 is used for the analysis of the study.

## 2.8. Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics: For the collected data the sum, mean, and Standard deviation was measured. Inferential Statistics: Independent T test was used.

## 2.9. Variables

The dependent variable here are dyadic adjustment, resilience and self-dignity and the independent variable being employment status (working and non-working)

## 3. Results and Discussion

The goal of the study was to find the significant difference of dyadic adjustment, resilience and self-dignity among non-working and working women

**Table 1** Group Descriptives of cognitive of working and non-working women

	Group	N	Mean	Median	SD	SE
Cognitive	Working	62	48.4	48.0	7.65	0.972
	Non Working	57	48.4	48.0	7.28	0.964

Table 1 shows, Independent Samples T-Test analysis conducted to examine differences between working and non-working women, the results strongly support the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the groups. The statistical findings reveal a t-value of -0.0248 (df = 117) with a p-value of 0.980, which substantially exceeds the conventional significance level of 0.05. No significant difference between working and non-working women in cognitive measures (t = -0.0248, p = 0.980). Identical means (48.4) and similar standard deviations confirm this. Results suggest employment status does not influence cognition; further research should explore mediating variables and qualitative insights.

**Table 2** Group Descriptives of relation among working and non- working

	Group	N	Mean	Median	SD	SE
Relational	Working	62	26.6	27.0	4.84	0.615
	Non Working	57	26.4	26.0	4.38	0.580

Table 2 shows the analysis investigated differences in Relational scores between working and non-working women using an Independent Samples T-Test. The results revealed a t-value of 0.248 (df = 117) with a p-value of 0.804, which is substantially higher than the conventional significance level of 0.05. No significant difference in Relational scores between working and non-working women (t = 0.248, p = 0.804). Similar means (26.6 vs. 26.4) and standard deviations confirm this.

**Table 3** Group Descriptives of Experience among working and non- working

	Group	N	Mean	Median	SD	SE
Experiences	Working	62	28.5	29.0	6.17	0.784
	Non Working	57	28.2	29.0	5.28	0.699

Table 3 shows, the analysis examined differences in Experience scores between working and non-working women using an Independent Samples T-Test. The results showed a t-value of 0.321 (df = 117) with a p-value of 0.749, which is considerably higher than the conventional significance level of 0.05. No significant difference in Experience scores between working and non-working women ( $t = 0.321$ ,  $p = 0.749$ ). Similar means (28.5 vs. 28.2) and identical medians confirm this. Employment status does not impact experience levels, supporting the null hypothesis. Further research may explore additional variables.

**Table 4** Group Descriptives of Loss among working and non-working

	Group	N	Mean	Median	SD	SE
Loss	Working	62	26.6	28.5	7.32	0.930
	Non Working	57	28.0	28.0	7.63	1.01

Table 4 shows, the analysis examined differences in Loss scores between working and non-working women using an Independent Samples T-Test. The results yielded a t-value of -1.05 (df = 117) with a p-value of 0.297, which is greater than the conventional significance level of 0.05. No significant difference in Loss scores between working and non-working women ( $t = -1.05$ ,  $p = 0.297$ ). Similar means (26.6 vs. 28.0) and standard deviations confirm this. Employment status does not impact Loss scores, but future research with larger samples may explore this further.

**Table 5** Group Descriptives of Consensus among working and non-working

	Group	N	Mean	Median	SD	SE
CONSENSUS	Working	62	23.1	23.0	3.96	0.502
	Non Working	57	24.2	24.0	3.24	0.430

Table 5 shows the analysis examined differences in Satisfaction scores between working and non-working women using an Independent Samples T-Test. The results yielded a t-value of -0.0515 (df = 117) with a p-value of 0.959, which is substantially higher than the conventional significance level of 0.05. No significant difference in Satisfaction scores between working and non-working women ( $t = -0.0515$ ,  $p = 0.959$ ). Identical means (11.4) and similar standard deviations confirm this. Employment status does not impact satisfaction, though differences in median scores suggest potential distribution patterns worth future exploration.

**Table 6** Group Descriptives of cohesion among working and non-working

	Group	N	Mean	Median	SD	SE
COHESION	Working	62	9.90	10.0	4.35	0.553
	Non Working	57	10.5	10.0	3.48	0.461

Table 6 shows the analysis examined differences in Cohesion scores between working and non-working women using an Independent Samples T-Test. An important preliminary note is that Levene's test was significant ( $p < .05$ ), indicating a violation of the assumption of equal variances between groups. Despite this violation, the results showed a t-value of -0.858 (df = 117) with a p-value of 0.393, which is higher than the conventional significance level of 0.05. No significant difference in Cohesion scores between working and non-working women ( $t = -0.858$ ,  $p = 0.393$ ). Despite unequal variances (Levene's test  $p < .05$ ), similar medians (10.0) and means (9.90 vs. 10.5) confirm statistical comparability, supporting the null hypothesis.

**Table 7** Group Descriptives of resilience among working and non-working

	Group	N	Mean	Median	SD	SE
RESILIENCE	Working	62	3.60	3.63	0.573	0.0727
	Non Working	57	3.59	3.75	0.640	0.0848

Table 7 shows, the analysis investigated differences in Resilience scores between working and non-working women using an Independent Samples T-Test. The results showed a t-value of 0.137 (df = 117) with a p-value of 0.891, which is considerably higher than the conventional significance level of 0.05. No significant difference in Resilience scores between working and non-working women ( $t = 0.137$ ,  $p = 0.891$ ). Similar means (3.60 vs. 3.59) and standard deviations confirm this, supporting the null hypothesis. Employment status does not significantly influence resilience levels.

#### 4. Conclusion

An Independent Samples T-Test found no significant differences between working and non-working women in Self-Dignity, Dyadic Adjustment, and Resilience ( $p > 0.05$ ). With balanced samples (62 working, 57 non-working), similar means, medians, and variability supported the null hypothesis, indicating comparable psychological and relational outcomes across groups. The findings suggest employment status does not significantly impact women's psychological, relational, or resilience levels. High p-values and minimal mean differences support group comparability. While slight variations existed, they lacked statistical significance, reinforcing the null hypothesis. Future research may explore moderating factors influencing these relationships

##### 4.1. Implications

- Employment status isn't a key predictor of dyadic adjustment, resilience, or self-dignity — focus on individual psychological factors.
- Individualized interventions are needed, considering coping strategies and social support rather than employment status alone.

##### 4.2. Limitations

This study's reliance on quantitative measures may overlook individual experiences. The balanced sample size limits generalizability, especially across diverse backgrounds. Unmeasured factors like job nature or satisfaction may influence outcomes more than employment status.

##### 4.3. Recommendations for Future Research

- Explore Mediating Variables: Investigate factors like job satisfaction, work-life balance, and family dynamics that might influence dyadic adjustment, resilience, and self-dignity.
- Expand the sample to include women from various socio-economic backgrounds, professions, and regions for broader generalizability

#### Compliance with ethical standards

##### *Acknowledgments*

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to everyone who supported me in completing this research paper. I am especially thankful to my advisor, Ms.Sharmili Chatterjee, Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Kristu Jayanti College, Autonomous, Bengaluru, Karnataka for their guidance, encouragement, and invaluable insights throughout the research process. Their expertise and patience played a crucial role in shaping this work.

##### *Disclosure of conflict of interest*

The research was done in order of fulfilment for the award of Master degree (M. Sc.) in Counselling Psychology of Kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous) affiliated to Bengaluru North University, the results of the research were not affected by the organization

### *Statement of informed consent*

Written informed consent was obtained from all participants, ensuring they were fully aware of the study's purpose and procedures, with guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity.

---

### **References**

- [1] Brudek, P., & Steuden, S. (2017). Questionnaire of Sense of Self-Dignity (QSSD-3): Construction and analysis of psychometric properties. *The Review of Psychology*, 3(60), 457-477.
- [2] Busby, D. M., Christensen, C., Crane, D. R., & Larson, J. H. (1995). A revision of the dyadic adjustment scale for use with distressed and nondistressed couples: Construction hierarchy and multidimensional scales. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 21(3), 289-308.
- [3] Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. T. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and Anxiety*, 18(2), 76-82. <https://doi.org/10.1002/da.10113>
- [4] Cutrona, C. E., & Russell, D. W. (1990). Type of social support and specific stress: Toward a theory of optimal matching. In B. R. Sarason, I. G. Sarason, & G. R. Pierce (Eds.), *Social support: An interactional view* (pp. 319-366). John Wiley & Sons
- [5] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227- 268.
- [6] Gecas, V. (1982). The self-concept. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 8(1), 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.08.080182.000245>
- [7] Grzywacz, J. G., Almeida, D. M., & McDonald, D. A. (2002). Work-family spillover and daily reports of work and family stress in the adult labor force. *Family Relations*, 51(1), 28-36.
- [8] Hildon, Z., Smith, G., Netuveli, G., & Blane, D. (2008). Understanding resilience in the oldest old: A qualitative approach. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 192(1), 49-54. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.107.037887>
- [9] Hoare, C. H. (2002). *Erikson on development in adulthood: New insights from the unpublished papers*. Oxford University Press
- [10] Kaufman, G., & White, D. (2015). Women's employment and well-being: The importance of work conditions. *Community, Work & Family*, 18(4), 543-568.
- [11] Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 38(1), 15-28. <https://doi.org/10.2307/350547>
- [12] Kardaś, M., & Gerc, K. (2018). Questionnaire of Sense of Self-Dignity (QSSD-3): Construction and analysis of psychometric properties. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology*, 6(4), 267-279. <https://doi.org/10.5114/cipp.2018.79963>