

Original Research Article

Multidimensional Roles of Mothers in Indian Families: A Scale Development and Factor Analytic Study

Rakesh Dwivedi¹, Anjali Mishra^{2*}¹Professor & Head, Department of Social Work, University of Lucknow, Lucknow²Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, University of Lucknow, Lucknow

Article History

Received: 16.05.2026

Accepted: 04.07.2026

Published: 07.07.2026

Journal homepage:

<https://www.easpublisher.com>

Quick Response Code



Abstract: Indian family structures provide mothers in a central yet under theorised position, contributing to the emotional, educational, cultural, managerial and social domains. The present study describes the development and psychometric validation of a 15-item measure measuring the multidimensional engagement of Mothers (N = 128). An Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) using Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation produced five interpretable factors: (1) Psychosocial Resilience & Growth (given value = 9.566, 38.27% variance), (2) Cultural & Moral Stewardship (8.02%), (3) Social Capital & Community Engagement (6.54%), (4) Emotional Core & Foundation (5.49%), and (5) Managerial & Strategic Authority (4.74%), together accounting for 63.06% of total variance. The scale revealed very good internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .930$). The sample adequacy was confirmed by the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO = .855) and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($\chi^2 = 1783$, df = 300, $p < .001$). Findings highlight the irreplaceable socio-cultural and developmental contributions of Mothers in multigenerational Indian households, with implications for family science, Indian family system and intergenerational policy.

Keywords: Mother Roles, Multigenerational Families, Scale Development, Exploratory Factor Analysis, Indian Family Systems, Intergenerational Caregiving.

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

The structure of Indian households has changed drastically in last few decades but the position of mothers has remained a pillar of generational continuity and family cohesion. Unlike the Western nuclear family models in which Mothers act as the primary agents of caregiving, cultural transmission and household governance (Bhattacharya, 2021; Croll, 2006), Indian homes, especially in the semi-urban and rural context, continue to sustain multigenerational living arrangements. Despite this societal significance, the extent of Mother engagement has not been fully operationalised within a cohesive psychometric framework in the scholarly literature. Across the globe, the parent-child relationship has been associated with better cognitive development, emotional security, and social competence in children (Griggs *et al.*, 2010; Hank & Buber, 2009). But in India mothers have tasks which are much beyond the Western conceptualisations of supplementary childcare. They act as moral arbiters, spiritual counselors, oral historians, community liaisons

and crisis managers in the household (Sharma & Mehta, 2019; Upadhyay, 2022). Such complexity necessitates a theoretically founded and experimentally proven measurement instrument.

The present study attempts to fill this gap by designing and testing a 15-item Mother Engagement Scale (MES) administered to a sample of 128 respondents from multigenerational Indian homes. The measure operationalises five theoretically independent but empirically connected characteristics of Mother engagement. This study describes the instrument creation process, factor structure, and reliability statistics with findings placed in the broader literature on intergenerational roles, family systems theory, and developmental ecology.

The study is theoretically grounded in Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological systems theory, suggesting the development is affected by systems of ecological environments. In this theory, the mother is a

*Corresponding Author: Anjali Mishra

Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, University of Lucknow, Lucknow

proximal agent of the microsystem and simultaneously mediates the influence of the meso- and exo-system through cultural transmission and community engagement. The multidimensional approach offered here builds on previous conceptualisations and includes management and strategic dimensions that are rarely addressed in the literature on the mother position (Herlofson & Hagestad, 2012; Mehta & Thang, 2012).

METHODOLOGY

The study applied a descriptive research design. A selective sample of N = 128 respondents was selected from Indian households in which a mother was actively involved in family life. Respondents involve adult family members who could see and report on the mother's involvement behaviours in the domains of interest. The sample has been taken from urban and semi-urban families of Lucknow representing a cross section of socio-economic backgrounds.

The Mother Engagement Scale (MES) was established using a methodical item creation approach based on the theoretical literature. After pilot testing (n = 20), the item was limited to 15 items scored on a five-point frequency scale (Always, 1; Often, 2; Sometimes,

3; Occasionally, 4; Never, 5). The five response categories were aimed to capture the routine character of mother engagement behaviors rather than isolated episodes. The 20 measures represented five categories indicated by theory: emotional caregiving, cultural transmission, household management, social capital and psychosocial resilience support.

SPSS Statistics (Version 27) was used to analyse the data. For all 15 items, descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) were calculated. Internal consistency was evaluated by Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α) with values over .70 and above regarded good .90 as being good. The exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed using principal component analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sample adequacy (cut-off > .60; Kaiser, 1974) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($p < .05$) were used to test the suitability of data for factor analysis. According to Kaiser's criterion, factors with given values greater than 1.0 were kept. Item-factor loadings $\geq .40$ were deemed relevant (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

RESULTS

Table 1: Frequency Distribution of Mother Engagement Scale (MES)

S. No	Item	Always n (%)	Often n (%)	Sometimes n (%)	Occasionally n (%)	Never n (%)	N
1.	Provides physical needs (food, clothing, healthcare)	117 (91.5)	4 (3.1)	3 (2.3)	4 (3.1)	0 (0.0)	128
2.	Offers unconditional emotional support	105 (82.0)	8 (6.4)	8 (6.4)	6(4.4)	1 (0.8)	128
3.	Shows warmth, affection, and love	107 (83.6)	9 (7.0)	7 (5.5)	4(3.1)	1 (0.8)	128
4.	Instils core values (honesty, discipline, respect)	111 (86.8)	9 (7.0)	4 (3.1)	4(3.1)	0 (0.0)	128
5.	Fosters curiosity, creativity, and love for learning	108 (84.4)	8 (6.3)	5 (3.9)	3(2.3)	4 (3.1)	128
6.	Teaches cultural traditions, rituals, and festivals	102 (79.6)	12 (9.4)	7 (5.5)	5(3.9)	2 (1.6)	128
7.	Preserves regional language and oral narratives	87 (68.0)	16 (12.5)	13 (10.1)	5(3.9)	7 (5.5)	128
8.	Guides in religious or spiritual practices	98 (76.5)	11 (8.6)	12 (9.4)	5(3.9)	2 (1.6)	128
9.	Manages household budgeting and scheduling	99 (77.4)	11 (8.6)	11 (8.6)	4(3.1)	3 (2.3)	128
10.	Makes important family health & finance decisions	85(66.5)	19 (14.8)	14 (10.9)	3(2.3)	7 (5.5)	128
11.	Participates in community activities	73 (57.0)	13 (10.2)	23(18.0)	15(11.7)	4 (3.1)	128
12.	Builds social networks for family & community	74 (57.9)	20 (15.6)	15(11.7)	15(11.7)	4 (3.1)	128
13.	Encourages civic awareness and responsibility	102 (79.6)	13 (10.2)	8(6.3)	3(2.3)	2 (1.6)	128
14.	Serves as bridge between family and institutions	91 (71.1)	17 (13.3)	14(10.9)	5(3.9)	1 (0.8)	128
15.	Manages crises with resilience	100 (78.2)	12 (9.4)	9(7.0)	4(3.1)	3 (2.3)	128

Note: Response categories coded as 1 = Always to 5 = Never.

Table 1 shows the frequency distribution of responses to the 15 items of the Mother Engagement Scale (MES). Most items had high scores on the

'Always' response category, suggesting consistently high levels of maternal involvement across all domains assessed.

The most consistently performed maternal behaviour across the dimensions of physical and emotional care was the provision of physical needs such as food, clothing and healthcare (Item 1) with the highest endorsement of 'Always' (n = 117, 91.5%). The second important objective was to instil core values such as honesty, discipline and respect (Item 4; n = 111, 86.8%), followed by promoting curiosity, creativity and a love for learning (Item 5; n = 108, 84.4%). Also strongly endorsed in the 'Always' category was showing warmth, affection and love (Item 3; n = 107, 83.6%) and offering unconditional emotional support (Item 2; n = 105, 82.0%) affirming that nurturing and socialisation behaviours are the most stable and universal dimensions of the maternal role as perceived by respondents.

Items on the cultural and spiritual transmission scored a moderate, but still mostly 'Always' response. Both 'Teaching cultural traditions, rituals and festivals' (Item 6) and 'Encouraging civic awareness and responsibility' (Item 13) received a 'Always' rating from 79.6% of respondents (n = 102). Item 15, managing crises with resilience, was supported by 78.2% (n = 100), and Item 9, managing household budgeting and scheduling, was supported by 77.4% (n = 99). 76.5% (n = 98) rated 'Always' on Guiding children in religious or spiritual practices (Item 8). These figures indicate that while household management and cultural mediation are predominant maternal functions, they are few more variable than direct caregiving behaviors.

Items on community engagement and social participation (Items 11 and 12) showed relatively wider

dispersal with 'Always' frequencies of 57.0% (n = 73) and 57.9% (n = 74) respectively, being the two lowest in the entire scale. Importantly, the two items had 11.7% of respondents with "Occasionally" responses. More individual variation was observed in community-facing functions compared to domestic and emotional ones. The item on preservation of regional language and oral narratives (Item 7) also showed relatively lower consistency, with 68.0% 'Always' responses and the highest 'Never' frequency on the scale (5.5%, n = 7). This reflected the impact of urbanisation and generational linguistic change on this dimension of mothering.

The most spread-out distribution over all items was on making important family health and finance decisions (Item 10): 66.5% 'Always' (n = 85), 14.8% 'Often' (n = 19) and 10.9% 'Sometimes' (n = 14), with 5.5% reporting 'Never' (n = 7). This pattern suggests that while the tendency to have the authority to make decisions is dominant, it is much more variable in context than the emotional caregiving or nurturing behaviours. This likely reflects the influence of household power structures, partner involvement and socio-economic factors on maternal agency in this domain.

In general, the distribution of MES frequencies shows a clear gradient from highly stable private caregiving behaviors to more variable public and decision-making roles, with 'Always' frequencies declining progressively from physical care (91.5%) at one end to community participation (57.0%) at the other.

Table 2: Reliability Statistics for the Mother Engagement Scale

Statistic	Value
Number of Items	15
Cronbach's Alpha (α)	0.930
Cronbach's Alpha (Standardized)	0.931
Grand Mean of Items	1.75

Note: Cronbach's $\alpha > .90$ is classified as excellent internal consistency (Nunnally, 1978).

Table 2 shows the reliability data for the complete 15-item scale. The internal consistency of the Mother Engagement Scale was outstanding (Cronbach's $\alpha = .930$), exceeding the cautious cutoff of .90 for high-stakes assessment applications (Nunnally, 1978). The nearly similar standardized alpha (.931) verified that

differential item variances did not materially influence the reliability estimate. The grand mean for items (M = 1.75) suggested that respondents, on the average, supported engagement activities at a frequency close to 'Always', consistent with the descriptive pattern reported in Table 1.

Table 3: KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity

Measure	Value
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy	0.855
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity – Approx. Chi-Square	1783
Degrees of Freedom (df)	300
Significance (p)	.000

Before the Exploratory Factor Analysis the factorability of the inter-item correlation matrix was examined. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sample adequacy was .855 (Table 3), which Kaiser

(1974) characterizes as 'meritorious', demonstrating that partial correlations between items were sufficiently minimal to imply a common factor structure. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically significant ($\chi^2 =$

1783, $df = 300$, $p < .001$), indicating the null hypothesis of an identity matrix was rejected and inter-item

correlations were substantively non-zero and suitable for factor analysis.

Table 4: Given Values and Variance Explained by Extracted Components

Component	Initial Given value	% of Variance	Cumulative %
Psychosocial Resilience & Growth	9.566	38.27%	38.27%
Cultural & Moral Stewardship	2.005	8.02%	46.28%
Social Capital & Community Engagement	1.636	6.54%	52.83%
Emotional Core & Foundation	1.373	5.49%	58.32%
Managerial & Strategic Authority	1.186	4.74%	63.06%

Factor Structure: Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation

The supplied values and variance explained for the five extracted components are shown in Table 4. Kaiser's criterion (eigenvalue > 1.0) discovered five components that explained 63.06% of the total variance in the 15-item scale, which is a proportion considered robust in scale construction in the social sciences (Hair

et al., 2019; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019). The first component (Psychosocial Resilience & Growth) was dominant (eigenvalue = 9.566; % of variance = 38.27%) and accounted for a significant general factor of Mother engagement with meaningful specificity across the next four components.

Table 5: Varimax-Rotated Factor Loadings for the Mother Engagement Scale (N = 128)

Variable	Loading
Factor 1: Psychosocial Resilience & Growth	
Manages crises with resilience and resourcefulness	0.694
Fosters curiosity and creativity in learning	0.669
Balances caregiving with professional demands	0.651
Instils core values (honesty, discipline, respect)	0.549
Creates stimulating intellectual home environment	0.529
Factor 2: Cultural & Moral Stewardship	
Preserves regional language and oral narratives	0.737
Shares mythological and historical narratives	0.729
Teaches cultural traditions and rituals	0.713
Mediates conflicts and maintains family harmony	0.631
Uses stories and real-life experiences for life lessons	0.612
Guides religious or spiritual practices	0.585
Factor 3: Social Capital & Community Engagement	
Builds and maintains strong social networks	0.822
Participates in community/welfare activities	0.789
Maintains strong social networks (Item 2)	0.761
Serves as a bridge between family and institutions	0.545
Factor 4: Emotional Core & Foundation	
Shows warmth, affection, and love	0.868
Offers emotional support and reassurance	0.848
Provides for physical needs (food, healthcare)	0.453
Factor 5: Managerial & Strategic Authority	
Makes important family health/finance decisions	0.772
Coordinates responsibilities among family members	0.729

Note: Loadings $\geq .40$ retained. Extraction method: Principal Component Analysis; rotation: Varimax with Kaiser normalisation.

Table 5 shows the Varimax rotated factor loadings of 20 items on the five components. Items were assigned to the factor on which they loaded greatest ($\geq .40$) consistent with typical procedure in EFA (Costello & Osborne, 2005). All 20 items loaded well on one of the five factors with little cross loading, over the loading criterion and indicative of a well-defined factor structure. Factor 1 (Psychosocial Resilience & Growth) was consisted of five items with factor loadings between .529 and .694. The top loading item 'manages crises with

resilience and resourcefulness' (.694) reflected the adaptive coping capacity of the mother. Items relating to intellectual stimulation, professional balance, value instillation and home learning environment reflected her growth promoting functions. Factor 2 (Cultural & Moral Stewardship) has six items with loadings between .585 and .737, including items on preservation of culture and language, storytelling, religious direction and conflict resolution. Factor 3 (Social Capital & Community Engagement) had four items with item loadings ranging

from .545 to .822, focusing on network building, community involvement, and institutional bridging. Factor 4 (Emotional Core & Foundation) was made up of three elements ranging from .453 to .868. These represented the provision of physical care, emotional support and affective warmth. Factor 5 (Managerial & Strategic Authority) was represented by two items with loadings of .729 and .772. This factor represented decision-making authority and coordination of family commitments.

DISCUSSION

This study developed and validated the Mother Engagement Scale (MES), a 15-item multidimensional measure of maternal engagement in multigenerational Indian families. The scale showed good psychometric properties, excellent reliability ($\alpha = .930$), adequate sample adequacy ($KMO = .855$), and a five-factor structure that explained 63.06% of the total variance. These results confirm the multidimensional nature of maternal involvement and the inadequacy of unidimensional measures.

Psychosocial Growth and Resilience

The most significant factor was psychosocial resilience and growth, which explained 38.27% of variance. It builds on existing frameworks that have traditionally seen mothers mainly as caregivers or transmitters of culture. The present findings suggest that Indian mothers simultaneously manage family crises, foster intellectual curiosity and build adaptive capacities among children which is akin to the role of the closer caregiver in resilience building as described by Ungar (2012). This picture of the "resilient-generative mother" has important implications for both gerontological and developmental scholarship.

Cultural & Moral Stewardship

The second factor identifies Indian mothers as the keepers of cultural memory with high loadings for preserving regional languages, transmitting mythological narratives and maintaining cultural traditions. Notably, conflict mediation also loaded on this factor rather than the managerial one, indicating that Indian mothers see peacekeeping as a moral and cultural obligation rather than an administrative duty – consistent with Sharma and Mehta's (2019) argument that maternal authority is based on ethical guardianship.

Social Capital and Community Engagement

A third factor was mothers' active participation in the larger social ecology of network building, community engagement and bridging institutions. The lower endorsement rates of these items compared to emotional and cultural items are consistent with Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological theory: Exo-system variables such as physical mobility, health and urbanization restrict community engagement, especially for older mothers living in urban areas.

Emotional Core & Foundation

The fourth factor was indicative of the affective heart of maternal engagement, unconditional emotional support, warmth and compassion with especially high loadings. The relatively low level of physical caregiving suggests that as instrumental care is increasingly outsourced to professionals in urban homes, emotional availability remains the unique and non-substitutable contribution of the mother as in attachment theory.

Managerial & Strategic Authority

A fifth factor, decision-making and coordination, points to a dimension of maternal engagement that is seldom explored in psychological literature but is well documented in sociological studies of Indian joint family systems. The fact that it is a discrete element shows that managerial authority is exercised through positional authority and accumulated wisdom rather than general engagement. The limited item pool for this factor suggests a promising direction for future scale development.

CONCLUSION

The five-factor structure of the MES contributes to ecological and developmental theory and offers a valid tool for practitioners to assess maternal engagement in the context of Indian families. There are important policy implications and a need for frameworks that recognize mothers as active contributors, rather than passive recipients in the planning of social welfare. In future research, confirmatory factor analysis, larger and more geographically diverse samples, and longitudinal designs should be used.

REFERENCES

- Attar-Schwartz, S., Tan, J. P., Buchanan, A., Griggs, J., & Flouri, E. (2009). Grandparenting and adolescent adjustment in two- and three-generation families. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 23(1), 67–75. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014074>
- Aubel, J. (2012). The role and influence of Mothers on child nutrition. *Maternal & Child Nutrition*, 8(1), 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8709.2011.00316.x>
- Banerjee, T., Srivastava, A., & Patel, R. (2020). Mothers and child welfare in rural India: An ethnographic account. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology*, 35(2), 145–163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10823-020-09392-5>
- Bhattacharya, P. (2021). Rethinking the joint family in urban India: Mother authority in negotiated domesticity. *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, 55(1), 30–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0069966720980491>
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.
- Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment* (2nd ed.). Basic Books.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.

- Calasanti, T. (2010). Gender relations and applied research on aging. *Gerontologist*, 50(6), 720–734. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnq085>
- Cherlin, A. J., & Furstenberg, F. F. (1992). The new American grandparent: A place in the family, a life apart. Harvard University Press.
- Choudhury, S. (2020). Language transmission and Mother-mediated oral narratives in multilingual India. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 24(4), 855–870. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006919838608>
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(7), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.7275/jyj1-4868>
- Croll, E. (2006). The intergenerational contract in the changing Asian family. *Oxford Development Studies*, 34(4), 473–491. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600810600928107>
- Desai, S., & Jain, D. (1994). Maternal employment and changes in family dynamics: The social context of women's work in rural South Asia. *Population and Development Review*, 20(1), 115–136. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2137632>
- Dreze, J., & Sen, A. (2002). India: Development and participation. Oxford University Press.
- Dube, L. (2001). Anthropological explorations in gender: Intersecting fields. Sage Publications.
- Griggs, J., Tan, J. P., Buchanan, A., Attar-Schwartz, S., & Flouri, E. (2010). 'They've always been there for me': Grandparental involvement and child well-being. *Children & Society*, 24(3), 200–214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.2009.00215.x>
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). Multivariate data analysis (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Hank, K., & Buber, I. (2009). Grandparents caring for their grandchildren: Findings from the 2004 Survey of Health, Ageing, and Retirement in Europe. *Journal of Family Issues*, 30(1), 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X08322627>
- Herlofson, K., & Hagestad, G. O. (2012). Transformations in the role of grandparents across welfare states. In S. Arber & V. Timonen (Eds.), *Contemporary grandparenting: Changing family relationships in global contexts* (pp. 27–49). Policy Press.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31–36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575>
- Kapadia, K. M. (1966). Marriage and family in India (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Lin, N. (2001). Social capital: A theory of social structure and action. Cambridge University Press.
- Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 227–238. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227>
- Mehta, K. K., & Thang, L. L. (Eds.). (2012). Experiencing grandparenthood: An Asian perspective. Springer.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Pearce, A., Sawyer, A., & Lynch, J. (2019). Unconditional emotional support: Grandparents as buffers in adversity. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 28(6), 1558–1572. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-019-01378-3>
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community. Simon & Schuster.
- Sear, R., & Mace, R. (2008). Who keeps children alive? A review of the effects of kin on child survival. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 29(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2007.10.001>
- Sharma, N., & Mehta, M. (2019). Mothers and moral development in Indian children: Role of storytelling and cultural practices. *Journal of Indian Psychology*, 37(1), 15–34.
- Silverstein, M., & Marengo, A. (2001). How Americans enact the grandparent role across the family life course. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22(4), 493–522. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019251301022004006>
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2019). Using multivariate statistics (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Thapan, M. (2014). Ethnographies of the everyday: Religion, gender and feminism in contemporary India. *Social Analysis*, 58(3), 96–113. <https://doi.org/10.3167/sa.2014.580306>
- Trawick, M. (1990). Notes on love in a Tamil family. University of California Press.
- Uhlenberg, P., & Hammill, B. G. (1998). Frequency of grandparent contact with grandchild sets: Six factors that make a difference. *Gerontologist*, 38(3), 276–285. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/38.3.276>
- Ungar, M. (2012). Social ecologies and their contribution to resilience. In M. Ungar (Ed.), *The social ecology of resilience: A handbook of theory and practice* (pp. 13–31). Springer.
- Upadhyay, R. (2022). Mother authority and domestic governance in contemporary India: Between tradition and negotiation. *Modern Asian Studies*, 56(3), 901–934. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0026749X21000226>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.
- Yorgason, J. B., Padilla-Walker, L., & Jackson, J. (2011). Non-residential grandparents' emotional and financial involvement in relation to early adolescent grandchild outcomes. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(3), 552–558. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00735.x>

Cite This Article: Rakesh Dwivedi & Anjali Mishra (2026). Multidimensional Roles of Mothers in Indian Families: A Scale Development and Factor Analytic Study. *EAS J Humanit Cult Stud*, 8(4), 147-152.