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INTRODUCTION:

In the previous chapter development of personality was discussed. An understanding of women with their working condition and marital status has also been discussed. In this chapter some studies related to personality factors of frustration tolerance, value pattern and locus of control, as well as theoretical literature of each will be presented. On the basis of the literature review, the problem of the present investigation will be developed. The design of the study and tests used to measure the relevant personality characteristics will be described. Finally, the administration of the tests and the statistical analysis of the obtained results will be discussed.

THEORETICAL LITERATURE:

STUDY OF VALUES:

A closely related way of approaching the criterion of maturity is to seek for the unifying philosophy in terms of some standard classification of values. One might say that a given person is a communist, a Christian, a pacifist or a beatnik. One would thereby imply that much or most of the unity in that person’s life came from following the value-orientation of one of these standards. Morris formulated a long paragraph describing each of thirteen “ways to live”. These were composed principally from leading world ideologies.

The Study of Values aims to measure the relative prominence of six basic interests or motives in personality. The classification is based directly upon Spranger’s Types of men, which defends the view that the personalities of men are best known through a study of their values or evaluative attitudes. Spranger, somewhat similar to Morris, defines six major value-types. He argued that every actual person can be regarded as approaching (but not fitting perfectly within) one or more of these value-directions. According to Spranger, human life harbors six main types of value, and these appeal in varying degrees to individuals who build the unity of their lives about them. He never argued that there are six main types of people. The typology is one of pure values, not of actual person. The term ‘ideal type’ is used in this connection. An ideal type is rather a ‘schema of comprehensibility’ – a
gauge by which we can tell how far a given person has gone in organizing his life by one or more, of these basic schemes.

1. The theoretical:

The dominant interest of the ‘ideal’ theoretical person is the discovery of truth. In the pursuit of this goal he or she takes a ‘cognitive’ attitude, one that looks for identities and differences, one that divests itself of judgments regarding the beauty or utility of object, and seeks only to observe and to reason. Since the interests of the theoretical person are empirical, critical and rational, he or she is necessarily an intellectualist, frequently a scientist or a philosopher. The chief aim in life may be to order and to systematize the knowledge.

2. The economic:

The ‘ideal’ economic person is characteristically interested in what is useful. Based originally upon the satisfaction of bodily needs (self-preservation), the interest in utilities develops to embrace the practical affairs of the business world – the production, marketing and consumption of goods, the elaboration of credit, and the accumulation of tangible wealth. This type is thoroughly ‘practical’ and conforms well to the prevailing conception of the average person.

The economic attitude frequently comes into conflict with other values. The economic person wants education to be practical and regards unapplied knowledge as waste. Great achievements of engineering, scientific management and ‘applied psychology’ result from the demands that economic persons make upon learning. Similarly, the value of utility, conflicts with the aesthetic value, except when art serves commercial purpose. Without feeling inappropriateness in the act, the economic person may denude a beautiful hillside or befoul a river with industrial refuse. In the personal life a person is likely to confuse luxury with beauty. In relations with people a person is more likely to be interested in surpassing them in wealth than in dominating them (political value) or in serving them (social value).
3. The aesthetic:

The aesthetic person sees the highest value in form and harmony. Each single experience is judged from the standpoint of grace, symmetry or fitness. The person regards life as a manifold of events; each single impression is enjoyed for its own sake. The person need not be a creative artist; a person is aesthetic if the chief interests are in the artistic episodes of life.

The aesthetic value is in a sense diametrically opposed to the theoretical; the former is concerned with the diversity and the latter with identities of experience. In the economic sphere the aesthetic person sees the process of manufacturing. In social affairs a person may be interested in persons but not in the welfare of persons. The aesthetic people tend towards individualism and self-sufficiency. Aesthetic people often like the beautiful insignia of pomp and power but oppose political activity when it makes for a repression of individuality. In the field of religion aesthetic people are likely to confuse beauty with puree religious experience.

4. The social:

The highest value for this ideal type is love for people, whether of one or many. Generally social person is kind, sympathetic and unselfish and likely to find the theoretical, economical and aesthetic attitudes cold and inhuman. In contrast to the political type, the social person regards love as the only suitable form of power or else repudiates the entire conception of power as endangering the integrity of personality. The social person’s interest is regarded as selfless and tends to approach very closely to the religious attitude.

5. The political:

The political person is interested primarily in power. The activities are not within the narrow field of politics. Leader in any field generally has high power value. Since competition and struggle play a large part in all life, many philosophers have seen power as the most universal and most fundamental motives. However, there are certain personalities in whom the desire for a direct expression of the motive is uppermost, who wish for personal power, influence and renown.
6. The religious:

The highest value for the religious person may be called unity. The person is mystical and seeks to comprehend the cosmos as a whole, to relate to its totality. Spranger defines the religious person as one "whose mental structure is permanently directed to the creation of the highest and absolutely satisfying value experience." Some people of this type are 'immanent mystic', i.e., they find their religious experience in the affirmation of life and in active participation therein. The 'transcendental mystic' on the other hand, seeks to unite with a higher reality by withdrawing from life. The person is ascetic and finds the experience of unity through self-denial and meditation.

A great deal of research has been done by Personality and social Psychologists on the values. A personality test titled Study of Values makes it possible to discover to what degree an actual individual does subscribe to these value-directions. Although these values as measured are of equal popularity in the population as a whole, they have very different strengths of attraction for individuals. One person may be interested in theory and in the beauty, but not in power or religion.

In the recent years, however, relatively few developments have occurred in the area of standardized, commercially available instruments aimed exclusively at the assessment of value. The Study of Values (Allport, Vernon and Lindzey, 1960), one of the first value inventories, consisted of items related to preferences, beliefs and interests rather than values. In the seventh edition of "The Psychological Testing" by Anastassi (1997) there is no mention of value test. This reflects the decrease in its popularity in the western countries. Though this is the case at the international level the researcher has included value test in the present study to verify its relevance with the Indian population. The Indian culture is considered and known as value base society and value education is given lot of weight-age in preparing the syllabus.

The main purpose of using study of value test for the present research is the emphasis upon value orientation as particularly revealing level of human traits. We know a person best if we know what kind of future the person is bringing about and the molding of the future rests on the personal values. A value is a belief upon which a person acts by preference. Spranger does not imply that a given man belongs exclusively to one or another of these ideal
types. The types are conceptually pure but actual lives reflect various mixtures. Spranger may be said to hold a flattering view of human nature. No person is purely theoretical, social or religious in his or her interest.

The test has been found useful in teaching, counseling, vocational guidance and research work. In short, the test is primarily an aid to self-insight. It does not measure absolute strength of values, but only their relative prominence in a given life. For this reason conventional comparison of ‘trait strength’ is not possible. The test is also limited to the six values, which are flattering in nature since they overlook the ‘baser’ value of sensuality and opportunism.

**LOCUS OF CONTROL:**

Alfred Adler once a follower of Freud broke away from the master because he (Adler) believed that striving for personal control over one’s own destiny was the most important motivation. A person without such a feeling of control had an ‘inferiority complex’, and might then ‘over compensate’ in this attempt to gain a feeling of control or mastery. Dechrame (1968) described this in terms of Origins and Pawns. Some individuals feel that they originate their own activities and are responsible for their own rewards and punishments; others feel that like chess pawns, such freedom depends on more powerful outside forces.

Internality is the general orientation of a person based on the belief that he ‘causes’ most of the phenomena, or can influence them. A person may perceive the contingency either as an individual or several individuals may perceive the contingency as a group. Both will form part of internality. Internality can be expressed in several ways. One form of internality is taking responsibility for the outcomes of one’s activity. Another form is independence. By definition externals attribute outcomes of events to outside factors and therefore indicate a sense of control. Their perceptions and interpretation of events thus reflect external dependences. It should be emphasized that, these are subjective feelings of individual interpretation of reality. For most of us, the feeling of power or personal control is probably situational. In some situations we feel competent because we know what to do and can do it successfully, while in other situations we feel helpless (Christian J., 1989). The theoretical assumption of locus of control is related to the individual’s self.
Although Jung proposed ‘introversion’ and ‘extroversion’ as personality types, H. J. Eysenck (1953) studied them as a dimensional trait. He described a typical ‘extrovert’ as sociable, like parties, has many friends, needs to have people to talk to, craves excitement, takes chances, acts on the spur of a moment and is generally an impulsive individual. Extrovert person tends to be aggressive and loses temper quickly. The typical ‘introvert’ is a quiet retiring sort, introspective, reserved, distant except with intimate friends, tends to plan ahead, takes everyday life with proper seriousness, keeps feelings under close control, seldom behaves in an aggressive manner and does not lose temper easily. Introvert person tends to place great value on ethical standards.

Thus, based on the above assumptions, the present research is aimed at studying a relation between values, locus of control and frustration-tolerance of women with regard to marital status, working status, socio-cultural environmental status and age groups.

**Concept of locus of control:**

Locus of control is regarded as personality construct which reflects the individual’s perception of the place, of events and degree of personal control that he has over the reinforcements following his behavior. The concept of locus of control is derived from Rotter’s social learning theory (1954). It has been defined by Rotter (1966) as, the tendency in the individual to attribute the outcomes in his life, irrespective of success or failure, to external factors or those which are within his control. The concept of locus of control refers to the perception of contingencies between action and outcomes, how much one’s action produces the outcome. Those who have high perception of such contingencies (believe that their actions produce the outcome) are said to be “internal” (with internal locus of control), and externals (with external locus of control) are those who have low perception of contingences, i.e., they believe that the outcomes are not produced by their actions (Pareek, et. al., 1981).

Internal locus of control is associated with the perception of events, whether positive or negative, of being consequent of one’s own actions and thus potentially under personal control. External locus of control on the other hand refers to the perception positive or negative events as being unrelated to self behaviors and accordingly beyond personal control, but rather are
under the control of powerful others, luck, chance, fate etc. Thus depending upon his past experiences, a person will have developed a consistent attitude tending towards either an internal or external locus of control as a source of reinforcement.

Since its introduction, the concept of internal-external control has proved to be highly useful personality dimension, for understanding the role of reinforcement in a wide variety of behavior.

Locus of control is not a typological concept. It is not even the case that people are either internally or externally controlled. Locus of control is a continuum and people can be ordered along that. For the sake of convenience, we may refer to internals and externals but it should be emphasized that the behavior is determined by many converging factors.

The scale locus of control may be successfully used by psychiatrists, psychologists, counselors, teachers and social workers as a screening device to identify individuals who may be in need of psychological assistance.

**Theoretical Background:**

Anastasi (1988) describes locus of control quoting Rotter, as a scale to assess the individual’s generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement (I - E scale).

Locus of control scale was developed from the framework of social learning theory (Rotter, 1954; Rotter, Chance and Phares, 1972). In explaining its use, Rotter wrote, “The effect of reinforcement following some behavior --- is not a simple stamping in process but depends upon whether or not the person perceives casual relationship between his own behavior and the reward”. Internal control refers to the one’s own behavior or one’s relatively permanent characteristics. External control on the other hand indicates that a positive or negative reinforcement following some action of the individual is perceived as not being entirely contingent upon his own action but the result of chance, fate or luck or it may be perceived as under the control of powerful others and is unpredictable because of the complexity of forces surrounding the individual.
The magnitude of that expectancy and value reinforcement are conditioned in part by the nature of the specific situation to which we are predicting. Therefore, prediction of behavior involves three variables: a) expectancies, b) reinforcements and c) the psychological situation of particular import of locus of control. These relationships are stated by Rotter (1954):

\[ ES_1 = f (ES_1 & GE/Ns_1) \]

The expectancy that a given behavior will be successful in a specific situation depends on the frequency with which the person has been rewarded before in the same situation. The psychological situation exerts a pronounced effect on reinforcement value and experiences.

Several diverse locus of control scales have been developed for use with different population, including school age and pre school children. Locus of control has been investigated in relation to such performance variables as learning, creative thinking, achievement drive and alcoholism and such demographic variables as age, sex, socioeconomic level and ethnic identification. It is clear that the available Indian scale for assessing locus of control is playing a significant part in on going research.

**FRUSTRATION-TOLERANCE:**

**Aggression:**

Aggression is often defined as any behavior carried out with the intention of harming another person, whether it be physical or verbal. Some researchers argue that aggression is innately determined and influenced by biological factors, while others claim that the main influence is that of learning. It is often assumed that aggression is always consequence of frustration. An interference with the occurrence of an instigated goal-response at its proper time in the behavior sequence is called a frustration.

Mcdougall has denoted the phenomenon of aggression in the ‘instinct of combat’ and he states explicitly that this instinct is aroused by ‘obstruction’, a word that, in a psychological context is almost an exact synonym for frustration.

Kornad Lorenz, considers human aggression to be an instinctive and natural feature of human behavior. Social learning theory emphasizes the role of
reinforcement, observation and limitation in the acquisition of aggressive behavior. Bandura (1977) admits that aggression is not a natural outcome of frustration, but will become so if an individual learns that such behavior is reinforcing. People differ in their responses to frustration.

Freud (1931) has made the most extensive and systematic hypothesis of frustration-aggression. According to him, tendency to seek pleasure and avoid pain is the basic mechanism of all mental functioning. Frustration occurred whenever pleasure-seeking or pain avoiding behavior was blocked. He viewed aggression as an innate drive, and therefore an unavoidable reality of human life. Hence, he saw aggression as related to the person and not to the situation.

The aggressive drive was seen as part of the id, the aspect of the mind and personality which motivates our behavior, while ego and superego often opposes the aggressive impulses of the id, creating conflict within the psyche. To cope with this conflict – and the aggressive tendency – we use defense mechanism which blocks conscious awareness of the underlying conflicts, and attempts to ameliorate the tension in various ways. In Freud’s view, we can never eliminate aggression; we can only seek to control it by channeling it in particular ways which involve symbolic gratification.

Dollard has formulated the general principle of frustration-aggression from these earlier Freudian writings. According to frustration-aggression hypothesis (Dollard et al., 1939), frustration leads to aggression and aggression is natural outlet from frustrating stimuli.

There is experimental evidence that aggression may be caused by frustrating conditions (Arzin et al., 1966). Many psychologists acknowledge that
frustration alone is not sufficient to trigger an aggressive reaction and that although aggression is one possible response to frustration; there are several others which an individual may carry out.

Berkowitz (1965, 1969) suggested some influential modifications to the original frustration-aggression hypothesis. Rather than frustration and aggression being seen almost as cause and effect, he introduces the concept of 'readiness' into the sequence of events, and states that frustration does not lead automatically to aggression, but rather sets up a readiness or predisposition to behave aggressively. This readiness may be affected by factors such as past experience and the presence of aggressive 'cues' in the environment, which may then evoke a response of aggression.

Most research confirms that males are more aggressive than females. The social and cultural expectations play a major role in supplementing any initial differences between the sexes.

Kohn (1988) points out that aggression is not a universal characteristic. Social and environmental factors play a major role in the expression of aggressive behavior. Cultural norms may be largely influential in determining the overt display of aggression.

It has been suggested that frustration is a contributing factor in prejudice and discrimination. Allport (1958) considered that build-up of frustration produced negative and hostile tendencies which would find an outlet against ethnic minorities.
**Frustration:**

Due to the predominantly social environment in which one lives, there are always situations arising in which wants, desires, urges and impulses have to be denied the satisfaction that they normally crave. Conflict between one's urges and the blocking of their satisfaction is a daily occurrence. What happens when there is such a conflict? The apparent result is - Frustration.

‘Frustration occurs whenever the organism meets a more or less insurmountable obstacle or obstruction en route to the satisfaction of any vital need, with the result that behavior becomes irrational’, Rosenzweig (1944). In this definition the nature of frustration remains same and one sees some what a new thought i.e. of ‘insurmountability of an obstacle’. He says that the obstacle should be ‘insurmountable’ and the term is always relative degree as well as the nature of the insurmountability, which is sufficient to produce state of frustration, varies with individual to individual. This implies that in the case of frustration one finds inter-individual as well as intra-individual differences. In another definition he defined frustration as, ‘the inaccessible obstacle which prevents an individual from satisfying his needs.’

Maier (1940) defines frustration in more dynamic terms as, “That stage where learning functions cease operating and other modes of adjustment begin operating”. He says that normally an individual’s tendency is to find out various ways of solving problems when an obstacle obstructs the way of satisfaction. More the individual can think about various alternative solutions, less the possibility of being frustrated. In this way he has related frustration with learning or problem solving capacity.

Freud’s analysis (1931) of reaction to frustration is important from clinical point of view. According to him, ‘frustration leads to unhealthy, disorganized and promiscuous sexual behavior.’

We cannot satisfy a need or solve a problem because an obstacle is blocking our effort, we experience feeling of frustration that disturb us, distract us from our other responsibilities, and interfere with our capacity to remain rational (Lehner and Cube, 1956). It was further observed by them that if our inability to overcome the obstacle continues, further problems and conflict arise.
Garret (1950) defines frustration as, ‘when a strong drive is blocked by equally strong motives or circumstances a sense of frustration often leading to conflict develops’. According to him, frustration can have two meanings – it may refer to tension arising from conflict among motives within the individual, or it may refer to the blocking of a response by people or obstacles in the environment.

From these definitions it is seen that ‘frustration’ is commonly defined in three ways by different psychologists:

(a) As a Barrier:
Some authors define frustration mainly in terms of a barrier. Symonda (1951) defines the term as, ‘a barrier or an obstacle which blocks a vital urge, no matter what the reaction to this obstacle is’.
Lehner and Cube (1955) have also defined frustration in terms of an obstacle blocking one’s efforts to remain rational.

Thus it is seen that frustration in this context is defined as an insurmountable barrier.

(b) As a Reaction:
Some psychologists define frustration in terms of the reaction to an obstacle and not principally in terms of the obstacle itself.

Maier (1949) describes frustration as a reaction to tension – ‘frustration behavior has as its sole aim, the reduction of tension’.

(c) As both, a Barrier and a Reaction:
Woodworth and Marquis (1963) emphasized the two factors of barrier and reaction, when they speak of people having an insurmountable obstacle or being blocked in their desires and of results in the way of worry, tension and futile responses. Thus, frustration is not only what confronts a man but also, how he faces the obstacle. It is an inadequate ability to meet overwhelming force.

Frustration-tolerance:
According to Rosenzweig, it is a common feature of frustrated behavior that it usually takes a turn towards ‘aggression which may be directed towards
someone, or towards oneself, or towards nothing at all i.e. the obstacle in the frustration situation is minimized almost to the point of denying its existence’.

“When an individual meets with a frustrating situation, he reacts in a specific way, which may be either in the form of a normal way of response or an inadequate mode of response. This difference will depend on the degree of ‘frustration-tolerance’ or how much frustration an individual can withstand”, (Pareek, 1964). Rosenzweig (1974) has defined frustration-tolerance as, “an individual’s capacity to withstand frustration without failure of psychological adjustment, i.e. without resorting to inadequate modes of response.”

Our ability to solve the innumerable problems which confront us in our daily life is rooted in our ability to handle frustration. In other words, our reactions to frustration depend to a great extent on how well we have developed frustration-tolerance. Frustration-tolerance is the ability to endure blocking and delay of satisfaction, without turning to disruptive, mal-adaptive behavior. Individuals differ in their ability to tolerate frustration.

As the child grows older, he learns to show diverse expression of anger. It is common observation that violence decreases and that the anger is expressed in a more subtle way and less overtly in adolescents. On the basis of general observation as the child grows, he learns to inhibit the anti-social or undesirable impulses in himself and may express himself in a more subtle way, by passing the censors.

The discussion so far classifies the main conceptual aspects of the total area of frustration. However, one also needs concrete operational definition, if one wants to study frustration-tolerance in day to day life. One such attempt has been made by Rosenzweig in which he tries to bring out some real life situations, and the individual’s response to these situations. This according to Rosenzweig would indicate his degree of frustration-tolerance. Thus it forms a theoretical basis for the present study.

**Reactions to frustrations:**

When an individual meets a frustration situation, he reacts in a specific way, which may be either in form of a normal way of response, or an inadequate mode of response. This difference will depend on the degree of frustration-
tolerance. Rosenzweig has worked out the concept of areas of high and low frustration-tolerance within personality and has shown how frustration-tolerance can be concretely studied in terms of direction and type of response.

According to Rosenzweig’s theory it is assumed that the response given by an individual has two dimensions which he calls direction of aggression and type of aggression.

**Direction of aggression:**

According to Rosenzweig there are three directions of aggression – inward, outward and evasion of frustration. When aggression is turned inward upon one’s self, it is called **intrapunitiveness**. Here the individual aggressively attributes the frustration to himself, the associated emotions being guilt and remorse and the related psychoanalytic mechanism being displacement and isolation. In intrapunitive response aggression does not apparently supply the motivating force. The cognate psychoanalytic mechanism here is repression.

When aggression is turned outward on the environment it is called **extrapunitiveness**. In expunitive responses, the individual aggressively attributes the frustration to external persons or things, the associated emotions here being anger and resentment and the cognate psychoanalytic mechanism being projection.

When aggression is ‘evaded’ or ‘glossed’ over it is called **impunitiveness**.

**Type of reaction:**

Rosenzweig has given three types of reactions to frustration namely obstacle-dominance, ego-defense and need-persistence.

In obstacle-dominant reaction, the barrier occasioning the frustration stands out in the responses.

In the ego-defensive reactions, the ego predominates. The person tries to defend himself.

In need-persistent reactions the solution of the problem is prominent.
REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH:

Very little work have been carried out in India and abroad relating to values, locus of control and frustration-tolerance as the dimensions of personality with special reference to women. There is no research undertaken where all four groups are compared on different personality characteristics. Therefore, it is felt that if the personality dimensions of the subjects are linked with independent variables like working condition and marital status, we can interpret them in a different way. The present investigation relates to a study of working women, non-working women, married women and unmarried women with regard to value pattern, locus of control and frustration-tolerance.

Frustration-tolerance:

McCary (1951) studied reaction to frustration in 600 northern and southern high school boys and girls, Negro and white. The northern groups were more overtly aggressive and less passive in their reactions to frustration than were the southern groups. All the females compared to all males, were significantly more conforming. These comparisons suggest that in interpreting P-F study results, the ethnic and cultural group from which the person comes is of some significance. This research has motived the present researcher to consider two different cosmopolitan cultures and study their frustration-tolerance level.

Lindzey and Goldwin (1954) examined the relation between several indices derived from sociometric responses and P-F study scores regarding the direction. Only in the case of G.C.R their findings did not conform. However, they concluded that the variables interpreted by the P-F study does relate to the sociometric status. This research has helped to decide very firmly to use P-F study as a tool.

Gupta (1963) in a study of reaction to frustration among hysterics found the rate of incidence of extrapunitive responses significantly higher in hysterics who had a long history of neurotic breakdown than among hysterics who have had a recent history of neurotic breakdown. This shows that the higher level of extrapunitiveness is against the mental health of women.

Pareek and Devi (1965) found scoring reliability out of the Indian adaptation of the Rosenzweig P-F study (adult form), by comparing the
scoring by two independent scorers was quite high; the percentage of agreement increasing to 98 after discussions. Reliability co-efficient ranged from .27 to .82 and consistency values from .46 to .74. This research also provided ground for selecting P-F study as a measure.

Robert and Patricia (1966) found significant relationships between tested personality variables on the Cattell’s 16 Personality Factor Test and on the various responses on Rosenzweig’s P-F study. The report does not show the details of each factor of 16 PF with its correlation with the frustration. The results obtained cannot be compared with the present research.

Gupta, Kumudini, (1993) found in the study of frustration among working women in relation to their needs, level of aspiration and some background variables.

Muyerji et. Al (1968) found that health and physical development, sociopsychological relations, morals, religion, home and family were significantly correlated with one or more aggression categories beyond one percent level. Increasing number of sociopsychological problems were directly associated with extrapunitiveness and inversely with the tendency to discount the effects of frustration.

Roth and Puri (1967) found while using P-F Test with achievers and underachievers of both the sexes that achievers were more extrapunitive and the underachievers were more intropunitive and impunitive. In the present research working and non-working conditions are considered as achievers and non-achievers and this study has helped to prepare the ground for present research and select P-F study as one of the tool.

Deepa Malvia (1969) found sex groups differed significantly on ‘E’ and ‘e’ categories. Mean score was higher on E reactions of males as compared to females. Both groups showed highest scores on ‘E’ and lowest on ‘m’ responses. Though the sample of the present study is not inclusive of male sample the conclusion of this reference is compared with female samples.

Balzano, Frederica, J (1996) found in study on African American and white women that African Americans were more likely to externalize their anger than white counterparts and white women were more prone to internal denial and blame in the same situation.
The above researches motivated the present researcher to consider P-F study as one of the tools and selecting women from two different cosmopolitan communities.

**Working status and Marital status:**

Myrdal and Klien (1956) tried to assess how a working woman feels torn between the strains of two roles—wife-mother and worker; and also how a housewife feels isolated and views the world of working woman glamorous and full of excitements; found that women preferred the strains of two roles than committing to themselves only to house work.

Nye and Hoffman(1963) compared working and non-working women of America in order to study the effect of job on different aspects of family and married life. They found that employment of wives increased the marital conflict.

Rama Kapur(1969) has studied role conflict among employed housewives and found that working women perceived the maximum difficulty in performing their mother role followed by the social role.

Kala Rani (1976) studied role conflict in working women, highlighting some problems related to role expectations from family, relatives etc.

Ramu (1989) carried out a comparative analysis amongst single earner families in India across a large cross section society. He concluded that wives’ work has not resulted in any universal change of attitude or acceptance of contribution to the domestic economy but has been translated in her traditional feminine obligation rather than improvement in her domestic status. This research has created a foundation to select working status as one of variable.

Houseknecht, Sharon K. et.al. (1981) carried out a study on marital adjustment of professional women. Highly qualified women were taken as a sample and the finding was predictive. It indicated that employment status was not as important in determining marital adjustment as to the extent of family adjustment to support the wife’s career.
Stokes, Joseph et al. (1986) conducted a comparative study between home makers and married women with jobs. It was found that working women reported overall dissatisfaction than home makers.

Akhtar, Pestonjee, Farooqui (1969) found in the study of attitude of men towards working women that there was resentment in men towards the increasing role of working women. It was also found that the customary dominant role of men and traditional values of Indian Society was perceived as being threatening due to the emergence of working women.

Faver, Catherine A. (1982) carried out statistical study on the ‘effects of Values and Roles on women’s well being’ and it was found that marriage is positively related to satisfaction among women with high family value and low career values and employment is positively related to satisfaction among married women with high career values.

Lee, William (2002) carried out a study in Hong Kong on working women in traditional patriarchal family structure. He found that full time paid middle class women still have to be responsible for the majority of house work and child care. They still continue to deal with the strain and contradiction of living their lives amidst countervailing traditional forces.

The above researches have helped the researcher to prepare the ground for present research and consider two different status of women i.e. working status and marital status as major variables.

Values:

Sen (1990) found value conflict from a sociological perspective in traditional Muslim society between personal development and social status. This research was one of the aspects which influenced researcher to study comparative values.

Singh, Gupta and Sen (1996) found in the study on unselected group of class XI students that neuroticism was positively related with theoretical, aesthetic and religious values whereas extroversion was found to be positively related with social, political and economic values. It was found, in general, that females show strong preference for aesthetic, social and religious values as compared to males. They have used the same test which
has been used for the present research but the nature of the sample is different in terms of age and other criteria.

Julilvand (2000) found while using study of values with working and non-working women that working women have different value structure than non-working women. Economic and political values were more prominent in working women, while religious value was higher in non-working women. This research has motivated the present researcher to select the study of values as one of the measure.

**Socio-cultural environment:**

Poluma, M.M., Garland, Neol (1971) carried out a study on 53 couples with dual professions. It was found that in traditional couples husband's career was automatically given priority, while neo-traditional couple gave some consideration to wives career. Many of the women showed a will to succeed far beyond the average American women. This research gave a base to consider two cosmopolitan communities for the present study.

**Locus of control:**

Noor, Noriani (2002) carried out study on three possible ways in which locus of control can influence the relationship between work-family conflict. Study was carried out on a sample of 310 Malaysian employed women with families. It was found that locus of control had direct effect on job satisfaction and played a significant moderating role.

Babu, P.Premchand (1988) studied impact of locus of control, religion, work ethic and adjustment on job satisfaction and job involvement of employees in religious and secular management.

Hall and Scheirdar (1973) presented a model of psychological success for organizational career development that has two components: self-esteem and control over the environment. People who do not perceive themselves as being able to act upon their environment do not experience the psychological success which enables them to feel satisfied and successful in their work.

Lofcourt (1976) found that externals are more attentive, positively responsive and facilitated in their task performance by the presence of social cues. Internals, on the other hand, seem to be more resistant to social
influences and are at the least distracted by social cues as they attempt to cope with various tasks.

Haworth, J. T.; J. Maria; L. Stephen (1997) conducted a study on positive psychological states in the daily life of a sample of working women and found that internal locus of control was associated with greater enjoyment, interest, feeling of well being and a number of principal environmental influences.

Blue, Beth-Anne (1996) investigated the degree to which job satisfaction, life satisfaction and locus of control are related in working women. It was found that locus of control was related to both and those who were most satisfied with their work and life were the most internally controlled.

These studies motivated the researcher to include locus control as one of the measure for the present research.