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REVIEW OF LITERATURE

JOB AND FAMILY INVOLVEMENT

Job and family represent the most personal realms of adult life. The adults identify emotionally with job and family domains. Each domain offers a unique opportunity and resources to the role enactment for the development and satisfaction of individuals.

The study of job and family has spawned rich conceptual and empirical literature. To investigate the linkages between job and family domains, in the beginning, the researchers have concentrated unidimensionally on the direct impact of work variables (Hoffman, 1984; Kanter, 1977; Piotrkowski, 1979; Voydanoff, 1987) on family life; and direct impact of family variables on work (Kelly and Voydanoff, 1985; Voydanoff and Kelley 1984 and Orthner and Pittman, 1986).

Recently researchers began to recognize the natural relationship that exists between the employing organization and family experiences. Kanter (1977) has identified five aspects of the structure, and organization of work-life that seemed most important in shaping and influencing the family. These are: the relative absorptiveness of an occupation; time and timing; rewards and resources; the job as a socializer of world view and emotional climate of work. She has also identified three ways in which family pattern has influenced work systems. These are: membership in ethnic groups and families, representing certain cultural traditions, the situation of the "corporate wife" and her impact on her husband’s career opportunities and ways in which family situation can define work orientation, motivation, abilities, emotional energy and demands people bring to the work place. The ‘open systems’ concept of Kanter (1977) has questioned and challenged the “myth of separate worlds of job and family domain”.
Neither job nor the family are closed systems, changes in one should interface with the other and it can be argued that organization undergoing the greatest change in society today is the family, not work-institution. This perspective created research interest in job and family relationship. Frone et al. (1992) have conceptualized a comprehensive model of job-family interface. This proposed model has extended prior research (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985) by explicitly distinguishing job interfering with family and family interfering with job. Job interfering with family is known as work → family conflict (W - F conflict) and family interfering with work is known as Family → Job conflict (F - W conflict). (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985 and Frone et al., 1992). One aspect of the job - family interface that has received research attention is the conflict an individual may experience in performing roles. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) have reviewed job-family research literature and have defined:

"Job-family conflict as a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressure from the job and family domains are mutually incompatible in some situation".

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) have identified three sources of job-family conflict: namely, time, strain, and behaviour. That is, any role characteristic that affects a person’s time involvement, strain or behaviour within a role can produce conflict between that role and another role. According to them the time-based conflict involved the concepts such as excessive work time, role over-load, schedule conflict, flexibility of schedules, marital status, presence of children and family - size. Similarly, they pointed out that the strain based conflict involved job-family stress, negative emotional spill-over and supportiveness of partners and the behaviour-based conflict involved incompatibilities between the role behaviours required in different spheres. Voydanoff and Kelly (1984) have suggested that the most important types of job and family conflicts for employed parents are income inadequacy and time-shortage (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985). Along with time based conflicts, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) have suggested that individual experiences strain-based and behaviour-based conflicts in balancing job and family life.
The researchers on job and family roles integration have identified these roles as “asymmetrically” permeable boundaries between two systems for men and women (Pleck, 1977; Pleck and Staines, 1985). They have recognized the normative differences that exist between men and women in the relative intrusion of family demands on job, and job-demands on family. Specifically, women allow family tasks and responsibilities to intrude on their paid job, but men are less inclined to do so. Men, on the contrary, allow job to intrude on family-time. Other (Burke, 1989; Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985) empirical studies revealed that job and family conflict was aroused by the presence of role pressures from job and family domains that are mutually incompatible in some respects.

The researchers on job and family-role integration support a positive relationship between job-involvement and job-family conflict (Beutell, 1983; Beutell and O'Hare, 1987; Frone and Rice, 1987; Greenhaus and Kopelman, 1981; Greenhaus et al., 1989 and Wiley, 1987).

Within the areas of stress-research new questions are being asked regarding such issues as the relative impact of job-stressors on family-life and the impact of family-stressors on job life. With regard to job and family-stressors, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) hypothesized that exposure to stressors in a given domain (eg. job) may lead to irritability, fatigue or preoccupation with these problems, thereby limiting one’s ability to meet the demands of other domains of life (eg. family). Expanding this general argument to include job-family conflict and family-job conflict they explicitly portray a bidirectional conceptualization. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) argued that high levels of psychological involvement might lead to increased job-family conflict in two ways: First, high levels of psychological involvement in one role may be associated with an increase in the amount of time and effort devoted to that role, thereby making it more difficult to comply with pressures associated with another role. Second, high level of psychological involvement in a given role may cause one to be mentally preoccupied in a given role even when physically attempting to fulfill the demands of a second role.
With augmentation of the above arguments, Frone et al. (1992) hypothesize that job-involvement is directly and positively related to job-family conflict, whereas family-involvement is directly and positively related to family-job conflict. With regard to distress, they hypothesize that job-family conflict is directly and positively related to family-distress, whereas family-job conflict is directly and positively related to job distress. With regard to job and family-stressors, they hypothesize that they are directly and positively related to their respective within-domain-measure of distress. Finally, with regard to job and family-involvement, they hypothesize that they are directly and negatively related to their respective within-domain-measure of distress. This model study suggests that: (1) the conflict relationship between job and family is reciprocal (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985), (2) job-stressors and job-involvement were positively related to the frequency of job-family conflict, conversely family stressors and family-involvement were positively related to the frequency of family-job conflict. This result clarifies the positive relationship between family stressors and job-family conflict, (3) these results suggest that if the demands and responsibilities associated with one role frequently interfere with the enactment of a second role, the quality of life associated with the second role may suffer and (4) the results also suggest that any relationship between either family-stressors or home-making commitment and job-relation affect is not direct, but is mediated by the frequency of family-job conflict. Finally these results clearly underscore the fundamental importance of distinguishing between job→family and family→job conflict and support the use of multivariate models in future research on the job-family interface.

To identify the basis of involvement in work and family contexts and their relationship Kanungo (1979; 1982) has proposed “A motivational model”, which explains the phenomenon of the involvement and alienation in terms of need-theoretical construct. Which suggests that the relationship between family- and job-involvement is moderated by the perceived potential of the family and job contexts for need-satisfaction. This means that when both the contexts are seen to have high potential for need-satisfaction, the individual would
experience high involvement in both contexts. When both the contexts are seen as lacking the potential for need-satisfaction, the individual would experience low involvement (alienation) in both contexts. If however, one of the contexts is perceived to be lacking the potential and the other as having the potential for need-satisfaction, the individual would experience alienation in the former and involvement in the latter context (Kanungo and Misra, 1988). With respect to the relationship between job- and family-involvement. Kanungo and Misra (1988) say that their results are in line with the segmentation notion that suggests relative independence of life-roles. All the same, it may be pointed out here that even then in their study work-involvement and family-involvement are positive and significantly related with lower magnitude.

Marks and MacDermid (1996) have proposed “a theory of role-balance” and confirmed that people who maintain more balance across their entire systems of roles and activities would experience lower level of role-strain and depression, and higher level of self-esteem, role-ease and other indicators of well-being.

JOB-FAMILY INVOLVEMENT AND SATISFACTION

Well-being is commonly defined by satisfaction and involvement in major domains of individual’s life. Job-satisfaction and family/marital or non-work satisfaction has been considered as primary contributors to perceived quality of life or well-being (Campbell et al., 1976; Near, Rice and Hunt, 1980; Payton-Miyazaki and Brayfield, 1976 and Wilkening, 1982; ). Kline and Cowan (1989) suggest that the individual, couple, parent and employment domains are primary contributors to family member’s well-being and the representative indicators of well-being are self-esteem, marital-satisfaction parenting satisfaction and job-satisfaction. Kopelman et al. (1983) provide a theoretical model for describing the relationship between role-conflicts at job, in the family and between the two, as well as satisfaction at home, at job and with life in general. They define job conflict as the extent to which an individual experiences incompatible role pressures within the work domain, and family
conflict as the extent to which incompatible role pressures are experienced within the family. For both types of conflict the model postulates that incompatibility may arise from multiple role senders, one role sender, or a lack of fit between the focal person and role requirements. The model also describes inter-role conflict which is described as the extent to which a person experiences pressures within one role that are incompatible with pressures from another role and also Kopelman et al. (1983) have reported the strong relationship between job-conflict and domain satisfaction, i.e., job-conflict and job-satisfaction, and between domain satisfaction and life satisfaction. Pittman and Orthner’s (1989) study on job and family interface has confirmed importance of family support as well as job and economic factors to explain commitment to work. They found that job-commitment was best explained by the “fit” between the organization and self/family. The Degree of “fit” was indicated by marital satisfaction, perception of organizational responsivences to families and the quality of the organizational environment as a child-rearing milieu and spousal support for one’s career (Pittman and Orthner, 1989).

Pleck’s (1977) notion of the work-family role system consists of the male work role, the female work role, the male family role and the female family role. These four roles are sufficient to describe the major work performed in market place and in household. In Pleck’s formulation, the female family role is composed of doing most of the household work, and this has been shown to be related to greater marital dissatisfaction among women (Veroff et al., 1981). Feeling of over-work has found to be a contributor, additively, to lower levels of family-life satisfactions. Similarly, on the other hand men who perform most of the household chores have lower levels of satisfaction with their family life.

The division of household work, by married men and women has important implications for the quality of married life. Empirical research has shown that marital happiness among wives is increased when household chores are shared between husband and wife (Veroff et al., 1981). Wives whose husbands help with household work have lower levels of
depression than those whose husbands do not (Ross et al., 1983). In general, how household work is divided by a couple plays an important role in their level of satisfaction with the marriage. This is true regardless of the employment status of the female member of the couple (Veroff et al., 1981).

In an intensive study of two earner working class and lower middle class, Lien et al. (1974) concluded that "men in contemporary industrial culture seek their primary emotional, personal and spiritual gratification in their family settings. Both in his study and review of the literature, Pleck (1985) found that husbands experience their family-roles as far more psychologically significant than their paid work-roles. Pleck also reported that men's adjustment in their family roles, using measures of happiness and/or satisfaction, consistently had substantially greater positive impact than did job adjustment on their psychological well-being.

Guelzow et al. (1991) proposed an explanatory model of stress-process for dual career woman and man. Their study results indicate that the men are psychologically involved in both professional and family roles. Further, it also revealed that the women all of whom were employed full-time reported no significant association between having younger children and role-strains, parental stress or distress. Men who have a flexible schedule exhibit significantly lower marital, parental or professional stress as well as distress it was further confirmed that use of cognitive restructuring coping strategy was related significantly to lower stress for both genders and the use of role-reduction strategies was linked to higher distress levels for men. Romzek (1989) has examined the effect of commitment on employees', non-work and career-satisfaction, the data indicated that higher level of organizational involvement resulted in higher non-work and career-satisfaction and has positive consequences for subjective perception. Thompson et al. (1992) found that there was a stronger relationship between job, life, family and self satisfaction.
PERSONALITY AND SATISFACTION

Personality traits and emotions are so intimately related that it is often difficult to distinguish the description of emotions from personality characteristics. Yet systematic links have been made between the structure of emotions and the structure of personality traits (McCrae and Costa, 1991).

To describe personality traits Tupes and Christal (1958, 1961) and Norman (1963) have identified the five-factors model of personality. These five factors—Neuroticism, Extroversion, Open, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness—are generally considered as more or less comprehensive classification of personality (Digman, 1990 and McCrae and Costa, 1987). Costa and McCrae (1985) have constructed and standardized NEO-personality inventory to measure the five-factors of personality. Goldberg (1993) has endorsed by saying:

"The prodigious outpouring reports by McCrae R. R. and Costa P.T.Jr. probably did more to form the modern consensus about personality structure than anything else that occurred during the 1980's specifically they used NEO-PI scales as a frame for integrating a wide variety of personality questionnaire".

The new sets of Big-five factor makers were investigated by Lewis R. Goldberg. Goldberg (1992) says "This new maker set can be considered as an alternative to the scales in the NEO and Hogan Personality inventory".

The five factors have traditionally been numbered and labeled as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor - I</td>
<td>Surgency or Extraversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor - II</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor - III</td>
<td>Conscientiousness (Dependability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor - IV</td>
<td>Emotional stability Vs Neuroticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor - V</td>
<td>Intellect or culture or openness to experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


These five-factors are regarded as providers of a more or less comprehensive classification of personality and provide a basis for systematic study of personality.

Emotions may be studied as subjective status. The subjective or psychological well-being is emotion. Bradburn (1969) proposed a measure of well-being based on the balance of positive affect and negative affect. McCrae and Costa (1991) say "intuitively, it is reasonable to suggest that well-being is highest when life contains many pleasures and few pains. Watson and Tellegen (1985) who have studied the structure of affects and have repeatedly found two broad factors, these are interpreted as positive and negative affects, and are akin to the basic psychological phenomena of pleasure and pain. The study of psychological well-being has revealed that positive and negative affect are not the polar opposites that their names suggest but, rather, are relatively independent dimension (Diener and Emmons, 1984) both of which contribute to overall happiness (cf. Costa and McCrae, 1980).

Research studies on the perceived quality of life or satisfaction have found that personal qualities such as age, educational level, income, and so on, account for very little of the variance in satisfaction. (Campbell, et al., 1976, Brickman, et al., 1978). Longitudinal studies of McCrae and Costa (1980, 1987) revealed that measures of satisfaction show substantial stability across periods of many years (Costa and McCrae, 1984; Griffin, 1988; Pulakos and Schmitt, 1983; Schneider and Dachler, 1978a and Staw and Ross, 1985). By reviewing the studies of well-being McCrae and Costa (1991) suggest that happiness and chronic emotional reactions that underlie it are probably best understood as reflections of enduring dispositions.

In 1980, Costa and McCrae proposed a model relating to positive and negative affect and the personality dimensions of neuroticism and extroversion. Specifically, they hypothesized that extroversion leads to positive affect, neuroticism leads to negative affect, and both, indirectly, influence overall happiness. This model has since been widely
replicated (Emmons and Diener, 1985; Hepburn and Eysenck, 1989 and Warr et al., 1983). The explanation for these findings is probably tempermental, that extroverts are simply more cheerful and high-spirited than introverts. The individuals high in neuroticism are more prone to negative affect than those low in neuroticism (McCrae and Costa, 1991). The idea that the tendency to experience positive or negative affect represents a stable on-going dispositional trait in people was proposed by Watson and Clark (1984). They have reviewed a wide variety of research studies in personality and subjective emotional experience, and identified consistently intercorrelations among measures of negative emotions such as anxiety, irritability, self-deprecation and neuroticism, and suggested that negative affectivity is a stable and pervasive tendency to experience aversive emotional states. They found that high negative affectivity individuals are more likely to report distress, discomfort and dissatisfaction, even in absence of any overt objective source of stress; and high negative affectivity scorers have ongoing feelings of distress and nervousness. They tend to dwell on their mistakes, disappointments and short comings and to focus more on the negative aspects of the world in general. In contrast low negative affectivity individuals appear to be more satisfied, self-secured and calm and to focus less on and to be more resilient in response to life's daily frustration and irritations (Watson and Clark, 1984).

Levin and Stokes (1989) studies reveal that negative affectivity is a predicative of task/job-satisfaction. They described that negative affectivity is an individual difference variable characterised by a disposition to experience aversive emotional states. People high in negative affectivity tend to be distressed, agitated, pessimistic and unsatisfied.

Researchers have made attempts to identify the relationship and influence of personality characteristics on job-satisfaction. Rahim (1981) found that personality characteristics such as extrovert-introvert and judging-perceiving influenced job-satisfaction irrespective of occupations. Clement (1980) found subjects with high intellectual levels were more extroverted and less rigid, having higher life-satisfaction and were more emotionally
stable. Porwal (1987) compared certain personality traits of satisfied and dissatisfied teachers, and, found that satisfied subjects tended to be reserved, detached, critical and cool, liked things rather than people, preferred working alone, and avoided compromise, whereas dissatisfied subjects were likely to be easy-going emotionally expressive, ready to co-operate, attentive to people, soft hearted, kind and adaptable with greater probability of interaction with colleagues and worked outside interests.

Mohan and Bali (1988) found that job-satisfaction was related to levels of self-esteem and the extroversion irrespective of different faculty positions. Kirkcaldy et al. (1989) assessed the job-satisfaction profiles of persons, who were working in counselling and helping professions in comparison with population norm scores. This characteristic profile was not affected by work-context, age or gender. But EPQ-Neuroticism was positively correlated with job pressure and dissatisfaction. Extroverts were inclined to be more dissatisfied with their work and yielded higher career motivation scores compared with introverts. There was evidence that the combined effects of traits psychoticism and neuroticism may relate to a composite of general job-dissatisfaction and job-pressure. Shah and Ojha (1989) studied male workers of a factory and office-clerks by administering job-satisfaction Questionnaire, Anxiety scale and EPI. Significant relationship was found between job-satisfaction and personality-factors. Job satisfaction, in both the groups, was positively related to extroversion but negatively related to anxiety, insecurity and neuroticism. Larsen and Ketelaar (1989) found that extroversion was related with response to a positive mood induction whereas neuroticism was related only to negative mood induction. Individual high in extroversion and low in neuroticism are predisposed to be satisfied. Similar results are revealed by the studies of Guha, 1965; Furham and Zacherl, 1986 and Sinha and Prabhat, 1993.

Hong and GiannaKopoulos (1994) administered a self report questionnaire to examine the predicative value of self-esteem, depression, locus of control, trait anger, religiosity, psychological reluctance and age in relation to life satisfaction. Results of
independent regression analysis show that all but psychological reluctance were significant predictors of life satisfaction. The strongest correlation was between life satisfaction and self-esteem. In step-wise analysis self-esteem, depression, trait anger, locus of control and religiousity were significant and together accounted for 26.3 per cent of the variation of life-satisfaction.

Marriage is a way of life for the majority of adults. Successful marriage and the quality of a marriage depend not on luck but on the marriageability of the two people involved, many traits and habit-patterns combine to determine satisfaction in marital life. Lewis M. Terman (1938) made an analysis of the traits of couples. He found differences in traits of the happily and unhappily married people. The happily married women were more likely to show the following characteristics: (1) Kindness to others (2) Do not easily take offense, (3) Not unduly concerned about the impressions they make upon others, (4) Do not look upon social relationships as rivalry situations, (5) Co-operative, (6) Not annoyed by advice from others, (7) Enjoy activities that bring educational and pleasurable opportunities to others, (8) Methodical and painstaking in their work, (9) Careful and (10) Self assurance and optimistic. The unhappily married women showed a different set of personality characteristics. In general, they were as follows: (1) Emotionally tense, (2) Moodiness, (3) Inferiority feelings, (4) Irritable and dictatorial, (5) Egocentric, (6) Impatient and (7) Unsystematic and easy going.

Terman (1938) found that happy husbands having the following characteristics: (1) Emotional stability, (2) Co-operative, (3) Equalitarian, (4) Benevolency, (5) Extroverted, (6) Initiative, (7) Responsible, (8) Attentiveness and (9) Systematic. Unhappy husbands personality traits are as follows: (1) Moodiness, (2) Social inferiority feelings, (3) Irritable, (4) Compensatory, (5) Sadist, (6) Withdrawing, (7) Day dreaming, (8) Sporadic and (9) Unsystematic.

The influence personality has on the interaction that takes place within romantic dyads received increased empirical attention in recent years. The few studies conducted in
this area have provided empirical support for an association between marital-satisfaction/adjustment and personality traits.

Parikh (1980) has studied happily married females and divorced females. The results revealed that happily married females have scored significantly more than the score of divorce female in the following psychological variables: (1) Need for achievement, (2) Need for sentience, (3) Need for affiliations, (4) Need for nurturance, (5) Need for abasement, (6) Need for super-ego integration, (7) Need for conjuctivity, (8) Need for sameness, (9) Need for deliberation, (10) Need for placidity, (11) Need for intensity, (12) Need for endure, (13) Need for intraception and (14) Need for understanding. Also revealed that divorce females have scored significantly more than the score of happily married female in the following personality variables: (1) Need for dominance, (2) Need for aggression, (3) Need for ego-ideal, (4) Need for sex and exhibition, (5) Need for rejection and narcissism, (6) Need for succarance, (7) Need for super-ego conflict, (8) Need for anxiety reaction, (9) Need for negative reaction traits, (10) Need for defendence, (12) Need for harmavoidance and (13) Need for exo-cathection and endo-cathection. He concluded that the personality patterns of happily married female and divorced female are different and they possess more or less opposite personality traits.

Eysenck (1980) interviewed married or divorced men and women and administered the Eysenck personality Questionnaire. The comparison analyses between married and divorced revealed that divorcees were more frequent among high psychoticism or high neuroticism, particularly among women. Extroversion was also related to divorce, but only among the men. He concluded that personality appears to be one among factors involved in marital-satisfaction and divorce. Rancer et al. (1986) examined whether couples similar or dissimilar in the trait of argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness differed in marital-satisfaction. The results revealed that couples dissimilar in argumentativeness reported high level of marital-satisfaction.
Kim et al. (1989) examined the effects of personality characteristics measured by the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, on marital-satisfaction among couples. The source traits identified in stable marriages were intelligence, guilt proneness, dominance, parmia, protection, ego-strength and self-concept, and these couples were more balanced in personality characteristics than the couples who felt their marriages were unsatisfactory. Partners in stable marriages were tenderminded, trusting each other, accepting of others, enthusiastic and genuine.

McCrae and Costa (1991) have viewed the literature on personality traits and affectivity, and say

"Most of the research has focussed on neuroticism and extroversion and to lesser extent on openness to experience. Two major dimensions-agreeableness and conscientiousness have not previously been seen as major determinants of well-being, but a role for them was suggested by Freud in his famous dictum about the need for love and work in a satisfying life".

They have suggested that the relations between the openness to experience dimension of personality and affect are qualitatively different. Open individuals are characterized by a broad and deeper scope of awareness and by a need to enlarge and examine experience, and they are imaginative, aesthetically responsive, empathic, exploring, curious and unconventional. These traits are characteristics of fully functioning individuals and might expect that open men and women would be higher in psychological well-being (McCrae and Costa, 1991). In particular, dimensions of agreeableness and conscientiousness might be hypothesized to have instrumental effects on well-being. Agreeable individuals are warm, generous and loving; conscious people are efficient, competent and hard working. The inter-personal bonds that agreeableness fastens, and the achievement and the accomplishments that conscientiousness promotes may contribute to greater quality of life and higher life satisfaction (McCrae and Costa, 1991).
Infact, however, being open makes relationship awareness. Just as awareness of the self and other has been associated with relationship-satisfaction (Franzoi et al., 1985), attention to relationships has also been linked to well-being.

McCrae and Costa (1991) study results revealed that different dimensions of personality clearly have qualitatively different patterns of association with measure of satisfaction: Neuroticism leads to dissatisfaction or negative affect and less well-being. Extroversion leads to more satisfaction or positive affect and more well-being; Open leads to more of both positive and negative affect or satisfaction and dissatisfaction with no net effect on well-being and both agreeableness and conscientiousness lead to more positive affect and less negative affect, and thus higher levels of well-being. At present, there is much more evidence for the role of neuroticism and extroversion in well-being than for agreeableness and conscientiousness; but there are both theoretical and empirical grounds for the inclusion of measures of all five factors of personality in studies of personality and satisfaction/emotion (McCrae and Costa, 1991).

**FOCUS OF THE STUDY**

Man is a social being. He is an employee, spouse or parent at some time or all the three at a time with his unique personality. He has the responsibility to play the roles in family and in employment in life-process. The life-process is the congruence of three dynamic factors:

1) **Individual** - Consisting of unique personality, aptitudes, perceptions, needs orientation, attitude towards family, job and leisure etc.

2) **Family** - Consisting of culture, members, needs, relations, roles etc.

3) **Job** - Consisting of contexts, demands and rewards.
Job and family environments provide opportunities to make use of his abilities, potentialities, resources etc, in role-enactment for fulfilling the needs of job and family life. Individual performs job-roles to meet demands of job in return for which he gets the rewards, and also he plays roles of spouse and parent utilizing the job-rewards to fulfil the needs of family and self. In this process, individual perceives the needs fulfillment potentiality of job and family, and correspondingly, he develops emotional attachment and psychological identification, which would be measured and adjudged by means of job and family involvement and also job and marital/family satisfaction.

Research results confirmed that the degree of psychological identification in job or family is a function of the perceived potential of job or family for fulfilling the individual's context specific needs. It can be assumed that involvement and satisfaction are related to one another (Kanungo and Misra, 1988 and Pleck, 1985).

Most research and theory to-date has emphasized either rarely positive or mostly negative view of combining family and job-roles. These facts indicate that the researchers have concentrated only on contextually determined roles or behaviour perception and neglected the individual level emotional attachment, psychological identification, and personality traits. A few research results revealed that both wives and husbands reported greater job and family involvement and also greater job and marital-satisfaction (Pleck, 1985).

The influence of personality on the interaction that takes place within romantic dyads has received increased empirical attention in recent years and theorists have argued that positive individual characteristics facilitate the acquisition, development and maintenance of satisfying personal relationship. (Carpenter et al., 1983; Jones, 1985).

A stream of life span research by Costa and McCrae (1977, 1980, 1984) has made amply clear that personality traits are enduring aspects of person presented by introversion/extroversion and neuroticism factors in satisfaction or affectivity.
The contribution of Indian psychologist to job-involvement and job-satisfaction relationship is varied in approach and broader in focus. Research on the nature of involvement suggests that it is a function of both job and individual characteristics. A large number of studies have explored significant and positive relationship between job-involvement and job-satisfaction. (Anantharaman and Kaliappan, 1982; Dhar and Jain, 1992; Kumar and Achamamba, 1993).

Most of the Indian psychologists have studied personality and job-satisfaction from culturally determined perspective of internality i.e, belief in one’s efforts (internal locus of control) and externality i.e, belief in luck, fate or other powerful factors (external locus of control). The considerable body of research using different samples have found that internals’ perceive the pressure less stressful and employ more task-oriented coping behaviour (Rao and Murthy, 1980; Das and Agarwala, 1994; Sharma and Choudari, 1980).

The contribution of psychologists to family studies in India is limited in approach and narrow in focus (Sinha, 1992). A few studies of multiple roles support that common source of stress was excessive pressure and over-load of multiple roles (Srivastava, 1995); and positive personality characteristics contribution to happiness in marriage was identified (Kumar and Rohatgi, 1984, 1985; Kumar and Maniyar, 1991).

These facts imply that there is a need to study job and family interface from multi-dimensional perspective.

Hence, in the present investigation, Multi-dimensional Model (Fig. 1) is conceptualized to assess individual and combined influence of job and family-involvement on job-/marital-satisfaction; and also to identify which personality factors mediate job/family-involvement in job/marital-satisfaction.
OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the present study are:

1) To study the relationship between job-involvement and job-satisfaction.
2) To study the relationship between job-involvement and marital-satisfaction.
3) To study the relationship between family-involvement and marital-satisfaction.
4) To study the relationship between family-involvement and job-satisfaction.
5) To study the relationship between job-involvement and family-involvement.
6) To study the combined influence of job and family involvement on job and marital satisfaction.
7) To study the relationship between each of the Big-five factors of personality and job-satisfaction.
8) To study the relationship between each of the Big-five factors of personality and marital-satisfaction.
9) To study the combined influence of job-involvement and each of the Big-five factor of personality on job-satisfaction.
10) To study the combined influence of family-involvement and each of the Big-five factors of personality on marital-satisfaction.