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CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A. INVOLVEMENT

Sociologists and Psychologists have been using the concepts of commitment and involvement in their researches on family and job.

Commitment has been defined as the binding of an individual to behavioural acts (Bielby and Bielby, 1988; Kiesler, 1971; Salancik, 1977). It involves: (a) The source of meaning (Bielby and Bielby, 1988; Spence and Rosenfeld, 1986), (b) Intentions regarding those behavioural acts, (these two dimensions sometimes referred to as “attitudinal and behavioural commitment” are explicitly recognised in research, Kiesler, 1971), and (c) distribution of behavioural acts (Bielby and Bielby, 1988). It means that the definition has distributional dimension and the individuals distribute or trade off commitments among alternative activities. Consequently activities differ in their relative importance as sources of identity and intentions regarding behaviour are formed with respect to an allocation of time and effort across activities.

Work and family roles are two important sources of identity in adulthood and activities for which individuals form intentions regarding their distribution of time and effort. But, researchers have conceptualized commitment only in one of two ways: One, emphasizing behaviour and the other emphasizing identity as the locus of individual actions. According to behavioural perspective, commitment is conceptualized with respect to situational determinants that sustain a line of activity (Selznick, 1949 and Biener and Gechman, 1977). Johnson (1973) defines “behavioural commitment” as consequences of the initial pursuit of a line of action that constrain the actor to continue that line of action. According to the behavioural
definition, as individuals find themselves engaged in a particular pattern of employment and family responsibilities, subjective attachments are changed to be consistent with those engagements (cf. Bielby, 1992).

According to identity perspective, commitment is conceptualized with respect to personal meaning or identity as the locus of individual action (Burke and Reitzes, 1991; Mowday et al., 1979).

The recent standpoint on commitment to work and family adopts identity approach of the concept (Bielby, 1992). That is, commitment is seen as an attachment that is initiated and sustained by the extent to which an individual's identification with a role behaviour, value or intention is considered to be central among alternatives as a source of identity, (Almgquist and Angrist, 1971; Becker, 1956; Bielby and Bielby, 1984; Morrow, 1983; Rosenfeld and Spenner, 1988). Stryker, (1981) emphasizes that the identity is more likely to generate forces which, in turn, can lead to behavioural consistency in lines of activity.

Research on work or family-commitment emphasizes the measurement of identity by assessing an individual's 'involvement' in work or family, (Kanungo, 1979; Lodhl, 1964). Subsequently, the concepts of job-involvement and family-involvement were used to account for psychological identification with job and family, (Kanungo and Misra, 1988; Lawler and Hall, 1970; Misra et al., 1985; 1990; Yogev and Brett, 1985).

1. JOB-INVOLVEMENT

The concept of job-involvement has gained much importance because of its pivotal role in providing a link between productivity and employee's needs and the quality of working life (Dewhirst, 1973; Hall and Lawler, 1970; Walton, 1972).

Vroom (1962) describes "involvement exists when a person's feelings of esteem are increased by good performance and decreased by bad performance".
Argyris (1964) and McGregor (1960) emphasize “job-involvement as a personal characteristic and a response to organizational conditions”. However, Blauner (1964) is of the opinion that involvement in work may come from personal control, from association with others, and from a sense of purpose.

According to Lodahl (1964), the main determinant of job involvement is a value orientation towards work that is learned early in the socialization process. Bass (1965) has identified five conditions which lead to strengthening of job-involvement. These include the opportunity to make more of job decisions, the feeling that one is making an important contribution to organizational success, achievement, self determination and the freedom to set one’s own work pace. Lodahl and Kcjner (1965) refer to “the job-involvement as the internalization of values about the goodness of work or the importance of work in the worth of a person”. Lawler and Ilall (1970) maintain that job-involvement is seen in terms of psychological identification with work or the importance of work to one’s total self-image. They suggest that job-involvement refers to the degree to which a person’s total work-situation is an important part of his life. The job involved is one who is personally affected very much by his whole job-situation, presumably because he perceives his job as an important part of his self-concept and perhaps as a place to satisfy his important needs.

Farris (1971) holds job-involvement as a function of interaction of a person with his environment. Wanous (1974) believes that an involvement-prone individual will become involved when holding a job with characteristics such as autonomy, variety, challenge, feedback and task identity.

Kanungo, Misra and Dayal (1975) opine that the job-involvement attitude represents the degree to which the total job situation is thought of as being central to one’s life or self-concept. Salch and Hosek (1976) consider job-involvement as the degree to which the person identifies with the job, actively participates in it, and considers his performance important to his self-worth.
Wiener and Gechman (1977) suggest a behavioural approach to the study of job-involvement. They argue that when individuals are committed to a cause, person, activity or institution, they must express this by an overt public act, and commitment-behaviours, which are socially accepted behaviours that exceed formal and/or normative expectations relevant to the object of commitment. After reviewing the researches on job-involvement, Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) concluded that:

a) Job-involvement is related to three classes of working variables: Personal characteristics, situational characteristics and work outcomes. No one class of variables shows clearly stronger relationships to job-involvement than any other.

b) Job-involvement is quite stable.

c) Much of the variance in job-involvement remains unexplained.

d) The data are more consistent with the “importance of work” definition of job-involvement.

e) Job-involvement seems to be a ‘feedback variable’—both a cause and effect of job-behaviour.

f) Personal and situational variables have independent effects on involvement.

g) Situational variables seem to have more effect on the attitudes of low job-involved persons than on highly job-involved persons.

Kanungo (1979) proposes a “motivational approach” to the study of job-involvement. According to this approach, the satisfaction of intrinsic needs might increase the likelihood of job-involvement. The approach also suggests that job-involvement is a cognitive state of psychological identification with the job that depends on the degree to which job is perceived to meet one’s salient needs, be they intrinsic or extrinsic.
Saleh (1981) has identified job-involvement as a “Self involving attitude”, according to him, job-involvement is a multi dimensional concept and the basic dimensions are cognitive, conative and affective.

In the present investigation job-involvement is operationalized as the cognitive state of psychological identification with job that depends on the level to which job is perceived to meet one’s intrinsic and extrinsic needs” (Kanungo, 1982).

2. FAMILY-ININVOLVEMENT

The concept of family-involvement does not have a comparable research-history. Family researchers and psychologists have given the least interest to identify the role of family-involvement in job and marital satisfaction. A few scholars have conceptualized and studied family-involvement as personal involvement in the roles of family. "It is the degree to which the person’s “self” is invested in it and also how important it is to the person’s life. This matter of involvement has implications for identifying how much and what kind of gratification a person expects from the role: a high degree of personal involvement implies he expects to gain from it an expression of the self and the satisfaction of personality and interpersonal needs...... The degree of involvement further suggests the extent to which a person seeks to validate the self in the role, the extent to which the role serves as an identity anchor, the extent to which inadequacies and problems in the role are experienced as ego blows" (Gurin et al., 1960).

Yogev and Brett (1985) defined family-involvement as the degree of psychological identification with family roles, the importance of family roles to person's self-image and self concept and the individual's commitment to family roles.

Misra et al. (1990) define :

"Family involvement as a unidimensional cognitive or belief state of psychological identification with family context, conversely, family alienation represents a
These definitions mean that family-involvement refers to cognitive aspect of individual which represents the magnitude of subjective attachment to the family context and the importance of family roles in the individual's life.

In the present investigation family-involvement is operationalized as a unidimensional cognitive or belief state of psychological identification with family that depends on the level to which family is perceived to meet one's intrinsic and extrinsic needs, (Misra, Ghosh and Kanungo, 1990).

NEED FOR THE STUDY OF JOB AND FAMILY INVOLVEMENT

Kanungo and Misra (1988) describe extensive sociological approaches to explain the nature of relationship between job-involvement and family-involvement: First, the Marxian approach suggested that involvement and alienation from work role, considered central to life, shall generalize to all other life roles. According to this viewpoint one would expect a strong positive correlation between job and family-involvement.

Secondly, the scarcity approach (Marks, 1977) posits that man has a fixed amount of energy which depletes as a result of involvement in given role. According to this, one would expect a strong negative correlation between job and family involvement.

Third approach provides three hypotheses such as generalization, compensation and segmentation (Champoux, 1981; Kanungo and Misra 1984; Wilensky, 1960). The generalization hypothesis, similar to the Marxian approach, suggests that involvement or alienation at job will extend to the family-context. The compensation hypothesis makes the assumption that need deprivation in work context leading to low involvement may accompany compensatory need satisfaction in family context leading to high involvement.

Finally, the segmentation hypothesis suggests that work and family roles are segmented; each role is played within its own context and is independent of the other.
Kanungo's (1979, 1982) "Motivational model" explains involvement in terms of need theoretic constructs. It suggests that the relationship between family- and job-involvement is moderated by the perceived potential of the respective context for need satisfaction. It is predicted that within each context, an individual’s involvement will be positively correlated with the perceived potential of that context to satisfy his/her needs (Kanungo, 1979, 1982; Kanungo and Misra, 1988).

Individuals are playing different roles in the life process. Sometimes as workers, spouses and parents or all three at a time. Individual behavioural shifts or shares in job and family domains have generated considerable debate about their social significance. Both progressive and conservative commentators lament change in involvement to the family and to long term love relationships and other forms of intimate bonds, and they question whether individuals still seek significant involvement with the institution of the family (Bielby 1992). Others challenge the presumption that increasing variety in family and house-hold arrangements indicate a declining involvement in the family (Bielby, 1992).

Much of the research focusses on the job and family relationships, specially, on work-family role conflict (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985; Kopelman, Greenhaus and Connolly, 1983, Voydanoff, 1988) work stressors (Guelzow et al, 1991; Bolger et al., 1990), shares an imagery of the intersection of work and family as a social "problem" (Greenhaus, 1989), work-nonwork stress (Greenhaus and Parasuraman, 1986), multiple roles and psychological stress, (Barnett et al, 1992). All these researchers have considered job and family as mutually constraining. These research conceptualizations overlook how job and family are integrated in ways that contribute meaning to the day-to-day lives of individuals (Bielby, 1992). These researchers are often inclined to deduce the involvement in job and family from knowledge of changes in behaviour rather than examining through the psychological identification of the individual with job and family. Job and family domains are more than just complications, they are the sources of meaning and identity to which man and woman apportion commitment. An adequate understanding of the job and family interface
requires identification of cross relationship between job-involvement and family-involvement and there combined influence on job-/marital-satisfaction.

One of the aims of the present investigation is to identify the relationship between job-involvement and family-involvement, further, their combined influence on job-/marital-satisfaction.

B. SATISFACTION

There has been an increasing effort to conceptualize and measure the quality of life beyond the level of material well-being. One of the first major attempts to measures subjective feelings about well-being was carried out by Hadley Cantril (1965). This study gave broader scope to the use of indices of satisfaction with job, family and leisure time activities etc. A more systematic treatment of the subjective aspects of well being was developed by Angus Campbell et al. (1976). They have provided a general model for the consideration of subjective indicators. They have maintained that the attributes of objective conditions are perceived and evaluated according to particular standards to determine a certain level of satisfaction with regard to specific domains of life. Satisfaction in various domains provides the basis for the individual to arrive at a overall state of well-being. The domains of life refer to areas or to aspects of the environment of the individual and the relative importance of the various domains to the general sense of well-being depends upon the importance of the various domains of the individual.

While reviewing subjective indications and quality of life, Wilkening (1982) says “In addition to satisfaction with various life domains and overall life satisfaction there are other general measures of individual well-being, such as happiness that are more affective and less cognitive in nature” (P-430).

In differentiating satisfaction and happiness Wilkening (1982) suggests that satisfaction is based upon the perceived relationship between standards and attainments, whereas, happiness is based upon one’s emotional tone and it varies more with mood and the
situation at a particular time.

Family and job are the major areas or domains of one’s life (Kline and Cowan, 1989) in which the needs of the individual, couples, parent-child relationships, and employment persist and attempts are made to fulfill them. In the process of fulfilling the salient needs individuals experience marital and job satisfaction. Though marital and job satisfaction are major aspects of individuals life, they are studied separately by the researchers.

3. MARITAL-SATISFACTION

Researchers have used the concepts of marital happiness, marital success and marital adjustment to study marital quality of couples. (Adams, 1946; Bentler and Newcomb, 1978; Calhoun and Acocella, 1978; Cole, et al., 1980; D-Souza, A.A. 1979; Glenn and McLanahan, 1982; Kumar and Maniyar, 1991; Kumar and Rohatgi, 1985; Terman, 1938). Roach et al. (1981) has described that marital happiness, marital success and marital adjustments refer to the static states, levels of achievement or ultimate conditions, none of which is a realistic conceptualization of the interrelational dynamics of marriage. Moreover the meaning of these phenomena of success, adjustment and happiness, although related are dissimilar. They have argued that historically, most studies dealing with the quality of marriages have in actuality used the inventories of marital adjustment rather than measure of attitude or satisfaction. This view suggests that the marital-satisfaction is the indicator of marital quality.

Marital-satisfaction, as defined by Rice (1979), is the person’s evaluation of the extent to which his or her individual needs are fulfilled through the husband-wife interaction or the extent to which each marital partner feels that he or she receives from the other partner the feelings, attitudes, services and goods needed.

Marital-satisfaction, as defined by Bahr et al. (1983), is a subjective evaluation of the overall quality of marriage, it is the degree to which the needs, desires and expectations are met in marriage.
These definitions mean that marital satisfaction is affective conceptualization developed by the spouse/spouses in the family relationship as a result of fulfillment of needs.

In this study, marital-satisfaction is operationalised as “the perception of one’s marriage along a continuum of greater or lesser favourability at a given point in time” (Roach et al., 1981). It means that marital-satisfaction is an attitude which is like any perception and is subject to change over time and especially in relation to significant life-experiences.

4. JOB-SATISFACTION

Hoppock’s (1935) pioneering studies draw the attention of scientists and administrators to the concept of “Job-satisfaction”. He described that different levels of satisfaction are related to different occupational levels, and within an occupational level each of the occupation-groups showed considerable range of job-satisfaction. Explanation of individual variations in job-satisfaction has become one of the major considerations.

Researchers have developed theories and approaches to explain job-satisfaction emphasizing individual, organizational and interpersonal variables (Locke, 1976; Davis, 1984; Lawler, 1973; Kanungo, 1982; Kumar, 1986; Schaffer, 1953 and Vroom, 1964).

Schaffer (1953) emphasizes variables within the individuals as contributing to satisfaction and to dissatisfaction. He suggests that there is some psychological set or mechanism that operates to make people satisfied or dissatisfied in general.

Lawler's model of job-satisfaction predicts that when perceived equitable rewards exceed the actual rewards, dissatisfaction would result; and when actual rewards exceed the perceived equitable rewards, satisfaction would result, (Lawler, 1973).

Locke's theory (1976) suggests that it is more reasonable to expect that the relative importance of each of the factors of job also plays a role in one's overall level of job-satisfaction. So, overall job-satisfaction is the sum of satisfactions with different aspects
of the job and importance attached to each of the elements.

From expectancy perspective, job-satisfaction depends on the match between expected and obtained rewards (Porter and Lawler, 1968). From valence and force perspective (Vroom, 1964) the individuals report of their job-satisfaction as an extent to which jobs provide them rewarding outcome; the more a person reports valuing these outcomes, the greater is the positive effect on his job-satisfaction. The process-theories of job-satisfaction consider job-dimensions as not only causally relevant but also how they combine to determine overall job-satisfaction.

Job-satisfaction is the nucleus in the organisation behaviour. Many psychologists have defined and explained the concept of job-satisfaction. Gilmer (1961) explains job-satisfaction or dissatisfaction as the result of various attitudes the person holds towards his job, toward related factors and towards life in general.

Benjamin and Robert (1975) conceptualized job-satisfaction as a personalistic evaluation of conditions existing on the job or outcomes that arise as a result of having a job.

Locke (1976) has defined that job-satisfaction as a pleasure or positive emotional state resulting from the perception of one's job-fulfilling or allowing the fulfillment of one's important job values, provided these values are compatible with one's needs.

Davis (1984) defined that job-satisfaction as the favourableness or unfavourableness with which employees view their work and it expresses amount of agreement between one's own expectations of job and the rewards the job provides.

In this study, job-satisfaction is operationally defined as the reflection of value of cognitive state of psychological involvement with the works of job (Kanungo, 1982). It expresses that each individual has needs and expectations in the job context. According to the importance attached to needs, the individual seeks to satisfy them in job context through instrumental behaviour. The out-come of performance-behaviour provides satisfaction
corresponding to contextual needs fulfillment; consequently, the individual develops attitude and conceptualizes perceived potential of job in satisfying the pattern of needs. Correspondingly the individual’s psychological identification with job formulates, and it persuades the individual to be involved in the job, which reflects in his job-satisfaction. This motivational model definition means that job-involvement and job-satisfaction co-vary and job-satisfaction is the affective state of psychological identification.

C. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INVOLVEMENT AND SATISFACTION

Since early 1970’s there has been a steady increase in the interest of psychologists concerning the nature and origins of overall satisfaction or well-being (Omodei and Wearing, 1990). In a recent review of both the theoretical and empirical research in subjective well-being or overall satisfaction, Diener (1984) noted that there was an almost total reliance on need-satisfaction or goal attainment models to the exclusion of activity models. This important distinction is between theories that locate overall satisfaction in the attainment of desired end states (Telic theories) and those that locate satisfaction in the movement toward such end-states (Autotelic theories) (Omodei and Wearing, 1990).

The understanding of Telic and Autotelic theoretical positions reveals two major points of convergence: (1) Both perspectives acknowledge the importance of the alternative approach as representing an independent account of the origins of satisfaction, and (2) both suggest that persons are more likely to allow themselves to become involved in the activities that they perceive to be likely to meet their needs (Omodei and Wearing, 1990). Schachtel (1959) argue that concern with the satisfaction of basic needs is an ever-present aspect of human functioning. He argued that it is only when one experiences basic needs as being met that one has available the time and the attentional resources to engage in allocentric perception (i.e., in intrinsically rewarding involvement). Omodei and Wearing (1990) opined that the perceived potential for need-satisfaction leads to involvement. This constitutes a more
fundamental point of theoretical convergence. Csikszentmihalyi (1985) has suggested that the end states leads to involvement because they give closure and meaning to an activity, presumably by providing sufficient grounds for the restriction of attention to relevant stimuli.

What is common to both Telic and Autotelic theories attempt to account for a causal link between perceived opportunities for need-fulfillment and involvement is the suggestions that persons exert voluntary control over the allocation of attention and that involvement is the outcome of the deliberate focusing of attention on only those stimuli that are judged to be relevant to an activity. An important implication of these considerations is that the perception of opportunities for need-satisfaction leads to both (a) the experience of involvement, and (b) behaviour that results in the satisfaction of needs (Omodei and Wearing, 1990).

Omodei and Wearing (1990) opined that need-satisfaction and involvement are conceptually distinct sources of overall satisfaction or well-being that overlap empirically, because they share a common sources in the perception of opportunities for need-satisfaction. Similarly, Kanungo (1979) explained that the phenomenon of involvement in terms of need theoretic constructs. In his 'Motivational Model'; involvement is assumed to be the function of the perceived potential of the context for satisfying the individual context specific needs.

An assessment of relationship between: (a) job-involvement and job-satisfaction, and (b) family-involvement and marital-satisfaction is one of the primary objectives of the present investigation.

5. PERSONALITY

The scientists who defined personality have conceptualized in one of the three ways: First, from one's external appearance or behaviour or role or social stimulus, Second: from one's awareness of self as a permanent organizing force, Third: One's particular pattern or organisation of measurable traits both inner and outer areas.
Definitions within the framework of self and traits generally imply that there is consistency and stability in human behaviour patterns.

It has been found that no definition of personality is completely satisfactory, but the definition of personality given by Allport (1961) is widely accepted. He says: "Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psycho-physical systems that determine his characteristics behaviour and thought".

The venture of describing and assessing personality by characteristic descriptions or adjectives was initiated from "Sir Francis Galton's lexical hypothesis" - namely that the most important individual difference in human transactions will come to be encoded as single terms in some or all of the world's languages (cf. Goldberg, 1993). The process of identifying personality trait-descriptive terms has been continuing through Allport and Odbert (1936), Cattell (1943, 1947), Thurstone (1934, 1951), Tupes and Christal (1958, 1961), Norman (1963, 1967), Borgatta (1964), Smith (1967), Peabody and Goldberg (1989). Presently, Goldberg (1992) investigated "the Big-Five factor structure of personality" that has emerged as personality descriptor and assessor with convinced reliability and validity.

Similar five factor structures of personality based on other sets of variables have been reported by a number of investigators. (Borgatta, 1964, Digman and Inonye, 1986; McCrae and Costa, 1985, 1987).

Goldberg (1993) says "At present, one could argue that there are two five factor models, one developed by McCrae and Costa and operationalized in the NEO personality inventory, and the other associated with studies based on the lexical hypothesis". These Big five factors have traditionally been numbered and labeled: as Factor I - Surgency (or extroversion); Factor II - Agreeableness, Factor III - Conscientiousness, Factor IV - Emotional stability Vs Neuroticism and Factor V - Culture. More recently factor V has been reinterpreted as "Intellect" and "openness to experience".
In this investigation, personality is operationalized as "a unique emissory of integrated factors, which have dynamic influence on psychological processes and behaviour". It means that each individual has all factors of traits. A factor represents a common nature of some traits, which is the source for predicting a pattern of behaviour; and also explanatory of the manner of reaction in which the individual has reacted more or less similarly and successfully in the past to similar situations in which one was similarly motivated. The magnitude of development of each trait depends on the hereditary endowment and nurture. Therefore, one individual differs from another on a particular trait.

The factors are dynamic which means that a situation may provide an opportunity for characteristic interaction among the traits to predominate the "recessive" factor of the traits to face the situation.

Definition means that each person has all the traits and those traits interact with one another to create a representation of themselves resulting in a "unique personality" having one of the factors predominant expression and other factors being recessive in their expression. The dominant and recessive factors have interactional influence on individual psychological processes and behaviour depending on the situation.

In this investigation, Goldberg's Big-Five factors of personality are used to measure personality. The definition of each of the Big-Five factors is as follows:

Factor I - Surgency: It is concerned with the preferences for social interaction and lively activity with the disposition of being verbally talkative, assertive, energetic, bold, daring, vigorous unrestrained and extroverted.

Factor II - Agreeableness: It refers to the concern for others with the disposition of being kind, co-operative, agreeable, warm, sympathetic, considerate, helpful, generous and trustful.

Factor III - Conscientiousness: It refers to individual organization and achievement with
the disposition of being systematic, careful, practical, neat, efficient, thorough, prompt and steady.

Factor IV - Emotional stability: It refers to reasonableness and judiciousness with the disposition of being unemotional, unenvious, independent, placid, imperturbable, objective, undemanding and relaxed.

Factor V - Intellect: It refers to perception and understanding with disposition of being introspective, imaginative, creative, artistic, innovative, deep, intellectual and philosophical.